

**NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING OF THE SAN ANTONIO REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING
GROUP**

Region 12 San Antonio RFPG

11/17/2022

2:00 PM

TAKE NOTICE that a meeting of the San Antonio Regional Flood Planning Group as established by the Texas Water Development Board, will be held on Thursday, November 17, 2022 at 2:00 PM, in-person at the San Antonio River Authority Board Room, located at 201 W. Sheridan St. and virtually on GotoMeeting at <https://meet.goto.com/459041821>.

- Agenda:**
1. (2:00 PM) Roll-Call
 2. Public Comments – limit 3 minutes per person
 3. Approval of the Minutes from the Previous San Antonio Regional Flood Planning Group Meeting (Region 12)
 4. Communications from the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)
 5. Chair Report
 6. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Filling the Existing Vacancies for Municipalities and Small Businesses Interest Groups
 7. Presentation on Task 12 Progress
 8. Review Formal Comments from TWDB on the Region 12 Draft Flood Plan
 9. Regional Liaison Update
 10. Public Comments - limit 3 minutes per person
 11. Date and Potential Agenda Items for Next Meeting
 12. Adjourn

If you wish to provide written comments prior to or after the meeting, please email your comments to khayes@sariverauthority.org or physically mail them to the attention of Kendall Hayes at San Antonio River Authority, 201 W. Sheridan, San Antonio, TX, 78204 and include “Region 12 San Antonio Flood Planning Group Meeting” in the subject line of the email.

Additional information may be obtained from: Kendall Hayes (210) 302-3641, khayes@sariverauthority.org, San Antonio River Authority, 201 W. Sheridan, San Antonio, TX.

AGENDA ITEM NO.3 – APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS SARFPG MEETING

Meeting Minutes
Region 12 San Antonio Regional Flood Planning Group Meeting
Thursday, October 13, 2022
3:00 PM
San Antonio River Authority

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Interest Category</u>	<u>Present (x) /Absent () / Alternate Present (*)</u>
Brian Yanta	<i>Agricultural interests</i>	X
David Wegmann	<i>Counties</i>	X
Derek Boese	<i>River authorities</i>	X
Doris Cooksey	<i>Electric generating utilities</i>	
Deborah (Debbie) Reid	<i>Environmental interests</i>	X
Nefi M. Garza	<i>Flood districts</i>	X
Cara C. Tackett	<i>Industries</i>	X
Jeffrey Carroll	<i>Municipalities</i>	X
John Paul Beasley	<i>Public</i>	
Suzanne B. Scott	<i>Nonprofit</i>	X
Steve Gonzales	<i>Small business</i>	
David Mauk	<i>Water districts</i>	*Hayli Hernandez
Steve Clouse	<i>Water utilities</i>	X

<u>Non-voting Member</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Present(x)/Absent()/ Alternate Present (*)</u>
Marty Kelly	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	X
James Guin	Texas Division of Emergency Management	
Jami McCool	Texas Department of Agriculture	X
Jarod Bowen	Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board	X
Kris Robles	General Land Office	X
Anita Machiavello	Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)	X
Susan Roberts	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	

Quorum:

Quorum: **Yes**

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: **10**

Number required for quorum per current voting positions of 13: **7**

All meeting materials are available for the public at: <http://www.region12texas.org>.

AGENDA ITEM NO.1: ROLL CALL

Ms. Kendall Hayes, San Antonio River Authority, called the role and confirmed a quorum.

AGENDA ITEM NO.2: PUBLIC COMMENT – LIMIT 3 MINUTES PER PERSON

No public comments.

AGENDA ITEM NO.3: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS SAN ANTONIO REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP MEETING (REGION 12)

Ms. Reid motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Wegmann seconded the motion, motion passed

AGENDA ITEM NO.4: COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD (TWDB)

Ms. Anita Machiavello provided an update from TWDB. The deadline for stakeholder survey responses is approaching and TWDB would appreciate wide participation.

AGENDA ITEM NO.5: CHAIR REPORT

Chair Boese reminded the RFPG that the public comment period closes on October 15th. Before transitioning to Agenda Item No.6, he provided a Technical Committee update. The committee met and has made recommendations for Task 12.

AGENDA ITEM NO.6: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION ON TASK 12

Mr. Troy Dorman provided a presentation on Task 12. He provided a summary of the task and the responsibilities of the RFPG today. His presentation is available online at region12texas.org.

Discussion ensued regarding funding specific FMEs for additional investigation. A request was made by a RFPG member for technical consultants to use additional time to promote nature-based solutions with the FMX sponsors.

Ms. Scott motioned to approve the list of FMEs to perform and recommend for additional flood mitigation projects. Ms. Reid seconded the motion, motion passed.

AGENDA ITEM NO.7: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Chair Boese reminded the RFPG that there is a vacancy on Executive Committee as the Vice Chair. Mr. Wegmann motioned to nominate Ms. Tackett to serve as Vice-Chair. Ms. Scott seconded the motion, motion passed. Ms. Tackett will serve as Vice Chair.

Ms. Tackett's transition to Vice Chair left the Secretary position vacant. Ms. Tackett motioned to nominate Mr. Wegmann to serve as Secretary. Ms. Reid seconded the motion, motion passed. Mr. Wegmann will serve as Secretary.

Mr. Wegmann's transition to Secretary left an At-Large Executive Committee membership vacant. Ms. Reid motioned to nominate Mr. Garza to serve as an At-Large Executive Committee member. Mr. Wegmann seconded the motion, motion passed. Mr. Garza will serve as an At-Large Executive Committee member.

AGENDA ITEM NO.8: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING ADDING NEW VOTING POSITIONS AND ANY SUBSEQUENT SOLICITATIONS

Chair Boese announced Mr. Gonzales's resignation from Region 12. Mr. Gonzales's resignation leaves a vacancy in the Small Businesses interest group. This position will be solicited for nominations.

The RFPG discussed the merits of adding a new voting position in the Municipalities interest group. Discussion ensued regarding the group's shared interest in representation from both a small and large municipality within the region. Ms. Reid motioned to add a voting position under the Municipalities interest group. Ms. Tackett seconded the motion, motion passed. This position will be solicited for nominations.

AGENDA ITEM NO.9: REGIONAL LIAISON UPDATE

No updates.

AGENDA ITEM NO.10: PUBLIC COMMENTS – LIMIT 3 MINUTES PER PERSON

No public comments

AGENDA ITEM NO.11: DATE AND POTENTIAL AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

For the next meeting, the RFPG requested an update from the technical consultants on their progress with Task 12. Mr. Dorman notified the RFPG that he will present TWDB's comments on the draft flood plan at the November meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO.12: ADJOURN

Ms. Reid motioned to adjourn. Ms. Scott seconded the motion, motion passed.

**AGENDA ITEM NO.6 – DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING
FILLING THE EXISTING VACANCIES FOR MUNICIPALITIES AND SMALL
BUSINESSES INTEREST GROUPS**

Includes: Jose Reyes' Nomination Form for Small Businesses Vacancy

Roberto Reyna's Nomination Form for Municipalities Vacancy

SAN ANTONIO REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Nomination for Interest Group (check one):

☐ Municipalities ☒ Small Businesses

Pursuant to official Bylaws and Guiding Principles adopted by the San Antonio Regional Flood Planning Group (SARFPG), nominators shall provide information regarding the nominee's current employer, and provide a description of the nominee's experience that qualifies him/her for the position in the interest group being sought to represent. Please refer to section 361.11 (e) (see *addendum*) of the Texas Administrative Code for the definitions of the interest categories represented on the SARFPG.

NOMINATOR

NAME: David R. Wegmann, P.E., CFM

ADDRESS: 1948 Probandt Street

PHONE: 210-335-3816 **FAX:** _____ **EMAIL:** dwegmann@bexar.org

OCCUPATION Bexar County Public Works Engineering Services Manager

NOMINEE

NAME: Jose L. Reyes, P.E., CFM

ADDRESS: 8122 Datapoint Drive, Suite 840

PHONE: 210-366-1988 **FAX:** _____ **EMAIL:** jreyes@maesce.com

INTEREST AREA: Water Resources, FEMA, Regional Flood Mitigation Masterplanning

COUNTY: Bexar County

OCCUPATION: Civil Engineer

PLEASE GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NOMINEE'S EXPERIENCE THAT WOULD QUALIFY HIM/HER FOR THE POSITION (please use additional pages if needed):

Mr. Reyes brings over 16 years of experience managing the planning, design, permitting, and construction of roadway and drainage engineering projects. Within the San Antonio area, Jose has worked for Bexar County, the City of San Antonio, the State of Texas, other local municipalities, and private developers. Jose's experience includes the previous FEMA DFIRM project, Atlas 14 Stakeholder group for San Antonio, and numerous regional flood mitigation projects within the San Antonio region.

Jose specializes in complex hydrology and hydraulic modeling and design. Jose's experience ranges from small drainage studies to large drainage master planning and FEMA DFIRM studies. He is experienced in 2D modeling, unsteady modeling, detention analyses, riverine floodplain mapping, erosion, and scour analyses. Furthermore, Jose is experienced in storm sewer design, roadway design, site grading, utilities, and general civil design.

Additionally, Jose is a managing owner and Vice President at Maestas & Associates, LLC (Maestas). Maestas is a small, minority owned civil engineering and surveying enterprise located in San Antonio, Texas. Maestas is primarily known for providing services in the water resources field for over 34 years.

PLEASE LIST ANY PERTINENT AFFILIATIONS (please use additional pages if needed):

Jose Reyes' affiliations are with the engineering professional organizations as follows:

- Texas Floodplain Management Association
- American Public Works Association
- American Council of Engineering Companies

DATE SUBMITTED: 11/1/2022

PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF DESIRED

Nominations must be received by **5:00 PM, Monday, November 14, 2022** addressed to Derek Boese, Chair, San Antonio RFPG, c/o San Antonio River Authority, Attn: Kendall Hayes, 100 East Guenther St., San Antonio, Texas 78204 or email to khayes@sariverauthority.org

SAN ANTONIO REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Nomination for Interest Group (check one):

☒ **Municipalities** ☐ **Small Businesses**

Pursuant to official Bylaws and Guiding Principles adopted by the San Antonio Regional Flood Planning Group (SARFPG), nominators shall provide information regarding the nominee's current employer, and provide a description of the nominee's experience that qualifies him/her for the position in the interest group being sought to represent. Please refer to section 361.11 (e) (see *addendum*) of the Texas Administrative Code for the definitions of the interest categories represented on the SARFPG.

NOMINATOR

NAME: David R. Wegmann, P.E., CFM
ADDRESS: 1948 Probandt St., San Antonio, TX 78214
PHONE: 210-335-3816 **FAX:** _____ **EMAIL:** dwegman@bexar.org
OCCUPATION Engineering Services Manager, Bexar County Public Works Dept.

NOMINEE

NAME: Roberto Reyna, P.E., CFM
ADDRESS: P.O. Box 839966, San Antonio, TX 78283-3966
PHONE: 210-207-1427 **FAX:** _____ **EMAIL:** Roberto.Reyna@sanantonio.gov
INTEREST AREA: Municipalities
COUNTY: Bexar
OCCUPATION: Interim Assistant Director, Storm Water Division,
Public Works Department, City of San Antonio

PLEASE GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NOMINEE'S EXPERIENCE THAT WOULD QUALIFY HIM/HER FOR THE POSITION (please use additional pages if needed):

Robert has over 19 years of civil engineering experience, 13 of which has been with the City of San Antonio. During this time, Robert has become very familiar with the processes of working in a large municipality as it relates to planning, funding, designing, and constructing drainage projects.

Robert developed a database containing over 400 projects (\$3.2B) needed to mitigate drainage issues in San Antonio. Every year, a varied amount of funding (between \$5-\$11M) is allocated towards this need; and every five years about (\$200M) is identified through the City's Bond Program. Project scopes will range between addressing maintenance, local, or regional issues.

In addition, Robert is currently serving as the Interim Assistant Director of Storm Water, which allows him firsthand knowledge of the resources required in maintaining the infrastructure of a large municipality, as well as the required regulations to prevent adverse impacts from development through strong floodplain management.

PLEASE LIST ANY PERTINENT AFFILIATIONS (please use additional pages if needed):

Bexar Regional Watershed Management (BRWM) partnership

Texas Floodplain Management Association (TFMA)

American Public Works Association (APWA); President-Elect for South Central Branch

DATE SUBMITTED: 11/7/2022

PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF DESIRED

Nominations must be received by **5:00 PM, Monday, November 14, 2022** addressed to Derek Boese, Chair, San Antonio RFPG, c/o San Antonio River Authority, Attn: Kendall Hayes, 100 East Guenther St., San Antonio, Texas 78204 or email to khayes@sariverauthority.org

**AGENDA ITEM NO.8 – REVIEW FORMAL COMMENTS FROM TWDB ON THE REGION
12 DRAFT FLOOD PLAN**

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen t	Page / Section			
SARFP Draft Flood Plan					
LEVEL 1					
1	Plan	General Comment	TWDB	1.Please ensure that all “Submittal requirements” identified in each of the Exhibit C Guidance document sections are submitted in the final flood plan.	Agree.
2	GIS	SOW Task 1	TWDB	2. a. Existing Infrastructure GIS Feature Class, ExFldInfraPt: Please include all low water crossings (LWCs) identified during the flood planning process in this feature layer. The ExFldExpAll feature class appears to contain LWCs that are not included in the ExFldInfraPt feature class. Note: This is required in contrast to the optional LWC feature class. See Exhibit D Table 7 for a list of valid entries [31 TAC §361.31]. b. Existing Projects (Exhibit C Table 2): Some of the projects in Table 2 do not appear to include an Expected Year of Completion. Please populate the expected year of completion field for all ongoing projects. [31 TAC §361.32(3)].	a. There are a total of 496 LWC's identified in the ExFldInraPt layer, this was reduced/modified from the original TNRIS LWC dataset based on the comment from March 7th about locations of the ExFldExpPt layer not lining up with Road and Stream CL. Of the 496 LWC identified in the ExFldInfraPt layer 443 were identified in the submittal ExFldExpPt layer. However after doing a select by location on the LWC in the ExFldInfraPt layer only 441 LWC's were selected. This indicated that there was a change that was not capture in the submittal. Reran the ExFldExpPt layer to fix. b. Agree, will update.
3	GIS	SOW Task 1	TWDB	3.Existing Projects GIS Feature Class, ExFldProjs: Some required fields appear to be missing entries, including 'EXHAZ_ID', 'COST', and ‘COMP_YR’. For 'EXHAZ_ID', please leave NULL or ‘999999’ if there is no data. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per [31 TAC §361.32 & Exhibit D Table 8].	Agree, will update.
4	Plan	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	4.Existing Condition Flood Exposure (Exhibit C Table 3): a. The day and night populations in Table 3 do not appear to match the ExFldExpAll feature class counts. Please review and reconcile. b. The Structure and Residential Structure counts in Table 3 do not appear to match the ExFldExpAll feature class counts. Please review and reconcile. [31 TAC §361.33 & Exhibit C 2.2.A.3].	a. After spot checking some counties it does appear to match. b. However, there a instances where buildings are in more than one county and to prevent duplicate counting the location of the ExFldExpAll point is taken into account and only reported for whichever county it falls within.
5	GIS	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	5.Existing Condition Flood Vulnerability GIS Feature Class, ExFldExpAll: a. The day and night populations in Table 3 do not appear to match the ExFldExpAll feature class counts. Please review and reconcile. b. The Structure and Residential Structure counts in Table 3 do not appear to match the ExFldExpAll feature class counts. Please review and reconcile. [31 TAC §361.33(c), (d) & Exhibit C 2.2.A.2].	a. After spot checking some counties it does appear to match. b. However, there a instances where buildings are in more than one county and to prevent duplicate counting the location of the ExFldExpAll point is taken into account and only reported for whichever county it falls within.
6	GIS	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	6. Model Coverage GIS Feature Class, <i>ModelCoverage</i> : It appears that some fields are missing entries, including 'MODEL_DESCR'. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per TWDB email Jan 31, 2022. [31 TAC §361.33(b)(2)].	Agree, will update.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen t	Page / Section			
7	Plan	SOW Task 2B	TWDB	7. Future Condition Flood Hazard Vulnerability, <i>Text</i> : Please expand the description of the future conditions vulnerability analysis by considering factors such as proximity to a floodplain, proximity to other bodies of water, past flooding issues, emergency management plans, and location of critical systems like primary and back-up power. [31 TAC §361.34 & Exhibit C 2.2.B.3].	Agree, will add more explanation.
8	Plan	SOW Task 3B	TWDB	8. Goals, <i>Text</i> : Tables 3-5 through 3-9 in Chapter 3 contain 36 goals, while the Exhibit C Table 11 and <i>Goals</i> feature class appears to contain 33 goals. Please review and reconcile for consistency. [31 TAC §361.36 & Exhibit C 2.3.B].	Agree, will update.
9	Plan	SOW Task 3B	TWDB	9.Goals (Exhibit C Table 11): a. It appears that some fields are missing entries, including Residual Risk. Please complete all required fields with valid entries b. Tables 3-5 through 3-9 in Chapter 3 contain 36 goals, while the Exhibit C Table 11 and Goals feature class appears to contain 33 goals. Please review and reconcile for consistency. [31 TAC §361.36 & Exhibit C 2.3.B].	a. Filled in "Unknown" for Residual Risk field, per additional guidance. b. Agree, will update to match.
10	Plan	SOW Task 3B	TWDB	10.Goals GIS Feature Class, Goals: a. It appears that the required field ‘RESIDUAL’ contains only NULL values. Please ensure required fields are populated with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 21 [31 TAC §361.36]. b. Tables 3-5 through 3-9 in Chapter 3 contain 36 goals, while the Exhibit C Table 11 and Goals feature class appears to contain 33 goals. Please review and reconcile for consistency. [31 TAC §361.36].	a. Filled in "Unknown" for Residual Risk field, per additional guidance. b. Agree, will update to match.
11	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	11.Flood Management Evaluation (Exhibit C Table 12): Some FMEs list \$0 for Estimated Study Cost (i.e., FME_IDs 121000015 and 121000033). Please review these FMEs for accuracy and reconcile as needed. [31 TAC §361.38(i) & Exhibit C 2.4.B].	Agree, will update.
12	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	12.Flood Management Evaluations GIS Feature Class, FME: It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘NEW_MODEL’, ‘HUC8’, ‘FLD_TP_RIV’, and ‘FLD_TP_LOC’. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 23.	Agree, will update.
13	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	13.Flood Management Evaluation (Exhibit C Map 16): Please indicate on the map whether the identified FME area is associated with a previously studied area that requires an update or if the identified study area does not have any existing or anticipated flood mapping, models, etc., and therefore requires an initial study. [31 TAC §361.38(m)].	Agree, will update.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location Document ↑ Page / Section		Reviewer	Comment	Response
14	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	14.Flood Mitigation Project GIS Feature Class, FMP: It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘HUC8’, ‘FLD_TP_RIV’, ‘FLD_TP_LOC’, and ‘ASSOCIATED’. Please populate all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 24. [31 TAC §361.38(c-e) & Exhibit D 3.11.1].	Agree, will update.
15	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	15.Flood Mitigation Strategies GIS Feature Class, FMS: It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘ENTITY_ID’, ‘NEG_IMPACT’, and ‘ASSOCIATED’. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 26. For ENTITY_ID, leave NULL or '999999' if there is no data.	Agree, will update.
16	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	16.Flood Management Evaluation Recommendations (Exhibit C Table 15): Some FMEs list \$0 for Estimated Study Cost (i.e., FME_IDs 121000015 and 121000033). Please review these FMEs for accuracy and reconcile as needed. [31 TAC §361.39(c), (f) & Exhibit C 2.5.A].	Agree, will update.
17	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	17.Flood Management Evaluation Recommendations GIS Feature Class, FME: a. It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘NEW_MODEL’, ‘HUC8’, ‘FLD_TP_RIV’, and ‘FLD_TP_LOC’. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 23.	Agree, will update.
18	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	18.Flood Mitigation Projects, Text: a.The description of No Negative Impact Determinations on pages 5-30 and 5-31 references Table 5-4 that would include "A general description of the scope of work and a summary of the expected impacts of the proposed improvements for each potentially feasible FMP", however, this table could not be located. Please reconcile. [31 TAC §361.39 & Exhibit C 2.5.B]. b. Each recommended FMP must be accompanied with an associated model or supporting documentation to show no negative impact. Please confirm that this was done and provide reference to supporting materials. As per the draft report (page 5- 31), “A comparative assessment of pre- and post-project conditions for the 1% annual chance event (100-yr flood) was performed for each potentially feasible FMP based on their reported hydrologic and hydraulic model results. Study results for floodplain boundary extents, resulting water surface elevations, and peak discharge values were reviewed to verify potential FMPs conform to the no negative impacts requirements.” For each recommended FMP, please identify in the plan how no negative impact was determined as required by the Exhibit C Section 3.6.A (page 108), either via a model or a study, and submit the associated model or include the study name in tabular format.	a. Agree, will add. b. Agree, will add.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen t	Page / Section			
19	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	19.Flood Mitigation Projects Recommendations (Exhibit C Table 16): a. FMP_ID 123000021 does not appear to include a BCR in Table 13, Table 16, FMP_Details table, and the FMP feature class. Please populate the BCR field Table 13, Table 16, and FMP Details table, and populate the ‘BC_RATIO’ field in the FMP feature class as required. If no BCR is available, please remove this FMP from the recommended FMP list in the plan. b. Twenty-seven recommended FMPs list "Y" for Negative Impact and are blank for Negative Impact Mitigation. Please review these FMPs to ensure accuracy of these data fields.§361.39 c. It appears that some fields are missing entries, including Water Supply Benefit. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit C Table 16. [31 TAC §361.39 & Exhibit C 2.5.B].	Agree, will update. Agree, will update. Agree, will update.
20	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	20.Flood Mitigation Project Recommendations GIS Feature Class, FMP: d. It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘HUC8’, ‘FLD_TP_RIV’, ‘FLD_TP_LOC’, and ‘ASSOCIATED’. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 24. e. Twenty-seven recommended FMPs list "Yes" for 'NEG_IMPACT' and "No" for 'NEG_MITIG'. Please review these FMPs to ensure accuracy of these data fields. [31 TAC §361.39 & Exhibit D 3.11.1].	Agree, will update. Agree, will update.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan			TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun		
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR					
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon					
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan					
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/								
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required								
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required								
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment			Response	
	Documen ↑	Page / Section						
21	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	21.Flood Mitigation Project Details Geodatabase, FMP_Details: The FMP Details table provided in the geodatabase appears blank. Please complete as required in §361.40			Agree, will update.	
22	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	22.Flood Mitigation Strategies Recommendations GIS Feature Class, FMS: It appears that some fields are missing entries, including ‘ENTITY_ID’, ‘NEG_IMPACT’, and ‘ASSOCIATED’. Please complete all required fields with valid entries per Exhibit D Table 26. For ‘ENTITY_ID’, leave NULL or 999999 if there is no data. [31 TAC §361.39 & Exhibit D 3.10].			Agree, will update.	
LEVEL 2								
23	Plan	General Comment	TWDB	23.To better align with our agency’s preferred nomenclature, please consider using the name, “Cursory Floodplain Data” instead of “Fathom” or Cursory Fathom Data” throughout the regional flood plan.			Agree, will update.	

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen t	Page / Section			
24	Plan	SOW Task 1	TWDB	24.Watersheds GIS Feature Class, Watersheds: Please populate the applicable ID fields to associate the Watersheds feature class with identified FME/FMS/FMP.	Agree, these fields have been updated.
25	Plan	SOW Task 1	TWDB	25.Existing Infrastructure, Text: Please provide a description of how Low Water Crossings were identified within the text of Chapter 1.	Agree, will update.
26	Plan	SOW Task 1	TWDB	26.Existing Infrastructure GIS Feature Class, ExFldInfraPt: There appear to be Low Water Crossings in the TNRIS dataset which do not appear to be included in the ExFldInfraPt feature class. Please consider reviewing the TNRIS dataset for potential inclusion.	LWC’s were all evaluated, some were moved to be more in line with the stream CL and road CL, and some were removed that did not seem to be correct based on road overtopping, based on the March 7th TM comments. In short, ExFldInfraPt layer was modified which was used to identify LWC’s that intersected the ExFldHazard layer to produce the ExFldExpPt layer that then fed into the ExFldExpAll (vulnerability) layer.
27	Plan	SOW Task 1	TWDB	27.Deficient Infrastructure (Exhibit C Map 3): Please consider renaming map to Non- Functional or Deficient Infrastructure since the map includes dams and levees.	Agree, will update.
28	Plan	SOW Task 1	TWDB	28.Existing Projects, Text: a. Please refer to Table 2 in the text of Chapter 1. b. Please ensure Map 2 is referenced in a similar manner. Chapter 4 is referenced in the text of Chapter 1 (and Chapter 4 references Map 2), however, for the sake of ease and convenience, please consider providing the reference to the Map 2 in Chapter 1 (in addition to the map's reference in Chapter 4). It appears all of this can be accomplished by referencing Table 2 and Map 2 within the following sections: "1.12.4 Proposed or Ongoing Flood Mitigation Projects" and "1.12.5 Implementation of Nonstructural Flood Mitigation Projects" in Chapter 1 (as well as Chapters 4).	a. Agree, will update. b. Agree, will update.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location Document ↑ Page / Section		Reviewer	Comment	Response
29	Plan	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	29. Existing Condition Flood Exposure GIS Feature Class, ExFldExpPol: a. The agricultural coverage layers appear to have irregular triangle and rectangular features that may be a result of the conversion of a raster to polygon. b. The agricultural coverage layers appear to have irregular triangle and rectangular features that may be a result of the conversion of a raster to polygon. Please review and revise as appropriate.	a. Based on the March/April comments we reprocessed the Agricultural raster into polygons that were rectangles as opposed to triangles. The August submittal had the rectangles. b. Same comment
30	Plan	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	30.Existing Condition Flood Exposure Vulnerability GIS Feature Class, ExFldExpAll: It appears that some entries with ‘EXP_TYPE’ listed as "Other" may better fit in the provided ‘EXP_TYPE’ valid entries. Please consider reviewing and revising as appropriate using the updated ‘CRIT_TYPE’ valid entry list: "Medical, Police, Fire, EMS, Shelter, School, Infrastructure, Water Treatment, Wastewater Treatment, Power Generation, Other".	a. "Other" was used in EXP_TYPE for Gas pipelines, Electrical Transmission lines and Railroad Segments. There did not seem to be a better category available for this field. However we categorized Gas and Transmission line as "Yes" in the CRITICAL field and used the "Infrastructure" classification in the CRIT_TYPE field. For the Railroad segments we did not consider as critical similar to the logic for the Roadway segments.
31	Plan	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	31.Existing Condition Vulnerability: Please consider modifying the map color scheme to enhance critical infrastructure legibility.	Agree, changed the infrastructure to orange.
32	Plan	SOW Task 2A	TWDB	32.Model Coverage, Text: Please consider providing a table of models within Chapter 2 or appendix that includes the modeling information contained in the ModelCoverage feature class.	Agree, will update.
33	Plan	SOW Task 2B	TWDB	33.Future Condition Flood Hazard Map Gaps (Exhibit C Map 9): Please consider changing the colors used for the Unknown future flood hazard and the areas where Cursory Floodplain Data (Fathom data) was used.	Agree, updated color to red.
34	Plan	SOW Task 2B	TWDB	34.Future Condition Flood Exposure GIS Feature Class, FutFldExpPol: a. The agricultural coverage layers appear to have irregular triangle and rectangular features that may be a result of the conversion of a raster to polygon. Please review and revise. b. Bldg_IDs 6025014 and 6331393 both appear to be within the extent of the FutFldHazard layer but do not appear to be identified in the FutFldExpPol feature class. c. Bldg_ID 6080782 (A Hospital) appears to be within the extent of the extent of the FutFldHazard layer but does not appear to be identified in the FutFldExpPol feature class. d. Bldg_ID 6028788 (A power generating facility) appears to be within the extent of the extent of the FutFldHazard layer but does not appear to be identified in the FutFldExpPol feature class. e. Please review the FutFldHazard layer confirm that buildings within the extent are properly identified in the FutFldExpPol feature class. Some buildings do not appear to include the entire building footprints.	a. Based on the March/April comments we reprocessed the Agricultural raster into polygons that were rectangles as opposed to triangles. The August submittal had the rectangles. b. After rechecking the August submittal these buildings do appear to be shown in the FutFldExpPol layer as is expected. c. After rechecking the August submittal this building does appear to be shown in the FutFldExpPol layer as is expected and classified as a critical Medical facility in the FutFldExpAll layer. d. After rechecking the August submittal this building does appear to be shown in the FutFldExpPol layer as is expected and classified as a critical Power Generation facility in the FutFldExpAll layer. e. There appears to be 55,514 Building footprints in the FutFldExpPol layer. Separately I did a select by location using the building footprints and the FutFldHazard layer that also had 55,514 buildings
35	Plan	SOW Task 2B	TWDB	35.Future Condition Flood Exposure Vulnerability GIS Feature Class, FutFldExpAll: FTEXPALLID 156611 is the site of San Antonio Fire Department Station 49, however, it does not appear to be identified as critical infrastructure. Please consider reviewing all critical infrastructure layers and modify, as appropriate, to identify them in the FutFldExpAll feature class.	This is captured in the FutFldExpAll layer as a Fire facility but the ID's don't match up. The issue could be from reviewing potentially out dated data and not the August submittal. The ID I see is FTEXPALLID 120176170

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen t	Page / Section			
36	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	36.Streams GIS Feature Class, Streams: a. Please consider linking this feature class to any relevant FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs when appropriate by populating the associated ID fields. b. Please ensure that identified streams are within the boundary of the associated FME, FMP, and FMS.	a. This was previously done. b. Previously Region-wide FMX's were identified and that is why the streams were included. For the August submittal the Region-wide FMX's were modified or removed. Based on the guidance the streams layer should only show Streams that intersect identified FMX's. We removed the streams that do not intersect and renumbered the ID's accordingly.
37	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	37.Flood Management Evaluation, Text: In areas where there is an ongoing TWDB-funded FIF Category 1 study, please consider describing how duplication of efforts would be avoided and how FIF Category 1 study data would be incorporated into the proposed FMEs. For example, several FMEs appear to overlap spatially with current FIF Category 1 funded Karnes County Flood Protection Planning Study (FIF ID 40011).	Agree, will expand on the on the stakeholder coordination in the text.
38	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	38.Flood Management Evaluation (Exhibit C Table 12) In areas where there is an ongoing TWDB-funded, FIF Category 1 study, please consider describing how duplication of efforts would be avoided and how FIF Category 1 study data would be incorporated into the proposed FMEs. For example, several FMEs appear to overlap spatially with current FIF Category 1 funded Karnes County Flood Protection Planning Study (FIF ID 40011).	Agree, will include in the 'Existing or Anticipated Maps (year)' column.
39	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	39.Flood Management Evaluation (Exhibit C Map 16): a.Map 16 does not include region-wide FMEs. Please consider providing an additional map that would show all of the FMEs within the region. b.Please include TWDB-funded, FIF Category 1 studies in the indication of a previously studied area.	a. There are no region-wide FMEs in the San Antonio Region. b. Agree, will add.
40	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	40.Flood Mitigation Projects (Exhibit C Table 13): Some FMPs list "0" for Project Area. Please review and ensure that these values are accurate.	Agree, will add.
41	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	41.Flood Mitigation Projects GIS Feature Class, FMP_HazPost: Please consider developing a FMP_HazPost feature class showing an updated hazard area that accounts for the impact of recommended FMPs.	Agree, will add.
42	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	42.Flood Mitigation Project (Exhibit C Map 17): Consider providing a zoomed in "inset" map of the San Antonio area to improve the legibility of the FMP extents.	Agree, updated map.
43	Plan	SOW Task 4B	TWDB	43.Flood Mitigation Strategies GIS Feature Class, FMS: For county-wide watershed strategies where majority of the county falls outside of the RFPG boundary, please include justification how the strategy benefits the region and please coordinate with other RFPGs to make sure the efforts are not duplicated.	There was coordination with other Regions, see text in Chapter 10. Will add to description on strategy benefits.
44	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	44.Flood Management Evaluation Recommendations, Text: In areas where there is an ongoing TWDB-funded, FIF Category 1 study, please consider describing how duplication of efforts would be avoided and how FIF Category 1 study data would be incorporated into the proposed FMEs. For example, several FMEs appear to overlap spatially with current FIF Category 1 funded Karnes County Flood Protection Planning Study (FIF ID 40011).	Agree, will expand on the on the stakeholder coordination in the text.

SARFPG Draft Plan Comment Log

Project Title:			San Antonio Regional Flood Plan		TWDB Reviewers: RZ - Reem Zoun
Project Development Engineer (PDE):			HDR		
Project Manager:			Ron Branyon		
Deliverable Milestone:			Draft Flood Plan		
Comments Folder Location PW: pw://pwhdruscen01:HDR_US_Central_01/Documents/State_of_Texas_San_Antonio_River_Authority/SA_River_Flood_Planning_Group/3.0_Correspondence/3.2_WIP/From_TWDB/202221021_Draft_Comments/					
Initial Disposition: A = Agree, will incorporate; C = Requires Clarification; D = Disagree, do not incorporate; E = Acknowledge comment, no change to deliverable required					
Final Disposition: A = Comment to be incorporated; D = Disagree; E = No change required					
Comme nt #	Comment Location		Reviewer	Comment	Response
	Documen ↑	Page / Section			
45	Plan	SOW Task 5	TWDB	45.Flood Management Evaluation Recommendations (Exhibit C Table 15): In areas where there is an ongoing TWDB-funded, FIF Category 1 study, please consider describing how duplication of efforts would be avoided and how FIF Category 1 study data would be incorporated into the proposed FMEs. For example, several FMEs appear to overlap spatially with current FIF Category 1 funded Karnes County Flood Protection Planning Study (FIF ID 40011).Flood Management Evaluations GIS Feature Class, FME: Please consider adding the 'ASSOCIATED' field to the FME feature class and populating as applicable.	Agree, will add to the ASSOCIATED field.
46	Plan	SOW Task 9	TWDB	46.Please consider providing the supporting calculation and supporting data that is the basis for the statement: “Of this \$1,184,840,000 it is projected that \$1,005,017,000 in state and federal grant funding is needed for implementation of these projects”. (Page 9-16).	Agree, will expand on.
47	Plan	SOW Task 9	TWDB	47.Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis text: Please review section for language accuracy. Please consider revising "rant" to "grant" in the subtitle of Chapter 9.1.6.	Agree, corrected.
48	Plan	SOW Task 9	TWDB	48.Water Supply, Text: a. Table 6-6 in Section 6.6 does not appear to include the estimated, quantified annual volume of water associated with the three identified FMPs. Please review and reconcile. [31 TAC §361.41 & Exhibit C 2.6.B]. b. On p. 6-6, there is a brief discussion about coordination with RWPGs to determine impacts on WMSs. The text states that the results of coordination are presented in "the following tables", but the tables appear to not be included. Please include a summary and a table identifying any negative impacts to water supply. If no negative impacts are identified, please include a statement to that effect.	Need more clarification from TWDB.