

VOLUME 2
Appendix 2-A to 3-B

REGION 5 NECHES 2023 REGIONAL FLOOD PLAN


JULY 2023

DRAFT

PREPARED FOR THE
REGION 5 NECHES FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

DRAFT

**APPENDIX 2-A
SUPPLEMENTARY MAPS FOR CHAPTER 2**



Legend

Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other


Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- River
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary





Region 5: Neches Regional Flood Plan
City of Nacogdoches

Future Condition Vulnerability



MAP 12B
FIGURE 8 of 19




Legend

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75 | Flood Hazard Areas |
| ▲ Agricultural Bldg | ■ 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard |
| ▲ Commercial Bldg | ■ 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard |
| ▲ Industrial Bldg | ■ Flood Prone Areas |
| ■ Power Generation | — River |
| ■ Public Bldg | — Tributary |
| ■ Residential Bldg | — Major Road |
| ○ Vacant or Unknown Bldg | □ City Limit |
| ● Roadway Stream Crossing | □ County Boundary |
| ● Other | □ Neches Region Boundary |





Region 5: Neches Regional Flood Plan
Shelby County


Future Condition Vulnerability



MAP 12B
FIGURE 9 of 19







Legend


Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary






Legend

Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- River
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary




Legend

Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary




Legend



Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary






Legend

Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other


Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- River
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary




Region 5: Neches Regional Flood Plan
Chambers County

Future Condition Vulnerability



MAP 12B
FIGURE 16 of 19





Legend


Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75



- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- River
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary









Legend

Exposed Features with SVI > 0.75

- ▲ Agricultural Bldg
- ▲ Commercial Bldg
- ▲ Industrial Bldg
- Power Generation
- Public Bldg
- Residential Bldg
- Vacant or Unknown Bldg
- Roadway Stream Crossing
- Other

Flood Hazard Areas

- 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard
- Flood Prone Areas
- River
- Tributary
- Major Road
- City Limit
- County Boundary
- Neches Region Boundary



DRAFT

**APPENDIX 2-B
EXISTING AND FUTURE EXPOSURE SUMMARY TABLES**

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

1% Annual Chance Flood Risk									
	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	70.71	70.71	0	0	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	228.11	228.11	0	0	0
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	264.64	203.33	61.30	0	0
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	171.37	171.37	0	0	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	53.82	6.41	47.42	0	0
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	306.37	306.36	0	0	0
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0.17	0	0.17	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	74.63	74.62	0	0	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	61.41	61.41	0	0	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	196.99	197.00	0	0	0
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	604.79	533.32	71.47	0	0
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	73.97	73.97	0	0	0
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	170.58	170.57	0	0	0
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0.74	0.74	0	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	102.59	87.23	15.36	0	0
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	100.67	100.67	0	0	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	72.39	72.39	0	0	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	21.31	21.31	0	0	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	122.71	122.72	0	0	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	21.60	21.61	0	0	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	69.13	69.13	0	0	0
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	73.89	73.89	0	0	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	186.01	186.00	0	0	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	29.91	29.91	0	0	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	3,078.52	2,882.77	195.71	0	0

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

				1% Annual Chance Flood Risk						
	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Number of Structures in Floodplain	Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	69	28	61	147	22.20	0.54	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	1,201	750	6,718	310	66.37	0.26	11
3	5	Neches	Chambers	1,175	459	1,128	161	161.62	57.71	0
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	672	302	987	305	49.29	1.44	1
5	5	Neches	Galveston	4,937	4,476	1,820	141	142.59	0.52	8
6	5	Neches	Hardin	3,678	2,638	7,212	207	135.80	1.16	25
7	5	Neches	Harris	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	240	108	162	117	20.05	0.54	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	17	3	16	112	19.70	0.18	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	756	367	1,388	148	45.70	0.16	7
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	12,869	9,726	26,027	374	473.80	51.59	316
12	5	Neches	Liberty	116	57	140	18	7.11	2.38	1
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	585	238	4,007	257	38.32	0.37	1
14	5	Neches	Newton	0	0	0	1	0.16	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	5,007	4,273	8,737	106	136.13	0.54	36
16	5	Neches	Polk	84	45	321	121	16.80	0.10	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	91	45	149	186	21.12	0.32	1
18	5	Neches	Sabine	11	2	16	23	2.67	0.01	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	64	28	110	107	13.22	0.07	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	15	0	7	38	4.63	0.09	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	2,347	1,064	6,216	311	50.01	0.34	72
22	5	Neches	Trinity	32	15	15	86	22.49	0.11	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	545	377	278	177	41.88	0.13	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	217	144	202	105	13.47	0.36	0
TOTAL				34,728	25,145	65,717	3,558	1,505.11	118.92	479

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

				0.2% Annual Chance Flood Risk					
	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	74.67	74.66	0	0	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	238.56	238.56	0	0	0
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	371.39	310.09	61.30	0	0
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	180.89	180.89	0	0	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	54.79	7.38	47.42	0	0
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	355.51	355.49	0	0	0
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.17	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	78.57	78.57	0	0	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	66.16	66.16	0	0	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	212.35	212.37	0	0	0
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	694.93	623.46	71.47	0	0
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	85.66	85.66	0	0	0
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	178.40	178.39	0	0	0
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0.83	0.83	0	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	121.58	106.22	15.36	0	0
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	106.01	106.02	0	0	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	76.87	76.87	0	0	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	22.49	22.49	0	0	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	127.06	127.07	0	0	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	22.67	22.67	0	0	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	73.53	73.54	0	0	0
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	79.00	78.99	0	0	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	198.73	198.72	0	0	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	32.01	32.01	0	0	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	3,452.84	3,257.09	195.71	0	0

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Number of Structures in Floodplain	0.2% Annual Chance Flood Risk					
					Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	98	45	98	164	27.48	0.58	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	1,418	891	7,665	339	78.11	0.28	12
3	5	Neches	Chambers	2,086	730	2,354	287	284.05	99.62	1
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	802	396	1,202	366	64.55	1.55	1
5	5	Neches	Galveston	4,968	4,497	1,831	141	144.32	0.53	8
6	5	Neches	Hardin	5,679	3,942	10,490	244	206.22	1.43	29
7	5	Neches	Harris	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	315	157	1,159	153	25.91	0.60	1
9	5	Neches	Houston	19	3	16	127	24.27	0.20	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	939	460	1,608	170	58.72	0.19	9
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	45,551	37,137	98,396	553	1,002.45	56.64	1,789
12	5	Neches	Liberty	155	79	192	20	10.75	2.55	2
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	694	300	4,989	274	47.82	0.40	1
14	5	Neches	Newton	0	0	0	1	0.18	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	10,827	9,468	19,607	142	248.64	0.71	119
16	5	Neches	Polk	116	61	433	127	20.32	0.10	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	116	55	186	214	26.43	0.35	1
18	5	Neches	Sabine	19	3	23	26	3.49	0.01	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	83	35	135	123	16.75	0.07	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	29	0	14	41	5.27	0.09	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	2,851	1,423	7,251	346	62.14	0.37	109
22	5	Neches	Trinity	41	19	27	94	27.47	0.12	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	647	446	364	194	50.20	0.14	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	264	174	235	129	18.32	0.40	0
TOTAL				77,717	60,321	158,275	4,275	2,453.86	166.91	2,082

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Possible Flood Prone Areas					
				Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	3.96	0.53	0	3.43	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	8.72	1.39	0	7.31	0.02
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	12.27	0	0	0	12.27
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	11.14	2.49	0	8.64	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	0.44	0	0	0	0.44
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	22.51	0	0	0	22.51
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	2.66	0.25	0	2.39	0.02
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	3.97	1.68	0	2.18	0.10
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	1.96	0	0	0	1.96
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	122.93	0	0	0	122.93
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	31.77	0	0	0	31.77
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	7.92	1.96	0	5.96	0
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0	0	0	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	1.41	0	0	0	1.41
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	1.48	0	0	0	1.48
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	7.77	2.64	0	5.13	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	1.09	0.06	0	0.67	0.37
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	4.54	1.29	0	3.25	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	1.22	0.21	0	1.01	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	6.98	0.79	0	6.05	0.14
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	2.34	0.28	0	2.06	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	2.10	0	0	0	2.10
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	2.73	0.18	0	2.42	0.13
TOTAL				11,405.55	261.91	13.76	0	50.50	197.64

Table 3: Existing Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Possible Flood Prone Areas							
				Number of Structures in Floodplain	Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)	Average SVI of features in floodplain or flood prone areas
1	5	Neches	Anderson	245	177	599	43	14.69	0.05	1	0.66
2	5	Neches	Angelina	808	544	5,248	50	34.70	0.02	10	0.65
3	5	Neches	Chambers	405	206	653	19	32.69	3.81	2	0.74
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	216	115	1,375	67	21.43	0.17	3	0.60
5	5	Neches	Galveston	2	2	0	0	0.04	0.02	0	0.27
6	5	Neches	Hardin	777	544	1,486	12	22.66	0.57	5	0.32
7	5	Neches	Harris	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
8	5	Neches	Henderson	132	79	545	26	7.33	0.06	3	0.40
9	5	Neches	Houston	25	16	21	13	3.81	0.02	2	0.38
10	5	Neches	Jasper	149	70	560	22	4.13	0	6	0.53
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	20,623	17,499	65,461	203	362.32	34.44	229	0.48
12	5	Neches	Liberty	117	89	214	3	12.93	2.43	0	0.57
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	323	201	1,755	41	14.46	0.04	6	0.71
14	5	Neches	Newton	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	N/A
15	5	Neches	Orange	507	404	760	1	9.77	0.01	3	0.35
16	5	Neches	Polk	35	20	101	7	1.73	0	0	0.79
17	5	Neches	Rusk	179	105	989	43	11.40	0.03	1	0.59
18	5	Neches	Sabine	13	6	23	2	0.42	0	3	0.60
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	42	21	49	22	4.72	0.01	0	0.73
20	5	Neches	Shelby	3	0	1	10	1.16	0	0	0.65
21	5	Neches	Smith	1,698	1,292	9,005	82	42.19	0.05	17	0.43
22	5	Neches	Trinity	6	4	6	7	2.02	0	0	0.37
23	5	Neches	Tyler	137	119	154	19	5.12	0	0	0.56
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	101	50	113	13	5.77	0.05	0	0.36
TOTAL				26,543	21,563	89,118	705	615.48	41.78	291	N/A

DRAFT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	1% Annual Chance Flood Risk				
					Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	74.67	74.66	0.00	0	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	238.56	238.56	0.00	0	0
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	371.26	310.09	61.16	0	0
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	180.89	180.89	0.00	0	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	54.40	7.37	47.04	0	0
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	350.58	350.56	0.00	0	0
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	78.57	78.57	0.00	0	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	66.16	66.16	0.00	0	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	204.37	204.39	0.00	0	0
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	694.90	623.43	71.47	0	0
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	85.66	85.66	0.00	0	0
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	178.40	178.39	0.00	0	0
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0.83	0.83	0.00	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	119.68	104.32	15.36	0	0
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	106.01	106.02	0.00	0	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	76.87	76.87	0.00	0	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	22.49	22.49	0.00	0	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	127.06	127.07	0.00	0	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	22.67	22.67	0.00	0	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	73.53	73.54	0.00	0	0
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	79.00	78.99	0.00	0	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	194.34	194.33	0.00	0	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	32.01	32.01	0.00	0	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	3,432.91	3,237.85	195.03	0	0

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

					1% Annual Chance Flood Risk						
	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Number of Structures in Floodplain	Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	98	45	95	164	27.48	0.58	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	1,418	891	7,665	339	78.11	0.28	12
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	2,086	730	2,354	287	284.05	99.62	1
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	802	396	1,127	366	64.54	1.55	1
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	4,968	4,497	1,825	141	143.45	0.53	8
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	5,640	3,921	10,441	243	204.02	1.43	29
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	315	157	1,159	153	25.91	0.60	1
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	19	3	16	127	24.27	0.20	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	890	426	1,522	168	56.38	0.18	9
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	45,551	37,137	98,396	553	1002.45	56.63	1,789
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	154	78	192	20	10.75	2.55	2
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	694	300	4,989	274	47.82	0.40	1
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0	0	0	1	0.18	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	10,752	9,407	19,498	142	246.36	0.71	119
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	116	61	433	127	20.32	0.10	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	116	55	186	214	26.42	0.35	1
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	19	3	23	26	3.49	0.01	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	83	35	135	123	16.75	0.07	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	29	0	14	41	5.27	0.09	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	2,850	1,422	7,250	346	62.14	0.37	109
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	41	19	27	94	27.47	0.12	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	604	410	321	194	47.77	0.13	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	264	174	235	129	18.32	0.40	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	77,509	60,167	157,903	4,272	2,443.73	166.88	2,082

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	0.2% Annual Chance Flood Risk				
					Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	78.11	78.10	0	0	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	247.06	247.06	0	0	0
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	401.14	339.97	61.16	0	0
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	188.90	188.90	0	0	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	56.55	9.51	47.04	0	0
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	393.96	393.94	0	0	0
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	81.90	81.89	0	0	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	69.79	69.79	0	0	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	222.37	222.39	0	0	0
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	888.39	816.92	71.47	0	0
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	128.90	128.89	0	0	0
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	185.38	185.37	0	0	0
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0.90	0.90	0	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	147.47	132.11	15.36	0	0
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	111.14	111.14	0	0	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	80.67	80.67	0	0	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	23.35	23.35	0	0	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	130.84	130.84	0	0	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	23.57	23.57	0	0	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	77.55	77.56	0	0	0
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	83.14	83.13	0	0	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	207.36	207.35	0	0	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	33.87	33.87	0	0	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	3,862.30	3,667.23	195.03	0	0

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

					0.2% Annual Chance Flood Risk						
	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Number of Structures in Floodplain	Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	126	63	150	188	33.73	0.61	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	1,690	1,083	8,590	367	91.48	0.29	18
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	3,298	1,365	4,295	334	349.03	107.88	6
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	1,011	553	1,514	436	80.53	1.64	3
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	5,246	4,686	2,088	142	150.38	0.56	13
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	7,852	5,432	14,070	268	279.12	1.78	51
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	373	195	1,236	174	32.19	0.64	1
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	24	4	16	150	28.67	0.21	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	1,135	537	2,283	192	71.67	0.22	9
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	85,121	69,440	208,558	858	1,778.49	99.01	2,987
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	364	237	645	31	32.82	5.93	3
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	819	386	5,843	312	60.22	0.42	1
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0	0	0	1	0.31	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	15,812	13,645	28,038	170	344.09	0.98	178
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	138	72	562	140	24.40	0.11	0
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	144	73	236	241	32.57	0.37	1
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	31	4	41	31	4.13	0.01	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	94	37	156	138	20.43	0.07	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	32	0	17	43	6.29	0.09	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	3,547	1,971	9,817	392	76.47	0.40	118
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	50	26	46	104	32.50	0.13	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	731	512	456	214	58.08	0.14	0
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	314	203	274	156	22.81	0.43	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	127,952	100,524	288,931	5,082	3,610.39	221.92	3,389

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Possible Flood Prone Areas				
					Area in Floodplain (sqmi)	Riverine Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Coastal Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Local Flood Risk Type (sqmi)	Other Flood Risk Type (sqmi)
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	4.83	0.66	0	4.17	0
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	10.16	1.40	0	8.74	0.01
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	4.53	0.00	0	0.00	4.53
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	13.63	2.46	0	11.17	0
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	0	0	0	0	0
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	31.81	0.00	0	0	31.81
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	3.86	0.43	0	3.44	0
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	5.12	1.86	0	3.27	0
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	2.37	0.00	0	0	2.37
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	22.01	0.00	0	0	22.01
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	22.54	0.00	0	0	22.54
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	9.87	2.33	0	7.54	0.00
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0	0	0	0	0
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	0.18	0.00	0	0	0.18
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	2.02	0.00	0	0	2.02
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	9.61	3.16	0	6.45	0
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	1.48	0.47	0	1.01	0
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	5.38	1.18	0	4.20	0
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	1.38	0.23	0	1.15	0
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	8.57	0.99	0	7.58	0
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	2.70	0.21	0	2.49	0
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	2.58	0.00	0	0	2.58
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	3.35	0.22	0	3.13	0
TOTAL				11,405.55	167.97	15.59	0	64.32	88.06

Table 5: Future Condition Flood Risk

	RFPG No.	RFPG Name	County	Area in Flood Planning Region (sqmi)	Possible Flood Prone Areas							
					Number of Structures in Floodplain	Residential Structures in Floodplain	Population	Roadway Stream Crossings (#)	Roadways Segments (miles)	Agricultural Areas (sqmi)	Critical Facilities (#)	Average SVI of features in floodplain or flood prone areas
1	5	Neches	Anderson	495.35	285	205	1,421	58	18.75	0.06	3	0.66
2	5	Neches	Angelina	860.98	997	669	8,062	58	42.80	0.03	13	0.65
3	5	Neches	Chambers	434.46	344	181	866	5	14.28	0.78	0	0.73
4	5	Neches	Cherokee	1057.77	308	166	2,439	75	27.25	0.23	3	0.61
5	5	Neches	Galveston	56.94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.27
6	5	Neches	Hardin	887.6	1,005	710	3,955	14	31.22	1.90	8	0.33
7	5	Neches	Harris	0.17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
8	5	Neches	Henderson	373.91	278	168	1,057	34	11.19	0.07	3	0.40
9	5	Neches	Houston	418.21	31	17	38	15	4.69	0.02	2	0.38
10	5	Neches	Jasper	615.49	172	89	904	31	5.25	0.01	7	0.53
11	5	Neches	Jefferson	954.14	6,563	5,615	35,464	58	92.61	4.36	80	0.47
12	5	Neches	Liberty	235.49	145	106	283	4	10.86	1.17	0	0.57
13	5	Neches	Nacogdoches	977.21	409	258	3,015	50	19.28	0.05	7	0.71
14	5	Neches	Newton	6.39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
15	5	Neches	Orange	155.72	13	13	27	0	0.19	0	0	0.36
16	5	Neches	Polk	535.17	52	32	186	9	2.76	0	0	0.79
17	5	Neches	Rusk	524.87	242	125	1,643	61	16.00	0.04	2	0.59
18	5	Neches	Sabine	95.27	14	7	38	3	0.83	0	4	0.60
19	5	Neches	San Augustine	533.5	58	29	146	29	6.58	0.01	1	0.73
20	5	Neches	Shelby	159.87	5	0	2	10	1.49	0	0	0.65
21	5	Neches	Smith	509.57	2,130	1,650	15,244	103	54.85	0.06	19	0.44
22	5	Neches	Trinity	341.74	7	5	12	9	2.63	0.01	0	0.38
23	5	Neches	Tyler	931.72	151	134	278	22	5.70	0	0	0.57
24	5	Neches	Van Zandt	244.01	129	66	254	19	8.54	0.06	0	0.36
TOTAL				11,405.55	13,338	10,245	75,334	667	377.76	8.86	152	N/A

DRAFT

**APPENDIX 2-C
FUTURE POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

Water User Group	Population, 2020	Population, 2030	Population, 2040	Population, 2050
AFTON GROVE WSC	1237	1357	1474	1614
ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF TEXAS	303	337	371	410
ALTO	1275	1398	1519	1663
ALTO RURAL WSC	3272	3589	3899	4266
ANAHUAC	1984	2010	2038	2068
ANGELINA WSC	3000	3210	3386	3547
APPLEBY WSC	3655	4108	4553	5026
ARP	1084	1136	1189	1245
ATHENS	306	342	372	411
BEAUMONT	130024	138409	147221	157461
BEN WHEELER WSC	2554	2802	2992	3181
BERRYVILLE	1097	1201	1287	1401
BETHEL ASH WSC	3783	4372	4851	5443
BEVIL OAKS	1345	1431	1522	1628
BLACKJACK WSC	778	853	927	1014
BOLIVAR PENINSULA SUD	2943	3480	4118	4875
BRIDGE CITY	6073	6348	6540	6672
BROOKELAND FWSD	931	937	938	938
BROWNSBORO	1368	1665	1915	2243
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	2190	2280	2330	2368
BULLARD	3733	4777	5826	6956
CARO WSC	2593	2913	3228	3565
CARROLL WSC	669	744	820	904
CENTERVILLE WSC	856	925	932	904
CENTRAL WCID OF ANGELINA COUNTY	7323	7835	8266	8658
CHANDLER	3704	4510	5181	6067
CHESTER WSC	1096	1129	1152	1171
CHINA	1230	1309	1393	1489
CHOICE WSC	161	172	183	193
COLMESNEIL	1045	1045	1045	1045
CORRIGAN	1871	2091	2263	2410
COUNTY-OTHER, Anderson	1395	1460	1483	1483
COUNTY-OTHER, Angelina	5672	6072	6407	6706
COUNTY-OTHER, Chambers	1696	2036	2388	2766
COUNTY-OTHER, Cherokee	2038	2307	2551	2868
COUNTY-OTHER, Galveston	6	6	6	5
COUNTY-OTHER, Hardin	5922	6069	6170	6232
COUNTY-OTHER, Henderson	4683	4139	4001	3264
COUNTY-OTHER, Houston	293	287	286	286
COUNTY-OTHER, Jasper	8671	8861	8897	8894
COUNTY-OTHER, Jefferson	13126	17879	23610	30269
COUNTY-OTHER, Liberty	787	855	920	984
COUNTY-OTHER, Nacogdoches	6751	7582	8404	9280
COUNTY-OTHER, Newton	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER, Orange	13785	14411	14850	15148
COUNTY-OTHER, Polk	3734	4053	4256	4378
COUNTY-OTHER, Rusk	5542	6199	6827	7495
COUNTY-OTHER, Sabine	207	209	208	208
COUNTY-OTHER, San Augustine	4431	4431	4431	4431
COUNTY-OTHER, Shelby	1489	1600	1700	1795
COUNTY-OTHER, Smith	6273	7871	9516	11572
COUNTY-OTHER, Trinity	1075	1149	1120	1037
COUNTY-OTHER, Tyler	6273	6269	6229	6194
COUNTY-OTHER, Van Zandt	4842	5280	5611	5915
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	5215	5717	6211	6799

APPENDIX 2-C: FUTURE
POPULATION PROJECTIONS

JULY 2023

Water User Group	Population, 2020	Population, 2030	Population, 2040	Population, 2050
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	383	444	512	590
CUSHING	924	1037	1150	1270
CYPRESS CREEK WSC	592	595	595	595
D & M WSC	6238	7009	7767	8574
DAISETTA	1103	1242	1375	1508
DAMASCUS-STRYKER WSC	1557	1739	1883	2005
DEAN WSC	4725	4905	5087	5281
DEVERS	6	7	7	8
DIBOLL	5646	6041	6372	6675
EBENEZER WSC	838	934	1027	1127
EDOM WSC	1395	1526	1631	1740
EMERALD BAY MUD	1133	1133	1133	1133
ETOILE WSC	2238	2514	2786	3075
FOUR WAY SUD	5596	5986	6317	6616
FRANKSTON	1307	1372	1406	1431
FRANKSTON RURAL WSC	1295	1338	1354	1354
G M WSC	1326	1327	1327	1327
GALVESTON	0	0	0	0
GARRISON	1124	1263	1399	1545
GASTON WSC	1661	1851	2036	2235
GOODSPRINGS WSC	2869	3198	3518	3861
GRAPELAND	1242	1248	1249	1249
GROVES	16007	16007	16007	16007
GROVETON	160	173	174	169
GUM CREEK WSC	1311	1437	1561	1709
HARDIN COUNTY WCID 1	1421	1528	1605	1661
HARDIN WSC	2322	2907	3465	4024
HENDERSON	14039	15649	17212	18892
HUDSON WSC	9588	10259	10823	11337
HUNTINGTON	2504	2680	2826	2961
JACKSON WSC	2946	3304	3691	4129
JACKSONVILLE	18083	19830	21543	23585
JACOBS WSC	577	643	707	776
JASPER	8832	9026	9064	9064
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	5654	6018	6402	6847
KELLY G BREWER	155	162	167	170
KOUNTZE	2135	2141	2145	2148
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	1782	2004	2223	2457
LEAGUEVILLE WSC	2023	2159	2330	2533
LEGGETT WSC	11	12	13	14
LIBERTY	0	0	0	0
LIBERTY COUNTY FWSD 1 HULL	706	794	879	965
LILLY GROVE SUD	2649	2975	3299	3641
LINDALE	3390	4205	5083	5880
LINDALE RURAL WSC	2778	3116	3488	3776
LITTLE HOPE MOORE WSC	992	1090	1163	1236
LUFKIN	43626	46679	49241	51580
LUMBERTON MUD	28587	31985	34397	36192
M & M WSC	3325	3558	3753	3932
MAURICEVILLE SUD	556	580	596	607
MEEKER MWD	3334	3548	3774	4037
MELROSE WSC	2828	3178	3521	3888
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	986	1100	1210	1328
MOORE STATION WSC	1430	1526	1647	1789
MOSCOW WSC	343	383	415	443
MT ENTERPRISE WSC	1864	2078	2285	2508

Water User Group	Population, 2020	Population, 2030	Population, 2040	Population, 2050
MURCHISON	603	604	606	608
NACOGDOCHES	37580	42218	46791	51656
NECHES WSC	1515	1564	1582	1582
NEDERLAND	18855	20071	21348	22833
NEW LONDON	1501	1672	1838	2018
NEW SUMMERFIELD	1238	1358	1475	1614
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	4900	5375	5840	6391
NORTH HARDIN WSC	7821	8344	8716	8990
NORWOOD WSC	826	832	841	841
ORANGE	0	0	0	0
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 1	12402	12963	13357	13625
ORANGEFIELD WSC	1872	1956	2016	2057
OVERTON	221	248	275	303
PALESTINE	8735	9022	9126	9126
PENNINGTON WSC	805	851	856	838
PINELAND	968	970	970	970
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	1802	1931	2042	2148
PORT ARTHUR	55398	56095	56095	56095
PORT NECHES	13858	14752	15691	16782
R P M WSC	2957	3602	4111	4653
RAYBURN COUNTRY MUD	1703	1741	1748	1748
REDLAND WSC	2624	2808	2961	3102
RURAL WSC	1029	1052	1056	1056
RUSK	6204	6804	7391	8091
RUSK RURAL WSC	2969	3255	3537	3872
SAN AUGUSTINE	2121	2121	2121	2121
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	1170	1170	1170	1170
SAND HILLS WSC	888	955	1015	1071
SILSBEE	7162	7320	7435	7517
SLOCUM WSC	2205	2276	2301	2301
SODA WSC	121	136	147	156
SOUR LAKE	1920	2021	2093	2147
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	452	462	464	464
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	1951	2174	2391	2627
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	41746	45000	48512	52936
SWIFT WSC	2773	3116	3453	3812
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	3556	3592	3600	3603
TIMPSON	23	24	26	27
TRINITY BAY CONSERVATION DISTRICT	9849	11806	13830	16009
TROUP	2178	2402	2628	2871
TYLER	104881	114209	123583	133688
TYLER COUNTY WSC	5683	5711	5711	5711
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	1317	1352	1362	1364
VAN	2669	2978	3214	3447
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	2298	2635	2919	3293
WALNUT GROVE WSC	8728	10281	11839	13516
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	2235	2308	2336	2336
WARREN WSC	1371	1377	1377	1377
WELLS	879	963	1046	1146
WEST HARDIN WSC	3850	3902	3945	3987
WEST JACKSONVILLE WSC	1127	1234	1341	1468
WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY MWD	8554	9105	9685	10359
WHITEHOUSE	9215	10854	12499	14270
WILDWOOD POA	1404	1469	1514	1545
WODEN WSC	2783	3127	3466	3825
WOODLAWN WSC	1829	1956	2064	2162
WOODVILLE	5809	5825	5825	5825
WRIGHT CITY WSC	3378	3769	4160	4585
ZAVALLA	834	893	943	987

DRAFT

**APPENDIX 2-D
BIBLIOGRAPHY**

CHAPTER 2. FLOOD RISK ANALYSES


- “CDC SVI 2018 Documentation.” Centers for Disease Control, January 1, 2020, https://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/252601/Floods-and-health-Fact-sheets-for-health-professionals.pdf.
- “Climate Change Indicators in the United States.” United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators>.
- “CropScape – Cropland Data Layer.” *National Agricultural Statistics Service*, United States Department of Agriculture, <https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/>.
- “Flood Planning Data.” Texas Water Development Board, https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/mla_style/mla_formatting_and_style_guide/mla_formatting_and_style_guide.html.
- “Floodplain Quilt.” Texas Water Development Board, May 19, 2021, <https://twdb-flood-planning-resources-twdb.hub.arcgis.com/pages/flood-hazard-quilt>.
- “Floods and health – Fact sheets for health professionals.” World Health Organization, https://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/252601/Floods-and-health-Fact-sheets-for-health-professionals.pdf.
- “Future population and water demand.” *2022 State Water Plan*, Texas Water Development Board, https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/swp/2022/docs/04-SWP22_Future-Population.pdf?d=26546.29999999702.
- “LandScan.” Oak Ridge National Laboratory, <https://www.ornl.gov/project/landscan>.
- “Sea Level 101, Part Two: All Sea Level is Local.” NASA Global Climate Change, July 14, 2022, <https://climate.nasa.gov/ask-nasa-climate/3002/sea-level-101-part-two-all-sea-level-is-local/>.
- “Sea-Level Change Curve Calculator.” Version (2022.34), US Army Corps of Engineers, May 1, 2022, https://cwbi-app.sec.usace.army.mil/rccslc/slcc_calc.html.
- “Technical Guidelines for Regional Flood Planning.” Texas Water Development Board, April 2021, https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/planningdocu/2023/doc/04_Exhibit_C_TechnicalGuidelines_April2021.pdf?d=2127.900000002235.
- “Technical Mapping Advisory Council Future Conditions Risk Assessment and Modeling.” Technical Mapping Advisory Council, December 2015, https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema_tmacc_2015_future_conditions_risk_assessment_modeling_report.pdf
- “Texas Administrative Code, Title 31, Part 10, Chapter 361, Subchapter C, Rule 361.33.” Texas Registrar, [https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=31&pt=10&ch=361&rl=33](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=31&pt=10&ch=361&rl=33).
- “U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Reservoir Reallocations.” Duke Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, <https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/reservoir-reallocation/>.

“Volumetric Survey of B.A. Steinhagen Lake.” Texas Water Development Board, March, 2, 2004,
https://www.twdb.texas.gov/surfacewater/surveys/completed/files/BASSteinhagen/2003-05/BASSteinhagen2003_FinalReport.pdf.

DRAFT

DRAFT

**APPENDIX 3-A
SUPPLEMENTARY MAPS FOR CHAPTER 3**



DRAFT

**APPENDIX 3-B
EXISTING FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
Anderson County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			http://www.co.anderson.tx.us/upload/page/3220/docs/Anderson%20Co%20Floodplain%20permit.pdf
Angelina County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.angelinacounty.net/files/pdf/emc/acfloodpco.pdf
Angelina and Neches River Authority	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Chambers County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate		https://www.co.chambers.tx.us/upload/page/0139/docs/FLOODPLAIN%20REGULATIONS.pdf
Cherokee County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Alto	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://cityofalto.com/city-government/ordinances/
City of Anahuac	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$250, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/anahuac/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITXVLAUS_CH153FLDAPR_S153.03GEPR
City of Appleby	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Arp	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Athens	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/athens/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH5BUST_ARTXIFLDAPR_S5-137ESDEPE
City of Beaumont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Moderate:, \$500, standard		https://z2.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=beaumontset
City of Berryville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		
City of Bevil Oaks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/f62e0282-a80f-420e-ae03-7559ffcd123e/downloads/1ca1adt9v_220698.pdf?ver=1627253792209
City of Bridge City	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			https://library.municode.com/tx/bridge_city/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH7DRFLCO_ARTIIFLDAPR
City of Brownsboro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://z2.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=brownsboroset
City of Bullard	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.bullardtexas.net/DocumentCenter/View/392/Flood-Prevention-Amendments?bidId=
City of Burke	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		https://z2.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=chandlerset

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
City of Chester	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		
City of China	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Chireno	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Coffee City	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Colmesneil	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Corrigan	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Cuney	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Daisetta	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$250, standard		
City of Diboll	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			https://library.municode.com/tx/diboll/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH7FLDAPR
City of Devers	Yes	Yes	Yes					
City of Edom	Unknown**		No	No				http://www.edomtexas.com/policies.html
City of Frankston	Unknown**		No	No				http://www.frankstontexas.com/documents/
City of Gallatin	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Garrison	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Grapeland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			
City of Groves	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/groves/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIGEOR_CH10_1-2FLDAPR
City of Groveton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Hardin	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			
City of Henderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.hendersontx.us/Search?searchPhrase=floodplain
City of Hideaway	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			
City of Hudson	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Huntington	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		
City of Ivanhoe	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://z2.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=ivanhoeeset

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
City of Jacksonville	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/jacksonville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH4BU_ARTVIIIFLDAPR_DIV1GE_S4-204MEREFLO
City of Jasper	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/jasper/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR_CH10FLDAPR
City of Kennard	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Kountze	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		
City of Lindale	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/lindale/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITXVLAUS_CH152FLDAPR
City of Lufkin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$1000 max/ each violation		https://z2.frankinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=lufkinset
City of Lumberton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate			https://library.municode.com/tx/lumberton/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR_CH6BUBURE_ARTVIFLRE
City of Moore Station	Unknown**		No	No				
City of Mount Enterprise	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://z2codes.frankinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=mountenterpriseset
City of Murchison	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		
City of Nacogdoches	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate			https://library.municode.com/tx/nacogdoches/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR_CH42FL
City of Nederland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/nederland/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR_CH50FL
City of New Chapel Hill	Unknown**		No	No				
City of New London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of New Summerfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://z2.frankinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=newsummerfieldset
City of Nome	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
City of Nooday	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Overton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://cdn-5be0be53f911c81894252e67.closte.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/CHAPTER-91-Flood-Prevention Mgt-Regs.pdf
City of Palestine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate			https://library.municode.com/tx/palestine/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=11964
City of Pine Forest	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		https://cityofpineforest.com/documents/250/Chapter_9_Flood_Damage_Prevention_Protection_in_the_City_of_Pine_Forest.pdf
City of Pineland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			
City of Port Arthur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Moderate		https://library.municode.com/tx/port_arthur/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH42FL
City of Port Neches	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low			https://library.municode.com/tx/port_neches/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH54FL
City of Poynor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		
City of Reklaw	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		
City of Rose City	Yes	Yes	Yes	No				
City of Rose Hill Acres	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://cityofrosehillacres.org/city-ordinances-1
City of Rusk	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/rusk/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITXVLAUS_CH151FLDAPR
City of San Augustine	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://z2codes.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=sanaugustineset
City of Silsbee	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/silsbee/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH16FLDAPR
City of Sour Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sourlake/latest/sourlake/0-0-0-2860
City of Taylor Landing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://storage.googleapis.com/production-ipage-v1-0-5/835/412835/lc6INDtZ/dd9f1fbb5d854a0bb836e414bbf4a8ad?fileName=Ordinances%201-15.pdf

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
City of Troup	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://z2codes.franklinlegal.net/franklin/Z2Browser2.html?showset=trouset
City of Tyler	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation	Yes	https://www.cityoftyler.org/home/showpublisheddocument/3197/637163404114630000
City of Van	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		https://library.municode.com/tx/van/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=14705
City of Vidor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/vidor/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOOOR_CH30FL
City of Wells	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
City of Whitehouse	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.whitehousetx.org/164/Permits-Building-Inspection
City of Woodville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://library.municode.com/tx/woodville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH32FLDAPR
City of Zavalla	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.cityofzavalla.com/ordinances
Galveston County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High; \$100/day; unique		https://www.galvestoncountytexas.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/4402/637371353924130000
Hardin County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		http://www.co.hardin.tx.us/upload/page/3706/docs/Final_Ordinance_10-6-2010%20signed.pdf
Harris County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong		No	
Henderson County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.henderson-county.com/home/showpublisheddocument/8696/636670070988770000
Houston County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
Jasper County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		
Jefferson County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate		https://co.jefferson.tx.us/agenda/agendas_pl/20190715_518/Attachments/July%202015,%202019%20-%20Flood%20Damage%20Prevention%20Order.pdf

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
Jefferson County Drainage District 3	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Jefferson County Drainage District 6	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Jefferson County Drainage District 7	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Liberty County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		https://www.co.liberty.tx.us/upload/page/4898/Liberty%20County%20Flood%20Prevention%20Ordinance.pdf
Liberty County Drainage District	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Lower Neches Valley Authority	Unknown**	No	No	No				
Nacogdoches County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
Newton County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
Orange County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: \$500, standard		https://www.co.orange.tx.us/media/Environmental%20Health%20Code%20Compliance/Flood%20Damage%20Prevention%20Order%202015.pdf
Orange County Drainage District	Unknown**	No	No	No				https://ocddtx.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/OCDD-DCM-Regulations-Adopted-10-06-20.pdf
Polk County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		https://www.co.polk.tx.us/upload/page/3608/Flood%20Damage%20Prevention%20Order.pdf
Rusk County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$500 max/ each violation		
Sabine County	Yes	Yes	Yes					
San Augustine County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate; \$250 max/ each violation		
Shelby County	Yes	Yes	Yes					

Table 6: Existing Floodplain Management Practices

Entity ^A	Floodplain management regulations (Yes/ No/ Unknown) ^A	Adopted minimum regulations pursuant to Texas Water Code Section 16.3145? (Yes/ No) ^A	NFIP Participant (Yes/ No) ^A	Higher Standards Adopted (Yes/ No) ^B	Floodplain Management Practices (Strong/Moderate/Low/ None) ^B	Level of enforcement of practices (High/ Moderate/ Low/ None) ^{B,C}	Existing Stormwater or Drainage Fee (Yes/No) ^B	Web Link to entity regulations ^B
Smith County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate			https://www.smith-county.com/home/showpublisheddocument/1098/636610448242330000
Town of Broaddus	Unknown**		No	No				
Town of Browndell	Unknown**		No	No				
Town of Cushing	Unknown**		No	No				
Trinity County	Yes	Yes	Yes					http://www.co.trinity.tx.us/upload/page/3956/docs/Subdivision/Sept2017-UpdatedSubDivisionRegulations.pdf
Trinity River Authority of Texas	No	No	No	No				
Tyler County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Moderate: misdemeanor, \$500, standard		
Van Zandt County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate	High; \$2000 max/ each violation		http://www.vanzandtcounty.org/upload/page/2685/2021%20Home/Subdivision%20Regulations.pdf

^A At a minimum, the RFPGs must list all counties, cities and communities in the region with flood related authority in the region and identify whether entity they have any established floodplain management practices. Texas Water Code Sec. 16.3145: "The governing body of each city and county shall adopt ordinances or orders, as appropriate, necessary for the city or county to be eligible to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program."

^B This field may be left blank during the 1st planning cycle. However, RFPGs are strongly encouraged to provide this information when applicable and available.

^C The following may serve as a guide for evaluating enforcement:

- high- actively enforces the entire ordinance, performs many inspections throughout construction process, issues fines, violations, and Section 1316s where appropriate, and enforces substantial damage and substantial improvement;
- moderate- enforces much of the ordinance, performs limited inspections and is limited in issuance of fines and violations;
- low- provides permitting of development in the floodplain, may not perform inspections, may not issue fines or violations;
- none- does not enforce floodplain management regulations.

**Indicates floodplain regulations were not assessed