

Chapter 10: Public Participation and Plan Adoption



Table of Contents

10.	Public Participation and Plan Adoption	10-1
10.1	RFPG Organization and Role in Flood Planning Process	10-1
10.2	Public Information and Engagement	10-5
10.2.1	Media Releases and Online Access.....	10-5
10.2.2	Public Meetings	10-5
10.2.3	Surveys	10-8
10.2.4	Draft RFP Review, Final Adoption, and Amendment.....	10-9
10.3	Flood Planning Guidance Principles	10-9

Tables

Table 10.1	Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Voting Members	10-1
Table 10.2	Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Non-Voting Members	10-2
Table 10.3	Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Group Committees.....	10-3
Table 10.4	Subcommittee 1 Members (Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices/Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals, Task 3)	10-3
Table 10.5	Subcommittee 2 Members (Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMPs, Task 4)	10-3
Table 10.6	Subcommittee 3 Members (Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMEs and FMSs, Task 4).....	10-4
Table 10.7	Subcommittee 4 Members (Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations, Task 8)	10-4
Table 10.8	Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Meetings	10-6
Table 10.9	Alignment of RFP with Guidance Principles.....	10-9

Appendices

Appendix 10A RFPG Meeting Minutes

Appendix 10B Survey Results

Appendix 10C Draft RFP Public Hearing Documentation

Appendix 10D Draft RFP Comments and Responses – TWDB

Appendix 10E Draft RFP Comments and Responses – Public

10. Public Participation and Plan Adoption

This chapter summarizes the role of the Upper Rio Grande RFPG in the flood planning process and the various public participation, information, and outreach activities conducted by the RFPG during the development of the RFP. These activities demonstrate the RFPG's commitment to engaging with the public and other flood planning stakeholders and providing as many opportunities as possible for public input.

The chapter also describes the flood plan adoption process, including information on the submittal of the Draft RFP, the required public hearing, addressing public comments, and the adoption of the Final RFP.

10.1 RFPG Organization and Role in Flood Planning Process

The Upper Rio Grande RFPG is one of the 15 RFPGs formed by the TWDB on October 1, 2020, as a result of the passage of Texas Senate Bill 8 in 2019, which established the state and regional flood planning process. The RFPG's role and functions are defined in Texas Water Code (TWC) Chapter 16 and in Title 31 of the TAC Chapters 361 and 362. Among these functions, the Upper Rio Grande RFPG's primary responsibility is to identify and manage flood risks across the region to reduce the impacts of flooding to life, property, and infrastructure.

Voting members within the Upper Rio Grande RFPG represent ten interest groups (shown in **Table 10.1**), while non-voting members represent state agencies or other neighboring regional planning groups (shown in **Table 10.2**). All RFPG members are recognized for their important contributions to the 2023 Upper Rio Grande Regional Flood Plan.

Table 10.1 Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Voting Members

Interest Group	Name	Entity	County	Alternate Member
Agriculture	Dr. Zhuping Sheng	Sheng Engineering PLLC	El Paso	N/A
Counties	Gilbert Saldana, Jr.	El Paso County	El Paso	N/A
Electric generating utilities	Vacant	N/A	N/A	N/A
Environmental Interests	Jeff Bennett	Rio Grande Joint Venture	Brewster	N/A
Industries	Sal Masoud	Del Rio Engineering	El Paso	N/A
Municipalities	Javier Acosta	FXSA	El Paso	N/A
Public	Dave Hall	N/A	El Paso	N/A
Public	Carlos Arturo Velarde Fernandez	Val Verde County	Val Verde	N/A
Small Business	Rene Rodriguez	N/A	El Paso	N/A
Water Districts	Omar L. Martinez	EPCWID #1	El Paso	N/A
Water Utilities	Gisela Dagnino	El Paso Water	El Paso	Enrique Ochoa, Marvin Gomez
Water Utilities	Levi Bryand	LCA, Inc.	Ector	N/A

Table 10.2 Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Non-Voting Members

Non-Voting Member	Agency/Organization
James Weaver	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Judy Lucio	Texas Division of Emergency Management
Larissa Place	Texas Department of Agriculture
Elijah Casas	Texas General Land Office
Richard Bagans	Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)
Anita Keese	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
Vanessa Rosales-Herrera	Region 15 Liaison
Delbert Humberson	U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC)
Ben Wilde	Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB)

Throughout the planning process, the RFPG formed several committees to focus on different aspects of the flood plan and provide recommendations to the overall planning group at general RFPG meetings. These committees included an executive committee and four topic-based subcommittees to examine specific parts of the RFP scope of work as listed below and summarized in **Table 10.3**:

- Subcommittee 1: Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices/Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals (Tasks 3A and 3B, Chapter 3), shown in
- Subcommittee 2: Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMPs (Task 4, Chapter 4)
- Subcommittee 3: Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMEs and FMSs (Task 4, Chapter 4)
- Subcommittee 4: Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations (Task 8, Chapter 8)

The four subcommittees were formed by the RFPG on September 7, 2021, and included both voting and non-voting members from the RFPG. Subcommittee members are listed in **Table 10.4** through **Table 10.7**. General RFPG meetings and subcommittee meetings were all held in accordance with Open Meetings Act (OMA) requirements, as described in Section 10.2.2.

Table 10.3 Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Group Committees

Committee	Number of Meetings
Executive Committee	1
Subcommittee 1 – Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices/Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals (Task 3)	4
Subcommittee 2 – Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMPs (Task 4)	6
Subcommittee 3 – Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMEs and FMSs (Task 4)	4
Subcommittee 4 – Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations (Task 8)	3

Table 10.4 Subcommittee 1 Members (Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices/Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals, Task 3)

Member	Interest Category	Member Type
Dave Hall, <i>Subcommittee 1 Chair</i>	Public	RFPG Voting Member
Carlos Arturo Velarde Fernandez	Public	RFPG Voting Member
Gilbert Saldana, Jr.	Counties	RFPG Voting Member
Gisela Dagnino	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Javier Acosta	Municipalities	RFPG Voting Member
Levi Bryand	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Omar L. Martinez	Water Districts	RFPG Voting Member

Table 10.5 Subcommittee 2 Members (Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMPs, Task 4)

Member	Interest Category	Member Type
Javier Acosta, <i>Subcommittee 2 Chair</i>	Municipalities	RFPG Voting Member
Carlos Arturo Velarde Fernandez	Public	RFPG Voting Member
Dave Hall	Public	RFPG Voting Member
Gilbert Saldana, Jr.	Counties	RFPG Voting Member
Gisela Dagnino	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Jeff Bennett	Environmental Interests	RFPG Voting Member
Levi Bryand	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Omar L. Martinez	Water Districts	RFPG Voting Member
Delbert Humberson	U.S. IBWC	RFPG Non-Voting Member

Table 10.6 Subcommittee 3 Members (Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMEs and FMSs, Task 4)

Member	Interest Category	Member Type
Sal Masoud, <i>Subcommittee 3 Chair</i>	Industries	RFPG Voting Member
Gisela Dagnino	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Jeff Bennett	Environmental Interests	RFPG Voting Member
Levi Bryand	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Omar L . Martinez	Water Districts	RFPG Voting Member
Delbert Humberson	U.S. IBWC	RFPG Non-Voting Member

Table 10.7 Subcommittee 4 Members (Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations, Task 8)

Member	Interest Category	Member Type
Omar L . Martinez, <i>Subcommittee 4 Chair</i>	Water Districts	RFPG Voting Member
Gilbert Saldana, Jr.	Counties	RFPG Voting Member
Gisela Dagnino	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Levi Bryand	Water Utilities	RFPG Voting Member
Sal Masoud	Industries	RFPG Voting Member
Anita Keese	TCEQ	RFPG Non-Voting Member
Delbert Humberson	U.S. IBWC	RFPG Non-Voting Member

The RFPG represents the interests of stakeholders throughout the flood planning region and functions in support of and in coordination with the TWDB to deliver the draft and final Regional Flood Plans. The RFPG responsibilities are outlined in 31 TAC §361.12 and include the following activities for every planning cycle:

1. Designate a political subdivision as a Planning Group Sponsor – in this planning cycle, the Planning Group sponsor was RGCOG.
2. Select a technical consultant(s) to be procured by the Planning Group Sponsor – in this planning cycle, the technical consultant was AECOM.
3. Hold at least one public meeting, to determine what, if any, additional public notice the RFPG determines is necessary to ensure adequate public notice in its own FPR. This meeting was held on November 5, 2020.
4. Hold public meetings at central locations readily accessible to the public within the FPR to gather general suggestions and recommendations from the public. These meetings are discussed further in Section 10.2.2.
5. Approve the contract(s) and any subsequent amendments thereto between the Planning Group Sponsor and the technical consultant or TWDB Scope(s) of Work or budgets in open

meetings. The original contract was approved and executed on June 11, 2021, and the contract amendment was approved and executed on March 25, 2022.

10.2 Public Information and Engagement

The Upper Rio Grande RFPG encouraged broad, regionwide public participation throughout the flood planning process. All RFPG activities and RFP updates were posted and accessible to the public with opportunities for public feedback. Flood planning stakeholders and the public were engaged throughout the process across several modes of outreach as described in the following section. The RFPG met all requirements under the Texas Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act.

10.2.1 Media Releases and Online Access

Media releases about the flood planning process were produced and distributed to local media organizations across the region. These media releases resulted in an estimated media reach of nearly 3 million through print, digital, and broadcast media stories, targeting the areas of El Paso, Pecos, Presidio, Alpine, Marfa, and Fort Davis. Additional public outreach was conducted by state media outlets.

The Upper Rio Grande RFPG maintains a flood planning website (www.urgfpg.org) with information for the public regarding past and upcoming RFPG meetings, open house events, planning documents, RFPG members, and public comment submission. Interested parties are encouraged to sign up to receive public meeting notices and other flood planning updates by email. Additional information regarding the state flood planning process is also available at the TWDB's flood planning website (www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/index.asp).

10.2.2 Public Meetings

RFPG Meetings

The Upper Rio Grande RFPG held several meetings between November 2020 and January 2023 to discuss relevant RFP topics, conduct pre-planning and administrative activities, receive updates from the technical consultant, and vote on specific measures. All meetings were posted and held in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act (OMA) with a copy of all materials presented or discussed available for public inspection prior to and following public meetings.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, selected OMA provisions were temporarily suspended by the Office of the Texas Governor, and public meetings were initially held fully online via GoToWebinar and Microsoft Teams. Once these temporary suspensions were lifted, RFPG meetings were conducted in-person at the RGCOG office in El Paso with a virtual option for the convenience and safety of attendees. Public attendance was encouraged, and each meeting included a scheduled time for public comments or questions. In addition, all meetings were recorded and posted online on the RFPG website along with the associated meeting minutes for public access following the meetings. **Table 10.8** provides an overview of all general RFPG meetings conducted during the first planning cycle. Meeting minutes from the RFPG general meetings and subcommittee meetings are provided in **Appendix 10A**.

Table 10.8 Upper Rio Grande Flood Planning Meetings

Meeting Number	Date	Meeting Location	Agenda Highlights
0.1	November 5, 2020	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Pre-Planning Meeting
0.2	January 21, 2021	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Pre-Planning Meeting
0.3	March 16, 2021	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Pre-Planning Meeting
0.5	April 9, 2021	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Executive Committee Meeting
0.5	April 15, 2021	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Pre-Planning Meeting
0.6	May 20, 2021	GoToWebinar Virtual Meeting	Pre-Planning Meeting
1	August 5, 2021	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Introduction to Consultant Team; Flood Plan Outline; Discussion of Tasks 1-2
2	September 7, 2021	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 1-2; RFPG Approval of Subcommittees 1-4
3	October 15, 2021	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 1-4; Stakeholder Coordination; El Paso Open House Meeting Preview; Updates from Subcommittee 1-3 Meetings
4	November 2, 2021	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 1-4; Stakeholder Coordination Results; El Paso Open House Meeting Recap; Updates from Subcommittee 1 and 3 Meetings
5	November 30, 2021	El RGCOG, Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 1-4; RFPG Approval of (1) Recommendations on Floodplain Management Standards, (2) Adoption of Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals, and (3) Process to Identify and Evaluate Potential FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs
6	December 16, 2021	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Updates from Subcommittee 2 Meeting; RFPG Adoption of Technical Memo and Authorization of Consultant to submit Technical Memo to TWDB
7	February 2, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 4-5; Pecos and Presidio Open House Meeting Preview; Updates from Subcommittee 2-3 Meetings; RFPG Approval of (1) Refinements to list of Identified FMEs and FMSs and (2) Refinements to FMP Prioritization Method
8	February 28, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 4-5 and 8 focusing on evaluation of FMEs and FMSs; Pecos and Presidio Open House Meeting Recap; RFPG Approval of Technical Memo March 7 th Deliverables and Authorization of Consultant to submit Deliverables to TWDB
9	March 15, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 4-5 focusing on evaluations of FMPs
10	April 21, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 4-5 focusing on evaluations of FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs; RFPG Approval of Recommendations for FMPs

Meeting Number	Date	Meeting Location	Agenda Highlights
11	May 25, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion of Tasks 4-5 and 8; RFPG Approval of (1) Recommendations for FMPs and (2) Revision of Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals
12	June 30, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of Draft RFP Chapters
13	July 13, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of Draft RFP Chapters
14	July 20, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of Draft RFP Chapters; RFPG Approval of (1) Draft RFP Deliverables and Authorization of Consultant to Submit Deliverables to TWDB and (2) Recommendations for FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs
15	July 26, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of Draft RFP Chapters
16	July 28, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of Draft RFP Chapters; RFPG Approval of Chapter 8 Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations
17	September 14, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion on potential FMEs to perform during Task 12 RFP amendment phase
18	November 15, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Initial discussion of TWDB and public comments on Draft RFP; Discussion of Stakeholder Coordination for Task 12 (FMEs for Amended RFP); RFPG Approval of FMEs to study in Task 12
19	December 6, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Review of TWDB/public comments and draft responses to comments on Draft RFP; Discussion of Task 12; RFPG Approval of changes to Task 12 FMEs
20	December 15, 2022	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	RFPG Adoption of Final RFP and Authorization of Consultant to Submit Final Deliverables to TWDB
21	February 7, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion on Task 12 (Performing FMEs for Amended RFP)
22	March 8, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion and potential action regarding administrative expenses; Digital Infrastructure Program; Discussion on Task 12 (Performing FMEs for Amended RFP)
23	April 12, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion and potential action regarding administrative expenses; Digital Infrastructure Program; Discussion on Task 12 (Performing FMEs for Amended RFP)
24	May 9, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion on Task 12 (Performing FMEs for Amended RFP)
25	June 7, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Vote to acknowledge and approve additional FMEs, FMPs, and funding sources
26	June 21, 2023	RGCOG, El Paso, TX / Microsoft Teams	Discussion and action to vote for approval of Final Amended RFP Deliverables as presented by AECOM with Authorization of Consultant/Political Subdivision to make edits finalizing responses to Draft Amended RFP comments submitted by the Public and to submit the Final Amended RFP Deliverables to TWDB; Consideration for the 2nd cycle of regional flood planning

Open House Meetings and Hearings

In addition to the regular RFPG and committee meetings, several public open house meetings were held throughout the region to facilitate engagement with the public and other flood planning stakeholders. Due to the region's large size, three locations relatively central to the region were identified to host these public open house meetings, including the Cities of El Paso, Pecos, and Presidio.

An initial pre-planning meeting was held in El Paso on July 25, 2021, to receive preliminary feedback from the public on important issues to be considered as part of the RFP. In addition, over the course of the flood planning process, four open house meetings were conducted on the following dates:

- Open House Meeting in El Paso: October 27, 2021
- Open House Meeting in Pecos: February 9, 2022
- Open House Meeting in Presidio: February 10, 2022
- Open House Meeting in El Paso: June 8, 2022

At each of these open house meetings, flood maps from the region were shared to allow community members the opportunity to identify any potential flood risks that had not previously been captured on the maps. Public feedback from these meetings was used during the development of flood prone areas discussed in *Chapter 2 ("Flood Risk Analyses")*. These meetings were also utilized to gather general suggestions and recommendations from the public as to issues, provisions, and types of FMSs, FMPs, and FMEs that should be considered for potential inclusion in the first-cycle RFP. The final open house meeting in El Paso was utilized to gather public feedback on the potential recommended FMSs, FMPs, and FMEs discussed in *Chapter 5 ("Evaluation and Recommendation of Flood Solutions")*. Public notifications for each open house meeting were advertised in local newspapers and on social media.

A Public Hearing was held in El Paso on September 14, 2022, to receive public feedback on the Draft RFP. Details of this public hearing are included with **Appendix 10C**.

10.2.3 Surveys

The RFPG conducted a stakeholder survey from September to October 2021 to obtain flood-related information from the public and other flood planning stakeholders. The survey was posted on the RFPG website and emailed directly to stakeholders, who were also contacted by the RFPG and technical consultant and encouraged to participate in the survey. In addition to stakeholder-specific questions, the survey included general flood-related questions to solicit feedback from the public related to overall flood experiences and issues of concern. A copy of the survey results is provided for reference in **Appendix 10B**.

In addition, an interactive web map was developed to collect feedback from the public regarding flood prone areas, critical infrastructure or resources, existing infrastructure, and existing or proposed flood mitigation projects. The interactive web map was shared as part of the stakeholder survey and at public open house meetings.

10.2.4 Draft RFP Review, Final Adoption, and Amendment

The Draft RFP was approved by the RFPG on July 20, 2022, and submitted to the TWDB for review. The Draft RFP was released for public review with a 60-day comment period between August 14, 2022, and October 14, 2022. In addition, a Public Hearing was held on September 14, 2022, to receive public comments. Printed copies of the Draft RFP were located in three publicly accessible locations in the region including the cities of El Paso, Pecos, and Presidio. The Draft RFP was also posted to the RFPG website for public review, and public comments were accepted electronically during the public review and comment period.

All comments from the TWDB on the Draft RFP are provided in **Appendix 10D** followed by RFPG responses to these comments. Public comments received during the 60-day comment period are summarized (along with responses) in **Appendix 10E**, including comments from the Rio Grande Council of Governments (RGCOG) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). During the Public Hearing on September 14, 2022, the RFPG met with members of the public to clarify the purpose and content included in the RFP; however, no additional formal comments requiring changes to the RFP were received from the public during this meeting.

The Final RFP was adopted by the RFPG on December 15, 2022, and submitted to the TWDB along with supporting materials on January 10, 2023. The RFP was submitted in accordance with the contractual, statute, and rule requirements.

The Amended RFP was subsequently approved by the RFPG on June 21, 2023. AECOM submitted the Amended RFP to TWDB along with supporting materials on July 14, 2023.

A second amendment to the RFP was approved by the RFPG on March 27, 2025. AECOM submitted the second Amended RFP to TWDB along with supporting materials on April 1, 2025.

10.3 Flood Planning Guidance Principles

The state and regional flood planning process is guided by 39 principles adopted in Title 31 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §362.3. This RFP conforms with each of these flood planning guidance principles, including the requirement that the plan will not negatively affect any neighboring areas. Specifically, each of the principles are aligned with one or more of the RFP report sections as outlined in **Table 10.9**. In addition, the RFP adequately provides for the preservation of life and property in the region.

Table 10.9 Alignment of RFP with Guidance Principles

Guidance Principle ("The regional and state flood plans: ...")		RFP Section(s)
1	shall be a guide to state, regional, and local flood risk management policy;	Chapter 3, Chapter 8
2	shall be based on the best available science, data, models, and flood risk mapping;	Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Chapter 4/5
3	shall focus on identifying both current and future flood risks, including hazard, exposure, vulnerability and residual risks; selecting achievable flood mitigation goals, as determined by each RFPG for their region; and incorporating strategies and projects to reduce the identified risks accordingly;	Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 4/5

Guidance Principle (“The regional and state flood plans: …”)	RFP Section(s)
4 shall, at a minimum, evaluate flood hazard exposure to life and property associated with 0.2 percent annual chance flood event (the 500-year flood) and, in these efforts, shall not be limited to consideration of historic flood events;	Chapter 2
5 shall, when possible and at a minimum, evaluate flood risk to life and property associated with 1.0 percent annual chance flood event (the 100-year flood) and address, through recommended strategies and projects, the flood mitigation goals of the RFPG (per item 2 above) to address flood events associated with a 1.0 percent annual chance flood event (the 100-year flood); and, in these efforts, shall not be limited to consideration of historic flood events;	Chapter 2, Chapter 4/5
6 shall consider the extent to which current floodplain management, land use regulations, and economic development practices increase future flood risks to life and property and consider recommending adoption of floodplain management, land use regulations, and economic development practices to reduce future flood risk;	Chapter 3
7 shall consider future development within the planning region and its potential to impact the benefits of flood management strategies (and associated projects) recommended in the plan;	Chapter 1, Chapter 2
8 shall consider various types of flooding risks that pose a threat to life and property, including, but not limited to, riverine flooding, urban flooding, engineered structure failures, slow rise flooding, ponding, flash flooding, and coastal flooding, including relative sea level change and storm surge;	Chapter 1, Chapter 2
9 shall focus primarily on flood management strategies and projects with a contributing drainage area greater than or equal to 1.0 (one) square miles except in instances of flooding of critical facilities or transportation routes or for other reasons, including levels of risk or project size, determined by the RFPG;	Chapter 4/5
10 shall consider the potential upstream and downstream effects, including environmental, of potential flood management strategies (and associated projects) on neighboring areas. In recommending strategies, RFPGs shall ensure that no neighboring area is negatively affected by the regional flood plan;	Chapter 4/5, Chapter 6
11 shall include an assessment of existing, major flood mitigation infrastructure and will recommend both new strategies and projects that will further reduce risk, beyond what existing flood strategies and projects were designed to provide, and make recommendations regarding required expenditures to address deferred maintenance on or repairs to existing flood infrastructure;	Chapter 1, Chapter 4/5
12 shall include the estimate of costs and benefits at a level of detail sufficient for RFPGs and sponsors of flood mitigation projects to understand project benefits and, when applicable, compare the relative benefits and costs, including environmental and social benefits and costs, between feasible options;	Chapter 4/5
13 shall provide for the orderly preparation for and response to flood conditions to protect against the loss of life and property and reduce injuries and other flood-related human suffering;	Chapter 7
14 shall provide for an achievable reduction in flood risk at a reasonable cost to protect against the loss of life and property from flooding;	Chapter 4/5
15 shall be supported by state agencies, including the TWDB, General Land Office, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and the Texas Department of Agriculture, working cooperatively to avoid duplication of effort and to make the best and most efficient use of state and federal resources;	Chapter 10
16 shall include recommended strategies and projects that minimize residual flood risk and provide effective and economical management of flood risk to people, properties, and communities, and associated environmental benefits;	Chapter 4/5

Guidance Principle (“The regional and state flood plans: ...”)		RFP Section(s)
17	shall include strategies and projects that provide for a balance of structural and nonstructural flood mitigation measures, including projects that use nature-based features, that lead to long-term mitigation of flood risk;	Chapter 4/5
18	shall contribute to water supply development where possible;	Chapter 6
19	shall also follow all regional and state water planning guidance principles (31 TAC 358.3) in instances where recommended flood projects also include a water supply component;	Chapter 6
20	shall be based on decision-making that is open to, understandable for, and accountable to the public with full dissemination of planning results except for those matters made confidential by law;	Chapter 10
21	shall be based on established terms of participation that shall be equitable and shall not unduly hinder participation;	Chapter 10
22	shall include flood management strategies and projects recommended by the RFPs that are based upon identification, analysis, and comparison of all flood management strategies the RFPs determine to be potentially feasible to meet flood mitigation and floodplain management goals;	Chapter 4/5
23	shall consider land-use and floodplain management policies and approaches that support short- and long-term flood mitigation and floodplain management goals;	Chapter 3
24	shall consider natural systems and beneficial functions of floodplains, including flood peak attenuation and ecosystem services;	Chapter 3, Chapter 4/5
25	shall be consistent with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and shall not undermine participation in nor the incentives or benefits associated with the NFIP;	Chapter 2, Chapter 3
26	shall emphasize the fundamental importance of floodplain management policies that reduce flood risk;	Chapter 3
27	shall encourage flood mitigation design approaches that work with, rather than against, natural patterns and conditions of floodplains;	Chapter 3, Chapter 4/5
28	shall not cause long-term impairment to the designated water quality as shown in the state water quality management plan as a result of a recommended flood management strategy or project;	Chapter 6
29	shall be based on identifying common needs, issues, and challenges; achieving efficiencies; fostering cooperative planning with local, state, and federal partners; and resolving conflicts in a fair, equitable, and efficient manner;	Chapter 10
30	shall include recommended strategies and projects that are described in sufficient detail to allow a state agency making a financial or regulatory decision to determine if a proposed action before the state agency is consistent with an approved regional flood plan;	Chapter 4/5
31	shall include ongoing flood projects that are in the planning stage, have been permitted, or are under construction;	Chapter 1
32	shall include legislative recommendations that are considered necessary and desirable to facilitate flood management planning and implementation to protect life and property;	Chapter 8
33	shall be based on coordination of flood management planning, strategies, and mitigation projects with local, regional, state, and federal agencies projects and goals;	Chapter 10
34	shall be in accordance with all existing water rights laws, including but not limited to, Texas statutes and rules, federal statutes and rules, interstate compacts, and international treaties;	Chapter 6
35	shall consider protection of vulnerable populations;	Chapter 2, Chapter 4/5
36	shall consider benefits of flood management strategies to water quality, fish and wildlife, ecosystem function, and recreation, as appropriate;	Chapter 4/5, Chapter 6

Guidance Principle (“The regional and state flood plans: ...”)		RFP Section(s)
37	shall minimize adverse environmental impacts and be in accordance with adopted environmental flow standards;	Chapter 4/5, Chapter 6
38	shall consider how long-term maintenance and operation of flood strategies will be conducted and funded; and	Chapter 9
39	shall consider multi-use opportunities such as green space, parks, water quality, or recreation, portions of which could be funded, constructed, and or maintained by additional, third-party project participants.	Chapter 4/5

Appendix 10A

RFPG Meeting Minutes

Appendix 10A.1

RFPG General Meeting Minutes

Appendix 10A.2

Subcommittee 1 Meeting Minutes

(Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices/Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals, Task 3)

Appendix 10A.3

Subcommittee 2 Meeting Minutes

(Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMPs, Task 4)

Appendix 10A.4

Subcommittee 3 Meeting Minutes

(Identification & Evaluation of Potential FMEs and FMSs, Task 4)

Appendix 10A.5

Subcommittee 4 Meeting Minutes

(Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations, Task 8)

Appendix 10B

Survey Results

Appendix 10C

Draft RFP Public Hearing Documentation

[Insert public hearing notice, meeting presentation slides, and meeting minutes (if available)]

Appendix 10D

Draft RFP Comments and Responses – TWDB

[Insert TWDB Comments PDF]

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

LEVEL 1:

General Comments

1. All "submittal requirements" were checked for inclusion, and the following changes were made to ensure the requirements are fulfilled: (1) Chapter 2 Section 2.2.4 [Existing Vulnerability] was updated to add language regarding the locations of high SVI areas within the region, (2) the "ExFldHazard" and "FutFldHazard" feature classes were updated to specify source and date of publicly-provided flood prone areas, and (3) a summary of flood risks by county and type of flooding (e.g., riverine, local, playa) was added in Sections 2.2.3 and 2.3.6.

Scope of Work (SOW) Task 2A

2. Invalid entries in the "ACTIVE" field were updated to valid "Yes" or "No" values.
3. Added all 187 HUC10 features in FPR14.
4. Required fields were added and populated with valid entries to Appendix Table 1B (Existing Flood Infrastructure Summary).
5. Changed 'Non-Functional' to 'Non-functional'; added a description to the "DESCR" field where NULL (3 entries).
6. Fixed missing/invalid attributes; ExFldInfraLn: Deleted 5 features with zero length: 14009554,14009557,14010083,14010485,14010488.
7. Appendix Table 1C has been revised to only include valid entries based upon Exhibit D, Table 8. Also, the ExFldProjs has been updated to reflect the information in the revised Appendix Table 1C.
8. There are 89 polygons for FLOOD_FREQ='Unknown' (SOURCE='Public'). Portions of the originally drawn 'Public' polygons are in Mexico. Total hazard areas have been updated in the Exhibit C Table 3 with portions located in Mexico noted as a footnote below the table.
9. A summary of the region's existing condition total land area of flood risks by flood risk type, county, and frequency has been added to Chapter 2 Sections 2.2.3.
10. The fields 'GAPS_ID' and 'EXGAPS_ID' have been updated per the "Summary of Updates to Exhibit D" document.
11. Cumulative values (for 1% AC and 0.2% events) were used for the 0.2% in the initial summary tables. Appendix Table 2A (Existing Condition Flood Risk Summary) has been updated to report results for the 1% and 0.2% storm events separately.
12. Cumulative values (for 1% AC and 0.2% events) were used for the 0.2% in the initial summary tables. The "ExFldExpAll" feature class has been updated to report results for the 1% and 0.2% storm events separately.

SOW Task 2B

13. A summary of the region's future condition total land area of flood risks by flood risk type, county, and frequency has been added to Chapter 2 Sections 2.3.6
14. Cumulative values (for 1% AC and 0.2% events) were used for the 0.2% in the initial summary tables. Appendix Table 2B (Future Condition Flood Risk Summary) has been updated to report results for the 1% and 0.2% storm events separately. In addition, small features outside of the region boundary were deleted: Deleted 43 features (County=") from "FutFldExpPol" feature class; Deleted 2 features (County=") from "FutFldExpLn" feature class; Two buildings outside the region boundary, partially in the FP adjacent to El Paso County, were added to the building total.
15. Field has been changed to 'FUTGAPS_ID' per the Summary of Updated to Exhibit D.
16. Missing entries have been added to "COUNTY" and "HUC8" fields.
17. Small features outside of the county boundary were deleted: Deleted 43 features (County=") from "FutFldExpPol" feature class; Deleted 2 features (County=") from "FutFldExpLn" feature class.

SOW Task 4B

18. Populated 'LEN_MILES'. All other required fields have been checked to ensure valid entries.
19. Values in the "ENTITY_ID" field have been updated to reflect ENTITY_IDs from the Entities feature class rather than the names of the entities. In the process, additional nonspatial entity records were added to the "Entities_Table" table in the geodatabase to ensure all entities were captured in either the "Entities" feature class or the "Entities_Table" table (no additional spatial records were added to the "Entities" feature class).
20. FME ID 1410000007 has been removed from the feature class which is consistent with the FME tables in Appendices 4A, 4B, and 5C.
21. Two-part response:
 - a. Due to some FMSs extending across a large portion of the region, the list of associated HUC8 names is longer than can fit in the 255 character limit for the "HUC8" field. TWDB confirmed that "HUC8" values longer than 255 characters should be changed to NULL (email 12/5/22). For "NRNC_COST" field, NULL is utilized to represent "not applicable" or "unknown".
 - b. Values in the "ENTITY_ID" field have been updated to reflect ENTITY_IDs from the Entities feature class rather than the names of the entities. In the process, additional nonspatial entity records were added to the "Entities_Table" table in the geodatabase to ensure all entities were captured in either the "Entities" feature class or the "Entities_Table" table (no additional spatial records were added to the "Entities" feature class).

SOW Task 5

22. A column named, "How No Negative Impact was Determined" has been added to Appendix Table 5D: "Flood Mitigation Projects Recommended by RFPG". This column documents whether models, previous studies, or engineering judgment were utilized to determine no

negative impact. Additional information has also been added to Appendix 5B to clarify which method was used to determine no negative impact. In addition, a new Appendix 5H was added to Chapter 5 to document existing and proposed flood depths at buildings to demonstrate no negative impact where models were used.

LEVEL 2:**General Comments**

23. Maps 4 & 8 have index and multi-pages; Map 6 has insets. Added insets to Map 10.

SOW Task 1

24. The following names were changed: "Chamizal National Park" to "Chamizal National Memorial"; "Amistad National Park" to "Amistad National Recreation Area"; and "Rio Grande National Park" to "Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River"

25. Two-part response:

- a. A description of how Low Water Crossings is provided in Section 1.7.1 "Stream Crossings". The section has been renamed to "Stream and Low Water Crossings" for clarity.
- b. A paragraph has been added to section 1.7.2.5 discussing potential reasons for unaccredited levees in El Paso County (note that FMS 142000001 is included to develop full coordination among stakeholders to inventory and address non-accreditation issues).

26. Two-part response:

- a. Zeros ("0") and blank strings were converted to NULL values;
- b. Features are clipped to flood planning region; c. Added 4 Major Reservoirs, IDs 14064579 - 14064583.

27. NULL data for the "ExFldInfraLn" feature class has been corrected for consistency.

28. Map 1 has been updated with the additional information.

29. The summary has been expanded with additional information in Section 1.8.

30. Symbolology for the Existing Flood Projects Map was revised for better clarity.

SOW Task 2A

31. Symbolology for the Existing Condition Flood Exposure Map was revised for better clarity.

32. The SVI was adjusted for >0.75 and LWC were added to the Existing Condition Flood Vulnerability Map.

SOW Task 2B

33. This issue has been corrected.

34. The sentence has been corrected to reflect Table 2.21 depicting future condition flood exposure.

35. Symbolology for the Future Condition Flood Exposure Map was revised for better clarity.

36. The SVI was adjusted for >0.75 and LWC were added to the Future Condition Flood Vulnerability Map.

SOW Task 3A

37. No changes were made to the map since data pertaining to levels of floodplain management practices are not currently available for the region.

SOW Task 4B

38. As stated in Section 5.2 of Chapter 5, "There were no potential FMEs or potentially feasible FMSs or FMPs that were evaluated and found to be infeasible by the RFPG."
39. As stated in Section 5.2 of Chapter 5, "There were no potential FMEs or potentially feasible FMSs or FMPs that were evaluated and found to be infeasible by the RFPG."
40. Values have been populated for 'ASSOCIATED'.
41. Due to budget and time constraints, this Post-Project Flood Hazard GIS Feature Class, FMP_HazPost has not been included in this first cycle of the RFP. This feature class is specified by TWDB as optional.

SOW Task 5

42. The geodatabase has been populated with the information from Appendix Table 5F.

Appendix 10E

Draft RFP Comments and Responses – Public

The following table of comments on the Draft RFP was received from the Rio Grande Council of Governments (RGCOG) on October 13, 2022. Responses have been added next to each of the comments in **Appendix Table 10E.1** below.

Appendix Table 10E.1: Rio Grande Council of Governments (RGCOG) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Chapter/Section or Page # (if applicable)	Comment	Response
1	Ch 1, PDF page 22	Remove redundant references to NFIP participation of communities in Section 1.3 (both the text and table) since this information is duplicated later in Chapter 3	Section 1.3 (Chapter 1) and Section 3.1.1 (Chapter 3) have each been updated to improve clarity based on this comment.
2	Ch 2, PDF page 48	Add bold emphasis to critical facilities in Table 2.23 (Summary of Future Conditions Vulnerability – Critical Facilities) that are unique to the future conditions table and do not appear in Table 2.15 (Summary of Existing Conditions Vulnerability – Critical Facilities)	Emphasis has been added (using bolded text) to Table 2.23 to clarify differences between Table 2.15 and Table 2.23
3	Ch 2, PDF page 27	Add clarification explaining the method used to identify critical routes in Section 2.2.4	Additional clarification regarding the method used to identify critical routes has been added.
4	Ch 2, PDF page 44	Add clarification explaining the differences between the existing and future flood hazard areas shown in Table 2.20 Section 2.3.4	Additional clarification explaining the differences between existing and future flood hazard areas has been added.
5	Ch 3, PDF page 7	Confirm with City of El Paso or El Paso Water that the TFMA Higher Standards are reportedly correctly for City of El Paso	Edits have been made to Chapter 3, Section 3.1.1 to delete documentation of specific higher standards for City of El Paso, as the higher standards for City of El Paso that are listed in the Higher Standards Survey (TFMA, 2018) do not match the City of El Paso Drainage Design Manual (City of El Paso Engineering Department, 2008). El Paso Water has reviewed the relevant edits made to Chapter 3.
6	Ch 4 Appendix 4D, PDF page 35	General comment: If project is within the City of El Paso limits, just state the City of El Paso for “Affected Jurisdiction” and not El Paso County. If project affects unincorporated areas within El Paso County, then include El Paso County. If project affects both, then include both.	Edits have been made to the “Affected Jurisdictions” sections of Appendix 4D for multiple FMPs. FMPs which are entirely contained within incorporated city limits no longer list El Paso County as an affected jurisdiction.

Comment #	Chapter/Section or Page # (if applicable)	Comment	Response
7	Ch 9, Appendix 9B, Table 9B, PDF page 1	In Table 9B of Appendix 9B, change 50% match to 0% match in "Funding to be Financed by Sponsor" column for FMP ID: 143000009. This correction is based on clarification from Hudspeth County and Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District 1 (HCCRD1), who confirmed there was a miscommunication in HCCRD1's response to the funding survey.	This correction has been made.
8	Ch. 9, PDF page 16 and Executive Summary, PDF page 21	After any potential changes occur to Sponsor Financing survey results in Table 9B of Appendix 9B, confirm/update statement in Section 9.2.2 of Chapter 9 and Section ES.9 of the Executive Summary which states that survey responses account for \$156.5 M in funding (97.6% of total implementation cost), and any other reported totals affected by potential changes to Table 9B.	Corrections were not needed to the data referenced in the comments. However, a review of the Appendix Table 9B compared to funding survey responses resulted in the following additional changes to Appendix Table 9B which were not associated with any other public comments: 1) Total Estimated Fixed Cost of FMP ID 143000003 changed from \$225,000 to \$224,000 to account for a rounding issue; 2) Unknown Funding Needed for FMP ID 1430000005 changed from 80% to 100% due to a typo; 3) Unknown Funding Needed for FMP ID 1430000021 changed from 0% to 45% due to misinterpreting a survey response in the draft RFP; 4) Funding to be Financed by Sponsor for FMP ID 1430000021 changed from 100% to 55% due to misinterpreting a survey response in the draft RFP. The above changes resulted in the need to change the total estimated funding needed from \$153.8M (95.9%) to \$155.7M (97%) in the first paragraph of Section 9.3. There were no changes necessary to the Executive Summary.

Comment #	Chapter/Section or Page # (if applicable)	Comment	Response
9	Ch 4, Appendix 4A, PDF pages 5-6	Update "Table 4A. Potential Flood Management Evaluations Identified by RFPG" (in Appendix 4A of Chapter 4) to correct a copy/paste issue causing 10 of the data columns (all columns to the right of "Potential Funding Sources and Amount") to include data one row higher than they are supposed to be for all except the last three rows.	This correction has been made to Table 4A. This correction was not necessary in the FME geodatabase.
10	Ch 4, Appendix 4F, PDF page 15	In Appendix 4F (FMS Narratives), correct or delete an incomplete sentence at the end of the 1st paragraph of SOW section of FMS 142000006	The incomplete sentence has been edited.
11	Ch 4, Appendix 4B, PDF pages 13-14	In Appendix 4B (FME Narratives), the FME 141000006 narrative appears to be a duplicate of the FME 141000005 narrative. Insert the correct narrative for FME 141000006.	The narrative for FME 141000006 has been corrected in Appendix 4B (FME Narratives)
12	Ch 4, Appendix 4B, PDF pages 15-48	In Appendix 4B (FME Narratives), add a narrative for FME 141000008, which is missing.	A narrative for FME 141000008 has been added to Appendix 4B (FME Narratives).
13	Ch 4, Appendix 4B, PDF page 16, 18	In Appendix 4B (FME Narratives), the cost estimates for FME Nos. 141000010 and 141000012 do not match latest costs for the same FMEs in "Table 4A. Potential Flood Management Evaluations Identified by RFPG" from Appendix 4A.	In Appendix 4B, the FME Nos. 141000010 and 141000012 cost tables entitled, "Estimated Cost for FME" have been updated to match the latest cost estimates, which are consistent with Table 4A and the remainder of the RFP document.
14	Ch 2	Update the model coverage map and geodatabase to be consistent with the data included in the TDIS model upload tool's metadata files	The model coverage GDB and Map 22 (Availability of Existing Hydrologic and Hydraulic Models Needed to Evaluate FMSs and FMPs) has been updated to match the data uploaded to the TDIS model upload tool
15	Ch 1, PDF page 3	Replace table references in Chapter 1 Table of Contents (they are currently showing Figure references instead)	Table references in the Chapter 1 Table of Contents have been corrected.
16	Ch 1, PDF page 3	Rename Figures 1.5 and Figure 1.6 to distinguish between the two figures	The figures have been renamed and the table of contents has been updated.

The following table of Chapter 8 recommendations was received from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as a comment on the Draft RFP (in addition, the same table was provided to other planning groups across the state for reference). A response for Region 14 follows **Appendix Table 10E.2** below.

Appendix Table 10E.2: USACE Recommendations

#	Recommendations	Comments
Legislative Recommendations		
1	Non regulatory regional flood control or drainage districts should be established and funded for rapidly growing urban areas such as DFW, Houston, San Antonio, etc. Responsibility would be to provide consistency, technical resources, funding and reviews in support of FME's, FMS's. These organizations would also implement or support implementation of FMP's. These organizations would augment communities and counties that just don't have the resources and expertise to manage flooding.	Rapidly developing areas surrounding larger urban centers are at greater risk of having runoff patterns increasing because of development. These urban areas are comprised of many communities and unincorporated county areas. Many of the smaller communities are not funded or resourced to deal with the complexities of floodplain management and therefore there is a lack of or inconsistencies in floodplain management practices.
2	Clarify the early 2000's state legislation that provide counties the authority to regulate floodplains to explicitly allow and encourage activities associated with floodplain management such as development of land use plans, regulatory authorities, e.g. permitting.	Although state legislation was passed in the early 2000's which gave counties the ability to regulate floodplains, interpretation of these regulations varies widely from county to county. The legislative bill lacks implementation guidance in the form of administrative rules. If development is occurring in unincorporated areas, this development can dynamically impact flood risk.
Regulatory Recommendations		
3	Require the use of n-values and channel conditions which would likely result if the channel or project were not maintained. Exceptions would be golf courses or other areas where an organization exists which would maintain the channel in perpetuity. Disallow maintenance by marginal organizations such as home owners associations to justify acceptance of lower n-values as this is an unrealistic expectation.	When channels are constructed, most often channel bed, banks and overbanks are cleared; however, with many miles of these channels, it is often difficult for communities to maintain those beds, banks and overbanks at their design conditions. Generally, there is a lack of channel maintenance to ensure flood conveyance areas, established as part of a development or improvement projects, to retain their design level n-values. This results in unexpected changes in channel conveyance and increased flooding. Channel maintenance is very expensive activity that can trigger environmental permitting requirements.

#	Recommendations	Comments
4	No loss of valley storage to the 500-year level. Communities could allow redistribution of valley storage to allow interactions with natural areas but no loss of storage.	Land development in upstream areas increases runoff in downstream areas. This happens because of increased impervious cover and decreased tree cover, and therefore less ability to absorb rainfall. Additionally, development, in most communities, encroaches into riparian areas and decreases the amount of storage available to accommodate flood waters. Just the main thread of the Trinity River though DFW stores more flood waters during of flood than any three of the USACE reservoirs that provide flood protection for DFW. The many other streams provide even more storage than the main stem. There is limited capacity in rivers and streams to convey floodwaters. This means that all areas above any given conveyance point have to store flood water until sufficient time has lapsed to pass the water away from the impacted area. The streams are where this water is stored and depleting these storage areas will impact DS areas.
5	Establish future land use plans for unincorporated areas associated with rapidly growing urban areas.	"
6	Use of ultimate development land use conditions in the development of future flows. Require use of future flows for regulation of floodplains and development of FMP's.	"
State Flood Planning Recommendations		
7	Encourage storm shifting to validate 100-yr estimates and to provide a broader understanding of communities actual flood risk Storms identified and cataloged as part of the GLO funded USACE led Texas Storm Study could be the primary source of storms to be shifted.	Notes: Great deal of uncertainty in 100-yr estimates. Use of observed storms that approximately match depth duration data from NOAA Atlas 14 or other precipitation frequency sources validates 100-yr estimates. Additionally wet, dry and average conditions as well as conditions at the time the storm occurred can be presented. Additionally, communities have and can experience storms that exceed the 100-yr. While not regulatory, this information will provide additional hazard mitigation data so communities can address critical infrastructure impacts and be better prepared.
8	Add detail to Watershed Hydrology Assessments (WHA) for communities within basins with completed WHA's. The WHA for the Trinity has been completed.	The WHA's, funded by FEMA, are considered the best available flood flow frequency estimates, e.g. 100-yr. These estimates consider the latest precipitation frequencies, the variations in watershed response and determine critical flood drivers by employing a wide range of sensitivity analysis for each computation point.
9	Update WHA's when future precipitation frequency estimates become available. Efforts to develop future precipitation frequency estimates for Texas are starting.	-
10	Establish regional efforts, for large urban centers to develop future land use data for all developing areas, not just incorporated areas, for use in developing future flood flow frequency estimates and future 100-yr (and other recurrence interval) hazard boundaries.	-

Response to USACE Comments:

USACE has provided comments on Flood Plan Recommendations in the Trinity River Regional Flood Plan (RFP) and made a general statement that these comments should be considered as potentially applicable to similar recommendations in other Texas RFPs. Two of these comments appear particularly relevant to the Upper Rio Grande RFP (URGRFP). Comments #7 and #8 from **Appendix Table 10E.2**, including in particular the phrases from the “Comments” column quoted below, appear particularly relevant to the Upper Rio Grande RFP (URGRFP):

- *“Use of observed storms that approximately match depth duration data from NOAA Atlas 14 or other precipitation frequency sources validates 100-yr estimates.”* and
- *“These estimates consider the latest precipitation frequencies, the variations in watershed response and determine critical flood drivers by employing a wide range of sensitivity analysis for each computation point.”*

There is an ongoing USIBWC project updating hydrologic and hydraulic modeling of the Rio Grande between Caballo Dam (in New Mexico) and American Dam (in El Paso, Texas). The USACE comments provided above suggesting “use of observed storms” and “employing a wide range of sensitivity analysis” will be cited as part of the review of the revised USIBWC Rio Grande models included in the Scope of Work for Flood Management Evaluation 141000001 (FME1): “Develop a plan for a Sediment and Vegetation Control Program in the Rio Grande at El Paso”.

These comments will also be considered for application in refined scoping and execution of numerous proposed FMEs in the URGRFP that include development of hydrologic and hydraulic models for defining flood risk. These comments are particularly relevant to the development of storm water master plans, the focus of FME10 (City of Pecos), FME21 (City of Kermit), FME23 (City of Alpine), FME26 (Monahans/ Southwest Sandhill), and FME33 (City of Socorro).

The following comments were received by the RFPG from Phillip Newberry on 9/15/22 and 9/16/22:

9/15/22 10:51 PM Hi I am wondering if I can see a map of the area or any maps and information you have so that I can offer a suggestion. My dad's an engineer and I'm a bit creative myself.

9/15 10:57PM Depending on the geography of the area you're talking about, and the direction of the flow of water, I might be able to help with the idea. If I had to guess off the top of my head, I would imagine that redirecting water is going to be your best bet because although the ground absorbs water very well, it becomes saturated very quickly. So if I had to take a guess, you're going to want to divert water. I'd guess you would divert the water based on geography to save costs. If you can divert flowing water you don't have to move it anywhere.

9/15 10:58 PM You're going to want to break your area up into geographic regions based on water flow, and go from there.

9/16 9:06 AM Make the pharmaceutical industries do the research on how to get everything out.

9/16 9:13 AM Hold them accountable under international law. Human rights.

9/16 9:18 AM There's something in there about poisoning people or mass population control or something.

9/16 9:40 AM Nikola tesla had the greatest ideas. Smartest guy ever. Didn't care enough about money though. I won't make the same mistake. So help me and I help you lmao. Just a little credit. Throw my name on there somewhere.

9/16 9:59 AM I'm gunna patent that if I can. Poor mans patent. Lol.

URGRFPG Response – The provided comments lack specificity and relevancy to the RFP to take action or incorporate them as changes to the RFP. Maps of estimated flood risk by geography along with potential flood risk solutions are provided with RFP Chapters 2 and 4.