

- iv. Approach
- e. Outreach Approach
 - i. Recap on data needed
 - ii. Outreach Methods Planned
 - iii. Stakeholder's list
- f. Schedule
 - i. Overview
 - ii. Future Meeting Plan

Other Business

- 10. Update from Planning Group Sponsor
- 11. Consider date and agenda items for next meeting
- 12. Adjourn

If you wish to provide written comments prior to or after the meeting, please email your comments to pprange@atcog.org and include "Region 2 RFPG Meeting" in the subject line of the email – OR – you may mail your comments to Region 2 RFPG, c/o ATCOG – Paul Prange, 4808 Elizabeth St, Texarkana, TX 75503.

If you wish to provide oral public comments at the meeting, please submit a request via email to pprange@atcog.org, include "Region 2 RFPG Meeting Public Comment Request" at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, and follow the registration instructions at top of page 1 of the Agenda.


Additional information may be obtained from: www.texasfloodregion2.org, or by contacting Paul Prange at pprange@atcog.org, 903-832-8636, -or- Region 2 RFPG, c/o ATCOG, 4808 Elizabeth St, Texarkana, TX 75503

All meeting agendas and notices will be posted on our website at www.texasfloodregion2.org. If you wish to be notified electronically of RFPG activities, please submit a request to pprange@atcog.org, include "Request for notification of Region 2 RFPG activities". This request will be honored via email only unless reasonable accommodations are needed.

**Titus Regional Medical Center, Titus Medical Plaza, 3rd Floor Conference Room
2015 Mulberry Street, Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455**

Park in the yellow parking spaces in front of the Medical Plaza building.

***Masks are required when entering/exiting the building. Masks may be removed while in the meeting room.**



Meeting Minutes
Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Flood Planning Group Meeting
July 8, 2021
2:00 p.m.
Via Zoom Webinar/Teleconference

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Interest Category</u>	<u>Present (x) /Absent () / Alternate Present (*)</u>
Preston Ingram (William)	Agricultural interests	
Andy Endsley	Counties	X
W. Greg Carter	Electric generating utilities	X
Laura-Ashley Overdyke	Environmental interests	X
Clark Crandall	Industries	
Dustin Henslee (Jonathan Wade-Alternate)	Municipalities	X
Kirby Hollingsworth	Public	X
R. Reeves Hayter	River authorities	X
Kelly Mitchell	Small business	X
Joseph W. Weir III	Water districts	X
Susan Whitfield	Water utilities	X

<u>Non-voting Member</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Present(x)/Absent()/ Alternate Present (*)</u>
James (Clay) Shipes	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	
Brian Hurtuk	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X
Darrell Dean	Texas Department of Agriculture	
Tony Resendez	Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board	X
Trey Bahm	General Land Office	X
Anita Machiavello	Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)	X
Michelle Havelka	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	X
Darlene Prochaska	USACE, Fort Worth District	X
Travis Wilsey	USACE, Tulsa District	
Randy Whiteman	RFPG 1 Liaison	X

Quorum:

Quorum: **Yes**

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: **9**

Number required for quorum per current voting membership of **11: 6**

Other Meeting Attendees: **

Chris Brown - ATCOG
Paul Prange – ATCOG
Reem Zoun – TWDB
James Bronikowski – TWDB
Richard Bagans – TWDB
Ben Pylant – Halff Associates Team
Walt Sears - NETMWD
Joshua McClure – Halff Associates Team
David Rivera – Halff Associates Team
Kimberly Miller- Halff Associates Team
Parker Moore – Halff Associates Team
Tyler Ogle – Halff Associates Team
Jim Keith – Halff Associates Team
Jarred Overbey – Halff Associates Team
Vance Liles – Halff Associates Team
Chris Donan – Hayter Engineers
Lisa Mairs - USACE
Richard Brontoli – Red River Valley Association
Christopher Armstrong – City of Sherman

**Meeting attendee names were gathered from those who entered information for joining the Zoom meeting.

All meeting materials are available for the public at:

<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/regions/schedule.asp>.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order

Reeves Hayter called the meeting to order at 2:06p.m. A roll call of the planning group members was taken to record attendance and a quorum was established prior to calling the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome

Reeves Hayter welcomed members to the meeting and asked ATCOG staff member, Paul Prange to conduct a roll call of attendees.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Confirmation of attendees / determination of a quorum

Each present voting and non-voting member of the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress RFPG introduced themselves, establishing that a quorum had been met. Nine voting members were present and three non-voting members were absent.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Reeves Hayter opened the floor to public comments. No public comments were given.

ACTION ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Consider approval of minutes for the meeting held Thursday, April 1, 2021 (p 6):

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. No discussion took place among the board members. A motion was made by Joseph Weir and was seconded by Andy Endsley to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Discuss and Consider action on appointing Mary Beth Rudel (ATCOG Deputy Director) as the Public Information Coordinator to fulfill requirements per Texas Government Code 551.005 (p 13):

Reeves Hayter handed the item over to Chris Brown who stated that this designation was necessary to ensure all public inquiries regarding meeting agendas or minutes of the regional flood planning group are directed to one individual responsible for providing a response. Mr. Brown also stated that this would remove the requirement for each board member to complete Public Information Act training. Reeves Hayter asked if board members should forward all requests from media outlets to Mary Beth, as well and Mr. Brown stated that each board member should use their own discretion when contacted by the press and that they are definitely allowed to respond to these types of inquiries. Mr. Brown stated that this designation would streamline the system of public requests through the flood planning group website. A motion was made to approve Mary Beth Rudel as the Public Information Coordinator by Joseph Weir and seconded by Laura-Ashley Overdyke. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Discuss and Consider action to add additional non-voting positions that may be needed to ensure adequate representation from the interest in the region (p 14):

Reeves Hayter opened the floor up for discussion and mentioned that the RFPG 2 Board of Directors had previously added two non-voting members from the USACE and that at the meeting in May, 2021 suggestions were made to possibly add non-voting members from TxDOT. Mr. Hayter stated that the RFPG 2 would be very well represented by TxDOT members from the Paris and Atlanta Districts and welcomed any discussion among the board members. Chris Brown announced that Rich Brontoli from

the Red River Valley Association was present at this meeting and is highly involved with planning efforts to expand navigation along the Lower Red River from the Texarkana area to Shreveport. Mr. Hayter then asked the RFPG 2 board members for a motion to request additional non-voting members from TxDOT and the Red River Valley Association. A motion was made by Kelly Mitchell and seconded by Greg Carter. The motion carried unanimously.

PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Texas Water Development Board Update:

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Anita Machiavello with the TWDB. Ms. Machiavello announced the Texas Legislature approved approximately 10 million dollars in additional flood planning funds which may become available on September 1, 2021 to enhance the regional flood plans during the first cycle. Ms. Machiavello also announced that the TWDB provided a survey regarding the additional funding to each RFPG and it is due to be submitted to the TWDB on July 16th instead of July 9th. She also stated that the TWDB has approved the subcontract between ATCOG and Halff Associates and that the technical guidelines for regional flood planning have been finalized and are posted on the TWDB website.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: US Army Corps of Engineers Presentation: Dam Operations (p 15):

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Darlene Prochaska with the Fort Worth District of the USACE who conducted a detailed presentation focusing on 25 flood control reservoirs located within her district. Ms. Prochaska stated that the USACE is mostly a civilian workforce but that all commanders are members of the US Army who oversee 9 divisions and 43 districts in 130 countries throughout the world, with a primary goal of flood damage reduction operations. The USACE manages 410 flood control reservoirs throughout the United States which are also used for water supply electric power generation purposes. Ms. Prochaska explained the processes involved in monitoring and inspecting the integrity of the dams located on the reservoirs and discussed the differences between the Conservation Pool, the Flood Storage Pool and the Surcharge Pool levels. Laura-Ashley Overdyke asked if any dams within our region have any significant safety issues at this time and if strategies can be employed at reservoirs to maintain higher levels of water during times of drought rather than constructing additional reservoirs and dams. Ms. Prochaska stated that no dams are at any significant risk at this time and that a reallocation study could be conducted on a reservoir, such as Lake o' The Pines to determine if additional storage is possible, but a financial sponsor would be required. Reeves Hayter mentioned that it was surprising to see that ½ of the population of the state resides along the I-35 corridor.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Region 1 Canadian-Upper Red Regional Flood Planning Group Updates:

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Randy Whiteman who stated that he did not attend the previous meeting and had no information to report.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Pre-Planning Public Input – Texas Water Development Board:

- a. The RFPG is soliciting public input regarding suggestions and recommendations as to issues, provisions, projects and strategies that should be considered during the flood planning cycle and/or input on the development of the regional flood plan (as required per Texas Water Code 16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code 361.12(a)(4))**

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Anita Machiavello with the TWDB who conducted a slide presentation focusing on the pre-planning meeting background, regional flood planning and the flood planning timeline. Ms. Machiavello also discussed the key tasks of the Regional Flood Planning Groups and presented information relating to flood mitigation practices, including examples of both structural and non-structural mitigation strategies. Finally, Ms. Machiavello stressed the importance of public input in the flood planning process and stated that there will be multiple opportunities for public input throughout the development of the regional flood plan. Reeves Hayter then announced that this concludes our 2nd public pre-planning meeting requirement.

WORKSHOP

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Halff Associates led workshop (p 46):

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Joshua McClure from Halff Associates to conduct the workshop. Mr. McClure announced that Tasks 1-4 are scheduled to be completed during 2021 and Tasks 5-10 during 2022, with today's presentation focusing on Chapter's 1, 2 and 3.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Discussion of Scope and Schedule overview for the region 2 flood plan:

- a. **Task 1 – Planning Area Description**
 - i. **Overview**
 - ii. **Methodology**

- b. **Task 2A – Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses**
 - i. **Objectives**
 - ii. **Approach**

- c. **Task 2B – Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses**
 - i. **Objectives**
 - ii. **Approach**

- d. **Task 3A and 3B – Recommended Floodplain Management Practices and Goals**
 - i. **Objectives**
 - ii. **Process and Schedule**
 - iii. **RFPG Decisions Needed**
 - iv. **Approach**

- e. **Outreach Approach**
 - i. **Recap on Data Needed**
 - ii. **Outreach Methods Planned**
 - iii. **Stakeholders List**

- f. **Schedule**
 - i. **Overview**
 - ii. **Future Meeting Plan**

Joshua McClure, Project Manager with Halff Associates introduced Kimberly Miller with Halff Associates and asked her to cover the material in Chapter 1 (Planning Area Description). Mr. McClure then stated that he would cover Chapter 2 (Data Collection) and that David Rivera would cover Chapter 3 (Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals) in today's workshop.

Kimberly Miller began her presentation by showing a timeline of events scheduled to occur between May and early August of 2021. Ms. Miller stated that the initial assessment of the Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress basins has been completed and 22% of the region is located within the 100 year floodplain and that 80% of the counties are participating in the NFIP. Lamar, Red River, Delta and Camp Counties are not participating in the NFIP. Brief discussion took place among the board members regarding the availability of flood maps in certain counties that are participating in the NFIP. Ms. Miller stated that the key stakeholders list has been developed and a data collection survey is being developed for distribution to community leaders throughout the region.

Joshua McClure then presented information about the flood risk assessment and data collection efforts, focusing on flood risk mapping, flood exposure estimation and vulnerability assessments to determine what the impact of a flood would be. Mr. McClure presented information relating to the various types of flooding, including flood event types, as well as data sources such as community data, which is a critical component of this flood planning process. Mr. McClure then presented information about a data collection website that is under development for the public to provide input relating to flooding. This process will be somewhat time consuming and the survey questions are available to be answered from July 12 through August 9, 2021. Laura-Ashley Overdyke asked how much information the USACE is going to be able to provide on the Cypress basin below Lake O' The Pines. Mr. McClure stated that Halff Associates is coordinating with the USACE and Darlene Prochaska stated that information from various studies and models would be include in the survey answers. Reeves Hayter asked if the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board's data would be collected in the surveys and incorporated into the regional flood plan. The Halff Associates team members stated that they utilize a different methodology so their data may or may not be incorporated into the regional flood plan as supplemental information.

David Rivera conducted a presentation focused on floodplain management practices and flood protection goals and provided a brief overview of the processes involved for adopting standards for the region and receiving RFPG 2 Board and public feedback. This included an overview of the activities scheduled from July to September 2021. Mr. Rivera explained that the RFPG 2 Board of Directors must decide on whether to "recommend" or "adopt" certain standards to be included within the regional flood plan. Joshua McClure announced that in order to receive funding from the TWDB for a particular project, that project must adhere to the standards and be included within the regional flood plan. Mr. Rivera then discussed short term and long term flood protection goals including; lowering the risk to life and property, infrastructure protection, land preservation, funding mechanisms, adopting minimum standards and increasing NFIP participation within the region. The RFPG 2 board members then participated in an interactive, online exercise by answering various survey questions relating to flooding. Reeves Hayter commented that he is very concerned about the RFPG 2 Board recommending flood planning strategies to the counties, because the "public" is largely unaware of this flood planning process. Kirby Hollingsworth stated that the RFPG 2 Board may need to ease into making any suggestions that the public should be required to adopt flood strategies. David Rivera commented that

recommendations may be preferable to requirements during the first round of regional flood planning and Joshua McClure suggested that any additional TWDB funding be directed toward public outreach activities. Andy Endsley suggested that more public may attend the RFPG 2 meeting if food was provided. Mr. Hayter asked if the RFPG 2 Board should publish a news release in local newspapers or on social media and Chris Brown stated that utilizing social media to advertise our meetings would reach a larger audience.

OTHER BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Update from Planning Group Sponsor

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Chris Brown for updates. Mr. Brown announced that additional funding for regional flood planning may become available after September 1, 2021 and that Governor Abbott has rescinded the restrictions placed on the Open Meetings Act requirements which were in place during the COVID-19 pandemic, beginning September 1, 2021. This means that future RFPG 2 meetings must be conducted in a physical location open to the public, however board members may still attend remotely to constitute a quorum.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Consider date and agenda items for next meeting

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion. The Region 2 RFPG board members agreed to conduct the next meeting on Thursday, August 5, 2021 at 2:00p.m. at the Northeast Texas Community College Campus in Mount Pleasant, Texas and via webinar/teleconference.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Adjourn

Reeves Hayter opened the floor to adjourn the meeting.

A motion was made by Kirby Hollingsworth and Seconded by Andy Endsley.

The vote to adjourn was passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47p.m. by Reeves Hayter

Approved by the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress RFPG at a meeting held on 8/5/2021.

Reeves Hayter, CHAIR



Regional Flood Planning Group 2 Meeting Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress

August 5, 2021



Outline/Agenda

- Task/Chapter 1- Planning Area Description
- Task/Chapter 2A- Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses
- Task/Chapter 2B - Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses
- Task/Chapter 3- Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals
- Task/Chapter 4 – Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis
- Schedule

Ch. 1 Introduction & Overview

Planning Area Description



Public Outreach Update

Public Outreach: Completed/Underway

- Survey sent out on 7/19/2021
- Survey will remain open until 8/16/2021
- Web domain name (LowerRedSulphurCypress.halff.com)
- Sent to 409 Stakeholders
- We have contacted over 150 people so far to make sure they received the survey and encourage participation
- Sent email reminder on 7/29/2021



**Figure 1:
Survey Response Map**

LOWER RED - SULPHUR - CYPRESS

As of July 28th, 2021



FLOOD PLANNING REGION LOCATOR
STATE OF TEXAS



Map Symbology

- Municipality/SUD Response
- County Response
- River Authority Response
- No Response
- County

**10 ENTITIES RESPONDED
AS OF 7/26/2021
400 PEOPLE CONTACTED
REPRESENTING 145 AGENCIES**



Public Outreach: Added Website Input

1. How often is your life impacted by flood events?
2. Briefly describe the impact flooding has had on your life.
3. Have you ever experienced flooding in your home?
4. How many times have you experienced flooding in your home?
5. Does your community have a plan to deal with flooding?

Public Outreach: Ongoing Efforts

- Continue contacting stakeholders
- Weekly review of survey responses
- Timely replies to inquiries submitted through website, email, mail
- Documentation of inbound queries, comments and responses
- Public meeting invitations

Ch. 2 Flood Risk Analysis


Part A & B

CHAPTER 2

Flood Risk Assessment

Task 2 - Purpose

- Flood Risk Mapping
- Flood Exposure Estimation
- Vulnerability Assessment



Task 2A – Existing Conditions Flood Risk Assessment

FLOOD TYPE


- Riverine
- Dams and Levee
- Possible Flood-prone Areas
- Pluvial including Urban flooding

FLOOD EVENT TYPES

- 100-Year
- 500-Year
- Other

DATA SOURCES

- TWDB Flood Quilt
- Community Data
- FATHOM
- FAFDS (First American Flood Data Services)



Fathom Data


- Approximate floodplain data
 - Statewide
 - Includes riverine (fluvial) flooding sources
 - Includes upland (pluvial) flooding sources
- TWDB is having them make significant corrections
 - Will use better topographic data
 - Will not be available before October
- **Will delay or change the Memo (due in January 2022) content**
 - We are working with TWDB to develop a plan

Task 2B – Future Conditions Flood Risk Assessment

Future Mapping

- FEMA
- Community Data
- Machine Learning
- Regional Deltas
- TWDB Estimates

- Working with TWDB to develop method



Ch. 3 Introduction & Overview

Floodplain Management Practices & Flood Protection Goals

TASK 3 – Process and Timeline

July

August

September



TC develops Floodplain Management Standards and Goals based on July meeting deliberation, additional data, and public input.



TC prepares recommended set of Standards and Goals.



TC and **RFPG** maintain close collaboration to prepare draft Goals and minimum Standards strategy.

TASK 3 – Process and Timeline

July

August

September



TC provides update on data collection and public input.




TC presents recommended set of Standards and Goals.



RFPG deliberates on Standards and Goals and considers public input.

TASK 3 – Process and Timeline




TASK 3 – Process and Timeline

July	August	September
★	★	★
✓	RFPG 1st decision: Recommend or Adopt minimum standards?	No) No further action Yes) Need to set preference
✓	RFPG 2nd decision: Preference	A) Recommend B) Adopt
✓	RFPG 3rd decision: Select specific minimum Standards to Recommend or Adopt (Region-wide and/or Sub-Region)	
✓	RFPG 4th decision: Adopt Short/Long-Term Goals	

Data Collection Overview

- Integral with the Public Engagement Process
- Critical to success of plan
- Collection started for all tasks in July
- Types of data needed:
 - Task 1 – General Planning Area information
 - Task 2 – Existing and Future Flood Risk
 - Task 3 – Goals and Objectives
 - Task 4 – FMEs

COLLECT DATA



Entity	Floodplain management regulations	Adopted minimum regulations	NFIP Participant	Higher Standards Adopted	Floodplain Management Practices	Level of enforcement of practices	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee
County 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Moderate	Moderate	Yes
City 1	No	No	No	No	Low	Low	No
Special Purpose District	Unknown	No	No	No	None	None	No

Template from TWDB – Exhibit C

COLLECTED DATA - IN PROGRESS

Entity ¹	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ¹	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ¹	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ¹	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ²	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/None) ²	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{2,3}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ²
Counties							
Bowie	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Cass	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Cooke*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Fannin*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Franklin*	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Grayson*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Gregg*	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Harrison*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Hopkins*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Hunt*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Moderate		
Marion	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Morris	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Panola*	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Titus	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Upshur*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Wood*	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		

¹ At a minimum, the RFPs must list all counties, cities and communities in the region with flood related authority in the region and identify whether entity they have any established floodplain management practices.

² This field may be left blank during the 1st planning cycle. However, RFPs are strongly encouraged to provide this information when applicable and available.

³ The following may serve as a guide for evaluating enforcement:

high- actively enforces the entire ordinance, performs many inspections throughout construction process, issues fines, violations, and Section 1316s where appropriate, and enforces substantial damage and substantial improvement;

moderate- enforces much of the ordinance, performs limited inspections and is limited in issuance of fines and violations;

low- provides permitting of development in the floodplain, may not perform inspections, may not issue fines or violations;

none- does not enforce floodplain management regulations.

* Indicates this county is partially within this RFP and is also represented by at least one other RFP

COLLECTED DATA - IN PROGRESS

Entity ¹	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/No/ Unknown) ¹	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/No) ¹	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ¹	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ²	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/None) ²	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{2,3}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ²
Cities/Towns							
Atlanta	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Bonham	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Clarksville	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Commerce	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Denison	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Gilmer	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Jefferson	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Linden	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Mount Pleasant	Yes	Yes	Yes		Moderate		
Mount Vernon	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		Yes
New Boston	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Ore City	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Paris	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Pittsburg	Yes	Yes	Yes		Low		
Sherman	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		Yes
Sulphur Springs	Yes	Yes	Yes		None		
Texarkana	Yes	Yes	Yes		Moderate		
Wake Village	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		
Whitewright	Yes	Yes	Yes		Strong		

¹ At a minimum, the RFPGs must list all counties, cities and communities in the region with flood related authority in the region and identify whether entity they have any established floodplain management practices.

² This field may be left blank during the 1st planning cycle. However, RFPGs are strongly encouraged to provide this information when applicable and available.

³ The following may serve as a guide for evaluating enforcement:

high- actively enforces the entire ordinance, performs many inspections throughout construction process, issues fines, violations, and Section 1316s where appropriate, and enforces substantial damage and substantial improvement;

moderate- enforces much of the ordinance, performs limited inspections and is limited in issuance of fines and violations;

low- provides permitting of development in the floodplain, may not perform inspections, may not issue fines or violations;


none- does not enforce floodplain management regulations.

* Indicates this county is partially within this RFPG and is also represented by at least one other RFPG


Task 3 – Floodplain Management Standards & Flood Protection Goals



ANALYSIS



FEMA Minimum Standards



DISCLAIMER: This map was generated by the Texas Water Development Board using GIS (Geographical Information System) software. No claims are made to the accuracy or completeness of the information shown herein nor to its suitability for a particular use. The scale and location of all mapped data are approximate. Map date: 05/01/2020

- County boundaries
- Major river basin boundaries
- Major roadways


- Major reservoirs
- Major rivers
- County seats



Texas Water Development Board
 1700 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701
www.twdb.texas.gov - @twdb - facebook.com/twdbboard



ANALYSIS



Identify Gaps

- Standards/policies
- Quantify risk reduction (life & property)
- Restore failing infrastructure
- Flood warning and response
- Floodplain protection
- Inter-jurisdictional cooperation

Sub-Regional Level

- Unique circumstances



DISCLAIMER: This map was generated by the Texas Water Development Board using GIS (Geographical Information System) software. No claims are made to the accuracy or completeness of the information shown herein nor to its suitability for a particular use. The scale and location of all mapped data are approximate. Map date: 05/01/2020

County boundaries
Major river basin boundaries
Major roadways



Major reservoirs
Major rivers
County seats



Texas Water Development Board
1700 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701
www.twdb.texas.gov - @twdb - facebook.com/twdbboard



ANALYSIS




Definitions

- BFE – Base Flood Elevation
- BLE – Base Level Engineering
- Freeboard – An additional amount of height above the BFE used as a factor of safety in determining the level at which a structure's lowest floor must be elevated or floodproofed to be in accordance with state or community floodplain management regulations
- Variances - A grant of relief by the city from the terms of a floodplain management regulation


Data Collection

Cities - Freeboard Requirement




■ None ■ Above BFE ■ 1 foot above BFE ■ 2 foot above BFE

Counties - Freeboard Requirement




■ None ■ Above BFE ■ 1 foot above BFE ■ 2 foot above BFE

Cities - Requires BFE Data Be Generated for Developments Greater Than 50 lots/3 Acres



■ None ■ Yes ■ Modified Requirement


Counties - Requires BFE Data Be Generated for Developments Greater Than 50 lots/3 Acres



■ None ■ Yes ■ Modified Requirement


Data Collection

Cities - Variances Not to be Granted Within Any Floodway if a Rise in Flood Levels Would Occur




■ None ■ Yes ■ Modified Requirement

Counties - Variances Not to be Granted Within Any Floodway if a Rise Flood Levels Would Occur




■ None ■ Yes ■ Modified Requirement

Cities - Have Detention Facility Requirements



■ No ■ Yes

Counties - Have Detention Facility Requirements



■ No ■ Yes

RECOMMEND

Preliminary Standards – if applicable



RFPG
Technical
Consultant



Data Collection



Public Input

Floodplain Management

Land Use Standards

Economic Development

Infrastructure Protection
Standards

RECOMMEND

Preliminary Goals



RFPG

Technical
Consultant



Data Collection



Public Input

Lower Risk to Life & Property

Infrastructure Protection

Land Preservation

Funding Mechanisms

Adopt Minimum Standards

Increase NFIP
Participation

Short-term
(10-yr)

Long-term
(30-yr)

Preliminary
Standards

Standards: Recommend or Adopt?

Recommend

No pre-requisite. All FME, FMS and FMP can be considered in the Regional Flood Plan

Adopt

Jurisdictions must meet adopted standards BEFORE FME, FMS or FMP can be considered for inclusion in the Regional Flood Plan

FME – Floodplain Management Evaluation

FMS – Floodplain Management Strategy

FMP – Floodplain Management Project

RECOMMEND

Preliminary Goals - Examples



RFPG

Technical
Consultant



Goal	Term of Goal	Target Year	Applicable to	Overarching Goal
Increase coverage of flood hazard data by completing studies in 50% of the areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.	Short Term	2033	HUC-8 Watershed	Protect against the loss of life and property

RECOMMEND

Preliminary Goals - Examples



RFPG, Technical Consultant



Non-Structural Goals



Goal	Term of Goal	Target Year	Applicable to	Overarching Goal
50% of the region's population is part of a municipality that has a dedicated funding mechanism for drainage projects.	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
Consider and incorporate nature-based practices in flood risk reduction projects.	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
Enroll 50% of non-participating communities into the National Flood Insurance Program .	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property

RECOMMEND

Preliminary Goals - Examples

RFPG

Technical
Consultant



Goal	Term of Goal	Target Year	Applicable to	Overarching Goal
Remove 20% of the existing structures from 1% annual chance floodplain	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
Remove 50% of the existing structures from 1% annual chance floodplain	Long Term	2053	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property

Goals - Examples

Goal	Term of Goal	Target Year	Applicable to	Overarching Goal
Increase coverage of flood hazard data by completing studies in 50% of the areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping	Short Term	2033	HUC-8 Watershed	Protect against the loss of life and property
Enroll 50% of non-participating communities into the National Flood Insurance Program	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
100% community enrollment with no suspensions or sanctions	Long Term	2053	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
Remove 50% of the existing structures in the current 1% annual chance floodplain	Short Term	2033	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property
Remove 95% of the existing structures from 1% annual chance floodplain in the region	Long Term	2053	Entire Region	Protect against the loss of life and property

Interactive Session

On your phone or computer, go to:

www.menti.com

Use code: [Will provide at meeting]



Please enter the code

You must enter a code to continue.

Submit

The code is found on the screen in front of you

Ch. 4 Introduction & Overview

Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis

Task 4 Summary

- 4A: Needs (Gap Analysis)
 - Studies needed to identify and quantify flood risks
 - Analysis needed to evaluate projects
- 4B: Identify and evaluate FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs
 - Flood Mitigation Evaluations
 - Flood Mitigation Strategies
 - Flood Mitigation Projects
 - Will need RFPG guidance on how to select for inclusion in plan
- 4C: Tech Memo
 - Due January 7, 2022
 - Will need to vote on at December meeting
 - Will discuss at the November meeting



WHAT NEXT?

LOOK-AHEAD

September

- Chapter 1 Discussion
- Review survey input
- Vote on goals (Chapter 3)
- Process to identify FMEs, FMSs & FMPs (Chapter 4)

Subject to TWDB Input on Fathom Data

October

- Review survey input
- Refine process to select FMEs, FMSs & FMPs (Chapter 4)

November

- Tech memo presentation and discussion
- Chapter 4 & Tech Memo approvals

December

- Tech Memo formal approval

Other Updates

- The legislature has authorized additional funding (\$10 M statewide) for the State Flood Planning effort.
 - Requested larger share of additional funding
 - Will spend on mapping gaps and updates
 - Additional FME, FMP, and FMS evaluation



OPEN DISCUSSION

Floodplain Management Practices & Flood Protection Goals