

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 143000005 changed from 80% to 100% due to a typo; 3) Unknown Funding Needed for FMP ID 143000021 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 143000021 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 RFGP" (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 RFGP" 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.