

Region 13. Nueces Regional Flood Planning Group (RFPG) Meeting - Minutes
May 16th, 2022 11:30 A.M. to 1:30PM
McMullen County EOC | 306 Live Oak Street | Tilden, Texas
ZOOM: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82662268207>

Agenda Item:

- 1) Call to Order at 11:30 a.m.
 - a) Roll Call

Voting Members:

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

Guest:

Robert Williams	Mayor of Jourdanton	
Brett Spicer	US Flood Control Corp.	
Jaime Noriega	City of Pearsall	
Britni Van Curan	Atascosa County	911 Rural Addressing/Subdivision
David Wright	City of Cotulla	Water & Wastewater
Sarah West	Freese & Nichols	Stormwater Engineering
Kathleen Jackson	TWDB	
Lisa M ^c Cracken Mairs	USACE	
Fred Reyes	City of Pearsall	City Manager
Patrick McGinn	Region 12 & 13 RFPG	
	Liaison to San Antonio & Lower Rio Grande RFPGs	

Travis Pruski	Nueces River Authority	Director of Planning
Kristi Shaw	HDR	
Bryan Martin	HDR	
Suzanne DiPiazza	Nueces River Authority	

- 2) Prayer

Travis Pruski led the prayer
- 3) Public Comment

No Comments
- 4) Approval of minutes from the March 28th, 2022 RFPG Meeting

Motion to approve minutes as presented made by JR Ramirez and seconded by Andrew Rooke. Motion passed unanimously.

- 5) Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) updates/Presentation: Travis Pruski - Introduced the Director of the TWDB, Kathleen Jackson.
- a) Kathleen Jackson:
- i. Appreciates the time, effort, and work the board is doing.
 - ii. Reminding the board that this is the very 'first' State Flood Plan which is composed of the regional flood plans. It is good to see there is engagement from all the sectors and communities from the region. Cannot wait for identified flood areas to go back and ask what needs to be done to mitigate it, need to be forward thinking. As Governor Abbott stated, "We need to future proof our state."
 - iii. For any kind of public assistance or financial assistance sponsored by the State, entities will need to be in the State Flood Plan to move those projects forward. It is important to let people know and get their thoughts and ideas. Focus on working collaboratively. Knowing what happens upstream impacts people downstream and vice versa.
 - iv. Anything the TWDB can do, please reach out. TWDB is not regulatory, they are a resource.
- b) Richard Bagans: From TWDB, (standing in for regular planner, Tressa Olsen) with updates from TWDB:
- i. Technical Memorandum (tech memo)- informal comments: Submitted two parts of the tech memo: the January 7th deliverables and March 7th deliverables. TWDB sent out all the informal comments to the January 7th deliverables in April and consultant should be working on those and just completed informal comments for the March 7th deliverables and consultants should be getting that today. Comments will be coming to the board after review from consultants. Informal comments are helpful suggestions to review data and to improve the Region's plan before submitting the draft plan. The suggestions are not required, but TWDB tried to find inconsistencies and requirements to make sure all Regions are aligning to the guidelines and the rules.
 - ii. Draft plan is due August 1, 2022. Region 13 will need to meet before due date to approve the submittal of the draft plan to TWDB as well as hold a public comment meeting where Region 13 accepts public comments on this draft plan which has strict public notice requirements. Those public notice requirements were sent out in an email. Reminder of the requirements: 1) for that specific meeting, it needs to be posted in physical locations for 30 days prior, 2) needs to be posted to Secretary of State 30 days prior and for 30 days after to allow for submission of written public comment.
 - iii. Meeting can happen after August 1st based on when HDR finishes with the timeline. The end of August or September for that public comment meeting is preferable.
 - iv. Other administrative updates: The TWDB executed most agreements between TWDB and the sponsors based on additional funding from the legislature. The contract amendment between the Nueces River Authority and TWDB for Region 13 has been completed and submitted to Tressa Olsen. Consultants can begin work on the amended Flood Plan tasks which includes potentially forming an additional FME or some additional information.
 - v. Administrative dates coming up: 1) May 24th - Technical conference call - all the consultants from all the regions invited to participate in a conference call regarding TWDB informal comments and questions the consultants may have; 2) May 26th - the Chairs' conference call (held quarterly) for all chairs of all the regions

Discussion: Heard that there is a nature-based solutions working group that the TWDB is organizing is that the case and if so, do you have an update? Response: It is in discussions at the moment. Currently, do not have any solid updates to give at this time. Will ask around and then see if I can give you update once that decision is finalized.

- 6) Presentation: USACE Silver Jackets Program & Real Time Simulation System - Lisa McCracken Mairs, Project Manager with the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) - predominantly serves as the Flood Risk Manager for the District and manages several different projects within the district. Wants to give a

brief account of some of the projects within USACE and how can USACE be of assistance.

- a) Silver Jackets is a collaboration (team) of Federal, State, and local agencies which provide assistants to the communities. Primarily work through various types of problems and come up with various solutions. The overall goal of Silver Jackets is to be there as a base for facilitation – a way to leverage the community as well as various agencies to bring it all together in one ‘forum’ where the team can meet, speak, and exchange information as well as ideas and data with the community.
- b) Another program is the Flood Plain Management Services (FPMS) – a way for the USACE to provide assistance to various communities and this is 100% Federal Expense. Primary dealing with non-structural flood risk management type avenues; introducing opportunities where USACE can provide mitigation support regarding infrastructure as well as non-structural mitigation.
- c) The most recent project funded for directly works with this community, Nueces County - with the City of Corpus Christi as well as the Nueces River Authority, doing a real time simulation (RTS) development of the Nueces River. USACE is in the beginning stages of this project and after they are done, they are going to be able to provide an updated HEC RAS model for that community and the Nueces River. Also built in are various types of potential futures where they can update accordingly. They are taking a portion of the federal funds to provide training for entities that are going to be utilizing these types of role modeling systems. This tool will provide more accurate and timely flood level forecasts and projected inundation mapping in the watershed for emergency managers, first responders, public officials, and the public to make better informed decisions to reduce the risk to the public and property damage.
 - i. One of the best features of RTS is the RAS Mapper. The maps will display flood depths and boundaries based on various rainfall scenarios and/or reservoir operations or other alternatives that can affect stages and flow.

USACE has various projects within the region; let them know how USACE can help and provide assistance.

Discussion: Question about the schedule for the model and the RTS system – when is that going to be available? Response: The goal is to have the RTS system completed by the end of the year. With training incorporated, USACE is looking at the end of February 2023 to have everything up and running.

- 7) Presentation: Regional Interim Flood Protection Measures program USFC & Garner ES – Brett Spicer – US Flood Control (purposed an Interim Flood Protection Measures (IFPM) project for consideration with Region 13 stakeholders)
 - a) Garner is a national leader in comprehensive catastrophic preparedness, response and recovery; US Flood Control Corporation manufacturers Tiger Dam system.
 - b) Regional Interim Flood Protection Measures Program - Proposal is to place temporary flood barriers at strategic locations to enable rapid local deployment of non-structural barriers. The goal being that stockpiling barriers would enable stakeholders and local responders to rapidly deploy barriers to protect communities within 72 hours.
 - c) Flooding is a great risk to Texas. USFC and Garner ES thought is that Texas cannot wait for the design, engineering, funding, and construction of structural solutions to protect high risk areas from flooding. Product is tested, approved, and proven. Non-structural, solutions are readily available to local responders to quickly protect communities. Interim systems can be left in place for years or can be removed after each event and stored for reuse. Proposed interim non-structural services and solutions are proven protective measures.
 - d) Garner can offer any solution for disaster response recovery, logistical support, training, and exercising. Garner trains and coordinates for non-structural applications. Garner offers 1) Hesco Barriers 2) Flood Planks and 3) Tiger Dam Systems.

Discussions: Question: If a community is interested in the services, what is required? Response: We would learn about their specific project and work with their risk managers or emergency managers to determine what their needs are and determine if we have a solution that is right for them. Question: There is equipment out there similar to the work you do with General Land Office. Is there grant

money that is currently available? Response: Through Garner, there is no grant money that is currently available. Question: Would like to see examples of returns in investments. How much does it cost for a community to put in verses if there was an impact, what would be the damages incurred? Answer: It is relative to the scope of your project and the value of the infrastructure we are protecting. Each one is different.

- 8) Discussion and possible action regarding Status of Flood Risk Mapping Update (Tasks 2A &2B) Bryan Martin with HDR:
- a) The objective of this task is to understand the areas of highest flood risk in Nueces Basin. Display of Flood Risk Map - Basically this map is a collection of metrics and sums up the flood risk on a watershed level. The darker the level the higher the risk. The map is based on life loss metrics like low water crossings, hazardous dams, and areas where there has been historical life loss. Also factors in property damage. Received input from stakeholders and at roadshows on where flood prone areas are in the basin.
 - b) (Slide showing one county map) Maps for 32 counties were sent out to stakeholders showing the 100-year and 500-year flood inundation boundaries as well as other flood hazards metrics. The updates coming in for the revised plan will incorporate the new fathom data and future coastal rise.
 - c) (Slide showing Fathom Updates) Mapping for 75% of Basin did not have detailed models and therefore is utilizing fathom data provided by the TWDB as shown in blue. (The 'hole' in the center is where there are detailed models; those are considered higher quality and are being used in the floodplain mapping.) The new fathom data provided recently took the resolution from 30-meter square to a 1-meter square which is more detailed and accurate.

Discussion: Currently, this provides a basis for an evaluation for the FME, FMS, and FMP. The mapping used for the 'draft' plan is using the old fathom. In between the draft plan and the revised plan (due in July 2023), HDR will be utilizing the new fathom information. Question: Mentioned a map currently being used, how old/current is that map and where was the data resource? Answer: Comes from most current lidar data available and applied the most recent rainfall data. Also includes the topography data, weather data, hydrology, etc. It is done in conjunction with FEMA. Fathom data was used where there was outdated mapping or no mapping. Question: The 'hole' in the mapping had Atascosa County, do you know when there will be an updated mapping data? Answer: Keeping in mind, that in an absence of information (the 'hole'), there is data that is available that is more accurate than the fathom data shown in blue on the map. Question: In terms of flood risk, are there any red flags showing that there is more risk than identified previously? Answer: The old fathom gave a good indication of the flood risk. The new fathom, is going to be a refine list on flood risk (with more detail). One thing to add, local stakeholder meetings and the roadshows were very instrumental in hearing from individuals who experienced flood conditions for which mapping was unavailable. Currently working on getting future coastal flood models from GLO for future conditions analysis; request has been made.

- 9) Discussion and possible action regarding identification, evaluation, and recommendation of FME, FMP, and FMSs (FMX for short) from Stakeholder Outreach and Input on How to Address Gaps - Bryan Martin with HDR: The list - terms for acronyms are 1) Flood Mitigation Evaluations (FME)(when you hear the word evaluations, think studies), 2) Flood Mitigation Strategies (FMS) a strategy is something that doesn't quite fit in the projects; it is a proposed plan to reduce flood risk or mitigate hazards to life or property that are caused by flood. A flood management strategy may or may not require infrastructure projects to be implemented. and 3) FMP -Flood Mitigation Projects are proposed projects, both structural and non-structural, that may be required to implement a flood mitigation strategy. Flood mitigation projects have capital costs or other non-recurring costs and are designed to reduce flood risk and mitigate flood hazards to life or property.
- a) Went through flood mitigation plans and drainage master plans and identified existing projects with two rounds of stakeholders' outreach – looking at the list for their counties and cities and determining status. Refined the list and added new FMXs. Reviewed list for compliance with TWDB requirements for FMPs e.g., cannot have an adverse impact on any downstream

neighbors, must have detailed hydrology hydraulic models for a project. Due to the lack of information, many FMPs then became FMEs meaning further studies are needed to characterize the project. When list was completed, the gaps were considered where flood hazard exists and no FMX has been identified. Looked at all the projects as a whole or studies and the highest flood risk areas that have the biggest needs that aren't being met; considered goals that aren't being met to identify new FME/FMSs.

- b) Screening: TWDB has specific requirements that must be evaluated and screened for all Projects/Evaluations/and Strategies. (Requirements listed on slides.) In all, there were 280 evaluations, 134 strategies and 109 projects that were reviewed for compliance with TWDB requirements and to screen and evaluate.
- c) Displaying flood risk map and FMX map (general assessment FMXs – where there are projects and how it relates to where the needs are.)
- d) Are the flood risk areas are being met? How to address high risk areas (or Gaps) – areas identified as high risk but no studies or projects to address need (Goal 5 – reduce number of structures in floodplain). Examples 1) City of Uvalde – city wide drainage study 2) City of Dilley – Martin Branch 3) Webb County – subdivision near 159/Becerra Creek 4) City of Three Rivers 5) City of Falfurrias. These are high risk areas with no FMXs to address needs.
- e) Prepared a plan to address gaps (goals) – Displayed a list of goals, with study & sponsor. Identified the ones that are the most dangerous or most critical need, prioritized those needs, and recommend studies/projects which are not currently in place
- f) When preparing recommendation of Strategies, the TWDB gives guidance:
 - i. Not every conceivable study can go into the plan – there are limited resources.
 - ii. Must decide which FMX will be recommended
 - iii. List must be sensible
 - iv. Best use of limited resources
 - v. Primary function must be flood risk reductions
 - vi. Must include quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits
- g) Looking at all the projects and made 208 initial recommendations

Discussion: *Note: Tables were sent out to flood planning group members in packet for review prior to the meeting with additional details for each FMX in each county by tab. (Displaying spreadsheet)* Many of the projects found in the mitigation plans were continuing forward and already have the 'seed' money. If project was already funded, it is not to be included as a recommended strategy. There is a different section within the flood plans for those. Secondly is making sure there is a sponsor and that it is achievable. The spreadsheet has details about every single option which was presented. Question: Concerns regarding Region 13 RFPG communication with other state and federal agencies, about projects being dropped, or omitted from plans. Response: Communication between entities is and will become more important as we move forward. Projects may have been dropped because they lacked information or details. For example, the TxDOT project at Secco Creek, was that a flood issues or structural. Not enough information was provided. Also, in some cases, entities wanted projects to be an FMP but not to the place yet where the cost were known. Cost are one of the requirements. It will be shown in the plan but shown as an FME because it is not ready. Gives the group an opportunity, as part of Task 12, to come back and look at the draft plan in August and discuss which of the plans need to be revisited. Some of the FMEs can be moved to the FMPs. If an entity brought a project or study to the group, the projects were not excluded. However, if entity stated that the project was an ongoing funded project, that project did not make the cut because the board wants to see just the projects that have no funding or have a need for additional funding.

Motion to accept the recommendations of the FMPs, FMEs, and FMSs as presented in the Excel documents committee members received in packet by Larry Dovalina and seconded by Shanna Owens. Roll call for vote. Motion passed unanimously.

- 10) Discussion and possible action regarding summary of Flood Response Information and Activities (Task 7) – Kristi Shaw with HDR: This is a status update.

- a) The TWDB has asked every Regional Flood Plan to include Chapter 7 that summarizes flood response information and activity. Kristi displayed a graph that has the four steps that FEMA has documented associated with emergency management: Mitigation, Preparedness, Response and Recovery. Most of the regional plan is focus on flood mitigation – which is the implementation of actions with both structural and nonstructural solutions to reduce flood risk to human health and life as well as property. This chapter focuses on the other three aspects because it is important to discuss what happens before a flood issue as well are the response and recovery. The plan is to include a summary of the current state of flood preparedness in the region and summary of entity roles and responsibilities along with entities involved and actions taken/planned for flood recovery. This will be used to develop Chapter 8 recommendations. **Flood preparedness** are the actions, aside from mitigation, that are taken before flood events to prepare for flood response activities which can include early warning systems, evacuation plans ordinances. With respect to **Flood Response**, those actions that are taken during an immediate aftermath of a flood event. This would include sheltering, closing roads, having a dedicated place individuals go in the event of a flood emergency. And finally, **Flood Recovery** - actions taken after a flood event involving repairs or other actions necessary to return to pre-event conditions.
- b) There are many different agencies and organization on both the State and Federal levels that have roles related to flood response and flood recovery. Displayed table with Agencies Name, State or Federal with and their roles, and specific notes, issues, and actions withing Region 13. This table will be included in the plan. This table only includes State and Federal entities.
- c) For local entities in Region 13, three tables were developed for this section in the Regional Flood Plan.
 - i. The first table deals with all the local entities within the region and what their level of engagement in flood activities. This includes identified points of contact, which communities had ordinances, if they had flood hazard or emergency management plan, as well as floodplain management plan.
 - ii. The second table included in plan deals with Flood Preparedness measures based on ordinances and flood management plans. The goal was to prepare a checklist of some of the common themes within communities in local plans and show that information to serve two purposes: (1) show what entities have information and who have flood preparedness measures are and (2) for agencies and communities who have not put together this information or where it is lacking, those communities/agencies can see what their neighboring county/city is doing and will help them develop/implement the same procedures.
 - iii. The Flood Response and Recovery Measures is the third table in this section. This contains the methods used during flood events and what communities are doing come to rescue and support their residents during these times. The list not only represents the counties in Region 13 but also the municipalities as well.

11) Discussion and possible action regarding subcommittee administrative, regulatory, and legislative recommendations (Task 8) – Kristi Shaw with HDR: Summarized the administrative regulatory and legislative recommendations formed by the subcommittee. Task 8 involves 1) looking at legislative recommendations necessary to facilitate floodplain management and flood mitigation planning 2) regulatory or administrative recommendations and any recommendations to achieve goals and 3) recommendations regarding potential, new revenue-raising opportunities and/or regional flood authorities that could fund development, operation and maintenance of floodplain management. The subcommittee met on May 3rd to discuss draft Region 13 recommendations and provided follow-up comment. *Note: information was sent out in packet with details about each one of the legislative and administrative flood mitigation recommendations.*

- a) Summary of the administrative recommendations
 - i. The Regional Flood Planning Group: 1) will continue to be a part of the discussion 2) to facilitate public information and public education activities
 - ii. Texas Water Development Board: 1) to identify and eliminate barriers that prevent agencies from working together 2) funding mechanism for smaller communities to receive dedicated

funding to help support the technical evaluation when dealing with FMXs 3) Use project list from RFP to help connect local communities to grant programs 4) Roadmap on how flood agencies work together and 5) use hybrid approach for structural engineered and nature-based solutions for flood mitigation

- iii. Encourage Region 13 public entities be a part of and to support administrative activities.
- b) Summary of the regulatory and policy recommendations: 1) support adoption of 2015 or 2018 versions of International Building Code 2) Develop program to provide support to rural communities for flood management activities, including toolkit resources for FPA and 3) empower county governments with greater regulatory control over land development activities.
- c) Summary of the legislative recommendations: 1) Continue to provide TWDB funding for state mandated regional flood planning activities 2) Consider enabling legislation to allow creation of a regional flood authority of funding river authority to support counties and cities to help the where needed 3) to support policies to address Texas' flood risk needs 4) funding to state agencies for flood planning initiatives, including technical support for developing building standards 5) funding for public information campaigns to increase community awareness of flood issues 6) direct TCEQ to work with TPWD and TxDOT, and others to support removal of debris and/or sediment from major floods 7) dedicated program to fund the implementation of projects identified through road and bridge assessments 8) dedicate program to fund maintenance of drainage and culvert systems and 9) dedicate program to support nature-based practices and promote land coverage studies.

One document that was considered was a compiled group of recommendations that some of the other flood planning groups had already done for subcommittee consideration to fit the needs of Region 13. Motion to approve the administrative, regulatory, and legislative flood mitigation recommendations from the subcommittee as presented by Andrew Rooke and seconded by Debra Barrett. Motion passed unanimously.

12) Discussion and possible action regarding Technical Memorandum content and TWDB Informal Comments received on 4/14/2022- Bryan Martin with HDR: Reviewed the technical comments.

Previous studies to consider:

- a) Two studies 1) TWDB sponsored Flood Protection Study w/ Medina County and the Community of D'Hanis completed in 2011 and 2) Bee County Flood Infrastructure Fund (FIF) withdrawn but may still be considered for future funding to consider.
- b) TWDB encouraged group to use USGS Estimated BFE and provided a link to the viewer.
- c) TWDB also encouraged us to consider on our goals (Task 3B) to be really intentional on baseline data and to make sure they are achievable and quantifiable. For example, increasing NFIP participation from 90% to 95%.
- d) For Task 4B 1) consider impact of new Atlas 14 rainfall data as 'Factors to Consider' when determining if mapping is inadequate 2) consider defining 'Emergency Need' which there is a check box to indicate emergency need 3) consider defining how infrastructure will be classified as damaged or failing 4) consider more detailed descriptions to clarify FMXs and 5) consider updating solutions descriptions to make clear why they are considered either an FMS or FMP.

The planning group will respond to the comments from TWDB and will respond to those comments in the draft plan which will be submitted in August.

Discussion: Question: Will Region 13 define what is considered an emergency in the future? Answer: Yes, in June. Question: Would like to know HDR's recommendation regarding comment on Task 3B " increase NFIP (National Flood Insurance Program) participation. How would Region 13 go about doing that?

Response: Provide more information on existing data, the source, and the baseline. Question: The NFIP have some requirements for committees that are voluntary. Are we encouraging stakeholder to participate in this program? Response: We want to increase the number of communities adopting a higher standard beyond NFIP requirements. Question: Did we specifically discuss avoidance strategies as a first line of defense to flood mitigation? Answer: This is 6A the Minimum Flood Standards Recommendations - the subcommittee had discussed that at length. Some communities are adopting 2 feet, some areas are higher

and others are sitting at 1 foot. During the discussions, it was at least to have a 1 foot minimum for guidance for the entire Nueces flood area (though not required for enforcement). Looked at how those projects that were identified were compatible with the existing goals and really dove more into the details in the goals where there was a lack of information.

- 13) Discussion and possible action regarding Region 13 Nueces Budget Memo - Travis Pruski: With the contract with TWDB, the original budget had \$102,700 under 'Contractor Other Expenses'. Once it was amended, 'Contractor Other Expenses' broken down to line item 'Contractor Salaries and Wages' in the amount of \$82,700 and line item 'Contractor Other Expenses' come out to be \$20,000. Total is the same, just needed to break it down to different categories. No changes to line item 'Subcontract Services' or line item 'Voting Planning Member Travel'.

Motion to approve the TWDB Contract No. 2101792498 'Budget Memorandum No 1' – Amended Exhibit B to reflect "Revised Budget line-item Contractor Other Expenses - \$20,000, line-item Contractor Salaries and Wages - \$82,700, line-item Subcontract Service – no change, and line-item Voting Planning Member Travel – no change" made by LJ Francis and seconded by J.R. Ramirez. Motion passed unanimously.

- 14) Discussion and possible action regarding accepting the resignation of Jeff Pollack – Industry Voting Member and removal of Adnan Rajib – Public Voting Member; authorizing Nueces River Authority to begin accepting nominations for vacant voting members positions. Travis Pruski: A 30-day nomination period, followed by an executive subcommittee meeting (if more than one candidate for either or both positions) to make recommendations at the next board meeting. Also, voting members, you are allowed to go into executive session to choose at this time.

Motion by J.R. Ramirez to move forward with recommendation of accepting Jeff Pollack's resignation as Industry Voting Member and removing Adnan Rajib as Public Voting Member and authorizing Nueces River Authority to begin accepting nominations which will last for 30-days posting period for the two vacancies for voting member board and seconded by Shanna Owens. Chairman Francis call voice count. Motion carries.

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

- a) Financial Update – Travis Pruski: Some of update was done in Agenda Item 13. Request of payments for \$365,000.11 to TWDB under the contract expenses for HDR services at the end of March. No additional expense.
- b) Update Schedule of 2022: June 27th, July 18th, and Dec 12th.

Discussion: Submit draft in August, issue a public comment notice for 30 days, input public comment meeting on September 26th, hold for 30 more days and public comment would end, finally incorporate TWDB and public input for final approval of the plan in December, final plan is due in January 2023.

- 16) Update from Patrick McGinn Liaison to Region 12 San Antonio RFPG and Region 15 Lower Rio Grande RFPG

- a) From Region 15 Lower Rio Grande RFPG: 1) Approval and certification of their admin expenses by the planning group for the development of their regional flood plan, 2) changing up some of the contract amendments to Task 10 with their public participation and plan adoption for their planning group sponsors, and 3) their technical consultants updated them on their Task 3A, 7, 8, 9 and partly 11.
- b) For Region 12 San Antonio RFPG: 1) Discussed Task 3B – Mitigation and Management goals - they had trouble determining whether to 'recommend' vs 'having areas adopt' a certain level for their flood plan. Placed on table for next meeting 2) had conversation for natural flood mitigation and nature-based solutions for their area.

- 17) RFPG members' comment:

