

Meeting Minutes
Region 14 Subcommittee 1 Meeting
Thursday, October 21, 2021

<u>Subcommittee Member</u>	<u>Interest Category</u>	<u>Present (✓)/Absent (X)/Alternate Present (*)</u>
Omar L. Martinez, Chair	<i>Water districts</i>	X
Oscar D. "Jay" Ornelas	<i>Agricultural interests</i>	✓
Gilberto Saldana Jr.	<i>Counties</i>	✓
Javier Acosta	<i>Municipalities</i>	✓
David "Dave" Hall	<i>Public</i>	✓
Gisela Dagnino	<i>Water utilities</i>	✓
Levi Bryand	<i>Water Utilities</i>	✓
Rick Tate	<i>River authorities</i>	X
Carlos Velarde	<i>Public</i>	✓
Others Present:		
Annette Gutierrez, RCGOG	Chris Wright, AECOM	
Richard Bagans, TWDB	Jeff Irvin - AECOM, PIC	
Gilbert Andujo, AECOM	Lily Cartwright-AECOM	
Bryan Blaisdell, AECOM	Tatum Lau-AECOM	

- 1) Subcommittee 1 Chairman Dave Hall welcomed the group.
- 2) Approval of Minutes from September 30, 2021. Omar Martinez made a motion and Levi seconded. Subcommittee 1 Chairman Hall called for a vote and the motion was approved.
- 3) Bryan Blaisdell provided Subcommittee 1 with a roadmap for the group where he highlighted all items that he would discuss. He mentioned the subcommittee could decide on recommendations today for minimum standards and that would give RCGOG enough time to post by October 25 and have the URGFPG vote on November 2nd. He also mentioned the Goals could be recommended by the subcommittee at the next meeting, post the notification by November 15, then have the URGFPG vote on November 30.
- 4) Bryan next presented on the differences between the URGFPG Minimum Standards vs. Goals. Subcommittee 1 Chairman asked Bryan what will happen to communities that do not meet the standards in terms of future funding. Bryan explained there are a number of flood funding sources that do not require communities to meet the standards. This requirement will only affect those who are interested in submitting projects to the TWDB after adoption of the plan. Bryan also laid out that communities who don't meet the standards today could use that as an incentive to adopt and apply next go around. Chairman Omar Martinez asked if the group adopts the minimum standards and communities who do not meet the minimum but apply to the Flood Infrastructure Fund (FIF), will that preclude them from receiving funding? Bryan stated it was his understanding that it would. Richard Bagans, TWDB, provided more clarification to the question. He said the group can adopt the minimum standards and the communities could then use this information as a resource to them when considering flood ordinances or if you choose to adopt the minimum flood standards, all Flood

Management Projects (FMPs) will have to adopt those standards to be included in the plan. The FIF is a potential future financial vehicle that may fund FMPs from the plan. He could answer how competitive a project would be if submitted without adoption of minimum standards.

Bryan also reminded the group of the pros and cons of adopting and not adopting the minimum standards. Bryan stated AECOM would like to get a recommendation from the subcommittee whether the minimum standards should be adopted or not. AECOM would also like a recommendation from the subcommittee chooses not to recommend minimum standards that they recommend standards that do not tie anything to the projects serve as a way for the group to serve as a resource and state what they would recommend.

- 5) Bryan next covered a review of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Requirements/CRS Program. He mentioned about 78% of counties in the region participate in the program. He explained the NFIP could be used as a source for the minimum standards. NFIP is a way for residents to access federal flood insurance. If incorporated communities participate but the County does not, there will not be considered as participating. He mentioned what communities would be impacted if minimum standards were incorporated. He went on to explain more information about the NFIP. Subcommittee Chairman Hall asked how is the SFHA designated? Bryan explained they are approved by FEMA ultimately. He referenced the process El Paso County is going through right now with FEMA is what other communities will experience and how an SFHA will be designated.
- 6) Bryan next covered the stakeholder survey results. As of last week, one hundred surveys were received. Forty percent of the surveys came from community representatives. The survey asked if the minimum standards should be adopted and 77% of the community representatives. He then covered other items within the survey as presented in the slides that highlighted support of following minimum standards and identified potential flood-related issues of concern. They were:
 - i. Insufficient land use standards
 - ii. Development within or near flood prone areas
 - iii. Increased runoff due to development
- 7) Bryan next gave an overview of the Subcommittee Survey Results. He highlighted the three top responses to the question of evaluating potential flood-related needs as they pertain to Region 14. The top answers were:
 - i. Communities need better defined floodplain or land use standards
 - ii. Counties need authority to regulate land use
 - iii. Region-wide need for minimum floodplain standards
- 8) Finally, Bryan laid out discussion topics for the subcommittee that included:
 - URGFPG Minimum Floodplain Management or Land Use Standards – Including Subcommittee Recommendations to RFPG during November 2 RFPG General Meeting
 - URGFPG Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals (ShortTerm/Long-Term) – Draft goals to be posted on URGFPG website by November 16 and voted on by RFPG during November 30 General Meeting
- 9) The group agreed to meet on November 4, 2021, at 1:30 pm for its 3rd meeting.
- 8) Prior to making a motion to adjourn, Chairman Dave Hall asked if anyone from the public had any comment to make. There being none, he asked for a motion to adjourn. Omar Martinez made a motion to adjourn at 11:46 am. Gisela Dagnino seconded the motion. Dave Hall called for a vote and the motion was approved.

11/04/2021

Date



Subcommittee 1 Chairman, Dave Hall