

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

February 3, 2022

2:00 pm

at

Northeast Texas Community College

The Community Room – (HUM 101),

2886 FM 1730, Chapel Hill Road,

Mt. Pleasant, TX 7455

(See map included)

or

Via teleconference/webinar

Use the following information to register for the meeting:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMsc-ivqzsuG9Si1Qn4n8gi1w6b6Bd8kFx>

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

If you experience issues while registering or do not have access to a computer, please contact Paul Prange no less than two (2) workdays prior to the meeting at 903.255.3519 or pprange@atcog.org.

Agenda:

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome
3. Confirmation of attendees / determination of quorum
4. Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Action Items

5. Consider approval of minutes for the meeting held December 9, 2021.
6. Discuss and Consider establishing a subcommittee to review Task 5 FMS/E/Ps and select for recommendation.

Presentations

7. Texas Water Development Board Update
8. Region 1 Canadian-Upper Red Regional Flood Planning Group Updates

Technical Consultant Update

9. Technical Presentation by Halff Associates, Inc.
 - a. Chapter 1 Summary and Discussion
 - b. Task 2
 1. Requirements
 2. Existing Conditions Flood Quilt Review
 3. Take public comments on existing conditions flood quilt
 4. Future Conditions Methodology
 - c. Task 5 Process
 1. Establish Task 5 subcommittee to review FMS/E/s and select for recommendation
 - d. Tech Memo Addendum
 1. Present Outline

2. Present Future Conditions Methodology
- e. Schedule through August 1, 2022

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.

Directions to Northeast Texas Community College:

From Mt. Pleasant, take Hwy 49 to FM 1730. From the intersection of Hwy 49 and FM 1730, travel south approx 2.5 miles to the north entrance of the campus on the right.

From the north entrance, the Humanities Building (HUM) is the first building you will see. Parking will be to your right and the entrance will be on the east side (left and towards the back as you walk toward the building after parking-see blue line on campus map)

You may also enter from the main entrance (College Rd.) and park in the visitor parking circle





Meeting Minutes
Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Flood Planning Group Meeting
January 6, 2022
2:00 p.m.

**City of Sherman Council Chambers, 220 W. Mulberry St., Sherman, TX 75091 and 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	X
Andy Endsley	Counties	X
W. Greg Carter	Electric generating utilities	X
Laura-Ashley Overdyke	Environmental interests	X
Casey Johnson	Industries	X
Dustin Henslee	Municipalities	X
Kirby Hollingsworth	Public	
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	
Andrea Sanders	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	
Anita Machiavello (Morgan White - Alternate)	Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)	X
Michelle Havelka	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	X
Darlene Prochaska	USACE, Fort Worth District	
Travis Wilsey	USACE, Tulsa District	
Randy Whiteman	RFPG 1 Liaison	X
Richard Brontoli	Red River Valley Association	X
Jason Dupree	TxDOT – Atlanta District	X
Dan Perry	TxDOT – Paris District	X

Quorum:

Quorum: **Yes**

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: **10**

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

Other Meeting Attendees: **

Chris Brown - ATCOG

Paul Prange – ATCOG

Joshua McClure – Halff Associates Team

David Rivera – Halff Associates Team

Parker Moore – Halff Associates Team

Chris Hartung - SRBA

Walt Sears – NETMWD

Paul Hensel – City of Hooks, TX

Lisa Mairs – USACE

James Bronikowski - TWDB

**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 2:00p.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome

Reeves Hayter welcomed members and attendees to the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Flood Planning Group meeting.

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

Reeves Hayter asked ATCOG staff member, Paul Prange, to conduct a roll call of attendees. 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 five non-voting members were absent.

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

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

ACTION ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Consider approval of minutes for the meeting held Thursday, November 4, 2021.

***Additional Action Items Below**

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. Paul Prange announced that a few dates were listed incorrectly in the minutes initially provided to the Region 2 board members, but had been revised prior to the meeting for review and approval. A motion was made by Greg Carter and was seconded by Susan Weir to approve the minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Discuss and Consider nominations for election of Region 2 RFPG Officers to include Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Executive Committee:

- a. Nominations for Chair by members**
- b. Discussion and Consideration of election of Chair**
- c. Nominations for Vice Chair by members**
- d. Discussion and Consideration of election of Vice Chair**
- e. Nominations for Secretary by members**
- f. Discussion and Consideration of election of Secretary**
- g. Nomination for additional Executive Committee members (2 voting members-at-large)**
- h. Discussion and Consideration of election of Executive Committee members**

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and consideration of election of RFPG2 Officers. A motion was made by Greg Carter to nominate Mr. Hayter to remain as Chair and the motion was seconded by Joseph Weir. Mr. Hayter then asked the Region 2 members if they would like to re-elect the current Officers to serve terms during 2022. The board members agreed to keep the current Officers in place and a motion to do so was made by Joseph Weir and seconded by Casey Johnson. The motion carried unanimously.

PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Texas Water Development Board Update:

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Anita Machiavello who announced that the TWDB hosted two webinars on December 8, 2021 and that they are available for viewing on the TWDB website. The first was the RFPG Technical Consultants' Conference Call focusing on Flood Management Strategies, Future Condition Flood Risk, Inclusion of Raw Data in the RFP, Unique ID Numbers, and Emergency Need Definition. The second was the RFPG Chairs' Conference Call focusing on Emergency Need and Flood Management Strategies. Ms. Machiavello also asked the Region 2 Sponsor and Technical Consultant to review recent emails submitted to them from the TWDB containing additional information relating to FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs and that she would be available to provide more details in the upcoming months. Casey Johnson mentioned that he did not receive the emails that Ms. Machiavello referred to and Mr. Hayter asked if the TWDB staff could check their contact list to make sure all Region 2 board members are receiving notifications. Chris Brown mentioned that the TWDB publishes a newsletter which could be provided to the Region 2 board members on a monthly basis.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Region 1 Canadian-Upper Red Regional Flood Planning Group Updates:

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Randy Whiteman, the liaison for Region 1, and he announced that the Technical Memorandum has been submitted by Region 1 and they are currently working on GIS data relating to low water crossings and the infrastructure summary. David Rivera announced that Region 1 is partnering with a few local universities to conduct additional educational outreach activities relating to Task 11. Mr. Hayter stated that he likes the idea of partnering with local universities to improve our outreach capabilities and that there are several institutions located within Region 2 that could participate in this effort. Joshua McClure announced that Halff Associates could look into this possibility. Anita Machiavello stated that the TWDB could provide guidance to Region 2 for contracting with local universities to conduct educational outreach.

TECHNICAL CONSULTANT UPDATE

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Technical Presentation by Halff Associates, Inc.

- a. Technical Memo Submittal Update**
- b. Chapter 1 Presentation**
- c. Task 2 Flood Risk Data Update**
- d. Schedule**

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Joshua McClure who provided a Status Update focusing on the Tech Memo Submittal, Chapter 1 Presentation, Task 2 Flood Risk Data Update, and the Schedule of Upcoming Deliverables. Mr. McClure stated that the Tech Memo Submittal is due to TWDB on January 7, 2022 and that the TWDB provided a submittal checklist requiring two additional tables to be included. Mr. McClure also mentioned that the Tech Memo will require signed approval from the Region 2 Chair prior to submittal to the TWDB for review.

Joshua McClure conducted a presentation focusing on Chapter 1 and produced several slides containing data that has been collected to provide an overview of the basins located within Region 2. Mr. McClure provided information relating to Population, Community Growth Rates, Median Household Income,

Agricultural Statistics, Social Vulnerability Index, Industry, Political Subdivisions, NFIP Participation, Presidential Disaster and Emergency Declarations, Flood Events, Critical Facilities, Natural and Constructed Flood Infrastructure, Low Water Crossings, Flood Infrastructure Condition, and Proposed Flood Mitigation Projects. Discussion took place among the Region 2 members and the technical consultants relating to this data. Chris Brown asked Anita Machiavello if future grant funding would be affected by the Social Vulnerability Index data and Ms. Machiavello stated that she would find out and let Mr. Brown know. Reeves Hayter stated that the Social Vulnerability Index data seemed to be completely backwards, according to his understanding and Mr. McClure mentioned that certain areas may have a difficult time receiving TWDB funding due to their Social Vulnerability Index rating. Greg Carter commented on the Property Damage Values listed on the Flood Events by County slide and indicated that some data may need to be confirmed. Walt Sears commented about possible inaccurate data listed for Franklin County, relating to property damage due to flooding. Mr. Brown stated that a lot of the data reflects the level of reporting provided by communities within the region. Mr. Hayter asked for a definition of a Low Water Crossing and Mr. McClure stated that it is an area of a roadway that is designed to be flooded during a significant rainfall event. Dan Perry announced that TxDOT does not designate or inventory areas defined as Low Water Crossings. Mr. Hayter asked Ms. Machiavello if she could provide more information relating to Low Water Crossings. Mr. McClure asked the Region 2 members to provide him with any local flood data to be included within the Regional Flood Plan.

Joshua McClure presented information on Task 2 Flood Risk Data Update. Task 2 focuses on merging all floodplain data together from NFHL (approximate and Detailed), FAFDS and FATHOM data sources to compile the Floodplain Quilt for Region 2. Mr. McClure pointed out that Delta, Camp, Franklin, Marion and Red River Counties had no existing floodplain data available, so the FATHOM data has been utilized to designate the approximate floodplains in these five counties. Mr. McClure stated that the completed Floodplain Quilt will be provided to the Region 2 board members as an interactive digital map to allow for more detailed viewing for additional feedback.

Joshua McClure then presented the Look-Ahead portion of his presentation and stated that the Tech Memo will be submitted to the TWDB on January 7, 2022 in compliance with the schedule of deliverables. In February 2022, the Final Tech Memo will need to be approved by the Region 2 board members along with discussion of Chapters 3 and 4. Task 5 will also need to be discussed and it contains the recommendations of FMSs, FMEs, and FMPs within Region 2. Task 5 may require a subcommittee to review the data and will likely be addressed at the March 2022 meeting. The Final Tech Memo is due to be submitted to the TWDB on March 7, 2022 as well. Reeves Hayter agreed that Task 5 should be addressed at the March 2022 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Update from Planning Group Sponsor

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Chris Brown who announced that ATCOG does not have any updates for the Region 2 board members at this time.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: 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, February 3, 2022 at 2:00p.m. at a location to be determined in the central part of the region and via webinar/teleconference.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Adjourn

Reeves Hayter opened the floor to adjourn the meeting.

A motion was made by Kelly Mitchell and Seconded by Laura Ashley Overdyke.

The vote to adjourn was passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:28p.m. by Reeves Hayter.


Approved by the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress RFPG at a meeting held on 02/03/2022.

Reeves Hayter, CHAIR



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

February 3, 2022



Outline/Agenda

- Tech Memo Addendum Status Update
- Chapter 1 – Planning Area Description
- Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions Flood Risk Analysis
- Chapter 5 - Recommendation of FMEs, FMPs and FMSs
- Schedule

Status Update

Tech Memo Addendum Submittal

- Initial Tech Memo was submitted January 7
 - January 7 Tech Memo has been administratively approved
- Final tech Memo due to TWDB Monday, March 7.
 - Required data not included in the January 7 tech memo
- TWDB provided submittal checklist
 - Geodatabases and maps



Chapter 1 – Planning Area Description



Discuss Chapter 1 Comments



Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions Flood Risk Analysis

Existing Flood Risks – Floodplain Quilt


- FEMA National Flood Hazard Layer
 - Detailed Studies - Zone AE
 - Includes 1% and 0.2% Annual Chance
 - Approximate Studies – Zone A
 - Only includes 1% AC
- FEMA Base Leve Engineering (BLE)
 - Includes 1% and 0.2% AC
- Fathom
 - Includes 1% and 0.2% AC
 - Pluvial – Riverine
 - Fluvial – Upland
- FAFDS Data
 - Likely from lost FEMA Maps
 - 1% AC and sometimes 0.2% AC

Floodquilt Hierarchy & Approach


Best Available		→		→		→		Most Approximate	
Local Floodplain (if determined)		NFHL AE		BLE		NFHL A		FAFDS, or No FEMA	
100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR
Local Study, if provided	Local Study, if provided	Zone AE + Pluvial Fathom*	Zone AE + Pluvial Fathom*	BLE + Pluvial Fathom	BLE + Pluvial Fathom	Zone A + Pluvial Fathom	Zone A + Pluvial Fathom	Combined Pluvial & Fluvial (Replaced FAFDS with Fathom)	Combined Pluvial & Fluvial (Replaced FAFD with Fathom)
Local Study, if provided	Local Study, if provided	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Fathom Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year

*Area of dated NFHL AE in Red River area was replaced with updated BLE.


Existing 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area



Existing 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area by Data Source




Populations Potentially Affected by 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area




Nighttime populations included. Percentages represent percentage of total population.


Structures in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area



Structures in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area




Critical Facilities in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area




Critical Facilities Include: Airports, Power Plants, Super Fire Stations, Police Stations, Nursing Homes, Schools, Shelters, Super Fund Sites, W/WW Treatment Facilities

Critical Facilities in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area



Critical Facilities Include: Airports, Power Plants, Super Fire Stations, Police Stations, Nursing Homes, Schools, Shelters, Super Fund Sites, W/WW Treatment Facilities

Agricultural Area in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area




**Over \$45.7 Million Crops at Risk in
1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area**

**Using USDA 2021 US Crop Values and 2021
Texas Yields*


**191,209 Acres of Cropland at Risk,
Valued Over \$411 Million**

**Using USDA 2021 Value of Texas Cropland
\$2150/acre*



Agricultural Area in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area



Roads in 1% & 0.2% Flood Risk Area




Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) by County



SVI calculated by averaging Census-tract assigned SVI of building footprints in flood risk areas.

Future Conditions



Floodquilt Hierarchy & Approach

Best Available		→		→		→		Most Approximate	
Local Floodplain (if determined)		NFHL AE		BLE		NFHL A		FAFDS, or No FEMA	
100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR	100YR	500YR
Local Study, if provided	Local Study, if provided	Zone AE + Pluvial Fathom*	Zone AE + Pluvial Fathom*	BLE + Pluvial Fathom	BLE + Pluvial Fathom	Zone A + Pluvial Fathom	Zone A + Pluvial Fathom	Combined Pluvial & Fluvial (Replaced FAFDS with Fathom)	Combined Pluvial & Fluvial (Replaced FAFD with Fathom)
Local Study, if provided	Local Study, if provided	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year	Fathom Existing 500-Year	27" Buffer of Existing 500' Year

*Area of dated NFHL AE in Red River area was replaced with updated BLE.

Chapter 5 - Recommendation of FMEs, FMPPs and FMSSs

Task 4B & 5 Interdependency




- Data Gathering
- Analysis

- Decision making process

Task 4B & 5 General Strategy

Task 4B



Task 5



Task 4B & 5 General Strategy

Task 4B

Task 5



- Meet TWDB requirements
- Actions in areas of greatest need
- Actions with highest flood risk indicators and potential for benefit
- Sponsor support

Process for Recommending FMEs

Screening

“Not every conceivable FME will be recommended. The RFPG and technical consultant must decide which identified potential FME will be recommended.”

1. Goals

- Remove FMEs that do not support a goal.



2. Contact Sponsors

- Verify if study has been completed.
- Verify interest in potential FME.
- Request additional data to refine FME Areas.
- Remove FMEs that have been completed or Sponsor is not interested.

Complete Analysis for Remaining Actions

3. Analysis

- Refine FME areas as needed.
- Populate Flood Risk Indicators.
- Calculate cost for FME.

Process for Recommending FMEs

Screening

“Not every conceivable FME will be recommended. The RFPG and technical consultant must decide which identified potential FME will be recommended.”

1. Goals

- Remove FMEs that do not support a goal.



2. Contact Sponsors

- Verify if study has been completed.
- Verify interest in potential FME.
- Request additional data to refine FME Areas.
- Remove FMEs that have been completed or Sponsor is not interested.

3. Analysis

- Refine FME areas as needed.
- Populate Flood Risk Indicators.
- Calculate cost for FME.

Complete Analysis for Remaining Actions

Flood Risk Indicators

- Structures in 100-yr floodplain
- Population at 100-yr flood risk
- Critical facilities at 100-yr flood risk
- # of low water crossings
- Farm and ranch land at 100-yr flood risk
- Roads at 100-yr flood risk

Process for Recommending FMEs

Sub-Committee meeting #1
Steps 4 and 5.

Sub-Committee meeting #2
Step 6

Evaluate
Feasible
Actions

“Recommend FMEs that the RFPG determines are most likely to result in identification of potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs”

4. Evaluate

- Quantifiable results to ID FMEs with the most complete information and/or could result in the greatest benefits.
- Identify FMEs that have real potential to develop into FMP for the next cycle.
- Identify FMEs that could be promoted to FMP (*RFPG to decide whether FMEs will be performed during this planning cycle as part of Task 12*).
- Identify FMEs located in areas of greatest need (Use Task 4A results).

5. Goals

- Review selected FMEs to verify if they cover all short-term goals.
- Develop additional FMEs as needed to cover missing short-term goal.
- Identify Sponsors for additional FMEs and obtain their commitment.

6. Recommend

- Final FME Recommendations.

Recommend

Process for Recommending FMPs



“The RFPGs will recommend specific FMPs in the regional flood plan. The primary function of each recommended FMP must be flood risk reduction and they must include quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits.”

1. Goals

- Remove FMPs that do not support a goal.



2. Unfeasible

- Focuses on addressing response and recovery rather than mitigation.
- Does not provide flood mitigation for the 100-yr flood event (*may still be recommended if RFPG desires*)
- FMP is dependent on another action that was classified as unfeasible.

3. Contact Sponsors

- Verify if project has been completed.
- Verify interest in potential FMP and request commitment to sponsor it.
- Request additional data to refine FMP Areas.
- Remove FMPs that have been completed or Sponsor is not interested.

Process for Recommending FMPs

“The RFPGs will recommend specific FMPs in the regional flood plan. The primary function of each recommended FMP must be flood risk reduction and they must include quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits.”

Screening

4. Initial Analysis

- Refine FMP areas as needed.
- Populate Flood Risk Indicators.

5. Evaluate

- RFPG Sub-committee determines which FMPs to perform full analysis.

6. Full Analysis

- Reduction in Flood Risk
- Negative Impacts Determination
- Calculate costs
- Benefit-Cost Analysis

Complete Analysis for Remaining Actions

Process for Recommending FMPs

Sub-Committee meeting #1
Step 9

Sub-Committee meeting #2
Step 10

“The RFPGs will recommend specific FMPs in the regional flood plan. The primary function of each recommended FMP must be flood risk reduction and they must include quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits.”

7. Unfeasible

- Causes adverse impacts
 - Duplicates benefits
 - Overallocation of water supply source
 - FMP is dependent on another action that was classified as unfeasible.
- Does not result in quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits.
Implementation issues
Known opposition.

8. Demote

- Determine if there are any FMPs that need to be demoted to FME.

9. Evaluate

- Quantifiable results to ID FMPs with the most complete information and/or could result in the greatest benefits.
- Identify FMPs located in areas of greatest need (Use Task 4A results).


10.
Recommend

- Final FMP Recommendations.

Evaluate
Feasible
Actions

Recommend

Potential Task 5 and Sub-Committee Meeting Schedule



Chapter 5- Recommendation of FMS/E/Ps

- TWDB provided notice to proceed
- Consider forming subcommittee to evaluate all FMS/E/Ps

LOOK-AHEAD

February

- Discuss Chapter 1 Comments
- Task 5 – Evaluate FMS/E/Ps
- Complete Chapter 2
- Complete Tech Memo Addendum

March

- Final Tech Memo approval
- Submit final Tech Memo to TWDB – Mar 7, 2022
- Discussion on Chapter 5
- Discuss Chapter 2 Comments
- Submit Chapter 4 and 5

April

- Discussion on Chapter 4 and 5
- Submit 6 and 7

May

- Discussion on Chapter 6 and 7
- Submit 8 and 9

June

- Discussion on Chapter 8 and 9
- Submit 10

July

- Discussion on 10
- Draft Regional Flood Plan Approval

August- Draft Regional Flood Plan due August 1