Texas Water Development Board

P.O. Box 13231, 1700 N. Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78711-3231, www.twdb.texas.gov
Phone (512) 463-7847, Fax (512) 475-2053

March 13, 2023

Mr. Travis Pruski
Senior Planner
Nueces River Authority
200 E Nopal St # 206
Uvalde, TX 78801

RE: Request for Information: Regional Flood Planning Grant Contract with Nueces River
       Authority; Contract No. 2101792498, Final Regional Flood Plan

Dear Mr. Pruski,

Thank you for submitting the 2023 Region 13 Nueces Regional Flood Plan (RFP) to the
Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) under the above referenced contract.

During our review we noticed some deficiencies that need to be addressed before the
regional flood plan will be considered acceptable by TWDB. Please see the attached
spreadsheet that contains a listing of these issues.

It is expected that the data presented within and across all written report sections, tables,
excel spreadsheets, and the geodatabase which constitute the single RFP submission will be
consistent. In cases where there are any discrepancies between equivalent data, the
submitted geodatabase dataset shall supersede other data and the TWDB shall utilize the
geodatabase dataset when developing the state flood plan.

For <u>Level 1 comments</u>:
Staff members have completed their initial review and have found these items either
missing or not sufficient for our review. These Level 1 comments must be addressed with
all relevant files resubmitted before our final plan review may continue.

For <u>Level 2 comments</u>:
We noted several issues that will require attention. Note that these issues are not required
to be resolved and resubmitted. However, we do request that you work to address these
issues as part of the Amended Regional Flood Plan due by July 14, 2023.

Our Mission

Leading the state's efforts in
ensuring a secure water future
for Texas and its citizens

Board Members

Brooke T. Paup, Chairwoman │ George B. Peyton V, Board Member │ L'Oreal Stepney, P.E., Board Member

Jeff Walker, Executive Administrator

Please email your Planner with a response, including resubmission of all relevant files, no later than March 27, 2023.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Tressa Olsen at tressa.olsen@twdb.texas.gov.

Sincerely,

Reem Zoun
Digitally signed by Reem Zoun
Date: 2023.03.13 15:18:11 -05'00'

Reem Zoun, PE, CFM
Director, Flood Planning
Office of Planning

Attachment: TWDB Final Regional Flood Plan Review Comments

cc: LJ Francis, RFPG Chair
        Kristi Shaw, HDR Inc.
        Bryan Martin, HDR Inc.
        Matt Nelson, TWDB
        James Bronikowski, TWDB
        Tressa Olsen, TWDB

Region 13 Nueces Regional Flood Plan

Comment No.	SOW Task No.	Task Name	Item Type	Ex C Item	Ex D Table No.	Ex D feature class	Level 1	Level 2	RFPG Response
1	1	Existing Infrastructure	Map 1	Section 2.1				Please consider referencing Map 1 and its location within the text of Chapter 1.	Reference added.
2	1	Deficient Infrastructure	Map 3	Section 2.1				Please consider referencing Map 3 and its location within the text of Chapter 1.	Reference added.
3	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3			Roadway Stream Crossings in 1% annual risk is 2,309 in the geodatabase as opposed to 5,382 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
4	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3			Critical Facilities in 1% annual risk is 11,356 in the geodatabase as opposed to 445 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
5	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3			Roadway Stream Crossings in Unknown% annual risk is 426 in the geodatabase as opposed to 1 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Stream Crossings in the Unknown annual risk is 3 in GDB and has been corrected in Table 3.
6	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3			Critical Facilities in Unknown% annual risk is 65 in the geodatabase as opposed to 32 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
7	2A	Existing Exposure	Table	Table 3				Structures in 1% annual risk is 60,934 in the geodatabase as opposed to 60,967 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.	The GDB shows 60,967 (See image 3), TWDB is not taking into account the "Power Generation" category of buildings
8	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll	Roadway Stream Crossings in 1% annual risk is 2,309 in the geodatabase as opposed to 5,382 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
9	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll	Critical Facilities in 1% annual risk is 11,356 in the geodatabase as opposed to 445 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
10	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll	Roadway Stream Crossings in Unknown% annual risk is 426 in the geodatabase as opposed to 1 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Stream Crossings in the Unknown annual risk is 3 in GDB and has been corrected inTable 3
11	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll	Critical Facilities in Unknown% annual risk is 65 in the geodatabase as opposed to 32 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.		Table 3 updated to match geodatabase
12	2A	Existing Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		14	ExFldExpAll		Structures in 1% annual risk is 60,934 in the geodatabase as opposed to 60,967 in the Exhibit C Table 3. Please reconcile.	The GDB shows 60,967 (See image 3), TWDB is not taking into account the "Power Generation" category of buildings
13	2A	Model Coverage	GIS feature class		N/A	ModelCoverage		Per Exhibit D, All ArcMap documents (.mxd) or equivalent map document formats used in final map production are also required for delivery to the TWDB with accompanying data in a stand-alone directory structure. Using the ModelCoverage feature class, please provide the underlying data used to create the map of model coverage included in the plan.	For R13 we did not have any ModelCoverage areas in the 2023 RFP but have provided for the 2023 Amended RFP.

The 2023 RFP did not have any models or recommended FMP's. However we did show the model info we had incorporated into the ExFld Hazard layer with this map. In order to provide these layer we saved them in the "Base GDB" we provided as addtional information. See Image 4 for screenshot of Map 22 that was provided as well as where the data came from. For the USGS and USACE data we never actually recieved floodplain data, however we showed the approximate study |
14	2B	Existing vs. Future Hazard	Map 10	Section 2.2.B.1				It appears difficult to distinguish flood hazard areas that increase from existing condition to future condition. Please consider revising how the extent of increased flood hazard area is displayed on this map.	Based on our citeria that was developed, It was assumed that outside of cities/towns there would be little to no change in the floodplains. You will only see increases in future floodplains within cities or towns based on the analysis that was done for population growth.
15	2B	Future Exposure	Table	Table 5			Critical Facilities in 1% annual risk is 11,474 in the geodatabase as opposed to 642 in the Exhibit C Table 5. Please reconcile.		Table 5 updated to match geodatabase
16	2B	Future Exposure	Table	Table 5			Critical Facilities in Unknown% annual risk is 67 in the geodatabase as opposed to 32 in the Exhibit C Table 5. Please reconcile.		Table 5 updated to match geodatabase
17	2B	Future Exposure + Vulnerability	GIS feature class		19	FutFldExpAll	Critical Facilities in 1% annual risk is 11,474 in the geodatabase as opposed to 642 in the Exhibit C Table 5. Please reconcile.		Table 5 updated to match geodatabase

| 18 | 2B | Future Exposure + Vulnerability | GIS feature class | | 19 | FutFldExpAll | Critical Facilities in Unknown% annual risk is 67 in the geodatabase as opposed to 32 in the Exhibit C Table 5. Please reconcile. | | Table 5 updated to match geodatabase |
| 19 | 2B | Future Exposure + Vulnerability | GIS feature class | | 19 | FutFldExpAll | | Critical infrastructure type 'EMS' appears to be missing, but may be included as 'Fire'. Please confirm if correct. | Correct. Received data from HIFLD that had a combination of Fire Department, Emergency Services, and Emergency Medical Services. These were all categorized under the term "Fire" |