

Table 20: RECOMMENDED FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECT DETAILS

Table 20: Recommended Flood Mitigation Project Details		Potentially Feasible Flood Management Strategies Identified by RPPG																													
Project Name	FMP	Project Description:	Flood Region	Project Type	FIUP Project Category	Project Watershed	Rural Applicant	Project Cost	Benefit Cost Ratio	Cost per Structure Removed	Pre-Project Level-of-Service	Post-Project Level-of-Service	# of Structures in 1% Annual Chance FP (Pre-Project)	Project Status	Average Flood Depth (100yr)	Notes	Severity Ranking: Pre-Project Average Depth of Flooding (100-year)	Score 1	Communities Served by Project	Community Population Served	Flood Plain Population	Notes 2	Severity Ranking: Community Need (% Population)	Score 2	# of Structures Removed from 1% Annual Chance FP	Notes 3	Flood Risk Reduction	Score 3	# of Structures with Reduced 1% Annual Chance Flood Risk	Pre-Project Damage \$	Post-Project Damage \$
North Pharr Mitigation Project	15300011	Construct 3400-linear feet of channel improvements on the ditch running from south to north along North Fir Street and 2800-linear feet of channel improvements on the Pharr-McAllen Lateral Ditch up to North I road. Install culvert improvements. 2-8	Lower Rio Grande	Infrastructure		15000146		7450000	6.49	8932.853717			3594	Planning	1.34 ft		Baseline >2ft	8	1	68022	11752		17.3	1	834		23	4		75,301,488.00	53,544,000.00
Southwest Pharr Drainage Mitigation Project	15300012	Construct four regional detention facilities (RDF). RDF 1 has a footprint of 19.75-acres and is a lateral detention facility located between Dicker and Thomas Road west of Highway 281 and near Carmen Anaya Elementary. RDF 2 has a footprint of 7.4-acres	Lower Rio Grande	Infrastructure, Regional Detention		15000119		5587280	1.31	29878.50267			1397	Planning	1.38		Baseline >2ft	8	1	68022	4568		6.7	1	187		13	4		56,215,264.00	48,946,976.00

Table 20: RECOMMENDED FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECT DETAILS

Notes 4	Flood Damage Reduction	Score 4	# of Critical Facilities Removed from 1% Annual Chance FP	Notes 5	Reduction in Critical Facilities Flood Risk	Score 5	Adjusted Injury Risk (%)	Notes 6	Life and Safety Ranking (Injury/Loss of Life)	Score 6	Water Supply Benefit in Acres-Feet	SourceID	WMS_ID	Notes 7	Water Supply Yield Ranking	Score 7	SVI Score	Notes 8	Social Vulnerability Ranking	Score 8	% Nature Based Solution by Cost	Notes 9	Nature-Based Solutions Ranking	Score 9	Multiple Benefits Description	Notes 10	Multiple Benefit Ranking	Score 10	O&M Cost (Annual)	Notes 11	Operations and Maintenance Ranking	Score 11	Notes 12	Administrative, Regulatory and Other Obstacle Ranking	Score 12	Notes 13	Environmental Benefit Ranking	Score 13	Notes 14	Environmental Impact Ranking	Score 14	Traffic Count for LWC Project	Notes 15	Mobility Ranking	Score 15	Project Count	Regional Ranking	Score 16	
1.26 ft ave depth proposed	29	4	0	na	0	0	13.56	2								0			0.865	10	na		na	0	Agricultural benefits and transportation				4	regular maintenace of channels and detention	low	7	typical	6		Moderate	6	Agricultural resources and soil quality	Agricultural area required for detention	6				Minor acces routes still flooded	7				
1.29 ft ave depth proposed	13	2	0	na	0	0	13.74	2								0			0.64	7	na		na	0	Agricultural benefits and transportation				4	regular maintenace of channels and detention	low	7	typical	6		moderate	6	Agricultural resources and soil quality	Agricultural area required for detention	6				some major routes flooded	4				