



---

**Final Notice and Public Explanation of a Proposed Activity in a Floodplain and Wetland  
San Jacinto Watershed and Tributary Barrier Flood Mitigation Project  
Montgomery County, Texas**

To: All interested Federal, State, and Local Agencies, Groups and Individuals

This is to give notice that the Montgomery County Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (the County) under 24 CFR Part 58 has conducted an evaluation as required by Executive Order 11988 and Executive order 11990 and in accordance with HUD regulations at 24 CFR 55.20 in Subpart C Procedures for Making Determinations on Floodplain Management and Wetlands Protection. The activity is funded under Texas General Land Office's (GLO) Community Development Block Grant - Mitigation (CDBG-MIT) Regional Mitigation Program (HUD Award Number B-18-DP-48-0002; GLO Contract No. 24-065-164-F079). The proposed action, San Jacinto Watershed and Tributary Barrier Flood Mitigation, is located within the San Jacinto Watershed, specifically, along segments of Lake Creek, Stewarts Creek, White Oak Creek, Caney Creek, Peach Creek, and San Jacinto River East Fork in Montgomery County, Texas.

The particular waterways and corresponding locations of the project are as follows:

Lake Creek. Begins 1,800 ft north of Johnson Road (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.450690, -95.780920), and traverses downstream to end at Sendera Ranch Drive (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.25773, -95.56381), covering roughly 24 miles.

Stewarts Creek. Begins at Shadow Lake (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.38009, -95.47057), and traverses downstream to end at its confluence with the San Jacinto River West Fork (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.24883, -95.45309), covering roughly 15 miles.

Caney Creek. Begins at the Montgomery-Walker County line (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.50882, -95.42619), and traverses downstream to end at the Montgomery-Harris County line (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.10600, -95.17330), covering roughly 44 miles.

Peach Creek. Begins at North Walker Road (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.50892, -95.36187), and traverses downstream to end at its confluence with Caney Creek (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.11828, -95.17203), covering roughly 40 miles.

White Oak Creek. Begins at Gene Campbell Blvd. (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.16488, -95.30362), and traverses downstream to end at the Montgomery-Harris County line (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.09945, -95.18053), covering roughly 10 miles.

San Jacinto River East Fork. Begins at the Montgomery-Liberty County line (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.18650, -95.10406), and traverses downstream to end at the Montgomery-Harris County line just south of FM 1485 Rd. (approximate geographic coordinates: 30.14484, -95.12461), covering roughly 4.6 miles.

Within each of these segments, the County proposes to remove vegetative and other obstructions from the waterways and restore the creeks to full channel capacity. In addition, where areas of significant erosion are observed, best management practices (BMPs) and non-structural controls will be utilized to stabilize banks and mitigate against scour, sedimentation, and additional degradation of the channels and banks.

Channel obstructions shall be extracted utilizing various types of land- and water-borne equipment deemed appropriate for the depth, width and accessibility of each creek segment, and suitable to accomplish the removal of vegetation and other flood-borne debris. Only dead vegetation will be removed from the channel and banks. Dead vegetation will be cut and the root balls will be left in place



to prevent erosion. Creeks will be accessed via locations that offer ideal entry (gentle bank slopes, clear of vegetation) and matting will be used as necessary to prevent disturbance to soil and vegetation. Grading, dredging and discharge of fill material are not proposed. All work will occur within the channels to top of the bank.

As necessary, debris will be temporarily staged at the County’s existing debris management sites prior to disposal. All vegetation and other debris removed from the channels will be disposed of in properly permitted landfills.

The proposed project is located almost entirely within the 100-year floodplain (approximately 1,119.4 acres), Floodway AE and Zone AE (floodway fringe), and 500-year floodplain, Shaded X (approximately 2.2 acres), with fewer than 3 acres being outside of the 100-year and 500-year floodplain, in a Zone X. Floodplains and floodways act as reservoirs, absorbing and holding excess runoff during storms to lower flood peaks downstream. Floodways allow large volumes of water to move from upstream to downstream without obstruction. By providing a dedicated path, they reduce flood heights and manage water velocities that could otherwise damage infrastructure. Vegetated floodplains also act as a natural filter, removing sediments, nutrients (like nitrogen and phosphorus), and impurities from runoff before they reach larger water bodies and offer essential breeding and feeding grounds for fish and wildlife, including migratory corridors for species migration and habitats for rare or endangered species. Additionally, floodplains serve as greenways or parks, providing recreational opportunities like fishing, hiking, and boating, which can increase adjacent property values and enhance a community's tax base.

The proposed project is also within, adjacent and/or connected to areas of NWI mapped wetlands (approximately 1,124 acres), classified as Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland, Freshwater Emergent Wetland, Freshwater Pond, Lake, and Riverine habitats. Although there are many types of floodplains and wetlands, each with a unique set of characteristics, they all provide essential ecological, economic, and social benefits, including water purification, flood control, shoreline stabilization, erosion control, habitat for flora and fauna, and recreation. Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetlands are often dominated by trees or shrubs and are crucial for wildlife nesting and migratory birds. They act as natural water filters, slowing surface runoff, storing floodwater, and trapping sediment and nutrients, which improves water quality. Freshwater Emergent Wetland marshes are highly productive, supporting a complex food web and serving as vital habitats for fish, crabs, and birds. They are exceptionally efficient at nutrient removal and cycling, preventing excess nutrients from entering larger water bodies. Freshwater Ponds provide essential aquatic habitats, offering spawning areas for fish and resting areas for migratory waterfowl. They also contribute to groundwater recharge/discharge and sustain water levels during dry periods, maintaining local hydrology. Lakes function in sediment retention and water quality protection, storing and filtering water. They are crucial for biodiversity, providing habitat for fish and migratory birds, and offer significant recreational opportunities (fishing, boating, swimming). Riverine systems are critical for nutrient cycling and providing passage for migratory aquatic species, while also maintaining water flow and quality in watersheds.

In total, the project is anticipated to potentially impact approximately 1,122 acres of floodplain and 1,124 acres of wetlands. See Table 1 (below) for a breakdown of acreages by creek/project area.

**Table 1. Floodplain / Wetland Acreage by Project Area**

<b>Project Area</b>	<b>Wetland Acres</b>	<b>Floodplain Type</b>	<b>Floodplain Acres</b>
Caney Creek	347	0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (500-year)	0.04
		1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	1.89
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	345.2



East Fork of San Jacinto River	34	1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	0.06
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	34.37
Lake Creek	251	1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	1.69
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	248.92
Peach Creek	310	1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	82.73
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	225.89
Stewarts Creek	93	0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (500-year)	2.08
		1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	10.04
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	80.06
White Oak Creek	89	0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (500-year)	0.03
		1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (100-year)	0.84
		Regulatory Floodway (100-year)	87.66

The County has considered the following alternatives and mitigation measures to minimize adverse impacts and to restore and preserve natural and beneficial functions and intrinsic values of the existing floodplain/wetland:

1. Relocate Residential Units Outside of the Floodplain Via Buyout Program
2. Reduce Stormwater Runoff Volume Through Detention/Retention Basin Construction
3. No Action

### **Alternative 1 – Relocate Residential Units Outside of the Floodplain Via Buyout Program**

This alternative would require the County to offer an incentive to residents whose property is located within the flood-prone areas adjacent to the proposed creeks. Homeowners would be required to relocate and allow the purchased parcel to be demolished and converted to greenspace. The intent of the buyout would be to reduce future repetitive flood losses by removing structures from areas subject to flooding and restoring those parcels to a non-development use that provides floodplain benefits, such as reduced impervious surfaces and restoration of the parcels to their riparian state enabling natural ecological processes. The buyout program would require identifying eligible properties, offering market-based compensation to willing sellers, completing acquisition and demolition of structures, and implementing post-acquisition land-use changes to ensure the parcel remains free of future residential development. A voluntary buyout program could reduce repetitive loss exposure for participating homeowners and, where implemented at meaningful scale in targeted locations, contribute to long-term floodplain management objectives.

However, the buyout-only alternative presents several fundamental challenges in terms of cost, logistics, and effectiveness that render it impracticable for this program. A substantial portion of residential structures are located in the floodplain adjacent to the approximately 138 miles of combined creeks. Acquiring and demolishing such a large number of properties would result in substantially increased program costs and administrative burden. Available land and homes outside the floodplain would become increasingly limited in the surrounding areas, which would increase market prices for replacement housing and would reduce the likelihood that buyout proceeds would allow homeowners to remain in their communities. Additionally, this alternative would not address the source of the problem – as more debris accumulates within the creeks, the potential for future flood events would increase and many non-residential parcels, such as businesses and agricultural lands, and homeowners unwilling or unable to relocate would continue to be at risk. For these reasons—high numbers of affected parcels,



prohibitive acquisition and demolition costs, limited availability and high cost of replacement land or housing, continued exposure of non-residential uses, and the failure to comprehensively resolve the watershed flood hazards, this alternative has been rejected.

### **Alternative 2 – Reduce Stormwater Runoff Volume Through Detention/Retention Basin Construction**

This alternative would involve constructing a network of detention and/or retention basins within the watershed to capture and temporarily store stormwater runoff before it reaches the creek channels. By reducing peak flows and attenuating stormwater volumes delivered to the creeks, detention/retention basins can decrease the frequency and magnitude of bank-overflowing and downstream flooding, provide opportunities for sediment and debris settling, and improve water quality by allowing suspended materials to settle out prior to discharge. Where sized and sited appropriately, basins can also provide ancillary benefits such as creation of greenspace and modest ecological or recreational enhancements while reducing immediate hydraulic stress on vulnerable creek segments.

Although this approach offers localized hydraulic and water-quality benefits, it is not a practicable standalone alternative for this program for several reasons. Implementing detention/retention basins at the scale needed to meaningfully reduce flows to the approximately 138 miles of combined creeks would require acquisition or use of a substantial amount of land within the watershed, which would substantially increase project cost and complexity. Effective basin implementation would also necessitate redesigning existing drainage patterns and conveyance networks to divert runoff to the basins rather than directly to the creeks, creating major engineering, right-of-way, and permitting challenges. Finally, basins would not eliminate the underlying sources of channel obstruction: debris and vegetation accumulation within the creeks would continue to form blockages, and upriver flows and debris contributions from adjacent jurisdictions would continue to enter the creeks and could cause flooding despite basin storage. For these reasons—extensive land requirements and associated acquisition costs, the need to reconfigure drainage to deliver runoff to basins, and the persistent risk of flooding from continued debris accumulation and upstream inflows, this alternative has been rejected.

### **Alternative 3 – No Action**

Under this alternative, the County would not take any action, meaning neither the proposed project, nor any alternative project would be implemented. The County would not undertake the proposed creek debris removal, bank stabilization, or any related project activities and existing channel conditions would remain unchanged. The County's objectives to reduce repetitive flood losses, restore channel capacity, and improve community resilience would not be achieved.

As such, flood-prone structures and infrastructure would remain at risk from future storm events and continued debris accumulation in the creeks could increase the probability of future flood events resulting in property damage, displacement, injury, or loss of life. In addition, without active removal of obstructions and stabilization of eroded banks, sedimentation and channel degradation would likely continue, potentially increasing future repair needs and emergency response costs. Over time, continued inaction could result in sustained or worsening flood impacts on residents and critical services and would forego the localized floodplain benefits that could be achieved through the implementation of the proposed activities. As with alternatives 1 and 2, this alternative would not accomplish the objectives of the County, would not benefit the existing natural and beneficial function of the creeks, may ultimately incur additional costs, and has therefore, been rejected.

The County has reevaluated alternatives to conducting the proposed activities in the floodplain/wetland and has determined that it has no practicable alternative to implementing the proposed action in the floodplain/wetland. Environmental files documenting compliance with Executive Order 11988, Executive



---

Order 11990, and 24 CFR 55, are available for public inspection, review and copying upon request at the times and location delineated in the last paragraph of this notice for receipt of comments.

There are three primary purposes for this notice. First, people who may be affected by activities in the floodplain or wetland and those who have an interest in the protection of the natural environment should be given an opportunity to express their concerns and provide information about these areas. Second, an adequate public notice program can be an important public educational tool. The dissemination of information and request for public comment about the floodplain/wetland can facilitate and enhance Federal efforts to reduce the risks and impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of these special areas. Third, as a matter of fairness, when the Federal government determines it will participate in actions taking place in a floodplain and/or wetland, it must inform those who may be put at greater or continued risk.

Written comments must be received by the Montgomery County Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management at the following address on or before **June 19, 2026** [a minimum 7 calendar day comment period will begin the day after the publication and end on the 8th day after the publication]: Montgomery County Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, 9472 Airport Road, Conroe, TX 77303, Attention: Morgan Lumbley, Disaster Recovery Manager. A full description of the project may also be reviewed from 8:00am to 4:00pm at the same address as above and at [www.mctx.org/recover/](http://www.mctx.org/recover/). Comments may also be submitted via email at [morgan.lumbley@mctx.org](mailto:morgan.lumbley@mctx.org).

Publication Date: **June 12, 2026**