

Blanco Riverine Community Meeting – April 18, 2018

| # | Comment from Community Meeting | Source of Comment (if known) | Response to Comment |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | Why has no work been done in the Blanco Gardens area since the floods? As you said it [has] already been over a year since the city received the funding. | Eddie Hurtado 807 Conway Drive, San Marcos 78666 | It takes considerable time to procure professional services, clear projects environmentally, and the design and permit the projects before actual construction may begin. The city has been making progress on those items so just be aware that it could be 2022 before the disaster recovery infrastructure projects are built. |
| 2 | This is a lot of money to be spent on such an infrequent event (like 2015 floods); money would be better spent on local storm sewer project in Blanco Gardens. | Property owner on east side of Blanco River | There are other projects being advanced to address local flooding in Blanco Gardens (improve the storm drainage systems for more frequent events) but the vast amount of property damage and safety hazards occur in the larger (less frequent) flood events. This project has been selected by city council as a highly ranked project in the city to advance. |
| 3 | Alleges the city is trying to fix problems for city residents by moving drainage out to the ETJ where people can't vote (spoken in opposition of the Large Bypass -option #4) | Property owner on east side of Blanco River | There is no intention of causing or moving flooding onto anyone; the options being considered are intended to provide the most flood protection for the most people and property possible with the available funds. In some cases, there will need to be easements or right-of-way acquired for public use (for drainage channels or berms as appropriate to the solution). |
| 4 | The railroad backs up much of the flow in Bypass Creek. | Property owner on east side of Blanco River | Our models confirm this fact (that the railroad is a constriction point at which flood waters back up) |
| 5 | We know we have 5 hours from the time the gauge in (Kyle?) says 30,000 cfs that the water is going to come up quickly in Old Martindale, when it rises it rises quickly. | Martindale resident | Noted, thank you. |
| 6 | Need More Focus on Stream stability (geomorphology) | | As part of the consultant team, we have hired a fluvial geomorphologist from Baylor University to evaluate the stream stability. |
| 7 | Relating the 20-year WSEL that spills out of the Blanco back to either the Kyle or SH80 gage | | We will relate the water surface elevations (WSEL) of spills with local gauges so that folks familiar with the gauges will have this information to relate them to. |
| 8 | Look at local events (no Blanco spilling) near Harris Hill Road and SH21, floods with 2" of rain | | Local projects are being evaluated with other city projects, but are not within the scope of this project, which is intended to address the Blanco River and flooding of Blanco Gardens. |
| 9 | Knowledge of other City projects and incorporation of those in the 2D model | | We concur. The city will coordinate any improvements from other city project into this model when applicable. |
| 10 | Requested a video of the 2D model on the website | | The flooding video will be shared on the city website. |
| 11 | New Pipeline near Diversion 2 | Marked on Table 1 Exhibit | The new line is noted as a constraint to be evaluated. |
| 12 | Upstream development and the concern of additional runoff | | New development will be required to meet the regulations in place at the time. Note, that due to the enormous size of the Blanco River watershed, the amount of runoff local development contributes has a negligible effect on peak flow rates (though if development were to fill/impede the floodplain, the hydraulic effects could be significant). |
| 13 | Explanation or video of the Bypass of Bypass 2 not adversely impacting Martindale | | We will evaluate timing during the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. Though it is possible some runoff could reach Martindale sooner, that runoff may be able to pass prior to the peak flood waters reaching Martindale, having the effect of reducing flood risk (but certainly not increasing risk). |
| 14 | Bypass Creek is known as Snake Creek by the locals | | Noted. This seems to be an unofficial creek name not recognized on stream maps. |
| 15 | Not favorable of the oxbow channels due to the non-natural flow patterns. | | Noted. |
| 16 | Want to make sure these options do not make backwater worse along the San Bernard | | Noted. FEMA rules do not allow us to adversely affect properties up or downstream. |

Blanco Riverine Community Meeting – April 18, 2018

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 17 | Concerns of the new roadway causing a “dam” effect along the San Marcos | | We will evaluate the new FM 110 bridge crossing in our modeling. |
| 18 | Concerns of impact to the San Marcos river | | <i>Comment lacks enough specificity for us to respond.</i> |
| 19 | All alternatives seem to have a significant impact to land owners | | The “no-build” alternative also has significant impacts to land, home, and business owners, and tenants so the alternatives being considered are intended to benefit the most |
| 20 | Is the cost of the bypass really \$50m | | Yes, this was the estimate prepared during the USACE study. We will relook at costs in this study (there may be some savings if using land owned by the city (versus acquiring easements). |
| 21 | Has upstream detention been considered? | | Yes, during the USACE study. The cost of ROW (easements) and the environmental impacts and permitting required make detention unaffordable and infeasible. |
| 22 | Height of berm, is its levee? What happens when the 100 year or Halloween flood occurs? | | The berm would not be considered a levee. The height of berm in the previous feasibility report was 2-3 feet tall on average. A 100-year event or storm like Halloween 2015 would overtop the berm, so some flood water (though not as much) would enter the neighborhood. The berm would be intended to reduce the probability of this occurring. |
| 23 | Have buyouts been considered? | | Yes, but there was not sufficient interest to proceed in this direction. |
| 24 | Affordable housing alternatives for buyout residents? | | Maybe |
| 25 | Citizens, especially renters, need to be informed of their risk | | Agree and noted. |
| 26 | What about alleviating river cutting? | | A fluvial geomorphologist has been retained as part of the engineering team and will be evaluating how any changes would affect the long-term river stability. |
| 27 | What about flooding North of IH-35? Seems to only focus on East/south portion of the Blanco. | | The scope of this study is limited to south of I-35. |
| 28 | Concern over flooding of IH-35 itself. Does this address that? | | The scope of this study is limited to south of I-35. IH-35 is owned and operated by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and will need to be evaluated and addressed by TxDOT. |
| 29 | What is the environmental approval process? | | Project contains federal funding and therefore must follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Impacting jurisdictional waters that need to be looked. TPWD will also assess impacts. Also, technical review by Hays/Caldwell/Guadalupe counties. |
| 30 | Why not considering the October flood, which impacted other areas? Why just consider the May event? | | Both events have been evaluated. Though May involved higher flooding on the San Marcos River, the October event is what produced the peak flows in the Blanco River. |
| 31 | Have you looked at backwater effects? | | Yes |

Blanco Riverine Community Meeting – April 18, 2018

| | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 43 | "Not a natural drainage area" and "doesn't flood much" (written on the diversion area of Option 3) | Marked on Table 1 Exhibit | We concur this is not where water floods currently, this area was proposed to be excavated to provide an additional path for water to flow (to avoid flooding in Blanco Gardens) |
| 44 | Old 30" line to be abandoned by Enterprise (written on the diversion area of Option 2) | Marked on Table 1 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 45 | Overflow areas and "high area" marked on east side of River north of CR 161 (with debris deposits notes) | Marked on Table 1 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 46 | Active excavation here; impact on Blanco? (written the quarry on west side of river north of Old Martindale Road) | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | We are aware of the excavation and will take it into account as we model the flows and |
| 47 | A hike and bike trail here can allow adjacent neighborhood access to the SM/Blanco greenbelt trails (marked on the berm for Option 1). | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 48 | Barbara and Conway streets convey the water (marked on the Blanco Gardens neighborhood). | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 49 | Work here (marked on diversion area of Option 2) can provide connection to greenbelt trails connecting SM & Blanco Trails | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 50 | Bike / Trail opportunities with improvements. | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | Noted, thank you. |
| 51 | Where does the San Marcos River downstream start backing up? Fentress? | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | There is not one specific location where water is impeded (there are many) but in general the topography west of I-35 is steeper / hill country terrain resulting in faster moving water in the river, and the topography east of I-35 becomes flatter / coastal plains resulting in slower moving water in the river (and deeper flood waters). |
| 52 | Requiring new development to include detention ponds in the Blanco watershed may involve inclusion of extra-territorial jurisdiction. | Marked on Table 2 Exhibit | We concur this is good practice where the city has jurisdiction to regulate development. |
| 53 | Please make sure the drainage down Bishop from development(s) does not flood out Belvin/Dixon/Hunter area. I have documented the trajectory of my concerns via videos for many years to cosm. Im frightened may reach much higher next rain event. Please make sure the Hunter Road bridge drains. I have many video blogs documenting it does not drain. I did not investigate last rain event b3cause im tired | Lisa Marie Coppoletta via email | The drainage in the Bishop, Belvin, Dixon, Hunter Road area is not part of this project scope. It is being evaluated by a separate city project. |

Blanco Riverine Community Meeting – April 18, 2018

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>of investing things. Thank you for open house. My apologies cannot attend. I am actually two hours out of a four year project to go thru my life and throw out most of my material items. Enjoy yawls meeting.</p> | | |
|---|--|--|