

Meeting Minutes

REGION 8 - LOWER BRAZOS REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Brazos River Authority, 4600 Cobbs Dr. Waco, TX 76710

10:00 a.m. – Thursday, April 28, 2022

Hybrid Meeting via Microsoft Teams

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

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Brandon Wade presided over the meeting in Waco, TX. Mr. Wade called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

2. Attendance and Announcements

Susan Alford	P	Glenn Lord	P
Anthony Beach	P	Matt Phillips Alternate: Brad Brunett attended	P
Sujeeth Draksharam Alternate: Dr. Satya Pilla attended	P	Gary Spicer	P
Alysha Girard	P	Mark Vogler	P
Charlotte Gilpin	P	Brandon Wade	P
David Lilly	P	Claudia Wright	P
P- Present, A- Absent,			

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

3. Approval of Minutes from the March 24, 2022 meeting

The March 24, 2022 meeting minutes were accepted as presented. Glenn Lord made the motion to accept the minutes and Gary Spicer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Brandon Wade opened the floor for public comments. No public comments were received.

5. Report, discussion, and possible action from the RFPG on update from the Region 8 Technical Consultant as it relates to:

5.1. Public Meetings/Roadshow Recap

- Sam Hinojosa gave an overview of the comments provided by the TWDB on the Technical Memorandum submitted in January.
- Susan Roth provided a recap of the Public Roadshow Meetings and the main takeaways from each location.

5.2. Chapter 2 Review

- Scott Rushing presented a summary of what is included in the Draft Chapter 2, provided to the Regional Flood Planning Group on 4/22. The Technical Consultant Team requested any comments be provided before the next Regional Flood Planning Group meeting (5/26).

5.3. Chapter 5 Discussion

- Ryan Londeen presented over the Task 5 evaluation process.
- Brad Brunett expressed concern about recommending FMXs that have not been proposed or approved by a sponsor or stakeholder.
 - Glenn Lord agreed. As a parallel to the State Water Plan, sponsor approval is needed for any mitigation to be included.
 - Both Brad and Glenn expressed that they believe FMXs that are not sponsored should still be included in the plan, just not recommended by the RFPG.
 - Mark Vogler stated that entities could submit their FMXs for the next cycle if they are missed.
 - Alysha Girard agreed.
- Charlotte Gilpin asked if the Technical Consultant Team could explain how potential sponsors expressed their interest in the plan or lack thereof.
 - Ryan replied that the Stakeholder Survey was sent out, then follow up calls were performed, then after the preliminary FMX list was developed (including FMXs found in

public documentation by the Technical Consultant Team) targeted emails and calls were made to the entities with FMXs listed. Some entities directly expressed that they did not have any feedback on the list, others expressed interest in submitting information for the next cycle but not in the timeline for the current cycle, and many entities never responded to any method of outreach.

- Dr. Satya Pilla asked how the total number of FMXs, compared to the total number of sponsored FMXs was determined.
 - Ryan explained that the large difference between total FMXs compared to the sponsored FMXs is due to the Hazard Mitigation Plans. Most of the FMXs sourced from these, have not had sponsors step up.
- Sam Hinojosa and Ryan Londeen inquired if the RFPG had any opinions on moving outdated FMPs (designed with outdated information, i.e. pre-Atlas 14) to the FME list to be updated.
 - Mark Vogler recommended moving potential FMPs with outdated rainfall to the FME list. He expressed that it would be hard to make an equitable comparison between FMPs if they are not based on the same data.
 - Alysha Girard agreed that this could skew the BCRs.
 - Sam Hinojosa added that the screening process for the FMPs includes determining whether there are negative impacts, which could be difficult if models and data are outdated.
 - Alysha Girard agreed that sponsor/no sponsor should be the first question for FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs.
 - Brad Brunett agreed. He encouraged the Technical Consultant Team to be very clear on what the “Not Recommended” category means in the documentation. “Not recommended” does not mean the FMXs do not have value, it can indicate that a sponsor is needed.
 - Glenn Lord and Brandon Wade agreed with this.
 - Glenn Lord stated that projects in the water plan need to have sponsorship.
- Charlotte Gilpin asked about the term “Recommendation”. Could the RFPG use different terminology, what does it mean, and will there be a “Not Recommended” list provided to the TWDB?
 - Ryan Londeen replied that “recommended” vs “not recommended” is TWDB required terminology. A “Not Recommended” list will be provided to the TWDB including a reason why the FMX was not recommended.
 - Sam Hinojosa clarified that the Not Recommended List will not have as much evaluation information included as the Recommended List will. He expressed that some entities may sponsor the FMXs after the Draft RFP is posted.
 - Ryke Moore agreed with Sam and emphasized that there will be a 60-day public comment period where entities may provide this type of feedback.

5.4. Updates on regional flood plan

- Hector Olmos presented on the preliminary findings from Task 4A – Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis.
- Alysha Girard asked how the categories used to rank the HUCs were determined.
 - Hector replied that these were determined by the Technical Consultant Team to represent the information that has been collected for Tasks 1-3.
 - Alysha expressed concern that some of the categories may have overlap and cause some HUCs to look like they are at higher risk than they are. For example, if there are gaps in flood mapping then there it is likely that there are no hydraulic and hydrologic modeling available for this region either. Having both categories counted, may skew the ranking.
 - Dr. Satya Pilla agreed with Alysha’s assessment.
 - Hector replied that gaps in flood risk are a big concern, so having multiple categories to represent this may be realistic. He confirmed that sensitivity of the ranking system was taken into account as much as possible. One of the main driving factors in emphasizing flood risk gaps, was to avoid just showing coastal regions as having high need.
 - Sam Hinojosa replied that the Technical Consultant Team will perform further sensitivity analyses to ensure that these metrics are not skewing the data, but the Consultant Team will move forward with a similar process.
- Charlotte Gilpin asked what historical duration is being used in the Declaration of Claims category.
 - Hector replied that any available information was used.
- Brandon Wade commented that there is a necessity for gaps to be covered with flood risk information. However, there may not be entities that can sponsor and perform these evaluations.

Some counties have entities like WCID, DD, or CNR districts in addition to cities, but others may not have this coverage. If there are not established cities, the unincorporated areas may have no sponsors. He encouraged that this be discussed in upcoming meetings.

- Additionally, some counties (like Brazoria) have so many districts that regional watershed studies may be difficult due to jurisdictional conflicts.
- Sam Hinojosa agreed that the team can look at this. However, the RFPG can encourage these jurisdictions to work together by bringing forward the need.
- Laura Haverlah presented over the proposed Emergency Need Definition.
- Alysha Girard inquired on how the definition will be applied.
 - Laura Haverlah replied that it is not exactly clear on how the TWDB will apply it.
 - Ryan Londeen added that there will have to be a yes/no indication on whether an FMX is an emergency need.
 - The RFPG was supportive of the definition proposed by Haverlah.
- Sam Hinojosa gave final updates and an overview of the upcoming meeting agendas.
 - Brandon Wade encouraged the Technical Consultant Team to look into a potential Task 8 Recommendation that has the TWDB further define what the water supply interaction entails and how it is supposed to be applied. Potentially remove that component altogether for future cycles.

6. Report from Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) staff

Ryke Moore provided the TWDB Report to the RFPG.

7. Report from the Regional Planning Sponsor

Pam Hannemann provided the report from the Sponsor on updates to the planning group's website navigation menu.

8. Report, Approval and Certification of the Finance Report expenditures

The financial report of expenditures for March 2022 was approved as presented. Alysha Girard made the motion to approve the finance report and Glenn Lord seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Report from Non-voting Member Agencies (TPWD, TDEM, TDA, TSSWCB, GLO, TCEQ, USACE, FEMA, Fort Bend Subsidence District and Brazoria County)

Steve Bednarz provided that the TSSWCB will share the data that they have on repair needs for USDA/NRCS dams.

10. Report from Liaisons (Region 6, Coastal, Region 7, Brazos G and Region H)

Liaisons did not have any new updates to provide to the RFPG.

11. Report from Lower Brazos RFPG Chair

The Chair provided a summary for the RFPG on his recent attendance at the recent National Water Supply Alliance and National Waterways Conferences in Washington DC.

12. Discussion on new business to be considered at next meeting

Potential new business: the Chair read an email from Sujeeth Draksharam for the record. The email proposed additional discussion on protecting surface water rights.

13. Confirmation of the next meeting date

Thursday, May 26, 2022 at 10:00am

14. Adjourn

Brandon Wade adjourned the meeting at 11:50 AM.

Approved by the Region 8 Lower Brazos RFPG at the May 26, 2022 meeting.



[Matt Phillips \(Jun 18, 2022 21:09 CDT\)](#)

Matt Phillips, Secretary



[BrandonWade \(Jun 18, 2022 14:47 CDT\)](#)

Brandon Wade, Chairman


Minutes April 28 Group Meeting


Final Audit Report


2022-06-19


Created:	2022-06-17
By:	Pamela Hannemann (pamela.hannemann@Brazos.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAuCdMyqP7SygreXrZKF2Nk30DIWlp-4G


"Minutes April 28 Group Meeting" History


 Document created by Pamela Hannemann (pamela.hannemann@Brazos.org)
2022-06-17 - 8:10:35 PM GMT- IP address: 24.155.182.72


 Document emailed to bwade@gcwatx.gov for signature
2022-06-17 - 8:10:58 PM GMT


 Email viewed by bwade@gcwatx.gov
2022-06-18 - 7:45:28 PM GMT- IP address: 98.200.14.50

 Document e-signed by BrandonWade (bwade@gcwatx.gov)
Signature Date: 2022-06-18 - 7:47:43 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 98.200.14.50

 Document emailed to Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org) for signature
2022-06-18 - 7:47:45 PM GMT

 Email viewed by Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org)
2022-06-19 - 2:08:50 AM GMT- IP address: 172.225.18.119

 Document e-signed by Matt Phillips (matt.phillips@brazos.org)
Signature Date: 2022-06-19 - 2:09:16 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 68.206.118.242

 Agreement completed.
2022-06-19 - 2:09:16 AM GMT