

FY18 Atascosa Watershed, TX

Base Level Engineering (BLE) Results

TWDB Contract No. 1800012224 Task Order 2

SARA Contract No. C000166 Task Order 8

Prepared for:

TWDB (Texas Water Development Board)

Attn: Manuel Razo, GISP, CFM

1700 N. Congress Avenue

Austin, Texas 78701

SARA (San Antonio River Authority)

Attn: Erin Cavazos, PE, CFM

600 E Euclid Ave

San Antonio, Texas 78212

Submitted by:

AECOM

9400 Amberglen Blvd

Bldg. E

Austin, Texas 78729

DOCUMENT HISTORY

DOCUMENT LOCATION

K:/FY2019/19-06-0027S/Hydraulics - BLE|FY18|Phase 0|Atascosa 02

REVISION HISTORY

Version Number	Version Date	Summary Changes	Team/Author
1	February 26, 2020	Initial Draft	AECOM

APPROVALS

This document requires the approval of the following persons:

Role	Name	Review Date	Approved Date
Project Manager	Sean Sutton	February 24, 2020	March 18, 2020

CLIENT DISTRIBUTION

Name	Title/Organization	Location
Manuel Razo	Project Manager/TWDB	Austin, Texas
Erin Cavazos	Project Manager/River Authority	San Antonio, Texas

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Base Level Engineering (BLE) Methodology	1
1.1 Topographic Data	2
1.1.1 Source Terrain Data	3
1.1.2 Terrain Data Processing	4
1.2 Hydrology	5
1.2.1 Regression Analysis	6
1.2.2 Stream Gage Analysis.....	7
1.3 Hydraulics.....	9
1.4 Quality Control	11
1.5 One-percent Special Flood Hazard Area Delineation	12
Challenges	13
Results and Recommendations	15
3.1 CNMS Validation of Effective Zone A SFHA	15
3.2 Flood Risk Analysis	20
References	21
Appendix A BLE Map	A-1

Executive Summary

Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and San Antonio River Authority (River Authority) contracted AECOM to complete a Base Level Engineering (BLE) analysis for the Atascosa HUC-8 Watershed in Central Texas, to support FEMA's Discovery process and validation of effective Zone A Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs).

The BLE process involves using best available data and incorporating automated techniques with traditional model development procedures to produce regulatory-quality flood hazard boundaries for the 1-percent annual chance event as well as estimates of flood hazard boundaries for multiple recurrence intervals.

The source digital terrain data used for surface model development in support of hydrologic and hydraulic analysis as well as mapping activities were leveraged from various local, State, and Federal partners. Details regarding the different datasets used are provided below in Section 1.1.

Flood discharges for this study were calculated using both the United States Geological Survey (USGS) regression equations and gage analysis, where stream gages with sufficient record exist. Regression equations were obtained from the USGS Scientific Investigations Report (SIR) 2009-5087, *Regression Equations for Estimation of Annual Peak-Streamflow Frequency for Undeveloped Watersheds in Texas Using an L-moment Based, PRESS-Minimized, Residual-Adjusted Approach* (2009).

The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program version 5.0.5 was used to compute water surface elevations on a stream by stream basis. All hydraulic models were computed using 1-D steady state analysis.

The stream mile network that was validated for these watersheds was compiled using FEMA's Community Needs Management Strategy (CNMS) inventory. CNMS is an inventory of flood hazard studies and flood hazard mapping needs for areas where a study is needed. This data is helpful for community officials in analyzing and depicting flood hazards to enhance the understanding of flood risks. Communities may use this information to make informed decisions on their planning and flood mitigation efforts. Table ES-1 lists the Zone A stream miles associated with this validation analysis.

Table ES-1: Summary of Stream Miles

Source	Atascosa Stream Miles
CNMS	955.8

The full inventory of Zone A studies in the watershed were classified in CNMS. Total miles validated in CNMS are summarized in Table ES-2 and illustrated in Figure ES-1 below.

Table ES-2: Zone A Validation Results

Validation Status	Status Type	Total Miles
VALID	BEING STUDIED	64.4
UNVERIFIED	BEING STUDIED	891.4




Figure ES-1: Atascosa Watershed CNMS Validation Results

An overall risk for each HUC-12 watershed was calculated using the National Flood Risk Percentages Dataset and its proportional area. The weighted risk was multiplied by the percentage of points in the watershed that failed the CNMS comparison to effective to determine the priority score. Figure ES-2 below shows the range of the Atascosa HUC-8 priority scores which can be used to initiate discussions during the Discovery phase.

Town of Whitsett-Atascosa River HUC-12 was determined to have the highest priority score and the most need while Lower Weedy Creek HUC-12 had the lowest scores.




Figure ES-2: Ranking of Atascosa Watershed HUC-12s

Base Level Engineering (BLE) Methodology

Recent innovations and efficiencies in floodplain mapping have allowed the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to develop a process called Base Level Engineering (BLE), which can be used to address current program challenges, including the validation of Zone A studies and the availability of flood risk data in the early stages of a Flood Risk Project. The BLE process involves using best available data and incorporating automated techniques with traditional model development procedures to produce regulatory quality flood hazard boundaries for the 1-percent annual chance event as well as estimates of flood hazard boundaries for multiple recurrence intervals. The cost for developing the data and estimates resulting from the BLE process are lower than standard flood production costs. The BLE results may be used for eventual production of regulatory and non-regulatory products.

As described in Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter III, Section 4101(e), once every five years, FEMA must evaluate whether the information on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) reflects the current risks in flood-prone areas. FEMA makes this determination of flood hazard data validity by examining flood study attributes and change characteristics, as specified in the Validation Checklist of the Coordinated Needs Management Strategy (CNMS) Technical Reference. The CNMS Validation Checklist provides a series of critical and secondary checks to determine the validity of flood hazard areas studied by detailed methods (e.g., Zone AE, AH, or AO). While the critical and secondary elements in CNMS provide a comprehensive method of evaluating the validity of Zone AE studies, a cost-effective approach for evaluating Zone A studies has been lacking.

In addition to the need for Zone A validation guidance, FEMA standards require flood risk data to be provided in the early stages of a Flood Risk Project. FEMA Program Standard SID #29 requires that during Discovery, data must be identified that illustrates potential changes in flood elevation and mapping that may result from the proposed project scope. If available data does not clearly illustrate the likely changes, an analysis is required that estimates the likely changes. This data and any associated analyses should be shared and results should be discussed with stakeholders.

An important goal of the BLE process is the scalability of the results. Scalability means that the results of a BLE analysis can not only be used for CNMS evaluations of Zone A studies, but can also be leveraged throughout the Risk MAP program. The data resulting from a BLE analysis can be updated as needed and used for the eventual production of regulatory and non-regulatory products, outreach and risk communication, and MT-1 processing. Leveraging this data outside the Risk MAP program may also be valuable to external stakeholders.

TWDB and the River Authority contracted AECOM to complete a BLE analysis for the Atascosa Watershed in Central Texas to support FEMA's Discovery process and validation of effective Zone A Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA). The study extents include portions of Atascosa, Bexar, Frio, Karnes, Live Oak, Medina, McMullen and Wilson Counties, and include the following communities: the Cities of Charlotte, Christine, Jourdanton, Lytle, Pleasanton, Poteet, and San Antonio. The study area consists of five HUC-10 basins: Borrego Creek-Atascosa River, Galvan Creek-Atascosa River, Headwaters Atascosa River, La Parita Creek-Atascosa River, and Lower Atascosa River. Figure 1 shows the orientation of the Atascosa HUC-10 basins with respect to the counties.




Figure 1: Atascosa Watershed HUC-10 Basins

AECOM studied approximately 1,800 miles of stream reaches within the Atascosa Watershed with a minimum drainage area tolerance of one square mile outside of population centers and half a square mile inside population centers. The selection and extent of stream reaches studied were based upon the number of stream miles with a minimum drainage area of one square mile and not the number of effective Zone A stream miles. Study reaches were extended above this threshold as appropriate to ensure all effective Zone A flood areas received an updated analysis. Topographic data from multiple sources were used to determine the hydrologic and hydraulic characteristics of the watershed. The following sections summarize the BLE process and discuss the results along with their recommended use.

1.1 Topographic Data

Topographic data from multiple sources were used to determine the hydrologic and hydraulic characteristics of the watershed. Topographic data were obtained from the Texas Natural Resources Information System (TNRIS), and the United States Geological Survey (USGS).

All available metadata, survey reports, and other leverage documentation are available with the source dataset. Figure 2 shows the extents of the source Digital Terrain Model (DTM) data used for the Atascosa Watershed.




Figure 2: Extent of LiDAR Data for Atascosa Watershed

1.1.1 Source Terrain Data

Five topographic datasets were used in the development of the BLE hydraulic models. Details on each dataset are outlined below.

1.1.1.1 2018 South Central Texas LiDAR

The USGS LiDAR project covers Atascosa, Frio, Live Oak, Gillespie, Kimble and Kerr Counties. The project was developed to create a consistent and accurate surface elevation dataset for the USGS FEMA VI Red River, Texas Project Area. The acquisition was conducted from January 4, 2018 to January 22, 2018. Dewberry served as the prime contractor for the project and was responsible for LAS classification, all LiDAR products, breakline production, DEM production, and quality assurance.

LiDAR acquired from this project will be used for floodplain management and planning, feature extraction, water quality modeling, stream restoration potential analysis, change detection, 9-1-1, wildfire mitigation, habitat identification/modeling for endangered species, and hurricane recovery projects.

Further details regarding this acquisition can be found by downloading the USGS 2018 South Central Project Reports.

1.1.1.2 2017 Central Texas LiDAR

The project was managed by the Texas Strategic Mapping (StratMap) Program and utilized the StratMap Contracts held by the Department of Information Resources (DIR). Collection took place January 28, 2017, through March 22, 2017. Data was collected and processed by Fugro EarthData, Inc. with third party quality assurance/quality control performed by AECOM.

LiDAR acquired from this project will be used for floodplain management and planning, feature extraction, water quality modeling, stream restoration potential analysis, change detection, 9-1-1, wildfire mitigation, habitat identification/modeling for endangered species, and dam safety. The project area of interest covers areas where previous LiDAR acquisition did not meet USGS Quality level 2 data specifications.

1.1.1.3 2013 Ellis, Navarro, Wilson & Karnes Counties LiDAR

The StratMap LiDAR collection covers portions of Johnson, Ellis, Hill, McLennan, Limestone, Navarro and Henderson counties in north Texas along with portions of Wilson and Karnes counties in central Texas. Aerial collection took place from January to March 2013 during the leaf-off season. Gorrondona & Associates teamed with McKim & Creed and Williams Aerial Mapping to perform data acquisition/processing while URS Corporation provided third-party quality assurance/quality control using the High Priority Imagery and Datasets (HPIDS) contract.

1.1.1.4 2010 Bexar LiDAR

The LiDAR collection covering Bexar County was flown from May to August 2010. The collection was made possible with funding from the City of San Antonio, Bexar Appraisal District, Bexar Metro 911, and SARA. The project was coordinated by the TNRIS StratMap Program and used the HPIDS contract. The collection was acquired and processed by TerraPoint with third party quality assurance/quality control by Dewberry.

1.1.1.5 2009 Goliad, McMullen, & Zapata Counties LiDAR

The StratMap LiDAR collection covers portions of Goliad, McMullen and Zapata counties, Texas. Data was captured by Photoscience, Inc. from June 19-20, 2009. The purpose of this project was to develop new flood hazard information that would be used in the update and creation of accurate flood zone maps in support of the National Flood Insurance Program.

The data products became part of ongoing data collection by the State of Texas to support mapping and modeling of floodplains, hydrography, and terrain. This project was procured through the Council on Competitive Government's HPIDS contract.

1.1.2 Terrain Data Processing

The LiDAR data were processed in Environmental System Research Institute (ESRI) ArcGIS software to create a composite DTM dataset for the project area. The outputs from the processing described below were used during the hydrology, hydraulics, floodplain mapping and CNMS processes and validations.

The Watershed Information System (WISE) software platform was utilized in order to create a digital surface model for the project area. This module allows source data from a variety of sources to be prioritized based on level of accuracy or preference of the user.

For the Atascosa Watershed, the 2018 South Central Texas LiDAR was the highest priority, with the 2017 Central Texas LiDAR prioritized second, the 2013 TNIRIS Ellis Navarro LiDAR prioritized third, the 2010 Bexar County LiDAR fourth and the 2009 Goliad, McMullen, & Zapata Counties LiDAR prioritized fifth. These datasets were used as the data sources for creating the 10-ft and 50-ft DEMs.

The DEMs created from the LiDAR datasets mentioned above were compiled in order of vertical accuracy into a mosaic dataset using ArcGIS. From this mosaic, a tile index was created for the project area and the mosaic was clipped into 50,000-foot tiles, converted to asciis and imported into WISE Terrain Analyst (WTA). Visual inspection of the 10-foot DEMs was performed to ensure no voids and/or artifacts were present in the DEM. The DEM surface model was affirmed to be suitable for hydraulic takeoffs and supporting other hydraulic analyses.

After the DEM was imported, an additional 50-foot DEM was created from the same mosaic and tile index used for the 10-foot DEM. This 50-foot DEM was used for hydro enforcement of the project areas. Proprietary software was used to identify natural sinks, peaks and flat areas in the 50-foot DEM surface. Elevations of the cells in the DEM were algorithmically calculated and the best path to route flow was determined without filling sinks in the DEM. Once all calculations were completed, the flow was checked confirming that all drainage flowed downstream correctly and routed to outside of the project area.

Stream centerlines were manually digitized using the 10-foot DEMs as a source for horizontal alignment and vertical elevation. These stream centerlines are created for use in the hydraulic analysis, hydro-enforcement of the 50-foot DEMs, and visual reference on the FIRM products. Several routines were then used to take localized elevations from the source topographic data and apply them to the stream centerlines. This gave the stream centerline vertices elevation information along the Z axis. The resulting elevations ensure that the streams are lower in elevation than any overbank sumps. A separate routine was then used to ensure that the elevations of these vertices descend in height down to an outfall. The final stream centerline file is then “burned” into the 50-foot DEMs to force flow through structures while preventing it from jumping out of the channel banks.

In addition to the quantitative assessment of the source digital terrain, a qualitative visual inspection of the composite DEM was performed using a hillshade derived from the 10-foot DEM. The visual inspection indicated that no unusual or non-terrestrial features were observed in the composite DEM, assuring the surface files used for hydrologic and hydraulic analyses and floodplain mapping activities are sufficient for BLE analysis.

1.2 Hydrology

Flood discharges for this study were calculated using both the USGS regression equations and gage analysis, where stream gages with sufficient record exist. Regression equations obtained from the USGS Scientific Investigations Report (SIR) 2009-5087, *Regression Equations for Estimation of Annual Peak-Streamflow Frequency for Undeveloped Watersheds in Texas Using an L-moment Based, PRESS-Minimized, Residual-Adjusted Approach* (2009) contain the most recent regression equations for Texas. USGS Peak FQ Version 7.1 was used to perform the Flood

Frequency Analysis (FFA) for the two gages within the Atascosa Watershed (see below for further discussion).

1.2.1 Regression Analysis

The WISE software was used to delineate drainage basins in shapefile format using the 50-foot DEM. WISE was also used to calculate the main-channel slope for each basin. The basin shapefile attribution was automated by WISE with drainage area, main-channel slope, precipitation, and OmegaEM, all inputs for the USGS regression equations.

Table 1 shows the published equations used in this study. In these equations, Q_i represents peak streamflow for i -recurrence interval (annual chance exceedance (a.c.e.)) in cubic feet per second (cfs), P represents mean annual precipitation in inches, S represents dimensionless main-channel slope, Ω represents the OmegaEM parameter, and A represents cumulative drainage area in square miles.

Table 1: Summary of Regression Equations in Texas (SIR 2009-5087)

Recurrence Interval	Equation
$Q_{10\%}$	$P^{1.203} \times S^{0.403} \times 10^{[0.918\Omega + 13.62 - 11.97A^{(-0.0289)}]}$
$Q_{4\%}$	$P^{1.140} \times S^{0.446} \times 10^{[0.945\Omega + 11.79 - 9.819A^{(-0.0374)}]}$
$Q_{2\%}$	$P^{1.105} \times S^{0.476} \times 10^{[0.961\Omega + 11.17 - 8.997A^{(-0.0424)}]}$
$Q_{1\%}$	$P^{1.071} \times S^{0.507} \times 10^{[0.969\Omega + 10.82 - 8.448A^{(-0.0467)}]}$
$Q_{0.2\%}$	$P^{0.988} \times S^{0.569} \times 10^{[0.976\Omega + 10.40 - 7.605A^{(-0.0554)}]}$
Variables: Q_i , peak flow for i recurrence interval (a.c.e.), in cubic feet per second; P , mean annual precipitation, in inches; S , Main-channel slope (dimensionless); Ω , OmegaEM parameter; A , cumulative drainage area, in square miles	

Discharges for the 1-percent plus and 1-percent minus a.c.e. were calculated as well. These values were computed as $Q_{1\% \pm} = Q_{1\%} \pm 10^{1.6 \times 0.30}$, where 0.30 is the mean residual standard error for the $Q_{1\%}$ equation.

The mean annual precipitation values were determined based on a shapefile coverage obtained from the TWDB and is available for download at the following location:

<https://www.twdb.texas.gov/mapping/gisdata.asp>

The annual precipitation values reflect data for the climatological period 1981-2010 as recorded by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

Main-channel slope was calculated in WISE. An automated routine determined the longest flowpath from upstream of a reach to the outlet of the sub-basin of interest. Two points along the channel, one at 0 percent and the other at 100 percent of the channel length, determined the

endpoints of the segment used in the main-channel slope calculation. The elevations for those endpoints were based on the 10-foot DEM developed from the LiDAR.

From SIR 2009-5087, the OmegaEM parameter is a generalized terrain and climate index that expresses relative differences in peak-streamflow potential. A shapefile was developed and populated with OmegaEM values based on Figure 2 in SIR 2009-5087. This shapefile was used to determine OmegaEM values on a sub-basin basis. For sub-basins spanning more than one OmegaEM grid, the sub-basin's centroid determined its OmegaEM parameter.

Drainage area for each sub-basin was determined based on automated basin delineations performed by WISE. Basin break points were set by the user with a sub-basin target size of one square mile. This criterion was adjusted for the main stem of the Atascosa River to avoid excessive and unnecessary discharge breaks. Break points were also set immediately upstream of stream confluences. Cumulative drainage area was determined based on these automated delineations performed by WISE in combination with a stream connectivity routine that defined the stream reach segments with upstream and downstream neighbors.

The sub-basin shapefile was attributed with the computed regression discharges, and those discharges were incorporated into the Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) models using an automated routine in WISE. Discharges, as well as water surface elevation results, were associated with the hydraulic cross sections prior to generation of floodplain boundaries and grid mapping. Those results are available in GIS format as part of this BLE submittal package.

1.2.2 Stream Gage Analysis

Figure 3 shows the location of the two active USGS stream gages on the Atascosa River mainstem used to develop weighted discharges for the study (Table 2). FFA were performed for both gages, according to USGS Bulletin 17C guidelines.




Figure 3: Locations of USGS Gages Utilized in Flood Frequency Analyses

Table 2: USGS Stream Gages in Atascosa Watershed

Gage ID	Flooding Source and Location	Computed Drainage Area (mi. ²)	Published Drainage Area (mi. ²)	Period of Record
08207500	Atascosa River near McCoy, TX	511	530	1951-present
08208000	Atascosa River near Whitsett, TX	1,148	1,171	1932-present

The flood flow frequency data from these gages were weighted with the regression developed discharges using the procedure described in SIR 2009-5087. Adjusted discharges were held constant if the adjustment resulted in flows decreasing in the downstream direction.

Gage variances for each storm event were used to develop weighted discharges. These variances are provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of Gage Variances Used

Gage ID	Variance				
	10PCT	4PCT	2PCT	1PCT	0.2PCT
08207500	0.0102	0.0151	0.0197	0.0253	0.0418
08208000	0.0059	0.0090	0.0124	0.0167	0.0306

Weighted discharges were adjusted using a gage adjustment factor developed from a comparison between the rural and gage discharges and rounded to determine final discharges. Final discharges for the Atascosa River estimated by gage analysis adjustment, and used in the final BLE hydraulic models, are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Final Discharges at USGS Stream Gages in Atascosa Watershed

Gage ID	10PCT (cfs)	4PCT (cfs)	2PCT (cfs)	1PCT (cfs)	0.2PCT (cfs)
08207500	9,480	15,900	21,900	29,000	50,500
08208000	14,100	23,700	35,500	52,400	121,100

1.3 Hydraulics

The hydraulic approach for this BLE analysis of the Atascosa Watershed consisted of using the terrain model described in Section 1.1 in combination with the hydrologic outputs from Section 1.2 to establish water surface elevations using 1-D steady state analysis. HEC-RAS program version 5.0.5 was chosen as the computer model to compute water surface elevations on a stream by stream basis. The WISE software was used to establish model stream orientation, generate initial hydraulic cross section layout and stationing, assign n-values to cross-sections, and develop all input files for the HEC-RAS program. ESRI's ArcGIS program was used to review and refine cross-section layout orientation.

First pass cross-section layout was performed using an automated routine in WISE that varies cross-section spacing based on the cumulative drainage area at the cross-section location. A first draft model was created based on this initial cross-section layout, and draft boundaries were developed. Next, a second pass inspection for cross-section placement and alignment occurred. Significant refinement occurred during this step. To improve the hydraulic models, additional cross-sections were added as needed to better define the BLE floodplain boundary. Cross-sections were extended in locations where overtopping occurred. Orientation of cross-sections was refined to improve on the perpendicular orientation to flow. Additional cross-sections were added at floodplain constrictions and at downstream portions of tributaries to ensure a proper tie-in with receiving streams. Cross-sections were adjusted to remove sections that intersected hydraulic crossings in the floodplain. For some of the largest studied streams, cross-sections were laid out manually in order to have more reasonable spacing and better capture the constrictions in the floodplain.

Cross-sections were not drawn on top of roadways or railroads but were placed at the upstream and downstream face of major roads and railroads. Ineffective flow stations were placed in the

hydraulic models as appropriate to account for flow constrictions and other locations deemed by the engineer to be ineffective at conveying flow downstream.

Cross-sections were drawn on dam crests for dams with well-defined spillways in order to better represent ponded water upstream of the structures. In so doing, it was assumed that the vast majority of the flow during a flood event would pass the spillway and that the hydraulic model would reasonably estimate flow across the spillway as represented in the hydraulic cross-section. The elevations used in the modeling were checked against effective Zone A boundaries, and the results were deemed reasonable.

The relationship between cumulative drainage area and assigned channel geometry is shown in Table 5. These default values for dimensions and spacing were subject to change based on engineering judgment.

Table 5: Cross-Section Default Parameters

Drainage area (upper limit)	XS Spacing	Channel Top Width	Channel Bottom Width	Channel Depth
1	500	4	3.5	0.8
2	500	6	5	0.8
4	500	11	10	0.8
8	500	12	11	0.8
10	500	13	12	0.8
15	500	18	13	0.8
20	500	19	14	0.8
25	500	20	15	0.8
30	500	21	16	0.8
40	500	25	17	0.8
50	600	28	18	1
75	600	30	19	1
100	750	33	20	1
150	750	36	21	2
250	1000	38	22	2
500	1500	40	23	3
1000	2500	100	50	3
2000	2500	150	75	3
5000	2500	200	100	0.8

In typical BLE projects, Manning's roughness coefficients (n-values) are determined using the 2016 National Land Cover Data (NLCD) dataset in combination with n-values from Chow (1959) and Calenda et al. (2005). For this watershed, the n-values for the developed areas indicated an underestimation of the roughness coefficients when compared to the aerial imagery and were adjusted accordingly. The association between the n-values and the NLCD Classification is shown in Table 6. Manning's n-value takeoffs are performed by WISE (default values taken from the "Normal" column). N-values within channel banks are constrained by the automated routine to a range of 0.030 to 0.070. Then, overbank and channel n-values are manually adjusted in certain locations based on engineering judgment.

Table 6: Manning's "n" Roughness Based on 2016 NLCD Classification (Moore, 2011)

NLCD Classification	Selected Manning's n	Minimum	Normal	Maximum	Source
Open Water	0.033	0.025	0.03	0.033	Chow 1959
Developed, Open Space	0.04	0.01	0.013	0.016	Calenda et al. 2005
Developed, Low Intensity	0.08	0.038	0.05	0.063	Calenda et al. 2005
Developed, Medium Intensity	0.1	0.056	0.075	0.094	Calenda et al. 2005
Developed, High Intensity	0.15	0.075	0.1	0.125	Calenda et al. 2005
Barren Land	0.025	0.025	0.03	0.035	Chow 1959
Deciduous Forest	0.16	0.1	0.12	0.16	Chow 1959
Evergreen Forest	0.16	0.1	0.12	0.16	Chow 1959
Mixed Forest	0.16	0.1	0.12	0.16	Chow 1959
Scrub/Shrub	0.1	0.035	0.05	0.1	Chow 1959
Grassland/Herbaceous	0.035	0.025	0.03	0.035	Chow 1959
Pasture/Hay	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	Chow 1959
Cultivated Crops	0.035	0.025	0.035	0.045	Chow 1959
Woody Wetlands	0.12	0.08	0.1	0.12	Chow 1959
Emergent Herbaceous Wetland	0.07	0.07	0.1	0.15	Chow 1959

The downstream boundary condition used for the majority of the study streams was normal depth with a default value of 0.005 ft/ft. For streams with large drainage areas (generally greater than 8 square miles), the normal depth slope was calculated based on the channel inverts of the downstream cross sections.

In cases where streams tie in to a lake, a normal depth slope was calculated based on the channel inverts of the downstream cross sections (typically between 0.0001 and 0.001 ft/ft). Several HUC-10s within this watershed are located in urban areas with storm drain systems, which are unaccounted for in the BLE models. Implications of these systems may considerably affect risk.

1.4 Quality Control

Following the initial hydraulic model analysis in each watershed, the resulting flood hazard area delineations were reviewed for areas where the results were not ideal.

QC results indicated that some of the models should be extended to cover the scope of effective flood hazard data. Those streams were extended farther upstream to match the extents of the effective SFHA data.

Typical revisions resulting from reasonability checks included adding cross-sections, adjusting orientation of cross-sections, trimming cross-sections and reduction of the default "V" angle of cross-sections. Examples of default "V" angled cross-sections are shown in Figure 4. It is estimated that 75 percent of cross-sections were adjusted in some work areas while other areas did not require as much editing. Other examples of manual editing included the addition of cross-sections at confluence areas (see Figure 5 below), modifications to improve perpendicular orientation at the channel, adjustment of discharge breaks to better represent flow addition points, revisions to

cross sections at dams, additional cross-sections bounding major hydraulic structures, and revisions to n-values.

A major component of the QC process was an automated check that identified locations where the 1-percent a.c.e profile was crossed by any other frequency profile. Significant effort was made to reasonably resolve all of these instances. Another automated check identified locations where there was a drawdown of greater than 0.5 foot on the 1-percent a.c.e. water surface profile. This check is particularly useful for identifying errors in the model such as a channel that is too wide, a poorly placed cross-section, or a need for additional cross-sections. Again, significant effort was made to reasonably resolve these drawdown situations.




Figure 4: Default "V" angle cross-sections automated by WISE (left). Manually edited cross-sections to more accurately capture terrain (right). Resulting flood boundaries shown in gold (left) or purple (right) for clarity.




Figure 5: Manually added cross-sections (green) to improve accuracy of tie-ins at confluences.

1.5 One-percent Special Flood Hazard Area Delineation

The 1-percent and 0.2-percent boundaries were mapped using a routine that develops water surface elevation grids based on the 10-foot cell size DEM developed from the LiDAR dataset used for this project (see Section 1.1). This product was converted to a polygon for cleaning. The cleaning routine involved manual inspection of the polygons to identify and remove areas of disconnected flooding. In general, all polygons greater than 5,000 square feet are investigated, but all polygons, including those less than 5,000 square feet that intersect the stream line are included in the final output. This investigation was aided by the ground DEM and aerial imagery. Manual adjustments to the polygons were made to account for spillways on dams which could not be accurately modeled using HEC-RAS as well as disconnected areas along the flooding source that should reasonably be connected.

Following the removal of disconnected flooding areas and other boundary adjustments, the small islands in the floodplain were filled. In general, islands less than 20,000 square feet were inspected and filled.

Once the island filling process was complete, the water surface raster mapping routine was run and set to conform to the polygon boundary. This ensures that the water surface raster and the floodplain boundary are consistent with each other. The depth raster product was created at the end of the process by performing a raster subtraction with the water surface elevation raster and the ground DEM.

Challenges

The Atascosa Watershed is located in Central Texas, an area known for flat terrain. In some of the wide and flat floodplains, small tributaries run parallel to large streams. Parallel streams with shared floodplains were modeled by moving the combined discharge upstream to the cross-section that begins the shared floodplain.

A significant effort was made to achieve proper 1% water surface elevation tie-ins at stream confluences. Cross-sections were manually added on the downstream end of nearly every stream, some of which traverse the receiving stream; so that the water surface elevation of the tributary would be lower than that of the receiving stream.

There are a significant number of dams of varying sizes throughout the watershed. Discharges calculated with the regression equations do not take into account the impact of these structures. There may be need for further investigation, particularly for those dams designed for flood control, when upgrading these models for detailed studies.

There are a few containment issues across the study area. In some areas, the 0.2% flows overtopped cross sections. For these situations, additional investigation is recommended when upgrading these models for detailed study.

Area-specific challenges follow:

In the Lower Atascosa River HUC-10 watershed, multiple streams need further study as cross-sections are overtopped: UNT 004 in Atascosa Rv WShed, UNT 005 in Atascosa Rv WShed, UNT 009 in Atascosa Rv WShed, and UNT 017 in Atascosa Rv WShed. Also, more detailed modeling is required at the confluence of UNT 781 in Atascosa Rv WShed and UNT 029 in Atascosa Rv WShed due to potential overflow between these two streams.

In La Parita Creek HUC-10, further study is required for: UNT 033 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 131 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 012 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 021 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 062 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 127 in La Parita Creek Watershed, UNT 156 in La Parita Creek Watershed and Salt Branch. These streams have few cross-sections which are overtopped by the floodwaters. This is represented in the mapping and grids as an abrupt edge.

In Borrego Creek HUC-10, several attempts were made to model UNT 265 in Borrego Cr Watershed, UNT 266 in Borrego Cr Watershed, UNT 267 in Borrego Cr Watershed and UNT 268 in Borrego Cr Watershed; however the BLE modeling and mapping did not support the effective flood hazard areas. The mapping differs from the effective flood hazard areas because of terrain and the delineated basins. Additional detailed analysis is recommended for this area.

In Headwaters Atascosa River HUC-10, UNT22 in Headwaters Watershed needs further study due to cross-section overtopping. These streams have few cross-sections which are overtopped by the floodwaters. This is represented in the mapping and grids as an abrupt edge.

In Galvan Creek HUC-10 watershed, multiple streams require further study due to overtopping concern. For UNT 110 and UNT 12 in Galvan Creek Watershed, UNT 12 in Galvan Creek Watershed, multiple cross-sections are overtopped by floodwaters. This is represented in the mapping and grids as an abrupt edge., so clip mapping is used and can be observed in the map. Also, further modeling is needed for Gallinas Creek in Galvan Creek Watershed around due to creation of a recent quarry area.

Results and Recommendations

The BLE results for this study produced an SFHA that conforms to the existing topography and compares favorably with the effective SFHA. These boundaries provide an approximate SFHA in areas that have not been previously studied and therefore do not currently have an SFHA mapped. These results provide context for flood risk communication as part of the Discovery process, and should be verified through community work map meetings before being applied to a regulatory product.

A map showing the BLE results is included as Appendix A.

3.1 CNMS Validation of Effective Zone A SFHA

The inventory of Zone A studies (955.8 miles) in the Atascosa Watershed were classified in CNMS with validation status of “UNVERIFIED” (891.4 miles) or “VALID” (64.4 miles), and with status type of “BEING STUDIED.” The following is a summary of the results of the CNMS validation assessment for the effective Zone A studies in the study area. Initial Assessment checks A1-A3 were evaluated for the CNMS inventory of Zone A studies.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT A1 – SIGNIFICANT TOPOGRAPHY UPDATE CHECK

This check involves determining whether a topographic data source is available that is significantly better than what was used for the effective Zone A modeling and mapping. For the study area in the Atascosa Watershed, the effective Zone A topographic data leveraged was based upon United States Interagency Elevation Inventory. The LiDAR sources discussed in section 1.1 are a significant improvement from the effective Zone A topographic source for the entire study area. Therefore, all reaches failed this check for the effective SFHA.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT A2 – CHECK FOR SIGNIFICANT HYDROLOGY CHANGES

This check involves first determining if regression equations were used for the effective study. Next, it must be determined whether new regression equations have become available from the USGS since the date of the effective Zone A study. If newer regression equations exist for the area of interest, then an engineer must determine whether these regression equations would significantly affect the 1-percent annual chance flow.

The hydrologic methods for all effective Zone A study areas located in the Atascosa watershed are unknown and, therefore, pass this assessment check.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT A3 – CHECK FOR SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT

This check involves using the National Urban Change Indicator (NUCI) dataset to assess increased urbanization in the watershed of the Zone A study. If the percentage of urban area within the HUC-12 watershed containing the effective Zone A study is 15% or more, and has increased by 50% or more since the effective analysis, the study would fail this check. Although the NUCI data provide year-to-year changes in urbanization, the NLCD also is needed to establish a baseline of urban land cover for this analysis. The check for significant development in this watershed was completed by evaluating percentage of urban change at the HUC-12 level. The entire study area is still classified as rural, so all reaches pass this check.

All of the initial assessment results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Zone A Initial Assessment Results

Assessment Check	Pass / Fail	Notes
A1 – Topography	Fail	LiDAR sources available are a significant improvement from effective topography
A2 – Hydrology	Pass	Regression equations not known to be used in effective study
A3 – Development	Pass	HUC-12 watershed does not meet urban threshold

VALIDATION CHECK A4 – CHECK OF STUDIES BACKED BY TECHNICAL DATA

Zone A studies that pass all initial assessment checks described above may be categorized as “Valid” in the CNMS Inventory only if the effective Zone A study is supported by modeling or sound engineering judgment and all regulatory products are in agreement. If the effective Zone A study passes all initial assessment checks, but is not supported by modeling, or if the original engineering method used is unsupported or undocumented, a comparison of the BLE results and effective Zone A’s is performed. Zone A studies in Atascosa, McMullen, and Medina Counties are not backed by technical data and, therefore, fail this check. All other Zone A studies within the Atascosa Watershed are model-backed studies and pass this check.

VALIDATION CHECK A5 – COMPARISON OF BLE AND EFFECTIVE ZONE A

The BLE /effective Zone A comparison method leverages the existing Floodplain Boundary Standard (FBS) certification procedures described in FEMA SID 113, but with a slight modification. This modified FBS comparison approach uses the 1-percent plus and 1-percent minus flood profiles and horizontal and vertical tolerances described in FEMA’s Automated Engineering guidance document dated May 2016. For the comparison of BLE and effective Zone A in the Atascosa Texas study area, the following vertical and horizontal tolerances were used to conduct the modified FBS procedure. One point was placed every 200 feet along the floodplain boundaries for comparison.

- Vertical Tolerance: +/- 10 feet (one-half contour interval of assumed effective topographic source).
- Horizontal Tolerance: +/- 75 feet (standard horizontal tolerance for BLE comparison testing).

Comparison results for these streams were grouped at the HUC-12 level and are summarized in Table 8 to better understand the general health of the HUC-12 watershed, but the validation check was performed at the stream level. Streams where the percentage of passing FBS sample points is greater than or equal to 85% are marked as “Pass”, otherwise they are marked as “Fail”.

Table 8: BLE Comparison Results

HUC-12 Watershed		Total FBS points	Fail	Pass	%Pass	BLE Comparison Pass? (>85%)	Priority Score
Watershed Name	Watershed Number						
Atascosa Watershed	All Streams	103,748	32,545	71,203	69%	FAIL	
74 Ranch-Atascosa River	12110110040	1,296	434	862	67%	FAIL	26.8
Averia Creek-Atascosa River	12110110030	9,328	3,698	5,630	60%	FAIL	31.7
Bonita Creek-Atascosa River	12110110020	3,350	1,376	1,974	59%	FAIL	26.3
Brown Lake-La Parita Creek	12110110040	2,102	468	1,634	78%	FAIL	16.9
Comanche Branch-Atascosa	12110110050	3,033	804	2,229	73%	FAIL	17.4
Gallinas Creek	12110110020	3,939	1,161	2,778	71%	FAIL	24.6
Galvan Creek	12110110020	6,233	1,762	4,471	72%	FAIL	22.9
Goose Creek-La Parita Creek	12110110040	3,160	536	2,624	83%	FAIL	10.8
Headwaters Borrego Creek	12110110030	2,234	789	1,445	65%	FAIL	28.3
Headwaters La Parita Creek	12110110040	2,052	306	1,746	85%	FAIL	9.5
Headwaters Turkey Creek	12110110040	2,612	690	1,922	74%	FAIL	21.1
Lipan Creek-Atascosa River	12110110030	4,750	1,562	3,188	67%	FAIL	26.3
Liveoak Creek-Atascosa River	12110110030	2,464	732	1,732	70%	FAIL	23.8
Lower Borrego Creek	12110110030	2,548	664	1,884	74%	FAIL	20.8
Lower Metate Creek	12110110040	1,798	490	1,308	73%	FAIL	21.8
Lower Siestedero Creek	12110110010	2,916	804	2,112	72%	FAIL	16.8
Lower Weedy Creek	12110110050	1,142	112	1,030	90%	PASS	4.9
Lucas Creek	12110110030	4,439	1,455	2,984	67%	FAIL	26.0
Macho Creek	12110110040	1,556	564	992	64%	FAIL	29.0
Middle Borrego Creek	12110110030	2,465	978	1,487	60%	FAIL	31.7
North Prong Atascosa River-	12110110010	1,443	573	870	60%	FAIL	28.4
Olmos Creek	12110110050	1,212	370	842	69%	FAIL	19.6
Padilla Creek-Atascosa River	12110110010	1,694	356	1,338	79%	FAIL	11.9
Palo Alto Creek	12110110020	7,537	2,649	4,888	65%	FAIL	25.4
Salt Branch-Atascosa River	12110110020	5,548	2,280	3,268	59%	FAIL	23.8
Santa Anna Creek-Atascosa	12110110020	2,884	710	2,174	75%	FAIL	13.9
Town of Anchorage-Atascosa	12110110010	6,426	1,960	4,466	69%	FAIL	15.6
Town of Whitsett-Atascosa	12110110050	502	132	370	74%	FAIL	33.4
Turkey Creek-Parita Creek	12110110040	2,728	894	1,834	67%	FAIL	26.2
Upper Borrego Creek	12110110030	1,294	513	781	60%	FAIL	31.7
Upper Metate Creek	12110110040	4,144	952	3,192	77%	FAIL	18.4
Upper Siestedero Creek	12110110010	709	193	516	73%	FAIL	13.6
Upper Weedy Creek	12110110050	1,407	511	896	64%	FAIL	29.1
Usher Hollow-Atascosa River	12110110050	1,020	342	678	66%	FAIL	16.8
West Weedy Creek	12110110050	1,783	725	1,058	59%	FAIL	18.3

VALIDATION RESULTS

Based on the validation assessments and BLE comparison results described above, the CNMS inventory of Zone A studies in the Atascosa Watershed has been updated as summarized in Table 9 and illustrated in Figure 6 below.

Table 9: Zone A Validation Results

Validation Status	Status Type	Total Miles
VALID	BEING STUDIED	64.4
UNVERIFIED	BEING STUDIED	891.4




Figure 6: Atascosa Watershed CNMS Validation Results

An overall risk for each HUC-12 watershed was calculated using the National Flood Risk Percentages Dataset and its proportional area. The weighted risk was multiplied by the percentage of points in the watershed that failed the CNMS comparison to effective to determine the priority score. Figure 7 below shows the range of the HUC-12 priority scores which can be used to initiate discussions during the Discovery phase.

Town of Whitsett-Atascosa River HUC-12 was determined to have the highest priority score and the most need while Lower Weedy Creek HUC-12 had the lowest scores.




Figure 7: Ranking of Atascosa Watershed HUC-12s

3.2 Flood Risk Analysis

An advanced flood risk analysis was performed using the updated 1-percent-annual-chance grid (known as ‘refined base level engineering grid’) created for this project. The loss analysis uses 2010 census data and the subsequent results are stored in the L_RA_Results table.

Hazus version 4.2 was used for the loss analysis.

The losses are reported via census blocks. It is important to note that Hazus version 4.2 uses dasymetric census blocks. Dasymetric mapping removes undeveloped areas (such as areas covered by other bodies of water, wetlands, or forests) from the Census blocks, changing their shape and reducing their size in these areas. For more information on dasymetric data visit FEMA’s Media Library for the Hazus-MH Data Inventories: Dasymetric vs. Homogenous, or Hazus 3.0 Dasymetric Data Overview.

References

1. Asquith, William H. and Roussel, Meghan C., "Regression Equations for Estimation of Annual Peak-Streamflow Frequency for Undeveloped Watersheds in Texas Using an L-moment-Based, PRESS-Minimized, Residual-Adjusted Approach," United States Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2009-5087, 2009.
2. Chow, Ven T. "Development of Uniform Flow and It Formulas." *Open Channel Hydraulics*. Caldwell, NJ: Blackburn, 1959. 109-113. Print.
3. FEMA, "Guidance for Flood Risk Analysis and Mapping – Automated Engineering", May 2016. (https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1469144112748-f3c4ecd90cb927cd200b6a3e9da80d8a/Automated_Engineering_Guidance_May_2016.pdf).
4. Texas Precipitation – Average monthly and annual precipitation for the climatological period 1981-2010. Data from NRCS. Retrieved July 2019. (<https://www.twdb.texas.gov/mapping/gisdata.asp/>).
5. United States Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (June 2018). HEC-RAS River Analysis System, Version 5.0.5. Davis, California.
6. United States Geological Survey, "Estimating Magnitude and Frequency of Floods Using PeakFQ Program: USGS Fact Sheet", 2006.
7. United States Geological Survey. Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium. *National Land Cover Database 2016*. (<http://www.mrlc.gov/nlcd2011.php>).
8. United States Geological Survey, Interagency Advisory Committee on Water Data. "Guidelines for determining Flood Flow Frequency", Bulletin #17B of the Hydrology Subcommittee, Revised September 1981, Editorial Corrections March 1982. Reston, VA.
9. Watershed Concepts, a Division of Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern. *Watershed Information System (WISE,)* Version 4.1.0. 2008.



Appendix A BLE Map

