VOLUME 2 Appendix 5-C

# REGION 5 NECHES 2023 REGIONAL FLOOD PLAN JULY 2023

PREPARED FOR THE REGION 5 NECHES FLOOD PLANNING GROUP **APPENDIX 5-C** 

FLOOD MANAGEMENT EVALUATIONS (FME), FLOOD MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES (FMS), AND FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECT ONE-PAGERS

Title Anderson County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000001 Sponsor Anderson (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Anderson
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 495
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ider Goal 2: In areas ider	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 61		#	# of structures	69	#	t of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	C	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	348			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	22
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical	road closures	2

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$2,236,919	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title
Angelina County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID#
051000002

Sponsor
Angelina (County)

Recommended by RFPG?
Reason for Recommendation

Study Details

Study type
Watershed Planning

County Angeli



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study type	Watershed Planning County Angelina
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 861
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Icrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,718		# of structure	s 1,201	#	of critical facilities 11	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal	? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	165		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	66	
# of low water crossings	19		# of historical	road closures	19	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Tatal		Potential fodoral	Potential Federal
lotal	¢2,000,000	Voc	FOLEIILIAI FEUEIAI
Cost	\$3,900,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0000		<b>o</b> ,	6





Title Chambers County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 
 ID#
 051000003
 Sponsor
 Chambers (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning			County Chamb	ers	
Study description	Complete a detailed st	tudy within the county exte	ent to delineate an u	odated flood hazard area	ι, which can be used for regula	tory purposes.
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	434
Goal(s) Goal 1: areas id Goal 2: areas id	ncrease the coverage of entified as having currer ncrease the coverage of entified as having currer	flood hazard data across th It gaps in flood mapping. flood hazard data across th It gaps in flood mapping.	he region by complet	ing detailed studies that	utilize consistent methodolog utilize consistent methodolog	;y in 75% of ;y in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? YesCoastal? YesLocal Flooding? NoOther? YesFarm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)36,933Roadways impacted (miles)162# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Population at risk 1,128		# of structures	5 1,175	#	of critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)36,933Roadways impacted (miles)162# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	36,933		Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	162
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost	\$652,546	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Cherokee County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000004 Sponsor Cherokee (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning			County Cheroke	e	
Study description	Complete a detailed stu	udy within the county exte	nt to delineate an up	idated flood hazard area,	, which can be used for regula	tory purposes.
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	ls in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	1,058
Goal(s) Goal 1: I areas ide Goal 2: I areas ide	ncrease the coverage of intified as having current ncrease the coverage of intified as having current	lood hazard data across th gaps in flood mapping. flood hazard data across th gaps in flood mapping.	ne region by complet ne region by complet	ing detailed studies that	utilize consistent methodolog utilize consistent methodolog	y in 75% of y in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   920 920 Roadways impacted (miles) 49   # of low water crossings 10 # of historical road closures 10	Population at risk 987		# of structures	672	#	of critical facilities 1
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)920Roadways impacted (miles)49# of low water crossings10# of historical road closures10	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No
# of low water crossings 10 # of historical road closures 10	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	920		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	49
	# of low water crossings	10		# of historical	road closures	10

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total .	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$4,800,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Galveston County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000005 Sponsor Galveston (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details			
Study type	Watershed Planning	County Galvesto	n
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county of	extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area,	which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Ye	Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 57
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ir areas ide Goal 2: Ir areas ide	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data acros entified as having current gaps in flood mapping ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data acros entified as having current gaps in flood mapping	ss the region by completing detailed studies that i ss the region by completing detailed studies that i	utilize consistent methodology in 75% of utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 330 Roadways impacted (miles) 143   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 1,820		# of structures	4,937	#	of critical facilities 8
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)330Roadways impacted (miles)143# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	330		Roadways imp	oacted (miles)	143
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$68,502	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Hardin County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000006 Sponsor Hardin (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning			County Hardin	
Study description	Complete a detailed st	tudy within the county exten	t to delineate an upo	lated flood hazard area,	, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models	s in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 888
Goal(s) Goal 1: I areas ide Goal 2: I areas ide	ncrease the coverage of intified as having currer ncrease the coverage of intified as having currer	flood hazard data across the it gaps in flood mapping. flood hazard data across the it gaps in flood mapping.	e region by completir e region by completir	ng detailed studies that ng detailed studies that	utilize consistent methodology in 75% of utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood rick types Diverine? Ver		
Flood fisk type: Riverine? Yes Coast	stal? No Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 743	Roadways impacted (mi	iles) 136
# of low water crossings 13	# of historical road closu	ures 13

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	4	Potential federal	Potential Federal	al _
Cost	\$1,800,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	5





Title Henderson County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 ID#
 051000007
 Sponsor
 Henderson (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning			County Henders	on
Study description	Complete a detailed st	udy within the county exten	nt to delineate an up	dated flood hazard area,	which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	ls in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 374
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ir areas ide Goal 2: Ir areas ide	ncrease the coverage of ntified as having current increase the coverage of ntified as having current	flood hazard data across the : gaps in flood mapping. flood hazard data across the : gaps in flood mapping.	e region by complet e region by complet	ing detailed studies that i	utilize consistent methodology in 75% of utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 162		# of structures	5 240	#	t of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	348		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	20
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical	road closures	1

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$1,681,614	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Title Houston County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000008 Sponsor Houston (County)
Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Houston
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       418
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ider Goal 2: In areas ider	crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 16		# of structures	5 17	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	117		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	20	
# of low water crossings	7		# of historical	road closures	7	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,697,174	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

NECHES Title Jasper County Update Flood Hazard Mapping ID# 051000009 Sponsor Jasper (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP** Recommendation **Study Details** Study type County Jasper Watershed Planning Study description Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.

FME to create new H&H model? Yes

Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes

**REGION 5** 

Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 615

Goal(s) Goal 1: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Goal 2: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 104 Roadways impacted (miles) 46   # of low water crossings 3 # of historical road closures 3	Population at risk 1,388		# of structures 756			of critical facilities 7	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)104Roadways impacted (miles)46# of low water crossings3# of historical road closures3	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings3# of historical road closures3	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	104		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	46	
	# of low water crossings	3		# of historical	road closures	3	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	¢4 040 704	Potential federal	100	Potential Federal
Cost	\$1,210,721	funding availability?	res	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Jefferson County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 
 ID#
 051000010
 Sponsor
 Jefferson (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning		Со	ounty Jefferson	
Study description	Complete a detailed stu	udy within the county exter	nt to delineate an updated flood	d hazard area, which can	oe used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create nev	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near te	erm? Yes Drainage a	rea (sq. mi., est.) 954
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	ncrease the coverage of the coverage of the the coverage of the coverage of the coverage of the	flood hazard data across th : gaps in flood mapping. flood hazard data across th : gaps in flood mapping.	e region by completing detailec e region by completing detailec	I studies that utilize consi	stent methodology in 75% of stent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       Yes       Local Flooding?       No       Other?       Yes         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       33,019       Roadways impacted (miles)       474	Population at risk 26,027		# of structures 12,869			of critical facilities 316	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       33,019       Roadways impacted (miles)       474	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	33,019		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	474	
# of low water crossings22# of historical road closures22	# of low water crossings	22		# of historical	road closures	22	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,900,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Liberty County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 ID#
 051000011
 Sponsor
 Liberty (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Liberty
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 235
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ir areas ide Goal 2: Ir areas ide	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 140		# of structures 116 #		of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,526		Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	7
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total Cost \$402,626 Potential federal funding availability? Yes	Potential Federal _ Funding Sources
--	--





Title Nacogdoches County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 ID#
 051000012
 Sponsor
 Nacogdoches (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Nacogdoches
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 977
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ir areas ide Goal 2: Ir areas ide	Icrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Icrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes   Coastal? No   Local Flooding? Yes   Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   240 Roadways impacted (miles)   38   # of how water crossings 20   # of historical road closures 20	Population at risk 4,007	#	of structures 585	# of critical facilities 1	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)240Roadways impacted (miles)38# of low water crossings20# of historical road closures20	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No Local Flooding?	Yes Other? No	
# of low water crossings 20 # of historical road closures 20	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	240	Roadways im	pacted (miles) 38	
	# of low water crossings	20	# of historical	road closures 20	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$4,400,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Orange County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000013 Sponsor Orange (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Orange
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 156
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ir areas ide Goal 2: Ir areas ide	Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

0,707	# of structure	s 5,007 #	of critical facilities 36
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 346		Roadways impacted (miles)	136
# of low water crossings 20		# of historical road closures	20

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal _
Cost \$760,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
CUSI		





Title Polk County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000014 Sponsor Polk (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Polk
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 535
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ider Goal 2: In areas ider	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of entified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of entified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 321		# of structures 84			#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	62			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	17	
# of low water crossings	8			# of historical road closures		8	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	_
Cost \$375,054	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Rusk County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000015 Sponsor Rusk (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Rusk
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       525
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ider Goal 2: In areas ider	crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No	Population at risk 149		# of structures 91		#	of critical facilities 1	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     206     Roadways impacted (miles)     21       # of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	206		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	21	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,318,550	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Sabine County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000016 Sponsor Sabine (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Sabine
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 95
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of Intified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 16		# of structures 11		#	of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings	1			# of historical	road closures	1	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

-
---





Title San Augustine County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

 ID#
 051000017
 Sponsor
 San Augustine (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Watershed Planning	County San Aug	ustine					
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purp							
FME to create nev	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 533					
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across th entified as having current gaps in flood mapping. ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across th entified as having current gaps in flood mapping.	e region by completing detailed studies that e region by completing detailed studies that	utilize consistent methodology in 75% of utilize consistent methodology in 100% of					

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 110		-	# of structures	64	#	t of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	42			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	13	
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical	road closures	2	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$904,125 Cost	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Shelby County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000018 Sponsor Shelby (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Shelby
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	V H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       160
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ider Goal 2: In areas ider	crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Icrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7			# of structures	15	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	56			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	5	
# of low water crossings	4			# of historical	road closures	4	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$711,827	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Smith County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000019 Sponsor Smith (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Smith
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 510
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	ncrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of entified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of entified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,216		#	of structures	2,347	#	of critical facilities 72	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Co	oastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	216			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	50	
# of low water crossings	42			# of historical	road closures	42	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Cost \$1,225,342 funding availability? Yes Funding Sources	Total Cost \$1,225,342	Potential federal funding availability?	Potential Federal _ Funding Sources
--	---------------------------	---	--





Title
Trinity County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID#
051000020

Sponsor
Trinity (County)

Recommended by
RFPG?

Yes
Reason for Recommendation

Complies with RFPG Goals
REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Study Details

Study type
Watershed Planning

Study description
Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.

FME to create new H&H model? Yes

Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes

**REGION 5** 

Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 342

Goal (s) Goal 1: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.
 Goal 2: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

Goal 2: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 15		# of structures	32	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coast	tal? No	Local Flooding? Yes	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	68		Roadways impacted (miles)	22
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical road closures	1

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	
Cost \$1,540,238	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Tyler County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000021 Sponsor Tyler (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning			County Tyler	
Study description	Complete a detailed stur	dy within the county exter	nt to delineate an u	odated flood hazard area	, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 932
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	crease the coverage of fl ntified as having current a crease the coverage of fl ntified as having current a	ood hazard data across the gaps in flood mapping. ood hazard data across the gaps in flood mapping.	e region by complet	ing detailed studies that ing detailed studies that	utilize consistent methodology in 75% of utilize consistent methodology in 100% of

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 82 Roadways impacted (miles) 42   # of low water crossings 8 # of historical road closures 8	Population at risk 278		# of structures	545	#	of critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)82Roadways impacted (miles)42# of low water crossings8# of historical road closures8	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings8# of historical road closures8	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	82		Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	42
	# of low water crossings	8		# of historical	road closures	8

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,800,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





reg

Title Van Zandt County Update Flood Hazard Mapping

ID# 051000022 Sponsor Van Zandt (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Van Zandt
Study description	Complete a detailed study within the county extent to delineate an updated flood hazard area, which can be used for regulatory purposes.
FME to create new	Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       244
Goal(s) Goal 1: In areas ide Goal 2: In areas ide	crease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping. Icrease the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of ntified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes   Coastal? No   Kocal Flooding? Yes   Other? Yes     Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 232   and low water crossings 0     # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 202	# of structure	s 217 #	of critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)232Roadways impacted (miles)13# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local Flooding? Yes	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	232	Roadways impacted (miles)	13
	# of low water crossings	)	# of historical road closures	0

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	64 444 227	Potential federal	oc.	Potential Federal
Cost	\$1,111,237	funding availability?	es	Funding Sources

22 of 157





Title Anderson County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000023	Spo	nsor	Anderson (County)	
Recc	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type Watershed Planning County Anderson						
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       495					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 5: R	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of sign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.					

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       Yes       Other?       No         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       348       Roadways impacted (miles)       22	Population at risk 61
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 348 Roadways impacted (miles) 22	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 348
# of low water crossings     2     # of historical road closures     2	# of low water crossings 2

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$737 953	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Angelina County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000024	Spo	nsor	Angelina (County)	
Recc	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Watershed Planning County Angelina							
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.							
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 861							
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi	<ul> <li>Goal (s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> </ul>							
Goal 3: R new floor	Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.							
new floor	hew flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.							
Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.							

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,718		# of structures 1,201			of critical facilities 11	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coasta	al? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	165		Roadways imp	oacted (miles)	66	
# of low water crossings	19		# of historical	road closures	19	

24 of 157

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,700,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Chambers County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000025	Spoi	nsor	Chambers (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Watershed Planning County Chambers								
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.									
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       434								
Goal(s) Goal 1: An of their d Goal 2: An their desi Goal 3: RI new flood	a average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. a average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of gn. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.								
Goal 4: RI new flood	Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.								
Goal 5: Re	Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.								

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,128		# of structures	5 1,175	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	36,933		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	162	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$1,600,000	Voc	
Cost \$1,000,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
COST		





FME Area

Title Cherokee County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000026	Spo	nsor	Cherokee (County)	
Recc	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Cherokee					
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OP conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1,058					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: B	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.					

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 987		# of structures	672	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	920		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	49	
# of low water crossings	10		# of historical	road closures	10	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$1 600 000	Yes	
Cost Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Hardin County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000027	Sponsor	Hardin (County)			
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Hardin					
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC fo conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 888					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.					

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7,212		;	# of structures	3,678	#	of critical facilities 25	i
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	743			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	136	
# of low water crossings	13			# of historical	road closures	13	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,000,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





27 of 157

Title Henderson County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000028	Spo	nsor	Henderson (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	Details					
Study ty	pe	Watershed Planning		County Henderson		
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluat						educe flood risk, develop OPCC for y of nature based solutions.
FME to c	reate new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Y	es Anticipated mod	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 374
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the b of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the bat their design.</li> </ul>						
	Goal 3: Rl new flood	FPG must consider in a d risk reduction projec	all projects and should in the second structure to the second second structure to the second structure to the second second structure to the second sec	ncorporate nature-based	practices and floodplai	n preservation in an average of 10% of their
	Goal 4: Rl new flood	FPG must consider in a d risk reduction projec	all projects and should in ts between 2033 - 2053	ncorporate nature-based	practices and floodplai	n preservation in an average of 25% of their
	Goal 5: Re	educe the number of c	critical facilities in the 10	00-year flood risk inunda	tion extents by 15%.	
	Goal 6: Re	educe the number of c	critical facilities in the 10	00-vear flood risk inunda	tion extents by 25%.	

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 162		# of structures	5 240	ŧ	t of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	348		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	20
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical	road closures	1

28 of 157

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,900,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Houston County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000029	Spo	nsor	Houston (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Houston				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solution					
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       418				
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	an average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Leduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Leduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.				

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 16		# of structures	17	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coast	tal? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	117		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	20	
# of low water crossings	7		# of historical	road closures	7	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$610,983	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Jasper County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000030	Spoi	nsor	Jasper (County)	
				Reason for	Complies with RFPG Goals
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Recommendation	



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Detai	tails					
Study type	Watershed Planning	County Jasper				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create	ate new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in n	near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 615				
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the their design.</li> <li>Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% or new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood plain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood</li></ul>						
new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.						

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,388		# of structure	s 756	#	of critical facilities 7	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal	? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	104		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	46	
# of low water crossings	3		# of historical	road closures	3	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al 61 200 000	Voc	
Cost \$1,200,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

30 of 157

Title Jefferson County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000031	Spo	nsor	Jefferson (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Jefferson					
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 954					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as t design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as th sign. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% od risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% od risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.	the basis ne basis of 5 of their 5 of their				
Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.						

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 26,027		# of structure	s 12,869	#	of critical facilities 31	6
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	33,019		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	474	
# of low water crossings	22		# of historical	road closures	22	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	
IOldi	¢1 100 000	Voc		
Cost	\$1,100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	
		<b>o</b> ,	0	





FME Area

Title Liberty County Master Drainage Plan

 
 ID#
 051000032
 Sponsor
 Liberty County Drainage District

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details		
Study type	Watershed Planning County Liberty	
Study description	Complete a county wide drainage plan, which can be used for regulatory purposes.	
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 235	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the lesign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.	basis basis of their their

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 140		# of structures	5 116	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,526		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	7	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$201 313	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources
		-





Title Nacogdoches County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000033	Sponsor	Nacogdoches (Count	y)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning	County Nacogo	County Nacogdoches		
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OP conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Y	es Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 977		
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastru esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastru ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should in d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033 FPG must consider in all projects and should in d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053 educe the number of critical facilities in the 10	icture projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize l icture projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize la ncorporate nature-based practices and floodplair ncorporate nature-based practices and floodplair 20-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.	arger storm events (>100-year) as the basis rger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of a preservation in an average of 10% of their a preservation in an average of 25% of their		

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 4,007		-	# of structures	585	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	240			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	38	
# of low water crossings	20			# of historical	road closures	20	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$1,000,000	Voc	
Cost \$1,900,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





33 of 157

Title Orange County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000034	Spon	sor	Orange (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	′es	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details			
Study type     Watershed Planning     County	County Orange		
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.	or		
FME to create new H&H model?YesEmergency Need?YesAnticipated models in near term?YesDrainage area (sq. mi., est.)	.56		
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) is their design.</li> </ul>	as the basis s the basis of		
Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.	.0% of their		
Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.	5% of their		
Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.			

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 8,737			f of structures	5,007 # of		of critical facilities 36	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	C	oastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? N	lo	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	346			Roadways impa	icted (miles)	136	
# of low water crossings	20			# of historical ro	oad closures	20	

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
10tal 6450.000	Voc	
Cost \$450,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
COSC		





34 of 157
Title Polk County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000035	Sponsor	Polk (County)	
				Complianuith

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Polk					
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       535					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis sign. average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis o in. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.	f				

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 321		# of structure	5 84	#	of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	62		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	17
# of low water crossings	8		# of historical	road closures	8

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	FIF Grant; Local Funds
Cost \$150,021	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Rusk County Master Drainage Plan

ID# 051000036 Sponsor Rusk (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study type       Watershed Planning       County Rusk         Study description       Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.         FME to create new H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 525         Goal(s)       Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.       Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.         Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.
Study description       Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.         FME to create new H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       525         Goal(s)       Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.       Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.         Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.
FME to create new H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       525         Goal(s)       Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.       Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.         Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.       Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> </ul>
Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 149		# of structures	91	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coa	oastal? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	206		Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	21	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	
iotai	¢1 400 000	Vec	i otentiar i caerar	-
Cost	\$1,400,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Sabine County Master Drainage Plan

ID# 051000037 Sponsor		Sabine (County)			
				Reason for	Complies with RFPG Goals
Recommended by RFPG? Ye		Yes	Recommendation		
				Recommentation	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Sabine					
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC f conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. m						
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	an average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Ieeduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.					

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 16		-	# of structures	11	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings	1			# of historical	road closures	1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$76,348 Cost	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title San Augustine County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000038	Spons	or	San Augustine (Coun	ty)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Ye	es	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County San Augustine
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 533
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: B	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk injundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No	Population at risk 110		# of structures	64	# of critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)42Roadways impacted (miles)13# of low water crossings2# of historical road closures2	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? Yes	Other? No
# of low water crossings 2 # of historical road closures 2	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	42		Roadways impacted (miles)	13
	# of low water crossings	2		# of historical road closures	2

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
(270 722	Yes	
Cost \$379,732	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Shelby County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000039	Sponsor	Shelby (County)	
			Decess for	Complies with RFPG Goals
Recommended by REPG? Voc			Reason for	
Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Recommendation		



**REGION 5** 

# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Shelby					
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create nev	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       160					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis or gn. IPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their I risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their I risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their I risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. I risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. I reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.					

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7			# of structures	15	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	56			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	5	
# of low water crossings	4			# of historical	road closures	4	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$1,250,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





Title Smith County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000040	Sponsor	Smith (County)	
_		B5000 ···	Reason for	Complies with RFPG Goals

Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Smith					
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 510					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new flood Goal 4: R new flood Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.					

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,216		4	# of structures	2,347	#	of critical facilities 72	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	(	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	216			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	50	
# of low water crossings	42			# of historical	road closures	42	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
6529 612	Ves	
Cost \$556,012	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0050		0.000





FME Area

Title Trinity County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000041	Spo	nsor	Trinity (County)	
				Descen for	Complies with RFPG Goals
Recommended by RFPG? Y			Voc	Reason for	
			ies	Recommendation	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Trinity
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create new	W H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       342
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new flood Goal 4: R new flood Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 15		# of structures	32	#	of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coasta	al? No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	68		Roadways imp	bacted (miles)	22
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical	road closures	1

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	M	Potential Federal	-
Cost S	5481,324	funding availability?	Yes	Funding Sources	





Title Tyler County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000042	Sponsor	Tyler (County)	
				Complias with BEDG

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Tyler
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create new	W H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       932
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new flood Goal 4: R new flood Goal 5: R Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 278		#	# of structures	545	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	82			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	42	
# of low water crossings	8			# of historical	road closures	8	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$700,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Title Van Zandt County Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000043	Sponso	r Van Zandt (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Ye	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Watershed Planning County Van Zandt						
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solution							
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       244						
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new flood Goal 4: R new flood Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of gn. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.						
Goal 6: Re	Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.						

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?YesCoastal?NoLocal Flooding?YesOther?Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)232Roadways impacted (miles)13	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	ELE Grants: Local Eurods
Cost \$484,386	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	FIF Grants, Local Fullus
CUSI	ranang avalability.	r anang sources	





Title City of Palestine Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000044	Sponsor	Palestine (Municipali	ity)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Watershed Planning County Anderson						
Study description	erform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for onceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 7						
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Ro Goal 3: Ro Goal 4: Ro Goal 5: Ro otherwise Goal 6: Ro	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.						

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 31		4	# of structures	14		# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	/es	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2			Roadways impa	acted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical r	oad closures	2	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$700,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title City of Lufkin Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000045	Sponsor	Lufkin (Municipality)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Angelina
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create nev	/ H&H model? Yes         Emergency Need? Yes         Anticipated models in near term? No         Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 35
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floor Goal 2: R new floor Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,004			# of structures	868	#	of critical facilities 5	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	3			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	23	
# of low water crossings	12			# of historical	road closures	12	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	LINACD DDNA ENAA budget
	1 000 000	Voc	i otentiari ederar	HIVIGP, PDIVI, FIVIA, budget
Cost <sup>2</sup>	1,000,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	
0050			0	





45 of 157

Title City of Jacksonville Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000046	Sponsor	Jacksonville (Municip	oality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Watershed Planning County Cherokee						
Study description	erform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for onceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	/ H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       17						
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floo Goal 2: R new floo Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis Goal 6: R	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.						

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 430		-	# of structures	367	i	# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5			Roadways imp	oacted (miles)	4	
# of low water crossings	7			# of historical	road closures	7	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$560,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Rusk Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000047	Spor	nsor	Rusk (Municipality)		
				Reason for	Complies with RFPG Goals	
Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Recommendation				



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Cherokee
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create new	V H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? No       Anticipated models in near term? No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 7
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Ro Goal 4: Ro Goal 5: Ro otherwise Goal 6: Ro	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       Yes       Other?       No         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       2       Roadways impacted (miles)       2	Population at risk 455	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)    2    Roadways impacted (miles)    2	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	# of low water crossings	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$280,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





47 of 157

Regional view of FME area

Title City of Lumberton Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000048	Spo	nsor	Lumberton (Municip	ality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Watershed Planning County Hardin					
Study description	'erform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for onceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       11					
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Re Goal 3: Re Goal 4: Re Goal 5: Re otherwise	PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. duce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or providing flood protection to 10% of structures.					

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at tisk 622	# of structures 230		# of critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 6			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	4	
# of low water crossings 1			# of historical i	road closures	1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$380,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title City of Rose Hill Acres Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000049	Spo	nsor	Rose Hill Acres (Mun	icipality)
Reco	Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Watershed Planning County Hardin						
Study description	Develop drainage study to identify flood mitigation measures and drainage improvements including purchase of easements in the ETJ or a possible MOU to implement improvements.						
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       0						
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Ro Goal 3: Ro Goal 4: Ro Goal 5: Ro otherwise Goal 6: Ro	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.						

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 234		# of structures 129 #		# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) (	)		Roadways impacted (miles)	2
# of low water crossings (	0		# of historical road closures	0

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101a1 \$200,000	Vec	
Cost \$200,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0050		0.000





FME Area

Title City of Silsbee Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000050	Sponsor	Silsbee (Municipality	)
Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Hardin				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop O conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions					
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 8				
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Re Goal 3: Re Goal 4: Re Goal 5: Re otherwise	PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. duce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or providing flood protection to 10% of structures.				

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

		# of structures 88		# of critical facilities 2
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 1			Roadways impacted (miles)	2
# of low water crossings 3			# of historical road closures	3

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$220,000	Voc	
Cost \$520,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Regional view of FME area

50 of 157

Title City of Athens Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000051	Sponsor	Athens (Municipality	()
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Henderson				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       No       Anticipated models in near term?       No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       1				
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: RI Goal 4: RI Goal 5: RI otherwise Goal 6: RI	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or				

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 0   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 0		# of structures 0			#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)0# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	С	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$31,056	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





51 of 157

Title City of Jasper Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000052	Sponsor	Jasper (Municipality)	
Reco	ommended by	/ RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Jasper				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.					
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 11				
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Re Goal 3: Re Goal 4: Re Goal 5: Re otherwise	PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. Educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or providing flood protection to 10% of structures.				

ctures in the 1 inundation exter cyunnig, otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,093			# of structures 171 #			# of critical	facilities 7	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	6		
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical	road closures	2		

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$440,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title City of Beaumont Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000053	Spo	nsor	Beaumont (Municipa	ility)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Watershed Planning County Jefferson						
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 85						
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floo Goal 2: R new floo Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.						

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7,759		# of structures	2,546	#	of critical facilities 16	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	120		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	55	
# of low water crossings	4		# of historical	road closures	4	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$600,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Nederland Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000054	Spons	or	Nederland (Municipa	ality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Y	es	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Jefferson
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create nev	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 6
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floor Goal 2: R new floor Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 804		-	# of structures	381	# of critical facilities 3
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1			Roadways impacted (miles)	3
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical road closures	0

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$240,000	Vec	
Cost \$240,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





54 of 157

Title City of Nacogdoches Update Flood Control Study

ID#	051000055	Sponsor	Nacogdoches (Munic	cipality)
Recc	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Nacogdoches
Study description	Conduct Flood Control Study and implement actions such as channelization, detention, retention, etc to stop repetitive flood losses.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 28
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floo Goal 2: R new floo Goal 3: R Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 3,965			# of structures	446		# of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	ſes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	14	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical r	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,080,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title City of Henderson Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000056	Spons	or	Henderson (Municipa	ality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Y	es	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Rusk				
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.				
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? No Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 10				
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an av new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an av new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> <li>Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.</li> </ul>					

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   5 Roadways impacted (miles) 2   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 73		÷	# of structures	37	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)5Roadways impacted (miles)2# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? Yes	S	Other? No	
# of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5			Roadways impact	cted (miles)	2	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical roa	ad closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal		Potential Federal	
iotai	\$480,000		Yes		
Cost	Ş-00,000	funding availability?		Funding Sources	





56 of 157

Title City of Arp Master Drainage Plan

ID# 051000057 Sponsor		Arp (Municipality)		
			Descen for	Complies with RFPG Goals
Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Reason for		
		Recommendation		



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Watershed Planning County Smith				
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.				
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes         Emergency Need? No         Anticipated models in near term? No         Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 3				
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> <li>Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.</li> </ul>					

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   0 Roadways impacted (miles) 0   # of how water crossings   0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 0		#	of structures	0		# of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)0# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Co	oastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) (	0			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	0	
	# of low water crossings (	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,300,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





57 of 157

Title City of Tyler Master Drainage Plan

ID#	D# 051000058 Sponsor		Tyler (Municipality)		
Recommended by RFPG? Yes		Reason for	Complies with RFPG Goals		
		Recommendation			



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Watershed Planning County Smith
Study description	Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.
FME to create nev	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 56
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floor Goal 2: R new floor Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis Goal 6: R	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 5,666		4	# of structures	1,042	#	of critical facilities 72	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	/es	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4			Roadways impa	acted (miles)	23	
# of low water crossings	31			# of historical r	oad closures	31	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal		Potential Federal	
	000	i otentiai ieuerai	Voc	i otentiari eucrai	-
Cost \$2,200	),000	funding availability?	les	Funding Sources	





Title City of Whitehouse Master Drainage Plan

ID#	051000059	Sponsor	Whitehouse (Munici	pality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Watershed Planning County Smith								
Study description	form H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC for nceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.								
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 5								
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floo Goal 2: R new floo Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis Goal 6: R	RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their drisk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their drisk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or se providing flood protection to 10% of structures.								

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 67		# of structures 36			# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 2			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	1	
# of low water crossings 1			# of historical	road closures	1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$150,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Willie Nerron Road and Gillan Creek Bridge Replacement

ID# 051000060 Sponsor Angelina (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details										
Study type	Project Planni	ng				County /	Angelina	а		
Study description	Evaluate bridg impacts, and I	valuate bridge improvements (upgrade bridge and increase channel flow) to current crossing to develop costs, quantify benefits, evaluate npacts, and begin design.								
FME to create new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	No Ant	ticipated models in	n near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. r	ni., est.) 2	
Goal(s) Goal 1: Re otherwise Goal 2: Re otherwise	educe exposura e providing floc educe exposura e providing floc	e of existir od protecti e of existir od protecti	ig and future struct ion to 10% of struct ig and future struct ion to 30% of struct	ures in the 1 ures. ures in the 1 ures.	.00-year flood risk .00-year flood risk	inundation ex	ktents b	y elevating, acquirinį y elevating, acquirinį	g, relocating, or g, relocating, or	

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 0 Impacted (miles) 0   # of low water crossings 0 Impacted closures 0 Impacted closures 0	Population at risk 0		# of structures	0	# of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)0# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? No	Other? No
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways impacted (miles)	0
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal
IOLdi	6225 000	Voc	
Cost	\$325,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0050		0	





Title Hall Street over White Oak Creek Bridge Improvements

 
 ID#
 051000061
 Sponsor
 Diboll (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details			
Study type	Project Planning		County Angelina
Study description	Evaluate alternatives to elevat	e bridge over White Oak Creek on Hall St going	into the park
FME to create new	/ H&H model? Yes Emerg	ency Need? Yes Anticipated models in nea	ar term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 41
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ro otherwise Goal 2: Ro otherwise	educe exposure of existing and e providing flood protection to educe exposure of existing and e providing flood protection to a	future structures in the 100-year flood risk inun 10% of structures. future structures in the 100-year flood risk inun 30% of structures.	idation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or idation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 593			# of structures 155			of critical facilities 6	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	15			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	7	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$103,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





61 of 157

Title Preliminary Engineering of Gibsonville Street and Porterville Road Bridges Improvements

ID#	051000062	Spor	nsor	Huntington (Municip	ality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning			County Angelin	a
Study descriptior	Evaluate alternatives to	o raise bridges on Gibsonvill	e St. and Porterville Roa	d to increase flow o	f creek under.
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? No	Anticipated models in	near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 48
Goal(s) Goal 1:   otherwi Goal 2:   otherwi	educe exposure of exist e providing flood protec educe exposure of exist e providing flood protec	ing and future structures in tion to 10% of structures. ing and future structures in tion to 30% of structures.	the 100-year flood risk in the 100-year flood risk in	nundation extents b nundation extents b	y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0	-	# of structures	6	#	of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings 0				# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$650,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Shawnee Creek Concrete Canal

Study Dotails

ID#	051000063	Spor	nsor	Huntington (Municip	ality)
Reco	ommended by	/ RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Planni	ng				County	Angelin	a	
Study description	Evaluate proje 6th Street.	ect to qua	ntify benefits, eval	uate imp	acts, and begin de	sign for a concret	e canal f	or Shawnee Creek from Louis	iana Street to
FME to create new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	40
Goal(s) Goal 1: Ar	n average of 10	0% of the	new regional infra	structure	e projects between	2023 – 2033 will	utilize la	irger storm events (>100-year	) as the basis

of their design. Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 22		-	# of structures	5 17	#	of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical	road closures	2

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	
IOLdi	¢200.000	Voc	Fotential Tederal	-
Cost	\$390,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	
0050		0	0	





Title City of Lufkin Detention Pond Construction and Improvements

ID# 051000064 Sponsor Lufkin (Municipality) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	Details						
Study typ	be	Project Planning			County Angeli	na	
Study de	scription	Evaluate project to q holding capacity of e	uantify benefits, evalua xisting retention ponds	ate impacts, and begin s throughout the city.	lesign for a retention pond	d behind Inez Timms property. Increase	
FME to c	reate new	/ H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated me	odels in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 220	
Goal(s)	Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi	n average of 10% of tl esign. n average of 25% of tl gn	ne new regional infrast ne new regional infrast	ructure projects betwee ructure projects betwee	en 2023 – 2033 will utilize en 2033- 2053 will utilize la	larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis arger storm events (>100-year) as the basis c	of
	Goal 3: R new flood Goal 4: R new flood	FPG must consider in d risk reduction project FPG must consider in d risk reduction project	all projects and should cts between 2023 - 203 all projects and should cts between 2033 - 205	incorporate nature-bas 33. incorporate nature-bas 53.	ed practices and floodplai ed practices and floodplai	n preservation in an average of 10% of their n preservation in an average of 25% of their	
	Goal 5: R	educe the number of educe the number of	critical facilities in the 2 critical facilities in the 2	100-year flood risk inun 100-year flood risk inun	dation extents by 15%. dation extents by 25%.		

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,103		#	# of structures	969	#	of critical facilities 5	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	(	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	37			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	34	
# of low water crossings	16			# of historical	road closures	16	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$82,500	funding availability?	Funding Sources





64 of 157

Title Anahuac, North of Canal Drainage

ID#	051000065	Spo	nsor	Chambers (County)		
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Del	tails						
Study type	Project Pla	nning			County Chamb	ers	
Study descr	iption Study to ic Counties N	entify possi Iavigation D	ble drainage improve istrict canal generally	ements in the city limits c y along N. Main Street, Te	f Anahuac. Study will foc xas Avenue, and Work Str	us on the area north of the Cł eet.	ambers-Liberty
FME to crea	ate new H&H mod	el? Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mo	dels in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	139
Goal(s) Go of Go the	oal 1: An average c their design. oal 2: An average c eir design.	f 10% of the f 25% of the	e new regional infrast e new regional infrast	tructure projects betwee	n 2023 – 2033 will utilize la n 2033- 2053 will utilize la	arger storm events (>100-yea rger storm events (>100-year	r) as the basis ) as the basis of

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   10,886 10,886 Roadways impacted (miles) 59   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 925		# of structures	949	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)10,886Roadways impacted (miles)59# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10,886		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	59	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	ıl -
Cost	\$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	;





<sup>65</sup> of 157

Title Dredging West Fork- Double Bayou

ID#	051000066	Spo	nsor	Chambers (County)		
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning			County C	hambers		
Study description	Evaluate project to c mouth to FM 562 br	uantify benefits, evaluate in idge.	npacts, and begin des	ign. Improvements	s include dredging V	Vest Fork- Double Ba	you from
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term?	/es Drainage are	a (sq. mi., est.) 139	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A	n average of 10% of t esign. n average of 25% of t	he new regional infrastructu he new regional infrastructu	re projects between 2	2023 – 2033 will ut 2033- 2053 will util	ilize larger storm ev lize larger storm eve	ents (>100-year) as t ents (>100-year) as th	he basis he basis of

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

their design.

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 10,886 Roadways impacted (miles) 59 Impacted (miles) 1mpacted (miles) 1mpacte	Population at risk 925		# of structures	949	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)10,886Roadways impacted (miles)59# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10,886		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	59	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical r	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	¢4,400,000	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost	\$1,400,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Spindletop Bayou Ditch Improvement

ID#	051000067	Spo	nsor	Chambers (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Chan	nbers	
Study description	Evaluate project to quant of the second s	Jantify benefits, evaluate in along the Spindletop Bayo	mpacts, and begin de u in east Chambers (	esign. Improvements ind County.	ude increasing IH10 cros	sings, enlarge ditches
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	dels in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi.	., est.) 302
Goal(s) Goal 1: . of their Goal 2: . their de	An average of 10% of th design. An average of 25% of th sign.	e new regional infrastructi e new regional infrastructi	ure projects betweer ure projects betweer	ı 2023 – 2033 will utilize ı 2033- 2053 will utilize	e larger storm events (>10 larger storm events (>100	Ю-year) as the basis )-year) as the basis of

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 147		# of structures	345	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	22,570		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	79	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,500,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title North Anahuac Drainage

Study Dataila

ID#	051000068	Sponso	or	Anahuac (Municipali	ty)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Ye	s	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Cham	nbers	
Study descriptior	Evaluate project to qu culverts and channelia	aantify benefits, evaluate im zing the drainage outfall for	pacts, and begin dee the area north of Lc	sign. Improvements inc nestar Canal.	lude expanding/repairing road	l ditches and
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	139
Goal(s) Goal 1: of their Goal 2: their dea	An average of 10% of th design. An average of 25% of th sign.	e new regional infrastructur e new regional infrastructur	re projects between re projects between	2023 – 2033 will utilize 2033- 2053 will utilize	e larger storm events (>100-yea larger storm events (>100-year	r) as the basis ) as the basis of

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 10,886 Roadways impacted (miles) 59 Impacted (miles) 1mpacted (miles) 1mpacte	Population at risk 925		# of structures	949	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)10,886Roadways impacted (miles)59# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10,886		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	59	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical r	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost	\$800,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Southeast Drainage Ditch

ID#	051000069	Spon	sor	Anahuac (Municipali	ty)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	ſes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning		County	Chambers	
Study descriptio	n Evaluate project to que from Benton Lane to lange.	ıantify benefits, evaluate imp FM 563.	bacts, and begin design. Improvemen	nts include channelization and crossing	g upgrades
FME to create n	ew H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	139
Goal(s) Goal 1: of their	An average of 10% of th design.	e new regional infrastructure	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will	utilize larger storm events (>100-year)	as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 10,886 Roadways impacted (miles) 59   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 925		# of structures	949	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)10,886Roadways impacted (miles)59# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10,886		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	59	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

5,000	Potential federal funding availability?	Potential Federal	
	funding availability?	unding Sources	





<sup>69</sup> of 157

Title Southwest Anahuac Ditch

ID# 051000070 Sponsor Anahuac (Municipality) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County	Chambers
Study description	Evaluate project to qu from Main Street to E	Jantify benefits, evaluate im 3ay.	pacts, and begin design. Improvemen	ts include channelization and crossing upgrades
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 139
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d	n average of 10% of th esign.	e new regional infrastructur	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will ι	itilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 925		# of structure	s 949	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10,886		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	59	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	\$125,000	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost	\$125,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources

70 of 157




Title City of Lumberton Adler Ditch Drainage Improvements

 ID#
 051000071
 Sponsor
 Lumberton (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin
Study description	H&H Study to identify alternatives for improving existing drainage of Adler Ditch
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 3
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood rick injundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

والمعد

Population at risk 27		# of structures	5 2	# of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	18		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





71 of 157

Title City of Lumberton East Village Creek Parkway Drainage Improvements

 ID#
 051000072
 Sponsor
 Lumberton (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning			County Hardin				
Study descriptior	H&H Study to identify	H&H Study to identify alternatives for improving existing drainage of East Village Creek Parkway						
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in nea	ar term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 2			
Goal(s) Goal 1: otherwi Goal 2: otherwi	Reduce exposure of exist se providing flood protec Reduce exposure of exist se providing flood protec	ing and future structures in ction to 10% of structures. ing and future structures in ction to 30% of structures.	the 100-year flood risk inur the 100-year flood risk inur	ndation extents b ndation extents b	y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or			

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 82		# of structure	es 27	# of critical facilities	s 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1		Roadways impacte	ed (miles) 1	
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical road	l closures 1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

al_	Potential Federal _	Potential federal	Total
s	Funding Sources	funding availability?	¢125,000





72 of 157

Title City of Lumberton Greens Branch Ditch Western Extension

 ID#
 051000073
 Sponsor
 Lumberton (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Hardin		
Study description	H&H Study to identify	y alternatives for impro	oving existing drainage of	Greens Branch Ditch		
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mod	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	11
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des	n average of 10% of th lesign. n average of 25% of th ign.	e new regional infrast e new regional infrast	ructure projects between ructure projects between	2023 – 2033 will utilize l 2033- 2053 will utilize la	arger storm events (>100-year rger storm events (>100-year)	) as the basis as the basis of

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Cturchy Dotoile

Flood rick type: Riverine? Vec Coastal? No Local Flooding? No. Othe	
constant. No constant. No constant. No	r? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     6     Roadways impacted (miles)     4	
# of low water crossings1# of historical road closures1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





73 of 157

Title City of Lumberton Drainage Chance Cut Off Concrete Lining

ID# 051000074 Sponsor Lumberton (Municipality) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy L	Petalls									
Study typ	be	Project Planni	ng				County	Hardin		
Study de	scription	H&H Study to	identify al	ternatives for impr	oving ex	kisting drainage of	Chance Cut Off			
FME to c	reate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	2
Goal(s)	Goal 1: Ai of their d Goal 2: Ai their desi	n average of 10 esign. n average of 25 gn.	0% of the n 5% of the n	ew regional infras ew regional infras	tructure tructure	projects between projects between	2023 – 2033 will 2033- 2053 will u	utilize la tilize lar	rger storm events (>100-year) ger storm events (>100-year)	) as the basis as the basis of

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

والمعد

Population at risk 71			# of structures	10	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical road closures		0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$50,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





74 of 157

Title City of Lumberton Detention Pond at FM 421

ID#	051000075	Spo	nsor	Lumberton (Municip	ality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	<b>Details</b>								
Study typ	be	Project Planning					County	Hardin	
Study de	scription	H&H Study to dev	elop alte	rnatives for dete	ention at	t FM 421			
FME to c	reate new	H&H model? Yes	; Em	ergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 11
Goal(s)	Goal 1: A of their d	n average of 10% o esign.	of the new	v regional infras	tructure	projects between	2023 – 2033 will (	utilize la	rger storm events (>100-year) as the basis
	Goal 2: A	n average of 25% o	of the new	v regional infrast	tructure	projects between	2033- 2053 will u	tilize lar	ger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of
	Goal 3: R	educe the number	of critica	l facilities in the	100-yea	ar flood risk inunda	ation extents by 15	5%.	
	Goal 4: R	educe the number	of critica	l facilities in the	100-yea	ar flood risk inunda	ation extents by 25	5%.	

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 10 Roadways impacted (miles) 10 10   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 847		# of	structures	539	ŧ	of critical facilities 1	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)10Roadways impacted (miles)10# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	C	Coastal? No	)	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

I _	Potential Federal Funding Sources	Potential federal funding availability?	\$50,000 Potential fee funding available
-----	--------------------------------------	---	---





Title City of Lumberton Elevate Taft Road and Brushy Creek Subdivision

 ID#
 051000076
 Sponsor
 Lumberton (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details							
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin						
Study description	H&H Study to identify alternatives for elevating Taft Road and Brushy Creek Subdivision						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0						
Goal(s) Goal 1: Re otherwise Goal 2: Re otherwise	educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 30% of structures.						

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Dotoile

Population at risk 357			# of structures 130			# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closu		road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$75,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Rose Hill Acres Flood Mitigation Improvements

 ID#
 051000077
 Sponsor
 Rose Hill Acres (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Har	din	
Study description	Develop drainage stu	dy to identify flood mitigat	ion measures in and	around Rose Hill Acres	s ETJ.	
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A	n average of 10% of th esign. n average of 25% of th	e new regional infrastruct	ure projects between ure projects between	2023 – 2033 will utiliz 2033- 2053 will utiliz	ze larger storm events (>100-year) as the	e basis basis of

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Increase the amount of State/Federal funding for flood mitigation projects and strategies awarded within the Neches Region by 25%. Goal 6: Increase the amount of State/Federal funding for flood mitigation projects and strategies awarded within the Neches Region by 75%.

### 100-Year Flood Risk Summary

Cturchy Dotoile

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 2 Impacted (miles) 2   # of historical road closures 0 Impacted (miles) 0 Impacted (miles) 0	Population at risk 234		# of struct	cures 129	# of critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)2# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? No
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0		Roadways impacted (miles)	2
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$500,000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title City of Nacogdoches Flood Mitigation Project

Study Dotails

ID#	051000078	Spo	nsor	Nacogdoches (Municipality)		
Reco	ommended by	/ RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning County Nacogdoches							
Study description	H&H study to mitigate the wide-spread flooding that occurs along LaNana and Banita Creeks in the City of Nacogdoches							
FME to create new	H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       28							
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of gn. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their I risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.							

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Increase the amount of State/Federal funding for flood mitigation projects and strategies awarded within the Neches Region by 25%. Goal 6: Increase the amount of State/Federal funding for flood mitigation projects and strategies awarded within the Neches Region by 75%.

#### 100-Year Flood Risk Summary

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       Yes       Other?       No         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       4       Roadways impacted (miles)       14	Population at risk 3,965
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   4   Roadways impacted (miles)   14	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 4
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	# of low water crossings 0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$100.000	Voc	
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Rose Hill Acres Ditch Improvements

ID#	051000079	Spo	nsor	Rose Hill Acres (Mun	icipality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Det	tails									
Study type		Project Plann	ing				County	Hardin		
Study desci	ription	H&H Study to	identify a	Iternatives for ditch	improv	ements within Ro	se Hill Acres			
FME to crea	ate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0	
Goal(s) Go of Go th	oal 1: Ar their de oal 2: Ar eir desi	n average of 10 esign. n average of 21 gn.	ጋ% of the r 5% of the r	new regional infrast new regional infrast	tructure tructure	projects between projects between	2023 – 2033 will 2033- 2053 will u	utilize la tilize lar	rger storm events (>100-year) as ger storm events (>100-year) as t	the basis he basis of

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 2 10   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 234		# (	of structures	129	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)2# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Cost \$50,000 funding availability? Yes Funding Sources	Total Cost \$50,000	Potential federal funding availability?	Potential Federal _ Funding Sources	
---	------------------------	--	--	--





Title City of Rose Hill Acres Road and Bridge Elevation

ID#	051000080	Spo	nsor	Rose Hill Acres (Mun	icipality)
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning			County Hardin	
Study description	H&H study to locate roa	adways prone to flooding ar	nd identify alternatives to	improve drainage.	
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in n	ear term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0
Goal(s) Goal 1: R otherwise Goal 2: R otherwise	educe exposure of existin e providing flood protect educe exposure of existin e providing flood protect	ng and future structures in t ion to 10% of structures. ng and future structures in t ion to 30% of structures.	the 100-year flood risk int	undation extents by undation extents by	γ elevating, acquiring, relocating, or γ elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 2   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 234		-	# of structures	129	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)2# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$50,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Silsbee Easy Street Drainage Improvements

 ID#
 051000081
 Sponsor
 Silsbee (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Plannin	ng				County	Hardin		
Study description	H&H study to	locate roa	dways prone to flo	oding and ide	ntify alternativ	es to improve d	rainage.		
FME to create new	/ H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anti	cipated models	s in near term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi.,	est.) 4
Goal(s) Goal 1: R otherwis Goal 2: R otherwis	educe exposure e providing floo educe exposure e providing floo	e of existin od protecti e of existin od protecti	g and future struct on to 10% of struct g and future struct on to 30% of struct	ures in the 10 tures. ures in the 10 tures.	)0-year flood ri: )0-year flood ri:	sk inundation ex	xtents by	y elevating, acquiring, re y elevating, acquiring, re	elocating, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 228		-	# of structures	135	#	of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3
# of low water crossings	4			# of historical	road closures	4

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$50,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title City of Vidor Schoolhouse Ditch Alternative B

ID# 051000082 Sponsor Orange (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning	; ;		County Orange	2	
Study description	H&H study to ide	entify alternatives for Schoo	olhouse Ditch			
FME to create new	H&H model? Ye	es Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mo	dels in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	}

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 411		;	# of structures	150	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings	3			# of historical	road closures	3	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal		Potential Federal	
		Voc	otentiari cuerar	-
Cost \$10	0,000 funding availability	F	Funding Sources	
COSC				





Regional view of FME area

82 of 157

Title City of Vidor Schoolhouse Ditch Alternative C

ID# 051000083 Sponsor Orange (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Orange	2	
Study description	H&H study to iden	tify alternatives for Schoo	lhouse Ditch			
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mod	lels in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	3

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 411		;	# of structures	150	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings	3			# of historical	road closures	3	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Ves	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Regional view of FME area

83 of 157

Title City of Vidor Drainage Improvements

ID#	051000084	Sponso	r	Orange (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Ye	s	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning	County Orange				
Study description Perform H&H modeling to identify and define flood risk, develop conceptual alternatives to reduce flood risk, develop OPCC f conceptual alternatives, and rank projects. Conceptual alternatives should evaluate feasibility of nature based solutions.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated mo	dels in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 10				
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects betwee lesign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects betwee ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-base d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-base d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inunc	n 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis n 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ed practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their ed practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their lation extents by 15%.				

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,143		# of structures	541	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 1			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	13	
# of low water crossings 5			# of historical	road closures	5	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal		
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources		





84 of 157

Title Hardin County Black Creek Detention Pond

ID# 051000085 Sponsor Hardin (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning		County	Hardin		
Study description	H&H Study to develop	alternatives for detention at	: Black Creek.			
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	No Dr	rainage area (sq. mi., est.)	50

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes     Coastal? No     Local Flooding? No     Other? No       Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     15     Roadways impacted (miles)     8       # of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Population at risk 11		# of structures	23	# of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)15Roadways impacted (miles)8# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	C	Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? No	
# of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	15		Roadways impacted (miles)	8	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101d1 61E0 000	Voc	
Cost \$150,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Hardin County Boggy Creek Detention Pond

ID# 051000086 Sponsor Hardin (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	etails									
Study typ	e	Project Plannin	ıg				County	Hardin		
Study des	scription	H&H Study to a	Jevelop	alternatives for dete	ntion o	n Boggy Creek.				
FME to cr	eate nev	/ H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 43	
Goal(s)(	Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A	n average of 109 esign. n average of 259	% of the % of the	e new regional infrast e new regional infrast	tructure tructure	e projects between e projects between	2023 – 2033 will u 2033- 2053 will ut	utilize la tilize lar	arger storm events (>100-year) as th rger storm events (>100-year) as the	e basis basis of
t c	Goal 3: R	gn. FPG must consid	der in al	I projects and should	l incorp	orate nature-base	d practices and floo	odplain	preservation in an average of 10% of	of their

new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   43 A3 Roadways impacted (miles) 14   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 1,000		# of structures	648	# of critical facilities 1	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)43Roadways impacted (miles)14# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	43		Roadways impacted (miles)	14	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$150,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





86 of 157

Title Hardin County Cooks Lake Road Bridge Elevation

ID# 051000087 Sponsor Hardin (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study De	tails								
Study type		Project Planni	ng			County	Hardin		
Study desci	ription	H&H study to	improve	drainage along Cook	s Lake E	Bridge.			
FME to crea	ate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	10
Goal(s) Go ot Go ot	oal 1: Re herwise oal 2: Re herwise	educe exposure providing floc educe exposure providing floc	e of existi od protec e of existi od protec	ing and future struct tion to 10% of struct ing and future struct tion to 30% of struct	ures in t cures. ures in t cures.	the 100-year flood risk inundation e the 100-year flood risk inundation e	xtents b xtents b	oy elevating, acquiring, relocati oy elevating, acquiring, relocati	ng, or ng, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 119	-	# of structures 41			# of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	8			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road closu		road closures	2s 0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$20,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Hardin County Reservoir

 
 ID#
 051000088
 Sponsor
 Hardin (County)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin
Study description	H&H study of large reservoir for flood control / drought assistance.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 43
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis o ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

	# of structures 648	# of critical facilities 1
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 43	Roadways impacted	d (miles) 14
# of low water crossings 0	# of historical road	closures 0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$500,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





88 of 157

Title Hardin County South Area Drainage System

ID# 051000089 Sponsor Hardin (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning			County Hardin				
Study description	description H&H study to identify alternatives for developing a drainage system to drain / retain flood waters around the communities of Countrywood, Bevil Oaks, and Rose Hill							
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term? Ye	es Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 886			
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of th esign. n average of 25% of th gn. FPG must consider in d risk reduction project FPG must consider in d risk reduction project educe the number of educe the number of	ne new regional infrastructur ne new regional infrastructur all projects and should incor cts between 2023 - 2033. all projects and should incor cts between 2033 - 2053. critical facilities in the 100-ye critical facilities in the 100-ye	re projects between re projects between porate nature-based porate nature-based ear flood risk inunda ear flood risk inunda	2023 – 2033 will uti 2033- 2053 will utili I practices and flood I practices and flood tion extents by 15% tion extents by 25%	ilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis ize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of Iplain preservation in an average of 10% of their Iplain preservation in an average of 25% of their			

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7,210		# of structures 3,676			of critical facilities 25	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coa	astal? No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	743		Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	136	
# of low water crossings	13		# of historical	road closures	13	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,000,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Hardin County SE Area Drainage System

ID# 051000090 Sponsor Hardin (County) Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin					
Study description	H&H study to identify alternatives for developing a large drainage system to drain Lumberton directly into the Neches River, instead of Pine Island Bayou.					
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       888					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 5: R	an average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis or ign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.					

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7,212		# of structures 3,678			#	of critical facilities 25	5	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Co	oastal? No		Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	743			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	136		
# of low water crossings	13			# of historical	road closures	13		

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$1,250,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





90 of 157

Title Hardin County Pinewood Drainage Improvements

ID# 051000091 Sponsor Hardin (County) Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin
Study description	H&H Study to identify alternatives for improving existing drainage within Pinewood.
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       43
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floo Goal 4: F new floo Goal 5: F	average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis asign. average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of gn. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. PG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. duce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,000		4	# of structures	648	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	(	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	43			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	14	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost	\$350,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





Title Hardin County Coon Marsh Gully Drainage Improvements

ID# 051000092 Sponsor Hardin (County)
Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Hardin
Study description	H&H Study to identify alternatives for improving existing drainage within Marsh Gully
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 2
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floo Goal 4: F new floo Goal 5: F	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of sign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 792		;	# of structures	285	#	of critical facilities 1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	6	
# of low water crossings	2			# of historical	road closures	2	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al 6200.000	Voc	
Cost \$300,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
COSC		





FME Area

Title Hardin County Municipal Storm Drain Project

Sponsor Hardin (County) ID# 051000093 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes





# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson, Hardin
Study description	Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 128
Goal(s) Goal 1: RI new flood Goal 2: RI new flood Goal 3: Re Goal 4: Re Goal 5: Re otherwise	FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. educe exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 7,462		# of structures 3,487		# of critical facilities 8
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	395		Roadways impacted (miles)	75
# of low water crossings	5		# of historical road closures	5

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$2.000.000	funding quality of Yes	Funding Courses
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Coffee City Flood-prone Roadway and Infrastructure Evaluation

 ID#
 051000094
 Sponsor
 Coffee City (Municipality)

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Planning			County Hender	rson				
Study description	Locate roadways and	ocate roadways and properties prone to flooding due to heavy rainfall							
FME to create nev	H&H model? No	Emergency Need? No	Anticipated models	in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 7				
Goal(s) Goal 1: R otherwis Goal 2: R otherwis	educe exposure of exis e providing flood prote educe exposure of exis e providing flood prote	ting and future structures ction to 10% of structures ting and future structures ction to 30% of structures	s in the 100-year flood ri s. s in the 100-year flood ri s.	sk inundation extents l	by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or				

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6			# of structures 4			# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	3			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	1	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$25,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title City of Moore Station Flood-prone Roadway and Infrastructure Evaluation

ID# 051000095 Sponsor Moore Station (Municipality)
Recommended by RFPG? Yes
Recommendation
Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planni	ng			County	/ Hender	son	
Study description	Locate roadwa	ocate roadways and properties prone to flooding due to heavy rainfall						
FME to create new	/ H&H model?	No	Emergency Need?	No	Anticipated models in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1	
Goal(s) Goal 1: Re otherwise Goal 2: Re otherwise	educe exposure e providing floo educe exposure e providing floo	e of existing od protectio e of existing od protectio	g and future struct on to 10% of struct g and future struct on to 30% of struct	ures in f cures. ures in f cures.	the 100-year flood risk inundation the 100-year flood risk inundation	extents t	y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or y elevating, acquiring, relocating, or	

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 5			# of structures 2			t of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road closures		road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$25,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Houston County Earthen Dike Construction

ID#	051000096	Spo	nsor	Houston (County)	
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning County Houston							
Study description	Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of an earthen dike to elevate emergency vehic access road to critical facilities to provide protection to the 500-year flood level.							
FME to create new	w H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       No       Anticipated models in near term?       No       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       418							
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R otherwise	an average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or e providing flood protection to 10% of structures.							

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 16		# of structures 17			of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	117		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	20	
# of low water crossings	7		# of historical	road closures	7	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total .	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$16,972	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Ditch 100 A (East Caldwood) Improvements

ID#	051000097	Spo	nsor	Jefferson County Drainage District 6			
Recc	mmended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Jefferso	on	
Study description Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of 2,200 ft of channel to be retrofi underground culvert to allow for shaping and resizing the ditch to allow for continued maintenance.						ritted with an
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	ls in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	146
<ul> <li>Goal (s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the their design.</li> <li>Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% o new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the integration of the store in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the integration of the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the integration of the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new regional should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% or new flood from the new flood flood</li></ul>					<sup>.</sup> ) as the basis as the basis of f 10% of their f 25% of their	

new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 8,660		# of structures	\$ 2,893	of critical facilities 22
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4,386		Roadways impacted (miles)	70
# of low water crossings	5		# of historical road closures	5

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$75,000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Ditch 119 Crossings at Yount and Edson

ID#	051000098	Spor	nsor	Jefferson County Drainage District 6			
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type Project Planning				County Jefferson			
Study description	Evaluate project to qu about 50 homes and	uate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of crossing improvements that will pro ut 50 homes and mitigate flood risk on a historically flood prone road.					
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 14	46	
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> <li>Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.</li> </ul>					0% of their 5% of their ıg, or		

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 8,660		# of structures	s 2,893 #	# of critical facilities 22
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coasta	l? Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4,386		Roadways impacted (miles)	70
# of low water crossings	5		# of historical road closures	5

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$50,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Lateral B4A and B4A Ext. Improvements

ID#	051000099	Spoi	nsor	Jefferson County Dra	inage District 7
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Planning County	Jefferson							
Study description	valuate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of widening those channels to increase the unoff capacity – upgrading/enlarging road crossings to reduce out of bank flooding.								
FME to create nev	new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 324							
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ir design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will us lesign. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and flo ood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and flo ood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and flo ood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.	utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of podplain preservation in an average of 10% of their podplain preservation in an average of 25% of their 5%.							

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 12,745		# of structures	5,013	#	of critical facilities 83	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	9,044		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	160	
# of low water crossings	3		# of historical	road closures	3	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101dl 6225 000	Voc	
Cost \$225,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Rodair Pump Station

 ID#
 051000100
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning		County	Jefferson			
Study description	cription Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 324			
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo	n average of 10% of the lesign. n average of 25% of the ign. FPG must consider in a d risk reduction project	e new regional infrastructur e new regional infrastructur Il projects and should incor is between 2023 - 2033.	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will e projects between 2033- 2053 will u porate nature-based practices and flo	utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis tilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of odplain preservation in an average of 10% of their			

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       Yes       Local Flooding?       No       Other?       Yes         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       9,044       Roadways impacted (miles)       160	Population at risk 12,745	# of structures	5,013 #	of critical facilities 83
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 9,044 Roadways impacted (miles) 160	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	,044	Roadways impacted (miles)	160
# of low water crossings3# of historical road closures3	# of low water crossings		# of historical road closures	3

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101d1 c2 000 000	Voc	
Cost \$2,000,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Upgrade to Lateral B4B

 ID#
 051000101
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning		Соц	unty Jefferson		
Study description	Evaluate project to q runoff capacity – upg	uantify benefits, evaluate imp grading/enlarging road crossir	acts, and begin design. Project gs to reduce out of bank floodir	consists of widening ng.	g those channels to increa	se the
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near te	erm? Yes Drain	age area (sq. mi., est.) 324	1
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	n average of 10% of the lesign. n average of 25% of the ign. FPG must consider in d risk reduction project FPG must consider in d risk reduction project	he new regional infrastructure he new regional infrastructure all projects and should incorp cts between 2023 - 2033. all projects and should incorp cts between 2033 - 2053.	e projects between 2023 – 2033 e projects between 2033- 2053 v orate nature-based practices an orate nature-based practices an	will utilize larger st will utilize larger sto nd floodplain preser nd floodplain preser	orm events (>100-year) as rm events (>100-year) as t vation in an average of 10 vation in an average of 25	the basis :he basis of % of their % of their

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 12,745		# o	of structures	5,013	#	of critical facilities 83	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coa	oastal? Ye	es	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	9,044			Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	160	
# of low water crossings	3			# of historical	road closures	3	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$50,000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

101 of 157

Title Beauxart Gardens Central Ditch Improvements

ID#	051000102	Spo	nsor	Jefferson County Dra	inage District 7
Recc	mmended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details		
Study type	Project Planning	County Jefferson
Study description	Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin desi runoff capacity – upgrading/enlarging road crossings to reduce out of l	ign. Project consists of widening those channels to increase the bank flooding.
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated model	ls in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2 lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2 ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based   d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based   d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundati	2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their fion extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 277		-	# of structures	226	4	t of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	10			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical r	oad closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$50,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





102 of 157

Title Houston Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 ID#
 051000103
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning		County	Jefferson	
Study description H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.					
FME to create nev	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor	n average of 10% of th lesign. n average of 25% of th ign. FPG must consider in a d risk reduction project FPG must consider in a d risk reduction project	e new regional infrastructure e new regional infrastructure Il projects and should incorp ts between 2023 - 2033. Il projects and should incorp ts between 2033 - 2053.	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will e projects between 2033- 2053 will u porate nature-based practices and flo porate nature-based practices and flo	utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis tilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of odplain preservation in an average of 10% of their odplain preservation in an average of 25% of their	

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0			# of structures	0	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	
\$250 000	Yes	i otentiari eaerai	<nui></nui>
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Title Grannis Upgrade Pumping Equipment

ID# 051000104 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning		County Jefferso	on		
Study description	H&H study to size pu	mp upgrades and improv	e existing level of service	2.		
FME to create nev	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Ye	s Anticipated mode	ls in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 0	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of th lesign. n average of 25% of th ign. FPG must consider in a d risk reduction project FPG must consider in a d risk reduction project educe the number of	he new regional infrastructure ne new regional infrastructure all projects and should in ts between 2023 - 2033. all projects and should in ts between 2033 - 2053. critical facilities in the 100	ture projects between 2 ture projects between 2 corporate nature-based corporate nature-based	2023 – 2033 will utilize l 2033- 2053 will utilize la practices and floodplair practices and floodplair	arger storm events (>100-year) as the bas rger storm events (>100-year) as the basis n preservation in an average of 10% of the n preservation in an average of 25% of the	is s of ir ir

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 95		# of structures 1			# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0	)		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings 0	)		# of historica	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	<null></null>
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Title Foley Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 ID#
 051000105
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County Jefferson	
Study description	H&H study to size pump upgrades and i	nprove existing level of service.		
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes Emergency Nee	d? Yes Anticipated models in ne	ar term? No Drainage area (sq. mi.	., est.) 1
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: B	n average of 10% of the new regional inf esign. n average of 25% of the new regional inf gn. PG must consider in all projects and sho I risk reduction projects between 2023 - PG must consider in all projects and sho I risk reduction projects between 2033 - educe the number of critical facilities in t	astructure projects between 2023 – 2 astructure projects between 2033- 20 uld incorporate nature-based practice 2033. uld incorporate nature-based practice 2053. be 100-year flood risk inundation ext	2033 will utilize larger storm events (>10 053 will utilize larger storm events (>100 es and floodplain preservation in an ave es and floodplain preservation in an ave	10-year) as the basis )-year) as the basis of rage of 10% of their rage of 25% of their

Goal S. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk munication extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0		# of structures 0			#	# of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0		
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0		

#### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	<null></null>
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





105 of 157

Title Lakeside Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 ID#
 051000106
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	etails								
Study typ	e	Project Planning			County Jefferson				
Study de	scription	H&H study to size pun	np upgrades and improve ex	isting level of service.					
FME to c	reate new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models i	n near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 5			
Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.									
	Goal 2: A their desi	n average of 25% of the gn.	e new regional infrastructur	e projects between 203	3- 2053 will utilize la	rger storm events (>100-year) as the	basis of		
	Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.								

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 387		#	of structures	207	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Co	bastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	3			Roadways imp	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings (	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total Cost \$100,000	Potential federal funding availability?	Potential Federal Funding Sources	<null></null>





106 of 157
Title Rodair Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 ID#
 051000107
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson						
Study description	H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.						
FME to create nev	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 12						
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R	an average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of lign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.						

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   64 Roadways impacted (miles) 10   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 981		# of structures	511	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)64Roadways impacted (miles)10# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	64		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	<null></null>
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Regional view of FME area

107 of 157

Title 9th Avenue - Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 
 ID#
 051000108
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson
Study description	H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 6
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floo Goal 4: F	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of sign. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their or risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their

new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?     Yes     Coastal?     No     Local Flooding?     No     Other?     Yes       Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     1     Roadways impacted (miles)     2       # of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Population at risk 528		# of structures 36	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     1     Roadways impacted (miles)     2       # of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No Local Floodin	g? No	Other? Yes	
the flow water crossings 0 the flow water crossings 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1	Roadways	impacted (miles)	2	
	# of low water crossings	0	# of histo	ical road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





108 of 157

Title Halbouty Add two pumps (open spots in structure)

 ID#
 051000109
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details		
Study type	Project Planning	County Jefferson
Study description	H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of servic	e.
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated mode	ls in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 12
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis Goal 6: R	In average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2 lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2 ign. Induce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundat reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundat reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood e providing flood protection to 10% of structures. reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood	2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of cion extents by 15%. cion extents by 25%. risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,008		# of structures	251	#	of critical facilities 33	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	164		Roadways impa	acted (miles)	7	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical r	oad closures	0	

109 of 157

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	<null></null>
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





Title Rodair Upper Build new station with associated levee

 ID#
 051000110
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Detai	IS			
Study type	Project Planning		County Jeffe	rson
Study descrip	tion H&H study to size pu	mp upgrades and improve ex	isting level of service.	
FME to create	e new H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 12
Goal(s) Goal of th Goal	<ol> <li>1: An average of 10% of the eir design.</li> <li>2: An average of 25% of the eir design of the eigen of 25% of the eigen of 25\% of the eigen of 25\% o</li></ol>	e new regional infrastructure	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize e projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize	e larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of

their design. Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their

new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 981		# of structure	s 511	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	64		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historica	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	<null></null>
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





110 of 157

Title Main C Diversion - Build New Pump Station and Channel

ID# 051000111 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning		County	Jefferson		
Study description	1 H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.					
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 13		
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R	n average of 10% of the esign. n average of 25% of the ign. educe the number of cri educe the number of cri educe exposure of existi e providing flood protec	utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of .5%. 25%. extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or				

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,008		# of structures 251 #		# of critical facilities 33
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coast	tal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	164		Roadways impacted (miles)	7
# of low water crossings 0		# of historical road closur		0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al	Vec	
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Central Gardens Ditch - Upgrade Drainage Channel

 ID#
 051000113
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Plannir	ng				County	Jefferso	n	
Study description	n H&H study to identify alternatives for Central Gardens Ditch								
FME to create new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated models in nea	ar term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	L

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes     Coastal? No     Local Flooding? No     Other? Yes       Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     0     Roadways impacted (miles)     1       # of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Population at risk 150		;	# of structures	80	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)1# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings     0     # of historical road closures     0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	1	
	# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road closures		0		

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100.000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Pure Oil Ditch Improvements

 ID#
 051000114
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Deta	ils			
Study type	Project Planning		County J	efferson
Study descrip	ption H&H study to identify	<i>i</i> alternatives for Pure Oil Dit	ch	
FME to create	e new H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 2
Goal(s) Goal of th Goal their	l 1: An average of 10% of th neir design. l 2: An average of 25% of th r design.	e new regional infrastructur	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will u e projects between 2033- 2053 will ut	tilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis ilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 33		# of structures 6			of critical facilities 6	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	3		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings 0	0	# of historical road closures		road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

otal	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Rodair Gulley Ditch Improvements

 
 ID#
 051000115
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details			
Study type	Project Planning	County Jefferson	
Study description	H&H study to identify alternatives for Rodair Gulley		

FME to create new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 12

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 981		# of structures 511		# (	# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	64		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
# of low water crossings (	0	# of historical road closures		road closures	0	

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Main C Diversion Channel Improvements

ID# 051000116 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Jefferson		
Study description	H&H study to identify	valternatives for Main	C Diversion Channel			
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mod	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 13	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A	An average of 10% of th	e new regional infrastr	ructure projects between	2023 – 2033 will utilize	e larger storm events (>100-year) as t	he basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,008		;	# of structures	251	#	of critical facilities 33	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	164			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	7	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Voc	
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Main B Channel Improvements

 ID#
 051000117
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Plannir	ng			County	Jefferso	on
Study description	H&H study to i	dentify alte	ernatives for Main	B Chanı	nel		
FME to create new	/ H&H model?	Yes E	mergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 6

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       No       Other?       Yes         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       8       Roadways impacted (miles)       19	Population at risk 4,603		# of structures 876	# of critical facilities 17	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)8Roadways impacted (miles)19	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No Local Flooding?	No Other? Yes	
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	8	Roadways imp	pacted (miles) 19	
# of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	# of low water crossings	0	# of historical	road closures 0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





116 of 157

Title Main A Channel Improvements

 ID#
 051000118
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County	y Jefferson
Study description	H&H study to identify a	lternatives for Main A Chanı	nel	
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 6

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 822			# of structures	5 147	#	of critical facilities 2	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	4			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	3	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





117 of 157

Title Rodair Lateral 5 Detention Pond Excavation

ملنصعه

 
 ID#
 051000119
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson
Study description	H&H study to identify additional detention required to expand existing level of service
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 2
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?     Yes     Coastal?     No     Local Flooding?     No     Other?     Yes	Population at risk 132	# of structures	<sup>29</sup> #	of critical facilities 0
	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 6 Roadways impacted (miles) 1	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	6	Roadways impacted (miles)	1
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	# of low water crossings	0	# of historical road closures	0

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources



Title Halbouty Detention Pond Excavation

ID# 051000120 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson						
Study description	tion H&H study to identify additional detention required to expand existing level of service						
FME to create new	new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area	(sq. mi., est.) 12					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floo Goal 4: F new floo	<ul> <li>An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm even in design.</li> <li>An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm even lesign.</li> <li>RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in ood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in ood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.</li> <li>RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in ood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.</li> <li>RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in ood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.</li> </ul>	nts (>100-year) as the basis ts (>100-year) as the basis of an average of 10% of their an average of 25% of their					

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,008		# of structures 251			of critical facilities 33	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coasta	al? No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	164		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	7	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Voc	
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title 9th Avenue Additional Detention Excavation

Cturchy Dotoile

 ID#
 051000121
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning	County Jefferson					
Study description	y description H&H study to identify additional detention required to improve existing level of service						
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated mo	dels in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 6					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	In average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects betwee lesign. In average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects betwee ign. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-base d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. IFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-base d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.	n 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis n 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ed practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their ed practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their					

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 528			# of structures	36		# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Vec	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





120 of 157

Title JCDD7 Hurricane Flood Protection Levee Study

ID# 051000123 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	etalis									
Study typ	e	Project Planning					County Jefferson			
Study des	cription	Study to ident jurisdictional a	ify possible area.	e upgrades to leve	es to help	p reduce the risk o	f flooding and to	help the	e District review and update le	vees in
FME to cr	eate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	112
Goal(s) (	Goal 1: Ar of their de	n average of 10 esign.	)% of the n	iew regional infrast	ructure p	projects between 2	2023 – 2033 will	utilize la	rger storm events (>100-year)	as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 12,671		# of structures 4,705		of critical facilities 82
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	876		Roadways impacted (miles)	95
# of low water crossings	3		# of historical road closures	3

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$777,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Crane Bayou Channel Improvements

 ID#
 051000124
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Detai	ls					
Study type	Project Planning		County Jeff	County Jefferson		
Study descript	tion H&H study to identify	I alternatives for Crane Bayou	Channel			
FME to create	new H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? Yes	s Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 7		
Goal(s) Goal of the	1: An average of 10% of their design.	e new regional infrastructure	projects between 2023 – 2033 will utili	ze larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis		

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033-2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 775		# of structures 359			of critical facilities 3		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	5	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

122 of 157

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





а

Title Rodair Upper Additional Pump Station

 
 ID#
 051000125
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study De	etalis									
Study type	e	Project Plannir			(	County Jefferson				
Study des	cription	H&H study to s	size pump	upgrades and imp	rove exis	sting level of service.				
FME to cre	eate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated models in near	r term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	12
Goal(s) G	Goal 1: Ar of their de	n average of 10 esign.	% of the n	new regional infrast	ructure	projects between 2023 – 20	)33 will ut	tilize laı	rger storm events (>100-year	<sup>.</sup> ) as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 981		# of structures	511	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	64		Roadways impacted (miles)	10
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





123 of 157

Title Rodair Gully System Detention

 ID#
 051000128
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details										
Study type	Project Planning		Coun	ty Jefferson						
Study descriptior	H&H study to identify	&H study to identify additional detention required to expand existing level of service								
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term	n? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 12						
Goal(s) Goal 1: . of their Goal 2: . their de Goal 3: . new floo	An average of 10% of th design. An average of 25% of th sign. RFPG must consider in a od risk reduction project	e new regional infrastructur e new regional infrastructur Ill projects and should incor ts between 2023 - 2033.	re projects between 2023 – 2033 w re projects between 2033- 2053 wil porate nature-based practices and	ill utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis I utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their						

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 981		# of structure	s 511	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	64		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Vec	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





124 of 157

Title El Vista Upgrade Pumping Equipment

ID# 051000129 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Jefferso	งท	
Study description	H&H study to size pu	mp upgrades and improve e	existing level of service.			
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models i	in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 2	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their	an average of 10% of the sign.	e new regional infrastructu	re projects between 202	23 – 2033 will utilize la	arger storm events (>100-year) as	the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 750		;	# of structures	507	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	10	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Regional view of FME area

125 of 157

Title W. Port Arthur Road Upgrade Pumping Equipment

 ID#
 051000130
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Deta	alis			
Study type	Project Planning		County Jeffers	on
Study descri	ption H&H study to size pu	np upgrades and improve ex	isting level of service.	
FME to creat	te new H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1
Goal(s) Goa	al 1: An average of 10% of th heir design.	e new regional infrastructure	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize	larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine?       Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       No       Other?       No         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       0       Roadways impacted (miles)       0       0         # af lawyeeter exercises       0       # af historical read classes       0	Population at risk 4		-	# of structures	3	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)     0     Roadways impacted (miles)     0       # af law water arraying     0     0     0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of historical road closures 0	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101dl \$100,000		
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Regional view of FME area

126 of 157

Title Central - Upgrade Pumping Equipment and Structure

ID# 051000131 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning		County Je	County Jefferson		
Study description	H&H study to size pum	p upgrades and improve exi	isting level of service.			
FME to create new	/ H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	O Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 3		
	64004 611					

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0		-	# of structures 0		#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Tatal		Potential federal	Potential Enderal	
lotal	¢100.000	Voc		
Cost	\$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	
0050			0	





Title Star Lake Upgrade Pumping Equipment

ID# 051000132 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Detail	S			
Study type	Project Planning		County	Jefferson
Study descript	on H&H study to size pu	np upgrades and improve ex	isting level of service.	
FME to create	new H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1
Goal(s) Goal : of the Goal :	L: An average of 10% of th ir design. 2: An average of 25% of th	e new regional infrastructure e new regional infrastructure	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will e projects between 2033- 2053 will u	utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of
their	design.			

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0	# of structures 1	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No Local Flooding?	No Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0	Roadways imp	pacted (miles) 0
# of low water crossings 0	# of historical	road closures 0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$100 000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Crane Bayou Additional Pumping

 ID#
 051000133
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson						
Study description	H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.						
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 7						
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the their design.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> <li>Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.</li> <li>Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.</li> </ul>							

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes       Coastal?       No       Local Flooding?       No       Other? Yes         Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       0       Roadways impacted (miles)       5         # of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	Population at risk 775		# of s	tructures 35	9	4	# of critical facili	ties 3
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)       0       Roadways impacted (miles)       5         # of low water crossings       0       # of historical road closures       0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	C	coastal? No	Loc	cal Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways imp	acted (miles)	5	
	# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal
iotai	¢100.000	Vec	
Cost	\$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0000		0 /	0





<sup>129</sup> of 157

Title Lakeview Additional Pumping

 ID#
 051000134
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning			County Je	efferson		
Study description	H&H study to size pu	mp upgrades and improve e	existing level of servio	ce.			
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No Drai	nage area (sq. mi., est.)	2
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A	n average of 10% of th esign. n average of 25% of th	e new regional infrastructu e new regional infrastructu	re projects between re projects between	2023 – 2033 will ut 2033- 2053 will uti	tilize larger s lize larger st	torm events (>100-year orm events (>100-year)	) as the basis as the basis of

their design. Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 479			# of structures	216	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	2	
# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road closures		0		

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101di 6100.000	Voc	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





130 of 157

Title City of Daisetta Drainage Projects

ID#	051000135	Spon	sor	Daisetta (Municipality)				
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals			



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Study Details** Study type County Liberty **Project Planning** Study description Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of drainage improvements throughout the city to include widening culverts and ditches. Anticipated models in near term? Yes FME to create new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1 Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design. Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design. Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0		# of structures 0			of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical road closures		0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$150,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Liberty County Culvert Replacement Project

ID# 051000136 Sponsor Liberty (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	5							
Study type	Project Planning	County Liberty						
Study descripti	Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of increasing culvert size in identified flood hazard problem areas within Liberty County.							
FME to create r	new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated	models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 235						
Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the b of their design. Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the b								
their c Goal 3 new fl	design. 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-b lood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.	ased practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their						
Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.								
Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.								

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 1,526 Roadways impacted (miles) 7 Impacted (miles) 7   # of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0 Impacted (miles) 1mpacted (miles) 1mpacted (miles)	Population at risk 140		# of structures	5 116	#	of critical facilities 1
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)1,526Roadways impacted (miles)7# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,526		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	7
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101d1 \$100 6E7	Vec	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0050		0





FME Area

Title Liberty County Recanalization Feasibility Study

ID# 051000137 Sponsor Liberty (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning	County Libe	rty					
Study description	valuate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of dechannelizing existing feeder creeks the low from north to south and improve drainage for storm water runoff.							
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 235					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floc Goal 4: F new floc Goal 5: F Goal 6: F	n average of 10% of the new regional infrast esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrast gn. FPG must consider in all projects and should d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 203 FPG must consider in all projects and should d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 203 educe the number of critical facilities in the educe the number of critical facilities in the	tructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utiliz tructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize l incorporate nature-based practices and floodpl 33. l incorporate nature-based practices and floodpl 53. 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.	e larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis e larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of lain preservation in an average of 10% of their lain preservation in an average of 25% of their					

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes   Coastal? No   Coastal	Population at risk 140	#	# of structures 116	# of critical facilities 1
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)1,526Roadways impacted (miles)7# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No Local Flooding?	No Other? Yes
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,526	Roadways imp	pacted (miles) 7
	# of low water crossings	0	# of historical	road closures 0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$26,171	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Stadium Upgrade Pumping Equipment

ID# 051000138 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study D	etalis									
Study typ	e	Project Planni	ing				County	Jeffersc	on	
Study des	escription H&H study to size pump upgrades and improve existing level of service.									
FME to cr	eate new	H&H model?	Yes	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) (	)
Goal(s) ( c t	Goal 1: Ar of their de Goal 2: Ar heir desi	n average of 10 esign. n average of 25 gn.	0% of the 5% of the	new regional infras new regional infras	tructure tructure	e projects between e projects between	2023 – 2033 will 2033- 2053 will u	utilize la tilize lai	arger storm events (>100-year) rger storm events (>100-year) a	as the basis as the basis of

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 27		# of structures 6			of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	0
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical road closures		0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





134 of 157

Title Delmar Upgrade Pumping Equipment

ID# 051000139 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 7 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning			County Je	efferson		
Study description	H&H study to size pur	np upgrades and improve	existing level of servi	ce.			
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1	
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their c	n average of 10% of th esign. n average of 25% of th	e new regional infrastruct	ture projects between	2023 – 2033 will ut	itilize lar	ger storm events (>100-year) as the basis	s of

etween 2033-- 2053 WIII UTIIIZ their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,618		#	f of structures	676	# (	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	(	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	6	
# of low water crossings	0			# of historical	road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title DeQueen Additional Pumping Equipment

 
 ID#
 051000140
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County .	efferson
Study description	H&H study to size pu	mp upgrades and improve ex	isting level of service.	
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	No Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o	n average of 10% of th lesign.	e new regional infrastructure	e projects between 2023 – 2033 will د	tilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

		•	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0		Roadways impacted (miles)	0
# of low water crossings 0		# of historical road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





FME Area

Regional view of FME area

136 of 157

Title Tyrrell Park Detention

وانصد

 ID#
 051000143
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning			County Jeffers	on	
Study description	Install a detention po	ond in the vicinity of Tyrre	ell Park Rd. within the c	ty of Beaumont.		
FME to create ne	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Ye	Anticipated mod	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	5
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des	in average of 10% of the lesign. In average of 25% of the ign.	ne new regional infrastruc ne new regional infrastruc	cture projects between cture projects between	2023 – 2033 will utilize 2033- 2053 will utilize k	larger storm events (>100-year arger storm events (>100-year)	) as the basis as the basis of

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0		# of structure	s 1	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coasta	l? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	258		Roadways impacted (miles)	2
# of low water crossings	0		# of historical road closures	0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$500,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Regional view of FME area

137 of 157

Title Mayhaw Lateral Improvements

 ID#
 051000144
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson, Chambers
Study description	Rectify negative impacts to properties downstream of IH-10 caused by additional drainage crossings
FME to create nev	W H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       47
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. FPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their d risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 534		# of structures	401	4	# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? N	lo	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2,479		Roadways impa	acted (miles)	28	
# of low water crossings	3		# of historical re	oad closures	3	

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$2,200,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Feasibility Assessment for Increase in Size of Culverts and Railroad Trestles on Major Drainage Structures Throughout Orange County

Recommended by RFPG? Yes Reason for Recommendation	D# 051000145 Sponsor	Orange County Drain	nage District
	Recommended by RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning			County Orange			
Study description	H&H Study to analyze Orange County.	most efficient alternatives fo	or dredging, widen	ing, or otherwise improving culverts and railroad trestles within			s within
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	Yes Draina	ige area (sq. mi., est.) 1	.56
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocation otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocation to 10% of structures.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocation to 30% of structures.</li> </ul>							ıg, or ıg, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   346 Roadways impacted (miles) 136   # of historical road closures   20 # of historical road closures 20	Population at risk 8,737		# of structures 5,007			of critical facilities 36	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)346Roadways impacted (miles)136# of low water crossings20# of historical road closures20	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings20# of historical road closures20	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	346		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	136	
	# of low water crossings	20		# of historical	road closures	20	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$150,000 Cost	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources





Title Feasibility Assessment of the Capacity of Drainage Ditches and Channels that Convey Stormwater from Neighborhoods Located Within Orange County

ID#	051000146	Spoi	nsor	Orange County Drair	age District	
Reco	ommended by	r RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Study Details** Study type County Orange **Project Planning** Study description H&H Study to analyze most efficient alternatives for improving existing drainage ditches and channels linked to neighborhoods within Orange County. FME to create new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 156 Anticipated models in near term? Yes Goal(s) Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 8,737		# of structures	\$ 5,007 #	of critical facilities 36
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	346		Roadways impacted (miles)	136
# of low water crossings	20		# of historical road closures	20

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost \$100,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources
COSL		Tunung Sources





140 of 157

Title Orange County DD Harvey Repairs

ID#	051000147	Spo	nsor	Orange County Drainage District		
Reco	ommended by	rFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning	County Orange					
Study description	Evaluate project to quantify benefits, evaluate impacts, and begin design. Project consists of repairing damage to drainage ditches, crossings, culverts, levees, and right-of-ways caused by Hurricane Harvey to restore pre-flood capacity.						
FME to create nev	w H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models	in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 156					
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R	An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 20 design. An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 20 sign. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based p d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033. RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based p d risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2053. Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation	123 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis 133- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ractices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their ractices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their on extents by 15%.					

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 8,737		# of structure	s 5,007 #	of critical facilities 36
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal	? Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	346		Roadways impacted (miles)	136
# of low water crossings	20		# of historical road closures	20

141 of 157

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
\$130,000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title Orange County DD SW Detention/Retention Facilities

D#	051000148	Spo	nsor	Orange County Drair	lage District
Reco	ommended by	/ RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Sludy Details						
Study type Study description	Project Planning			County Orange		
	Evaluate project to qua throughout OCDD.	ntify benefits, evaluate in	npacts, and begin design. Project	consists of st	ormwater detention/retentio	n facilities
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near te	rm? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	156
Caal(a) Caal 1. A.	a subserve of 100/ of the	way, waste wall information at the	na musicata haturaan 2022 2022			\ aa tha haaia

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033-2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding?	No Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 346 Roadways in	npacted (miles) 136
# of low water crossings 20 # of historic	al road closures 20

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	
iotai	\$130,000	Yes	i oteritiari cucrar	-
Cost	\$130,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	
		<b>o</b> <i>i</i>	U U	





142 of 157
Title Feasibility Assessment of Widening and Deepening Segments of Tiger Creek

ID# 051000149 Sponsor Orange County Drainage District Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study De	etails									
Study type	5	Project Planning			County Orange	, Jasper				
Study desc	cription	on H&H Study to analyze most efficient alternatives for constructing improvements to segments of Tiger Creek.								
FME to cre	eate new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models	s in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 28				
<ul> <li>Goal (s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> </ul>										
G	Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.									

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,268		# of structures	848	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coast	tal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	15		Roadways impacted (miles)	17
# of low water crossings	5		# of historical road closures	5

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	
Cost \$150,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





Title Feasibility Assessment of Construction of a Stormwater Detention Pond Adjacent to Tiger Creek

D#	051000150	Spons	or	Orange County Drain	age District	
Recc	ommended by	RFPG? Ye	es	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Deta	ails								
Study type	P	roject Plannin	g				County Orange, Jasper		
Study descri	iption H	&H Study to a	inalyze mo	ost efficient altern	atives fo	or constructing a st	ormwater detenti	on pond	l in the vicinity of Tiger Creek.
FME to creat	te new H	ا &H model؟	/es E	Emergency Need?	Yes	Anticipated mod	els in near term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 28
<ul> <li>Goal (s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-ye</li></ul>									

their design. Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,268		# of structures	848	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coast	al? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	15		Roadways impacted (miles)	17
# of low water crossings	5		# of historical road closures	5

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$100,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Regional view of FME area

144 of 157

Title Feasibility Assessment of Widening and Deepening Segments of Ten-Mile Creek

ID#	051000151	Spo	nsor	Orange County Drain	age District
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

,						
Study type	Project Planning		County	County Orange, Jasper		
Study description H&H Study to analyze most efficient alternatives for constructing improvements to segments of Ten-Mile Creek.						
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 46		
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo	Il utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis I utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of Ploodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their Ploodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their					

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

**Study Details** 

Population at risk 748		# of structures	415	:	# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	44		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	13	
# of low water crossings	2		# of historical	road closures	2	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost \$175,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Feasibility Assessment of Widening and Deepening Segments of Anderson Gully

ID#	051000152	Spo	nsor	Orange County Drain	age District
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning			County Orange	, Jefferson
Study description	H&H Study to analyze	most efficient alternatives f	or constructing imp	rovements to segments	of Anderson Gully.
FME to create new	w H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated mode	els in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 42
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their of Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: F new floo Goal 4: F	in average of 10% of the lesign. in average of 25% of the ign. IFPG must consider in a d risk reduction project IFPG must consider in a	e new regional infrastructur e new regional infrastructur Il projects and should incorp s between 2023 - 2033. Il projects and should incorp	e projects between e projects between porate nature-based porate nature-based	2023 – 2033 will utilize la 2033- 2053 will utilize la practices and floodplain practices and floodplain	arger storm events (>100-year) as the basis rger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of a preservation in an average of 10% of their a preservation in an average of 25% of their

new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053. Goal 5: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 6: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 2,262		# of structures	1,366 #	of critical facilities 194
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coas	stal? Yes	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	140		Roadways impacted (miles)	35
# of low water crossings	9		# of historical road closures	9

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$225,000	Yes	
Cost	funding availability?	Funding Sources





146 of 157

Title City of Bullard Culvert Upgrades

ID# 051000153 Sponsor Bullard (Municipality)
Recommended by RFPG? Yes
Reason for
Recommendation
Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Plannin	ing	County Smith	n
Study description	Study to evalua	late existing culverts for current co	ondition and identify culverts that need to be	e upgraded.
FME to create new	v H&H model?	Yes Emergency Need? No	Anticipated models in near term? No	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 3
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R new floo Goal 4: R new floo Goal 5: R otherwis	n average of 109 esign. n average of 259 ign. FPG must consic d risk reduction FPG must consic d risk reduction educe exposure e providing flood	D% of the new regional infrastructures of the new regional infrastructures ider in all projects and should incon projects between 2023 - 2033. ider in all projects and should incon projects between 2033 - 2053. e of existing and future structures od protection to 10% of structures	ure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize ure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize proorate nature-based practices and floodpla proorate nature-based practices and floodpla in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents	e larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ain preservation in an average of 10% of their ain preservation in an average of 25% of their s by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 0	# of structures 0	# of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No Local Flooding? Yes	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0	Roadways impacted	d (miles) 0
# of low water crossings 0	# of historical road	closures 0

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total		Potential federal	Potential Federal	-
Cost <sup>\$50</sup>	0,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





147 of 157

Title Smith County Drainage Capacity Upgrades

ID# 051000154 Sponsor Smith (County)

Recommended by RFPG? Yes

Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County Smith	
Study description	Study to evaluate ex	isting culverts within Smith	County and identify culverts that need to be	upgraded.
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 510
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their d Goal 2: A their desi Goal 3: R new floor Goal 4: R new floor Goal 5: R Goal 6: R	n average of 10% of t esign. n average of 25% of t gn. FPG must consider in d risk reduction proje FPG must consider in d risk reduction proje educe the number of educe the number of	he new regional infrastructu he new regional infrastructu all projects and should inco cts between 2023 - 2033. all projects and should inco cts between 2033 - 2053. critical facilities in the 100-y critical facilities in the 100-y	are projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize are projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize f rporate nature-based practices and floodpla rporate nature-based practices and floodpla year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.	larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis arger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of in preservation in an average of 10% of their in preservation in an average of 25% of their

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 6,216	÷	# of structures	2,347	# of critical facilities 72
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding? Yes	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 2	216		Roadways impacted (miles)	50
# of low water crossings	42		# of historical road closures	42

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101a1 \$225,000	Vec	
Cost \$225,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources
0050		0.000





Title Bridge City Drainage Outfall Improvement Project

ID#	051000155	Spo	nsor	Orange County Drain	age District
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details				
Study type	Project Planning		County Orang	e
Study description	Improve and extend area.	three major drainage ditche	es and extend a neighborhood outfall to redu	ce structural flooding in residences within the
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 4
Goal(s) Goal 1: R new floo Goal 2: R new floo Goal 3: R Goal 4: R Goal 5: R otherwis	FPG must consider in d risk reduction project FPG must consider in d risk reduction project educe the number of educe the number of educe exposure of exi e providing flood prot	all projects and should inco tts between 2023 - 2033. all projects and should inco tts between 2033 - 2053. critical facilities in the 100-y critical facilities in the 100-y sting and future structures ection to 10% of structures.	rporate nature-based practices and floodplai rporate nature-based practices and floodplai year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. year flood risk inundation extents by 25%. in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents	n preservation in an average of 10% of their n preservation in an average of 25% of their by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

Goal 6: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 3,394		-	# of structures	1,889	#	of critical facilities 6	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	6			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	36	
# of low water crossings	1			# of historical	road closures	1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal
101al \$200,000	Voc	
Cost \$200,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





FME Area

Title Colonial Outfall Ditch Culvert Improvements

ID#	051000156	Sponsor	Orange County Drainage District				
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals			



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details								
Study type	Project Planning		County	Orange				
Study description	H&H Study to analyze most efficient alternatives to install new culverts along FM 1442 (Bridge City) at Colonial Outfall Ditch.							
FME to create new	H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1				
Goal(s) Goal 1: Re otherwise Goal 2: Re otherwise	educe exposure of exist e providing flood protec educe exposure of exist e providing flood protec	ing and future structures in tion to 10% of structures. ing and future structures in tion to 30% of structures.	the 100-year flood risk inundation ex	xtents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or xtents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or				

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 905			# of structures	5 188	#	t of critical facilities 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1			Roadways im	pacted (miles)	5
# of low water crossings	1			# of historical	road closures	1

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	¢200.000	Potential federal	Potential Federal
Cost	\$200,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources





Title City of Beaumont Drainage Studies

ID#	051000157	Sponsor	Beaumont (Municipality)			
Reco	ommended by	RFPG? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details									
Study type	Project Planni	ng				County Jefferson			
Study descriptio	<ul> <li>Drainage study to evaluate new storm water and sanitary sewer lines associated with localized flooding issues.</li> </ul>							uction of key areas in the city to re	educe
FME to create n	ew H&H model?	Yes E	Emergency Need?	Yes Anti	cipated models in	n near term?	Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 1	
Goal(s) Goal 1: of their	An average of 10 design.	)% of the n	ew regional infrast	ructure proje	cts between 2023	3 – 2033 will u	ıtilize la	rger storm events (>100-year) as t	he basis

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 0 #of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 588		# of structures	5 29	#	of critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)0# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal? No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	0	
	# of low water crossings	0		# of historical	road closures	0	

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

|--|





Regional view of FME area

151 of 157

Title North Taylor Regional Detention Basin

ID#	051000158	Spo	nsor	Jefferson County Drainage District 6				
Recc	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals			



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Study Details** Study type County Jefferson **Project Planning** Study description The project proposes a regional detention facility north of FM365 and west of South China Road in the upper portion of the North Fork of Taylors Bayou watershed. FME to create new H&H model? Yes Emergency Need? Yes Anticipated models in near term? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 62 Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design. Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,384		# of structures	5 1,085	#	of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5,114		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	71	
# of low water crossings	2		# of historica	road closures	2	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	EIE Grants, Local funds (ICDD6)
Cost \$75,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





FME Area

152 of 157

Title Mayhaw Bayou Regional Detention Basin

Study Dotails

ID#	051000159	Spoi	nsor	Jefferson County Drainage District 6			
Reco	ommended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Del	lans					
Study type	Project Plannir	ng		County Jefferson, Chambers		
Study descr	Idy description The project proposes conveyance improvements along Mayhaw Bayou and tributaries in the upper portion of the Mayhaw Bayou watershed (between IH10 and SH124) via widening and deepening of the existing channels.					
FME to crea	ate new H&H model?	Yes Emergency Need?	Yes Anticipated mod	lels in near term? Yes	Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)	16
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will util of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utiliz their design.</li> </ul>					arger storm events (>100-year Irger storm events (>100-year)	) as the basis as the basis of

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 510		# of structures 367			of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,373		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	23	
# of low water crossings	3		# of historical	road closures	3	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	EIE Grants Local funds (ICDD6)
Cost \$75,000	funding availability? Yes	Funding Sources	





153 of 157

Title South Taylor Regional Detention Basin

ID#	051000160	Spo	nsor	Jefferson County Drainage District 6			
Recc	mmended by	RFPG?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals		



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details					
Study type	Project Planning		Count	County Jefferson	
Study description	The project proposes Bayou.	a regional detention facility	west of Heizig Road in the watershe	eds of both the North and South Forks of Ta	ylors
FME to create new	v H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term	n? Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 72	h - h'-

Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal 4: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 5: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 1,502		# of structures 1,157		# of critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	5,455		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	87	
# of low water crossings	1		# of historical	road closures	1	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	FIF Grants, Local funds (JCDD6)
Cost \$75,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	, , , ,





FME Area

Title Calder Diversion Connections

 ID#
 051000161
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details	
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson
Study description	Evaluate sub-surface diversion primarily located along Calder Avenue that discharges into the Neches River.
FME to create nev	W H&H model? Yes       Emergency Need? Yes       Anticipated models in near term? Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 5
Goal(s) Goal 1: A of their o Goal 2: A their des Goal 3: R Goal 4: R	n average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis esign. n average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of ign. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%. educe the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local Flooding? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.) 0 Roadways impacted (miles) 0 Impacted (miles) 0   # of low water crossings 0 Impacted Closures 0 Impacted Closures 0	Population at risk 2,068		# of structures	5 17	# of critical facilities 1
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)0Roadways impacted (miles)0# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes		Coastal? No	Local Flooding? No	Other? Yes
# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	0		Roadways impacted	(miles) 0
	# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road c	losures 0

## **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	FIF Grants, Local funds (JCDD6)
Cost \$75,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





Title Needmore Diversion

ID# 051000162 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Complies with RFPG Goals Reason for Recommended by RFPG? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details							
Study type	Project Planning		County .	Jefferson			
Study descriptio	Evaluate a diversion channel from downstream of Lower Mayhaw Bayou to Needmore						
FME to create n	ew H&H model? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes	Anticipated models in near term?	Yes Drainage area (sq. mi., est.) 51			
<ul> <li>Goal (s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basis of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utiliz</li></ul>							
their de Goal 3:	their design. Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or						

otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures. Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Population at risk 632		# of structures 483			# of critical facilities 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local Flooding?	No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	1,635		Roadways im	pacted (miles)	34	
# of low water crossings	0	# of historical road closu		road closures	0	

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total	Potential federal	Potential Federal	FIF Grants, Local funds (JCDD6
Cost \$75,000	funding availability?	Funding Sources	





FME Area

Title Channel 100-A Concrete Repair

du Dataila

 ID#
 051000163
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 Recommended by RFPG?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Study Details						
Study type	Project Planning County Jefferson					
Study description	Conduct repairs and install improvements to Channel 100-A located within the city of Beaumont.					
FME to create nev	W H&H model?       Yes       Emergency Need?       Yes       Anticipated models in near term?       Yes       Drainage area (sq. mi., est.)       3					
<ul> <li>Goal(s) Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the bas of their design.</li> <li>Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (&gt;100-year) as the basi their design.</li> <li>Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.</li> <li>Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.</li> </ul>						

### **100-Year Flood Risk Summary**

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes Local Flooding? Yes Other? No   Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)   2 Roadways impacted (miles) 24   # of historical road closures   0 # of historical road closures 0	Population at risk 7,388		# of structures 1,622			of critical facilities 9
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)2Roadways impacted (miles)24# of low water crossings0# of historical road closures0	Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coa	oastal? Yes	Local Flooding?	Yes	Other? No
# of low water crossings 0 # of historical road closures 0	Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac.)	2		Roadways imp	acted (miles)	24
	# of low water crossings 0			# of historical road closures		0

### **Estimated Cost and Funding Availability**

Total<br/>CostPotential federal<br/>funding availability?Potential federal<br/>YesPotential Federal<br/>Funding SourcesFIF Grants, Local funds (JCDD6)



Houston Regional view of FME area

157 of 157

Title Bayou Din Detention Basin

ID# 053000001 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

Construct a new detention basin with nearby channel and crossing improvements in the vicinity of Bayou Din.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120402010100,120402010200	Emergency Need? Yes				
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 19				
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson				
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999				
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Population at risk 1,297 # of structures	534	4 Critical facilities 21			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1,048	Roadway(s) impacted (length)	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 15			
Number of low water crossings 5	Historical road closures 5				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr 286	# of structures removed fro	m 100-yr	101		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 4	Farm/Ranch land removed	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 45			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 0	Low water crossings remove	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0			
Other benefits Annual ecosystem services benefits of \$20,673,627.	Reduction in # of road closu	ires over 10 years	-		
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No Negative impacts description	n -				
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution d	lescription -				

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$85,000,000

Recurring costs \$6,144,283

% Nature-Based - BCR 5 USACE coordination may be required due to presence of wetlands. Survey may be required to avoid existing utility conflicts from nearby residential and industrial properties.





1 of 26

Title	Title Bessie Heights Drainage Ditch Extension Project				N	ECHES	
ID# RFPG r	053000002 ecommend? Yes	Sponsor	Orange Cour	nty Drainage Distri Reason for Recommendation	ct Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals	REGIO	NAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
<b>Proje</b> Expand	<b>ct Description</b> I the Bessie Height	s Drainage	e Ditch to add	ress flooding risk t	o residential properties in th	ne area.	



**REGION 5** 

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Flood risk type: Ri	iverine?	Yes	Coastal?	ſes	Local? Yes	5	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 207	,		# of	structures 13	39		Critical facilities 0	
Farm/Ranch land impa	acted (acre	es) 6			Roadway(s) im	pacted (length)	3	
Number of low water	crossings	0			Historical road	closures 0		

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 100-yr Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		10	# of structures removed from 100-yr	8	
		0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	0	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		0	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0	
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution descript	ion -		

% Nature-Based -

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$4,250,000

Recurring costs \$307,214

Project is located in a concentrated area of residential buildings. Coordination Issues is likely required with the city and local residents for construction operations.

BCR 0





Title	Port Arthur and Vicinity Coastal Storm Risk Management Project

 ID#
 053000004
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 7

 RFPG recommend? Yes
 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Recommendation Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals
 Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

Construct levees, floodwalls, pump stations, drainage structures, and other flood mitigation infrastructure to reduce adverse flood impact in the vicinity of the city of Port Arthur.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 12020003	0407,120402010300	Emergency Need? Yes			
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 66				
Associated FME's 999999		County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 9999999		Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No	
Population at risk 49,671	# of structures 2	3,310	Critical facilitie	s 1,201	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 97		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	327		
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures 3			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	8,315	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	3,275	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	71	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres	) 12	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	32	Low water crossings remov	ed from 100-yr	0	
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closu	ures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution des	scription -			

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$863,000,000

Recurring costs \$40,841,408

% Nature-Based - BCR 5 There are industrial facilities and residential properties near the project; Issues project may change in design to avoid right-of-way infringements and existing utility conflicts.





3 of 26

riood willgation riojec						
Title Orange County Coastal Storm Risk Manager	ment Project	N	EL	HES		
ID# 053000005 Sponsor Orange County RFPG recommend? Yes Re	y Drainage District eason for Project ecommendation compli	in area of ency need and as with RERG Goals	NAL FLOOD P	LANNING GROUP		
	Comple					
Project Description						
Construct levees, floodwalls, pump stations, draina	ge structures, and other	flood mitigation infrastructure	e to reduce adverse	e flood impact in Orange County.		
Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200030407,120100	0051005,12010005100	Emergency Need? Yes				
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 14				
Associated FME's 999999		County Orange				
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999				
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk						
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Co	oastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No		
Population at risk 6,708	# of structures 3,87	872 Critical facilities 49		s 49		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 43	R	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 61				
Number of low water crossings 1	Н	istorical road closures 1				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr 357		# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	201		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 2				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 2		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0				
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closu	ures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No Negative	e impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No Water su	Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution description -					

**REGION 5** 

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$119,900,000

Recurring costs \$173,485,632

% Nature-Based - BCR 1 There are industrial facilities and residential properties near the project; Issues project may change in design to avoid right-of-way infringements and existing utility conflicts.





4 of 26

Title	Black Fork Creek	Improvem	ent Project		
ID#	053000006	Sponsor	Tyler (Muni	cipality)	
RFPG re	commend? Yes			Reason for Recommendation	Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

Construct a detention pond and install a diversion to be placed near the decommissioned Hogg Middle School within the city of Tyler.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200010105		Emergency Need? Yes				
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 0					
Associated FME's 999999		County Smith	County Smith			
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999				
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk						
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Population at risk 540	# of structures 1	.77	Critical facilities	5 6		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	5			
Number of low water crossings 4		Historical road closures 4				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr 29		# of structures removed fro	m 100-yr	12		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	0		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 0	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0					
Other benefits Detention Pond will be des	signed for dual-use.	Reduction in # of road closu	ires over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No N	egative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No W	ater supply contribution de	scription -				
Ectimated Coct						

Estimated Cost

**Project Cost** \$22,234,300

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based -BCR 0 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





5 of 26

Title	Sandy Creek Imp	provement	Project		
ID# RFPG re	053000007 commend? Yes	Sponsor	Jasper (Mur	nicipality) Reason for Recommendation	Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals
				and the second	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project includes two new detention basins located along Sandy Creek to mitigate flooding historically experienced by the City of Jasper.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200030	0205,120200030301,1202000508	<sup>0</sup> Emergency Need? Yes		
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 8		
Associated FME's 999999		County Jasper		
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 2,199	# of structures 2	79	Critical facilities	s 10
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	13	
Number of low water crossings 2		Historical road closures 2		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	160	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	16
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	) 0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	0	Low water crossings remov	ed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-
Impacts				

Impacts			
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description	

% Nature-Based -

### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$224,924,330

Recurring costs \$12,000

The project area is located in a "flood valley" where there are significant Issues elevation changes as you move closer to the more developed parts of the city. Substantial improvements will have to be implemented to affect any

BCR 0





6 of 26

Title Sour Lake Channel Improvements	NE	CHES
ID# 053000008 Sponsor Hardin (County)		
RFPG recommend? Yes Reason for Recommendati	Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals	FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Project Description		
The project proposes a new diversion channel through Sour Lake	providing a path for runoff from the West to th	ne East.
Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200070104,120200070105,1202	0007011 Emergency Need? Yes	
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 45	
Associated FME's 999999	County Hardin, Jefferson, Liberty	
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999	
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes	Local? Ves Plava?	Y No Other? No
Population at risk 2 565 # of struct	ures 1.106 Crit	tical facilities 23
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 2,306	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 30	
Number of low water crossings 3	Historical road closures 3	
100-Vear Flood Risk Reduction		
Population removed from 100-yr 515	# of structures removed from 100-	-vr 50
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 1	Earm/Ranch land removed from 10	00-vr (acres) 6
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 2	Low water crossings removed from	n 100-vr 0
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road closures over	er 10 years -
Impacts		
Negative impacts? No Negative impacts desc	iption -	
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contributions	ion description -	
Estimated Cost		
Project Cost \$63,303,926	% Nature-Based - BCR (	)
Recurring costs \$12,000	N/A Issues	

**REGION 5** 





7 of 26

Title Rosedale Improvement System

ID# 053000009 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes widening and deepening of existing channels upstream of the LNVA canal, a diversion channel to the Neches River, and detention basins, near the Rosedale Acres community.

Watershed HUC# (if known	) 120200070205,120200070302,12020007030	Emergency Need? Yes
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 13
Associated FME's 999999		County Hardin, Jefferson
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999

Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes		Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 3	,022		# o	f structures 1	,697		Critical facilities 6	
Farm/Ranch land im	npacted (acr	es) 398			Road	dway(s) impacted (length)	29	
Number of low wat	er crossings	1			Histo	orical road closures 1		

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 10	0-yr	421	# of structures removed from 100-yr	194
Critical facilities removed from	m 100-yr	4	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	21
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	3	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
111104665				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution descrip	ption -	

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$308,620,428

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 Project is located next to a concentration of existing development and is adjacent to a major highway. Coordination will likely be required with multiple agencies for construction operations.





8 of 26

Title Nome Conveyance Improvements

ID# 053000010 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes an improvement system consisting of channelization along Cotton Creek and an off-line detention basin to mitigate impacts.

Watershed HUC# (if known)	120200070	0110,120200070201,120402010	10 Emergency Need? Yes		
			Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 10		
Associated FME's 999999			County Jefferson,Liberty		
Associated FMS's 9999999			Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year Flood F	Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine	? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 248		# of structures	277	Critical facilitie	s 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (	acres) 1,39	99	Roadway(s) impacted (length)	12	
Number of low water crossir	ngs O		Historical road closures 0		
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	uction				
Population removed from 10	00-yr	11	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	11
Critical facilities removed fro	m 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres	) 3
Road removed from 100-yr (	miles)	1	Low water crossings remov	ved from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-
Impacts					
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		
Estimated Cost					
Project Cost \$163,293,62	.3		% Nature-Based -	BCR 0	

Issues

Recurring costs \$12,000





9 of 26

Title Pevitot Gully Improvement System

ID# 053000011 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes an improvement system consisting of offline detention basins and channelization along Pevitot Gully.

Watershed HUC# (i	f known) 12	0402010200		Emergency Need?	Yes				
				Drainage area (mi²	est.) 11				
Associated FME's	99999			County Jefferson					
Associated FMS's 9	99999			Associated FMP's	999999				
Existing 100-Yea	r Flood Ris	sk							
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes		Playa? No		Other? No	
Demolation of state	4 650		# of structures 207	,		Critical facili	tios 1		

Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 935       Roadway(s) impacted (length)       15	Population at risk 1,652	# of sti	uctures 287	Critical facili	ties 1
	Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	935	Roadway(s) impa	icted (length) 15	
Number of low water crossings     0     Historical road closures 0	Number of low water crossings	0	Historical road cl	osures 0	

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed fr	om 100-yr	245	# of structures removed from 100-yr	27
Critical facilities remov	ed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	13
Road removed from 10	00-yr (miles)	4	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	
itegative impuets.	NU	regative impacts description		

Water supply contribution description -

Water supply contributions? No

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$319,970,815

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 Project is located next to a concentration of existing development and is adjacent to a major highway. Coordination will likely be required with multiple agencies for construction operations.





10 of 26

Title	Willow Marsh Bayou Phelan Blvd Detention

 
 ID#
 053000012
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 RFPG recommend? Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Project in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project proposes an improvement system consisting of in-line detention basins and channelization along Willow Marsh from Phenlan Blvd to Highway 90.

Watershed HUC# (if known)	120402010100,120	402010200	Emergency Need? Yes Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 4			
Associated FME's 999999			County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999			Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year Flood	Risk					
Flood risk type: Riverine	? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	
		# of structures 2	70	Critical facilitie	0	

Population at risk 417	# of structures	378	Critical facilities 8
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	231	Roadway(s) impacted (length)	6
Number of low water crossings	0	Historical road closures 0	

### 100-Year Flood Risk Reduction

Population removed from 100-yr	35	# of structures removed from 100-yr	14
Critical facilities removed from 100-ye	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	5
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	1	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts			
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-	

regative impacts.	NO	Negative impacts description		
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description		

### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$203,869,200

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 Project is located in a concentrated area of residential buildings. Coordination Issues is likely required with the city and local residents for construction operations.





11 of 26

Title	Willow Marsh Main Improvement System
Title	Willow Marsh Main Improvement System

ID# 053000013 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for **RFPG recommend? Yes** emergency need and Recommendation complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes an improvement system consisting of off-line detention basins and channelization along Willow Marsh from Highway 90 to South Major Dr.

Watershed HUC# (if	known)	120402010100,120402010200,12040201030	Emergency Need?	Yes
			Drainage area (mi	<sup>2</sup> est.) 98
Associated FME's 99	99999		County Jefferson	
Associated FMS's 99	99999		Associated FMP's	999999

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes		Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 7	,544		# o	f structures	3,853		Critical facilities 35	
Farm/Ranch land im	pacted (acr	es) 5,564			Roa	dway(s) impacted (length)	85	
Number of low wat	er crossings	0			Hist	orical road closures 0		

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 100-yr Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		239	# of structures removed from 100-yr	102
		0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	8
Road removed from 100-yr (	miles)	8	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution descrip	ption -	

Water supply contributions? No

### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$1,136,334,277

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based -BCR 0 Project is located next to a concentration of existing development and is Issues adjacent to a major highway. Coordination will likely be required with multiple agencies for construction operations.





12 of 26

Title Willow Marsh Downstream

ID# 053000014 RFPG recommend? Yes

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project proposes an improvement system consisting of off-line detention basins and channelization along Willow Marsh from South Major Dr to Hillebrandt Bayou.

Emergency Need? Yes
Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 9
County Jefferson
Associated FMP's 999999

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes		Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 2,	.390		# c	f structures	506		Critical facilities 4	
Farm/Ranch land im	pacted (acr	es) 163			Road	dway(s) impacted (length)	19	
Number of low wate	er crossings	0			Hist	orical road closures 0		

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 100-yr	96	# of structures removed from 100-yr	25
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	2
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	4	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts			
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-	

Water supply contribution description -

## Water supply contributions? No

## Estimated Cost

Project Cost \$118,142,723

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 Project is located next to a concentration of existing development and is adjacent to a major highway. Coordination will likely be required with multiple agencies for construction operations.





13 of 26

Title	Tyrrell Park Improvements			
ID#	053000015	Sponsor	Jefferson	

RFPG recommend? Yes

County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproduct and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes a new channel alignment across Tyrrell Park to an existing channel that outfalls into Hillebrandt Bayou; to gain the full benefits the project should be accompanied by improvements of roadside ditches in adjacent neighborhoods.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120402010200	Emergency Need? Yes
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 2
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes Playa? No Other? No
Population at risk 576 # of structures	s 503 Critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 17	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 7
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures 0
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	
Population removed from 100-yr 82	# of structures removed from 100-yr 18
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 1	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years _
Impacts Negative impacts?	on -
	description
water supply contributions? No water supply contribution	description -
Estimated Cost	
Project Cost \$25,095,036	% Nature-Based - BCR 0
Recurring costs \$12,000	





14 of 26

Green Pond Flow Diversion Title

ID# 053000016 **RFPG recommend? Yes** 

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for Recommendation emergency need and



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project proposes a diversion of storm runoff into the Green Pond detention facility via construction of a berm and spillway across Channel 505-B east of the Green Pond facility. Channel improvements are also included.

complies with RFPG Goals

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120402010100	Emergency Need? Yes	Emergency Need? Yes		
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 4			
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Co	oastal? Yes Local? Yes I	Playa? No Other? No		
Population at risk 362	# of structures 263	Critical facilities 0		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 90	Roadway(s) impacted (length)	7		
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures 0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr 64	# of structures removed fron	n 100-yr 43		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0	Farm/Ranch land removed fr	rom 100-yr (acres) 27		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 3	Low water crossings remove	d from 100-yr 0		
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road closur	es over 10 years -		
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No Negative	impacts description -			
Water supply contributions? No Water su	upply contribution description -			

% Nature-Based -

**Estimated Cost** 

Project Cost \$7,779,088

Recurring costs \$12,000

Project is located next to a concentration of residential buildings. Coordination Issues is likely required with local residents for construction operations.

BCR 0





Title Lucas/Delaware Diversion

ID# 053000017 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Project in area of Recommendation emergency need and

ommendation emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project includes storm sewer improvements that divert flow away from DD6 channels 100 and 122 to be redirected to instead flow to channel 010 near Charles Street before ultimately discharging into the Neches River.

	Drainage area (mi2 est ) 9	
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson	
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 9999999	
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk		

Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 1	4,543		# of structures	5,231	Critical facilities 27	
Farm/Ranch land in	npacted (acr	es) 2		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	84	
Number of low wat	er crossings	0		Historical road closures 0		

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 10	0-yr	2,845	# of structures removed from 100-yr	595
Critical facilities removed from	m 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	0
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	5	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	

Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution description

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$130,286,230

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





Title South Park Diversion

ID# 053000018 RFPG recommend? Yes Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project includes storm sewer improvements that divert flow away from DD6 channels 104 and 104-B to be redirected to the Neches River.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200030	Emergency Need? Yes			
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 2	Drainage area (mi² est.) 2		
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 4,303 # of structures 1		1,367	367 Critical facilities 16	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	21	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures 0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	1,225	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	373
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres	i) 0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 4		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0		0
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-	
Impacts Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		

Water supply contribution description -

Water supply contributions? No

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$99,908,750

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 0 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





FMP area

**Tevis Diversion** Title

ID# 053000019 **RFPG recommend? Yes**  Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for emergency need and Recommendation complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

This project includes storm sewer improvements that divert flow away from DD6 channel 115 to be redirected to the Neches River.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200030	0405,120200030406,12040201020	<sup>0</sup> Emergency Need? Yes		
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 1		
Associated FME's 999999		County Jefferson		
Associated FMS's 9999999		Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 6,744	# of structures 7:	12	Critical facilitie	<sup>25</sup> 15
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	18	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures 0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	1,986	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	394
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	7	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres	i) 0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	5	Low water crossings remov	ed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road close	ures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution des	cription -		

Water supply contributions? No

**Estimated Cost** 

Project Cost \$97,327,200

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based -BCR 0 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





Title	Blanchette Diversion

ID# 053000020 RFPG recommend? Yes

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Recomplies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project proposes storm sewer improvements that divert flow away from existing channels to be redirected to the Neches River at a proposed outfall location near Blanchette Street.

Watershed HUC# (if known)	120200030406,120402010200	Emergency Need? Yes
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 2
Associated FME's 999999		County Jefferson
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 999999

Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 3,737		# of structures 1	.,548	Critical facilities 6	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acr	es) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	38	
Number of low water crossings	0		Historical road closures 0		

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from '	00-vr	2 005	# of structures removed from 100-vr	550
	100 yi	2,005		220
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres	0
Road removed from 100-yr	(miles)	11	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	

Water supply contribution description -

Water supply contributions? No

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$99,173,000

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 1 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





19 of 26

**Tyrrell Park Detention** Title

ID# 053000021 **RFPG recommend? Yes**  Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for Recommendation emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project consists of installing eight new detention basins to increase capacity to existing storm sewer and provide storage during extreme rainfall events.

Watershed HUC# (if known)		120402010200		Emergency Need? Yes		
				Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 10	)	
Associated FME's 999999			County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999				Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year F	lood Ris	k				
Flood risk type: R	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No

Flood fisk type:	Riveriner	res	Coastal	Yes		Local: Yes		Playar No	D	Other No	
Population at risk 3	331		# c	of structures 2	283			Critica	l facilities 0		
Farm/Ranch land in	npacted (acr	es) 77			Road	way(s) impacted	(length)	6			
Number of low wat	er crossings	0			Histo	orical road closure	s 0				

### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 100-yr Critical facilities removed from 100-yr Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		331	# of structures removed from 100-yr	231
		0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	1
		4	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-	
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution descri	ption -	

Water supply contributions? No

### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$187,974,220

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based -BCR 0 The project area is located near a major highway that services traffic coming Issues both in and out of the city of Beaumont. Coordination with TxDoT to prevent conflicts may be necessary.





20 of 26

Title	Virginia Street De	tention		
ID#	053000022	Sponsor	Jefferso	

RFPG recommend? Yes

n County Drainage District 6 Reason for Project in area of Recommendation complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Project Description**

The project consists of storm sewer improvements and the construction of new detention ponds to provide increased capacity to the existing storm sewer system. Improvements primarily located at the southern edge of Beaumont near US-287 N.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120402010200	Emergency Need? Yes			
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 1			
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes Playa? No Other? No			
Population at risk 1,138 # of structure	es 376 Critical facilities 0			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 2	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 10			
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures 0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr 689	# of structures removed from 100-yr 199			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 0			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 3	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0			
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -			
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No Negative impacts descript	tion -			
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution	n description -			
Estimated Cost				
Project Cost \$9,751,456	% Nature-Based - BCR 3			
Recurring costs \$9,000	N/A Issues			




Title Delaware Hilcorp Detention Diversion

ID# 053000023 Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 REPG recommend? Yes Reason for Proju

Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

Construct two detention ponds near Delaware Street that outfall to DD6 Ditch 121 and Hillebrandt Bayou. Ponds to be accompanied by storm sewer improvements to aid in redirecting flow.

Watershed HUC# (if I	known) 120	0402010200		Emergency Need? Yes			
			Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 2				
Associated FME's 99	9999			County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 99	9999			Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year	Flood Ris	k					
0							
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	

/1				,	
Population at risk 3,729		# of structures 1,	496	Critical facilities 7	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	27	
Number of low water crossings	0		Historical road closures 0		
100 Voor Flood Bick Boduct	ion				

100-Year Flood Risk Reduction			
Population removed from 100-yr	681 #	of structures removed from 100-yr	229
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0 Fa	arm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	) 0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	0 L	ow water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A	R	eduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts			
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-	
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution descriptio	n -	

**Estimated Cost** 

Project Cost \$13,181,257

Recurring costs \$12,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 4 There is a high density of development near the project location. Issues Transportation to project site could be hampered and work may have to be done surveying land to prevent negatively impacting existing utilities.





22 of 26

**Borley Heights Relief Project** Title

ID# 053000024 **RFPG recommend? Yes** 

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for Recommendation emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals

**REGION 5** NECHES

## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project consists of constructing three new crossings under the LNVA Canal, a diversion ditch on the west side of the canal, concrete-lined receiving ditches along the canal, and improvements to the existing Ditch 1002-B.

Natershed HUC# (if known) 120200070205			Emergency Need? Yes			
				Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 0		
Associated FME's	999999			County Jefferson		
Associated FMS's	999999			Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Ye	ar Flood Ris	sk				
0						
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No

Population at risk 296	# of structures 172	Critical facilities 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 6	Roadway(s) impacted (length)	1
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures 0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction		

Population removed from 100-yr	277	# of structures removed from 100-yr	157
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres	) 4
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	1	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-
Impacts			
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-	
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution descrip	otion -	

% Nature-Based -

#### **Estimated Cost**

**Project Cost** \$4,577,210

Recurring costs \$6,000

BCR 2 Project is located next to a concentration of residential buildings. Coordination Issues is likely required with local residents for construction operations.





23 of 26

Title East China Relief Project

ID# 053000025 RFPG recommend? Yes

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project consists of constructing new linear detention upstream of the LNVA Canal, a concrete block-lined channel downstream of the canal crossing, and an adequate structure at Turner Road.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120402010100	Emergency Need? Yes			
	Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 4			
Associated FME's 999999	County Jefferson			
Associated FMS's 999999	Associated FMP's 999999			
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes Playa? No Other? No			
Population at risk 352 # of structure	res 374 Critical facilities 0			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 374	Roadway(s) impacted (length) 7			
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures 0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr 21	# of structures removed from 100-yr 22			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 17			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) 0	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0			
Other benefits N/A	Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -			
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No Negative impacts descrip	otion -			
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution	on description -			
Estimated Cost				
Project Cost \$2,853,160	% Nature-Based - BCR 2			
Recurring costs \$10,000	N/A Issues			





South Nome Relief Ditch Title

ID# 053000026 **RFPG recommend? Yes**  Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Project in area of Reason for Recommendation emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project consists of constructing storm sewer improvements and a detention basin to prevent stormwater runoff from backing up into Nome.

Watershed HUC# (if known) 120200070	0201,120402010100	Emergency Need? Yes			
		Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.)	) 6		
Associated FME's 999999		County Jefferson,Libert	ty		
Associated FMS's 999999		Associated FMP's 9999	99		
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	
Population at risk 146	# of structures	91	Critical faciliti	es 0	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1,18	33	Roadway(s) impacted (ler	ngth) 5		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures 0	)		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	96	# of structures remov	ved from 100-yr	22	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land ren	noved from 100-yr (acre	s) 9	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	1	Low water crossings	removed from 100-yr	0	
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of roa	d closures over 10 years	; -	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	n -			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution d	lescription -			
Estimated Cost					
Project Cost \$2,286,770		% Nature-Based -	BCR 1		
Recurring costs \$6,000		N/A Issues			

Recurring costs \$6,000





25 of 26

Title Ditch 505 Detention

ID# 053000027 RFPG recommend? Yes

Sponsor Jefferson County Drainage District 6 Reason for Recommendation Recommendation Reproject in area of emergency need and complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Project Description**

The project consists of constructing a detention pond near the intersection of IH-10 and Hwy 365 to the southwest of Beaumont.

Watershed HUC# (if known)	120402010100		Emergency Need? Yes		
			Drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> est.) 3		
Associated FME's 9999999			County Jefferson		
Associated FMS's 999999			Associated FMP's 999999		
Existing 100-Year Flood	Risk				
Flood risk type: Riverir	e? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No
Population at risk 272		# of structures 2	22	Critical facilit	ties 0
Farm/Ranch land impacted	(acres) 26		Roadway(s) impacted (length)	6	
Number of low water crossings 0			Historical road closures 0		

#### **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction**

Population removed from 100-yr	3	# of structures removed from 100-yr	2
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	0	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	0
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	0	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	0
Other benefits N/A		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	0
Impacts			
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-	

Water supply contribution description -

Water supply contributions? No

#### **Estimated Cost**

Project Cost \$13,803,086

Recurring costs \$23,000

% Nature-Based - BCR 1 Project is located next to a concentration of existing development and is adjacent to a major highway. Coordination will likely be required with multiple agencies for construction operations.





26 of 26

Title	Anderson Co	ounty Flood	Education Pro	gram			E
ID#	052000001	Sponsor	Anderson (Co	unty)			
RFPG r	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	als REGIO	)NAL FL



## OOD PLANNING GROUP

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Education and Outreach	County	Anderson	
Strateg	y description	Educate homeowners to increase awareness about the hazard of flooding reduce risk.	g and to inform residents	of mitigation actions to	
Goal(s)	Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Dal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.				

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 73		# o	f structures	69		Critical f	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 348			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	22			
Number of low water crossings	2			Historical roa	d closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-	yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Rar	nch land removed	l from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	iles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	-yr -		
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$50,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area

1 of 147

Anderson County Natural Hazards Education Program Development Title

ID# 052000002 Sponsor Anderson (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Anderson
Strategy description	Develop, enhance and implement education programs to increase awarene mitigation actions to reduce risk to citizens, public infrastructure, private prop	ess of natural hazards ar perty owners, businesses	nd to inform residents of and schools.
Cool 1: 100% of cour	ation to perform public education and awareness compaigns to better inform t	he public of flood related	ricks on an annual

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 73		# of structures	69		Critical f	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 348		Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	22			
Number of low water crossing	gs 2		Historical roa	d closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction							
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-	# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-	Farm/Rar	nch land removed	l from 100-yr	· (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (m	niles)	-	Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	)-yr -		
Other benefits _			Reduction	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts								
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution de	scription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$50,000	Amount of available fu	unding -			% Nature-Based 0	
	Palêstine	The second secon		Dallas	R C	LOUISI	ANA
	5		,	Austin	Houston	25	
		FMS area 2	of 147		Regional view of	FMS area	

2 of 147

Title	City of Frankstor	n Flood Education F	Program	NECHES
ID#	05200003 S	Sponsor Frankston	(Municipality)	
RFPG r	ecommend? Yes	;	Reason for Recommendation	REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Strat	egy Details			
Strate	egy type	Education a	nd Outreach	County Anderson

Strategy description The City will provide public education on the dangers of flash flooding, and to inform residents of mitigation actions to reduce risk to citizens, public infrastructure, private property owners, businesses and schools.

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr -			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -				
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years -			
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -				
Estimated Cost						
Stratagy Cost	Amount of availab	alo funding				



Angelina County Public Education on Mitigation Techniques Title

ID# 052000004 Sponsor Angelina (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details** Strategy type **Education and Outreach** County Angelina Strategy description Publish educational materials to inform the public in methods of mitigating private property against natural hazard damage. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8,420	# of structures	1,201	Critical facilities	11
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes C	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 165		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	66	
Number of low water crossings 19		Historical road closures	19	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remov	red from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road close	ures over 10 years	
Impacts				

Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description	

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$10,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Lufkin LOUISIANA Rese Austin Houston

FMS area

4 of 147

Title Chambers County Public Education on Mitigation Techniques

ID# 052000005 Sponsor Chambers (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Education and Outreach	County	Chambers			
Strategy description		mplement an outreach and education campaign to educate the public on mitigation techniques for all hazards to reduce loss of life and property.					
	Goal 1: 100% of cour basis.	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	he public of flood-related	risks on an annual			

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 1,431	# of structures	1,175	Critical facilities	; 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 36,933		Roadway(s) impacted (mile	es) 162	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures remove	ed from 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land remo	oved from 100-yr (acres)	) -
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings re	moved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road	closures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No Neg	ative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No Wa	er supply contribution de	-		

#### **Estimated Cost**

\$50,000

Strategy Cost

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

Title	City of Gallatin "Turn Around Don't Drown" Campaign

 
 ID#
 052000006
 Sponsor
 Gallatin (Municipality)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Strategy Department Strategy type Education and Outreach Strategy description County Promote the "Turn Around Don't Drown" campaign in partnership with DPS. Strategy description Soal 1: 100% of curtegy type to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related tisks on an annual basis. Goal (2: Maintain 1) participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related tisks on an annual basis.

Complies with RFPG Goals

risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0	# of structures	2	Critical facilitie	es 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Ot	ther?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 60		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fi	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres	5) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				

#### **Estimated Cost**



City of Jacksonville Public Education on Mitigation Actions Title

ID#	052000007	Sponsor	Jacksonville (Municipality)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Develop and implement public education program to educate the public or posting updated pertinent weather information on City social media during v	mitigation actions to rec veather events.	luce their risk, along with
Goal 1: 100% of cour	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	the public of flood-related	risks on an annual

basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 606		# of structures	192		Critical f	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	es Coa	istal? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	5) 4		Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	4			
Number of low water crossings	7		Historical roa	d closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on							
Population removed from 100-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 10	00-yr _		Farm/Rai	nch land removed	l from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles	5) _		Low wate	er crossings remov	ved from 100	-yr -		
Other benefits _			Reductio	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No	Negative	impacts descriptio	n -					
Water supply contributions? No	Water su	oply contribution c	lescription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**



7 of 147

Recommendation

Title	City of Rusk "	Turn Arour	nd Don't Drown" Campaign	
ID#	052000008	Sponsor	Rusk (Municipality)	
			Reason for	



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Strategy Details Strategy type Education and Outreach Strategy description County Promote the "Turn Around Don't Drown" campaign in partnership with DPS. Goal 1: 100% of curtes to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of related risks on an annual basis. Goal 2: Maintain 1: V participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

Complies with RFPG Goals

risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

RFPG recommend? Yes

Population at risk 462	# of structures	41	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2	
Number of low water crossings (		Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-	/r _	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$10,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

8 of 147

FMS area

Title	Henderson County Emergency Training Program									
ID#	052000009	Sponsor	Henderso	n (County)						
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	als				
Strategy Details										



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Henderson
Strategy description	Increase training opportunities for citizens to encourage their involvement in r	nitigation efforts.	
	······································		
Goal 1: 100% of cour	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform th	ne public of flood-related	risks on an annual
basis.	·····	- <b>F</b>	

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Title

Population at risk 267		# c	of structures	240		Critical	facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 348			Roadway(s)	impacted (miles)	20				
Number of low water crossing	gs 1			Historical ro	ad closures	1				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction									
Population removed from 100	D-yr	-		# of stru	ctures removed	from 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land remove	ed from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low wat	er crossings rem	oved from 10	0-yr -			
Other benefits				Reductio	on in # of road clo	osures over 1	0 years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$50,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Athens Austin

FMS area

9 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title City of Berryville Public Education on Mitigation Techniques

ID# 052000010 Sponsor Berryville (Municipality) RFPG recommend? Yes Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

County

Henderson

# Strategy Details Strategy type Education and Outreach

Strategy description Provide materials and data sources to educate citizens of all potential hazards in the planning area and methods to mitigate hazards and increase awareness.

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Complies with RFPG Goals

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilities	5 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$3,000

Amount of available funding





City of Brownsboro Flood Mitigation Education for City Officials and Citizens Title

Sponsor Brownsboro (Municipality)

Reason for

Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

052000011

RFPG recommend? Yes

ID#

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Henderson
Strategy description	Seek FEMA and State training in flood mitigation to assist with NFIP and e Flood Insurance Program assistance to citizens	ncourage awareness of f	lood hazard and National
Goal 1: 100% of cour basis.	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	the public of flood-related	risks on an annual

Complies with RFPG Goals

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 52			# of structures	32		Critical	facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coast	al? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	acres) 8			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	1				
Number of low water crossin	gs O			Historical roa	d closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	uction									
Population removed from 10	0-yr	-		# of struc	# of structures removed from 100-yr			-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (	miles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	0-yr -	-		
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 1	0 years	-		
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative im	pacts descriptio	n -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supp	y contribution d	escription -						

#### Estimated Cost

Strategy Cost

\$5,000

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

11 of 147

Title City of Brownsboro Public Education on Mitigation Techniques

ID#	052000012	Sponsor	Brownsboro (Municipality)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### Strategy Details

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Henderson
Strategy description	Provide materials and data sources to educate citizens of all potential hazar hazards and increase awareness.	ords in the planning area	and methods to mitigate
Goal 1: 100% of cou	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	he public of flood-related	risks on an annual

basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 52		# of stru	ctures	32		Critical fa	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	/es	Coastal? No		Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	s) 8			Roadway(s) im	pacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossings	0			Historical roac	l closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on								
Population removed from 100-yr	-			# of struct	ures removed fro	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles	s) _			Low water	r crossings remov	ed from 100	-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	Negat	ve impacts des	cription	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water	supply contrib	ution deso	cription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$5,000

Amount of available funding -







City of Chandler Citizen/Business/City Mitigation Strategy Planning Title

ID# 052000013 Sponsor Chandler (Municipality) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Henderson
Strategy description	Encourage the development of public and private partnership with busine groups to work together on mitigation	esses, service organizatio	ns and other community
Goal 1: 100% of cour basis.	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	he public of flood-related	l risks on an annual

Complies with RFPG Goals

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 105	# of structures	s 29	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Ye	coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	7	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1	
Number of low water crossings	0	Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reductio	n			
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100	)-yr _	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remov	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	on -		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution	description -		

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$10,000

Amount of available funding

Chandler

FMS area



13 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

% Nature-Based 0

Title City of Chandler Public Education on Code Red Syste	em
---	----

ID# 052000014 Sponsor Chandler (Municipality) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Education and Outreach	County	Henderson
Strategy	y description	Provide public training and education materials about the Code Red systen notifications	em and how to register	for the warning system
Goal(s)	Goal 1: 100% of cour basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100 risks on an annual ba	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the participation of counties performing public education and awareness campa	he public of flood-related aigns to better inform the	risks on an annual public of flood-related

Complies with RFPG Goals

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 105	# of structures	29	Critical facilities	6 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 7		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$10,000

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

14 of 147

Houston County Property Elevation and Public Education on NFIP Title

ID# 052000015 Sponsor Houston (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details** Strategy type **Education and Outreach** County Houston Strategy description Conduct program to educate residents on NFIP/availability of flood insurance and elevating new construction in and outside of mapped floodplain areas. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 16		# of stru	ictures 1	.7		Critical fa	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? No		Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 117		F	Roadway(s) im	pacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossings	7		ŀ	Historical road	l closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduct	ion								
Population removed from 100-y	r -			# of struct	ures removed fro	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 1	LOO-yr _		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acre				(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mile	es) _			Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reduction	in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	o Neg	ative impacts des	scription	-					
Water supply contributions? N	o Wat	er supply contrib	ution descu	rintion -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$10,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin

15 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Houston County Public Education Program on Emergency Evacuation Title

ID# 052000016 Sponsor Houston (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details** Strategy type **Education and Outreach** County Houston Strategy description Conduct public education program and advertise Houston County Emergency Evacuation Plan, such as escape routes in coordination with TxDOT. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 16	# of structures	17	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 11	7	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	20	
Number of low water crossings 7		Historical road closures	7	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$22,200

Amount of available funding





Title	City of Kennar				
ID#	052000017	Sponsor	Houston (County)		

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Strategy description		Education and Outreach	County	Houston			
		nduct public awareness program and distribute NFIP education information to citizens including availability of flood surance.					
Goal(s)	Goal 1: 100% of cou basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100 risks on an annual b	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform to participation of counties performing public education and awareness campasis.	the public of flood-related paigns to better inform the	l risks on an annual e public of flood-related			

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 16		# of	fstructures	17		Critical fa	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	/es	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	s) 117			Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossings	7			Historical road	d closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on								
Population removed from 100-yr	-			# of struct	tures removed fro	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 10	00-yr _			Farm/Ran	ch land removed	from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles	s) _			Low wate	r crossings remov	ed from 100	-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	N	egative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	W	ater supply co	ntribution de	scription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

\$10,000 Amount of available funding Strategy Cost % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin

17 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	JCDD6 Public E	ducation Material	Distribution		NECHES				
ID#	052000018	Sponsor Jefferson	County Drainage Distri	ict 6	-				
RFPG re	ecommend? Ye	25	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	NAL FLOOD PLANN	NING GROUP		
Strat	egy Details								
Strate	egy type	Education	and Outreach			County	Jefferson		

Strategy description Develop distribution centers in local libraries, DD6 facilities, DD6 website and other public buildings where information and safety guidance on natural and manmade hazards as well as ways to mitigate hazards can be provided to citizens

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 20,772			# of structu	ires	6,491			Critical f	acilities	30		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coa	astal? Yes		Local?	No	Ρ	laya?	No		Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 20,94	15			Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	) 2	15				
Number of low water crossings 16					Historical road	d closures	1	.6				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction											
Population removed from 100-yr 286					# of struct	tures removed	from	100-yr		-101		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr 4					Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 45							
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	θ			Low water crossings removed from 100-yr			l-yr	θ			
Other benefits					Reductior	in # of road clo	osure	es over 10	years	-		
Impacts												
Negative impacts?	No	Negative	impacts descri	ption	-							
Water supply contributions?	No	Water su	pply contribution	on des	scription -							
Estimated Cost												

#### Estimated Cos

Strategy Cost

\$50,000

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

18 of 147

Title City of Daisetta Education of City Council on Mitigation Benefits

ID# 052000019 Sponsor Daisetta (Municipality) RFPG recommend? Yes Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Strategy type Education and Outreach County Liberty Strategy description Educate City Council on benefits of mitigation and encourage council members to become more involved. Strategy description Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal (s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

Complies with RFPG Goals

risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0		# of	fstructures	0		Critical f	acilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	C	ther?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 0			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings	0			Historical roa	d closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reducti	ion									
Population removed from 100-yr	r -	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 1	.00-yr			Farm/Rar	ich land removed	from 100-yr	(acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (mile	es) -	-		Low wate	r crossings remov	ved from 100	-yr -			
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts? No	c	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions? No	D	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$10,000

Amount of available funding





Title City of Nacogdoc	thes Public Education Program	NECHES
ID# 052000020 Sp	ponsor Nacogdoches (Municipality)	
RFPG recommend? Yes	Reason for Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goal	REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Strategy Details		
Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County Nacogdoches
Strategy description	Develop and promote a public education program regarding	flood hazards, NFIP, and flood plain regulations.
Goal 1: 100% of	f counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns t	o better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annu

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

**REGION 5** 

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 5,331	# of structures	446	Critical facilities	1		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	14			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fi	rom 100-yr -			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -				
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years -			
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$20,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas ш HES LOUISIANA Nacogdoches Austin Houston

FMS area

20 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

annual

Polk County Public Education Campaign Title

ID# 052000021 Sponsor Polk (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Education and Outreach	County	Polk			
Strategy description	Initiate public education campaign to improve the community's understanding and access to information on natural hazards and how to improve level of protection for their homes.					

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 368	# of structures	# of structures 84		6 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 62		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	17		
Number of low water crossings 8		Historical road closures	8		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	wed from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$50,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 R Dallas LOUISIANA Austin

21 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

San Augustine County Public Education on Mitigation Techniques Title

ID# 052000022 Sponsor San Augustine (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details** Strategy type **Education and Outreach** County San Augustine Strategy description Includes programs in schools and senior citizen centers, pamphlets, and community meetings. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146	# of structures	64	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4	2	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	13	
Number of low water crossings 2	2	Historical road closures	2	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-	yr _	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**





Title	Shelby Coun	ty Public Ed	ucation on Ha	azards		
ID#	052000023	Sponsor	Shelby (Cour	nty)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	oals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Education and Outreach	County	Shelby
Strategy description		Educate the residents of Shelby County and participating jurisdictions on sa plan	fety and planning for the	hazards identified in this
Goal(s)	Goal 1: 100% of cou basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100 risks on an annual b	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t % participation of counties performing public education and awareness camp asis.	the public of flood-related	risks on an annual e public of flood-related

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8		# o	f structures	15		Critical f	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 56			Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	5			
Number of low water crossings	4			Historical road	d closures	4			
100-Year Flood Risk Reducti	ion								
Population removed from 100-yr		-		# of structures removed from 100-yr			-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ran	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)				
Road removed from 100-yr (mile	es) -			Low wate	r crossings remov	ved from 100	)-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clos	ad closures over 10 years			
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No		Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	۵ N	Water supply co	ntribution de	scription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**



23 of 147

Fitle City of Groveton Public Education on Mitigation Actio	ons
---	-----

 
 ID#
 052000024
 Sponsor
 Groveton (Municipality)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Education and Outreach County Trinity Strategy description Create a program to educate the public about specific mitigation actions for multiple hazards Create a program to educate the public about specific mitigation actions for multiple hazards Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Complies with RFPG Goals

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	3	Critical facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No Other? No				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	۰ -					
Water supply contributions? No							
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$5,100	Amount of availab	le funding -	% Nature-Based 0				
		Dalla	S				

FMS	area

Groveton



Austin

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

LOUISIANA

Title Trinity County Public Education on Mitigation Actions
---

ID# 052000025 Sponsor Trinity (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

#### Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strate	gy Details				
Strateg	y type	Education and Outreach	County	Trinity	
Strategy description		Create a program to educate the public about specific mitigation actions for m	ultiple hazards		
Goal(s)	Goal 1: 100% of cour basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100 risks on an annual ba	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform th 0% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campa asis.	e public of flood-related igns to better inform the	risks on an annual Public of flood-rela	ited

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 15	# of structures	32	Critical facilities 0					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 68		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	22					
Number of low water crossings 1		Historical road closures	1					
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-				
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-						
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**



 Title
 Anderson County Code Red System

 ID#
 052000026
 Sponsor
 Anderson (County)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning County Anderson Strategy description Plan and implement a new publicity campaign to expand enrollment in CODE RED notification system; use CODE RED to warn of impending hazard events. Goal 1: 100% of cymtest to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 73	# of structures	69	Critical facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	348	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	22			
Number of low water crossings	2	Historical road closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	1					
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed from 100-yr -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -				
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				

#### **Estimated Cost**



Title Angelina County S	iren Warning Syst	em Installation	NE	ECH	IES
ID# 052000027 Spo	onsor Angelina (C	ounty)			
RFPG recommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	REGIONAL	FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strategy Details					
Strategy type	Flood Measu	rement and Warning		County	Angelina
Strategy description	Install warnin	g siren system.			

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8,420	on at risk 8,420 # of structures 1,201			Critical facilities 11					
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 165			Roadway(s)	mpacted (miles)	66				
Number of low water crossing	gs 19			Historical roa	ad closures	19			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)			Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts descriptior	ı -					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost									

#### Estimated Cost

Strategy Cost \$209,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Lufkin LOUISIANA Rese Austin Houston FMS area Regional view of FMS area 27 of 147

Reason for

Recommendation

Title	Houston Coun	ty Alert/N	lotification System Installation
ID#	052000028	Sponsor	Houston (County)



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details** Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning County Houston Strategy description Purchase and install I-info alert/notification system including one user license per jurisdiction or participating entity. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Complies with RFPG Goals

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

RFPG recommend? Yes

Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Ves Playa? No Other? Yes   Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 117 Roadway(s) impacted (miles) 20 Impacted (miles) 20   Number of low water crossings 7 Impacted (losures) 7 Impacted (losures) 7	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 117       Roadway(s) impacted (miles)       20         Number of low water crossings       7       Historical road closures       7	
Number of low water crossings     7     Historical road closures     7	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	
Population removed from 100-yr - # of structures removed from 100-yr -	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr acres) - Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)     _     Low water crossings removed from 100-yr     -	
Other benefits _ Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -	
Impacts	
Negative impacts?         No         Negative impacts description         -	
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution description -	

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$602,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area

28 of 147

Title Houston County	Gage Installation a	nd Monitoring		NE		IES
ID# 052000029 S	ponsor Houston (C	ounty)				
RFPG recommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL	FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strategy Details						
Strategy type	Flood Measu	rement and Warning			County	Houston
Strategy description	Install stream new alert not	and rain gauges in the interval in the interval is a second structure interval interval is a second structure interval interv	flood prone areas and water	ways as part of o	verall rainfall trackir	ng, recording program, a

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Increase the number of gauges across the Neches basin to cover 50% of the region's HUC10s.

Goal 2: Increase the number of gauges across the Neches basin to cover 100% of the region's HUC10s. Goal(s)

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 16		# c	# of structures 17		Critical facilities 0					
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 117			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	20				
Number of low water crossing	gs 7			Historical roa	d closures	7				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	D-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fi	rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Rai	nch land removed	d from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	D-yr -			
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	) years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$121,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area

29 of 147

Title	Houston County Ra	ainfall Observer F	rogram		NE(		1ES
ID#	052000030 Spc	onsor Houston (C	ounty)				
RFPG r	ecommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	s with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL FLO	OD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strat	egy Details						
Strate	egy type	Flood Measu	rement and Warning			County	Houston
Strate	egy description	Implement ra	infall observer program utilizin	g volunteers.			
	Goal 1: Increase t	he number of ga	uges across the Neches basin to	o cover 50% of the regio	on's HUC10s.		

**REGION 5** 

Goal 2: Increase the number of gauges across the Neches basin to cover 100% of the region's HUC10s. Goal(s)

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 16	# o	f structures	17		Critical f	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 117				Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossing			Historical roa	d closures	7				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu									
Population removed from 100	D-yr	-		# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (n	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	)-yr -			
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	ı -					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$5,000

Amount of available funding







Sponsor Brownsboro (Municipality)

Reason for

Recommendation

Title	City of Brownsboro Code Red System Implementation



## **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

## **Strategy Details**

RFPG recommend? Yes

052000031

ID#

	01				
Strateg	y type	Flood Measurement and Warning	County	Henderson	
Strategy description		Obtain access and/or incorporate the use of the automated emergency management plan	calling system, Code R	led, into local	emergency
	Goal 1: 100% of cour	nties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform t	he public of flood-related	d risks on an an	nual
Goal(s)	Goal 2: Maintain 100	% participation of counties performing public education and awareness camp	aigns to better inform th	e public of floo	d-related

Complies with RFPG Goals

risks on an annual basis.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 52	# of structures	32	Critical facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 8		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr				
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	-				

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$100,000	Amount of availa	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 0
		Brownsboro	7 Austin	llas	LOUISIANA
	FMS a	area	31 of 147	Regional view	of FMS area

31 of 147
### \_ . 1

Flood Mana	Flood Management Strategy (FMS) the City of Chandler Warning Siren Maintenance						REGION 5			
Title City of Chandler Wa							łΕ.	S		
ID# 052000032 Spon	sor Chandler (Municip	ality)								
RFPG recommend? Yes	lies with RFPG Goa	<sup>IIs</sup> REGIO	REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP							
Strategy Details										
Strategy type	Flood Measurement	and Warning				County	Henderso	n		
Strategy description	Check the location ar	nd condition of warn	ing sirens; determi	ne if repairs ar	re needed					
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual	unties to perform publi 00% participation of con basis.	c education and awa unties performing pu	ublic education and	l awareness ca	mpaigns to I	better inform	the public of	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual	unties to perform publi 00% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b>	c education and awa unties performing pu	ublic education and	l awareness ca	mpaigns to	better inform	the public of	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual Existing 100-Year Flood	unties to perform publi 20% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b>	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures	ublic education and	l awareness ca	mpaigns to	better inform facilities 0	the public of	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual <b>Existing 100-Year Flood</b> Population at risk 105 Flood risk type: Rivering	unties to perform publi 00% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b> ?? Yes Co	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures pastal? No	ublic education and 29 Local? Y	l awareness ca	mpaigns to l Critical Playa?	better inform facilities 0 No	the public of	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co         basis.       Goal 2: Maintain 10         risks on an annual         Existing 100-Year Flood         Population at risk 105         Flood risk type:       Riverine         Farm/Ranch land impacted	unties to perform publi 00% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b> ?? Yes Co (acres) 7	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures pastal? No	29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp	l awareness ca es acted (miles)	Critical Playa?	better inform facilities 0 No	the public of Other?	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal (s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual Existing 100-Year Flood Population at risk 105 Flood risk type: Riverine Farm/Ranch land impacted Number of low water crossi	unties to perform publi D0% participation of con- basis. <b>Risk</b> ?? Yes Co (acres) 7 ngs 0	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures bastal? No	29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp	es acted (miles)	Critical Playa? 1 0	better inform facilities 0 No	the public of Other?	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of co basis. Goal (s) Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual Existing 100-Year Flood Population at risk 105 Flood risk type: Riverine Farm/Ranch land impacted Number of low water crossi	unties to perform publi 20% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b> 2? Yes Co (acres) 7 ngs 0	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures bastal? No	29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp Historical road c	es acted (miles) losures	Critical Playa? 1 0	better inform facilities 0 No	the public of Other?	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of cobasis.         Goal(s)       Goal 2: Maintain 10         Fisks on an annual         Existing 100-Year Flood         Population at risk 105         Flood risk type:       Riverine         Farm/Ranch land impacted         Number of low water crossi         100-Year Flood Risk Record         Population removed from 1	unties to perform publi 20% participation of con- basis. Risk ? Yes Con- (acres) 7 ngs 0 Con- vr -	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures bastal? No	29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp Historical road c	es acted (miles) losures	mpaigns to l Critical Playa? 1 0 om 100-yr	facilities 0 No	the public of Other?	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of cobasis.         Goal(s)       Goal 2: Maintain 10         Fisks on an annual         Existing 100-Year Flood         Population at risk 105         Flood risk type:       Rivering         Farm/Ranch land impacted         Number of low water crossi         100-Year Flood Risk Rec         Population removed from 1         Critical facilities removed from 1	unties to perform publi 20% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b> ?? Yes Co (acres) 7 ngs 0 <b>Luction</b> 00-yr - om 100-yr -	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures bastal? No	29 29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp Historical road c # of structur Farm/Ranch	es acted (miles) losures res removed fro	mpaigns to l Critical Playa? 1 0 om 100-yr I from 100-y	better inform facilities 0 No r (acres) -	the public of Other?	flood-related		
Goal 1: 100% of cobasis.         Goal(s)       Goal 2: Maintain 10 risks on an annual         Existing 100-Year Flood         Population at risk 105         Flood risk type:       Rivering         Farm/Ranch land impacted         Number of low water crossi         100-Year Flood Risk Rec         Population removed from 1         Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	unties to perform publi 20% participation of con basis. <b>Risk</b> ? Yes Con (acres) 7 ngs 0 <b>Luction</b> 00-yr - om 100-yr - (miles) -	c education and awa unties performing pu # of structures bastal? No	29 Local? Y Roadway(s) imp Historical road c # of structur Farm/Ranch Low water c	es acted (miles) losures res removed fre land removed rossings removed	mpaigns to l Critical Playa? 1 0 om 100-yr l from 100-y ved from 10	better inform facilities 0 No r (acres) - 0-yr -	the public of Other?	flood-related		

Impacts			
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description	

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$100,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Chandler LOUISIANA Austin

32 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	City of Murc	hison Warni	ing Siren S	ystem Installation	
ID#	052000033	Sponsor	Murchiso	n (Municipality)	
RFPG recommend?		Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Flood Measurement and Warning County Henderson Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning County Henderson Strategy description Obtain early warning siren system installment inside jurisdiction to assist in public notification of hazard prior to hazard occurrence Goal 1: 100% of courtes to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related issais. Goal 2: Maintain 10% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related issais.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 1	# o	f structures	3		Critical	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 0			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	0			
Number of low water crossings	0			Historical road closures		0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-yr				# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	Dyears -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de			escription -						



Title JCDD6 Increase Flood Predictive Capability for Streams and Creeks

 ID#
 052000034
 Sponsor
 Jefferson County Drainage District 6

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation

 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning County Jefferson Strategy description Utilize ALERT stations and work with National Weather Service to help citizens of the Bevil Oaks community better understand the flood warnings and predictions. Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related

(S) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 20,772	# of structures	6,491	Critical facilities	30					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 20,9	945	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	215						
Number of low water crossings 16		Historical road closures	16						
LOO-Year Flood Risk Reduction									
Population removed from 100-yr	-286	# of structures removed fi	om 100-yr	-101					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	4	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 45							
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	θ	Low water crossings remo	θ						
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-					
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-							
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -							

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$100,000

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

34 of 147

Title	JCDD7 Updat	D7 Update Data Operation System-Control Center					NECHES		
ID#	052000035	Sponso	r Jefferson C	ounty Drainage Distri	ict 7				
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONA	L FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP	
Strat	egy Details								
Strategy type Strategy description			Flood Measu	rement and Warning			County	Jefferson	
			Will allow officials to see what pump stations are operating in real time, monitor pumps/generator conditions and status						
	Goal 1: Increase the number of gauges across the Neches basin to cover 50% of the region's HUC10s.								

**REGION 5** 

Goal 2: Increase the number of gauges across the Neches basin to cover 100% of the region's HUC10s. Goal(s)

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 17,575		# o	# of structures		4,705		Critical facilities 82		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 876			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	95			
Number of low water crossing	gs 3		Historical road closures		3				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction			_					
Population removed from 100-yr -		-		# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits _				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					



Flood Manageme	ent Strategy	(FMS)	REGION 5			
Fitle OCDD Hazard Notification System	Development		NEC	HES		
D# 052000036 Sponsor Orange C	County Drainage District					
RFPG recommend? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	lies with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL FLOOD P	LANNING GROUP		
Strategy Details						
Strategy type Flood Mea	surement and Warning		Cou	Inty Orange		
Strategy description Develop en	nployee emergency notificatio	n system to warn staff of i	mminent hazards/risks.			
Existing 100-Year Flood Risk	# of structures	5 007	Critical facilities	26		
lood risk type: Piverine? Vec			Playa2 No.	SU Othor? Voc		
arm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 346		Boadway(s) impacted (	miles) 136	other: les		
Number of low water crossings 20		Historical road closures	20			
00-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures rem	oved from 100-yr	-		
Road removed from 100-vr (miles)	-	Farm/Ranch land re	s removed from 100-yr (acres)	-		
Other benefits	-	Reduction in # of ro	ad closures over 10 years			
Impacts						
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	- escription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$11,000	Amount of availa	ble funding _		% Nature-Based 0		





36 of 147



I	n	n	n	а	C	łc
٠			м	u	ີ	ພ

Impacts			
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description	



Title	Polk County	Improved H	azard Commu	nication		
ID#	052000038	Sponsor	Polk (County)			
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	oals
Strate	egv Details					



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strateg	y Details					
Strategy type Strategy description		Flood Measurement and Warning	County	Polk		
		Upgrade and expand implementation of natural hazard warning systems and methods.				
Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of Goal(s)						

risks on an annual basis.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 368		# o	of structures	84		Critical	facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	acres) 62			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	17				
Number of low water crossin	gs 8			Historical roa	d closures	8				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction									
Population removed from 100-yr				# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from	m 100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	osures over 10	) years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**



FMS area

38 of 147

Shelby County Electronic Hazard Warning Message Board Acquisition Title

ID# 052000039 Sponsor Shelby (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details** Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning County Shelby Strategy description Acquire electronic message board for use during disaster response and recovery operations Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

'opulation at risk 8 # of structures		15		Critical facilities 0					
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 56			Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	5			
Number of low water crossings	4			Historical road	d closures	4			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-yr				# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	les)	-		Low wate	r crossings remov	ved from 100	-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	10	Negative impacts	s description	-					
Water supply contributions?	lo	Water supply co	ntribution de	scription -					

# **Estimated Cost**



39 of 147

Reason for

Recommendation

Shelby County Warning Siren Installation Title ID# 052000040 Sponsor Shelby (County)



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details** County Strategy type Flood Measurement and Warning Shelby Strategy description Install warning sirens at strategic locations for use during disaster events Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis. Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Complies with RFPG Goals

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

RFPG recommend? Yes

Population at risk 8 # of structures		15	Critical facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 56		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	5			
Number of low water crossings 4		Historical road closures	4			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -				
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road close	ures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				

# **Estimated Cost**



40 of 147

itle City of Groveton V	Narning System Upgrades	NECHES
D# 052000041 Sp	onsor Groveton (Municipality)	
RFPG recommend? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	s REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Strategy Details		
Strategy type	Flood Measurement and Warning	County Trinity
Strategy description	Implement, upgrade, expand, and integrate digital method including: cell phones, text messages, land-lines, internet net	s for storm notification to include all methods of communication to include all methods of communication.

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2 # of structures	3	Critical facilities	0					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No					
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0						
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures	0						
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr -	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	Low water crossings remove	ved from 100-yr	-					
Other benefits _	Reduction in # of road clos	Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution d Estimated Cost	escription -							
Strategy Cost \$11,000 Amount of availa	able funding		% Nature-Based 0					
	Dalla	es for a second se	LOUISIANA					

Groveton

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Austin

41 of 147

Title	Van Zandt C	ounty Warn	ing System	ı Acquisit	ion		
ID#	052000042	Sponsor	Van Zandt	t (County	)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reas Reco	on for mmendation	Complies with RFPG G	ioals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details

Strategy type	Flood Measurement and Warning	County	Van Zandt
Strategy description	Acquire and Install Warning Systems throughout the County, including Incorporate through improved communications and early warning.	d Jurisdictions	. Reduce risk to citizens

Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 233	# of structures	217	Critical facilities	0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? Yes			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 232		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	13				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years				
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -					

# **Estimated Cost**



Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

**REGION 5** 

County

Angelina

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8,420 # of stru		tructures	1,201		Critical fa	cilities 11			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	Yes	Coastal? N	10	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	s) 165			Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	66			
Number of low water crossings	19			Historical road	l closures	19			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on								
Population removed from 100-yr -				# of struct	ures removed fro	m 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 10	00-yr _			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles				Low wate	r crossings remov	ed from 100-	yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	in # of road closu	ires over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	Negati	ve impacts o	description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water	supply cont	ribution des	scription -					



Elevate properties in the floodplain.



Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

**REGION 5** 

Angelina

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Strategy description

Population at risk 8,420 # of structure		1,201	Critical facilitie	5 11				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Oth	er? Yes			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 165		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	66					
Number of low water crossings 19		Historical road closures	19					
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed	from 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr						
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years	-				
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No Ne	gative impacts description	-						
Water supply contributions? No Wa	ater supply contribution de	scription -						

# **Estimated Cost**



FMS area



 Title
 Hardin County Voluntary Flood Buyout

 ID#
 052000045
 Sponsor Hardin (County)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation

 Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County Hardin Strategy description Voluntary flood buyouts. County Hardin

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 10,528		# c	of structures	3,678		Critical	facilities	25			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Oth	ıer?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136					
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	d closures	13					
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction										
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-		# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-y	r (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	oved from 10	0-yr -				
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	osures over 10	) years -				
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-							
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -							

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$4,000,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 100

FMS area

45 of 147

Title	Hardin County Voluntary Residential Structure Elevation

ID# 052000046 Sponsor Hardin (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

### Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy Details				
Strategy type	Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation	County	Hardin	
Strategy description	Voluntary elevations of flood prone properties in Hardin County.			

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 10,528		# o	f structures	3,678		Critical f	acilities 2	.5		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136				
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	ad closures	13				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-		# of stru	ctures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land removed	d from 100-yr	(acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr						
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$7,500,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston Beaumont

FMS area

46 of 147



**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	3	Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -			





**REGION 5** 

Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 658		# o	f structures	235		Criti	cal facilities	6 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No		Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 23			Roadway(s)	impacted (mile	s) 4				
Number of low water crossing	s 1			Historical ro	ad closures	1				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -							
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ra	anch land remo	ved from 10	0-yr (acres)	-			
Road removed from 100-yr (m	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						
Estimated Cost										





**REGION 5** 

Population at risk 278		# of structures	134		Critical	facilities (	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 0		Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings	5 0		Historical roa	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion							
Population removed from 100-	-yr	-	# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-	Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-yr	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	iles)	-	Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	D-yr -		
Other benefits			Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts								
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution de	scription -					

Strategy Cost	\$5,000,000	Amount of available funding	-	% Nature-Based 100
	Ros	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Hill} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} $	Dallas	LOUISIANA
	FMS a	irea 49 of 1	147	Regional view of FMS area

Title City of Rose Hill Acres Voluntary Residential Structure Elevation

ID#	052000050	Sponsor	Rose Hill /	Acres (Municipality)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goal	s



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy Details			
Strategy type	Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Voluntary elevations of flood prone properties in Rose Hill Acres.		

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 278	# of structures	134	Critical facilities	0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed from	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remove	ed from 100-yr	-			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-			
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No N	egative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No W	later supply contribution de	scription -					

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$6,000,000	Amount of available funding	-		% Nature-Based 0
	Ros	$ \begin{array}{c} Hill = \lambda h = h = h = h h = h h = h h h h = h h h = h h h = h h h h = h h h h = h h h h = h h h h = h h h h h = h h h h h = h h h h h h = h h h h h h h h$		Dallas	LOUISIANA
				Ноц	Iston

FMS area

50 of 147





# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy typeProperty Acquisition and Structural ElevationCountyHardinStrategy descriptionVoluntary flood buyouts.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 780	# of structures	87	Critical facilities 2				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2				
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr					
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-			
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -					





Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk	1,687			# of structures	435		Critical	facilities 7	1	
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coasta	l? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land ir	mpacted (ac	res) 7			Roadway(s)	impacted (miles	) 8			
Number of low wat	ter crossings	3			Historical ro	ad closures	3			
100-Year Flood F	Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-yr				# of stru	ctures removed	from 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			-		Farm/Ra	nch land remov	ed from 100-y	vr (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)				Low wat	er crossings rem	noved from 10	0-yr -			
Other benefits _					Reductio	on in # of road cl	osures over 1	0 years -		
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	Γ	No	Negative imp	acts description	ı -					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de					escription -					
Estimated Cost										
Strategy Cost	\$6,000,0	00	А	mount of availa	ble funding -				% Nature-Based	100









# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### Strategy type Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County Jefferson Strategy description FIF Application; aimed to elevate houses within county subject to inundation from flooding.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 40,765	# of structures	12,869	Critical facilitie	s 316			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 33,01	19	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	474				
Number of low water crossings 22		Historical road closures	22				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr -286		# of structures removed from 100-yr 401					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land remove	ed from 100-yr (acres	<b>;)</b> 45			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	θ	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr					
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road cl	osures over 10 years	-			
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -					

**Estimated Cost** Strategy Cost \$1,110,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Austin Houston

FMS area

53 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

LOUISIANA

 Title
 Liberty County Property Acquisition
 ID#
 052000054
 Sponsor Liberty (County)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals
 REGIO

 Strategy Details
 Strategy Details
 Resonand Complexity
 Strategy Details



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy typeProperty Acquisition and Structural ElevationCountyLibertyStrategy descriptionAcquire property located in the floodplain including properties located in subdivisions along the Trinity River.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 143		#	of structures	116		Critical	facilities	1		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	ocres) 1,526	5		Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	7				
Number of low water crossing	gs O			Historical roa	ad closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction									
Population removed from 10	D-yr	-		# of strue	ctures removed	from 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ra	nch land remove	ed from 100-y	r (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reductio	on in # of road cl	osures over 1	0 years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impa	cts descriptior	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply o	escription -							
Estimated Cost										

# Strategy Cost \$2,140,000

FMS area



City of Nacogdoches Study and Ranking of Repetitive Loss Structures Title

ID#	052000055	Sponsor	Nacogdoches	s (Municipality)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details** Strategy type Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County Nacogdoches Strategy description Analyze flood-prone properties in the City of Nacogdoches and identify appropriate mitigation options for each repetitive loss structure. Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

with RFPG Goals

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 5,331		ł	# of structures	446	446		Critical facilities 1			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coasta	l? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 4			Roadway(s) ir	mpacted (miles)	14				
Number of low water crossing		Historical roa	d closures	0						
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits _	Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -									
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative imp	acts descriptior	n -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply	contribution d	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**



55 of 147

San Augustine County Acquisition and Conversion of Flood Prone Properties Title

ID# 052000056 Sponsor San Augustine (County) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County San Augustine Strategy description Acquire flood prone/repetitive loss properties and convert to open space, parks, boating access, trails, agricultural projects, and/or as a general community asset.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146		# o	# of structures		64		Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 42			Roadway(s) ir	mpacted (miles)	13				
Number of low water crossing	gs 2			Historical roa	2					
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	D-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Rar	nch land removed	from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits _				Reduction	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	) years			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$530,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 100 ogdo hes Dallas Tole Bei Reser LOUISIANA kin Austin Houston

FMS area

56 of 147



**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146		# o	f structures	64		Critical	facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 42			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	13				
Number of low water crossing	s 2			Historical roa	d closures	2				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	ction									
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -							
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Rai	nch land remove	ed from 100-y	vr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road cl	osures over 1	0 years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	ı -						
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de			escription -							

### Estimated Cost

Strategy Cost	\$318,000	Amount of available fundir	ıg -	% Nature-Based 0
ogdo hes Fkin		Toled Ben Reser	Dallas	
		Sa Rayburn	Austin	Houston
	FMS a	irea 57 of	147	Regional view of FMS area

57 of 147

Shelby County Property Acquisition Title ID# 052000058 Sponsor Shelby (County) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County Shelby Strategy description Acquire flood prone/repetitive loss properties and convert to open space, parks, boating access, trails, agricultural projects, and/or as a general community asset

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8	# of structures 15		Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Co	oastal? No Loca	? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 56	Roadwa	y(s) impacted (miles)	5		
Number of low water crossings 4	Historica	al road closures	4		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr -	# of	structures removed fro	m 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farr	n/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	Low	water crossings remov	ed from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _	Red	uction in # of road closu	ires over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No Negative	e impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No Water s	upply contribution description	-			

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$100,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 100 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area

58 of 147

Title	Trinity Coun	ty Buyout Pr	ogram Imp	blementation	
ID#	052000059	Sponsor	Trinity (Co	ounty)	
RFPG recommend? Yes		Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goa



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details** Strategy type Property Acquisition and Structural Elevation County Trinity Strategy description Develop and implement a program to buyout repetitive loss properties and convert to open space, parks, boating access, trails, and/or as a general community asset. Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or

otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 15	# of structures	32	Critical facilities	s 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 68		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	22				
Number of low water crossings 1		Historical road closures	1				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-			
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$100,000	Amount of availa	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 100			





59 of 147

FMS area

Title	City of Grove	eton Buyou	it Program Imp	lementation		N	ECH	IES
ID#	052000060	Sponsor	Groveton (M	unicipality)		-		
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	AL FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strat	egy Details							
Strate	egy type		Property Acqu	isition and Structur	al Elevation		County	Trinity

Strategy description Develop and implement a program to buyout repetitive loss properties and convert to open space, parks, boating access, trails, and/or as a general community asset.

REGION 5

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2 # d	of structures	3		Critical	facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	0			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of struc	tures removed fro	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Rar	ich land removed	from 100-yi	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low wate	r crossings remov	ved from 100	D-yr -		
Other benefits		Reduction	n in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Estimated Cost Strategy Cost \$100,000 Am	ount of availab	ole funding -			%	Nature-Based	100
Groveton	Z		Dalla	PS		LOU	ISIANA

60 of 147

Houston

Title	City of Dibol	l Ordinance	and Regulatio	n Update		N
ID#	052000061	Sponsor	Diboll (Munic	ipality)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	oals REGION
Strate	egv Details					



# AL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Angelina
Strategy description	Update building code and subdivision ordinance to include restrictions on streams and creeks.	the distance a structure	can be built from active

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 610	# of structures	118	Critical facilities	6	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	4		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -			
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

# **Estimated Cost**



61 of 147

Title	City of Cuney I	Bridge and	l Culvert Inspection Program
ID#	052000062	Sponsor	Cuney (Municipality)



Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Plan and implement a program to regularly inspect low-lying bridges and pathways for excess water runoff, to avoid flooding.	d highway culverts, clear	debris, and create safe

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Give notice to 100% of affected units of local government and solicit funding applications for improvement or removal of 25% of Low Water Crossings identified in the latest Regional Flood Plan.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilities	3 0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0		
Number of low water crossings 0	Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			
Estimated Cost					
Strategy Cost \$25,000	Amount of availal	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 0	





62 of 147



Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

**REGION 5** 

Cherokee

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilities	5 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes C	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres	) -
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road close	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts       No       Negative         Negative impacts?       No       Negative         Water supply contributions?       No       Water supply	e impacts description supply contribution de	- scription -		
Estimated Cost				
Strategy Cost \$5,000	Amount of availal	ole funding -		% Nature-Based 0
		Dalla	35	LOUISIANA

63 of 147

Reese

FMS area

Austin

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	City of Gallatin Multi	-Jurisdiction Coordi	nation		N	E(	H	IES
ID#	052000064 Spons	sor Gallatin (Munic	pality)					
RFPG re	ecommend? Yes	R	eason for ecommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIO	NAL FLOO	D PLAN	NING GROUP
Strat	egy Details							
Strate	egy type	Regulatory and G	uidance				County	Cherokee
Strate	gy description	Work with County	or TXDOT to inc	crease drainage capacity in sit	es that are p	rone to floodii	ng.	

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0			of structures	2			Critical f	acilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal	No	Local?	Yes		Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 60				Roadway(s	) impacted (mile	es)	1				
Number of low water crossings 0				Historical road closures 0							
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion										
Population removed from 100-	-		# of st	ructures remove	d fror	n 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -								
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impa	cts descriptior	ı -							
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de				escription -							
Ectimated Cost											

### Estimated Cost



64 of 147

						<u> </u>				~			C
Title	City of Jack	sonville Mu	lti-Jurisdictio	n Coordin	ation			Γ	NE	L		IE.	2
ID#	052000065	Sponso	r Jacksonville	e (Municij	pality)			-	-				_
RFPG red	commend?	Yes		Reaso Recom	n for nmendatior	Comp	lies with RFPG	Goals RE	GIONALI	LOOD P	LAN	NING GR	OUP
Strate	gy Details	5											
Strateg	y type		Regulatory a	nd Guidai	nce					Cour	nty	Cherokee	
Strateg	y descriptio	on i	Work with Co	ounty or T	XDOT to in	crease o	drainage capac	ity in sites that	are prone to	flooding.			
Goal(s)	Goal 1: An of their de Goal 2: An their desig Goal 3: Re Goal 4: Re	average of esign. average of gn. duce the nu duce the nu	10% of the r 25% of the r umber of crit umber of crit	new region new region ical faciliti ical faciliti	nal infrastru nal infrastru ies in the 10 ies in the 10	ucture p ucture p 00-year 00-year	projects betwee projects betwee flood risk inun flood risk inun	en 2023 – 2033 en 2033- 2053 dation extents dation extents	will utilize la will utilize la by 15%. by 25%.	arger storm e	events vents (	(>100-year >100-year)	) as the basis as the basis c
Existin	g <b>100-Y</b> ea	r Flood Ri	isk										
Populat	ion at risk (	506			# of stru	ctures	192		Criti	cal facilities	0		
Flood ri	sk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coa	stal? No		Local?	Yes	Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ra	anch land ir	npacted (ad	cres) 4				Roadway(s)	impacted (mile	es) 4				

REGION 5

**100-Year Flood Risk Reduction** 

7

Number of low water crossings

Population removed from 100-yr       -       # of structures removed from 100-yr       -         Critical facilities removed from 100-yr       -       -       -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed from 100-yr	-
ranny kanch and removed nom 100-yr (acres) -	Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)     _     Low water crossings removed from 100-yr     -	Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _ Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -	Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years	-

Historical road closures

7

Impacts			
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description	



Title	City of Reklaw Improved Enforcement of Ordinances							
ID#	052000066	Sponsor	Reklaw (Mu	nicipality)				
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	oals		



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Cherokee				
Strategy description	Improve the long-range management and use of flood-prone areas by the adoption and enforcement of local ordinances to regulate new development within the floodplain. Review and revise ordinances, when needed.						

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0	# of structures	1	Critical facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No Other? No				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution description -							
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$10,000	Amount of availab	le funding -	% Nature-Based 0				
	714	Dalla	IS				





66 of 147

Title	City of Rusk	Flood Maps	Maintenan	ce and Update		
ID#	052000067	Sponsor	Rusk (Mun	icipality)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendat	Complies with R	₹FPG



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy Details				
Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Cherokee	
Strategy description	Work with state and federal agencies to maintain current flood maps.			

Goal 1: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

Goals

Goal(s) Goal 2: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 462			f structures	41	41		Critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1				Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings 0				Historical road	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction									
Population removed from 100-yr		-			# of structures removed from 100-yr		-		
Critical facilities removed from	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		-			Low water crossings removed from 100-yr		)-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? N	10	Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions? No		Water supply co	ntribution de	scription -					

# **Estimated Cost**



67 of 147

FMS area
Title	Hardin Cour	ity Continue	d NFIP Part	ticipation	
ID#	052000068	Sponsor	Hardin (Co	ounty)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Hardin			
Strategy description	Continue participation in the NFIP and initiate participation in CRS. Includes improvement of flood mapping and elevation data,					
	mitigation for repetitive loss properties, and instituting higher regulatory standards for future floodplain development.					

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 10,528	# of structures	3,678	Critical facilities	25	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 743		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	136		
Number of low water crossings 13		Historical road closures	13		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	-			

### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$80,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin

FMS area

68 of 147

Beaumont

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

 Title
 Hardin County Drainage District

 ID#
 052000069
 Sponsor

 Hardin (County)
 Reason for Recommendation

 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy typeRegulatory and GuidanceCountyHardinStrategy descriptionForm Drainage District: Purpose would be to oversee/ maintain, and construct required drainage projects for the County.<br/>Regulate stormwater mitigation for new and future developments.Provide CountyProjects for the County

Goal 1: 50% of the region's population is part of an entity that has a dedicated drainage charge, fee, or other continuous funding mechanism for the maintenance and/or restoration of flood infrastructure.

Goal(s) Goal 2: 75% of the region's population is part of an entity that has a dedicated drainage charge, fee, or other continuous funding mechanism for the maintenance and/or restoration of flood infrastructure.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 10,528		# 0	of structures	3,678		Critical	facilities 25		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136			
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	d closures	13			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100-yr				# of strue	ctures removed fi	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land removed	d from 100-y	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr					
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					

### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$900,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

69 of 147

FMS area

Title	City of Kountze	e Continue	ed NFIP Part	icipation		N		1E	5
ID#	052000070	Sponsor	Kountze (M	lunicipality)				_	_
RFPG r	recommend? Y	es		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONA	L FLOOD PL	ANNING G	ROUP
Strat	tegy Details								
Strate	egy type	R	egulatory ar	nd Guidance			County	Hardin	
<b>a</b>									

Strategy description Continue participation in the NFIP and initiate participation in CRS. Includes improvement of flood mapping and elevation data, mitigation for repetitive loss properties, and instituting higher regulatory standards for future floodplain development.

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 2		# of structures	# of structures 3		Critical	facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 0		Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossing	gs O		Historical roa	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction							
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-	Farm/Rai	nch land removed	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (m	niles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr					
Other benefits			Reductio	ures over 10	) years –			
Impacts								
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution des			scription -					
Estimated Cost								

Strategy Cost

Amount of available funding







Title	City of Lumb	erton Co	ntinued NFIP	Participa	tion			N	E(	JH	IE S	
ID#	052000071	Spons	or Lumberto	n (Munic	ipality)			-				
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reas Reco	on for mmendation	Complies with R	FPG Goals	REGION	IAL FLOO	DPLANN	IING GROU	Ρ
Strat	egy Details											
Strate	gy type		Regulatory	and Guid	ance					County	Hardin	
Strategy description		n	Continue pa mitigation fo	rticipatio pr repetiti	n in the NFIP	and initiate parti	cipation in CR	S. Includes	improvemen ndards for fu	t of flood ma ture floodpla	apping and elev	ation data

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 658	# of structures	235	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coa	stal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 23		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	4	
Number of low water crossings 1		Historical road closures	1	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr -	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres) -	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remove	ved from 100-yr -	
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years -	
Estimated Cost	oply contribution de:	scription -		
Strategy Cost \$80,000	Amount of availab	le funding -		% Nature-Based 0
Lumbertor	Village Creek SP	Dalla Austin	IS S	LOUISIANA

71 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

**Regulatory and Guidance** 

Title	City of Rose	Hill Acres C	ontinued N	FIP Participation		N	EC	HE	S
ID#	052000072	Sponsor	Rose Hill A	cres (Municipality)					-
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIO	NAL FLOOD P	LANNING G	ROUP
Strat	egy Details	;							

REGION 5

Continue participation in the NFIP and initiate participation in CRS. Includes improvement of flood mapping and elevation data,

mitigation for repetitive loss properties, and instituting higher regulatory standards for future floodplain development.

County

Hardin

# Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Strategy type

Strategy description

Population at risk 278	# of structures	134	Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr		
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years		
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$80,000	Amount of available funding	-	% Nature-Based 0
	Ro	Dise Hill = $abc = abc = abc$ Acres $bc = abc = abc$ bb = abc bb = abc bb =	Dal	LOUISIANA
NP		Loeb	Austin	Houston

FMS area

72 of 147

Title	City of Silsbee Continued N	NFIP Participation	NECHES
ID#	052000073 Sponsor Si	ilsbee (Municipality)	
RFPG r	ecommend? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Strat	tegy Details		



Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 780		# o	f structures	87		Critical	facilities 2		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	acres) 1			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossin	Number of low water crossings 3			Historical roa	ad closures	3			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	uction								
Population removed from 100-yr				# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from	-		Farm/Ra	nch land removed	d from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	0-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de:			escription -						
Estimated Cost									
a	-								



Sour Lake

FMS area

Grayburg

Title	City of Sour Lake Continued NFIP Participation					ECH	IES	
ID#	052000074 Spons	or Sour Lake (	Municipality)					
RFPG r	ecommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	AL FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP	
Strat	egy Details							
Strate	egy type	Regulatory a	nd Guidance			County	Hardin	
Strate	egy description	Continue par	ticipation in the NFIP	and initiate participation in C	RS. Includes in	provement of flood m	apping and elevatio	on data,

mitigation for repetitive loss properties, and instituting higher regulatory standards for future floodplain development. Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 1,687	# of structures	435	Critical facilities 7				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No Other? Yes				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 7		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	8				
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-уг -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years -				
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -					
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$60,000	Amount of availab	le funding -	% Nature-Based 0				
		Dalla	as				

Austin

74 of 147

Houston

Regional view of FMS area

LOUISIANA

 Title
 Houston County Mobile Home Inspection

 ID#
 052000075
 Sponsor

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes

 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Houston
Strategy description	Conduct routine inspection of manufactured home/mobile homes in flood-	prone area to ensure pro	oper tie-downs per Flood

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 16	# of structures	17	Critical facilities	5 O
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 117		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	20	
Number of low water crossings 7		Historical road closures	7	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road close	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$61,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Dallas Louisiana

75 of 147

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

**Regulatory and Guidance** 

new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Title	JCDD6 Mult	i-Jurisdictior	n Coordinatic	N	ECH		
ID#	052000076	Sponsor	Jefferson Co	ounty Drainage Distri	ct 6		
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goal	s REGIO	NAL FLOOD PLAN
Strat	egy Details						



# NING GROUP

County

Jefferson

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

of their design.

their design.

Strategy type

Strategy description

-												
Population at risk 2	20,772		# c	f structures	6,491		Critical	facilities	30			
Flood risk type:	Riverine? Ye	es	Coastal?	Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes		
Farm/Ranch land ir	mpacted (acres)	) 20,945			Roadway(s	) impacted (mil	es) 215					
Number of low water crossings 16				Historical r	Historical road closures 16							
100-Year Flood F	Risk Reductio	n										
Population removed from 100-yr			286 # of structures re			uctures remove	ed from 100-yr	4	L01			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr					Farm/F	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres				<b>)</b> 45		
Road removed fror	n 100-yr (miles)	) Đ			Low wa	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr						
Other benefits _					Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts												
Negative impacts?	No	ſ	Negative impac	ts description	ı -							
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution			ontribution de	escription -								
Estimated Cost												
Strategy Cost	\$20,000		Amo	ount of availa	ble funding	-			% Nature-Based	0		

Increase coordination with the City and County regarding flood predictions and post event recovery.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their



FMS area



76 of 147



NECHES

**REGION 5** 

# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Jefferson

% Nature-Based 0

# Goal 1: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Maintain 100% participation of counties performing public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual basis.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 20,772	# of structures	6,491	Critical facilities	s 30			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 20,94	5	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	215				
Number of low water crossings 16		Historical road closures	16				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr	-286	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-101			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	4	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) 45					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	θ	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr 0					
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years	-			
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -					

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost

\$60,000

Amount of available funding





77 of 147



**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 17,575	# of structures	4,705	Critical facilitie	s 82
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 876		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	95	
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres	) -
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-
Negative impacts? No Water supply contributions? No Estimated Cost	Negative impacts description Water supply contribution de	- scription -		
Strategy Cost \$50,000	Amount of availab	ole funding		% Nature-Based 0
RSON	Port Ne hes land Port Arthur Lake	Dalla	as	LOUISIANA

FMS area

78 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	City of Daise	etta Property	y Constructi	on Ordi	nance		ſ	N
ID#	052000079	Sponsor	Daisetta (N	/lunicipa	llity)		-	-
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reas Recc	on for mmendation	Complies with RFPG Go	<sup>als</sup> RI	EGIOI
Strat	egy Details							
Strate	egy type	F	Regulatory a	ind Guid	ance			



# NAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

County

Liberty

# Strategy type

Strategy description The city shall adopt a land-use ordinance which prohibits building residential or commercial structures in the 100-year floodplain.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilities	6 0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

### **Estimated Cost**

\$10,000

Strategy Cost

Amount of available funding





Title	City of Daisetta Prop	perty Elevation C	Ordinance		N	ECI		E2
ID#	052000080 Spor	nsor Daisetta (M	lunicipality)				-	
RFPG	recommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendatior	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	AL FLOOD PL	ANNI	NG GROUP
Stra	tegy Details							
Strat	egy type	Regulatory a	nd Guidance			Count	y I	Liberty

Strategy description The city shall adopt a land use ordinance which requires any structure within the 100-year floodplain to be elevated 2 feet above base flood elevation.

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 0		# of structure	es O		Critical	facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	′es Co	astal? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	5) 0		Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings	0		Historical roa	ad closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on								
Population removed from 100-yr	-		# of stru	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 10	00-yr _		Farm/Ra	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles	s) _	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits			Reductio	on in # of road clo	sures over 10	0 years -			
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	Negative	impacts descript	ion -						
Water supply contributions? No	Water su	pply contribution	description -						
Estimated Cost									

### Estimated Cost

Strategy Cost

\$5,000

Amount of available funding





Title	City of Hard	in Subdivisic	on Ordinance I	mplementation		
ID#	052000081	Sponsor	Hardin (Muni	cipality)		-
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG	Goals R
Strat	egv Details					



# REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

otrategy betano			
Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Liberty
Strategy description	Implement subdivision ordinance regulations concerning building in flood-prone	areas.	

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 1		# o	f structures	1		Critical	facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 1			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	0			
Number of low water crossing	s 0			Historical roa	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100-yr -		-		# of structures removed from		rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 1			r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	oved from 100	D-yr -		
Other benefits _				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -					

# **Estimated Cost**



Title City of Nacogdoches Stormwater Drainage Fee Implementation

ID#	052000082	Sponsor	Nacogdoches (Municipality)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details Regulatory and Guidance County Nacogdoches Strategy description Implement stormwater drainage fee to assist funding of flood mitigation infrastructure projects Vacogdoches

Goal 1: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 75% of communities.

Goal 3: 50% of the region's population is part of an entity that has a dedicated drainage charge, fee, or other continuous funding mechanism for the maintenance and/or restoration of flood infrastructure.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 5,331	# of structures	446	Critical facilities	1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	14		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -			

### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$40,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area

82 of 147

**Regulatory and Guidance** 

Title	City of Nacog	doches Co	des and Oro	dinances Update		N	-Cł	HES
ID#	052000083	Sponsor	Nacogdocl	nes (Municipality)		-		
RFPG r	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	omplies with RFPG Goals	REGIONA	L FLOOD PLA	NNING GROUP
Strat	tegy Details							

# Strategy description Review and update, if necessary, all City codes and ordinances pertaining to floodplain management to ensure their compliance with state and federal laws and to achieve cohesion with the mitigation strategies contained herein.

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

**REGION 5** 

County

Nacogdoches

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Strategy type

Population at risk 5,331	# of structures	446	Critical facilities	1		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	14			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed f	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	-			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$30,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area

83 of 147

Title OCDD Drainage Criteria Manual and Regulations Enforcen
--

ID#	052000084	Sponsor	Orange County Drainage District	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	n RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Orange
Strategy description	Implement and enforce the Drainage Criteria Manual and Regulations for r stormwater runoff.	regulation of the effects o	f new developments and

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 11,929		# 0	of structures	5,007		Critical	Critical facilities 36			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 346			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136				
Number of low water crossing	gs 20			Historical roa	d closures	20				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-	# of structures removed fro			rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr						
Other benefits _			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply c	ontribution de	escription -						

### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$20,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area



Title OCD	DD Support/Cre	ate Stricter Flood	blain Ordinances		N	EC	Н	ES	
ID# 052	000085 Spo	nsor Orange Cou	nty Drainage District	:					
RFPG recom	mend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	AL FLOOD P	LANN	ING GROUP	
Strategy	Details								
Strategy ty	vpe	Regulatory an	d Guidance			Cou	inty	Orange	

**REGION 5** 

Strategy description Work with Communities to support ordinances or create ordinances that help to protect new structures from being built in the floodplain or floodway

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 11,929			# of structures 5,0		5,007		Critical facilities				
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No		Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 346			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136					
Number of low water crossings	20			Historical roa	d closures	20					
.00-Year Flood Risk Reduction											
Population removed from 100-yr				# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	les)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-							
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -							

### **Estimated Cost**

FMS area

85 of 147

Title San Augustine Cou	unty Continue NFIP P	articipation		N		IES
ID# 052000086 Spo	onsor San Augustine	(County)				
RFPG recommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL	FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strategy Details						
Strategy type	Regulatory and	Guidance			County	San Augustine
Strategy description	Continue partici	pation in the Natio	nal Flood Insurance Program	(NFIP) and expan	nd administration and	I monitoring capabilitie

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 146		# o	# of structures 64		54		facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 42			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	13			
Number of low water crossings	2			Historical road	d closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduct	ion								
Population removed from 100-y	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mile	es)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -		D-yr -			
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	0	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de			escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$53,000	Amount of available funding -		% Nature-Based 0
ogdo hes		Tole Ben Reser	Dallas	
Fkin				
	have	Sam	Austin	ston

FMS area

86 of 147

Title	City of Linda	le Natural R	unoff Polic	ies Implementation	
ID#	052000087	Sponsor	Lindale (M	lunicipality)	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



# REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type **Regulatory and Guidance** County Smith Strategy description Incorporate "natural run-off" policies. Calculate cumulative effect of development, increase capacity of storm water drainage systems, institute regular drain system maintenance.

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 69	# of structures	17	Critical facilities	5 O	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	-       # of structures removed from 100-yr         -       Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres)			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			
Estimated Cost					
Strategy Cost \$30,000	Amount of availab	ole funding		% Nature-Based	100





87 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

% Nature-Based 100

**Regulatory and Guidance** 

new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Title	City of Linda	ity of Lindale No Adverse Impact Implementation					
ID#	052000088	Sponsor	Lindale (Mun	icipality)			
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL	
Strat	egy Details	;					

design engineers; building code adoption and plan approval process.



# FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

County

Smith

basis.

Strategy type

Strategy description

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk** Critical facilities 0 Population at risk 69 # of structures 17 Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Coastal? No Local? Yes Playa? No Other? No Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1 Roadway(s) impacted (miles) 0 Number of low water crossings Historical road closures 0 0 **100-Year Flood Risk Reduction** Population removed from 100-yr # of structures removed from 100-yr Critical facilities removed from 100-yr Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) Road removed from 100-yr (miles) Low water crossings removed from 100-yr Other benefits Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years Impacts Negative impacts? Negative impacts description No Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution description

Incorporate "no adverse impact" design requirements in community development. Provide awareness to stakeholders and

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their

Goal 3: 100% of counties to perform public education and awareness campaigns to better inform the public of flood-related risks on an annual

# **Estimated Cost**

\$60,000

Strategy Cost

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

88 of 147

otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Title	City of Troup Floodp	lain Ordinance	Update		NECH	1E2
ID#	052000089 Spon	sor Troup (Mu	nicipality)			
RFPG red	commend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONAL FLOOD PLA	NNING GROUP
Strate	egy Details					
Strateg	gy type	Regulatory a	nd Guidance		County	Smith
Strateg	y description	Adopt and er Council actio	nforce a stricter floodpl n.	ain ordinance that no new s	tructures are allowed in the 100-y	ear floodway. Adopted by City
Goal(s)	Goal 1: RFPG must new flood risk redu Goal 2: RFPG must new flood risk redu	consider in all ction projects consider in all ction projects	projects and should inc petween 2023 - 2033. projects and should inc petween 2033 - 2053.	orporate nature-based pract orporate nature-based pract	tices and floodplain preservation in tices and floodplain preservation in tices and floodplain preservation are provided as a set of the set of	n an average of 10% of their n an average of 25% of their

**REGION 5** 

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at rick 17	# of structures	1	Critical facilities	0			
	# Of Structures	1		0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr -				
Other benefits _ Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -					
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$40,000	Amount of availab	le funding -		% Nature-Based 0			
And the second s		Dalla	35				

 Strategy Cost
 \$40,000
 Mount of available funding
 % Nature-Based
 0

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

 O

Title	Trinity County Dam/Levee Failure Data Collection							
ID#	052000090	Sponsor	Trinity (Count	ty)				
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	oals		
Strat	eov Details							



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

# Strategy Details

Strategy type	Regulatory and Guidance	County	Trinity
Strategy description	Develop and implement standard operating procedures for collecting and shar	ng data to provide exter	nt of dam/levee failure

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 15		# o	f structures	32		Critical facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 68			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	22				
Number of low water crossing	s 1			Historical roa	d closures	1				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion									
Population removed from 100	-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fi	rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits _				Reduction	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	) years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**



Title	Van Zandt Co	ounty Hig	her Standards	Incorporation		N	ECH	IES	
ID#	052000091	Sponso	or Van Zandt (	County)					
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	AL FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP	
Strat	ogy Dotails								
Strat	egy Details								
Strate	gy type		Regulatory ar	nd Guidance			County	Van Zandt	
Strate	gy descriptior	١	Incorporate H	igher Standards for H	lazard Resistance in Local Ap	oplication of th	e Building Code.		
		<u> </u>						(400/ CH	

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

Goal(s) Goal 2: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 25% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2033 - 2053.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	233			# o	f structures	217		Critical	facilities C	)	
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Co	bastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land in	npacted (ac	res) 232				Roadway(s)	mpacted (miles)	13			
Number of low wat	ter crossings	0				Historical roa	ad closures	0			
100-Year Flood R	Risk Reduc	tion									
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of stru	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-y	r (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles) _ Low water crossings removed from 100-yr				0-yr -							
Other benefits						Reductio	on in # of road clo	sures over 1	0 years -		
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	Γ	No	Negative	e impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contr	ibutions?	No	Water su	upply co	ontribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost											
Strategy Cost	\$30,000			Amo	ount of availal	ble funding -				% Nature-Based	0





91 of 147

Title	Anderson Co	ounty Culver	rt Improvements
ID#	052000092	Sponsor	Anderson (County)
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Anderson
Strategy description	Widen culverts to mitigate against future drainage issues that lead to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 73		# c	of structures	69		Critical f	facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 348			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	22				
Number of low water crossing	s 2			Historical roa	d closures	2				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -							
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -						

# **Estimated Cost**



92 of 147

Title Anderson County Dam Inspection and Maintenance Program

ID# 052000093 Sponsor Anderson (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Anderson		
Strategy description	Work with dam owners to keep dams in excellent condition by visiting dam locations and doing inspections with owners to ensure that dams are properly maintained and failure possibilities are greatly reduced.				
Goal 1: Increase per	centage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenar	nce for storm drainage sys	tem to 50% of		

communities. Goal(s) Goal 2: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 75% of communities.

Goal 3: 50% of the region's population is part of an entity that has a dedicated drainage charge, fee, or other continuous funding mechanism for the maintenance and/or restoration of flood infrastructure.

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 73		# of	fstructures	69		Critical	facilities (	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 348			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	22			
Number of low water crossing	gs 2			Historical roa	d closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction								
Population removed from 10	D-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	D-yr -		
Other benefits _				Reduction	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -					

# **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$2,000,000	Amount of available funding -		% Nature-Based 0
	Palestine		Dallas	LOUISIANA
Contraction of the second seco	5 mg	eran a	Austin	uston

FMS area

93 of 147



Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Anderson				
Strategy description	Develop plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.						
Goal 1: An average of	f 10% of the new regional infractructure projects between 2022 – 2022 will utilize larg	or storm ovents (	>100 year) as the basi	c			

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0	# of structures	0	Critical facilitie	2S 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years			
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availal	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 0		





94 of 147

City of Palestine Drainage System Expansion and Maintenance Title

ID# 052000095 Sponsor Palestine (Municipality) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Anderson
Strategy description	Establish plan and necessary standards to increase the capacity of drainage dit	ches along all city streets	s and roads

Complies with RFPG Goals

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 42		# of structures	14		Critical fa	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Y	es Coa	astal? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres	5) 2		Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings	2		Historical roa	d closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction	on							
Population removed from 100-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fro	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 10	00-yr _		Farm/Rar	nch land removed	from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles	5) _		Low wate	er crossings remov	ved from 100-	-yr -		
Other benefits _			Reduction	n in # of road clos	ures over 10	years -		
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No	Negative	impacts descriptio	n -					
Water supply contributions? No	Water su	oply contribution o	lescription -					

### **Estimated Cost**



95 of 147

Title	Angelina Co	unty Culver	t Improvemer	nts	
ID#	052000096	Sponsor	Angelina (Co	ounty)	
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goal



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Angelina
Strategy description	Develop plan to upgrade major culvert areas which are prone to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8,420		# o	f structures	1,201		Critical f	facilities	11			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	C	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 165			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	66					
Number of low water crossing	s 19			Historical roa	d closures	19					
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction											
Population removed from 100	-yr	-		# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-yr	· (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	years -				
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-							
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -							

### **Estimated Cost**



96 of 147

Title	City of Burke	e Drainage D	itch Capacity	/ Upgrades		
ID#	052000097	Sponsor	Burke (Muni	icipality)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	oals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Angelina
Strategy description	Establish a plan and necessary standards to increase the capacity of drainage of	ditches along all city stree	ets and roads

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0				# of structures	5 1			Critical	facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riv	verine?	Yes	Coast	al? No	Local	? Yes		Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impa	cted (acro	es) 0			Roadway	y(s) impac	ted (miles)	0				
Number of low water of	crossings	0			Historica	al road clo	sures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk	Reduct	ion										
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of	structures	removed fr	om 100-yr	-					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr					Farn	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 10	00-yr (mile	es)	-		Low	water cro	ssings remo	ved from 10	0-yr -			
Other benefits _					Redu	uction in #	of road clos	sures over 10	Oyears -			
Impacts												
Negative impacts?	N	0	Negative im	pacts description	on	-						
Water supply contribut	tions? N	0	Water supp	y contribution	description	-						
Estimated Cost												
Strategy Cost	\$500,000			Amount of avai	lable funding	g -				% Nature-Based	0	





97 of 147

**Chambers County Property Protection** Title ID# 052000098 Sponsor Chambers (County) Reason for RFPG recommend? Yes Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Chambers	
Strateg	y description	Project will clear obstacles, widen and reshape ditches, and upgrade culverts throughout all participating jurisdictions	to restore adequate drai	nage to mitigate flood	ing
	Goal 1: An average of their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will uti	ilize larger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis	į
Goal(s)	Goal 2: An average of	of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will util	ize larger storm events (>	100-year) as the basis	of

their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 1,431		# of structures	1,175		Critical	facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal? Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 36,93	33	Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	162				
Number of low water crossing	gs O		Historical roa	d closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction								
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits			Reductio	n in # of road clo	osures over 10	) years			
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impacts description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution de	scription -						

# **Estimated Cost**

\$1,000,000

Strategy Cost

Amount of available funding





% Nature-Based 0

98 of 147

 Title
 Cherokee County Culvert Upgrades

 ID#
 052000099
 Sponsor
 Cherokee (County)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Develop plan to upgrade major culvert areas which are prone to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 1,382	# of structures	672	Critical facilities	1		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 920		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	49			
Number of low water crossings 10		Historical road closures	10			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acres)	-		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr				
Other benefits _ Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Negative impacts?     No       Water supply contributions?     No	Negative impacts description Water supply contribution de	- scription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$2,000,000	Amount of availab	ole funding -		% Nature-Based 0		
		Dalla		LOUISIANA		

99 of 147

Austin

Nacogdoches

FMS area

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

City of Alto Culvert Improvements 052000100 Sponsor Alto (Municipality) Reason for Complies with RFPG Goals RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County Cherokee				
Strategy description	Develop plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.					

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 2		# o	f structures	11		Critical facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	acres) 0			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossin	gs O		Historical road closures 0							
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	uction									
Population removed from 10	-		# of stru	ctures removed fr	ved from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (r	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	n -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply contribution description -								
Estimated Cost										



FMS area

100 of 147

Reklaw

FMS area

Title	City of Reklaw Drainage System Upgrades							
ID#	052000101	Sponsor	Reklaw (Muni	icipality)		1		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	RE		
Strate	egy Details							



# REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Establish plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Shady

Grove

Population at risk 0	# of structures	1	0					
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No				
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0					
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0					
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No Neg	ative impacts description	-						
Water supply contributions? No Wat	er supply contribution de	scription -						
Estimated Cost								
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availab	le funding -		% Nature-Based 0				
		Dalla	s croc					

101 of 147

Austin

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

LOUISIANA





# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Establish plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 462	# of structures	41	Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fi	rom 100-yr		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

# **Estimated Cost**



102 of 147





# **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Cherokee
Strategy description	Establish plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

# **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0		# o	f structures	1	Critical	Critical facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 0			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings	6 0			Historical roa	d closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion									
Population removed from 100-yr		-		# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr						
Other benefits _			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	- scription						
Estimated Cost										

# Strategy Cost \$1,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Wells Austin Houston FMS area Regional view of FMS area 103 of 147
Title	Hardin Coun	ity Culverts,	Ditches, and	d Channel		
ID#	052000104	Sponsor	Hardin (Cou	unty)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	oals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Establish plan to upgrade storm water capacity by installing/upgrading culvert	s and enlarging storm wa	ter channels.

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 10,528		# of	fstructures	3,678		Critical	facilities 25		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136			
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	d closures	13			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction								
Population removed from 100-yr -				# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	ı -					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$3,000,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area

104 of 147

 Title
 Hardin County Detention Ponds

 ID#
 052000105
 Sponsor

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes

 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Strategy description		Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin	
		evelop a program to construct water retention ponds to collect stormwater run-off, reduce flooding, and use as an alternate vater source throughout Hardin County.			
Cool(c)	Goal 1: An average o of their design.	f 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will util	lize larger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis	

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 10,528		#	of structures	3,678		Critical	facilities 2	25		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal	? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136				
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	ad closures	13				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	-		# of strue	ctures removed	from 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ra	nch land remove	ed from 100-y	vr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits _			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -							
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impa	acts description	ı -						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply	contribution d	escription -						
Estimated Cost										_

#### Estimated Cost



FMS area

105 of 147

Title	Hardin Coun	nty Elevate R	oads and I	Bridges	;		
ID#	052000106	Sponsor	Hardin (C	ounty)			
RFPG recommend?		Yes		Re Re	eason for ecommendation	Complies with RFPG	Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Develop a program to elevate roads and bridges including installing, upsizing	culverts and headwalls, a	nd bridge upgrades.

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 10,528		# 0	of structures	3,678		Critical	facilities	25	
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 743			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	136			
Number of low water crossing	gs 13			Historical roa	d closures	13			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction								
Population removed from 100-yr -				# of strue	ctures removed fi	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ra	nch land removed	d from 100-y	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)			Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	00-yr -			
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	ı -					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply c	ontribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost									
Stratogy Cost \$10.00	0.000	٨٣	ount of availa	blo funding					

Strategy Cost	\$10,000,000	Amount of available funding -		% Nature-Based 0
			Dallas	LOUISIANA
		Beaumont	Austin	louston

FMS area



**REGION 5** 

of their design. Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	3	Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fro	om 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remov	ed from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -			



Title	City of Kountz	ze Elevate	Roads and B	Bridges		N	ECH	IES	
ID#	052000108	Sponsor	Kountze (N	1unicipality)					
RFPG r	recommend?	/es		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	NAL FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP	
Strat	tegy Details								
Strate	egy type		Infrastructur	e Projects			County	Hardin	
Strate	egy description	[	Develop a pro	ogram to elevate road	ds and bridges including insta	Illing, upsizing	culverts and headwalls,	and bridge upgrad	es.

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	3	Critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1		
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed from 100-yr -			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years -		
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -			



Title	City of Koun	tze General	Drainage	Improven	nents		
ID#	052000109	Sponsor	Kountze (	Municipa	llity)		
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reas Reco	on for ommendation	Complies with RFPG G	oals



#### REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description		Increase drainage capacity; add stormwater detention basins and stormwa feasible.	ater pumping stations v	vhere gravity flow is no
Goal(s)	Goal 1: An average of of their design. Goal 2: An average of their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will util	lize larger storm events ( ze larger storm events (>	>100-year) as the basis •100-year) as the basis of

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	# of structures 3		Critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				



Title	City of Lumberton C	ulverts, Ditches,	, and Channels	N	ECH	IES
ID#	052000110 Spon	isor Lumberton	(Municipality)			
RFPG r	ecommend? Yes		Reason for Recommendation	REGIONA	L FLOOD PLAN	NING GROUP
Strat	egy Details					
Strate	egy type	Infrastructur	e Projects		County	Hardin
Strate	egy description	Develop plan	to increase drainage capacity in sites that are pror	ne to flooding.		
Goal(s	Goal 1: An average of their design. ) Goal 2: An average their design.	of 10% of the n of 25% of the n	ew regional infrastructure projects between 2023 ew regional infrastructure projects between 2033	– 2033 will utili - 2053 will utiliz	ze larger storm events e larger storm events (	(>100-year) as the basis >100-year) as the basis of

**REGION 5** 

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 658	# of structures	235	Critical facilitie	s 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 23		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	4			
Number of low water crossings 1		Historical road closures	1			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed	from 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	ed from 100-yr (acres	;) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings rem	oved from 100-yr	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -				
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$3,000,000	Amount of availab	le funding -		% Nature-Based 0		
	Lumberton Village Creek SP	Dal	las	LOUISIANA		

FMS area

110 of 147

Austin

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	City of Rose	Hill Acres Fl	ood Contr	ol Improvements		
ID#	052000111	Sponsor	Rose Hill	Acres (Municipality)		
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	R



#### EGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Develop a program to upgrade flood control structures (barriers, berms) for water sources, and agricultural resources from water contamination and salty	the purpose of protecting vater intrusion.	g critical facilities, potable

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 278	# of structures	134	Critical facilitie	es O		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-		
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -				

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$3,000,000	Amount of available f	unding -	% Nature-Based 0
	Rose		Dallas	LOUISIANA
	FMS a	ea 1	11  of  1/7	Regional view of FMS area

111 of 147

Title	City of Rose Hill Acres General Drainage Improvements

ID#	052000112	Sponsor	Rose Hill Acres (Municipality)	
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strateg	y type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin	
Strategy description		Establish criteria to increase drainage capacity; add stormwater detention ba capacity.	sins, box culverts and/or	pipes to increase drainag	şe
Goal(s)	Goal 1: An average c of their design. Goal 2: An average c their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will uti	tilize larger storm events ( lize larger storm events (>	>100-year) as the basis •100-year) as the basis o	f

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 278	# of structures	134	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2	
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remove	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**



FMS area

112 of 147

Title City of Silsbee Detention, Culverts, Ditches and Channels

ID# 052000113 Sponsor Silsbee (Municipality)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin		
Strategy description	n Develop plan to increase drainage capacity in sites that are prone to flooding.				
Goal 1: An average of	f 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2023 will utilize larger s	torm events (	>100-year) as the basis		

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 780	# of structures	87	Critical facilities	5 2	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2		
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			





Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Develop a program to upgrade drainage ditches and explore converting neces	ssary ditches into curb / s	ewer construction.

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Title

ID#

Population at risk 780	# of structures	87	Critical facilities	2		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres)	-			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr				
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availab	le funding -		% Nature-Based 0		
s		Dalla				





114 of 147

Title City of Silsbee Flood Mitigation for Hendrix Development

ID# 052000115 Sponsor Silsbee (Municipality)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Explore, plan, and implement flood mitigation strategies within the Hendrix De	evelopment.	

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 780		# o	f structures	87		Critical f	acilities 2		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 1			Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings	3			Historical roa	d closures	3			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-	yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Rai	nch land removed	d from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	iles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	)-yr -		
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					



Title	City of Sour	Lake Chann	el Improvemo	ents		N	E
ID#	052000116	Sponsor	Sour Lake (N	/lunicipality)			-
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	<sup>als</sup> REGIO	NAL FI



#### REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin		
Strategy description	Establish criteria and standards for installing large concrete channels, box culvert, concrete pipe, and/or mechanisms as needed to mitigate drainage ditch erosion and improve water capacity and conveyance.				
Goal 1: An average of their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut	ilize larger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis		

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 4: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 1,687	# of structures	435	Critical facilitie	s 7
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 7		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	8	
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres	) -
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		
Estimated Cost				
Strategy Cost \$500,000	Amount of availab	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 0





116 of 147





#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Advance a plan to rectify, enlarge, and maintain outfall channels for the City o ditches.	of Sour Lake, including e>	cavating interior roadside
Goal 1: An average of of their design. Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of their design. Goal 3: Reduce the r Goal 4: Reduce the r	f 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut f 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will util number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15% number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%	ilize larger storm events ( ize larger storm events (> 5.	>100-year) as the basis

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Dopulation at rick 4 CO7	# of structuros	425	Critical facilitie	S 7
Population at risk 1,687	# OF STRUCTURES	435	Circical facilitie	3 /
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 7		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	8	
Number of low water crossings 3		Historical road closures	3	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres	) -
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years	
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	-		
Estimated Cost				
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availab	ole funding -		% Nature-Based 0
Sou	- ] r Lake	Dall	as	

trategy Cost	\$1,000,000	Amount of available funding -		% Nature-Based 0
Level	Grayburg	ake	Dallas Austin	LOUISIANA
	FMS a	rea 117 of 147	7	Regional view of FMS area





#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Hardin
Strategy description	Establish criteria and standards to construct water retention ponds to collect	stormwater run-off and re	educe flooding.

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 1,687	# of structures	435	Critical facilities	5 7
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	,	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	8	
Number of low water crossings	ł	Historical road closures	3	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	
Critical facilities removed from 100-	yr <sub>-</sub>	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		



Title	Houston County Drainage Culvert Upgrades									
ID#	052000119	Sponsor	Houston	(County)						
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reas Reco	son for ommendation	Complies with RFPG	Goals			



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Houston
Strategy description	Develop a plan to expand/upgrade drainage culverts to prevent flooded roadv	ways and add signage in lo	ow-water crossings.

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 16		# of s	structures	17		Critical f	acilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acr	res) 117			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossings	7			Historical roa	d closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-	yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/Rar	nch land removed	l from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	les)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 100	)-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? N	10	Negative impacts	description	-					
Water supply contributions? N	lo	Water supply con	tribution de	escription -					



Title	Houston Co	unty Flood II	nfrastructure	Maintenance		P
ID#	052000120	Sponsor	Houston (Co	unty)		-
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REG
Strate	egy Details					

# **NECHES**

#### REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

## Strategy type Infrastructure Projects County Houston Strategy description Clear debris from bridges, box culverts, and drainage systems throughout unincorporated county. Image: Clear debris from bridges, box culverts, and drainage systems throughout unincorporated county.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 16		# 0	# of structures 1		17		Critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 117			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossing	s 7			Historical roa	ad closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reductio	on in # of road clos	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply c	ontribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost									



Strategy Cost \$2,000,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area



Title City of Gra	peland Critical Facilities F	lood-Proofing	NECHES
ID# 05200012	1 Sponsor Houston (C	ounty)	
RFPG recommend	? Yes	Reason for Recommendation	REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
Strategy Detai	ls		

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Houston
Strategy description	Flood proof critical facilities to the 500-year flood that are located in flood-pro	one areas of the city.	

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 16	# of structures	17	Critical facilities	s 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 117		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	20			
Number of low water crossings 7		Historical road closures	7			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availab	ole funding		% Nature-Based 0		
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	3				





121 of 147

Title	City of Kennard Ditch Maintenance Program						
ID#	052000122	Sponsor	Kennard (Mu	nicipality)		-	
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIONA	
Strate	egy Details						



#### L FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

#### alegy Details

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Houston
Strategy description	Implement program to routinely remove debris from drainage ways and roa and improve conveyance of stream during flood events.	adside ditches to prevent	back up of flood velocity

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 16		# o	f structures	17		Critical	facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Othe	er?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acr	res) 117			Roadway(s)	impacted (miles)	20				
Number of low water crossings	7			Historical ro	ad closures	7				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion									
Population removed from 100-	yr	-		# of stru	uctures removed	from 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from	100-yr	-		Farm/R	anch land remove	ed from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	les)	-		Low wa	ter crossings rem	oved from 100	D-yr -			
Other benefits				Reducti	on in # of road clo	osures over 10	) years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts? N	lo	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions? N	10	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$1,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area

122 of 147

 Title
 Liberty County Drainage Projects

 ID#
 052000123
 Sponsor

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes

 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Liberty				
Strategy description	The county will work with partnering jurisdictions and engineers in order to implement drainage projects throughout the county-including adding ditches, detention ponds and detention basins in identified locations throughout the county.						
Goal 1: An average of their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut	ilize larger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis				

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 143	# of structures	116		Critical	facilities	1	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes Co	oastal? No	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1,526		Roadway(s) ii	mpacted (miles)	7			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical roa	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr		# of struc	ctures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Rai	nch land removed	d from 100-y	vr (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	0-yr -		
Other benefits _		Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 1	0 years -		
Impacts							
Negative impacts? No Negative	impacts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water su	upply contribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$2,000,000	Amount of availab	ole funding -				% Nature-Based	0
		and an a house of the	Dalla	as	~~~		



Title	City of Daise	tta Culvert I	Maintenance a	and Upgrades		ſ
ID#	052000124	Sponsor	Daisetta (Mui	nicipality)		1
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	RE



#### GIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Liberty
Strategy description	Removal of debris, silt and vegetation obstacles in drainage ways. Project w upgrade culverts to restore adequate drainage to mitigate flooding.	vill clear obstacles, mow	and reshape ditches, and

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 0	)			# o	f structures	0		Critica	al facilities	0		
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Со	astal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No		Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land in	npacted (ac	res) 0				Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	0				
Number of low wat	er crossings	5 0				Historical roa	ad closures	0				
100-Year Flood R	lisk Reduc	tion										
Population remove	d from 100-	-yr	-			# of strue	ctures removed	from 100-yr		-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			-			Farm/Ra	nch land remove	ed from 100	-yr (acres)	-		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)				Low wate	er crossings rem	oved from 1	.00-yr	-				
Other benefits						Reductio	n in # of road clo	osures over	10 years	-		
Impacts												
Negative impacts?	r	No	Negative	impact	ts description	-						
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de					escription -							
Estimated Cost												
Strategy Cost	\$1,000,0	000		Amc	ount of availal	ble funding -				% Nat	ture-Based	0





124 of 147

т	itle	OCDD Flood	Infrastruc	ture Improv	ements		N	ECH	HES
П	D#	052000125	Sponso	or Orange Co	ounty Drainage District	:			-
R	RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGIO	NAL FLOOD PLA	NNING GROUP
	Strat	egy Details							
	Strate	gy type		Infrastructu	ire Projects			County	Orange
	Strate	gy descriptio	n	Support rog	ional offerts to plan d	ocian and construct large s	cale fleed cont	trol / storm surgo prot	action improvements
		0,		Support leg	ional enorts to plan, u	esign, and construct large st		non / storm surge prote	ection improvements

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

**REGION 5** 

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 11,929	Population at risk 11,929		f structures	5,007		Critical f	Critical facilities		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	Yes	Local?	No	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 346			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	136			
Number of low water crossing	gs 20			Historical roa	d closures	20			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed f	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Rar	nch land remove	d from 100-yr	(acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr					
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impac	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**



125 of 147

Title	Polk County	Facilities Ha	azard Harde	ening Ret	rofit	
ID#	052000126	Sponsor	Polk (Cour	nty)		
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reas Reco	on for mmendation	Complies with

FMS area



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

т

Strategy type Infrastructure Projects County Polk Strategy description Activities may include but are not limited to: flood proofing, impact resistant windows, storm shutters, roof straps, structural bracing, low-flow plumbing fixtures, roll-up door reinforcement, grounding systems, and surge-protection.

**RFPG Goals** 

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 368		# of	fstructures	84		Critical	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	No	Playa?	No		Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acr	es) 62			Roadway(s) ir	mpacted (miles)	17				
Number of low water crossings	8			Historical roa	d closures	8				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduct	tion									
Population removed from 100-y	/r	-		# of struc	tures removed f	rom 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 2	100-yr	-		Farm/Rar	nch land remove	d from 100-y	r (acres) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (mil	es)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	oved from 10	0-yr -			
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clo	osures over 10	) years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts? N	lo	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions? N	lo	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$1,500,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston

126 of 147

Title	Polk County	Flood Infras	structure Impro	ovements		
ID#	052000127	Sponsor	Polk (County)			
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Go	bals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Infrastructure Projects County Polk Strategy description Implement program to elevate and reinforce roadways and bridges prone to inundation from flooding. Projects may include general road elevation; upgrading culverts and installing headwalls; upgrades and reinforcement of bridges and bridge footings.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 368	# of structures	84	Critical facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 62		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	17		
Number of low water crossings 8		Historical road closures	8		
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction					
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land remove	d from 100-yr (acres)	-	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-	
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clo	sures over 10 years	-	
Impacts					
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-			
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -			

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$2,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston

FMS area



Title City of Hende	erson Flood Infrastr	ucture Maintenance		N	ECH	
ID# 052000128	Sponsor Henders	son (Municipality)		-		-
RFPG recommend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	IAL FLOOD PLAN	NING
Strategy Details						
Strategy type	Infrastruc	ture Projects			County	Rusk

Strategy description Establish a plan to conduct various flood control maintenance improvements throughout the City

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

**REGION 5** 

GROUP

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 97		# of	fstructures	37		Critical	facilities	0	
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acre	es) 5			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	2			
Number of low water crossings	0			Historical roa	d closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reducti	ion								
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (mile	es)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	0-yr -		
Other benefits				Reduction	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts? No	0	Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	0	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost									

## 

FMS area



Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	San Augustir	ne County B	ridge Improver	nents		N	EC	H	ES
ID#	052000129	Sponsor	San Augustine	(County)					
RFPG r	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	s REGIO	NAL FLOOD	PLANNI	NG GROU
Strat	tegy Details								

REGION 5

#### Strategy type Infrastructure Projects County San Augustine Strategy description Develop a program to elevate roads and bridges including installing, upsizing culverts and headwalls, and bridge upgrades.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146	# of structures	64	Critical facilitie	es 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other?	No	
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 42		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	13			
Number of low water crossings 2		Historical road closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	oved from 100-yr	-		
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clo	osures over 10 years	-		
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	-				

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$2,000,000	Amount of available fundir	ng -	% Nature-Based 0
ogdo hes Fkin		Tolei Ben Rese	Dallas	Louisiana
	EMS are	Sam Rayoun		Houston
	FMS are	a 170 d	of 147	Regional view of FIMS area

129 of 147





#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	San Augustine
Strategy description	Establish a plan to upgrade culverts in county extent. Actions can include b and headwalls; and enlarging storm water ditches and canals.	out are not limited to: ins	talling/upgrading culverts

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146	# of structures	64	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 42		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	13	
Number of low water crossings 2		Historical road closures	2	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	- rom 100-yr	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed	from 100-yr (acres) -	
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr -	
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years -	
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$2,000,000	Amount of available funding	-	% Nature-Based 0
ogdo hes		Toles Ben Reser	Dallas	LOUISIANA
	ENC	Sam Rayburn	Agen	Houston
	FMS area	130 of	147	Regional view of FMS area

130 of 147

Title San Augustine County Facilities Hazard Hardening Retrofit

ID# 052000131 Sponsor San Augustine (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy typeInfrastructure ProjectsCountySan AugustineStrategy descriptionActions can include but are not limited to: installing window screens, storm shutters, window film reinforcements, roof straps, and flood proofing.

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 146		# o	f structures	64		Critical	facilities	0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ad	cres) 42			Roadway(s) ir	npacted (miles)	13				
Number of low water crossing	s 2			Historical roa	d closures	2				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction									
Population removed from 100	-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (m	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -						
Other benefits				Reductio	n in # of road clos	sures over 10	years -			
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	-						
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -						

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$1,500,000	Amount of available funding	-	% Nature-Based 0
ogdo hes kin		Tale Ben Reserv	Dallas	Louisiana
		Sam Rayourn	Austin	Houston

FMS area

131 of 147

San Augustine County Detention and Retention Pond Construction Title

ID# 052000132 Sponsor San Augustine (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Infrastructure Projects County San Augustine Strategy description Construct storm water detention/retention ponds at strategic locations for improved stormwater storage to hold storm water run-off and as a mitigation measure for drought and wildfire.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 146	# of structures	64	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 4	2	Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	13	
Number of low water crossings 2		Historical road closures	2	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-
Critical facilities removed from 100-y	r _	Farm/Ranch land removed	d from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road clos	sures over 10 years	-
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -		

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$3,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 ogdo hes Dallas Tole Bei Reser LOUISIANA kin Austin Houston

FMS area

132 of 147



#### ID# 052000133 Sponsor San Augustine (Municipality)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	San Augustine
Strategy description	Construct flood protection, winter storm-hardening, and expansive soils miti wastewater facilities for Cities of Broaddus and San Augustine.	gation projects for water	distribution networks and

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 114 # of structures		34	34 Critical facilities			D				
Flood risk type: F	Riverine?	Yes	Coast	al? No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land imp	pacted (acr	res) 2			Roadway(s)	impacted (miles)	1			
Number of low wate	r crossings	0			Historical roa	ad closures	0			
100-Year Flood Ris	sk Reduct	tion								
Population removed	from 100-y	yr	-		# of stru	ctures removed fr	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities remo	s removed from 100-yr _ Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -									
Road removed from	Road removed from 100-yr (miles) _ Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -									
Other benefits					Reductio	on in # of road clo	sures over 1	0 years -		
Impacts										
Negative impacts?	N	lo	Negative im	pacts description	n -					
Water supply contrib	outions? N	lo	Water supp	y contribution d	escription -					
Estimated Cost										
Strategy Cost	\$1,000,00	00		Amount of availa	able funding -				% Nature-Based	0
	N									





133 of 147

Shelby County Detention and Retention Pond Construction Title

ID# 052000134 Sponsor Shelby (County)

RFPG recommend? Yes

Reason for

Complies with RFPG Goals Recommendation



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Shelby
Strategy description	Establish a plan and necessary standards to construct storm water det improved stormwater storage to hold storm water run-off and as a mitigation	tention/retention ponds a n measure for drought and	at strategic locations for wildfire
	f 10% of the new regional infractructure projects between 2022 2022 will u	tiliza largar starm avanta (	100 year) as the basis

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8		# 0 <sup>-</sup>	f structures	15		Critical	facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 56			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	5			
Number of low water crossing	gs 4			Historical roa	d closures	4			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-		# of strue	ctures removed f	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ra	nch land remove	d from 100-y	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low wate	er crossings remo	ved from 10	D-yr -		
Other benefits _				Reductio	n in # of road clo	sures over 10	) years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description	ı -					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ntribution de	escription -					



Shelby County Drainage Upgrades 052000135 Sponsor Shelby (County) Reason for Complies with RFPG Goals RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Title

ID#

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Shelby
Strategy description	Establish a plan to upgrade stormwater conveyance capacity via drainage impr	ovement projects	

Goal 1: An average of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8	# of structures	15	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 56		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	5	
Number of low water crossings 4		Historical road closures	4	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road close	sures over 10 years	
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -		



Title	Shelby Cour	ity Facilities	Hazard Harde	ening Retrofit	
ID#	052000136	Sponsor	Shelby (Cour	ity)	
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

LOUISIANA

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Shelby
Strategy description	Establish a plan to storm-harden and/or retrofit existing and newly constructe	d critical facilities	

Goal 1: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 15%.

Goal 2: Reduce the number of critical facilities in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by 25%.

Goal(s) Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal 4: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 8 # of structures		15		Critical	facilities 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 56			Roadway(	s) impacted (miles	5) 5			
Number of low water crossing	gs 4			Historical	road closures	4			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction								
Population removed from 100	D-yr	-		# of st	ructures removed	l from 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reduc	tion in # of road c	losures over 1	.0 years -		
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions?	No	Water supply co	ontribution de	escription -					
Estimated Cost									

### Strategy Cost \$2,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Dallas Austin Houston FMS area Regional view of FMS area 136 of 147

 Title
 Shelby County Roadway/Bridge Elevation

 ID#
 052000137
 Sponsor
 Shelby (County)

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation
 Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Shelby
Strategy description	Develop a program to elevate roads and bridges including installing, upsizing of	culverts and headwalls, a	nd bridge upgrades.

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 8	# of structures	15	Critical facilities	0
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 56		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	5	
Number of low water crossings 4		Historical road closures	4	
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction				
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acres)	-
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road close	sures over 10 years	
Impacts				
Negative impacts? No No	Negative impacts description	-		
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	scription -		



 Title
 City of Tyler Open Channel Improvements

 ID#
 052000138
 Sponsor

 RFPG recommend?
 Yes
 Reason for Recommendation

Complies with RFPG Goals



#### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy typeInfrastructure ProjectsCountySmithStrategy descriptionImplement a program to enclose open channels that are contributing to flooding. Priority locations are: 1) Ashmore subdivision<br/>between Ashmore and Salisbury and 2) Fleishel Ave. between 6th and 8th Streets.Implement a program to enclose open channels that are contributing to flooding. Priority locations are: 1) Ashmore subdivision

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 7,482		fstructures	1,042		Critical	Critical facilities 72		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres)	Ļ		Roadway(s) in	npacted (miles)	23			
Number of low water crossings	1		Historical road	d closures	31			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr	-		# of struc	tures removed fr	om 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-	yr _		Farm/Ran	ch land removed	from 100-yr	r (acres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-		Low wate	r crossings remov	ved from 100	D-yr -		
Other benefits			Reductior	n in # of road clos	ures over 10	) years -		
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No	Negative impact	s description	-					
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply co	ntribution de	scription -					

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost \$1,500,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0

FMS area

Whitehouse



Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Title	City of Whit	ehouse Drai	nage Capacity	/ Upgrades		N	EC	H	=S	
ID#	052000139	Sponsor	Whitehouse	(Municipality)						
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG Goals	REGION	NAL FLOOD	PLANNIN	G GROUP	
Strat	egy Details									

**REGION 5** 

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Smith			
Strategy description	Establish a plan to increase stormwater drainage capacity by completing a hydraulic study, evaluating historical water drainage then constructing needed improvements.					

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 98	# of structures	33	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 2		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	1			
Number of low water crossings 2		Historical road closures	2			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed from 100-yr -				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (ac					
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-	Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -				
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road clos	ures over 10 years -			
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions?       No         Water supply contribution description       -						
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$1,000,000	Amount of availab	ole funding	%	Nature-Based 0		
	5					





139 of 147
Title	Trinity County Flood Infrastructure Upgrades								
ID#	052000140	Sponsor	Trinity (Cou	inty)					
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	ioals			



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Strategy description		Infrastructure Projects	County	Trinity	
		Within the county, develop a plan to install/improve culverts and headwalls canals	in addition to expanding	g stormwater ditches a	ind
Goal(s)	Goal 1: An average c of their design. Goal 2: An average c their design	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut If 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will util	ilize larger storm events ( ize larger storm events (>	>100-year) as the basis ·100-year) as the basis o	; of

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 15		# of structures		32		Critical facilities		0			
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local	Yes		Playa?	No		Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 68			Roadway	(s) impacted (mile	es)	22				
Number of low water crossing	gs 1			Historica	road closures		1				
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	ction										
Population removed from 100	)-yr	-		# of structures removed from 100-yr			-				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -							
Road removed from 100-yr (n	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -							
Other benefits _				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years			-				
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	s description		-						
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution des			escription	-							
Estimated Cost											

## Strategy Cost \$2,000,000 Amount of available funding - % Nature-Based 0 Mature-Based 0 Dallas Dallas Dallas LOUISIANA Houston Houston Houston Houston Regional view of FMS area

Title	Trinity County	Flood-pro	ne Infrastructure Upgrades
ID#	052000141	Sponsor	Trinity (County)



Reason for

Recommendation Complies with RFPG Goals



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Trinity					
Strategy description	Develop a program to upgrade flood infrastructure in the county. May include	evelop a program to upgrade flood infrastructure in the county. May include general roadway elevation upgrading culverts and						
	installing headwalls; upgrades and reinforcement of bridges and bridge footings; etc.							

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 15			# of structures		32		(	Critical facilities 0			
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Coast	al? No	Local?	Yes	Play	ya? N	ю	Other?	No
Farm/Ranch land in	npacted (acr	res) 68			Roadway(	s) impacted (mile	s) 22				
Number of low wat	er crossings	1			Historical	road closures	1				
100-Year Flood R	isk Reduc	tion									
Population removed from 100-yr				# of st	# of structures removed from 100-yr			-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			-		Farm/	Ranch land remo	ved from	n 100-yr (a	cres) -		
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)			Low w	ater crossings re	moved fr	rom 100-yr	r -				
Other benefits _					Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts											
Negative impacts?	Ν	lo	Negative im	oacts descriptio	n -						
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de				escription -							
Estimated Cost											
Strategy Cost	\$2,000,0	00		mount of availa	able funding	-			%	Nature-Based	0





Title	City of Groveton Flood Infrastructure Upgrades									
ID#	052000142	Sponsor	Groveton	(Municipality)						
RFPG recommend? Yes				Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	ioals				
Church	Deteile									

Groveton

FMS area



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type Strategy description		Infrastructure Projects	County	Trinity
		Within the city, develop a plan to install/improve culverts and headwalls in canals	n addition to expanding	stormwater ditches and
Goal(s)	Goal 1: An average of of their design. Goal 2: An average of their design.	of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will uti If 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utili	lize larger storm events ( ze larger storm events (>	>100-year) as the basis 100-year) as the basis of

### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 2	# of structures	3	es 0				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes C	Coastal? No	Local? Yes	Playa? No	Other? No			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 0		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	0				
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0				
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction							
Population removed from 100-yr -		# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr	-			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed	l from 100-yr (acre	s) -			
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)		Low water crossings remo	ved from 100-yr	-			
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Negative impacts? No Negative   Water supply contributions? No Water supply	e impacts description supply contribution de	- escription -					
Estimated Cost							
Strategy Cost \$750,000	Amount of availal	ble funding -		% Nature-Based 0			
		Dalla	as	LOUISIANA			

142 of 147

Austin

Regional view of FMS area

Houston

Recommendation

Title	Van Zandt C	ounty Draina	age Capacit	ty Upgrades		
ID#	052000143	Sponsor	Van Zandt	(County)		
RFPG re	ecommend?	Yes		Reason for	Complies with RFPG Go	als



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Van Zandt
Strategy description	Establish a plan to increase Drainage Capacity; possible actions include Upgrading Undersized Pipe under State Hwy for Water to Run into Creek.	installing French Drains,	Building Elevation, and
Goal 1: An avera	age of 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will ut	tilize larger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis

of their design. Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of their design.

Goal 3: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

#### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 233		# o	f structures	217		Critical	Critical facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (ac	res) 232			Roadway(s)	impacted (miles)	13			
Number of low water crossings	5 0			Historical ro	oad closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduc	tion								
Population removed from 100-yr -				# of structures removed from 100-yr -					
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr				Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (mi	iles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits				Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -					
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution des			escription -						
Estimated Cost									

## Strategy Cost \$2,000,000 Amount of available funding % Nature-Based 0 Canton Dallas LOUISIANA Austin Houston FMS area Regional view of FMS area 143 of 147

Title	Van Zandt Co	In Zandt County Flood Infrastructure Maintenance						
ID#	052000144	Sponsor	Van Zandt	t (County)				
RFPG re	commend?	Yes		Reason for Recommendation	Complies with RFPG G	ioals		



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

#### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Van Zandt			
Strategy description	Adopt and Implement a Program for Clearing Debris from Bridges, Drains and Culverts. Reduce damages caused by flooding by maintaining or restoring drainage capacity.					
Goal 1: Reduce expo	sure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood rick inundation ext	ents by elevating acquirir	a relocating or			

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

Goal 3: Increase percentage of areas with dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance for storm drainage system to 50% of communities.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk	233			# o	f structures	217			Critical	facilities	0	
Flood risk type:	Riverine?	Yes	Со	astal?	No	Local?	Yes		Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land	impacted (ad	cres) 232				Roadway	(s) impact	ed (miles)	13			
Number of low w	ater crossing	s 0				Historical	road clos	ures	0			
100-Year Flood	Risk Reduc	ction										
Population remo	ved from 100	-yr	-			# of s	tructures	removed fr	rom 100-yr	-		
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr			Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -									
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)			Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -									
Other benefits _			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years _									
Impacts												
Negative impacts	?	No	Negative	impact	s description		-					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de			escription -	-								
Estimated Cos	t											
Strategy Cost	\$2,000,0	000		Amc	ount of availal	ble funding	-				% Nature-Based	0





144 of 147

Regional view of FMS area



### **Strategy Details**

Strategy type	Infrastructure Projects	County	Van Zandt
Strategy description	Develop a program to elevate roads and bridges including installing, upsizing c	ulverts and headwalls, a	nd bridge upgrades.

**REGION 5** 

Goal 1: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10% of structures.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Reduce exposure of existing and future structures in the 100-year flood risk inundation extents by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 30% of structures.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 233		# o	f structures	217		Critical	facilities 0		
Flood risk type: Riverine?	Yes	Coastal?	No	Local?	Yes	Playa?	No	Other?	Yes
Farm/Ranch land impacted (a	cres) 232			Roadway(s) i	mpacted (miles)	13			
Number of low water crossing	gs O			Historical roa	ad closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Redu	iction								
Population removed from 100-yr -			# of structures removed from 100-yr -						
Critical facilities removed from	n 100-yr	-		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -					
Road removed from 100-yr (r	niles)	-		Low water crossings removed from 100-yr -					
Other benefits _			Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts									
Negative impacts?	No	Negative impact	ts description	ı -					
Water supply contributions? No Water supply contribution de			escription -						
Estimated Cost									

#### **Estimated Cost**

Strategy Cost	\$2,000,000	Amount of available funding	-	% Nature-Based 0
Cant	on	Wan Lin	Dallas	LOUISIANA
	FMS a	area 145 of	147 <sup>R</sup>	egional view of FMS area

Title	Liberty Coun	ity Topograp	phical Mapping Update
ID#	052000146	Sponsor	Liberty (County)
RFPG re	commend?	Yes	Reason for Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy Details			
Strategy type	Other	County	Liberty
Strategy description	Purchase updated topographical maps/complete LiDAR aerial survey for drainage plan.		

Goal 1: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 75% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

Goal(s) Goal 2: Increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing detailed studies that utilize consistent methodology in 100% of areas identified as having current gaps in flood mapping.

#### Existing 100-Year Flood Risk

Population at risk 143	# of structures	116	Critical facilitie	S 1				
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other?	Yes			
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1,526		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	7					
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0					
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction								
Population removed from 100-yr		# of structures removed f	rom 100-yr	-				
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr		Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -						
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)								
Other benefits		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -						
Impacts								
Negative impacts? No Nega	ative impacts description	-						
Water supply contributions? No Water	er supply contribution de	scription -						
Estimated Cost								
Strategy Cost \$107,000	Amount of availab	ble funding -		% Nature-Based	0 t			
35		and and a second second						





146 of 147

Regional view of FMS area

Liberty County Drainage District Multi-County Coordination Title

#### ID# 052000147 Sponsor Liberty County Drainage District Reason for Complies with RFPG Goals RFPG recommend? Yes Recommendation



### **REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP**

Strategy Details			
Strategy type	Other	County	Liberty
Strategy description	Work with adjoining counties regarding flood and drainage issues.		
Goal 1: An average o	f 10% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2023 – 2033 will utilize larg	ger storm events (	>100-year) as the basis

of their design. Goal(s) Goal 2: An average of 25% of the new regional infrastructure projects between 2033- 2053 will utilize larger storm events (>100-year) as the basis of

their design.

Goal 3: RFPG must consider in all projects and should incorporate nature-based practices and floodplain preservation in an average of 10% of their new flood risk reduction projects between 2023 - 2033.

### **Existing 100-Year Flood Risk**

Population at risk 143	# of structures	116	Critical facilities	1		
Flood risk type: Riverine? Yes	Coastal? No	Local? No	Playa? No	Other? Yes		
Farm/Ranch land impacted (acres) 1,526		Roadway(s) impacted (miles)	7			
Number of low water crossings 0		Historical road closures	0			
100-Year Flood Risk Reduction						
Population removed from 100-yr	-	# of structures removed fr	om 100-yr -			
Critical facilities removed from 100-yr	-	Farm/Ranch land removed from 100-yr (acres) -				
Road removed from 100-yr (miles)	-					
Other benefits _		Reduction in # of road closures over 10 years -				
Impacts						
Negative impacts? No	Negative impacts description	-				
Water supply contributions? No	Water supply contribution de	escription -				
Estimated Cost						
Strategy Cost \$50,000	Amount of availal	ole funding		% Nature-Based 0		





147 of 147

Regional view of FMS area