

**From:** [FloodPlanning](#)  
**To:** [FloodPlanning](#)  
**Cc:** [Reem Zoun](#); [Cynthia Roush](#); [James Bronikowski](#); [Megan Ingram](#); [Richard Bagans](#); [Anita Machiavello](#); [Tressa Olsen](#); [Ryke Moore](#); [Matt Nelson](#)  
**Subject:** Flood Planning Data Update – FMX Questions and Fields  
**Date:** Friday, June 3, 2022 11:47:00 AM

Dear Regional Flood Planning Group Technical Consultants:

In this Flood Data Update, we are covering:

1. [FME Additional Fields](#)
2. [Model Questions](#)
3. [Field Questions](#)
4. [Population Questions](#)
5. [Unique ID Issues](#)

## 1. FME Additional Fields

- a. Please add the field FMP\_COST (“Total Anticipated Project Cost”) as an optional field to the FME feature class, after the ‘FME\_COST’ field. This provides a place to preserve estimated cost data that may have been gathered.

Item	Required?	Field Name	Data Type	Guidance	Valid Entries
Total Anticipated Project Cost	N	FMP_COST	Float	Anticipated total project cost in dollars including construction cost. Should not include FME_COST.	

- b. Please add the following optional fields to FME for associated FMP, FME, and FMSs (FMXs). It was anticipated that if a flood risk study area needed an FME, it would not have an associated FMP or FMS identified yet. However, with progress of the current planning cycle, it appears possible that there will be cases where an FME could have these associated FMSs or FMPs.

Item	Required?	Field Name	Data Type	Guidance	Valid Entries
Associated FMEs, FMSs, FMPs	N	ASSOCIATED	Text	Are there associated FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs? Must account for any interdependencies	Yes, No
	N	ASSCFME_ID	Text	FME IDs of strategies compared, comma-separated if multiple	
	N	ASSCFMS_ID	Text	FMS IDs of strategies compared, comma-separated if multiple	
	N	ASSCFMP_ID	Text	FMP IDs of strategies and projects compared, comma-separated if multiple	
	N	ASSC_DESC	Text	A description of the how associated FME, FMS, and FMPs related to this FMP. Must include any interdependencies.	

## 2. Model Questions

**Q:** How should we fill FMP fields when models may not be ready for the draft plan?

**A:** Please utilize professional judgement and approximate information for the draft plan submittal. Confirmation of ‘no

negative effect' is required prior to RFPG recommendation of an FMP. The RFPG recommended FMPs are also required to be permissible, constructible and implementable. Please state assumptions made to generate approximate information.

**Q:** When model extents exceed project boundaries, should all model results be included in the project?

**A:** While it is appropriate for the entire model extent to be included in the ModelCoverage feature class, the model results, such as area or structures removed from the floodplain, should be limited to the extent of the project.

### 3. Field Questions

#### SOURCE Field – Multiple Feature Classes

**Q:** Are the data source fields intended to be the source of mapping/modeling data?

**A:** The mapping/modeling SOURCE field is intended to be a study (FIS or citywide master plan). This is true for the Hazard feature classes (ExFldHazard, FutFldHazard, FMP\_HazPost) as well as FME. The SOURCE field in FMP and ExFldProjs feature classes should reference “The originating planning study or document” which “can be used to connect the project to originating document such as a city or county master plan”. Please reference the [Summary of Updates to Exhibit D](#) for further information on the SOURCE field.

**Q:** Can you clarify if the Source is intended to be an agency or municipality (like FEMA or HCFCD) or a study (like an FIS or citywide master plan)?

**A:** The mapping/modeling SOURCE is intended to be a study (FIS or citywide master plan).

#### REGULATORY Field - Multiple Feature Classes

**Q:** How should we populate the Regulatory field if there are multiple sources of data for a study area and some are regulatory and some are not?

**A:** Please add the entry “Partial” to the valid entry list for the REGULATORY field in the FME and FMP\_HazPost feature classes, making the complete list “Yes, No, Partial”. If a region is unable to identify partial at this stage, it is acceptable to list them as “Yes”. If a region chooses to use “Yes” for “Partial”, please identify in the flood plan that if any portion of the study or project area has regulatory data, the REGULATORY field was filled with “Yes”. Please be consistent for the entire region.

#### Model Date Fields – FME Feature Class

**Q:** There is inconsistency between the two model dates required in the FME feature class and the one model year required in the Excel table.

**A:** The FME feature class has fields for dates of hydrologic model and hydraulic model. The later (more recent) of the two dates needs to be used to determine a year for “Existing or Anticipated Models (year)” in the table.

#### Nature-Based Solution Fields – FMS and FMP Feature Classes

**Q:** There is inconsistency between Nature-based Solution in the feature class (%) and Excel table (Y/N).

**A:** In general, the tables require fewer details than the feature classes. The regions can use percent instead of Y/N in the Excel table to match the GIS if they choose. This flexibility was provided since it was anticipated that the RFPGs may not have this level of detail for fields such as % nature-based solution for FMSs.

#### Negative Impact Mitigation Fields – FMS and FMP Feature Classes

**Q:** There is inconsistency between negative impact mitigation in the feature class (text) and the table (Y/N).

**A:** The tables require fewer details than the feature classes. Regions may choose to add fields to the feature classes and columns to the tables beyond what is specified by TWDB.

#### COSTSTRUCT Field – FMS and FMP Feature Classes

**Q:** How should the cost per structure removed be handled when no structures are removed from the floodplain (as in the case of a low water crossing)?

**A:** Cost per structure will not be required if the number of structures removed is 0. Please leave the COSTSTRUCT field blank in this case.

### 4. Population Questions

**Q:** Should additional sources be used to assign population to buildings?

**A:** Yes. The [building dataset](#) from the [Flood Data Hub](#) provides an estimate based on 2019 Landsat data. However, this is

a starting point, and it is appropriate for regions to utilize other sources to improve the population estimates.

**Q:** Should day vs. night population be selected on a building basis or project basis?

**A:** The goal is to choose day or night for the total project, reflecting whether the flood impact would be greatest during the day or night. Day or night should not be selected on a building-by-building basis because this could result in a population greater than is present at any one time.

## 5. Unique ID Issues

**Q:** Is it acceptable to have gaps in Unique ID sequencing? One scenario: Projects are removed between the Tech Memo and the Draft Plan.

**A:** Yes, it is fine to have gaps in the Unique ID sequencing. The most important consideration is the ID format. Please ensure that it matches the latest [Unique ID guidance](#). We will rely on these Unique IDs when combining region information into the state flood plan. In addition, please be sure that IDs are numeric rather than alphanumeric.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia

**Cynthia Roush** | Manager, Flood Planning Data  
Office of Planning | Texas Water Development Board  
(512) 475-1573 | [cynthia.roush@twdb.texas.gov](mailto:cynthia.roush@twdb.texas.gov)