

Meeting Minutes
Region 11 Guadalupe Regional Flood Planning Group Meeting
September 8, 2021 at 4:00 PM
Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority River Annex (905 Nolan Street, Seguin, TX 78155)
or
GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Interest Category</u>	<u>Present (x) / Absent () / Alternate Present (*)</u>
Doug Miller Melissa Reynolds*	<i>Agricultural</i>	X
John Johnston	<i>Counties</i>	X
Lon Shell	<i>Counties</i>	X
Bobby Christmas	<i>Electric Generating Utilities</i>	
Annalisa Peace Vanessa Puig-Williams*	<i>Environmental</i>	X
Beth Parker Doug Sethness*	<i>Flood districts</i>	*Camera unable to turn on
Kevin Stone	<i>Industries</i>	
Joseph Pantalion Laurie Moyer*	<i>Municipalities</i>	X
Ken Gill	<i>Municipalities</i>	X
Dr. Kimberly Meitzen	<i>Public</i>	X
R. Brian Perkins Charlie Hickman*	<i>River Authorities</i>	X Camera unable to turn on
Ray Buck Jonathan Letz*	<i>River Authorities</i>	
Gian Villarreal Tami Norton*	<i>Small Business</i>	X
Ronald (Ron) Fieseler	<i>Water Districts</i>	X
Vacant	<i>Water Utilities</i>	

<u>Non-voting Member</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Present(x)/Absent()/ Alternate Present (*)</u>
Sue Reilly Beth Bendik*	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	X
Jim Guin	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X
Jami McCool Kristin Lambrecht*	Texas Department of Agriculture	*
Allen Nash	Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board	
Kris Robles Teresa Williams*	General Land Office	*
Morgan White Richard Bagans*	Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)	X
Joel Klumpp Brittney Wortham-Teakell*	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	

Don Durden	Public	X
Suzanne Scott	Region 12 Liaison	X
Patrick Brzozowski Scott Hartl*	Region 10 Liaison	*

Quorum:

Quorum: Yes

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: 9 (voting members Doug Sethness & Brian Perkins not counted in Quorum as their cameras were unable to turn on)

Number required for quorum per current voting positions of 15: 8

Other Meeting Attendees:

Lauren Willis, GBRA (Facilitator)	John Espinoza
Jay Scanlon, Freese & Nichols, Inc.	James Fancher
Adam Conner, Freese & Nichols, Inc.	Jeremy Garrett
Velma Danielson, Blanton & Associates	Charles Hastings
Alicia Reinmund-Martinez, Blanton	Pam Hawkins
Tom Hegemier, Doucet & Associates	Christina Lopez
Daniel Harris, Scheibe Consulting	Laurie Moyer
Hilmar Starcke, GCGCD	Blake Neffendorf
Linda Bishop, SCTX Water Coalition	Pratibha Sapkota
Michael Pieprzica, Resident	Eric Scheibe
Humberto Ramos, CRWA	Angela Smith
James Blakey	Kurt Solis
Cheri Courtney	Joyce Wannuzzi
Jen Crownover	Dianne Wassenich

All meeting materials are available for the public at: <http://www.guadalupeRFPG.org>

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order

Chairman Doug Miller called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM. Lauren Willis called roll of the planning group members to record attendance and a quorum was established.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome

Chairman Miller welcomed members to the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Approval of Minutes from the August 4, 2021 Region 11 RFPG Meeting

Chairman Miller opened discussion on approving the minutes from the August 4, 2021 Region 11 RFPG Meeting.

A motion was made by Ron Fieseler to approve the August 4, 2021 Region 11 RFPG Meeting. Ken Gill seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Region 11 Guadalupe RFPG Chair Updates

Chairman Miller did not have any updates.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Updates

Morgan White provided updates regarding the additional funding of \$10 million that will be taken in front of the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) for approval at the September 23rd meeting. The TWDB will be working with the contract sponsors (GBRA) to enter into contract amendments. The TWDB issued an extension for portions of the Technical Memorandum that's due in January 2022. An extension of time has been given for only 2A deliverables. Ms. White also reviewed upcoming meetings for the Chairs Conference Call, Webinar for planning group sponsors for payment requests and Webinar about the Benefit/Cost Analysis tool.

Ms. Annalisa Peace asked if the TWDB would be providing a matrix for the RFPG to prioritize projects from the additional allocation of funds. Ms. White clarified that the TWDB would be taking to the board how the additional \$10 Million in funds could be allocated between the 15 regions. In the RFPG current scope of work, the RFPG is required to evaluate and recommend projects, regions won't be doing any ranking/prioritizing of projects. Ranking will occur during the State Flood Planning Process.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Guadalupe Region 11 RFPG Sponsor Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority (GBRA) Updates

Lauren Willis discussed the hybrid format of meetings, re-iterating that voting members must have their camera's on throughout the meeting. Public comments will be taken at the end of the meeting for both online and in-person attendees. Ms. Willis reviewed what media outlets received the Public Service Announcement for the August 4th Public Input Meeting.

Chairman Miller asked a question about the location of the articles published. The links to these online articles were provided in the meeting materials. Dr. Kimberly Meitzen asked Commission Durden what kind of community outreach he performed in order to get the public participation. Commission Durden responded that the Comfort Floodplain Coalition was to attribute to this success.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Discussion and potential action regarding administrative expenses to be submitted to the Texas Water Development Board for reimbursement.

Lauren Willis explained the TWDB rules with regards to the RFPG approving administrative costs incurred by GBRA. Ms. Willis reviewed the approved budget for GBRA to be reimbursed for their expenses.

A motion was made by John Johnston to approve the submittal of \$5,246.39 in administrative costs to be reimbursed by the TWDB. Ron Fieseler seconded the motion. The motion was approved by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Update from Region 10 (Lower Colorado-Lavaca) and Region 12 (San Antonio) Liaisons

Mr. Ron Fieseler gave the following updates for Region 10; (1) the group has not yet met in person, (2) Region 10 and Region 11 are on the same track timeline wise, and (3) Public meetings have been done online and through questionnaires. Ms. Annalisa Peace gave the following updates for Region 12; (1) the group has been discussing sub-committees for public outreach and technical review and temporary sub-committees to set the criteria for goals and emergency responses, and (2) technical consultant presentations and (3) part of the consultants outreach, an ArcGIS story map was created. Ms. Suzanne Scott stated that the voting membership has been changed. A Non-profit vacancy was created for herself and Derek Boese, General Manager of SARA is now the new River Authority representative.

Mr. Fieseler asked the TWDB to clarify the emails that he's been receiving about Flood Planning Liaisons to have additional meetings. Ms. White stated that this was for the Texas Integrated Flooding Framework (TIFF) effort that the TWDB invited the coastal liaisons to a meeting to get input and advice.

Chairman Miller reviewed the Open Meetings Act criteria that sub-committees would need to follow and opened the floor for discussion on creating these. At this time, additional sub-committees are not being created.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Discussion and potential action regarding the solicitation to fill the vacant voting position in the Water Utilities interest category.

Lauren Willis informed the RFPG that four nominations had been received, reminded the group that the nomination is open until Friday, September 10th at 5pm and reviewed the definition of the water utility interest category. Chairman Miller reviewed the process for the interviews with the Executive Committee to then bring a recommendation to the full group.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Technical consultant's public outreach updates.

Ms. Velma Daniels reviewed the public involvement efforts, focusing on following three categories:

- Second Pre-planning public meeting: 61 attendees (32 members of the public and 7 elected officials), 11 individuals provided verbal comments
- Virtual public meeting from August 4th – 18th: 87 individual users that visited the site, 5 individuals submitted comments via electronic comment form, 9 individuals submitted comments through the interactive comment map
- Public comments received through project email address (comments@guadaluperfpg.org): received 8 comments and the process was discussed. All comments get a response from the consultant team.

Ms. Annalisa Peace and Dr. Kimberley Meitzen asked for the full text of the public comments to be provided as an attachment to the meeting minutes or appendix to meeting materials. Mr. Ron Fieseler inquired about the types of comments being submitted.

AGENDA ITEM NO.11: Discussion and potential action regarding Region 11 RFPG Technical Consultants work and schedule

Mr. Jay Scanlon reviewed the schedule of getting the base data ready/processing new data and focusing on the immediate concerns with the information that needs to be included in the technical memorandum. This meeting will focus on practices and goals and the potential screening process to put in place for flood management evaluations, studies and projects.

Task 1 review of project area description: 22 counties in the region, 6,030 sq. miles, 752,586 residents, population locations, day/night time populations, 14,633 stream miles (according to base level engineering), USDA land use classifications, approximately 34 cities/towns, and reviewed flood damages.

Task 2 review of flood risk: identifying structures at risk, potential road inundation, reviewed the social vulnerability index (SVI) and composition map.

Mr. Tom Hegemier led the discussion for Task 3 of floodplain management and flood mitigation practices and goals. The following topics were reviewed: Texas Floodplain Management Association (TFMA) statewide survey results, interactive comment map (29 inputs = 10 projects and 19 concerns), Region 11 Survey Monkey (12 responses received from the middle of the basin), Public Meeting Real-Time Survey (August 4th Menti survey results), and RFPG Survey for goals/practices/timelines (received 9 responses).

The question was asked if the RFPG should adopt minimum standards for local governments before FME, FMS, and FMP can be included in the Regional Flood Plan. According to the RFPG survey, 50% indicated yes but with concerns over what the standards could be. Chairman Miller led a discussion among the RFPG members about the potential effect to local communities & governments.

- Mr. Fieseler asked for clarification on whether the regional planning group has the authority to set standards. Ms. Morgan White stated that the Regional Flood Planning groups have the authority/control of what projects are allowed within the flood plan.
- Mr. Ken Gill mentioned that Cities would need to adopt the requirements with a city ordinance and is concerned about unfunded mandates. He also mentioned the difference between coastal communities and the hill country.
- Mr. Brian Perkins would like to be more inclusive rather than exclusive in the plan. He would like to provide recommendations not requirements.
- Ms. Annalisa Peace has concerns with the development practices within the region and spoke about reviewing subdivision plans that clearly add to flooding issues and mentioned the practice of making variances to the regulations. She believes that making minimum recommendations to be eligible to funding will go a long way to mitigating flooding.
- Mr. Gian Villarreal believes that inclusivity is good. He would like to encourage cities to be involved with the adoption of standards.
- Dr. Kimberley Meitzen agrees with both Mr. Perkins and Mr. Villarreal. She wants to ensure that an additional burden isn't created since many organizations have a lack of staff and resources. She would like to have language that strongly encourages adoption of minimum standards, but believes that it's premature to do set requirements in this first cycle. Would like to see an incentive (carrot) for minimum standards.
- Mr. Joe Pantalione agrees with Mr. Villarreal and Dr. Meitzen. He likes the idea of strongly encouraging but doesn't believe a mandatory requirement should be put into place.
- Commissioner Durden commented that the decision should be made on a statewide basis and not by region.
- Mr. Jay Scanlon stated that the TWDB is developing what the prioritization process will be of projects. He mentioned that part of the planning process is making legislative recommendations.

- Mr. Tom Hegemier reiterated that the group would like for it to not be mandatory and would like to include recommendations and standards that might even be unique to coastal and hill country.

The survey results about impediments to effective flood management and flooding concerns were reviewed. Discussion occurred about the rating of the flooding concerns with regards to flooded roadways and damages to private property.

- Mr. John Johnston stated that *flooded roadways* should be rated close to *potential loss of life* as there are 'turn around don't drown' efforts. With regards to the *damages to private property* score, he mentioned that individuals are responsible for their own actions with regards to building elevation.
- Chairman Miller commented on the safety precautions of roadways.
- Dr. Kimberley Meitzen asked about where the *lack of flood risk data* came into the rankings. It ranked in the two or three range. This could be attributed to the discussion of the amount of Base Line Engineering (BLE) for the basin. She also stated that with regards to *damages to private property* that economic and agriculture production would have a larger impact at the societal level.
- Gian Villerreal stated that he believes that there is a *potential loss of life* associated with all the flooding concerns listed. He also reduced his ranking for *flooded roadways* because not all roadways are equal, some are critical because they are the only access point for communities. Mr. John Johnston reiterated that there is a difference between flooded roads and low water crossings. Dr. Kimberly Meitzen suggested that *flooded roadways* be combined with *inadequate infrastructure*.
- Ms. Annalisa Peace reiterated that the *potential loss of life* can be attributed to any of the other categories. She is interested to see if the *potential loss of life* category was taken out how the rankings would change. With regards to *damages to private property* along the IH-35 corridor, unregulated development is directly responsible for damage to private property.

The ranking of flood planning outcomes, flooding prevention practices, and flooding mitigation practices received consistent responses. With regards to flooding mitigation practices, Mr. Ron Fieseler stated that flooding along the Blanco River created over topping of water wells creating water quality issues. He would like to see the TWDB well database integrated with a floodplain map.

A discussion occurred about the flooding management goals with regards to setting up short and long term practices and the percent increase or reduction associated with these goals. Dr. Kimberley Meitzen struggled assigning the percentages to these goals since the group doesn't know the baseline for these goals to assign the appropriate values. Mr. Tom Hegemier and Mr. Jay Scanlon stated that these are draft goals that will be provided in the technical memorandum and can be updated.

The technical consultant would like for the RFPG to approve the draft practices/goals at the October 6, 2021 meeting. The meeting materials will be provided one week before the October meeting.

Mr. Jay Scanlon reviewed the steps that need to be taken towards Task 4 Screening. The RFPG needs to have an idea of how to put things into the three buckets; Flood Management Strategies, Flood Management Evaluations and Flood Mitigation Projects. This will lead to Task 5. Mr. Jay Scanlon reviewed the proposed process for Task 4B.

AGENDA ITEM NO.12: Consider date and agenda items for next meeting

Chariman Miller mentioned that while the group is having hybrid meetings, we will not be able to travel because of technical constraints. The meeting will be on October 6th at 2pm and will be held hybrid. Ms. Morgan White mentioned a potential agenda item for the next meeting to enter into a contract amendment with the sponsor from the additional funds that will be allocated from the TWDB.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Public General comments (Public comments limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

Mr. Michael Pieprzica: Gillette, Texas

- Commented on figuring out the process that was set out by the Legislature; what rules and recommendations will be made.
- His experience is mostly in the San Antonio area dealing with both new urban development and the repercussions they make for the public works departments.
- Working with Bexar County flood control district with homes that weren't built in the floodplain but were built on certain soil types that frequently or rarely flood. Overtime those soils that have been flooded will flood again. Individuals doing the reviews don't necessarily pay attention to this attribute.
- Some projects in San Antonio are spending millions of dollars to take several homes out of the floodplains.
- Any assistance that can help reviewers of subdivision plans to be able to fight/push back.
- Would hope that the Guadalupe basin can learn from other urbanized areas like San Antonio.
- Mentioned that nature is the best way to treat and slow down floodwaters instead of engineered ditches.
- Spoke about development upstream of a quarry and how flooding occurred because of a development. Would like for the group to consider regional effects.
- Spoke about detention ponds and the soil types for future developments.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Adjourn

Ken Gill made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by John Johnston. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting adjourned at 6:14 PM by Doug Miller.

Approved by the Region 11 Guadalupe RFPG at a meeting held on 10/06/2021.



Brian Perkins, SECRETARY



Doug Miller, CHAIR