

Proposed 2024 State Flood Plan Flood Management Evaluation (FME), Flood Mitigation Project (FMP) and Flood Management Strategy (FMS) Ranking Criteria and Weight

Texas Water Code Sec. 16.061, "(b) The state flood plan must include: ... (2) a statewide, ranked list of ongoing and proposed flood control and mitigation projects and strategies necessary to protect against the loss of life and property from flooding..."

TWDB rules state that the state flood plan shall incorporate "a statewide, ranked list of recommended FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs that have associated one-time capital costs derived from the Board-approved RFPs (31 TAC §362.4 (c)(5))."

* All flood risk and risk reduction information are for 1% annual chance storm.

	Criteria Name	Criteria Type	Criteria Grouping	FME Ranking Criteria	FME Ranking Weight	FME Grouping Weight	FMP Ranking Criteria	FMP Ranking Percent Weight	FMP Grouping Weight	FMS Ranking Criteria	FMS Ranking Percent Weight	FMS Grouping Weight
REPORTED DATA FROM FME, FMP and FMS FEATURE CLASSES	1 Emergency Need (Y/N)	Other		No	0.0%		No	0.0%		No	0.0%	
	2 Estimated number of structures at 100yr flood risk	Flood Risk	Life, Safety and Structures	Yes	15.0%	80.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	10.0%	45.0%
	3 Residential structures at 100-year flood risk	Flood Risk		Yes	10.0%		No	0.0%		Yes	5.0%	
	4 Estimated Population at 100-year flood risk	Flood Risk		Yes	15.0%		No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%	
	5 Critical facilities at 100-year flood risk (#)	Flood Risk		Yes	20.0%		No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%	
	6 Number of low water crossings at flood risk (#)	Flood Risk		Yes	20.0%		No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%	
	7 Estimated number of road closures (#)	Flood Risk	Mobility	Yes	5.0%	15.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	5.0%	15.0%
	8 Estimated length of roads at 100-year flood risk (Miles)	Flood Risk		Yes	10.0%		No	0.0%		Yes	10.0%	
	9 Estimated farm & ranch land at 100-year flood risk (acres)	Flood Risk	Agriculture	Yes	5.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%	Yes	5.0%	5.0%
	10 Number of structures with reduced 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain	Flood Risk Reduction	Life, Safety and Structures				Yes	5.0%	50.0%	No	0.0%	20.0%
	11 Number of structures removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain	Flood Risk Reduction		Yes	5.0%	Yes	10.0%					
	12 Percent of structures removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain (Calculated by TWDB from reported data)	Flood Risk Reduction						No		0.0%		
	13 Residential structures removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain	Flood Risk Reduction		Yes	10.0%	Yes	10.0%					
	14 Estimated Population removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain	Flood Risk Reduction		Yes	10.0%	No	0.0%					
	15 Critical facilities removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain (#)	Flood Risk Reduction		Yes	10.0%	No	0.0%					
	16 Number of low water crossings removed from 100yr (1% annual chance) Floodplain (#)	Flood Risk Reduction	Mobility				Yes	10.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%
	17 Estimated reduction in road closure occurrences	Flood Risk Reduction		No	0.0%	No	0.0%					
	18 Estimated length of roads removed from 100yr floodplain (Miles)	Flood Risk Reduction					Yes	5.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%
	19 Estimated farm & ranch land removed from 100yr floodplain (acres)	Flood Risk Reduction	Agriculture				Yes	5.0%	5.0%	No	0.0%	0.0%
	20 Cost per structure removed from 100-year floodplain	Other					No	0.0%		No	0.0%	
	21 Percent Nature-based Solution (by cost)	Other					Yes	2.5%		Yes	5.0%	
	22 Benefit-Cost Ratio	Other					Yes	2.5%				
	23 Water Supply Benefit (Y/N)	Other					Yes	5.0%		Yes	10.0%	
Subtotal				100.0%			70.0%			100.0%		
FMP PROJECT DETAILS SCORING (COMPUTED BY RFPG, SOME DUPLICATION MAY EXIST)	24 Score 1: Severity - Pre-Project Average Depth of Flooding (100-year)	Flood Risk					Yes	5.0%				
	25 Score 2: Severity - Community Need (% Population)	Flood Risk					No	0.0%				
	26 Score 3: Flood Risk Reduction	Flood Risk Reduction					See above	0.0%				
	27 Score 4: Flood Damage Reduction	Flood Risk Reduction					Yes	2.5%				
	28 Score 5: Critical Facilities Damage Reduction	Flood Risk Reduction					No	0.0%				
	29 Score 6: Life and Safety	Flood Risk Reduction					Yes	5.0%				
	30 Score 7: Water Supply	Other Benefits					Yes	5.0%				
	31 Score 8: Social Vulnerability	Other					Yes	2.5%				
	32 Score 9: Nature-Based Solution	Other Benefits					See above	0.0%				
	33 Score 10: Multiple Benefits	Other Benefits					Yes	2.5%				
	34 Score 11: O&M	Other					Yes	2.5%				
	35 Score 12: Admin, Regulatory Obstacles	Other					No	0.0%				
	36 Score 13: Environmental Benefit	Other Benefits					Yes	2.5%				
	37 Score 14: Environmental Impact	Other Benefits					No	0.0%				
	38 Score 15: Mobility	Other Benefits					Yes	2.5%				
	39 Score 16: Regional (Geographic Distribution)	Other Benefits					No	0.0%				
Subtotal				0.0%			30.0%			0.0%		
Total				100.0%			100.0%			100.0%		

Please refer to RFP Exhibit C (pages 114 - 135) for definition of Project Details Scoring:

[Exhibit C: Technical Guidelines for Regional Flood Planning](#)

- 1 Severity Ranking - Pre-Project Average Depth of Flooding (100-year): Ranking of severity based on the baseline/pre-project average 100-year flood depth.
- 2 Severity Ranking - Community Need (% Population): Ranking of severity based on a community's need by percentage of project community affected by population.
- 3 Flood Risk Reduction: Ranking of reduced flood risk by percentage of structures removed from the 100-year floodplain in post-project condition.
- 4 Flood Damage Reduction: Ranking of flood risk reduction (property protection) by a percentage of 100-year damage reduction calculation.
- 5 Critical Facilities Damage Reduction: indication of reduced flood risk by percentage of critical facilities removed from the 100-year floodplain in post-project condition.
- 6 Life and Safety Ranking (Injury/Loss of life): Ranking project based on life/injury risk percentage using estimates of area hazard rating, area vulnerability rating, and historical loss of life injury data for project.
- 7 Water Supply Ranking: Ranking project based on a project's water supply benefits to direct or indirect water availability and/or supply.
- 8 Social Vulnerability Ranking: A ranking based on the Center for Disease Control SVI data for Texas, by calculating an average project SVI by census tract and classifying the vulnerability level.
- 9 Green/Nature-Based Solution Ranking: Ranking by the percentage of project cost that qualifies as green/nature based as reported by RFPG.
- 10 Multiple Benefit Ranking: Ranking a project based on the reporting of significant, measurable, expected benefits to: recreation, transportation, social and quality of life, local economic impacts, meeting sustainability goals, and/or project resilience goals.
- 11 Operations and Maintenance Ranking: Project ranking by expected level of O&M needs and annual costs provided.
- 12 Administrative, Regulatory, and other implementation obstacles/difficulty ranking: Ranking based on anticipated project limitations and/or requirements in terms of administrative, regulatory, and other implementation obstacles.
- 13 Environmental Benefit Ranking: Ranking of expected level of environmental benefits to be delivered by project to water quality, cultural heritage, habitat, air quality, natural resources, agricultural resources, and soils/erosion and sedimentation.
- 14 Environmental Impact Ranking: Ranking of expected level of adverse environmental impacts due to project affecting water quality, cultural heritage, habitat, air quality, natural resource protection, agricultural resources, and erosion and sedimentation.
- 15 Technical Complexity Ranking: Ranking of estimated project design, modeling, and construction requirements.
- 16 Mobility Ranking: Ranking project improvement and protection of mobility during flood events, with particular emphasis on emergency service access and major access routes.