



Technical Conference Call | January 31, 2025

Q&A

Amended Plans

1. Please provide guidance regarding how to sign and seal the RFP Amendment. Please confirm this is a new document with a new seal (Scott Hubley, FNI, Region 1).

Answer: Amendments that include additional recommended FMEs, FMPs or FMSs must be signed and sealed by a registered Professional Engineer in the State of Texas.

Exhibit C and Exhibit D

Task 1

2. We are planning to utilize the TWDB bridge tool to populate bridge deck elevations. Can you please advise when it will be available (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Per the TWDB website this toolkit will not be available for another 6-8 months. Please see the TWDB Flood Research Project website¹ for more information.

3. We understand that the intent from the infrastructure toolkit is that RFPGs will not report the functionality of natural infrastructure. We assume that we will fill out Functionality as "Unknown" and Function Description as "N/A" (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Correct, we will not require RFPGs to report the functionality of natural infrastructure. However, if you already reported on condition and functionality of natural infrastructure in the first cycle, or otherwise have this information, please include that information.

¹ <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/science/research.asp#fy2020-2021::~:~:text=Approximate%20Bridge%20Modeling%20Automation>

4. Please clarify the meaning of “RFPGs should include any projects (FMP, FMS) recommended in previous cycles of regional flood planning (utilizing existing FMP/FMS IDs) that have been either proposed or are now ongoing.” (Exhibit C, page 20). Does that mean all FMPs from first cycle should be included in the proposed or ongoing flood mitigation projects geodatabase? Even if there has been no progress on some/most FMPs (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

UPDATED Answer: Only FMX that are “currently under construction, being implemented, or with dedicated funding to construct” should be included, as per Exhibit C. Previously recommended FMX included under Task 1 should not also be re-recommended in the 2028 regional flood plan.

All previously recommended FMX which do not fall into this Task 1 category may be re-recommended in the 2028 regional flood plans unless there is no longer need or if they are found to be infeasible, all of which should be documented. All FMX IDs should be the same as cycle 1 but updated utilizing the new ID field formatting recommendation outlined in Exhibit D.

Task 2A

5. Re Low Water Crossings - Is the expectation that we use 2-year depths from BLE mapping and compare roadway deck elevations to identify low water crossings (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: The TWDB did not compile or provide a statewide 2-year depth grid for the current (2nd) planning cycle. Therefore, it is not a requirement for RFPGs to determine low water crossings based on 2-year flood depths and bridge deck elevations for this cycle. However, RFPGs are encouraged to identify low water crossings beyond what was readily available during the first cycle of regional flood planning if better data or information becomes available during this cycle, wherever possible.

6. Will the building dataset have finished floor elevations? Are we expected to identify buildings at risk based on a vertical comparison of WSEL and FFE (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: It will not have the FFE data.

7. Are we also expected to identify roadway crossing inundation based on a comparison of LiDAR data and WSEL rasters (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: I do not believe this is a required field. That is the hopeful expectation, but it is not required.

8. The main text of 2.2.A.2. says to identify structures within the 10 percent flood risk areas. However, looking at the submittal requirements (item 3b), identifying structures within a 10-year boundary appears to be optional. Please confirm (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: 10% frequency is required as identified in the SOW. There was a typo in Exhibit C which will be addressed.

Task 2B

9. Future Conditions—The prior four methods have been removed. Fathom will be provided, or RFPGs can be used in future conditions from local sources if it is available. Guidance reads that there is a strong preference to use Fathom. Please discuss and elaborate. There has been some discussion about utilizing BLE models and future conditions rainfall grids (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Correct. We have removed the four methods because we plan to make cursory future condition flood hazard (Fathom) available. RFPGs may utilize BLE and future conditions rainfall grid, or any better dataset. Please document why a different approach was used.

10. Section 2.2.B.1 - Elaborating on the previous question, Fathom data is the preferred FutFldHazAr data source assuming no future flood hazard data is readily available. However, 2D BLE modeling is considered a higher priority, and these models can be re-run with modified inputs to produce future conditions data. Can documentation on future fathom assumptions such as rainfall changes, land use changes, subsidence, and sea level rise be provided? Having sufficient background on the assumptions used to inform the Fathom data can support the review of that data and communicating/documenting assumptions within the Regional Flood Plan (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Yes, we are planning to post the executive summary of the Future Conditions methodologies on the [Flood Planning DataHub website](#) in March. The data is still in its final review phase and will be made available once it is finalized.

11. Will you be providing land use and rainfall data (Ryan Londeen, Halff, Region 8)

Answer: It is USGS data, but we can provide you with the link and source.

12. SOW 1.a, 1.b, 1.c, and 1.d refer to assumptions that should be used for developing future flood hazard data. If assumptions and metrics for how fathom data accounts for changes in land use, rainfall, subsidence, and sea level rise are provided to technical consultants, would using this data satisfy the mentioned scope items,

even though 1.a specifically refers to the State Water Plan (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Yes, Fathom data will provide flood hazard information. However, fathom data does not address the exposure or future population located in future flood hazard areas. The RFPGs will still need to perform exposure analyses.

13. Re Section 2.2.B.2, is it reasonable to assume that LWC designation would not change substantially from existing to future conditions if existing 2-yr BLE will be used to define LWCs (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Can you not identify all roadway creek crossings that are inundated during a 2yr event utilizing future condition flood hazard data? If you make that assumption, please justify it.

14. Can you confirm the flood frequencies included in the Fathom data (Holly Ahumada, FNI, Region 7)?

Answer: The dataset will include 20%, 10%, 1%, 0.2% frequencies, however only the 10%, 1%, and 0.2% frequencies are required for existing and future conditions.

15. Are the processes the same (Cindy Engelhart, FNI, Region 10)?

Answer: We asked Fathom to provide for polygons and grids.

Task 3B

16. Can TWDB confirm that there is no prescriptive approach to perform the flood mitigation needs analysis (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Confirmed. This did not change from the first cycle of Regional Flood Planning.

Task 3C

17. For floodplain management goals, is it acceptable for some regions to re-affirm goals from the first cycle with minimal changes if they prefer (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Yes, it is. It is our hope that while RFPGs may choose to adopt new goals, they keep and track progress toward the goals adopted in previous planning cycles.

18. What are acceptable status descriptions for floodplain management goals from the first cycle going into the second cycle? If no significant data changes, is “in-progress” or “monitoring” acceptable descriptions (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: The intent is to track progress from the first cycle. We would like to see the percentage of the goal achieved and a brief description of the progress made.

Task 4A

19. FME Project Type - "Flood Mapping Updates" is listed as an FME type (Exhibit C - page 55). FEMA mapping projects were considered ineligible for FIF funding. Should Exhibit C specify that these FMEs should not be intended to create/update effective FEMA maps (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

a. For example, can a LOMR be added as an FMX? Smaller communities may not have the funding capabilities to go through a LOMR process to have floodplains remapped for their residents so that they can benefit from reduced floodplains due to a local project.

i. If yes, what would it be categorized as? FME or FMS? What would be eligible for funding? (Engineering to produce a LOMR, FEMA processing fee?)

Answer: Per the FIF Intended Use Plan², the FME Category does not include the actual preparation of a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). Preparation of a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) is not an eligible activity.

20. FMP Project Type - "Flood Management Strategies" is listed as a Non-Structural FMP project type (Exhibit C - page 56). We assume this is an inadvertent oversight (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: This is a typo; we will update and re-post Exhibit C to the Second Cycle webpage.

21. FMS Project Type - "Property Acquisition" is listed under the FMS and Non-Structural FMP project types. Could TWDB provide guidance on selecting the proper FMX category for this project type (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Depending on the stage of your project, it can either be categorized as FMP or FMS.

22. No Negative Impact (NNI) – If a Sponsor does not initially provide a NNI analysis (during Task 4A efforts), will TWDB allow an FMP to be included as a potential FMP on Table 13 without a NNI determination? The NNI analysis could be completed

² <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/financial/programs/fif/index.asp>

later as part of Task 5A to determine if the FMP can be recommended (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Yes.

23. Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) - It appears that Task 4A requires a BCR for any potential FMP (Table 13). If a Sponsor does not provide a BCR as part of their FMP submittal, can the RFPG temporarily leave this field blank and perform the BCA under Task 5A? Also, FNI recommends that RFPGs calculate BCRs after making a NNI determination. If an FMP does not meet NNI criteria, it is not worth calculating a BCR since the FMP cannot be recommended (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Yes, the BCA field is not required for Table 13/ the technical memorandum. If you have the BCA, please include it. The BCA and NNI determination are required for all recommended FMPs in the draft and final regional flood plan.

24. Please confirm that FMXs recommended in the 2023 RFP will need to be updated to new 2028 cycle schema. Do NNIs need to be updated? BCRs? (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1).

Answer: Yes, previously submitted FMXs will need to be resubmitted using required fields in the new geodatabase as outlined in Exhibit D Guidelines (including the new ID format). BCRs for previously recommended FMXs should be updated using the most-current year's dollar value. NNI determinations should only be updated as necessary.

Task 4B

25. Questions from Task 4A regarding NNI and BCR (7.d and 7.e) apply to Task 4B. Will this information be required for the Technical Memorandum submittal (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: The information required for recommending FMPs and FMSs in the regional flood plans may be incomplete for those identified in the Technical Memorandum. Additional information may be added, updated or completed during the later phases.

26. For the purposes of the Technical Memorandum, would TWDB consider including "Pending" as a valid entry to the "Negative Impact (Y/N)", "Negative Impact Mitigation (Y/N)" and "Benefit-Cost Ratio" fields on Tables 13 and 14? Or can those be left blank until the analysis is completed under Task 5A (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: For the technical memorandum, yes it can be pending or left blank. However, this information is required for all recommended FMP/FMS in the draft and final plans.

Task 5A

27. Tables 16-17-18 (Recommended FMXs) - Should these tables include the "RFPG Recommendation (Y/N)" field? The table title already indicates that these are the recommended FMXs. Or the idea is to bring all the FMXs from Tables 12-13-14 and populate the "RFPG Recommendation (Y/N)" field to indicate which ones are recommended? If this is the case, should the RFPG include a reason for not recommending them (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: All FMX-related Exhibit C tables (Tables 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18) should derive from the same FMX feature classes. While Tables 12, 13, and 14 should include all identified FMXs, only recommended FMXs should be included in Tables 16, 17, and 18. Because these are summary tables, we do not want to see identified but not recommended FMXs in Tables 16, 17, and 18 (all entries should have Recommended = Y). The geodatabase feature classes should include reasons for not recommending FMXs that were identified but determined to be infeasible.

28. For FMPs that have been funded/removed/or downgraded to FMEs - should FMP_HazPost be updated to remove info associated with those FMPs that are no longer recommended (Scott Hubley, FNI Region 1)?

Answer: Yes, the post-project flood hazard feature class (HazPost_FMP) is intended to only show updated hazard conditions reduced by FMPs. If the FMP has been funded, removed, withdrawn, etc., the FMP should not be included in this feature class.

29. One area which is still ambiguous is the HUC analysis from the flood quilt which is great for master drainage studies but for smaller FMEs where the flood risk is limited. But the guidance recommends that we do a flood risk assessment, and this seems to create ambiguity. How to delineate different flood risk instead of the whole water shed (Ryan Londeen, Halff, Region 8).

Answer: If you could give us a specific example, that would be helpful. We have received several FMEs for low water crossing. We ask you to consider the whole watershed when dealing with low water crossing. The watershed may not stop at the jurisdictional boundaries.

Datasets and Available Resources

1. Are there significant changes for the flood quilt (Ryan Londeen, Halff, Region 8)?

Answer: Any progress from the FEMA layers and updated BLE. Cursory floodplain dataset has been updated. There is likely minimal need for digitized paper maps during this cycle.

2. Is the existing BLE data for the Flood Quilt available along with the future (Jay Scanlon, FNI, Region 11)?

Answer: The existing BLE data is available. The future condition cursory floodplain dataset (Fathom) is under review. We found some discrepancies and hope to make this available in Spring 2025. Please see our February newsletter for more information on how to request BLE data not yet available online.

3. Section 1.7, there is a list of available resources that are new, he is curious about those resources specifically the infrastructure assessment toolkit (Bryan Martin, HDR, Region 13).

Answer:

Resource	Status	Location (when available)
Infrastructure Assessment Methodologies	Available now at https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/planningdocu/2028/index.asp .	https://twdb-flood-planning-resources-twdb.hub.arcgis.com/pages/flood-infrastructure
Texas Flood Social Vulnerability Index (TX F-SVI)	Available now within the 'Buildings Nov 2021' feature class.	https://twdb-flood-planning-resources-twdb.hub.arcgis.com/pages/property
Nature-based Solutions for Flood Mitigation in Texas	Public Comment: Spring 2025 ETA: Fall 2025	https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/research/Nature-based-Solutions-2022/index.asp
Effective Flood Awareness Communication	Available now	https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/research/Flood-Awareness-2022/index.asp
Model for Calculating Agricultural Flood Loss	ETA Summer 2025	https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/research/Agricultural-Flood-Loss-2022/index.asp

Developing Future Rainfall Frequency Grids	ETA Spring 2025	https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/research/Rainfall-Frequency-Grids-2022/index.asp
---	-----------------	---

4. When should we expect the Texas Flood SVI data (Audrey Giesler Klump, Halff, Region 3)?

Answer: Texas Flood SVI will be a part of the building layer. It will be presented to the Board in a work session in March and expected to be posted on our website shortly there-after pending approval from the word during work-session.

5. Is there going to be a follow-up call in 30-60 days (David Garza, Chair, Region 15 and Scott Hubley, FNI, Region 1)?

Answer: Yes, we can schedule quarterly, or as needed, conference calls if they are helpful. We are also looking into scheduling the future Chairs conference call.