

July XX, 2023

Mr. Jeff Walker  
Executive Administrator  
Texas Water Development Board  
P.O. Box 13231  
Austin, TX 78711-3231

SUBJECT: Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Plan (Region 10)  
Transmittal of Adopted Amended Regional Flood Plan and Completeness Checklist

Dear Mr. Walker:

On behalf of the Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Planning Group (RFPG), I am pleased to submit the amended Regional Flood Plan (Plan) for the Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Planning Region (Region 10), as adopted by the RFPG on June 22, 2023. This Plan conforms with the guidance principles in Title 31 TAC §362.3 and includes explanations as to how the Plan satisfies the requirements of each of the guidance principles and that the Plan will not negatively affect a neighboring area and adequately provides for the preservation of life and property and the development of water supply sources, where applicable. Additionally, the content of the adopted Plan is fully compliant with the provisions of Section II, Article II, Paragraph A of the project contract between the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and the Lower Colorado River Authority, acting as the administrative sponsor for Region 10. This submittal includes a technical report with 10 required Plan chapters organized as outlined in TWDB guidance (Exhibit C Table 1.6).

Attached to this transmittal letter is a completed TWDB checklist with additional explanatory notes for each checklist item as appropriate. All required elements enumerated in the checklist are included or addressed in the Plan and its appendices.

As noted, the Plan for Region 10 was adopted by roll call vote and approved for submittal by the RFPG at its meeting on June 22, 2023. As with all meetings of the RFPG and its committees, this meeting was properly noticed and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Texas Open Meetings Act, Public Information Act, the bylaws of the RFPG, and posting requirements specified by TWDB for this meeting. Note that the RFPG approved submittal of the Plan subject to minor non-substantive changes and refinements by the RFPG's Technical Consultant.

As required, we are providing one (1) double-sided hard copy excluding appendices and two (2) electronic copies (one in searchable PDF and one in Microsoft Word format). The adopted Plan is also accessible to the public via the RFPG's website ([www.lowercoloradolavacaflood.org](http://www.lowercoloradolavacaflood.org)).

---

If you or your staff have any questions about the various electronic files that collectively constitute the Plan, please first contact Cindy Engelhardt at [CEngelhardt@half.com](mailto:CEngelhardt@half.com) or by phone at 512-777-4552. You may also reach me at [Lauren.Graber@lcra.org](mailto:Lauren.Graber@lcra.org) or by phone at 512-578-7085. We look forward to any feedback you may have on the adopted Plan and look forward to continuing the flood planning process through the plan amendment phase and beyond.

Sincerely,

Lauren Graber  
Region 10 Sponsor – Lower Colorado River Authority

#### Attachment – Completeness Checklist

c: Reem Zoun, TWDB Director of Flood Planning  
Ian Blair, TWDB Project Manager for the Lower Colorado-Lavaca Flood Planning Region  
Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Planning Group Members  
Technical Consultants

DRAFT

**Amended Regional Flood Plan Checklist**

Date: 7/14/2023		Region Name & Number: Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Planning Group (Region 10)						
Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
1	10	Files Submitted					Submittal delivered on time, and includes <b>one hard copy (without appendices)</b> and two electronic copies (PDF and WORD).	Submitted
2	10	Verified Adoption					Evidence that the amended regional flood plan is complete and adopted by the RFPG. This could be a cover letter from the Chair or Sponsor. Submittal contains a technical report with 10 required plan chapters organized as outlined in Exhibit C Table 1.6.	See Cover Letter
3	10	Guidance Principles and No Negative Impact Statement	Text	Section 2.11			A statement, as required in 31 TAC §361.20, that the plan conforms with the guidance principles in Title 31 TAC §362.3, including an explanation of how the Plan satisfies the requirements of each of the guidance principles including that the plan will not negatively affect a neighboring area.	See Cover Letter and Chapter 10, 'Guidance Principles for State and Regional Flood Planning' section
4	10	Adequately provides for the preservation of life and property					A statement as to whether the RFP adequately provides for the preservation of life and property and the development of water supply sources, where applicable.	See Cover Letter
5	10	Executive Summary	Text	Section 2.11			An executive summary documenting key findings and recommendations that does not exceed 20 pages.	See Executive Summary
6	10	Copy of TWDB Comment Letter	Text				Submittal contains a copy of the TWDB Draft RFP Comment Letter and RFPG responses for each comment.	See Appendix D
7	10	TWDB Comments addressed	Text				LEVEL 1 Comments in the TWDB Draft RFP Comment Letter have been included and adequately addressed. Planners should verify that stated revisions are actually made in the RFP.	See Appendix D and associated Regional Flood Plan
8	10	TWDB Comments addressed	Text				LEVEL 2 Comments in the TWDB Draft RFP Comment Letter have been included and adequately addressed.	See Appendix D and associated Regional Flood Plan
9	10	Public Comments addressed	Text				Public and other agency comments are summarized and responses explain revisions or why changes are not warranted.	See Appendix D and associated Regional Flood Plan
10	10	OMA/PIA Statement	Text	Section 2.11			A statement as to whether or not the planning group met all requirements under the Texas Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act	See Cover Letter and Chapter 10
11	10	Adoption of plan and public participation	Text	Section 2.10			A completed Chapter 10 summarizing public participation activities and appendices with public comments and RFPG responses to comments.	See Chapter 10, Appendix D and associated Regional Flood Plan
12	1	Planning Area Description	Text	Section 2.1			Description of the flood planning region, inventory and assess natural features and constructed major flood infrastructure, and describe proposed or ongoing flood mitigation projects in the region.	See Chapter 1, 'Characterization' section
13	1	Entities	GIS feature class		1	Entities	Entities with flood-related authority and whether they are actively engaged in flood planning, floodplain management, and flood mitigation activities	See GDB
14	1	Watersheds	GIS feature class		4	Watersheds	Identify local watersheds, for example, Onion Creek, Shoal Creek, etc., as applicable. The scale for this layer is flexible and at the discretion of each FPR. Urban areas may require smaller scale watersheds while rural area watersheds may be larger.	See GDB
15	1	Existing Infrastructure	Text	Section 2.1			Assessment of existing major infrastructure and natural features including general description of conditions along with the tabulated data of locations of types of infrastructure. RFPGs have discretion in determining the scale of what constitutes "major" infrastructure.	See Chapter 1, 'Assessment' section
16	1	Existing Infrastructure	Table	Table 1			Table including location and summary of existing flood infrastructure and natural features within the Flood Planning Region. The summary of non-functional or deficient natural flood mitigation features or major flood infrastructure may be included in the same table. Must include summary and location of all low water crossings (LWC) in the region identified by local communities.	See Appendix B, Table 1
17	1	Existing Infrastructure	GIS feature class		5	ExFldInfraPol	This completed polygon feature class should include a general description of the location, condition, and functionality of existing natural flood mitigation features and constructed major flood infrastructure within the FPR.	See GDB
18	1	Existing Infrastructure	GIS feature class		6	ExFldInfraLn	This completed line feature class should include a general description of the location, condition, and functionality of existing natural flood mitigation features and constructed major flood infrastructure within the FPR	See GDB

Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
19	1	Existing Infrastructure	GIS feature class		7	ExFldInfraPt	This completed point feature class should include a general description of the location, condition, and functionality of existing natural flood mitigation features and constructed major flood infrastructure within the FPR.	See GDB
20	1	Existing Infrastructure	Map 1	Section 2.1			Map should include general information on the condition of infrastructure and owners.	See Appendix A, Map 1
21	1	Deficient Infrastructure	Map 3	Section 2.1			Map showing all Non-Functional or Deficient Flood Mitigation Features or Infrastructure within the regional flood planning area.	See Appendix A, Map 3
22	1	Previous Studies	Text	Section 2.1			(OPTIONAL) A list of previous flood studies considered by the RFPG to be relevant to development of the RFP. Note: This is optional.	See Chapter 1, 'Identification of Flood-Prone Areas' section, Chapter 2, 'Best Available Flood Risk Data' and 'Hydrology & Hydraulic (H&H) Model Availability' sections
23	1	Existing Projects	Text	Section 2.1			Summary description of proposed or ongoing flood mitigation projects currently under construction, being implemented; and with dedicated funding to construct and the expected year of completion.	See Chapter 1, 'Action' section
24	1	Existing Projects	Table	Table 2			Summary table of proposed or ongoing flood mitigation projects currently under construction, being implemented, or with dedicated funding to construct and the expected year of completion utilizing Table 2 template and the GIS geodatabase template.	See Appendix B, Table 2
25	1	Existing Projects	GIS feature class		8	ExFldProjs	Proposed or ongoing flood mitigation projects currently under construction, being implemented; and with dedicated funding to construct and the expected year of completion.	See GDB
26	1	Existing Projects	Map 2	Section 2.11			Map showing the locations and extents of proposed or ongoing projects within the regional flood planning area. These projects should all be sponsored and have secured funding.	See Appendix A, Map 2
27	2A	Existing Hazard	Text	Section 2.2.A.1			Identify and compile a comprehensive outlook of existing condition flood hazards in the region including riverine flooding, urban flooding, coastal flooding, playa flooding and possible flood-prone areas of risks.	See Chapter 2, 'Existing Condition Flood Hazard Analysis' section
28	2A	Existing Hazard	GIS feature class		9	ExFldHazard	Completed feature class showing location and magnitude of both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events This task also includes identification of flood prone areas.	See GDB
29	2A	Existing Hazard	Map 4	Section 2.2.A.1			Existing Condition Flood Hazard map should be consistent with the GIS data (ExFldHazard).	See Appendix A, Map 4
30	2A	Existing Gaps	GIS feature class		10	Ex_Map_Gaps	This feature class should show areas with insufficient or outdated existing mapping data. The feature class should also identify additional flood prone areas. Previously called "Fld_Map_Gaps". For "Fut_Map_Gaps" see review item 38.	See GDB
31	2A	Existing Gaps	Map 5	Section 2.2.A.1			Existing Condition Flood Hazard – Gaps in Inundation Boundary Mapping and Identify known Flood Prone Areas map should be consistent with GIS data ( Ex_Map_Gaps).	See Appendix A, Map 5
32	2A	Existing Exposure	Text	Section 2.2.A.2			Description of flood exposure analysis, including structures and population in the existing 1% and 0.2% floodplains identified.	See Chapter 2, 'Existing Condition Flood Exposure Analysis' section
33	2A	Existing Vulnerability	Text	Section 2.2.A.3			1. Identify resilience of communities located in flood-prone area. 2. Identify vulnerabilities of critical facilities to flooding by looking at factors such as proximity to a floodplain or other bodies of water, past flooding issues, emergency management plans, and location of critical systems like primary and back-up power.	See Chapter 2, 'Existing Conditions Vulnerability Analysis' section
34	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3			Once Task 2A Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses is complete, RFPGs must include a summary table with findings summarizing flood risk by county.	See Appendix B, Table 3
35	2A	Existing Exposure	GIS feature class	2.2.A.2	11	ExFldExpPol	This polygon feature class should show the results of existing condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB
36	2A	Existing Exposure	GIS feature class		12	ExFldExpLn	This line feature class should show the results of existing condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB

Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
37	2A	Existing Exposure	GIS feature class		13	ExFldExpPt	This point feature class should show the results of existing condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB
38	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll	This layer combines the existing condition exposure polygon, line, and point data into a single point layer that identifies whether the exposure is a critical facility and provides the Social Vulnerability Index for each point.	See GDB
39	2A	Existing Exposure	Map 6	Section 2.2.A.2			GIS coverage map of existing condition flood exposure in the region.	See Appendix A, Map 6
40	2A	Existing Vulnerability	Map 7	Section 2.2.A.3			GIS coverage map of all existing features (structure, low water crossings, critical infrastructure etc.) with high SVI (over 0.75) in the region.	See Appendix A, Map 7
41	2A	Model Coverage	Text				RFPGs should: identify areas within each FPR where hydrologic and hydraulic model results are already available and summarize the information.; utilize best available data, hydrologic and hydraulic models for each area.	See Chapter 2, 'Hydrology & Hydraulic (H&H) Model Availability' section
42	2A	Model Coverage	GIS feature class		N/A	ModelCoverage	The 'ModelCoverage' polygon feature class identifies models which are relevant to the region's FMP, FMS, or FMEs. This includes models that are used to determine negative impact. Each model should be represented with a polygon showing the coverage of the model. Identify all models used in the flood planning process, including those for determining negative impact. NOTE: While Exhibit D does not prescribe a specific format or other guidelines for this deliverable, TWDB provided additional guidelines via email on Jan. 31, 2022.	See GDB
43	2A	Model Coverage	Map 22	Section 2.4.C			Map(s) showing where existing hydrologic and hydraulic models needed to evaluate FMSs and FMPs are available. NOTE: This map is not specifically mentioned or assigned a number in Exhibit C Section 3.10; however, the general mapping guidelines therein shall be followed for the creation of this map.	See Appendix A, Map 22
44	2B	Future Hazard	Text	Section 2.2.B.1			Identify and compile a comprehensive outlook of future condition flood hazards in the region including riverine flooding, urban flooding, coastal flooding, playa flooding and other possible flood-prone areas of risks including how they will change in extent and nature from the existing flood hazard.	See Chapter 2, 'Future Condition Flood Hazard Analysis' section
45	2B	Future Hazard	GIS feature class		15	FutFldHazard	GIS data layer that shows boundaries of future condition 1 percent and 0.2 percent annual chance riverine flood risk, urban flood risk, coastal flood risk and possible flood prone area.	See GDB
46	2B	Future Hazard	Map 8	Section 2.2.B.1			GIS coverage map of comprehensive future condition flood risk in the region with identification of each type of flooding (e.g., riverine, coastal etc.).	See Appendix A, Map 8
47	2B	Future Map Gaps	GIS feature class		N/A	Fut_Map_Gaps	GIS feature class identifying known flood-prone areas based on location of hydrologic features, historic flooding, and/ or local knowledge.	See GDB
48	2B	Future Map Gaps	Map 9	Section 2.2.B.2			Future Condition Flood Hazard - Gaps. Map showing gaps in inundation boundary mapping and identify known flood-prone areas based on location of hydrologic features, historic flooding, and/ or local knowledge.	See Appendix A, Map 9
49	2B	Existing vs. Future Hazard	Map 10	Section 2.2.B.1			A GIS coverage map showing the extent of increase if flood hazard compared to existing condition.	See Appendix A, Map 10
50	2B	Future Exposure	Text	Section 2.2.B.2			General description, summary of buildings, roadways crossings, length of roadway segments, agricultural land and other identified items that are located within the flood hazard area identified in 'Future condition flood hazard analysis'.	See Chapter 2, 'Future Condition Flood Exposure Analysis' section
51	2B	Future Vulnerability	Text	Section 2.2.B.3			1. Identify resilience of communities located in flood-prone areas identified in the future condition flood exposure analysis. 2. Identify vulnerabilities of critical facilities to flooding by looking at factors such as proximity to a floodplain, proximity to other bodies of water, past flooding issues, emergency management plans, and location of critical systems like primary and back-up power.	See Chapter 2, 'Future Conditions Vulnerability Analysis' section

Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
52	2B	Future Exposure	Table	Table 5			Summary table of findings from Task 2B Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses. Summarized information in the table should accurately reflect associated text, feature class, and maps.	See Appendix B, Table 5
53	2B	Future Exposure	GIS feature class	2.2.B.2	16	FutFldExpPol	This polygon feature class should show the results of future condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB
54	2B	Future Exposure	GIS feature class		17	FutFldExpLn	This line feature class should show the results of future condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB
55	2B	Future Exposure	GIS feature class		18	FutFldExpPt	This point feature class should show the results of future condition flood exposure analyses, identifying who and what might be harmed within the region for, at a minimum, both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events.	See GDB
56	2B	Future Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		19	FutFldExpAll	Combines the future polygon, line, and point data into a single point layer that also includes Vulnerability data.	See GDB
57	2B	Future Exposure	Map 11	Section 2.2.B.2			GIS coverage map of additional total areas, structures, population, agricultural land etc. added to 1 percent and 0.2 percent annual chance flood risk in the 30 years based on future condition flood risk analysis.	See Appendix A, Map 11
58	2B	Future Vulnerability	Map 12	Section 2.2.B.3			GIS coverage map of all features (structure, low water crossing, critical infrastructure etc.) with high SVI (over 0.75) in the region.	See Appendix A, Map 12
59	3A	Existing Management	Text	Section 2.3.A			General description and summary of existing floodplain management practices in the region.	See Chapter 3, 'Minimum Standards and Regulations' section
60	3A	Floodplain Management	Table	Table 6			Table listing all cities, counties and political subdivision with flood-related authorities in the region and at a minimum identify whether the entity adopted any floodplain management regulations, adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145 and/ or if the community is a NFIP participant.	See Appendix B, Table 6
61	3A	Floodplain Management	GIS feature class		20	ExFpMp	Completed geodatabase table: ExFpMP. This geodatabase table should identify areas with existing floodplain management practices, identify common and compare contrasting practices within the region, and acknowledge locations that may lack floodplain management.	See GDB
62	3A	Floodplain Management	Map 13	Section 2.3.A			GIS coverage map depicting the areas with established floodplain management practices and the entities that regulate and enforce those floodplain practices and locations that lack floodplain management.	See Appendix A, Map 13
63	3A	Management Recs	Text	Section 2.3.A			Summary of recommendations and/or adopted standards on Floodplain Management Practices and Infrastructure protection standards for the entire region or by specific areas (HUC-8s) in the region, as applicable. Summarize the recommendations and/or adopted standards including the area where they apply and associated regulatory authority for each recommendation if applicable.	See Chapter 3, 'Recommended Floodplain Management Practices' section
64	3B	Goals	Text	Section 2.3.B			Written list defining the overarching flood mitigation and floodplain management goals for their regional flood plans that will guide the overall approach and recommendations in the plan.	See Chapter 3, 'Lower Colorado-Lavaca Region Goals' section
65	3B	Goals	Table	Table 11			Tabular list of regional flood plan flood mitigation and floodplain management goals as adopted by the RFPG.	See Appendix B, Table 11
66	3B	Goals	GIS feature class		21	Goals	Limited fields of geodatabase table: Goals. This Geodatabase Table should be partially complete with each goal represented as a single record as shown in the Table 21 template provided in Exhibit D.	See GDB
67	4A	Needs Analysis	Text	Section 2.4			Summary of the greatest flood risk and mitigation needs in the region, identify, and document the assumptions and process utilized to identify the greatest flood risk.	See Chapter 4
68	4A	Greatest Gaps	Map 14	Section 2.4.A			Map showing the greatest Gaps in Flood Risk Information.	See Appendix A, Map 14
69	4A	Greatest Risk	Map 15	Section 2.4.A			Map of areas with greatest flood risk in the region.	See Appendix A, Map 15

Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
70	4B	FMX	Text	Section 2.4.B			The documented process used by the RFPG to identify FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs.	See Chapter 5, 'Task 4B: Screening and Evaluation of FMPs, FMEs, and FMSs' section
71	4B	Streams	GIS feature class		22	Streams	Shows the streams to be studied by FMEs, and those relevant to FMS and FMPs, when applicable.	See GDB
72	4B	FME	Text	Section 2.4.B			General description of identified FMEs in the region.	See Chapter 5, 'Initial Screening Results' section and associated Appendix B, Table 12
73	4B	FME	Table	Table 12			Potential Flood Management Evaluations identified by the RFPG.	See Appendix B, Table 12
74	4B	FME	GIS feature class		23	FME	Limited fields of feature class: FME. This feature class should be partially complete with polygon features showing all flood management evaluations identifying areas requiring flood risk evaluation.	See GDB
75	4B	FME	Map 16	Section 2.4.A			A GIS coverage map showing the extent of all identified FME study areas in the region with an indication whether the identified FME area is associated with a previously studied area that requires an update or if the identified study area does not have any existing or anticipated flood mapping, models, etc., and therefore requires an initial study	See Appendix A, Map 16
76	4B	FMP	Text	Section 2.4.B			General description of identified FMPs in the region.	See Chapter 5, 'Initial Screening Results' section and associated Appendix B, Table 13
77	4B	FMP	Text	Section 2.4.B			(OPTIONAL) Written list of FMPs that were identified but determined by the RFPG to be infeasible, including the primary reason for it being infeasible.	See Chapter 5, 'Initial Screening Results' section
78	4B	FMP	Table	Table 13			Potentially feasible flood mitigation projects identified by RFPG	See Appendix B, Table 13
79	4B	FMP	GIS feature class		24	FMP	Limited fields of feature class: FMP. This feature class should be complete with polygon features showing service areas of identified flood mitigation projects.	See GDB
80	4B	FMP	GIS feature class		25	FMP_HazPost	(OPTIONAL) Project specific features showing an updated hazard area that accounts for the impact of the project. This feature class is optional for projects, though it encouraged to be submitted. If not included in submission, mark "No" but will not affect completeness. Note whether it has been submitted on the draft comment checklist.	See GDB
81	4B	FMP	Map 17	Section 2.4.B			Map showing the extent of Potential Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs)	See Appendix A, Map 17
82	4B	FMS	Text	Section 2.4.B			General description of identified FMSs in the region.	See Chapter 5, 'Initial Screening Results' section and associated Appendix B, Table 14
83	4B	FMS	Text	Section 2.4.B			(OPTIONAL) Written list of FMSs that were identified but determined by the RFPG to be infeasible, including the primary reason for it being infeasible.	See Chapter 5, 'Initial Screening Results' section
84	4B	FMS	Table	Table 14			Potentially feasible flood management strategies identified by RFPG	See Appendix B, Table 14
85	4B	FMS	GIS feature class		26	FMS	Limited fields of Feature class: FMS. This feature class should only include FMSs that point to a specific area, as opposed to being a general strategy for an entire entity's jurisdiction. The target area should be represented by a polygon.	See GDB
86	4B	FMS	Map 18	Section 2.4.B			Map showing the extent of Potential Flood Management Strategies (FMS).	See Appendix A, Map 18
87	5	FME Recs	Text	Section 2.5.A			1. General description and summary of the RFPG approach in recommending FME. 2. General description and summary of the FMEs recommended by the RFPG.	See Chapter 5, 'Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs) Recommendation Approach' and 'Recommended Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs)' sections
88	5	FME Recs	Table	Table 15			List of the FMEs recommended by the RFPG.	See Appendix B, Table 15
89	5	FME Recs	GIS feature class		23	FME	Complete the RFPG Recommendation fields in the blank (23. FME) GIS Geodatabase feature.	See GDB
90	5	FME Recs	Map 19	Section 2.5.A			A GIS coverage map of recommended FMEs during this planning cycle depicting FME study area, RFPG boundary, counties, HUC-12s, streams, reservoirs, major roadways, and other features identified by RFPGs.	See Appendix A, Map 19
91	5	FMP Recs	Text	Section 2.5.B			General description and summary of the RFPG approach in recommending FMPs.	See Chapter 5, 'Flood Management Projects (FMPs) Recommendation Approach' and 'Recommended Flood Management Projects (FMPs)' sections
92	5	FMP Recs	Table	Table 16			A table of FMPs recommended by the RFPG.	See Appendix B, Table 16

Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
93	5	FMP Recs	GIS feature class		24	FMP	Complete the RFPG Recommendation fields in the blank 'FMP' GIS Geodatabase feature class (24).	See GDB
94	5	FMP Recs	Map 20	Section 2.5.B			A GIS coverage map of recommended FMPs during this planning cycle depicting FMP project areas, RFPG boundary, counties, HUC-12s, streams, reservoirs, major roadways, and other features identified by RFPGs and proposed project features.	See Appendix A, Map 20
95	5	FMP Details	Table	Section 3.9			Each recommended FMP should have associated project details Tables 23-40.	See GDB
96	5	FMP Details	GDB	Tables 23-40		3.11.3 [FMP_Details]	An Excel workbook that, once complete, will be imported into the RFPG .gdb. The Project Details table is to be completed for RECOMMENDED FMPs only.	See GDB and digital tables
97	5	FMP Recs	Table	3.10.C			Completed template 'No Negative Impact' Excel spreadsheet including all recommended FMPs. A table listing all recommended FMPs, affirmation of no negative impact, quantification of negative impact and how no negative impact was determined for each. Each recommended FMP must be accompanied with an associated model or supporting documentation to show no negative impact. For each recommended FMP, please identify in the plan how no negative impact was determined as required by Exhibit C Section 3.6.A (page 108), either via a model, a study or engineering judgement, and submit the associated model, include the model name, study name, or engineering judgement in tabular format.	See Appendix B, Table 20
98	5	FMS Recs	Text				General description and summary of the RFPG approach in recommending FMSs.	See Chapter 5, 'Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs) Recommendation Approach' and 'Recommended Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs)' sections
99	5	FMS Recs	Table	Section 2.5.C			A table of FMSs recommended by the RFPG.	See Appendix B, Table 17
100	5	FMS Recs	GIS feature class	Table 17	26	FMS	Complete the RFPG Recommendation fields in the blank 'FMS' GIS Geodatabase feature class (26).	See GDB
101	5	FMS Recs	Map 21				A GIS coverage map of recommended FMSs during this planning cycle depicting FMS areas, RFPG boundary, counties, HUC-12s, streams, reservoirs, major roadways, and other features identified by RFPGs and proposed project features.	See Appendix A, Map 21
102	5	FMX Recs	Table	Section 2.5.C			A tabular list of all models that are being submitted, including unique model ID, associated region number, region name, model name, model type, associated FMX IDs, submission date, and identify if the model was being submitted during draft plan submittal or the final plan submittal.	See Appendix B, Table 20
103	6A	Impacts	Text				The RFPGs must include a statement that the plan, when implemented, will not negatively affect neighboring areas located within or outside of the FPR.	See Chapter 6, 'Task 6A: Impacts of the Regional Flood Plan' section
104	6A	Impacts	Text	Section 2.6.A			The plan content should speak to the anticipated overall impacts of the plan on each of the categories; environment, agriculture, recreational resources, water quality, erosion, sedimentation, and navigation. Refer to Exhibit C for list of information.	See Chapter 6, 'Socioeconomic and Recreational Impacts' and 'Overall Impacts' sections
105	6B	Water Supply	Text	Section 2.6.A			Region-wide summary and description of the contribution that the regional flood plan would have to water supply development. Description of any anticipated impacts that the regional flood plan FMSs and FMPs may have. A table listing all recommended FMSs, or FMPs that would measurably contribute to water supply.	See Chapter 6, 'Task 6B: Contributions to and impacts on water supply development and the State Water Plan' section. Note, no activities contribute to water supply.
106	6B	Water Supply	Text	Section 2.6.B			Table listing every recommended FMS or FMP in the flood plan that, if implemented, would negatively impact and/or measurably reduce: 1. water availability volumes that are the basis for the most recently adopted state water plan and/or 2. water supply volumes.	See Chapter 6, 'Task 6B: Contributions to and impacts on water supply development and the State Water Plan' section. Note, no activities negatively impact water supply.
107	7	Flood Response	Text	Section 2.6.B			The Plan must contain a written summary of the current state of flood preparedness in the region to respond to future floods, including a summary of the roles and responsibilities of various entities.	See Chapter 7, 'Roles and Responsibilities for Flood Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery' and 'State of Flood Preparedness' sections
108	7	Flood Response	Text	Section 2.7			The Plan must also contain a written summary of entities involved and actions taken or planned for recovery from past flood disasters in the region.	See Chapter 7, 'Flood Response' and 'Flood Recovery' sections



Item	SOW Task No.	SOW Task Name	Item Type	Exhibit C Item	Exhibit D Table	Exhibit D Feature Class	Abbreviated Description of Deliverable (see guidance documents for full context)	Notes
109	8	Policy Recs	Text	Section 2.7			RFPs will develop legislative, regulatory, administrative, or other recommendations that benefit and/or can be implemented at the local, regional, or state level and support flood risk reduction.	See Chapter 8
110	8	Policy Recs	Text	Section 2.8			Chapter 8 policy recommendations the same as in the Draft RFP.	See Chapter 8
111	9	Financing	Text	Section 2.8			Description of how data was collected, the effectiveness of the survey methodology, percentage of survey completions, and whether an acceptable minimum percent survey completion was achieved.	See Chapter 9, 'Flood Infrastructure Financing Survey' section
112	9	Financing	Table	Section 2.9			FMS, FMP, FME funding survey	See Appendix B, Table 19
113	All	Accessibility		Table 19	Section 2.2		<p>The digital copy of the amended RFP must comply with the requirements and standards specified in 1 TAC §213, Subchapter B (Electronic and Information Resources Accessibility Standards for State Agencies) and the Contract.</p> <p>All figures must have alternative text descriptions, except for decorative elements, which should be tagged as artifacts or background elements. The file must be titled and language specified. <b>All charts must have corresponding data tables.</b> In addition, the document must establish a logical reading order through the consistent use of styles and headings.</p>	See Digital Submittal
114	All	Accessibility			Section 2.2		<p>All PDFs intended for online publication must be tagged for accessibility and reflow. All electronic Adobe PDF files must use embedded fonts with electronically searchable text. Hyperlinks should be live and bookmarks used in a consistent manner to provide easy navigation. Reading order should be evaluated and tab order correctly set. PDFs must pass the Acrobat accessibility full check. <b>It is recommended that PDF files be a size of 50 MB or less to minimize the amount of time it will take to download from the TWDB website. However, if a larger file size is necessary, please ensure that the PDF file is no greater than a file size of 100 MB.</b></p>	See Digital Submittal

DRAFT

**Amended Regional Flood Plan Submittal Items** (5/10/23 email)

Date: 7/14/2023		Region Name & Number: Lower Colorado-Lavaca Regional Flood Planning Group (Region 10)
No.	Item	Notes
1	An index listing the revisions that were made by chapter and/or a table.	See tabular index included as Appendix F
2	An executive summary that documents key RFP findings and recommendations.	See Executive Summary
3	FMP_Details table in a separate excel file and Exhibit C tables in one excel file with multiple tabs.	FMP_Details provided as separate excel file instead rather than included in the Appendix B Tables excel file.
4	The technical report and data prepared in accordance with this chapter and the EA's specifications.	Amended Regional Flood Plan delivered July 14, 2023
5	A list of recommended FMPs, FMEs, and FMSs, with accompanying data to be used by the EA to rank each associated non-zero capital costs or other non-recurring costs in accordance with specifications and guidance to be provided by the EA.	See Appendix B, Tables 15, 16, 17, 19 and FMP_Details
6	One (1) electronic copy of all files on which the plan is based (e.g., spreadsheets, maps).	Provided on TWDB SharePoint
7	Two (2) electronic copies of the entire RFP, one (1) in searchable Portable Document Format (PDF) and one (1) in Microsoft Word (MSWord) Format.	Provided on TWDB SharePoint
8	One (1) electronic copy of the entire RFP in PDF with bookmarks and without the appendixes.	Provided on TWDB SharePoint
9	One (1) hard copy of the entire RFP without the appendixes.	Hand delivered to TWDB
10	A set of ArcGIS compatible data constituting a single file geodatabase of feature classes.	Provided on TWDB SharePoint
11	Certification that the RFP is complete and adopted by the RFPG (cover letter to the Executive Administrator).	See Cover Letter
12	Executive summary that contains less than 20 pages.	On 5/31/23, Region 10 received an email from TWDB (Ian Blair) approving extension of the Executive Summary by 2-3 pages
13	A statement as to whether the RFPG met all requirements under the Texas Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act.	See Cover Letter and Chapter 10
14	A statement that the RFP conforms with the guidance principles in 31 TAC 362.3, including an explanation of how the RFP satisfies the requirements of each of the guidance principles including that the RFP will not negatively affect a neighboring area.	See Cover Letter and Chapter 10, 'Guidance Principles for State and Regional Flood Planning' section
15	A statement as to whether the RFP adequately provides for the preservation of life and property and the development of water supply sources, where applicable.	See Cover Letter
16	Each recommended FMP shall be accompanied by a model, previously signed and sealed report, and/or an explanation based on engineering judgement to affirm no negative impact. Please include a table or a reference to it in the body of the report, listing each recommended FMP, how no negative impact was determined, either via a model, a study or engineering judgement, listing of the model's name and unique model ID, study name, or engineering judgement description and submit the associated model. Please utilize the attached template for this table.	See Chapter 5, 'Recommended Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs)' section and data provided on TWDB SharePoint, 'FinalData/HHModels'
17	Please submit the completed template 'No Negative Impact' Excel spreadsheet including all recommended FMPs for your region.	See Appendix B, Table 20