

**Minutes of the Region 13. Nueces Flood Planning Group Meeting
 March 28th, 2022 from 11:30 A.M. to 1:30PM
 McMullen County EOC | 306 Live Oak Street | Tilden, Texas**

LISTEN ONLY OPTION VIA ZOOM:

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82662268207>
 Dial by phone: 877 853 5257 US Toll-free
 Meeting ID: 826 6226 8207

Agenda:

1) Call to Order & Roll Call

Chairman, LJ Francis, called the meeting to order at 11:35 p.m.

Voting Members:

David Baker	Electric Generating Utilities	Present
Debra Barrett	Agricultural	Absent
Larry Dovalina – Vice Chairman	Water Utilities	Present
LJ Francis - Chairman	Municipalities	Present
Sky Lewey	River Authorities	Proxy (Suzanne DiPiazza)
Shanna Owens -Secretary	Counties	Proxy (Susan Boutwell)
Jeff Pollack	Industries	Absent
JR Ramirez	Water Utilities	Present
Adnan Rajib	Public	Absent
Andrew Rooke	Small Business	Present
Larry Thomas	Flood Districts	Present
Lauren Hutch Williams	Environmental	Present

Guest:

Ellyn Weimer	CDM Smith	
Stacy Barna	CDM Smith	
David Wright		
Tressa Olsen	TWDB	
Jim Tolan	TPWD	
Britni Van Curan	Atascosa County	911 Rural Addressing/Subdivision
Kennard Bubba Riley	Atascosa County	County Commissioner Pct 4
Robert A Williams	City of Jourdanton	Mayor
Sarah West	Freese & Nichols	Stormwater Engineering
Susan Boutwell	San Patricio County	Flood Plain Management
Luke Whitmire	BCRAGD	Surface Water Science Manager
Travis Pruski	Nueces River Authority	Director of Planning
Kristi Shaw	HDR	
Bryan Martin	HDR	
Suzanne DiPiazza	Nueces River Authority	
Online Attendance	Beatriz Rivera	Jayni Saenz

2) Prayer

Chairman, LJ Francis, led the prayer

3) Public Comment:

Travis Pruski: one person – Lisa McCracken with US Corps of Engineers on Zoom but is having audio difficulty. Will try to chat with her. Would like to do a presentation at the May meeting on the upcoming project that would be beneficial to the Nueces Basin.

4) Approval of minutes from the January 31, 2022 meeting

Motion to approve minutes as presented made by David Baker and seconded by Larry Dovalina.
Motion passed unanimously.

5) TWDB updates/presentation

Tressa Olsen:

- a) The Region 13 contract amendment was executed on February 18, 2022. Working with John Byrum of the Nueces River Authority and HDR (Tech Consultants) to amend the subcontract
- b) As far as the Tech Memo, TWDB is still reviewing and will provide comments for the first set of deliverables in April and the second set of comments in May.
- c) On February 15, 2022, TWDB provided a media package to assist any groups in expanding and deepening their outreach in public awareness efforts
- d) Also recently sent out newsletter which included information regarding the 60-day public comment period for the draft plan (which should be built in the cycle)
- e) Also sent out an email with a guidance on FMS voting (reviewed and approved on their own – one by one.). You can do batch voting if there is enough time ahead so you may review everything and the opportunity to discuss anything in a meeting. TWDB is deferring to planning groups on how they wish to proceed but wanted to allow for some flexibility.
No other discussion or comments

6) Discussion and possible action – Update of Stakeholder Outreach and Roadshows

Bryan Martin:

- a) This was a two-step process. 1) Reached out to individual stakeholders in Subregion A – Upper Basin: Met with Frio County, and plan to meet with Medina County, Subregions B & C – Mid Basin: Met with Dimmit County, Webb County, Atascosa County, Live Oak County, Wilson County, Zavala County, and Subregion D – Lower Basin: Met with Aransas County. 2) Interviewed floodplain administrators and/or flood management individuals to gather input on missing flood prone areas and any urgent project needs. A draft list of projects and maps were provided in advance of the meeting and used to gather a) any projects that are no longer under consideration; b) any projects missing; and c) funding for projects; Additional information sought on flood plains management standards & policies, and regional coordination. Note: Prior to roadshows, the HDR team worked on contact list to make sure they were reaching out to the right individuals.
- b) Roadshow meeting: First meeting was in Leakey, Texas on March 21st for Subregion A – Upper Basin. The Mid Basin Roadshow was on March 8th in Cotulla for Subregions B & C and Subregion D – Lower Basin was held on March 22nd in Sinton. The Lower Basin meeting was also attended by the National Weather Service, USGS and Texas A&M University. At these roadshows, an update was given on the last year. Had another opportunity to for input (similar questions to Agenda item 6a). There was opportunity for regional collaboration; answering questions ‘What can we do together?’, ‘What are the

local flood emergency responses?', 'What administration and legislation needs would help them to do their job better?'. The information gathered was used to 1) update by adding additional flood prone areas – the new information was given high priority for mapping in our database and 2) identified areas with a lack of drainage study that can identify flooding problems. With all the outreach with different individuals, we were able to work on refining our project list.

- c) We have a total of 345 projects/evaluations/strategies: 220 for Flood Management Projects (FMP), 62 for Flood Management Evaluations (FME)(when you hear the word evaluations, think studies), and 63 for Flood Management Strategies (FMS) (a strategy is something that doesn't quite fit in the projects or studies). [Kristi Shaw: Once we are able to confirm, by April 8th, the additional inputs, some of these can be projects/evaluations/strategies can be combined. By May, the list will be updated with new numbers.]
- d) We also asked for feedback on the goals. Asked what goals resonate the most importance for the communities in the various subregions. In Mid Basin, increase funding for both maintenance and floodplain administrators scored high. Throughout entire basin, improved mapping scored high (70% of basin lacks mapping). Improve regional coordination especially in data sharing and flood warning system. We will make recommendations on additional projects, evaluations, and strategies in high-risk areas.

Kristi Shaw: (Summary of the roadshows and stakeholder engagement interviews) Very successful especially in the Mid Basin where we have historically had very little information. It was great to have the community fill in the gaps and talk about their concerns. There are a few goals that are very important to the flood planning group that were described. Just because it scored low here doesn't mean those goals were off the table. We are expecting to have a updated list at the May meeting. The draft plans are due in August. What we hope to achieve in May is to be able to say this is where we are as far as the flood hazards, here are the areas to prioritize, here are ongoing studies, and opportunities in other areas.

Discussions: For some counties with no information there are aware of issues and challenges, but they lack funding and or staff to be able to implement any of the projects. Some have given us information on their flood prone areas. Information will be pulled into the flood risk map in the next update. Other counties, with 'zero' totals, are in other Flood Planning Groups and we won't have their data. Once we put together updated maps, we will coordinate with other Flood Planning Groups to make sure any projects (that extend to our region where there is a high risk) are identified for those areas. We are working hard to get as much as we can into the draft plan in June. When we initially did the roadshows in May 2021, the process was just being started. For those who are just now getting started, we will have a 'place holder' in the draft plan to revisit for the revised plan in 2023. No further discussion or questions.

7) Discussion and possible action – Presentation: Sabinal/Medina River Flood Warning System

Larry Thomas: PowerPoint presentation Flood Early Warning Systems (FEWS)

- a) What is a Flood Early Warning System (FEWS)? 1) Strategically located hydrological monitoring stations designed to collect continual near real-time data. 2) Data is transmitted via satellite to resources such as websites and social media outlets. 3) Accessible for use as needed before, during and post flooding events.
- b) What is the Importance of having a FEWS? 1) Ability to provide existing potentials and near real-time data of forthcoming hydrologic conditions which may precede significant flooding. 2) Preparedness: Aiding in protection of human life, livestock, reduction of property damage, overall public safety, transportation, emergency response, utilities, post flood catastrophic, and economical impact cost reductions.
- c) What Hydrologic Parameters are typically monitored for the FEWS? 1) Rainfall: Near real-time intensity 2) Water Surface Stage: Also referred to as Gage-Height (ght) 3) River Water Flow: Also referred to as Discharge and reported in cubic feet per second (cfs)
Rainfall totals and intensity combined with the river state response provides a better presumptive analysis of the river travel times providing an early flood warning scenario.

Describing a rapid rise in water surface stage value from 3.5 to 15+ ght is an important component of Flood-Warning-Awareness.

- d) Potential Flood Inundation | Flood Risk Communication: BCRA GD, USGS, and the National Weather Service (NWS) continually monitors all FEWS gages and existing stream gages within the storm's path for all events likely to cause flooding.
- Resource tools used include:
 - BCRA GD Home Page (bcragd.org)
 - Available USGS internet access (usgstx.gov)
 - Social media access (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
 - USGS Flood information mapping tools (<https://webapps.usgs.gov/infrm/fdst/?region=tx>)
 - National Weather Service (NWS.gov)
 - The NWS developed a simplified fast loading radar website called Local Standard Radar (https://www.weather.gov/radar_lite)
 - Independent internet resources (i.e., WindyWeather.com)
- e) In response to feedback for emergency managers, the National Weather Service, NWS has developed a simplified fast loading radar website called 'Local Standard Radar' https://www.weather.gov/radar_lite. Larry had handouts with additional resources.

Comments: 1) For our area, two basic types of flooding which FEWS look at are the large riverine events and urban and small stream floods. In addition, rainfall data is needed to predict those types of floods. Depending on location, two different types of FEWS may be needed and 2) in addition to having these systems, flood response programs should be in place in case of floods are in the area.

No further discussion or questions.

- 8) Discussion and possible action – Presentation: Cotulla Water Study (Larry Dovalina) – Stacy Barna and Ellyn Weimer with CDM Smith will conduct presentation:
- a) Larry Dovalina: The City of Cotulla realized the Corps of Engineers had done very little work in mapping; we had to do an additional study. The City of Cotulla, like many cities, is rural and is hard to attract residents. The only residence and the land that is available (or the cheapest) is land next to a creek. They have a flood plain going up a hill.
 - b) Stacy Barna with CDM Smith: Been working with the City of Cotulla for many years now. This is a great success story out of the Flood Infrastructure Fund. This project is one in the initial round of funding. As Mr. Dovalina mentioned, many of the previous maps the City had been using were archaic. The city really needed an updated map to see who does and doesn't belong in the flood area or what should be considered in the flood area. Ellyn will be going through the project itself; she is one of the main water resource engineers who worked on the project.
 - c) Ellyn Weimer: A little background on the study. It was for the City of Cotulla. We looked at both the Mustang Creek and the Nueces River bounded by I-35 and down to where they are confluent. The study limited its focus on the Nueces River and Mustang creek through the city. {Slide showing the effective Floodplain FIRM done in 1976} The study conducted was based on observations that the floodplain was potentially too wide. On the east side of the map, Flood Zone A, takes up half of the city's boundary. Looking at the hydrology (methodology and modeling) how we updated the floodplain. 1) For Mustang Creek, we ended up deleting ~ 18 square miles. The 1% chance flow was about 1,810 cfs 2) For the Nueces River: it was ~ 5,170 square miles to the confluence with Mustang Creek. We ended up using a gage analysis with USGS in order to determine the drainage as well as the flow area which ended up being about 40,000 cfs. 3) Once we got our hydraulics and flows, we used HEC-RAS where we deleted cross sections developed from DEM and survey data. Survey was conducted on Mustang Creek and did a floodway analysis using high water marks to perform calibration of the models. Issues with access to Nueces River Survey crossings, so moved study to limited detail. 4) Display of 'Proposed Floodplain (County)' Contains extents of flooding for study area both inside City limits and in La Salle County. 5) Proposed FIRM (Flood Insurance Rate Map) i) Firm limited to City boundaries based on existing extents of FIRM and affected properties, ii) greatly reduces the extent of the floodplain from existing

FIRM and iii) potential for La Salle County to submit for entire floodplain, but further coordination is needed to determine impact. 6) The big takeaway is all the affected properties. With the updated studies in the existing FIRM, there is about 763 properties that are under the floodplain. With the proposed, there are 210 within the city limits. So removed 553 properties from the floodplain. It did add about 12 properties due to updated extents of City limits and floodplain study. Properties in proposed floodplain (for the county) is 342. A large portion of those outside the city limits are agricultural and based on aerial observation and do not contain structures within the floodplain.

- d) Larry Dovalina: We did the study in order to reduce the need for individuals building new houses and 'roadmaps' to be forced to purchase flood insurance (which is about \$4,000 to \$5,000 per year). By doing this study, we can use that map to develop the remaining portion of the land that surrounds this area to be able to continue to grow.
- e) Stacy Barna: The study was submitted last week to be reviewed. May have it approve withing next six months. Any questions:

Questions and answers: 1) Have you considered future conditions? Have you built that in to protect people from building in areas that could be possibly in a floodplain in the future? Mr. Dovalina: First thing they needed to do was get an accurate map. In the building standards, we require 'close flow' and 'free flow' to be considered by the property developer. We require you to do an attention or retention basin as you develop. 2) Was this open for public input process and was what were residents thinking about the study and the proposed reduction in the flood plains? Stacy Barna: Maps were posted at city hall and in newspaper; I don't believe there were any public comments on the revise maps to date. Mr. Dovalina: There is a lot of interest from new landowners who had to mortgage their land and the mortgage required them to get flood insurance. No further discussions.

9) Discussion and possible action – Status of Flood Risk Mapping and Draft Projects for the 2023 Regional Flood Plan

- a) Kristi Shaw: We had individual interviews at the regional roadshows that went well. Several individuals stated that they had material to provide to us. We are asking for the materials by April 8th so we can have all the identification of the FME/FMS/FMPs to be included in Draft Plan based on ongoing project nailed down. That also gives us a kind of a 'close' on the flood prone area input. We gathered flood prone input from several meetings including roadshows and then publishing a map on Region 13 website for public input. That information rolls into update for Task 2 which is the existing/future flood risk analyses. Updated maps are anticipated to be available by our next meeting. Some of that information receive also includes the Cotulla study that was just discussed. As Brian has mentioned, we assimilated that to the inundation mapping, We are making all of that information consistent holding it into the risk evaluation that we preformed previously and being able to update those maps. We will have to update flood risk maps and the greatest needs maps prepared by May 9th in time for the next meeting on May 16th. We will bring that information to the group. In the meantime, between now and then, we are also looking into areas where there are gaps. We anticipate with that even with the processing of new information by others, if we have identified that need in the past, the need will likely still be there. We are taking advantage of some of the efficiencies in that schedule to be able to refine our areas with current projects and show on the maps, to identify potential projects that might help in those gaps areas where there aren't any identified currently. The schedule also shows the concurrent work we are working on. In fact, we are working on one regarding the admin regulatory legislative recommendations that shows explicitly here on Task 8. We took advantage of the opportunity when we were reaching to these stakeholders and asked some questions that are helping to inform the other tasks; that information will be available to subcommittees and others that dive into the details. After the May meeting, we have a June 27th meeting. We talked about a tentative meeting in July; that will be important. The plan is due in the beginning of August. If we are able to get a firm understanding of the projects that are going to be evaluated and included in the plan at the May 16th meeting, then we will be able to present a summary of the results of that in the June 27th meeting as well as some intern drafts in sections that go to the plan. A July meeting would give the planning group an opportunity to adopt so

that we have time to make any changes necessary to submit to TWDB in August. Once it is submitted in August, there is a timeframe that we are sharing as well. There is a 120-day period for some agencies, some it is 90 days. It is also where we will hold the public comment meeting to get input on the draft plan which will be available on the Region 13 website so people can look at it and formulate questions. We will convene as a group to talk about the comments that have come through and make some decisions as to moving forward in adopting the final plan for submittal. Once we put together that list (the week of May 9th), we will send that out to the flood planning group members and if you notice there are any projects you feel should be included that aren't included and or have agencies interested in sponsoring a project where we might have one, that would be helpful. And we will talk about it as a group at the May 16th meeting (date correction).

- b) Bryan Martin: Recommendation of projects – to identify projects to meet 1) greatest needs and 2) goals. (Displaying Map) The areas with the darker tones are the areas of the greatest needs. We also have a list of ten goals. We will be working on those between this meeting and the May 16th meeting. TWDB has specific requirements that must be evaluated for all FMP/FME/FMS during the next month into June. There is a lot of criteria the board must look at (e.g., community need, cost estimate, flood risk reduction, ...). We will have an update at the next meeting.

Discussion regarding flood risk mapping (contribution from roadshows information, categories and other factors producing map), interactive tool on Region 13 website, tide surges, USGS data from storm surges sensors, the Texas General Land Office and their coastal resiliency plan, subsidence impacts, and lack of warning systems in our region. These issues will be taken up with the subcommittee (Agenda item # 11) meetings.

10) Discussion and possible action – Coastal Rise Scenarios for Future Flood Condition Analysis

- a) Kristi Shaw: (Introduction) Sarah West has been attending our meetings; she is with Freese & Nichols and is in our team. They have put together this Coastal Rise Analyses presentation and we are wanting to share background information today. Also look at the work that has been done and go home with a recommendation on what assumption to use moving forward.
- b) Sarah West: we are going to talk about Task 2 specifically. This is Future Conditions Flood Risk Analyses – coastal related is the discussion that we are going to have today. The purpose of this presentation today is to understand the 1) Project Task Scope 2) Available Data Sources that we can utilize 3) Sea Level Rise Projection Scenarios 4) Region 13- Data Sources (specific to our region) to Consider and 4) Path Forward, we would like to get some recommendations.

1) Scope is to perform future conditions flood exposure analysis – Task 2B: Future Conditions Flood Risk

- Identify who and what might be harmed for the 100 year and 500-year flood events, and we will look at existing and future with 'no action' scenario (30-year projection) and we will also need to consider anticipated relative sea level change and subsidence based on existing information.
- Analyses are based on the use of existing and available data such as: FIRMs or other flood inundation maps, available hydraulic flood modeling results, model-based or other geographic screening tools for identifying flood prone areas and other relevant technical analysis that RFPG determines to be most updated or reliable.
- Available Data Sources (Previous Studies)
 - (i) In 1987, the National Research Council put together a study called Responding to Changes in Sea Level: Engineering Implications and that developed sea level rise (SLR) / change (SLC) scenarios and the NRC study leverage by USACE & NOAA: This is main resource for all present-day estimates. (This is a historical look at sea level rise)
 - (ii) In 2013, the USAC put together the Incorporating Sea Level Change in the Civil Works Programs to provide design guidelines.
 - (iii) More recently, in 2017, NOAA did the Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the US.

- (iv) In 2021, the GLO published their Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study, and this utilizes the NOAA 2017 data and prepared inundation mapping of the entire coast of Texas.
- (v) NOAA did provide an update in 2022. They put out a Sea Level Rise Technical Report and updated their 2017 report and data.
- Giving a background on sea-level rise projection scenarios and what goes into the change in sea-level
 - (i) Global Sea Level Change (GSLC) and Relative Sea Level Change (RSLC) and certain factors include thermal expansion of ocean water, melting of mountain glaciers, melting of Greenland glaciers, and the possibility that Antarctic glaciers could slide into the ocean. So, those are the global macro factors.
 - (ii) Local Uncertainty factors that contribute to the dynamics which are: regional hydrodynamics, ocean circulation patterns, hydrologic cycles (riverine flow) and subsidence/ uplift. Those are all factors that went into the NOAA studies that they considered when they considered their projects/their work.
- More background on NOAA's work and what goes into the sea level rise projection scenarios. NOAA has developed several different scenarios (in table which correlates with USACE scenarios)). The graph displays the different projections of sea-level rise based on different scenarios. 1) The first scenario is the Low scenario (NOAA and USACE call it the same thing) This scenario assumes that the past trends continue. A linear trend based on past observations. 2) The next scenario is the Intermediate-Low, based on what NOAA description is (and USACE calls it Intermediate). It uses the NRC Curve 1 and is corrected for the local rate of vertical land movement. This starts to include land subsiding or land rise. And it is kind of assuming a low value for the global sea-level change and it does not include glacier melt in this scenario. That is the second level. (This is the one typically used for design.) 3) The next up is the Intermediate. (USACE doesn't have a breakout, they only have three.) Similar to the previous one, but with higher emissions and temperature changes. 4) Next is the intermediate High (USACE calls this one High) and this one, starts taking into consideration some glacier melts 5) and finally the NOAA has High and is similar to the previous one but now assuming higher glacier melts. This is where you see the lines diverge from each other.
- Region 13 specific input on what kind of data sources to consider. As mentioned earlier, part of our scope is to try to utilize sources with information already out there. 1) Existing conditions what we are looking at for the benchmark is the FEMA FIRMs maps. 2) For future conditions, we can utilize the NOAA data, or we can potentially utilize this GLO Coastal Texas Study, and this is what I am going to talk about next.
- The NOAA Data – Sea Level Rise Viewer (go to <https://coast.noaa.gov/sir/> to view – interactive map). The View will show impacts of sea level changes. If it changes one foot, how much would it cause the inundation to change. It is a screen level tool. NOAA Data does not provide the 100-year/500-year info. You could utilize the NOAA data to extrapolate for the 100 year/500 year. Demonstrating how interactive map works.
- More specific into the actual data in the technical report. This is a global project that also looked at regional factors contributing to sea level change. It had a 100-year outlook based on various scenarios (a hundred years into the future). The data they provided can be extrapolated from graphs and applied to a digital terrain model to see what the inundation would be based on sea level rise. There is a potential we could end up with inconsistencies with other studies (Coastal Texas Study) in this project. But NOAA has 2022 updated values available.
- GLO Coastal Texas Study: 1) Based on NOAA data scenarios 2) Currently available hydraulic flood modeling results 3) Inundation mapping based on various scenarios (Does include the 100-year & 500-year storm events) Does have future conditions with no mitigation: 2035 and 2085 scenarios available. 4) We will be submitting to obtain that data 5) Could use the inundation maps directly. This was for data sources.

- The first table was a comparison chart of the different data sources we have: USACE 2013 data, NOAA 2017 data and the 2022 NOAA data. Highlighted the intermediate low because that is the data for the 30-year outlook. If you look at the 2017 data, it shows that .9-foot rise (the graph I showed you, shows the differential in rise over 30 years). Based on the 2022, it has changed to a 1-foot rise instead. The second table is the Coastal Texas Study. They have a different time event horizon, so it doesn't collate with the 30 years. What we are proposing to do is where their 20/35 data outlook, we could utilize. Instead of the intermediate (which we would normally utilize) we would utilize their high values instead – that is at .8-ft. Or we could look forward into the future at the 2085 data and use their low value which is 2.0-ft rise because what we expect the 30-year of the 1-ft rise. That is a way we could utilize the studies already been completed and the data is available without us having to start over and redo that work.
- Our Path Forward – Region 13 Recommendation: 1) Utilize existing conditions from FEMA and FIRM maps 2) Future conditions, (we also want to get the groups input today) to utilize the Coastal Texas Study data. They already have the 100-yr/500yr inundation values but utilizing the 2085 low value data or the 2035 high value data.

Discussions: Concerns about using the Texas Coastal Study, proposing a certain design point, multiple modeling, options available, will be able to revisit on a five-year cycle, the sea-level rise can be adjusted and there will be six plans between now and 2055 which we are doing on a five-year planning cycle.

Motion to accept the recommendation for a 1.2 sea-level rise for coastal studies in region 13 was made by Andrew Rooke and seconded by Lauren Williams. Motion carries. (Need names of members who made the motion and second.)

11) Discussion and possible action - Form subcommittee to discuss administrative/legislative flood mitigation recommendations:

Kristi Shaw: In this plan, the Texas Water Development Board has requested a special subsection of the plan for each of the 15 regions to include administrative regulatory legislative recommendations. Broken out: 1) What does the region feel is most important from a legislative perspective to help facilitate floodplain management and flood mitigation planning. 2) local or administrative regional recommendations that would be helpful 3) any other recommendations that planning groups desires to achieve goals and 4) recommendations regarding potential, new revenue-raising opportunities and/or regional flood authorities that would fund development, operation, and maintenance of floodplain management. What we have traditionally done, because there is a lot of information there that is being pulled together, is have a subcommittee made up by the members of the flood planning group and we will go through a couple of workshops where we can put together a list of those recommendations and bring it back to the planning group for discussion and consideration. We are asking today for volunteers to serve on the subcommittee and what we will do is first start with what we heard with the regional roadshow meetings. We asked this question: "Where do you need help? We also asked that at the local/individual stakeholder's interviews. We got a few items here that we summarized. So, we would start there as a basis and formulate language regarding those recommendations to the planning group. Input from the three roadshows included 1) a need for accurate inundation mapping and coordination with the Water Development Board and FEMA on the best data verses using old maps 2) Counties sometimes lack the authority to adopt and enforce code and it is a challenge especially in rural areas where often the floodplain administrators wear multiple hats 3) minimum standards and uniformity would help 4) system needs to be fair for both rural and urban areas 5) in upper regions, gravel removal in conflict with TPWD and other regulatory bodies; we heard today too, that it is a real challenge when that sedimentation happens and being able to manage future flooding 6) financing for drainage maintenance programs; support cities and counties purchase lands for flood mitigation along the lines of nature based solutions 7) normal efficiency, funding, training needed by floodplain administrators/board and 8) creation of a regional flood authority that could help move some of these water/flood projects off the ground. These are several of the items we heard at the roadshow; we can talk about it more as a subcommittee and submit a formal recommendation to the group at the May 16th meeting. Meetings will be held virtually until the May meeting. Motion to form subcommittee by Larry Dovalina and seconded by Laura Williams. Motion passed unanimously.

Subcommittee members: Britni Van Curan, Larry Dovalina, Laura Williams, Andy Rooke, LJ Francis, (cc Larry Thomas and Luke Whitmire)

12) Update from Planning Group Sponsor – Nueces River Authority regarding administrative matters of the Regional Flood Planning Group.

Travis Pruski:

- a) Financial Update: HDR Engineering – Amount Due: \$527,005.89, Amount Paid: \$448,705.89 and has a balance of: \$78,300.00. Our contract is \$1.87 million and that leaves is with about \$1.34 million. Tressa and our director of finances at the NRA have been emailing back and forth, and there will be request for payments. The Nueces River Authority hasn't had their portion funded yet. We will hopefully have some updates for the May meeting. LJ Francis: I know last year we had approved all the payments to HDR up to 2021. Tressa, can you clarify what approval does the board need to be making for these money? Is it when we request money from the board or is it money paid out to the consultant? Tressa: I only need board approval for sponsor funds. Travis Pruski: We don't need any action from the board right now.
- b) Update Schedule of 2022: May 16th, June 27th, July 18th (tentative), October (tentative), and December 12th
- c) Update on Webpage: There is a new link (tab) called County Maps. All the technical data is broken down in maps. It will have all the existing flood hazards, highest flood risk, preliminary list of Flood Mitigation Projects (FMP)s, Flood Management Evaluation (FME)s and Flood Management Strategy (FMS)s for each county in our region. LJ Francis: Once the original flood plan is complete, is there a way to make the page more attractive/ appealing?

13) Update from Patrick McGinn Liaison to Region 12 San Antonio RFPG and Region 15 Lower Rio Grande RFPG: Patrick McGinn was not in attendance for update. LJ Francis: Will contact Patrick for any updates in Regions 12 and 15.

14) RFPG members' comment - LJ Francis: About a year ago, I met with colleagues with the US Army Corps of Engineers, and they introduce me to what is called a Silver Jacket Program. This is a collaboration of State, Federal and Local governments (along with the US Army Corps of Engineers and 12 other partners). Our region is going to be participating in 'first in a lifetime – real-time simulation' on Nueces River for the Nueces River. Now the funding is only to pay for the modeling which is only going to be done by the US Army Corps of Engineers. We had Ms. Lisa McCracken with the US Army Corps of Engineers, on earlier and has agreed to give us a full presentation at our May meeting. Other partners from other cities will be invited to this presentation. The thought process is that once this is developed, it will go into users' hands; and have users comment on what they want to see in this model. It ties in well with our regional flood planning.

15) Adjourn: Motion to adjourn and seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Passed and approved on this the _____ day of May, 2022.

LJ Francis, Chairman

Shanna Owens, Secretary or Larry Dovalina, Vice-Chairman