

Region 2. Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Regional Flood Planning Group

February 4, 2021

2:00 pm

Via teleconference/webinar

Use the following information to register for the meeting:

<https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJEkf-CorzgoE9FqFRaHzmys09Ull5iNpVvKl>

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

If you experience issues while registering or do not have access to a computer, please contact Paul Prange no less than two (2) workdays prior to the meeting at 903.255.3519 or pprange@atcog.org.

Agenda:

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome
3. Confirmation of attendees / determination of quorum
4. Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person
5. TWDB Update and Presentation

Action Items

6. Consider approval of minutes for the meeting held Thursday, January 4, 2021 (p3).
7. Discuss and consider action on Technical Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and process of selection (p9).

Other Business

8. Update from Planning Group Sponsor
 - a) ATCOG/TWDB Group Sponsor Contract
 - b) Contact with the Army Corp of Engineers for appointment to new, non-voting member position
 - c) www.texasfloodregion2.org website development.
9. Discuss Requirement for Flood Planning Members to obtain Public Information Act and Open Meetings Certification to fulfill Texas Government Code 551.005 (p41)
10. Consider date and agenda items for next meeting
11. Adjourn

If you wish to provide written comments prior to or after the meeting, please email your comments to pprange@atcog.org and include "Region 2 RFPG Meeting" in the subject line of the email – OR – you may mail your comments to Region 2 RFPG, c/o ATCOG – Paul Prange, 4808 Elizabeth St, Texarkana, TX 75503.

If you wish to provide oral public comments at the meeting, please submit a request via email to pprange@atcog.org, include "Region 2 RFPG Meeting Public Comment Request" at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, and follow the registration instructions at top of page 1 of the Agenda.

Additional information may be obtained from: www.texasfloodregion2.org, or by contacting Paul Prange at pprange@atcog.org, 903-832-8636, -or- Region 2 RFPG, c/o ATCOG, 4808 Elizabeth St, Texarkana, TX 75503

All meeting agendas and notices will be posted on our website at www.texsfloodregion2.org. If you wish to be notified electronically of RFPG activities, please submit a request to pprange@atcog.org, include "Request for notification of Region 2 RFPG activities". This request will be honored via email only unless reasonable accommodations are needed.

Meeting Minutes
Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Flood Planning Group Meeting
January 7, 2021
2:00 PM
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Roll Call:

| <u>Voting Member</u> | <u>Interest Category</u> | <u>Present (x) /Absent () / Alternate Present (*)</u> |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Preston Ingram (William) | Agricultural interests | X |
| Vacant | Counties | N/A |
| W. Greg Carter | Electric generating utilities | X |
| Laura-Ashley Overdyke | Environmental interests | X |
| Vacant | Flood districts | N/A |
| Vacant | Industries | N/A |
| Dustin Henslee | Municipalities | |
| Kirby Hollingsworth | Public | |
| R Reeves Hayter | River authorities | X |
| Kelly Mitchell | Small business | X |
| Joseph W. Weir III | Water districts | X |
| Susan Whitfield | Water utilities | X |

| <u>Non-voting Member</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Present(x)/Absent()/ Alternate Present (*)</u> |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| James (Clay) Shipes | Texas Parks and Wildlife Department | |
| Brian Hurtuk | Texas Division of Emergency Management | X |
| Darrell Dean | Texas Department of Agriculture | X |
| Tony Resendez | Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board | X |
| Trey Bahm | General Land Office | X |
| Megan Ingram | Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) | X |
| Michelle Havelka | Texas Commission on Environmental Quality | X |

Quorum:Quorum: **Yes**Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: **7**Number required for quorum per current voting membership of **12: 7****Other Meeting Attendees: ****

Anita Machiavello, TWDB

Matt Nelson, TWDB

Morgan White, TWDB

Megan Ingram, TWDB

Richard Bagans, TWDB
Chris Brown
Clark Crandall
Andy Endsley
Stephanie Griffin
Brennan Kane
Joshua McClure
Jarred Overbey
Paul Prange
Jennifer White
Kathleen Jackson, TWDB Director
Laura Jones
Chris Hartung

**Meeting attendee names were gathered from those who entered information for joining the Zoom meeting.

All meeting materials are available for the public at:
<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/regions/schedule.asp>.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order

Reeves Hayter called the meeting to order at 2:02PM. A roll call of the planning group members was taken to record attendance and a quorum was established prior to calling the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome

Reeves Hayter welcomed members to the meeting, specifically announcing the attendance of TWDB Director, Kathleen Jackson as well as potential board member candidates, Andy Endsley and Clark Crandall.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Confirmation of Attendees / determination of a quorum

Each present voting and non-voting member of the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress RFPG introduced themselves, establishing that a quorum had been met.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Public Comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Reeves Hayter opened the floor to public comments. No public comments were given.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Approval of minutes from the previous meeting (p3)

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. A motion was made by Greg Carter and was seconded by Joseph Weir to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: TWDB Update and Presentation (p9)

Megan Ingram introduced TWDB Director, Kathleen Jackson, who presented a brief overview of the regional flood planning process currently underway in the State of Texas and thanked everyone involved in these efforts. Megan Ingram then introduced TWDB staff member, Anita Machiavello, who will be assigned to coordinate with the Region 2 Flood Planning Group as the process moves forward.

Megan Ingram then conducted a slide presentation focusing on the basic aspects of flooding, the request for applications process, including contract details and the responsibilities of the Regional Flood Planning Group, including an overview of the Scope of Work.

Reeves Hayter commented that Region 2 contains more river basins and is being allocated the least amount of funding for this planning process, and asked TWDB staff why that was the case. Megan Ingram stated that she would provide Reeves Hayter with additional information relating to the funding distribution process from the TWDB.

Megan Ingram then stated that the Region 2 sponsor may begin the process of soliciting for technical consultants at this time and does not need to wait until the contract between the ATCOG and the TWDB is executed.

Megan Ingram then summarized tasks 1-10 in the Scope of Work and stated that the Flood Management Evaluation (FME), Flood Management Strategy (FMS) and the Flood Mitigation Project (FMP) are extremely important aspects of the planning process.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Update from Planning Group Sponsor regarding status of Regional Flood Planning Grant contract with the TWDB: link to 1st Planning Cycle Documents (2020-2023) webpage

- a. Discussion on status of application for Regional Flood Planning Grant funds**
- b. Discussion of technical consultant procurement process**
- c. Discussion on Scope of Work posted with TWDB RFA**

Chris Brown, ATCOG Executive Director, announced that the application was currently being prepared and will be submitted to the TWDB by the due date of January 21, 2021. Coordination between ATCOG staff and TWDB staff is ongoing in order to expedite the application process.

Chris Brown and Megan Ingram discussed the process of procuring a technical consultant and the TWDB staff stated that the selection process may begin prior to contract execution. General discussion took place among the board members regarding potential contractors and sub-contractors.

Chris Brown asked the board members if the Scope of Work currently posted in the TWDB Regional Flood Planning Grant Application package needed to be amended prior to ATCOG submitting a Request for Application to the TWDB for flood planning funds. The board members engaged in general conversation and agreed that the Scope of Work was sufficient.

ACTION ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Consider revision of Group Bylaws (p48)

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion to revise the Group Bylaws. Article VIII. 2(b) would allow 180 days for members to select initial officers (April 28, 2021 Deadline) and Article VIII. 2(b) would require regular officers to be selected at the first meeting of each calendar year, beginning in 2022.

Chris Brown briefly described Article V. 4.1 and 4.2 which explains the process of filling vacancies in voting positions, as it relates to the executive committee.

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for approval to revise the Group Bylaws as presented. Laura-Ashley Overdyke made a motion and it was seconded by Joseph Weir. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Consider applications of nominees to fill the currently vacant *Counties, Flood Districts* and *Industries* voting positions (p49)

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and approval to fill the 3 vacant voting member positions. Chris Brown explained that ATCOG received a total of 5 applications from 3 individuals, however 1 individual did not appear to meet the minimum qualifications to serve in any of the vacant categories. The other applicants, Andy Endsley and Clark Crandall are both qualified to serve in the categories of *Counties* and *Industries* respectively.

Reeves Hayter commented about the lack of specific flood districts located within our planning group region and discussion took place among the board members on this topic. Megan Ingram stated that if no flood districts exist, then the planning group could remove and/or replace the category on the list. Preston Ingram suggested that the board remove the *Flood District* category from the list and replace it with another category, in order to maintain 12 voting members.

Discussion took place among the board members and Greg Carter made a motion to approve the *Counties* and *Industries* categories but not the *Flood Districts* category, and to remove it from the list. The motion was seconded by Preston Ingram. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Joseph Weir and seconded by Preston Ingram to approve the appointment of Andy Endsley to the board to represent *Counties*. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Reeves Hayter and seconded by Greg Carter to approve the appointment of Clark Crandall to the board to represent *Industries*. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Consider adding voting members, non-voting members, and/or new interest categories (p50)

Reeves Hayter opened the floor for discussion and stated that he would like to have a representative from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the board as a non-voting member. Discussion took place among the board members and Joseph Weir made a motion to contact the Tulsa and Fort Worth Districts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in order to solicit a non-voting member to the Region 2 board. The motion was seconded by Greg Carter and carried unanimously.

Reeves Hayter stated that he would like to have a liaison from Region 2 for Region 1 and vice versa. Chris Brown elaborated on ATCOG's regular interaction with Region 1's Sponsor, the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission (PRPC) and concurred with this recommendation. Greg Carter mentioned the possibility of enlisting liaisons from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Weather Service (NWS), as well.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Consider a means by which the RFPG will develop and host a public website (required per §361.21(b)). (p51)

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Chris Brown who spoke to the board members about potentially purchasing a domain name for approximately \$20.00 and provided 3 examples. Laura-Ashley Overdyke agreed with the example of texasfloodregion2.org as a good choice. The remainder of the board members concurred.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Consider a means by which the RFPG will accept written public comment prior to and after the meetings (required per §361.21(c)). (p52)

Reeves Hayter turned the floor over to Chris Brown who briefly explained the process by which written public comments will be accepted and reviewed. Greg Carter agreed, along with the entire board.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Discussion of the required solicitation for persons or entities who request to be notified of RFPG activities (required per §361.21(e)). (p53)

Reeves Hayter opened the floor up for discussion and Chris Brown explained that ATCOG currently uses a certain solicitation format and that the agency may soon transition to the Constant Contact format. Brief discussion took place among the board members and Chris Brown, and the Region 2 Planning Group agreed with the suggested process.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Consider date and agenda items for next meeting

Reeves Hayter opened the floor up for discussion and asked if the board members would like to select a certain day and time each month as a standard policy. The board members agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 2021 at 2:00pm via Zoom virtual meeting.

Greg Carter asked Megan Ingram if the TWDB had access to a template for contracting with consultants to conduct technical activities. Megan Ingram responded by stating that the TWDB does have guidance documents available to assist with the development of the RFQ or RFP, but that the development of these documents by the regional flood planning group sponsor is a non-reimbursable activity.

Reeves Hayter mentioned the possibility of conducting interviews with consultants and selecting a consultant at the March or April meeting. Megan Ingram provided the board members with specific information regarding required agenda items for future meetings.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Adjourn

Reeves Hayter made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The board members unanimously agreed.

The vote to adjourn was passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53PM by Reeves Hayter

Approved by the Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress RFPG at a meeting held on 1/7/2021.

Reeves Hayter, Chair
Region 2 RFPG

Attest

BRIEFING PAPER - ACTION ITEM

ITEM 7:

Discuss and consider action on Technical Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and process of selection

BACKGROUND:

Under the TWDB Administrative Guidance for RFPG Sponsors Paragraph 2 Section C, Planning Groups Sponsor responsibilities include:

C. Procure the technical consultant(s) selected by the RFPG to assist the group in developing or revising a regional flood plan. i. The Planning Group Sponsor must follow its own local procurement requirements and state laws, including requirements in Texas Government Code Chapter 2254.

DISCUSSION:

Attached you will find the proposed RFQ with attachments. The following public notice is prepared to be advertised in the Sherman, Greenville, Paris, Texarkana, Longview and Tyler Newspapers:

“The Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Regional Flood Planning Group (Region 2 RFPG) is currently accepting proposals for Technical Consulting Services for the Creation of a Regional Flood Plan as defined by the Texas Water Development Board. Proposals must be submitted by email only to Paul Prange, pprange@atcog.org, and will be received until 4:00 p.m. on March 8, 2021. Information for the Request for Proposals and the format required is available on Region 2 RFPG’s website at www.texasfloodregion2.org. For additional information prior to submitting a proposal or to submit questions regarding the proposal requirements, please contact Paul Prange, Environmental Services Coordinator, 903-255-3519, pprange@atcog.org.”

The RFQ will be posted on the State Comptroller’s website, www.texasfloodregion2.org, along with links from TWDB and ATCOG.

The review committee is suggested to be the Executive Committee that is scheduled for the March meeting agenda.

The Timeline in the RFQ allows for 30 days for qualification submissions. The committee review period and final selection should be reviewed to confirm adequate time is allowed.

RECOMMENDATION:

After review and consensus on the proposed draft and any amendments, staff recommends the Group approves the RFQ for publication by the Sponsor.

REGION 2 LOWER RED-SULPHUR-CYPRESS REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS TO PREPARE THE REGIONAL FLOOD PLAN FOR REGION 2 AND TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL CONSULTING SERVICES TO THE REGION 2 LOWER RED- SULPHUR REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUP AS DEFINED BY 31 TAC CHAPTERS 361 & 362.

The Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress Regional Flood Planning Group (Region 2 RFPG) invites qualified parties to submit a statement of qualifications for preparing a Regional Flood Plan for the Region 2 RFPG, as defined by 31 TAC Chapters 361 & 362.

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill 8 (SB 8), 86th Legislature, allowed for the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive state flood plan requiring the plan to incorporate the regional flood plans approved under section 16.062. As part of that process, the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) has designated 15 flood planning regions with appointed members of Regional Flood Planning Groups (RFPGs). Each RFPG is to prepare a regional flood plan and submit that plan to the TWDB by January 2023. The TWDB will then assemble those regional flood plans into a State Flood Plan to be submitted to the Texas Legislature. The 2023 regional flood plans will represent the initial round of regional planning for the state.

The Region 2 RFPG includes all or portions of 20 counties in Northeast Texas: Bowie, Camp, Cass, Cooke, Delta, Fannin, Grayson, Franklin, Gregg, Harrison, Hopkins, Hunt, Lamar, Marion, Morris, Panola, Red River, Titus, Upshur, and Wood.

Under the direction of the Region 2 RFPG, the consultant shall prepare a regional flood plan. The consultant shall also assist the Region 2 RFPG in preparing an appropriate scope of work that adequately addresses all tasks in 31 TAC 361 and contains the elements needed for the state plan as defined in 31 TAC 362.

In addition to the technical role, the consultant shall assist in the preparation of applications for financial assistance, design and implementation of public involvement activities, including conducting public meetings, reviewing and responding to public comments, and developing educational materials on regional flood planning issues for presentation to both technical and non-technical audiences in the region. The consultant shall provide for electronic communication as requested by the Region 2 RFPG.

Consultants submitting qualifications should be familiar with the rules for state and regional flood planning adopted by the TWDB. These rules contain procedures governing applications for financial assistance related to the development or revision of regional flood plans, and guidelines for the development of the state flood plan. Particularly, the rules contain specific

time frames and requirements for the development of the scope of work and budget for the development of the regional flood plan, as well as details of the scope of work and deadlines for the submittal of the regional flood plan. The schedule for completion and delivery of work products for the Region 2 RFPG shall reflect these publication deadlines.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this request for statements of qualifications is to permit the evaluation of the relative professional and technical qualifications of respondents. The statement of qualifications should be no more than 20 pages (8.5" by 11") in length exclusive of required attachments, 12-point font size, single sided, including cover letter and resumes of all project team members, including subcontractors. Responses should address the following:

1. A list of no more than five (5) projects similar to the scope of work discussed herein, with descriptions of the projects, members of the project teams, time schedule, and contact persons who are able to verify the information presented. All projects must have been completed within the past ten (10) years. It is preferred that project descriptions demonstrate the following types of recent work experience:
 - regional and local flood protection planning for multi-jurisdiction regions including, but not limited to determination and description of current and protected problems resulting from and relating to flooding; determining the views and needs of the affected public; identifying potential solutions, estimating costs and benefits of potential solutions; recommending feasible solutions to flood protection problems; and determining that any proposed solutions are consistent with other regional or state wide plans, laws and regulations;
 - familiarity of water supply and demand issues specific to entities located within Region 2, sufficient to evaluate the effect of proposed flood protection solutions of regional water supply and demand issues;
 - interactions with diverse interest groups and stakeholders participating in regional flood planning with the description demonstrating the range of diversity involved;
 - facilitating consensus-building and conflict resolution among stakeholders with diverse and potentially-conflicting interests;
 - working with the TWDB and Region 2 RFPG in reviewing population forecasts throughout the region and developing and gaining acceptance of alternative forecasts as necessary;
 - familiarity with data and information available from the TWDB, TCEQ, and other sources specifically including but not limited to federal sources, special study commissions, and river authorities;
 - familiarity with TWDB's planning grant administration and invoicing requirements;
 - knowledge of state and federal statutory and regulatory policies affecting water supply, mitigation, water quality, water conservation, and drought management issues for both surface and groundwater; and
 - experience with environmental issues and analyses related to flood planning and flood management;

2. Your firm's resources and capabilities: including the legal name of the firm, description of the business entity (i.e., individual, corporation, L.L.C.), organizational chart, location of firm, size, staffing, experience, evidence of being licensed to provide professional engineering services in the state of Texas, and location of the office proposed to perform the bulk of the work;
3. Any planned subcontractor or teaming arrangement for the project. Information requested in Items 1 and 2 shall be submitted for teaming partner(s);
4. A description of your firm's approach to completing the Plan in accordance with 31 TAC Chapters 355 (subchapter A), 361 and 362 and your firm's current workload and its ability to comply with the scope of work, including the capability of your firm to commit necessary resources to the project in order to meet the project schedule and the identity of those key individuals to be assigned to this project;
6. The identity of any Region 2 RFPG voting member or employer of a Region 2 RFPG voting member with which your firm or planed subcontractors have a current contractual, business or family relationship;
7. Any additional information you would like the Region 2 RFPG to be aware of or which you feel might have a direct bearing on your firm's qualification to perform on the project;

The selection of the successful firm(s) shall be accomplished by a vote of the Region 2 RFPG. Before that vote is taken, it is anticipated that Region 2 RFPG will have some of its members participate in evaluating the Statements of Qualifications received. Any firm submitting a Statement of Qualifications should be prepared to meet with such members and provide a verbal presentation upon request by the Group Sponsor for the Region 2 RFPG. It is anticipated that the screening committee will develop a recommendation for the full Region 2 RFPG to consider. The full Region 2 RFPG has the authority to accept, reject, or modify any recommendation from the screening committee.

In developing a recommendation, the screening committee may use the following matrix in its evaluation:

Selection Criteria

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Maximum Points</u> |
|--|-----------------------|
| Experience of Similar Work by Firm | 20 |
| Experience of Similar Work by Project Team Members | 25 |
| Knowledge of Region-Specific Matters for Plan Elements | 20 |
| Resources & Availability of Firm | 15 |
| Project Approach | <u>20</u> |
| Total | 100 |

By submitting a Statement of Qualifications, the respondent accepts the evaluation process as described in this document and acknowledges that the determination of the “most qualified” firm may require subjective judgments of the screening committee and Region 2 RFPG. The process described in this document is intended to comply with Texas Government Code Chapter 2254 so that the selected firm will be secured on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications through a request for qualifications process.

SCHEDULE

- February 6, 2021 – Begin advertisement and mailing of notices for Request for Statement of Qualifications
- March 8, 2021 4pm – Statement of Qualifications due.
- March 18 (or 25), 2021 – Region 2 RFPG Committee review of Statements of Qualifications received. Development of recommendation for selection.
- April 1 (or 8), 2021 – Presentation by finalists and Region 2 RFPG consultant selection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The submittal, either as part of the Statement of Qualifications or the cover letter, shall provide the following acknowledgments:

- Acknowledgment that, if requested, you will prepare and make a presentation to the Region 2 RFPG;
- Acknowledgment that, if selected, the key individuals of the proposed team will not be changed without the written notification to the Region 2 RFPG and the Administrative Agency for Region 2 RFPG;
- Acknowledgment that, if selected, you will conform to TWDB rules and requirements for grant funding and invoicing;
- Acknowledgment that all information, documentation and other material submitted in response to this document are considered non-confidential and non-proprietary and are subject to public disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act after the solicitation has been completed and the contract executed with the selected firm.
- Acknowledgement that the firm and subcontractors have reviewed their existing resources and commitments and will conform to the schedule established by the TWDB as included herein.

The deadline for responses to this request is 4:00 p.m. on March 8, 2021. One (1) electronic copy in PDF format shall be delivered to Reeves Hayter, Chairman of the Region 2 RFPG, at the following address:

cbrown@atcog.org and include Region 2 RFPG RFQ in the subject line

or

Reeves Hayter, Chair – Region 2 RFPG

c/o Chris Brown

Ark-Tex Council of Governments

4808 Elizabeth St.

Texarkana, TX 75503

Attachments:

Attachment 1 - TWDB Schedule

Attachment 2 - TWDB Draft Scope of Work

Attachment 3 - TWDB Draft Budget

Link to other documents and guidance developed by the TWDB for RFPGs

<https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/planningdocu/2023/index.asp>

Working Conceptual Schedule**

First Cycle of Regional Flood Planning

As of December 2020



| Item | Entity | Activity | Planning SOW Task # | 2020 | | | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2023 | | | | |
|------|--------------|---|---------------------|------|-----|-----|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|--------------------|-----|
| | | | | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May |
| 1 | TWDB | Designation of RFPG members | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | RFPG | RFPG First Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | RFPG | Public participation, stakeholder input, post notices, hold meetings, maintain email lists and website. | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | TWDB | Publish Request for Regional Flood Planning Grant Applications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | RFPG/Sponsor | Submission of Applications for Regional Flood Planning Grants to TWDB | | | | | (DUE JAN 21, 2021) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | TWDB/Sponsor | Review and Execution of Regional Flood Planning Grant Contracts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | RFPG/Sponsor | Solicitation for Technical Consultant by RFQ process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | RFPG | Pre-Planning Meetings for Public Input on Development of RFP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | RFPG | Selection of Technical Consultant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | RFPG/Sponsor | Execution of Technical Consultant Subcontract | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | RFPG | Planning Area Description | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | RFPG | Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses | 2A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | RFPG | Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses | 2B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | RFPG | Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices | 3A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | RFPG | Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals | 3B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | RFPG | Flood Mitigation Need Analysis | 4A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | RFPG | Identification and Evaluation of Potential FMEs and Potentially Feasible FMSs and FMPs | 4B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | RFPG | Preparation and Submission of Technical Memorandum to the TWDB | 4C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | TWDB | Issue Notice-to-Proceed on Task 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | RFPG | Recommendation of FMEs, FMSSs, and FMPs | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | RFPG | Impacts of Regional Flood Plan | 6A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | RFPG | Contributions to and Impacts on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan | 6B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | RFPG | Flood Response Information and Activities | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | RFPG | Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | RFPG | Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | RFPG | Preparation and Submission of Draft RFP to the TWDB | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | RFPG | Public Input on Draft RFP | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | TWDB | TWDB Review and Comment on the Draft RFP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | RFPG | Incorporate TWDB & Public Input into Final RFP | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | RFPG | Adopt and Submit the 2023 RFP to the TWDB | All | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (DUE JAN 10, 2023) | |

Acronyms:

RFP - Regional Flood Plan
RFPG - Regional Flood Planning Group
FME - Flood Management Evaluation
FMS - Flood Management Strategy
FMP - Flood Mitigation Project

Notes:

**This conceptual schedule contains approximate timeframes for high-level planning activities for the purpose of illustrating the anticipated order of and interrelationship/overlap between key activities. Each RFPG & Sponsor will develop their own working schedule and will direct its own planning effort which will vary by region. Milestone dates shown red are required deadlines contained in the Regional Flood Planning Grant Contracts. Details work associated with each task can be found in the Draft Scope of Work: <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/doc/2020DraftsOW.pdf>

Draft Regional Flood Planning (RFP) Scope of Work

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Task 1 – Planning Area Description | 1 |
| Task 2A – Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses | 2 |
| Task 2B – Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses | 4 |
| Task 3A - Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices | 7 |
| Task 3B – Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals | 8 |
| Task 4A – Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis | 9 |
| Task 4B – Identification and Evaluation of Potential Flood Management Evaluations and Potentially Feasible Flood Management Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects..... | 11 |
| Task 4C – Prepare and Submit Technical Memorandum | 15 |
| Task 5 – Recommendation of Flood Management Evaluations and Flood Management Strategies and Associated Flood Mitigation Projects | 16 |
| Task 6A – Impacts of Regional Flood Plan..... | 17 |
| Task 6B – Contributions to and Impacts on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan..... | 18 |
| Task 7 – Flood Response Information and Activities | 19 |
| Task 8 – Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations | 19 |
| Task 9 – Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis | 20 |
| Task 10 – Public Participation and Plan Adoption..... | 21 |

Task 1 – Planning Area Description

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.30, 361.31, and 361.32.

The objective of this task is to prepare a standalone chapter to be included in the 2023 Regional Flood Plan (RFP) that describes the Flood Planning Region (FPR).

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to prepare a chapter that includes:

1. A brief, general descriptions of the following:
 - a. social and economic character of the region such as information on development, population, economic activity, and economic sectors most at risk of flood impacts;
 - b. the areas in the FPR that are flood-prone and the types of major flood risks to life and property in the region;
 - c. key historical flood events within the region including associated fatalities and loss of property;
 - d. political subdivisions with flood-related authority and whether they are currently actively engaged in flood planning, floodplain management, and flood mitigation activities;
 - e. the general extent of local regulation and development codes relevant to existing and future flood risk;
 - f. agricultural and natural resources most impacted by flooding; and
 - g. existing local and regional flood plans within the FPR.
2. A general description of the location, condition, and functionality of existing natural flood mitigation features and constructed major flood infrastructure within the FPR.
3. Include a tabulated list and GIS map of existing infrastructure.
4. Include an assessment of existing infrastructure.
5. Explain, in general, the reasons for non-functional or deficient natural flood mitigation features or major flood infrastructure being non-functional or deficient, provide a description of the condition and functionality of the feature or infrastructure and whether and when the natural flood feature or major flood infrastructure may become fully functional, and provide the name of the owner and operator of the major flood infrastructure.
6. A general description of the location, source of funding, and anticipated benefits of proposed or ongoing major infrastructure and flood mitigation projects in the FPR.
7. A review and summary of relevant existing planning documents in the region. Documents to be summarized include those referenced under 31 TAC §361.22.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: A completed Chapter 1 describing the FPR, existing natural flood mitigation features, constructed major flood infrastructure, and major infrastructure and flood mitigation projects currently under development. A tabulated list and GIS map of existing infrastructure and their conditions. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 2A – Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.33.

The objective of this task is to prepare a chapter to be combined with Task 2B and included in the 2023 Regional Flood Plan (RFP) that describes the existing and future condition flood risk in the FPR.

The RFPGs shall perform existing condition flood risk analyses for the region comprising: (1) flood hazard analyses that determine the location, magnitude, and frequency of flooding; (2) flood exposure analyses to identify who and what might be harmed within the region; and (3) vulnerability analyses to identify vulnerabilities of communities and critical facilities.

The information developed shall be used to assist the RFPG to establish priorities in subsequent planning tasks, to identify areas that need Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs), and to efficiently deploy its resources.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Perform existing condition flood hazard analyses to determine the location and magnitude of both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events as follows:
 - a. collect data and conduct analyses sufficient to characterize the existing conditions for the planning area;
 - b. identify areas within each FPR where hydrologic and hydraulic model results are already available and summarize the information;
 - c. utilize best available data, including hydrologic and hydraulic models for each area;

- d. prepare a map showing areas identified by the RFPG as having an annual likelihood of inundation of more than 1.0% and 0.2%, the areal extent of this inundation, and the sources of flooding for each area; and
 - e. prepare a 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.
- 2. Develop high-level, region-wide, and largely GIS-based existing condition flood exposure analyses using the information identified in the flood hazard analysis to identify 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 as follows:
 - a. analyses of existing development within the existing condition floodplain and the associated flood hazard exposure;
 - b. for the floodplain as defined by FEMA or as defined by an alternative analysis if the FEMA-defined floodplain is not considered best available;
 - c. may include only those flood mitigation projects with dedicated construction funding and scheduled for completion prior to adoption of the next state flood plan.
 - d. shall consider the population and property located in areas where existing levees or dams do not meet FEMA accreditation as inundated by flooding without those structures in place. Provisionally accredited structures may be allowed to provide flood protection, unless best available information demonstrates otherwise.
 - e. shall consider available datasets to estimate the potential flood hazard exposure including, but not limited to:
 - i. number of residential properties and associated population;
 - ii. number of non-residential properties;
 - iii. other public infrastructure;
 - iv. major industrial and power generation facilities;
 - v. number and types of critical facilities;
 - vi. number of roadway crossings;
 - vii. length of roadway segments; and
 - viii. agricultural area and value of crops exposed.
 - f. shall include a qualitative description of expected loss of function, which is the effect that a flood event could have on the function of inundated structures (residential, commercial, industrial, public, or others) and infrastructure, such as transportation, health and human services, water supply, wastewater treatment, utilities, energy generation, and emergency services.
- 3. Perform existing condition vulnerability analyses as follows:
 - a. identify resilience of communities located in flood-prone areas identified as part of the existing condition flood exposure analyses, utilizing relevant data and tools.

- b. 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.
4. All data produced as part of the existing condition flood exposure analysis and the existing condition vulnerability analysis shall include:
 - a. underlying flood event return frequency;
 - b. type of flood risk;
 - c. county;
 - d. HUC8;
 - e. existing flood authority boundaries;
 - f. Social Vulnerability Indices for counties and census tracts; and
 - g. other categories as determined by RFPGs or in TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 2A & 2B) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- Prepare maps according to 1(d) and 1(e).
- A tabulated list and GIS map of all pertinent information. All maps should be submitted with underlying GIS data utilized to prepare them.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 2B – Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.34.

The objective of this task is to prepare a chapter to be combined with Task 2A and included in the 2023 Regional Flood Plan (RFP) that describes the existing and future condition flood risk in the FPR.

RFPGs shall perform future condition flood risk analyses for the region comprising: (1) flood hazard analyses that determine the location, magnitude and frequency of flooding; (2) flood exposure analyses to identify who and what might be harmed within the region; and (3) vulnerability analyses to identify vulnerabilities of communities and critical facilities.

The information developed shall be used to assist the RFPG to establish priorities in subsequent planning tasks, to identify areas that need FMEs, and to efficiently deploy its resources.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Perform future condition flood hazard analyses to determine the location and magnitude of both 1.0% annual chance and 0.2% annual chance flood events as follows:
 - a. collect data and conduct analyses sufficient to characterize the future conditions for the planning area based on a "no-action" scenario of approximately 30 years of continued development and population growth under current development trends and patterns, and existing flood regulations and policies based on:
 - i. current land use and development trends and practices and associated projected population based on the most recently adopted state water plan decade and population nearest the next RFP adoption date plus approximately 30 years or as provided for in TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents;
 - ii. reasonable assumptions regarding locations of residential development and associated population growth;
 - iii. anticipated relative sea level change and subsidence based on existing information;
 - iv. anticipated changes to the functionality of the existing floodplain;
 - v. anticipated sedimentation in flood control structures and major geomorphic changes in riverine, playa, or coastal systems based on existing information;
 - vi. assumed completion of flood mitigation projects currently under construction or that already have dedicated construction funding; and
 - vii. other factors deemed relevant by the RFPG.
 - b. identify areas within each FPR where future condition hydrologic and hydraulic model results are already available and summarize the information;
 - c. utilize best available data, including hydrologic and hydraulic models for each area;
 - d. where future condition results are not available, but existing condition hydrologic and hydraulic model results are already available, the RFPGs shall

- modify hydraulic models to identify future conditions flood risk for 1.0% and 0.2% annual chance storms based on simplified assumptions utilizing the information identified in this task.
- e. prepare a map showing areas of 1.0% and 0.2% annual chance of inundation for future conditions, the areal extent of this inundation, and the sources of flooding for each area.
 - f. prepare a 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.
2. Perform future condition flood exposure analyses using the information identified in the flood hazard analysis to identify 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 as follows:
- a. analyses of existing development within the existing condition floodplain and the associated flood hazard exposure;
 - b. analyses of existing and future developments within the future condition floodplain and the associated flood hazard exposure; and
 - c. to include only those flood mitigation projects with dedicated construction funding scheduled for completion prior to the next RFP adoption date plus 30 years or as provided for in TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
 - d. Identification of flood prone areas associated with the hazard exposure analyses shall be based on analyses that rely primarily on the use and incorporation of existing and available:
 - i. FIRMs or other flood inundation maps and GIS related data and analyses;
 - ii. available hydraulic flood modeling results;
 - iii. model-based or other types of geographic screening tools for identifying flood prone areas; and
 - iv. other best available data or relevant technical analyses that the RFPG determines to be the most updated or reliable.
3. Perform future condition vulnerability analyses as follows:
- a. identify resilience of communities located in flood-prone areas identified as part of the future condition flood exposure analyses, utilizing relevant data and tools.
 - b. 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.
4. All data produced as part of the future condition flood exposure analysis and the future condition vulnerability analysis shall include:
- a. underlying flood event return frequency;
 - b. type of flood risk;

- c. county;
- d. HUC8;
- e. existing flood authority boundaries;
- f. Social Vulnerability Indices for counties and census tracts; and
- g. other categories as determined in TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 2A & 2B) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- Prepare maps according to 1(e) and 1(f). A tabulated list and GIS map of all pertinent information. All maps should be submitted with underlying GIS data utilized to prepare them.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 3A - Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.35.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Consider the extent to which a lack of, insufficient, or ineffective current floodplain management and land use practices, regulations, policies, and trends related to land use, economic development, and population growth, allow, cause, or otherwise encourage increases to flood risks to both:
 - a. existing population and property, and
 - b. future population and property.
2. Take into consideration the future flood hazard exposure analyses performed under Task 2B, consider the extent to which the 1.0% annual chance floodplain, along with associated flood risks, may change over time in response to anticipated

development and associated population growth and other relevant man-made causes, and assess how to best address these potential changes.

3. Based on the analyses in (1) and (2), make recommendations regarding forward-looking floodplain management and land use recommendations, and economic development practices and strategies, that should be implemented by entities within the FPR. These region-specific recommendations may include minimum floodplain management and land use standards and should focus on how to best address the changes in (2) for entities within the region. These recommendations shall inform recommended strategies for inclusion in the RFP.
4. RFPGs may also choose to adopt region-specific, minimum floodplain management or land use or other standards that impact flood-risk, that may vary geographically across the region, that each entity in the FPR must adopt prior to the RFPG including in the RFP any Flood Management Evaluations, Flood Management Strategies, or Flood Mitigation Projects that are sponsored by or that will otherwise be implemented by that entity.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 3A & 3B) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- List region-specific recommendations regarding forward-looking floodplain management and land use, which may include minimum floodplain management and land use standards.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 3B – Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.36.

Consider the Guidance Principles under 31 TAC §362.3, Tasks 1-3A, input from the public, and other relevant information and considerations.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Identify specific and achievable flood mitigation and floodplain management goals along with target years by which to meet those goals for the FPR to include, at a minimum, goals specifically addressing risks to life and property.
2. Consider minimum recommended flood protection goal provided by TWDB.
3. Recognize and clearly state the levels of residual risk that will remain in the FPR even after the stated flood mitigation goals are fully met.
4. Structure and present the goals and the residual risks in an easily understandable format for the public including in conformance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
5. When appropriate, choose goals that apply to full single HUC8 watershed boundaries or coterminous groups of HUC8 boundaries within the FPR.
6. Identify both short-term goals (10 years) and long-term goals (30 years).

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 3A & 3B) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- Identify flood mitigation and floodplain management goals considering minimum recommended flood protection goal provided by TWDB.
- Identify specific and achievable flood mitigation and floodplain management goals (10 year and 30 year) in an easily understandable format for the public.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 4A – Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.37.

The RFPG shall conduct the analysis in a manner that will ensure the most effective and efficient use of the resources available to the RFPG.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Based on the analyses and goals developed by the RFPG under Tasks 2A through 3B and any additional analyses or information developed using available screening-level models or methods, the RFPG shall identify locations within the FPR that the RFPG considers to have the greatest flood mitigation and flood risk study needs by considering:
 - a. the areas in the FPR that the RFPG identified as the most prone to flooding that threatens life and property;
 - b. the relative locations, extent, and performance of current floodplain management and land use policies and infrastructure located within the FPR;
 - c. areas identified by the RFPG as prone to flooding that don't have adequate inundation maps;
 - d. areas identified by the RFPG as prone to flooding that don't have hydrologic and hydraulic models;
 - e. areas with an emergency need;
 - f. existing modeling analyses and flood risk mitigation plans within the FPR;
 - g. flood mitigation projects already identified and evaluated by other flood mitigation plans and studies;
 - h. documentation of historic flooding events;
 - i. flood mitigation projects already being implemented; and
 - j. any other factors that the RFPG deems relevant to identifying the geographic locations where potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs shall be identified and evaluated under §361.38.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 4A & 4B) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- A map identifying the geographic locations within the FPR considered to have the greatest flood mitigation and flood risk study needs where potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs shall be evaluated
- A tabulated list and GIS map of all pertinent information. All maps should be submitted with underlying GIS data utilized to prepare them.

- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 4B – Identification and Evaluation of Potential Flood Management Evaluations and Potentially Feasible Flood Management Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.38.

Based on analyses and decisions under Tasks 2A through 4A the RFPG shall identify and evaluate potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs, including nature-based solutions, some of which may have already been identified by previous evaluations and analyses by others.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Receive public comment on a proposed process to be used by the RFPG to identify and select FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs for the 2023 RFP. Revise and update documentation of the process by which FMS that were identified as potentially feasible and selected for evaluation in the 2023 RFP. Include a description of the process selected by the RFPG in the Technical Memorandum and the draft Regional Flood Plan and adopted RFPs.
2. Plans to be considered in developing this chapter include relevant plans referenced under 31 TAC §361.22.
3. When evaluating FMSs and FMPs the RFPG will, at a minimum, identify one solution that provides flood mitigation associated a with 1.0% annual chance flood event. In instances where mitigating for 1.0% annual chance events is not feasible, the RFPG shall document the reasons for its infeasibility, and at the discretion of the RFPG, other FMSs and FMPs to mitigate more frequent events may also be identified and evaluated based on TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
4. A summary of the RFPG process for identifying potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs shall be established and included in the draft and final adopted RFP.
5. The RFPG shall then identify potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs in accordance with the RFPG established process.
6. For areas within the FPR that the RFPG does not yet have sufficient information or resources to identify potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs, the RFPG shall identify areas for potential FMEs that may eventually result in FMSs and/or FMPs.
7. The RFPG shall evaluate potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs understanding that, upon evaluation and further inspection, some FMSs or FMPs initially identified as potentially feasible may, after further inspection, be reclassified as infeasible.

8. Evaluations of potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs will require associated, detailed hydrologic and hydraulic modeling results that quantify the reduced impacts from flood events and the associated benefits and costs. Information may be based on previously performed evaluations of projects and related information. Evaluations of potentially feasible FMS and FMPs shall include the following information and be based on the following analyses:
- a. A reference to the specific flood mitigation or floodplain management goal addressed by the feasible FMS or FMP;
 - b. A determination of whether FMS or FMP meets an emergency need;
 - c. An indication regarding the potential use of federal funds, or other sources of funding, as a component of the total funding mechanism;
 - d. An equitable comparison between and consistent assessment of all FMSs and FMPs that the RFPG determines to be potentially feasible;
 - e. A demonstration that the FMS or FMP will not negatively affect a neighboring area;
 - f. A quantitative reporting of the estimated benefits of the FMS or FMP, including reductions of flood impacts of the 1.0% annual chance flood event and other storm events identified and evaluated if the project mitigates to a more frequent event, to include, but not limited to:
 - (1) Associated flood events that must, at a minimum, include the 1.0% annual chance flood event and other storm events identified and evaluated;
 - (2) Reduction in habitable, equivalent living units flood risk;
 - (3) Reduction in residential population flood risk;
 - (4) Reduction in critical facilities flood risk;
 - (5) Reduction in road closure occurrences;
 - (6) Reduction in acres of active farmland and ranchland flood risk;
 - (7) Estimated reduction in fatalities, when available;
 - (8) Estimated reduction in injuries, when available;
 - (9) Reduction in expected annual damages from residential, commercial, and public property; and
 - (10) Other benefits as deemed relevant by the RFPG including environmental benefits and other public benefits.
 - g. A quantitative reporting of the estimated capital cost of FMPs in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents;
 - h. Calculated benefit-cost ratio for FMPs in accordance with *Exhibit C: General Guidelines* and based on current, observed conditions;
 - i. For projects that will contribute to water supply, all relevant evaluations required under §357.34(e) (relating to Identification and Evaluation of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies and Water Management Strategy Projects), as determined by the EA based on the type of

- contribution, and a description of its consistency with the currently adopted State Water Plan;
- j. A description of potential impacts and benefits from the FMS or FMP to the environment, agriculture, recreational resources, navigation, water quality, erosion, sedimentation, and impacts to any other resources deemed relevant by the RFPG;
 - k. A description of residual, post-project, and future risks associated with FMPs including the risk of potential catastrophic failure and the potential for future increases to these risks due to lack of maintenance;
 - l. Implementation issues including those related to rights-of-way, permitting, acquisitions, relocations, utilities and transportation; and
 - m. Funding sources and options that exist or will be developed to pay for development, operation, and maintenance of the FMS or FMP.
9. Evaluations of potential FMEs will be at a reconnaissance or screening-level, unsupported by associated detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. These will be identified for areas that the RFPG considers a priority for flood risk evaluation but that do not yet have the required detailed hydrologic and hydraulic modeling or associated project evaluations available to evaluate specific FMSs or FMPs for recommendation in the RFP. These FMEs shall be based on recognition of the need to develop detailed hydrologic models or to perform associated hydraulic analyses and associated project evaluations in certain areas identified by the RFPG.

Evaluations of potential FMEs shall include the following analyses:

- a. A reference to the specific flood mitigation or floodplain management goal to be addressed by the potential FME.
- b. A determination of whether FME may meet an emergency need.
- c. An indication regarding the potential use of federal funds, or other sources of funding as a component of the total funding mechanism.
- d. An equitable comparison between and consistent assessment of all FMEs.
- e. An indication of whether hydrologic and or hydraulic models are already being developed or are anticipated in the near future and that could be used in the FME.
- f. A quantitative reporting of the estimated benefits, including reductions of flood risks, to include:
 - (1) Estimated habitable, living unit equivalent and associated population in FME area;
 - (2) Estimated critical facilities in FME area;
 - (3) Estimated number of roads closures occurrences in FME area;
 - (4) Estimated acres of active farmland and ranchland in FME area; and
 - (5) A quantitative reporting of the estimated study cost of the FME and whether the cost includes use of existing or development of new hydrologic or hydraulic models.

- g. For FMEs, RFPGs do not need to demonstrate that an FME will not negatively affect a neighboring area.
10. RFPGs shall evaluate and present potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs with sufficient specificity to allow state agencies to make financial or regulatory decisions to determine consistency of the proposed action before the state agency with an approved RFP.
11. Analyses shall be performed in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
12. All data produced as part of the analyses under this task shall be organized and summarized in the RFP in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
13. Analyses shall clearly designate a representative location of the FME and beneficiaries including a map and designation of HUC8 and county location.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 4B & 5) to be included in the 2023 RFP.
- A list of the potentially feasible FMSs and associated FMPs that were identified by the RFPG. The TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents will include minimum data submittal requirements and deliverable format.
- A map identifying the geographic locations within the FPR considered to have the greatest flood mitigation and flood risk study needs where potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs shall be evaluated. TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents will include minimum data submittal requirements and deliverable format.
- Data shall be organized and summarized in the RFP in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
- A tabulated list and GIS map of all pertinent information. All maps should be submitted with underlying GIS data utilized to prepare them.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 4C – Prepare and Submit Technical Memorandum

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.13(e).

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Prepare a concise Technical Memorandum to include:
 - a. A list of existing political subdivisions within the FPR that have flood-related authorities or responsibilities;
 - b. A list of previous flood studies considered by the RFPG to be relevant to development of the RFP;
 - c. A geodatabase and associated maps in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents that the RFPG considers to be best representation of the region-wide 1.0% annual chance flood event and 0.2% annual chance flood event inundation boundaries, and the source of flooding for each area, for use in its risk analysis, including indications of locations where such boundaries remain undefined;
 - d. A geodatabase and associated maps in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents that identifies additional flood-prone areas not described in (c) based on location of hydrologic features, historic flooding, and/or local knowledge;
 - e. A geodatabase and associated maps in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents that identifies areas where existing hydrologic and hydraulic models needed to evaluate FMSs and FMPs are available;
 - f. A list of available flood-related models that the RFPG considers of most value in developing its plan;
 - g. The flood mitigation and floodplain management goals adopted by the RFPG per §361.36;
 - h. The documented process used by the RFPG to identify potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs;
 - i. A list of potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs identified by the RFPG, if any; and
 - j. A list of FMSs and FMPs that were identified but determined by the RFPG to be infeasible, including the primary reason for it being infeasible.
2. Approve submittal of the Technical Memorandum to TWDB at a RFPG meeting subject notice requirements in accordance with 31 TAC §361.21(h). The Technical Memorandum must be submitted to TWDB in accordance with Section I Article I of the contract.

Task 5 – Recommendation of Flood Management Evaluations and Flood Management Strategies and Associated Flood Mitigation Projects

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.39.

The objective of this task is to evaluate and recommend Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs), Flood Management Strategies (FMSs) and their associated Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs) to be included in the 2023 RFP that describes the work completed, presents the potential FMEs, potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs, recommended and alternative FMSs and FMPs, including all the technical evaluations, and presents which entities will benefit from the recommended FMSs and FMPs.

Work associated with any Task 5 subtasks shall be contingent upon a written notice-to-proceed. This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Recommend FMSs and FMPs to reduce the potential impacts of flood based on the evaluations under §361.38 and RFPG goals and that must, at a minimum, mitigate for flood events associated with at 1.0 percent annual chance (100-yr flood) where feasible. In instances where mitigating for 100-year events is not feasible, FMS and FMPs to mitigate more frequent events may be recommended based on TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents. Recommendations shall be based upon the identification, analysis, and comparison of alternatives that the RFPG determines will provide measurable reductions in flood impacts in support of the RFPG's specific flood mitigation and/or floodplain management goals.
2. Provide additional information in conformance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents which will be used to rank recommended FMPs in the state flood plan.
3. Recommend FMEs that the RFPG determines are most likely to result in identification of potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs that would, at a minimum, identify and investigate one solution to mitigate for flood events associated with a 1.0% annual chance flood event and that support specific RFPG flood mitigation and/or floodplain management goals.
4. Recommended FMSs or FMPs may not negatively affect a neighboring area or an entity's water supply.
5. Recommended FMSs or FMPs that will contribute to water supply may not result in an overallocation of a water source based on the water availability allocations in the most recently adopted State Water Plan.
6. Specific types of FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs that should be included and that should not be included in RFPs must be in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

7. FMS and FMP documentation shall include a strategy or project description, discussion of associated facilities, project map, and technical evaluations addressing all considerations and factors required under 31 TAC §361.38(h).
8. Coordinate and communicate with FME, FMS, and FMP sponsors, individual local governments, regional authorities, and other political subdivisions.
9. Process documentation of selecting all recommended FMSs and associated FMPs including development of FMS evaluations matrices and other tools required to assist the RFPG in comparing and selecting recommended FMSs and FMPs.
10. Document the evaluation and selection of all recommended FMS and FMPs, including an explanation for why certain types of strategies may not have been recommended.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables:

- Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 4B & 5) to be included in the 2023 RFP to include technical analyses of all evaluated FMSs and FMPs.
- A list of the recommended FMEs, FMSs, and associated FMPs that were identified by the RFPG. TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents will include minimum data submittal requirements and deliverable format.
- Data shall be organized and summarized in the RFP in accordance with TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.
- A tabulated list and GIS map of all pertinent information. All maps should be submitted with underlying GIS data utilized to prepare them.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 6A – Impacts of Regional Flood Plan

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.40.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to include:

1. a region-wide summary of the relative reduction in flood risk that implementation of the RFP would achieve within the region including with regard to life, injuries, and property.
2. a statement that the FMPs in the plan, when implemented, will not negatively affect neighboring areas located within or outside of the FPR.
3. a general description of the types of potential positive and negative socioeconomic or recreational impacts of the recommended FMSs and FMPs within the FPR.
4. a general description of the overall impacts of the recommended FMPs and FMSs in the RFP on the environment, agriculture, recreational resources, water quality, erosion, sedimentation, and navigation.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 6A & 6B) to be included in the 2023 RFP. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 6B – Contributions to and Impacts on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.41.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Include a region-wide summary and description of the contribution that the regional flood plan would have to water supply development including a list of the specific FMSs and FMPs that would contribute to water supply.
2. Include a description of any anticipated impacts, including to water supply or water availability or projects in the State Water Plan, that the regional flood plan FMSs and FMPs may have.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: Prepare a stand-alone chapter (including work from both Tasks 6A & 6B) to be included in the 2023 RFP. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 7 – Flood Response Information and Activities

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.42.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Summarize the nature and types of flood response preparations within the FPR including providing where more detailed information is available regarding recovery.
2. Coordinate and communicate, as necessary, with entities in the region to gather information.
3. RFPGs shall not perform analyses or other activities related to planning for disaster response or recovery activities.
4. Plans to be considered in developing this chapter include relevant plans referenced under 31 TAC §361.22.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: Prepare a stand-alone chapter to be included in the 2023 RFP. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 8 – Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.43.

The objective of this task is to prepare a separate chapter to be included in the 2023 RFP that presents the RFPG's administrative, legislative, and regulatory recommendations.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to develop:

1. Legislative recommendations that they consider necessary to facilitate floodplain management and flood mitigation planning and implementation.
2. Other regulatory or administrative recommendations that they consider necessary to facilitate floodplain management and flood mitigation planning and implementation.
3. Any other recommendations that the RFPG believes are needed and desirable to achieve its regional flood mitigation and floodplain management goals.
4. Recommendations regarding potential, new revenue-raising opportunities, including potential new municipal drainage utilities or regional flood authorities, that could fund the development, operation, and maintenance of floodplain management or flood mitigation activities in the region.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: Prepare a stand-alone chapter to be included in the 2023 RFP. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 9 – Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis

In addition to generally meeting all applicable rules and statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning under 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, this portion of work shall, in particular, include all work necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC §361.44.

The objective of this task is to report on how sponsors of recommended FMPs propose to finance projects.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. Coordinate and communicate with individual local governments, regional authorities, and other political subdivisions.
2. Perform a survey, including the following work:
 - a. Contacting FME and FMP sponsors.

- b. Collection and collation of data.
- c. Documentation of the effectiveness of survey methodology, providing percent survey completions, and whether an acceptable minimum percent survey completion was achieved.
- d. Submission of data.
3. Coordinate with FME and FMP sponsors as necessary to ensure detailed needs and costs associated with their anticipated evaluations and projects are sufficiently represented in the RFP for future funding determinations.
4. Assist the RFPG with the development of recommendations regarding the proposed role of the State in financing flood infrastructure projects identified in the RFP.
5. Summarize the survey results.

The information gathered and developed in preparation of this chapter shall be subject to the following review process prior to submission of any deliverables:

1. Review of the chapter documents and related information by RFPG members.
2. Modifications to the chapter document based on RFPG, public, and/or agency comments.
3. Submittal of chapter document to TWDB for review and approval.
4. All effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP chapter by TWDB.

Deliverables: A completed Chapter 9 shall be delivered in the 2023 RFP to include summary of reported financing approaches for all recommended FMPs. Data shall be submitted in accordance with TWDB guidance documents. Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Task 10 – Public Participation and Plan Adoption

The objective of this task is to address public participation, public meetings, eligible administrative and technical support activities, and other requirements and activities eligible for reimbursement. Objectives also include activities necessary to complete and submit a draft RFP and final RFP, and obtain TWDB approval of the RFP.

This Task includes, but is not limited to, performing all work in accordance with TWDB rules and guidance required to:

1. In addition to generally meeting all applicable statute requirements governing regional and state flood planning this portion of work shall, in particular, include all technical and administrative support activities necessary to meet all the requirements of 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362 that are not already addressed under the scope of work associated with other contract Tasks but that are necessary and or required to complete and deliver an draft Regional Flood Plan and final, adopted RFP to TWDB and obtain approval of the adopted RFP by TWDB.
2. Organization, support, facilitation, and documentation of all meetings/hearings associated with: preplanning meeting; consideration of a substitution of alternative flood management strategies; public hearing after adoption of the draft Regional

Flood Plan and prior to adoption of the final RFP; and consideration of RFP amendments, alternative FMS substitutions, or Board-directed revisions.

Technical Support and Administrative Activities

1. RFPGs shall support and accommodate periodic presentations by the TWDB for the purpose of orientation, training, and retraining as determined and provided by the TWDB during regular RFPGRWPG meetings.
2. Attendance and participation of technical consultants at RFPG, subgroup, subcommittees, special and or other meetings and hearings including preparation and follow-up activities.
3. Developing technical and other presentations and handout materials for regular and special meetings to provide technical and explanatory data to the RFPG and its subcommittees, including follow-up activities.
4. Administrative and technical support and participation in RFPG activities, and documentation of any RFPG workshops, work groups, subgroup and/or subcommittee activities.
5. Technical support and administrative activities associated with periodic and special meetings of the RFPG including developing agendas and coordinating activities for the RFPG.
6. Provision of status reports to TWDB for work performed under this Contract.
7. Development of draft and final responses for RFPG approval to public questions or comments as well as approval of the final responses to comments on RFP documents.
8. Intraregional and interregional coordination and communication, and or facilitation required within the FPR and with other RFPGs to develop a RFP.
9. Incorporation of all required data and reports into RFP document.
10. Modifications to the RFP documents based on RFPG, public, and or agency comments.
11. Preparation of a RFP chapter summarizing Task 10 activities including review by RFPG and modification of document as necessary.
12. Development and inclusion of Executive Summaries in both draft Regional Flood Plan and final RFP.
13. Production, distribution, and submittal of all draft and final RFP-related planning documents for RFPG, public and agency review, including in hard-copy format when required.
14. Assembling, compiling, and production of the completed draft Regional Flood Plan and Final Regional Flood Plan document(s) that meet all requirements of statute, 31 TAC Chapters 361 and 362, Contract and associated guidance documents.
15. Submittal of the RFP documents in both hard copy and electronic formats to TWDB for review and approval; and all effort required to obtain final approval of the RFP by TWDB.

Other Activities

1. Review of all RFP-related documents by RFPG members.
2. Development and maintenance of a RFPG website or RFPG-dedicated webpage on the RFPG administrator's website for posting planning group meeting notices, agendas, materials, and plan information.
3. Limited non-labor, direct costs associated with maintenance of the RFPG website.
4. Development of agendas, presentations, and handout materials for the public meetings and hearings to provide to the general public.
5. Documentation of meetings and hearings to include recorded minutes and/or audio recordings as required by the RFPG bylaws and archiving and provision of minutes to public.
6. Preparation and transmission of correspondence, for example, directly related to public comments on RFP documents.
7. Promoting consensus decisions through conflict resolution efforts including monitoring and facilitation required to resolve issues between and among RFPG members and stakeholders in the event that issues arise during the process of developing the RFP, including mediation between RFPG members, if necessary.
8. RFPG membership solicitation activities.
9. Meeting all posting, meeting, hearing and other public notice requirements in accordance with the open meetings act, statute, and 31 TAC §361.21 and any other applicable public notice requirements.
10. Solicitation, review, and dissemination of public input, as necessary.
11. Any efforts required, but not otherwise addressed in other SOW tasks that may be required to complete an RFP in accordance with all statute and rule requirements.

Deliverables:

- A completed Chapter 10 summarizing public participation activities and appendices with public comments and RFPG responses to comments.
- Complete draft Regional Flood Plan and final, adopted RFP documents.
- Any additional deliverables identified in the TWDB Flood Planning guidance documents.

Initial Task Budget

Region 2 Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress

Regional Flood Planning Group

| TASK | | 2. Lower Red-Sulphur-Cypress |
|--------------|--|------------------------------|
| 1 | Planning Area Description | \$45,520.00 |
| 2A | Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses | \$91,040.00 |
| 2B | Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses | \$91,040.00 |
| 3A | Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices | \$18,208.00 |
| 3B | Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals | \$9,104.00 |
| 4A | Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis | \$27,312.00 |
| 4B | Identification and Evaluation of Potential Flood Management Evaluations and Potentially Feasible Flood Management Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects | \$136,560.00 |
| 4C | Prepare and Submit Technical Memorandum | \$18,208.00 |
| 5 | Recommendation of Flood Management Evaluations and Flood Management Strategies and Associated Flood Mitigation Projects | \$182,080.00 |
| 6A | Impacts of Regional Flood Plan | \$36,416.00 |
| 6B | Contributions to and Impacts on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan | \$9,104.00 |
| 7 | Flood Response Information and Activities | \$9,104.00 |
| 8 | Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations | \$9,104.00 |
| 9 | Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis | \$18,208.00 |
| 10 | Adoption of Plan and Public Participation | * \$209,392.00 |
| TOTAL | | \$910,400.00 |

*Approximately \$76,000 of Task 10 is reserved for Planning Group and Sponsor Direct Activity Costs.

BRIEFING PAPER – Information Only

ITEM 9:

Discuss and consider action on Technical Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and process of selection

BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to Texas Water Code § 16.062(l), all RFPG, committees, and subcommittees are subject to the Texas Government Code (Government Code) §§ 551 and 552 (Texas Open Meetings Act and the Public Information Act). This is of particular importance with regard to interactions between RFPG members outside of their publicly posted meetings.

DISCUSSION:

FPG members, including voting and non-voting members, should complete the following trainings.

- Open Meetings Act training required by Texas Government Code §551.005
- Public Information Act training required by Government Code §552.012.

<https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/governmental-bodies/pia-and-oma-training-resources>

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended you complete both trainings and print the certificates for your records. Please send a copy to Paul (pprange@atcog.org) for our records.