

This log is a record of public comments regarding the San Marcos CDBG-DR Action Plan. The Action Plan was made available to the public from August 19 – September 2, 2016. Comments were gathered via website submittal, paper drop offs, and emails. The comments received were editorial and general in nature or address issues that are not directly related to the Action Plan or CDBG-DR process and reflect “no change”.

The City’s HUD CDBG-DR team has provided responses to the comments as best as the information currently available allows. The team will also make editorial, clarity, and other edits to the Plan if necessary. This Comment Log and all responses was provided to the San Marcos City Council at the September 6, 2016 City Council meeting prior to the submission of this Action Plan to HUD, and have been included with the Action Plan as Appendix G.

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
1	8/22/16	Online Form	Housing; 35	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: Our family would like the city to know that we would prefer a buy-out. My wife was in a car accident years ago and still has issues because of it to this day (rods and screws in her back). Last flood she and the dogs had to be evacuated and I don't know what we would do once kids got here. It has gotten to the point that when it rains at night we just don't really sleep well anymore. If there is not a neighborhood buyout a lot of flood prevention work would have to be done before we felt safe again.</p>	<p>Comment duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
2	8/26/16	Online Form	Section VI. Approach to Housing Rehabilitation, Reconstruction, New Construction	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: Stop building in the flood zone</p>	<p>The City will design all rehabilitation and reconstruction projects to incorporate principles of sustainability, including resilience and mitigation against the impact of future disasters and flooding.</p> <p>Additionally, as is required, construction projects will be properly vetted and approved through the City’s Permitting Department. We will gladly pass along this suggestion to their office as evidence of public desire to consider flood zones as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
3	8/29/16	Submitted at City Hall in writing	Housing – General	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: He stated that he doesn't have a computer so he can review the plan, but his comment is positive on buyouts.</p>	<p>Comment duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
4	8/29/16	Online Form	Infrastructure – General	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: Dredge the Blanco River below hwy 80 bridge. Take out the curve in the Blanco River at that location.</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure and reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos. We appreciate and will consider your suggestion.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
5	8/30/16	Online Form	Overall plan for recovery	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: While I see the need for the city of San Marcos to act for the benefit of its citizens, I see this plan as a shallow solution to a major, long range plan. The elected officials are responding in a very predictable manner, trying to stay elected. Please consider the following points.</p> <p>1. The city government of San Marcos has been irresponsible in the past by allowing the commercial and private development of known flood hazard areas. This is one of the main reasons that flooding is a continual problem in the city. You just cannot dodge this point with a strait face.</p> <p>2. Mitigating hazards faced by San Marcos by sending your flood water downstream is not a solution; it only creates increased levels of hazard for those that do not vote in your precincts. The bypass plan is a bad idea that will be totally opposed at</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure, reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, and assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>every level. San Marcos has not managed its own house very well; why do you think you can get away with putting downstream communities at risk without addressing your own problems?</p> <p>3. Finding housing for your own displaced citizens should be your number one priority; this is a better use of your federal funds than digging a ditch.</p> <p>4. Caving in to commercial developments that operate for their own benefit while damaging local communities is bad policy for water and flood management. This includes the apartment complex by the river and plans for a new HEB. The continued out of control development that affects flood plains and runoff management will only intensify water problems.</p> <p>5. You are not alone in this process of finding solutions to flood hazards and San Marcos River Management. Please make efforts to broaden your focus and look beyond the doorstep of your city hall.</p> <p>6. As a final point, I must reiterate that your plans for developing a bypass for water out of the Blanco River Basin will be totally and forcefully opposed by your neighbors. Maybe you think you can redraw your water boundaries, but you simply cannot be allowed to cause harm</p>	
6	8/30/16	Online Form		<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: We live outside the flood zone-but the heavy downpours in both disasters caused flooding in our split level home. We are not seeking any assistance. We do emphathize and understand the</p>	<p>At the time of the Needs Assessment development the data in hand drove the suggested allocation proportions; however, the numbers are always open for revision as new and better data becomes available. The Needs Assessment is a fluid document that</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>anguish caused by the floods though). However, we do believe that the majority of the \$25 million federal assistance should go to housing assistance for flood victims-- not just 30%. The City's plan calls for 50% for infrastructure and 20% for planning and administration. Infrastructure needs could be addressed through bond elections; aid to individual flood victims cannot. The city should see how much administration / planning could be absorbed in-house. The long term infrastructure repairs ARE important. The \$12.5 million barely touches the \$83 million need. But the causes and the fixes are regional in nature and should be addressed long term through state & federal grants, county contributions and city bond elections.</p> <p>At stake here is the survival of a family neighborhood with affordable housing. As the city's data indicate, San Marcos has urgent housing needs and a high level of low income families and residents. Please reconsider this plan and dedicate more funding to help the families in SF homes and public housing who were devastated by the two disasters and have yet to recover. Thank you.</p>	<p>requires change as needs change or are identified. The City will continue to assess need throughout the recovery process and will change allocations proportions accordingly.</p> <p>Comments duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
7	8/30/16	City Hall Email Address	Infrastructure-General	<p>Dear City Officials,</p> <p>I have been following the news stories of the \$25 million grant from the federal government to the City of San Marcos for the purpose of recovering from both the 2015 Memorial Day Flood and the All Saints Flood the following October, and putting into place policies and infrastructure to mitigate future flood damage.</p> <p>We did not suffer any loss during the first flood but suffered mightily from the second. And we do not live anywhere near the river. The closest landmark to our residence is the observation tower at the Wonder World tourist attraction at Bishop and Prospect Streets.</p> <p>We did not have flood insurance which would</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure and reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos. We appreciate and will consider your suggestion.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>probably not covered all our losses since so much occurred outside the house on the property. We got about 2 inches of water inside the house--a first! We did lose the ground level sun porch at the back of the house and much of the raised deck on one side of the house. The water was so high and the flow so intense it floated one of our 1500 gallon rainwater tanks through a fence to the other side of the creek. We lost much of the fencing, outside sheds and structures, and many items of personal property. The FEMA inspector came and after viewing all the loss gave us a grant of \$4300 to help with our recovery. I wrote a letter to the City Manager shortly after the flood detailing some of the loss but never received a response. I have included a copy of that letter.</p> <p>I understand that the residents along the river are in dire need of all sorts of relief and changes to infrastructure to mitigate future damage. But what about the residents who live elsewhere in the city and also suffered?</p> <p>We live right next to a "wet weather" creek that channels runoff from the properties beside and behind us on almost 3 sides. This is normally a dry creek bed that only runs when we get a lot of rain. That "runoff" includes water straight from the sky, plus that which is channeled down the same creek bed from up near Prospect and Quarry Streets and beyond, and from the city drainage system which catches water from the south, or west, side of Bishop Street and funnels it under Bishop to the back side of the Wonder World tourist attraction and thence downhill to the normally dry creek bed and through our property.</p> <p>We estimate that the flash flood that occurred here Friday morning on October 30 must have been at least 4 feet deep when it came over the creek sides. Is there anything the city can do to help prevent this in the future? Could some of the water be diverted before it reaches our property and those downstream from us? Could the under-the-street culvert I</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>mentioned on Bishop be redesigned so that it doesn't cause massive amounts draining down the hill on Bishop to join the massive amounts of water coming down the natural creek bed? Could a wall be built, at least on the residence side of the creek, to prevent so much water from flooding against the house?</p> <p>I know the city has a lot to take care of with a limited amount of money, but I'm afraid the residents along the river will get all the attention and all the funds when there are other equally vulnerable and at-risk residents elsewhere in the city who went through a hellish experience in October and afterwards and are needing attention as well. We are looking for help in finding a solution to mitigate such damage in the future. I have also enclosed some photos of some of our damage.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention and consideration</p>	
8	8/31/16	Online Form	Infrastructure-General	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Left Blank</p> <p>Comment: Any recovery must begin with the recovery of the San Marcos river. These actions should include removal of trash, debris, trees and branches and "strainers" that impede flow or present safety hazards to humans in the river. Some bank and tree stabilization may also be required. The river recovery should go from below Rio Vista park to the junction with the Blanco River. This must be done for flood minimization.</p> <p>An additional step would be to reclaim the river for the people of San Marcos and the general public. The minimum would be to replace the foot bridge, clear/open/develop public points of access:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. down to I-35 2. access, facilities, parking at 299 (Sturgeon Dr.) 3. provide other public access points down to the 	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure and reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos. We appreciate and will consider your suggestion.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>Blanco River junction</p> <p>Sadly, I do not believe that the Memorial Day event was a "worst case" scenario for the City of San Marcos. What if the Blanco rain event took place over the upper San Marcos River watershed overlapping significantly into the Purgatory Creek (Purgatory Creek is not mentioned once in the report - Why?) and Blanco Watersheds? Before this is arbitrarily dismissed think of all the significant rain events in the region in the last 18 months.</p> <p>Planning should begin with studies by "hydrologist specialists" mapping the Purgatory Creek, San Marcos River and Blanco River (below Wimberly) watersheds. With the resultant water flow models various scenarios can be studied. (I first became involved with this discipline during studies of rain events in Seattle where flows into and around Lake Washington were very environmentally sensitive due to salmon migration and the fact that Bill Gates lives there). The "what if" studies can provide a range of resultant conditions that will allow development of best responses.</p>	
9	8/31/16	Online Form	Housing-Elevation	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: Please consider helping residents living in this neighborhood raise their homes to a proper height so that we may continue to live here.</p>	<p>The City plans to design its housing program(s) in a way that creates long term resiliency against flooding.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
10	8/31/16	Online Form	Housing-Elevation	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: Please consider helping residents living in this neighborhood raise their homes to a proper height so that we may continue to live here.</p> <p>(note, although this entry appears to be a duplicate, it was entered under a different name)</p>	<p>The City plans to design its housing program(s) in a way that creates long term resiliency against flooding.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
11	9/1/16	Online Form	Housing-Elevation	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: I feel that money should be used in lift-up our house.</p>	<p>The City plans to design its housing program(s) in a way that creates long term resiliency against flooding.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
12	9/2/16	Online Form	Infrastructure	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: I am strongly against the proposal to divert Blanco flood waters. I pay outrages school taxes to SMISD so I should have a voice. I live in Guadalupe County on the San Marcos river. We also received flood damage. How can you even consider putting my neighbors and I in more danger by diverting the water into our neighborhoods. I have my doubts regarding your engineers, look how well the Woods project turned out. I am apalled that you think my life and property are not as important as the people living in San Marcos.</p> <p>A possible better solution is to construct a resovior in less populated area on the upper Blanco river.</p> <p>If San Marcos ISD does not tax me out of my home I guess you will try to flood me out.</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure, reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, and assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
13	9/2/16	Online Form	Infrastructure	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: Having lived in San Marcos since 1981, having recently built a new home on the SM River, and having kept close eye on San Marcos river and city politics over the years, I submit this comment about the proposed bypass plan being considered by SM leaders using HUD funding. Several years ago the SM leaders at that time approved the development of a massive apartment t complex on the SM River, despite significant scientific evidence that such structure would create severe flooding problems for</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure, reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, and assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>nearby long standing housing. Indeed that very scenario played out twice in 2015, creating the housing disaster that has now led to this request for federal relief funds.</p> <p>The concept of a river bypass is ill conceived. Despite supposed Corps of Engineers endorsement of such plan (reference Louisiana for one of many Corps debacles), any such successful diversion of a natural river would only exchange one set of flooding victims to others downstream. But the most likely scenario would be that many millions more dollars would be needed to study, engineer, buy out land, install the system. That additional funding is far from certain, and the ability to enact such structure before the next big flood is even less likely. And those issues don't even begin to explore the ecological impacts to the river and riparian systems already designed by nature.</p> <p>Spending the money on current flooding victims is much smarter than the foolish waste of time and money that the bypass would create. Thank you.</p>	
14	9/2/16	Online Form	Infrastructure	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage? Answer: No Comment: My objections to the proposed Balance River Bypass are these:</p> <p>The plan ignores scientific evidence that a healthy riparian zone is the best flood prevention. The plan would bypass the normal riparian zone, creating a superhighway conduit for greater downstream impact.</p> <p>The plan would have impact on communities such as Prairie Lea, Martindale and Luling downstream which would have no vote in this matter.</p> <p>Established flood plain maps would no longer be accurate, putting current home owners at new risk for</p>	<p>Comment appreciated and duly noted. No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>flooding.</p> <p>River divergence has rarely worked well in the past, as example the Mississippi River.</p> <p>San Marcos should consider using this funding by removing the apartment complex that created much of this damage through irresponsible building practices. Perhaps attention should be focused on upstream flood prevention as well.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
15	9/2/16	Online Form	Infrastructure and housing	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: The board of directors of San Marcos River Foundation and I as staff for SMRF are very concerned about the inclusion of the Blanco River Bypass project in the funding needs for infrastructure in this plan for the \$25 million in federal funds. This project is also called the Blanco Overflow project. We know that projects like this, which seek to direct floodwaters elsewhere to avoid the city residents, sound simple on paper and beneficial to city residents currently living in a flood plain affected by the Blanco River floods. It is often expressed to these residents who have been flooded, as "a way to stop flooding permanently". We think that is over-simplified, and residents do not understand exactly what a bypass or overflow project would mean, nor how it is engineered for certain kinds of floods, nor its costs, nor its impacts in cases of more severe flooding than the project is designed to handle.</p> <p>San Marcos is definitely in an unusual location, just downstream from steep hills which gather rainfall and send it swiftly through our city. Also it is in an area that has some of the most extreme rainfall events in the world, due to its geographic location where Gulf of Mexico moisture flows inland and meets hills. In fact, for almost 20 years, our organization has been raising</p>	<p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>the alarm to elected officials in San Marcos about high volume rainfall events happening around us here in central Texas. Many of these are even more extreme than those that San Marcos has received in recorded history. The May 2015 event is not the worst that we can expect---it is only about half of the volume of rainfall events around us, based on historical records of U.S.G.S gauges. We attach a 1 page history of such central Texas events that we have used to educate elected officials since the 1998 flood in, to help calculate the volume of the floods in other watersheds, compared to San Marcos.</p> <p>Our concern about the Blanco Bypass project being included in the infrastructure funding totals for the \$25 million from HUD is that the Bypass project will be eventually found to be impractical, involving extreme cost overruns, delays and perhaps termination of the project. This happens around the country, and often the engineering promises are far from fool proof. It could simply transfer the flood risk to another set of people.</p> <p>Land acquisition would be extremely expensive with land prices in the IH 35 corridor in Central Texas being high. Such a bypass would require much acreage in a very flat landscape where the bypass is proposed. Longterm there would be high costs to maintain such a huge structure after flood damage occurs. Even digging a deep trench to handle floodwater would take large acreages to protect those living downstream along the route, from being flooded once the bypass creates the new route for floodwaters. The spot where the bypass would then meet the San Marcos River also has many homeowners living on it as well, and they would need to be protected, as well as all those living close and downstream. It would not be enough for engineers to just protect all these residents for a 100 year flood event. The city would have to think about what would happen when the bypass capacity is overpowered by</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>larger floods than those engineered for. We fully expect much larger floods since they happen all around us in central Texas. We need to be sure we are not exchanging one set of flooding victims for another.</p> <p>The reality (check our one-pager) is that we can expect much higher floods than the FEMA 100 year flood plain lines would lead people to expect. The combination of climate change and our already extreme rainfall events in central Texas overpowering such a bypass or overflow trench, are a danger to all those who live at the point where the bypass would meet the San Marcos River, as well as all along the bypass route, and also those living on the San Marcos river within a few miles below the bypass exit point.</p> <p>We are confident that these concerns, along with environmental concerns in altering a river course (which always leads to erosion and transport of massive amounts of soil that would then flow into the San Marcos River), would eventually show such a bypass project or overflow project to be impractical, too expensive and too harmful to both the residents in the new route and to the rivers and their ecosystems. Thus spending this limited amount of HUD funding toward that Bypass project would be a waste of precious resources.</p> <p>For these reasons, we believe the HUD funding given to the city needs to be used in sensible ways to improve infrastructure and drainage inside city limits, other than this enormous bypass project. And funds should be spent mostly on funding the housing needs that are so overwhelming in the city since the floods of 2015. Repairs and raising of houses are the urgent priorities for this financial assistance, along with purchasing those houses most likely to flood again, to allow that flood plain land to be left open as a buffer against flooding in the future. Some drainage infrastructure in those unbuilt riparian buffer zones, could be planted properly or structured to better</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>absorb floodwaters. This would be smarter than assuming that human engineering re-routes of an ancient river system are going to be successful. There are too many examples of re-engineered rivers that have failed in our country's past, lessons that we should certainly heed from Louisiana and Florida.</p> <p>Note that the re-location/buyouts of homes in flood plains need to be done in a way that gives those homeowners some chance of buying a home in a non-flood-vulnerable spot.</p> <p>Underpinning the recovery efforts should be good efforts, like the ones the city has already undertaken, to NOT BUILD ANY MORE in places that will flood, and NOT MAKING FLOODING WORSE by building upstream of San Marcos in spots that will cause increased flooding downstream. We must work to avoid flood amnesia, which has certainly happened over and over in the past, and led to our city allowing thousands of apartments, homes and businesses to be built in the 100 year flood plain. Even if a building is slightly elevated on a pile of dirt to rise out of the 100 year flood plain (which we realize is allowed by FEMA) the resident's cars are destroyed in the parking lots or driveways. Damage occurs to such buildings as well since we seem to have floods that too often exceed the 100 year or 1% risk lately. The financial and emotionally devastating effect of allowing building in the 100 year flood plain is too harmful to our community in the long run.</p>	
16	9/2/16	Online Form	Housing - Elevation	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Comment: First my vote is for raising the homes to FEMA/SM City code height. Reason being, the neighborhood was established before all the surrounding construction. Current residential area impact should ALWAYS be the first priority before any surrounding construction is even considered, much</p>	<p>The City plans to design its housing program(s) in a way that creates long term resiliency against flooding.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>less started. We all know the problems caused by The Woods Apartments. This became a City responsibility once they were allowed to build, because the neighborhood voice was not heard and exactly what we said would happen, did. Now someone has to be responsible for making it right especially since the money is there to do it with. Not to mention the fact that as of June 2016 (last information I could find on the subject of a certificate of occupancy) The Woods still had no Certificate of Occupancy which tells me they still do not comply with City Code, so why should the neighborhood continue to worry whether they will comply to what has or will be required in order to not cause more damage than has already been done. Since the money was given to the City to help with flood recovery, it should be used for exactly that. What better way to recover than to put people back into their homes where they feel safe from future flooding events, therefore using it for what it was intended for, to help the people directly affected. There are a lot of residents in the neighborhood that have lived there the majority of their lives; "inheritance homes". We can't all afford to go out and buy something new. I myself have a disabled husband, and work a full time job. I can't afford to go out and purchase a new home, but most of all, I don't want to. Why should I? The October flood was compared to the 1998 flood, but I was at the home in 1998 with my parents, and the CFS rating of the water might have been the same, but the amount of water that remained in the neighborhood and the length of time it took it to go down, was absolutely NOT the same. If you look at River Road at Smith Lane end you can see the angle in which the road was reconstructed for "improvement" prior to the apartment construction. In 1998 the water came up, then as the river receded, the flow went back down into the river. In 2015 the flooding flow had nowhere to go. The angle of River Road did not allow the water to take the natural flow back into the river, therefore it took longer to</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>recede...a LOT longer, which I base on past personal experience. I myself was extremely lucky during both floods, as the water didn't get to the inside of my home, but that doesn't mean I didn't have loss and didn't have a horrible bacterial infected mess to deal with. I have an investment in my property and plan to pass it on to my family, but it's not easy to worry every time the weather report starts talking about flooding. Call it PTSD if you want, but my neighbors have the same problem, especially the elderly.</p> <p>Please be responsible with the money and listen to the people this time.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration on the matter.</p>	
17	9/2/16	Online Form	Housing	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: NOTE: While I did not experience flooding in my personal home, I have been deeply involved with flood relief and recovery efforts. As a pastor, several of my congregation members had direct damage. Our church hosted a flooded daycare, Kactus Kids, in the immediate months so flood survivors could work and their kids would have a safe place. We have hosted groups from outside the area and coordinated their local help. In the San Marcos region, The United Methodist Church has organized thousands of volunteers who donated tens of thousands of hours. We have donated hundreds of thousands of dollars throughout the region in direct flood relief, training for case workers, and support of long term recovery organizations. I have personally participated in task forces, community meetings, workshops and direct one-on-one conversations to hear the needs of the community. I keep our ongoing discernment regarding how best help our most vulnerable citizens in my prayers.</p> <p>It is disappointing that City Council currently draft recommends 70% of the \$25 million HUD CDBG</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of solutions to assist the community in recovering in the most sustainable and resilient manner.</p> <p>The comment regarding the proportions of the proposed allocation for housing and infrastructure is duly noted. At the time of the Needs Assessment development the data in hand drove the suggested allocation proportions; however, the numbers are always open for revision as new and better data becomes available. The Needs Assessment is a fluid document that requires change as needs change or are identified. The City will continue to assess need throughout the recovery process and will change allocations proportions accordingly.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>disaster relief grant be designated for infrastructure, planning and administration – leaving only 30% to address unmet housing needs of flood damaged homes. This disaster grant is most likely the final chance to help our citizens repair and recover from two historic floods last year.</p> <p>At a city council workshop July 25th, grant consultants presented analysis indicating \$33 million in unmet housing needs due to flooding. The consultants recommended dedicating 50% of the disaster grant to housing. During a two-hour meeting, councilmembers Derrick, Prewitt, Hughson, and Gregson expressed deep concern that the \$33 million in unmet housing needs numbers seemed too low and the process might be missing key parts of our community.</p> <p>Eight days later at an August 2nd council meeting, during a 15-minute presentation, the unmet needs report was updated to include an additional \$70 million in infrastructure projects submitted by the city engineer and staff. These new numbers included \$28 million for a Blanco River bypass plan, which the City Manager has stated is not eligible to receive more than \$250,000 from this CDBG disaster grant. Despite previous concerns expressed by a majority of city council members about low housing numbers, the initial housing analysis remains unaddressed and unchanged. The council approved a draft plan allocating 70% of the grant for infrastructure, planning and administration.</p> <p>FLOODING UNMET NEED: INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Infrastructure is important and helps reduce repetitive flooding. During community feedback, neighbors of flooded areas continually highlighted drainage needs in the existing neighborhoods. City analysis estimates drainage projects to cost \$22.5 million and many appear shovel ready. I fully echo to community support of these projects are reasonable near-term</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>projects to help reduce repeat flooding.</p> <p>LONG-TERM REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE QUESTIONS</p> <p>A concern comes with the inclusion of an additional \$50 million in the grant needs analysis for new infrastructure projects including the Blanco River bypass and “combined flood mitigation”. The Blanco river bypass project is still in exploration and would require environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition, regional partnerships to fund the total \$80+ million price, and a decade (or more) before it would become a reality. No substantial public discussion of this bypass project and its impact our river ecosystem has occurred, nor have any possible funding options, including bonds, have been publically explored. It has been highlighted that CDBG-DR cannot be used on an Army Corp of Engineer project such as the Blanco River bypass, and such a bypass would not have helped with the October 2016 flooding which occurred on the San Marcos River (not the Blanco). There also exist questions if such a project could adequately handle the extremely large volumes of water in short times that mark the flood and not simply pass the flooding onto another neighboring community.</p> <p>These long-term regional projects may prove worthwhile. A \$250,000 CDBG-DR allocation for planning seems reasonable for the COE Blanco Bypass project at this point. If the analysis and public discussion reveals a plan to move forward, regional partners should be able to put together a funding mechanism apart from any further CDBG-DR from this particular grant. The inclusion of this project as an unmet disaster need distorts the final grant allocation percentages and stretches the grant’s primary purpose of helping with damage from previous floods in the city limits of San Marcos.</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>CRITICAL UNMET HOUSING NEEDS</p> <p>Housing is critical. The unmet housing needs analysis was based on only 300 houses; yet more than 1,200 homes were affected by flooding. A year later, many homes still have flood damage. Flooded families, particularly widows, are unsure how to move forward. City housing programs can leverage homeowner money with reliable, honest repairs, help bring families back safely into vacant homes throughout the neighborhoods, coordinate with local nonprofits and faith-based groups for greater impact, and explore innovative options if particular existing housing locations are unsafe.</p> <p>The City of San Marcos has a serious struggle with affordable housing. The inability to repair existing homes in a neighborhood will exacerbate an already difficult housing situation. An infrastructure focused plan that attempts to reduce the flood plain, yet under funding housing repairs, will hurt current residents and benefit investors waiting to scoop up damaged housing on the cheap that residents can't afford to fix. In 10-20 years, the neighborhood may be dry but there will not be any neighbors left due to their unmet ability to repair their homes.</p> <p>A final action plan must benefit both neighborhoods and neighbors. This action plan is a key moment in our city's history where we have the resources to take strategic action on housing needs to complement our ongoing economic and environmental initiatives. The council deserves recognition for their efforts to secure the \$25 million disaster grant. City staff deserves appreciation for their efforts to engage the community and move this process forward in a short time frame. City leaders are quick to note grant disaster funding allocations can – and most likely will – change through this process.</p> <p>I strongly encourage housing projects to be made the clear priority of this Department of Housing disaster</p>	

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				relief money.	
18	9/2/16	Online Form	Relocation of both housing and infrastructure	<p>Form Question: Did you experience flood damage?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Comment: In the interest of being proactive with the housing funding, I would like to recommend the city take two important measures. These are: 1) Use the funding allotment to relocate residents of the flood plains of both the Blanco and San Marcos Rivers to non-flood plain areas, and 2) Relocate the wastewater treatment plant on the San Marcos River, currently located east of I35, to a higher area out of the flood plain of the river. The San Marcos River is a treasure. The natural quality of the water is rare and delicate. San Marcos is a city of interest because of the natural beauty of the river and surrounding ecosystem. Affordable urban development can take place, but plan these developments with the protection of the unique and irreplaceable environment in mind. Develop east of the floodplain of the San Marcos River on the Blackland prairie.</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for creating better and more sustainable infrastructure, reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, and assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>Comment appreciated and duly noted.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>
19	9/2/16	City Hall Drop Box	Housing	<p>I am John J. Edgell, Jr. commenting on the HUD Plan for my wife, Lucy Edgell, son, John J. Edgell, III, and myself. Our home, since 1967 and located at 1008 Hackberry St., San Marcos, was flooded during the "Memorial Day" flood and later by the "All Saints Flood". Our home withstood the initial flood wave and was flooded, totally destroyed with a remaining exterior shell, by about six feet of mud and water during the "Memorial Day" flood. We were fortunate to escape with the clothes on us and our lives. My son is a fifty-one year old handicapped person requiring continuous care and ambulates via a wheel chair. I</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, as well as assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>

#	Date	Source	Element	Comment	Response
				<p>am a seventy-nine year old handicapped person with Parkinson's disease complicated by hip and knee replacements and other ailments. My wife, at the same age as I, takes care of us. Our home with all of our appliances, furniture, and family heirlooms were totally destroyed, with a few pictures off the walls and items salvaged from the virtually concrete deep river mud. There was no affordable housing in San Marcos for us and so we had to borrow and move to a much smaller house in New Braunfels. We were advised by the chief engineer of San Marcos to leave the shell of the house with only support studs standing and to wait for a possible "buyout". We are in need of a buy out before we expire.</p>	
20	9/2/16	Library Drop Box	Infrastructure	<p>Our home was flooded in May (10 inches) and Oct (2") We were repairing when flooded in October and had to buy the doors again. Since then we have sold our house at 262 Spring River Dr., Martindale and moved to senior housing. Our house was built a foot above the rest of the neighbors.</p> <p>All the water came from the Blanco River and I think a canal would divert the water so this does not happen again. Either that or a large berm. Thanks for listening.</p>	<p>The City is exploring a number of options for reducing repetitive loss and flooding within the City of San Marcos, as well as assisting those with outstanding unmet housing needs. We appreciate and will consider your comments.</p> <p>No change to Action Plan necessary at this time.</p>