

Amended 2023 Regional Flood Plan Ranking

April 16, 2026

The Information in the ranking workbooks is representative of the data provided by Regions 1 and 3-15 in their second amended 2023 regional flood plans that were due to the TWDB on April 1, 2025. The second 2023 regional flood plan amendments were approved by the Board on March 31, 2026. The information in these second amendments is reflected in the Flood Management Evaluation (FME) and the Flood Mitigation Project (FMP) rankings. The Region 15 Lower Rio Grande RFPG convened on March 18, 2026, to adopt a third amendment to their 2023 Regional Flood Plan. The information in this administrative amendment is reflected in the Flood Management Strategy (FMS) rankings only.

Together, the 2023 Regional Flood Plan amendments resulted in 592 additional recommended flood risk reduction solutions which will be reflected in an amendment to the 2024 State Flood Plan. These flood risk reduction solutions represent \$7.4 billion in newly recommended projects, evaluations, and strategies to reduce flood risk to people and property.

The data in the ranking workbooks is considered the working FIUP version and has been released for usage in the SFY 2026-2027 FIF IUP cycle. Aside from the underlying data submitted by the regional flood planning groups regarding flood risk reduction solutions, no other substantive changes have been made to the ranking methodology. Refer to page 2 of this document for ranking criteria and their associated weights, which have not changed from the 2024 State Flood Plan.

Figure 1. Criteria and associated weights used to rank recommended flood management evaluations (FME), flood mitigation projects (FMP), and flood management strategies (FMS)*

	Criterion	Criterion type	Criteria grouping	FME ranking criterion?	FME ranking weight	FME grouping weight	FMP ranking criterion?	FMP ranking weight	FMP grouping weight	FMS ranking criterion?	FMS ranking weight	FMS grouping weight	Max score	
Reported data from FME, FMP, and FMS GIS feature classes	1	Estimated structures at 1 percent (100-year) flood risk**	Flood risk	Life, safety, and property	Yes	15.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	10.0%	40.0%	10	
	2	Estimated population at 1 percent (100-year) flood risk**	Flood risk	Life, safety, and property	Yes	15.0%	No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%		10	
	3	Critical facilities at 1 percent (100-year) flood risk**	Flood risk	Life, safety, and property	Yes	25.0%	No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%		10	
	4	Low water crossings at flood risk**	Flood risk	Life, safety, and property	Yes	20.0%	No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%		10	
	5	Estimated road closures**	Flood risk	Mobility	Yes	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	5.0%	15.0%	10	
	6	Estimated road miles at 1 percent (100-year) flood risk**	Flood risk	Mobility	Yes	10.0%	No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%		10	
	7	Estimated farm & ranch land at 1 percent (100-year) flood risk (acres)**	Flood risk	Agriculture	Yes	10.0%	10.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	5.0%	5.0%	10
	8	Structures removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Agriculture	Yes			Yes	5.0%		Yes	10.0%		10
	9	Percent structures removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain (Calculated by TWDB from reported data)	Flood risk reduction	Life, safety, and property				Yes	10.0%	45.0%	No	0.0%	25.0%	10
	10	Residential structures removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Life, safety, and property				Yes	2.5%		Yes	5.0%		10
	11	Estimated population removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Life, safety, and property				Yes	10.0%		Yes	10.0%		10
	12	Critical facilities removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Life, safety, and property				Yes	10.0%		No	0.0%		10
	13	Low water crossings removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Mobility				Yes	7.5%	No	0.0%	10		
	14	Estimated roadway miles removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain**	Flood risk reduction	Mobility				Yes	5.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	10
	15	Estimated farm & ranch land removed from 1 percent (100-year) floodplain (acres)**	Flood risk reduction	Agriculture				Yes	5.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	10
	16	Percent nature-based solution (by cost)	Other					Yes	5.0%		Yes	7.5%		10
	17	Benefit-cost ratio	Other					Yes	2.5%					10
	18	Water supply benefit (Y/N)	Other					Yes	5.0%		Yes	5.0%		10
	19	FMP project type (10 points) Low water crossing (4 points) Preparedness	Other					Yes	2.5%		No	0.0%		
	20	FMS project type (10 points) Flood measurement and warning (8 points) Regulatory and guidance (6 points) Education and outreach (4 points) Property acquisition and structural elevation (4 points) Infrastructure projects (2 points) Other	Other					No	0.0%		Yes	2.5%		10
	Subtotal					100.0%			70.0%			100.0%		
FMP project details scoring (computed by the regional flood planning groups)**	21	Score 1: Severity - Pre-project average depth of flooding (100-year)	Flood risk				Yes	5.0%					10	
	22	Score 2: Severity - Community need (percent population)	Flood risk				Yes	5.0%					10	
	23	Score 6: Life and safety	Flood risk reduction				Yes	5.0%					10	
	24	Score 8: Social vulnerability	Other				Yes	5.0%					10	
	25	Score 10: Multiple benefits	Other benefits				Yes	2.5%					10	
	26	Score 13: Environmental benefit	Other benefits				Yes	2.5%					10	
	27	Score 15: Mobility	Other benefits				Yes	5.0%					10	
		Subtotal					0.0%			30.0%			0.0%	
	Total (must add to 100 percent)					100.0%			100.0%			100.0%		

Note: All flood risk and risk reduction information are for 1 percent (100-year) annual chance storm. Grey cells indicate the criterion is not applicable for that flood risk reduction solution type.

* Only recommended flood management strategies with non-recurring, non-capital costs were ranked in the 2024 State Flood Plan

** Indicates that select reported data were normalized on the curve (ArcSinh), scoring 0-10

*** Project details criteria are described below. Refer to "project details scoring" for a description of all data included in project details available here: www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/planningdocu/2023/doc/04_Exhibit_C_TechnicalGuidelines_April2021.pdf

Score 1: Severity - Pre-project average depth of flooding (100-year): Ranking of severity based on the baseline/pre-project average 100-year flood depth.

Score 2: Severity - Community need (percent population): Ranking of severity based on a community's need by percentage of project community affected by population.

Score 6: Life and safety: Ranking of reduced flood risk by percentage of structures removed from the 100-year floodplain in post-project condition.

Score 8: Social vulnerability: Ranking based on the Center for Disease Control SVI data for Texas, by calculating an average project SVI by census tract and classifying the vulnerability level.

Score 10: Multiple benefits: Ranking a project based on the reporting of significant, measurable, expected benefits to: recreation, transportation, social and quality of life, local economic impacts, meeting sustainability goals, and/or project resilience goals.

Score 13: Environmental benefit: Ranking of expected level of environmental benefits to be delivered by project to water quality, cultural heritage, habitat, air quality, natural resources, agricultural resources, and soils/erosion and sedimentation.

Score 15: Mobility: Ranking project improvement and protection of mobility during flood events, with particular emphasis on emergency service access and major access routes.