Meeting Minutes

REGION 8 - LOWER BRAZOS REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Brazos River Authority, Lt. Gen. Phillip J. Ford Central Office,
4600 Cobbs Dr. Waco, TX 76710

10:00 a.m. – Thursday, September 18, 2025

Meeting agenda, materials, and audio recordings are available online at www.lowerbrazosflood.org

1. **Call Meeting to Order and Attendance**

   Alysha Girard presided over the meeting in Waco, TX. Ms. Girard called the meeting to order at 10:01 am.

Anthony Beach	P	Alysha Girard	P
Bruce Bodson	P	Matt Phillips	P
Sujeeth Draksharam	P	Kristina Ramirez	P
Tim Finley	P	Jonathan Steiber	A
Russell Ford	P	Mark Vogler	P
Charlotte Gilpin	P	Brandon Wade	A

   Quorum Present: **Yes.** A quorum is 7 of 12 voting members.

2. **Public Input - Public comments on agenda items or flood planning issues (limited to 3 minutes each)**

   Alysha Girard opened the floor for public comments. No public comments.

3. **Consent Agenda**

   3.1. **Approval of Minutes for the August 21, 2025 meeting**

   3.2. **Report, Approval and Certification of the Finance Report Expenditures – No Finance Report**

   Alysha Girard opened the floor for approval of the previous meeting as they were presented. Kristina Ramirez noted a correction needed that her Alternate Robert Wilson attended in her place. Anthony Beach made the motion to approve the previous meeting minutes with this correction and Kristina Ramirez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Discussion and possible action on the report from the technical consultant.**

   Ryan Londeen (Halff) provided an update on the overall schedule and general items that are underway including key points from the TWDB technical consultant call meeting and an emphasis that completion of Task 2A was a critical path for completing the Technical Memo.

   An update on the outreach effort for gathering FMXs was provided. Anthony Beach asked if the number of and type of FMXs could be provided. Ryan indicated that the team is still receiving FMXs and that the final number of FMXs will be provided at the next meeting.

   Ryan asked if there were any comments on draft Chapter 1. No comments were received.

   The technical team provided an update for Task 2A (existing conditions flood quilt). Ryan indicated that the flood inundation issues reported in the Sugarland area are a result of the BLE models not modeling levees appropriately and not accounting for storm sewer infrastructure. He compared the results of detailed modeling versus Fathom data which showed a much better correlation between the two, indicating Fathom may be better than BLE in representing flood risk in urban areas.

   Alysha Gerard mentioned that she believes the current flood quilt is currently overpredicting urban flood risk in all the areas she is familiar with and that BLE does not seem to be functioning well in urban areas.

Ryan provided a summary of the different types of urban/pluvial datasets being used for the flood quilt and how each handles storm sewer infrastructure. He provided examples of each dataset for different areas of the region. He recommended using Fathom for urban areas since it approximates storm sewer infrastructure by removing a portion of the rainfall from the modeling while BLE does not approximate storm sewer at all. He also recommended using a 5,000 population threshold since it roughly correlates with cities that are little over 1-square mile.

Alysha expressed some concern about the population threshold because things may not fit that well. Ryan indicated it's just an approximation. She made the point that small towns use ditches instead of storm sewer which would be reflected in the BLE models.

Kristina Ramirez expressed concern that small cities (especially near her area of Killeen) do not typically have much storm sewer with most of the runoff being routed within the right-of-way, but that Fathom is assuming there is storm sewer there. Ryan responded that the 2-year rainfall is being removed in the Fathom modeling for the City of Killeen to approximate storm sewer (1-year in suburban areas) and that her concern is valid. Both BLE and Fathom are approximations of flood risk, and the team is trying to find a good balance between two imperfect modeling approaches.

Alysha asked if the current flood quilt has BLE or Fathom. Ryan indicated that BLE is being used in Killeen and Temple. However, the east side of Temple is using Fathom. Temple is a good example of Fathom versus BLE.

Tim Finley asked how the team determined where Fathom urban flood risk controls versus riverine flooding where the two may overlap. Ryan responded that in the Fort Bend County area, the team meticulously and manually demarcated pluvial (urban) versus fluvial (riverine) based on experience and engineering judgment. Tim clarified that he is talking specifically about the flooding in Brazoria County and thinks most of the flooding is riverine flooding. Ryan agreed that the Brazos flood plain controls in most areas of Brazoria County except for some areas that are protected by levees (City of Angleton) and that the team took a good amount of effort to differentiate between urban and riverine flood risk.

Sujeeth asked if the team could also take into consideration repeat flood claims or historic issues. Alysha clarified that he is asking if the team could check the flood quilt in areas with historic flood claims, for validation. She indicated a challenge is that the claims can be for any storm (including 500-year or higher) and re-emphasize that this is regionally focused effort, not local. Ryan doubted whether this would be worth the effort and actually give information that is helpful for this exercise. Not everyone reports flood claims, and it may not be a good indicator for how accurate the flood quilt is.

Alysha asked if the group went with this approach, but a community provides corrective feedback on the flood quilt, can the flood quilt be updated and deviate from the approved approach. Ryan indicated that was one purpose of the public road show (to allow communities to review the flood quilt) and the team did get feedback from some communities on the flood quilt at those meetings. That is why the team went back and re-reviewed urban flood risk. He stressed that a decision on the approach does need to be made and does not think waiting for more feedback is going to work with the schedule. He indicated that comments that the team receives after the flood quilt is finalized can be incorporated into the flood quilt during the next cycle.

Alysha agreed that a decision needs to be made. She indicated that riverine flood risk is the most important to get right since that is most associated with regional flood risk but that getting urban flood risk right is still important.

Mark Vogler asked what the purpose of the flood quilt is. Is it a source to identify funding or just better information for communities? Ryan responded that the primary purpose is to identify areas that have the highest flood risk which will help to focus funding on those communities to complete studies (FMEs). It doesn't really help with FMPs since those come with their own detailed studies that quantify flood risk (not based on the flood quilt). Secondarily, the information is helpful to communities to communicate their level of flood risk, in addition to the FEMA flood maps. He reminded everyone that the flood quilt is not regulatory.

Alysha asked if there is a longer narrative behind the prioritization approach that explains some more of the nuanced things like differentiating between riverine and urban flood risk. She also reminded everyone that the group would like a map that shows what data source is being used across the region. Ryan responded that the data source map will be provided on the viewer after the flood quilt is prepared. He indicated that determining what was urban versus riverine flood risk and that in some areas, the team just took the max of either riverine or pluvial flood risk because it couldn't easily be determined where the pluvial and fluvial divide was. Some areas were more easy than other in, but it still took some manual and subjective work to demarcate pluvial against fluvial. This will be discussed in more detail within the chapter write-up.

Sujeeth indicated that he agrees with the approach but if a community provides better data, then the team should use it or at least take it into consideration. He would like to see the map that shows the data source behind the flood quilt. Ryan said the team is working on producing the map.

Alysha asked if the map could be provided before the next meeting. Even before the packet, possibly.

Anthony Beach asked if the data source and quilt could be togglable. Ryan said there have been problems with that, but he is working with the team to make it togglable.

Alysha close by saying a decision needs to be made and nothing will be 100-percent right due to the limited nature of the modeling. Switching to Fathom seems to represent flood risk in urban areas better. If a community asks for a revision, at some point there will need to be a cutoff to update the quilt.

Anothy Beach motioned to approve the revised approach. Matt Phillips seconded. Unanimous approval.

Alysha reminded everyone that the quilt has been published for over a month and communities had a chance to comment on it.

Nick Boardman (FNI) provided an overview of the Task 3B (Needs Analysis) and provided a recommended approach for identifying areas with the highest flood risk mitigation needs and areas with most significant gaps in flood risk mapping.

Anthony Beach commended the team for taking the group's prior comments from last year into consideration regarding the flood risk scoring metrics.

Ryan reminded the group that this scoring will be used when ranking "FMEs to be performed" by the TWDB and the RFPG.

There were no questions from the group.

Connor Stokes (Holloway) provided a recap on the public roadshow meetings including meeting format, materials, and attendance. The video presented at the meetings, which is currently on the website, will be refined further to make it a better resource.

Ryan mentioned that he thinks the in-person meetings were helpful but that there was likely some disincentive for communities to show up because the team has already been in regular contact with many of the communities and they may have not seen a need to show-up. The distance also probably played a factor, as well. During the amendment, the team reached out to several communities and set up a 30-minute virtual meeting. That seemed very effective to get in touch with communities and get feedback and information from many of them. In-person meetings also have their own benefits, but they may not be worth the investment in time and other resources.

Alysha indicated that she thinks these were a tremendous waste of resources and that there are much better ways to get in contact with communities. Her preference is to not do this again in the future.

Ryan explained that the team had good success with doing a presentation at a Fort Bend County levee improvement district meeting that was focused on providing continuation education credits to levee district officials. This may be a better approach: present at meetings that are already happening (e.g. COGs, professional organizations, etc.). Alysha mentioned TFMA. Kristina agreed with this suggestion of tag-teaming with COGs or other organizations associated with flooding, even if it's just advertising LBRFP meetings.

Ryan finished with a summary of what will be presented at the next two meetings.

5. **Report from:**

   5.1. **Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) staff**

   Tressa Olson provided the TWDB Report to the RFPG.

   5.2. **Regional Planning Sponsor**

   No Sponsor report this month.

   5.3. **Lower Brazos RFPG Liaisons and Chair**

   5.3.1 Bylaws Discussion - Alysha lead a discussion on potential updates to the Bylaws. Will bring back

   at a future meeting. Requested voting members to send any comments on the Bylaws to Pam.

6. **Confirm next meeting date and discuss new business to be considered at next meeting**

   The next regular meeting will be on Thursday, October 16, 2025, at 10:00AM.

Adjourn

Alysha Girard adjourned the meeting at 11:21 AM.

Approved by the Region 8 Lower Brazos RFPG at the meeting held on October 16, 2025.

Matt Phillips (Oct 28, 2025 08:52:52 CDT)

Matt Phillips, Secretary

Alysha Girard (Oct 28, 2025 08:36:36 CDT)

Alysha Girard, Chair

Minutes September 18 2025 RFPG Meeting

Final Audit Report   2025-10-28

Created:	2025-10-27
By:	Pamela Hannemann (pamela.hannemann@Brazos.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA_hkwMtGhKuUP26qXReDeA8rhC7nevEBy

"Minutes September 18 2025 RFPG Meeting" History

📄 Document created by Pamela Hannemann (pamela.hannemann@Brazos.org)
2025-10-27 - 8:41:26 PM GMT- IP address: 12.178.241.58

📧 Document emailed to alysha.girard@ubcdams.org for signature
2025-10-27 - 8:42:28 PM GMT

📄 Email viewed by alysha.girard@ubcdams.org
2025-10-27 - 9:25:48 PM GMT- IP address: 104.28.97.20

✍ Signer alysha.girard@ubcdams.org entered name at signing as Alysha Girard
2025-10-28 - 1:36:34 PM GMT- IP address: 136.41.97.227

✍ Document e-signed by Alysha Girard (alysha.girard@ubcdams.org)
Signature Date: 2025-10-28 - 1:36:36 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 136.41.97.227

📧 Document emailed to Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org) for signature
2025-10-28 - 1:36:37 PM GMT

📄 Email viewed by Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org)
2025-10-28 - 1:52:36 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254

✍ Document e-signed by Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org)
Signature Date: 2025-10-28 - 1:52:52 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 70.115.116.73

✅ Agreement completed.
2025-10-28 - 1:52:52 PM GMT