

Lower Colorado-Lavaca  
**REGIONAL FLOOD  
PLANNING GROUP**

**REGION 10**

**Technical Committee Meeting  
June 16, 2022**

# Region 10 Lower Colorado-Lavaca RFPG Technical Committee Meeting

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Welcome**
- 3. Approval of minutes from the previous meeting**

**Region 10 Lower Colorado-Lavaca Flood Planning Group  
 Technical Committee  
 May 25, 2022  
 9:00 AM  
 Hybrid Meeting**

Roll call:

Voting Member	Role	Present (x) /Absent ( ) Alternate Present (*)
<b>Kelly Payne</b>	Chair	X
<b>Kacey Cubine Paul</b>	Vice Chair	X (joined @ 10:16 AM)
<b>Ann Yakimovicz</b>	Secretary	X
<b>Matt Hollon</b>	Member	X
<b>Brandon Klenzendorf</b>	Member	X

**Quorum:**

Quorum: **Yes**

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: **4** (Kacey Paul joined at 10:16 AM, bringing the number of voting members present to 5 at that time.)

Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 5: **3**

**Other Meeting Attendees: \*\***

\*\*Meeting attendee names were gathered from those who entered information for joining the Zoom meeting.

Cindy Engelhardt– Halff Associates

Mike Personett – Halff Associates

Jay Scanlon - FNI

Cris Parker – HDR

Karen Ford – Water PR

Jennifer Bassett – LCRA

Lauren Graber – LCRA

Marcin Tyszka – LCRA

Augusto Villalon

Sanjay Negi

*All meeting materials are available for the public at:*

[www.lowercoloradolavacaflood.org/meetings](http://www.lowercoloradolavacaflood.org/meetings)

**Agenda:**

1) Call to Order

Kelly Payne called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM CDT. A roll call of the technical committee members was taken to record attendance and a quorum was established prior to calling the meeting to order.

2) Welcome

Kelly Payne welcomed members and other attendees to the meeting.

3) Approval of minutes from the previous meeting

The draft meeting minutes were reviewed.

Matt Hollon moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Brandon Klenzendorf. The motion passed by a vote of four to zero.

4) Public comments– limit 3 minutes per person

Kelly Payne called for public comments. No public comments were made.

5) Task 5 – Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding recommended Flood Management Evaluations and Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects

Mike Personett and Jay Scanlon from the technical consultants presented the batches of FMXs for review and initial action by the Technical Committee. Jay Scanlon pointed out that some projects had moved from one category to another. If a project was undefined, it was placed in the FME group. If it was a specific, defined study, it was placed in the FMP group.

Batch 2A of FMEs was discussed. Matt Hollon moved to recommend the FMEs in Batch 2A, subject to non-substantive changes, and send them to the full RFPG for action. Ann Yakimovicz seconded. The motion passed four to zero.

Batch 2B of FMEs was discussed. The Technical Committee recommended that a note “To Be Determined” be added where appropriate in studies where risk information was not yet available and would be collected during the study. Ann Yakimovicz moved to recommend the FMEs in Batch 2B, subject to non-substantive changes, and send them to the full RFPG for action. Brandon Klenzendorf seconded. The motion passed four to zero.

Batch 2C of FMEs was discussed. The technical consultants noted that some FMEs with small drainage areas were included because the SVI is higher, and a small community may not have a large drainage area to consider. Ann Yakimovicz moved to remove the Jonestown city-wide drainage study from the batch due to the city’s small size and lack of flooding issues except those caused on the lowest points due to Lake Travis flooding. Matt Hollon seconded. The motion passed four to zero. Matt Hollon then moved to recommend the FMEs in Batch 2C, subject to non-substantive changes, and send them to the full RFPG for action. Ann Yakimovicz seconded. The motion passed four to zero.

Batch 3 of FMEs was discussed. Committee members raised a question about costs, which are low. Jay Scanlon noted that the RFPG guidance was to use costs from earlier years rather than current costs, and that the technical consultants would circle back to the sponsors for further discussion on costs. The question of how to handle FMXs that sit in overlapping regions was noted. The RFPG will need direction from TWDB. Matt Hollon moved to recommend the FMEs in Batch 3, subject to non-substantive changes, and send them to the full RFPG for action. Kacey Paul seconded. The motion passed five to zero.

The full batch of FMPs was discussed. Several specific items:

- The generator projects included studies in the project descriptions. However, these were not flood studies. These were small upfront studies to correctly select and

place the generators. The main task of each was selection and placement of the generators, so they were considered projects.

- Studies conducted during a project often show more people at risk than originally included. Add recognition of this with the phrase “best estimate according to the study” in the project descriptions.
- Check the SVI numbers for the actual buyout area where possible, because a large non-affected area can influence the SVI downward.
- Note whether or not funding should be restricted to non-local funding if a sponsor is proposing improvements such as elevation on private property, where the private owner retains ownership.

Matt Hollon moved to recommend the reviewed FMPs, subject to non-substantive changes, and send them to the full RFPG for action. Kacey Paul seconded. The motion passed five to zero.

General comments discussed included the following:

- Risk descriptions should be as detailed as possible. TWDB will be considering where the greatest risk is and what solution makes good sense for that risk.
- The two priorities that should be included on templates for Flood Early Warning Systems are traffic counts and how much a road is overtopped in flood events.
- If design work is ongoing, a project may be in a greater state of readiness by the time the Plan is completed, so note this in the project description.
- Level of service needs to be flexible. A recommendation to be inclusive is suggested for inclusion in Chapter 8. High standards can be easier to achieve in new projects. Retrofitting sets limitations on what is possible. This can also be discussed in Chapter 5. Storm drains, in particular, are hard to build or retrofit to reach the 100-year design storm criteria, restricted by very high costs and low adverse impact.
- Consultant should continue to look for projects to bundle in communities where it makes sense.
- Continue to refine the maps in the FMXs.
- Make sure we are consistent on the categorization of FMXs on the one-page descriptions.
- Need direction from TWDB on how to handle projects that appear to be in two RFPG regions.

6) Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Kelly Payne called for public comments. No public comments were made.

7) Consider date and agenda items for next meeting

Kelly Payne opened discussion to consider the date and agenda items for the next meeting.

After general discussion, Kelly Payne concluded that the next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 16 at 1:00 PM CDT.

8) Adjourn

Ann Yakimovicz made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Kacey Paul. The motion passed five to zero. The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 AM CDT by Kelly Payne.

*Approved by the Lower Colorado-Lavaca RFPG Technical Committee at a meeting held on **DATE**.*

---

Ann Yakimovicz, SECRETARY

---

Kelly Payne, CHAIR

DRAFT

# Region 10 Lower Colorado-Lavaca RFPG Technical Committee Meeting

**4. Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person**

**5. Task 5 - Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding recommended Flood Management Evaluations and Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects**

***\*See summaries file for details***

# Region 10 Lower Colorado-Lavaca RFPG Technical Committee Meeting

- 6. Public comments– limit 3 minutes per person**
- 7. Consider date and agenda items for next meeting**
- 8. Adjourn**