Q&A on the Infrastructure Toolkit

Below are some questions recently received by the TWDB.

1. If communities are expected to populate the toolkit, what is the expectation for the RFPG? Is the RFPG expected to populate the toolkit on behalf of communities and provide it to them for review, or is the RFPG expected to provide blank forms for the communities to populate and send back to the RFPG?

   a. The expectation from the RFPGs is to populate/ utilize the toolkit to report the condition and functionality of the major flood infrastructure. The intent of the toolkit was to assist both the RFPGs and the communities in identification and assessment.

   b. The toolkit is "a spreadsheet-based resource designed for communities without a GIS-based inventory." It was created to help communities who do not have a GIS inventory to create an organized inventory. Communities may fill the spreadsheet, and/or technical consultants can work with communities as applicable to gather information for the regional flood plans.

2. Is the RFPG expected to use completed toolkits to populate TWDB-Required Table 2?

   a. The RFPGs are expected to utilize the toolkit to populate the required feature classes to generate the Exhibit C Summary Table 2.

   b. If a GIS inventory is not available, then this tool should help with collecting information on previously unknown existing flood infrastructure. Location information should be included when populating the existing infrastructure feature classes and by extension Exhibit C Summary Table 2.

3. "Unknown" responses do not get captured in the summary table. What happens to those entries? Please note that this could cause a discrepancy in the number of features between TWDB-Required Table 2 and the "FldInfra" feature classes in the required geodatabase. Is that an acceptable outcome?

   a. The toolkit was updated as follows: the Aggregated From Detailed Entry Table was modified to capture "unknown" asset types captured in the Detailed Asset Inventory Table.

   b. The Exhibit C Summary Table 2 should be generated from the FldInfra feature classes. Unknown responses may be combined in the summary table so that counts do not deviate from the feature classes.

4. The Aggregated Inventory does not connect directly back to GIS - meaning there is no place to provide an ID or location of aggregated inventory. Is TWDB aware

of this? If so, how should aggregated items be represented in the required geodatabase?

    a. Aggregated items should be documented in a separate table along with the community's Entity ID. This allows for a join to be established between the aggregated data and the community's jurisdictional boundary.

5. Is the RFPG expected to submit one Infrastructure Toolkit for each community or is the summarization of this information into TWDB-Required Table 2 adequate?

    a. TWDB does not want or expect the RFPGs to submit Infrastructure Toolkits as part of their regional flood plans. The infrastructure toolkit is provided to help with the RFGP effort of collecting information on existing flood infrastructure and natural features. Information provided by communities should be reflected in the required GDB features classes and the Exhibit C Summary Table 2 (generated from the GDB).

6. Local communities are unlikely to have latitudes and longitudes of their relevant infrastructure. Is the RFPG expected to identify and submit that level of information on behalf of the community, if the community does not provide the specific location? Similarly, is it acceptable to the TWDB to include all infrastructure from the toolkit as ExFldInfraPts, per the detailed inventory tab providing only one coordinate point?

    a. Yes, RFPGs are expected to identify and submit location information on behalf of the community. Lat/Long may be estimated using Google Maps or similar programs. RFPGs can utilize the lat/long to generate points and, thus, include all reported 'major' flood infrastructure in the ExFldInfra features classes.

    b. Each of the ExFldInfra features classes have valid infrastructure types outlined in Exhibit D. For example, dams should be represented as points in the ExFldInfraPt feature class. Levees should be represented as lines in the ExFldInfraLn feature class. If RFPGs run into situations where they receive, for example, levee information as only points, they should attempt to identify the levee and input as lines. If this is not doable, please reach out to us.