



# SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

In response to the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), Suffolk County and the jurisdictions located therein have developed this Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP), which represents a regulatory update to the 2008 *Suffolk County Hazard Mitigation Plan* and the 2014 *Suffolk County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update* (HMP, also referred herein as the *Hazard Mitigation Plan* or *the plan*). The DMA 2000 amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) and is designed to improve planning for, response to, and recovery from disasters by requiring state and local entities to implement pre-disaster mitigation planning and develop HMPs. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has issued guidelines for HMPs. The New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (NYS DHSES), formerly the New York State Office of Emergency Management (NYSOEM), also supports plan development for jurisdictions in New York and issued the NYS DHSES Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards for HMPs developed with NYS DHSES-administered funds.

**Hazard Mitigation** is any sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk and effects that can result from specific hazards.

FEMA defines a **Hazard Mitigation Plan** as the documentation of a state or local government evaluation of natural hazards and the strategies to mitigate such hazards.

Specifically, the DMA 2000 requires that states, with support from local governmental agencies, develop and update HMPs on a five-year basis to prepare for and reduce the potential impacts of natural hazards. The DMA 2000 is intended to facilitate cooperation between state and local authorities, prompting them to work together. This enhanced planning better enables local and state governments to articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more effective risk reduction projects.

### 1.1.1 DMA 2000 Origins -The Stafford Act

In the early 1990s, a new federal policy regarding disasters began to evolve. Rather than reacting whenever disasters strike communities, the federal government began encouraging communities to first assess their vulnerability to various disasters and proceed to take actions to reduce or eliminate potential risks. The logic is that a disaster-resistant community can rebound from a natural disaster with less loss of property or human injury, at much lower cost, and, consequently, more quickly. Moreover, these communities minimize other costs associated with disasters, such as the time lost from productive activity by business and industries.

The DMA 2000 provides an opportunity for states, tribes, and local governments to take a new and revitalized approach to mitigation planning. The DMA 2000 amended the Stafford Act by repealing the previous mitigation planning provisions (Section 409) and replacing them with a new set of requirements (Section 322). Section 322 sets forth the requirements that communities evaluate natural hazards within their respective jurisdictions and develop an appropriate plan of action to mitigate those hazards, while emphasizing the need for state, tribal and local governments to closely coordinate mitigation planning and implementation efforts.

The amended Stafford Act requires that each local jurisdiction identify potential natural hazards to the health, safety, and well-being of its residents and identify and prioritize actions that the community can take to mitigate those hazards—before disaster strikes. To remain eligible for hazard mitigation assistance from the federal government, communities must first prepare and then maintain and update an HMP (this plan).



Responsibility for fulfilling the requirements of Section 322 of the Stafford Act and administering the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Program has been delegated to the State of New York, specifically to NYS DHSES. FEMA also provides support through guidance, resources, and plan reviews.

### 1.1.2 Benefits of Mitigation Planning

Mitigation planning forms the foundation for Suffolk County’s long-term strategy to reduce disaster losses and break the cycle of disaster damage, reconstruction, and repeated damage. Mitigation planning also allows Suffolk County, as a whole and with participating jurisdictions, to remain eligible for mitigation grant funding for mitigation projects that will reduce the impact of future disaster events. The long-term benefits of mitigation planning include the following:

National Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) Per Peril <small>*BCR numbers in this study have been rounded</small>		Beyond Code Requirements	Federally Funded
<b>Overall Hazard Benefit-Cost Ratio</b>		<b>\$4:1</b>	<b>\$6:1</b>
<b>Riverine Flood</b>		\$5:1	\$7:1
<b>Hurricane Surge</b>		\$7:1	Too few grants
<b>Wind</b>		\$5:1	\$5:1
<b>Earthquake</b>		\$4:1	\$3:1
<b>Wildland-Urban Interface Fire</b>		\$4:1	\$3:1

Source: FEMA 2018; Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration 2018  
 Note: Natural hazard mitigation saves \$6 on average for every \$1 spent on federal mitigation grants.

- An increased understanding of hazards faced by Suffolk County and their inclusive jurisdictions.
- Building more sustainable and disaster-resistant communities.
- Increasing education and awareness of hazards and their threats, as well as their risks.
- Developing implementable and achievable actions for risk reduction in the County and its jurisdictions.
- Building relationships by involving residents, organizations, and businesses.
- Identify implementation approaches that focus resources on the greatest risks and vulnerabilities.
- Financial savings through partnerships that support planning and mitigation efforts.
- Focused use of limited resources on hazards that have the biggest impact on the community.
- Reduce long-term impacts and damages to human health and structures.
- Reduce repair costs.

### 1.1.3 Organizations Involved in the Mitigation Planning Effort

Suffolk County and the participating jurisdictions intend to implement this HMP with full coordination and participation of County and local departments, organizations and groups, and relevant state and federal entities. Coordination helps to ensure that stakeholders have established communication channels and relationships necessary to support mitigation planning and mitigation actions included in Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy) and Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes).

In addition to Suffolk County, the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA), the Shinnecock Tribal Nation, the Unkechaug Tribal Nation, and 41 of the 42 municipal governments in the County participated in the 2020 planning process as indicated in Table 1-1 below. The Village of Sagaponack was invited to participate but declined to join the planning process.

**Table 1-1. Participating Suffolk County Jurisdictions**

Jurisdictions		
Suffolk County	Village of Asharoken	Village of North Haven
Suffolk County Water Authority	Village of Babylon	Village of Northport
Shinnecock Tribal Nation	Village of Belle Terre	Village of Ocean Beach



Jurisdictions		
Unkechaug Tribal Nation	Village of Bellport	Village of Old Field
Town of Babylon	Village of Brightwaters	Village of Patchogue
Town of Brookhaven	Village of Dering Harbor	Village of Poquott
Town of East Hampton	Village of East Hampton	Village of Port Jefferson
Town of Huntington	Village of Greenport	Village of Quogue
Town of Islip	Village of Head of Harbor	Village of Sag Harbor
Town of Riverhead	Village of Huntington Bay	Village of Saltaire
Town of Shelter Island	Village of Islandia	Village of Shoreham
Town of Smithtown	Village of Lake Grove	Village of Southampton
Town of Southampton	Village of Lindenhurst	Village of The Branch
Town of Southold	Village of Lloyd Harbor	Village of Westhampton Beach
Village of Amityville	Village of Nissequogue	Village of West Hampton Dunes

Multiple Agency Support for Hazard Mitigation

Primary responsibility for the development and implementation of mitigation strategies and policies lies with local governments. However, local governments are not alone; various partners and resources at the regional, state, and federal levels are available to assist communities in the development and implementation of mitigation strategies. Within New York State, NYS DHSES is the lead agency providing hazard mitigation planning assistance to local jurisdictions. NYS DHSES provides guidance to support mitigation planning. In addition, FEMA provides grants, tools, guidance, and training to support mitigation planning.

Additional input and support for this planning effort was obtained from a range of agencies and through public involvement (as discussed in Section 3). The Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (FRES), with support from the Steering Committee, provided project management and oversight of the planning process. While participating jurisdictions were asked to identify a primary and alternate local Point of Contact (POC), broad participation by jurisdictional representatives was encouraged and supported throughout the planning process. A list of Steering Committee and municipal POCs is provided in Section 3 (Planning Process), while Appendix B (Participation Matrix) provides further documentation of the broader level of jurisdiction involvement.

This HMP was prepared in accordance with the following regulations and guidance:

- FEMA Local Mitigation Planning Handbook, March 2013.
- FEMA Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning, March 1, 2013.
- FEMA Plan Integration: Linking Local Planning Efforts, July 2015.
- Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide, October 1, 2011.
- DMA 2000 (Public Law 106-390, October 30, 2000).
- 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 201 and 206 (including: Feb. 26, 2002, Oct. 1, 2002, Oct. 28, 2003, and Sept. 13, 2004 Interim Final Rules).
- FEMA How-To Guide for Using HAZUS-MH-MH for Risk Assessment FEMA Document No. 433, February 2004.
- FEMA Mitigation Planning How-to Series (FEMA 386-1 through 4), 2002, available at: <http://www.fema.gov/fima/planhowto.shtm>.
- FEMA Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards, January 2013.





- NYS DHSES *Hazard Mitigation Planning Standard*, 2017.
- NYS DHSES *Hazard Mitigation Planning Standard Guide*, 2017.
- NYS DHSES *NYS Standard Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan*, 2019.

The planning area for this effort is inclusive of the participating municipalities within the County as illustrated in Figure 1-1 below.

DRAFT



Figure 1-1. Suffolk County, New York Mitigation Plan Area



Source: Suffolk County GIS

DRAFT





Table 1-2 summarizes the requirements outlined in the DMA 2000 Interim Final Rule and provides the section where each is addressed in this HMP.

**Table 1-2. FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Crosswalk**

Plan Criteria	Primary Location in Plan
<b>Prerequisites</b>	
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5)	Section 2.0; Appendix A
<b>Planning Process</b>	
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)	Section 3.0
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)	Sections 5.2
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)	Section 5.4
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)	Section 5.4
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	Section 4.0 Section 5.4
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	Section 5.4
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	Section 4.0; Section 9 Annexes
<b>Mitigation Strategy</b>	
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)	Section 6.0; Section 9 Annexes
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)	Section 6.0; Section 9 Annexes
Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)	Section 6.0; Section 9 Annexes
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)	Section 6.0; Section 9 Annexes
<b>Plan Maintenance Process</b>	
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)	Section 7.0
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)	Section 7.0; Section 9 Annexes
Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)	Section 7.0

**Organization**

The Suffolk County HMP update is organized as a two-volume plan. Volume I provides information on the overall planning process and hazard profiling and vulnerability assessments, which serves as a basis for understanding risk and identifying appropriate mitigation actions. As such, Volume I is intended for use as a resource for on-going mitigation analysis. Volume II provides an annex dedicated to each participating jurisdiction. Each annex summarizes the jurisdiction’s legal, regulatory, and fiscal capabilities; identifies vulnerabilities to natural hazards; documents mitigation plan integration with other planning efforts; records status of past mitigation actions; and presents an individualized mitigation strategy. The annexes are intended to provide a useful resource for each jurisdiction for implementation of mitigation projects and future grant opportunities, as well as place for each jurisdiction to record and maintain their local aspect of the Countywide plan.

**Goals and Objectives**

The planning process included a review and update of the prior mitigation goals and objectives as a basis for the planning process and selection of appropriate mitigation actions addressing all hazards of concern. Further, the goal development process considered the mitigation goals expressed in the New York State HMP, as well as other relevant County and local planning documents, as discussed in Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy).



## Hazards of Concern

Suffolk County and participating jurisdictions reviewed the hazards that caused measurable impacts based on events, losses, and information available since the development of the 2014 Suffolk County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update and the New York State Hazard Mitigation Plan - 2019 Update. A list of potential hazards of concern was reviewed by Suffolk County FRES and the Steering Committee, and each was evaluated to identify the hazards of concern for the 2020 planning process. The list was presented to each of the participating jurisdictions where they evaluated their risk and vulnerability from each hazard of concern. While the overall hazard rankings were calculated for the County and each participating jurisdiction, the overall hazard rankings displayed in each annex reflect jurisdictional input. The hazard risk rankings were used to focus and prioritize individual jurisdictional mitigation strategies.

## Plan Integration into Other Planning Mechanisms

Plan integration is the process by which jurisdictions look at their existing planning framework and align efforts with the goal of building a safer, smarter, and more resilient community. It is specific to each jurisdiction and depends on the vulnerability of the built environment. Community-wide plan integration supports risk reduction through various planning and development measures, both before and after a disaster. Plan integration involves a jurisdiction's plans, policies, codes, and programs that guide development and the roles of people and government in implementing these capabilities. Successful integration occurs through collaboration among a diverse set of stakeholders in the community (FEMA 2015). Appendix G (Plan Review Matrix) documents the plans that were reviewed for each jurisdiction.

Effective mitigation is achieved when hazard awareness and risk management approaches and strategies are integrated into local planning mechanisms and become an integral part of public activities and decision making. Within Suffolk County, there are numerous existing plans and programs that support hazard risk management and reduction, and thus, it is critical that the 2020 HMP update integrates, coordinates with, and complements those mechanisms.

The *Capability Assessment* section of Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy) provides a summary and description of the existing plans, programs and regulatory mechanisms at all levels of government (federal, state, county, local) that support hazard mitigation within the County. Within each jurisdictional annex in Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes), the County and each participating jurisdiction identified how they have integrated hazard risk management into their existing planning, regulatory and operational/administrative framework ("existing integration"), and how they intend to promote this integration ("opportunities for future integration").

A further summary of these continued efforts to develop and promote a comprehensive and holistic approach to hazard risk management and mitigation is presented in Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes).

### 1.1.4 Implementation of Prior and Existing Local Hazard Mitigation Plans

Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy) and Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes) of the plan present the status of the mitigation projects identified in the 2014 Suffolk County HMP. Numerous projects and programs have been implemented that have reduced hazard vulnerability to assets in the planning area. The County and jurisdictional annexes, as well as plan maintenance procedures in Section 7 (Plan Maintenance), were developed to encourage specific activities. Future actions include integrating hazard mitigation goals into comprehensive plan updates; reviewing the HMP during updates of codes, ordinances, zoning, and development; and ensuring a more thorough integration of hazard mitigation, with its related benefits, will be completed within the upcoming five-year planning period.



### 1.1.5 Implementation of the Planning Process

---

The planning process and findings are required to be documented in local HMPs. To support the planning process in developing this HMP, Suffolk County and the participating jurisdictions have accomplished the following:

- Developed a Steering Committee and Countywide planning partnership with jurisdictions and stakeholders.
- Reviewed the 2014 *Suffolk County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update*.
- Identified and reviewed those hazards that are of greatest concern to Suffolk County and its jurisdictions (hazards of concern) to be included in the plan.
- Profiled the relevant hazards.
- Estimated the inventory at risk and potential losses associated with the relevant hazards.
- Reviewed and updated the hazard mitigation goals and added new objectives.
- Reviewed mitigation strategies identified in the 2014 Suffolk County HMP.
- Developed new mitigation actions to address reduction of vulnerability of hazards of concern.
- Involved a wide range of stakeholders and the public in the plan process.
- Developed mitigation plan maintenance procedures to be executed after obtaining approval of the plan from NYS DHSES and FEMA.

As required by the DMA 2000, Suffolk County and its participating jurisdictions have informed the public and provided opportunities for public comment and input. Numerous agencies and stakeholders have participated as core or support members by providing input and expertise throughout the planning process. Refer to Appendix D (Public and Stakeholder Outreach) for copies of website announcements, newspaper articles, and social media posts.

This HMP update documents the process and outcomes of Suffolk County and the jurisdictions' efforts. Section 2 (Plan Adoption) includes documentation that the prerequisites for plan approval have been met. Section 3 (Planning Process) includes additional information on the process to develop this plan.


### 1.1.6 Organization of This Mitigation Plan

---

This HMP is organized in accordance with FEMA and NYS DHSES guidance. The structure of this HMP follows the four-phase planning process recommended by FEMA and summarized in Figure 1-2.



Figure 1-2. Suffolk County Hazard Mitigation Planning Process



As noted earlier, the HMP is organized into two volumes: Volume I includes all information that applies to the entire planning area (Suffolk County) and Volume II includes participating jurisdiction-specific information.

Volume I of this Plan includes the following sections:

**Section 1:** Introduction: Overview of participants and planning process.

**Section 2:** Plan Adoption: Information regarding the adoption of the HMP by Suffolk County and each participating jurisdiction.

**Section 3:** Planning Process: Description of the HMP methodology and development process; Steering Committee, Planning Committee, and stakeholder involvement efforts; and a description of how this HMP will be incorporated into existing programs.

**Section 4:** County Profile: Overview of Suffolk County, including: (1) general information, (2) economy, (3) land use trends, (4) population and demographics, (5) general building stock inventory, and (6) critical facilities.



**Section 5: Risk Assessment:** Documentation of the hazard identification and hazard risk ranking process, hazard profiles, and findings of the vulnerability assessment (estimates of the impact of hazard events on life, safety, health, general building stock, critical facilities, the economy); description of the status of local data; and planned steps to improve local data to support mitigation planning.

**Section 6: Mitigation Strategy:** Information regarding the mitigation goals and objectives identified by the Steering Committee in response to priority hazards of concern and the process by which Suffolk County and local mitigation strategies have been developed or updated.

**Section 7: Plan Maintenance Procedures:** System established by the Steering Committee to continue to monitor, evaluate, maintain, and update the HMP.

Volume II of this plan includes the following sections:

**Section 8: Planning Partnership:** Description of the planning partnership, their responsibilities, and description of jurisdictional annexes.

**Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes:** Jurisdiction-specific annex for Suffolk County and each participating jurisdiction containing their hazards of concern, hazard risk ranking, capability assessments, mitigation actions, action prioritization specific only to Suffolk County or that jurisdiction, progress on prior mitigation activities (as applicable), and a discussion of prior local hazard mitigation plan integration into local planning processes.

Appendices include the following:

**Appendix A: Resolution of Plan Adoption:** Resolutions from the County and each jurisdiction included as each formally adopts the HMP update.

**Appendix B: Participation Matrix:** Matrix to give a broad overview of who attended meetings and when input was provided to the HMP update, as well as Letters of Intent to Participate as described in Section 3.

**Appendix C: Meeting Documentation:** Agendas, attendance sheets, minutes, and other documentation (as available and applicable) of planning meetings convened during the development of the plan.

**Appendix D: Public and Stakeholder Outreach Documentation:** Documentation of the public and stakeholder outreach effort including webpages, informational materials, public and stakeholder meetings and presentations, surveys, and other methods used to receive and incorporate public and stakeholder comment and input to the plan process.

**Appendix E: County Profile and Risk Assessment Supplementary Data:** Critical Facility list and vulnerability assessments conducted for the hazards of concern from Section 5 (Risk Assessment).

**Appendix F: Critical Facilities:** Critical facilities included in the risk assessment.

**Appendix G: Plan Review Matrix:** Summary of plans reviewed, including documentation of content relevant to the mitigation planning process.

**Appendix H: Suffolk County Mitigation Catalog:** Documentation of the broad range of actions identified during the mitigation process.

**Appendix I: FEMA Plan Review Tools:** Examples of plan review templates available to support annual plan review.



**Appendix J:** Linkage Procedures: Provides procedures for the increase or decrease in planning partners linked to this plan.

## 1.2 The Updated Plan – What is Different?

Due to the success of the 2014 plan, no major changes were made to the format or function of the 2020 update. The 2020 update has been enhanced using best available data and technology, especially in the risk assessment portion of the plan in Section 5 (Risk Assessment). The updated plan differs from the initial plan in a variety of ways:

- Updated NYS DHSES guidance existed at the time of its development. The 2017 New York State Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards and Guide were used to develop the 2020 update.
- Newly available data provided for a more detailed and accurate risk assessment.
- User-friendly tone to cater to the strong desire for this plan to be understandable to the general public and not overly technical.
- Identification and priority for numerous actions to be implemented by the planning partnership. The status of these actions will be monitored over the plan performance period by a plan maintenance strategy identified in Section 7 (Plan Maintenance) that included annual progress reporting.
- Updated annexes to include increased information regarding capabilities, adaptive capacity, climate change related actions, and planning integration.
- Relocation of critical facilities from the County Profile to Appendix G

Table 1-3 indicates the major changes between the two plans as they relate to 44 CFR planning requirements.

**Table 1-3. Plan Changes Crosswalk**

44 CFR Requirement	2014 Plan	2020 Updated Plan
<p><i>Requirement §201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include:</i></p> <p>(1) <i>An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;</i></p> <p>(2) <i>An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and</i></p> <p>(3) <i>Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information.</i></p>	<p>The 2014 plan followed an outreach strategy utilizing multiple media developed and approved by the Steering Committee. This strategy involved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public participation on an oversight Steering Committee.</li> <li>• Establishment of a plan informational website.</li> <li>• Press releases.</li> <li>• Use of a public information survey.</li> </ul> <p>Stakeholders were identified and coordinated with throughout the process. A comprehensive review of relevant plans and programs was performed by the planning team.</p>	<p>Building upon the success of the 2014 plan, the 2020 planning effort enhanced the same engagement methodology. The plan included the following enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using social media.</li> <li>• Web-deployed surveys to residents and targeted stakeholders.</li> <li>• Informational brochure.</li> <li>• Deployment of a Story Map and interactive Hazard Mapping Tool to allow residents to screen their properties for hazards</li> <li>• Multi-lingual informational materials in Spanish and Mandarin</li> </ul> <p>As with the 2014 plan, the 2020 planning process identified key stakeholders and coordinated with them throughout the process. A comprehensive review of relevant plans and programs was performed by the planning team.</p>



44 CFR Requirement	2014 Plan	2020 Updated Plan
<p><i>§201.6(c)(2): The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.</i></p>	<p>The 2014 plan included a comprehensive risk assessment of hazards of concern. Risk was defined as (probability x impact), where impact is the impact on people, property, and economy of the planning area. All planning partners ranked risk as it pertains to their jurisdiction. The potential impacts of climate change are discussed for each hazard.</p>	<p>The same methodology, using new, updated data, was deployed for the 2020 plan update. Cyber Security, Disease Outbreak, and Extreme Temperatures were added as new hazards of concern. The flood hazard was expanded to include urban flooding (or flooding outside of the floodplain). The hazard ranking methodology was expanded to include adaptive capacity and climate change. Jurisdiction-specific risk assessment results are summarized in Section 4 (Risk Assessment) and in each jurisdictional annex (Section 9).</p>
<p><i>§201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment] shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all-natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.</i></p>	<p>The 2014 plan presented a risk assessment of each hazard of concern. Each section included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard profile, including maps of extent and location, previous occurrences, and probability of future events.</li> <li>• Climate change impacts on future probability.</li> <li>• Impact and vulnerability on life, health, safety, general building stock, critical facilities, and economy.</li> <li>• Impact on people, property, critical facilities, and environment.</li> <li>• Future growth and development.</li> <li>• Additional data and next steps.</li> <li>• Overall vulnerability assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>The same format, using new and updated data, was used for the 2020 plan update. Each section of the risk assessment includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard profile, including maps of extent and location, previous occurrences, and probability of future events.</li> <li>• Climate change impacts on future probability using the best available data for New York State.</li> <li>• Vulnerability assessment includes: impact on life, safety, and health, general building stock, critical facilities, and the economy, as well as future changes that could impact vulnerability.</li> <li>• The vulnerability assessment also includes changes in vulnerability since the 2014 plan.</li> <li>• Identified issues have been documented in each hazard profile.</li> </ul>
<p><i>§201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment] shall include a] description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i). This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.</i></p>	<p>Vulnerability was assessed for all hazards of concern. The HAZUS-MH-MH computer model was used for the severe storm, earthquake, and flood hazards. These were Level 2 analyses using County data. Site-specific data on County-identified critical facilities were entered into the HAZUS-MH model. HAZUS-MH outputs were generated for other hazards by applying an estimated damage function to an asset inventory extracted from HAZUS-MH-MH.</p>	<p>A robust vulnerability assessment was conducted for the 2020 plan update, using new and updated asset and hazard data. Volume 1, Section 5.3 summarizes countywide and jurisdiction-specific vulnerability for each hazard of concern. The jurisdictional annexes (Section 9) include a summary table of impacts on each jurisdiction.</p>
<p><i>§201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment] must also address National Flood Insurance Program insured structures that have been repetitively damaged floods.</i></p>	<p>A summary of NFIP insured properties including an analysis of repetitive loss properties was included in the plan.</p>	<p>The same methodology was deployed for the 2020 plan update using new and updated data.</p>
<p><i>Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and</i></p>	<p>A complete inventory of the numbers and types of buildings exposed was generated for each hazard of concern.</p>	<p>Quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted using the updated hazard and inventory data as</p>



44 CFR Requirement	2014 Plan	2020 Updated Plan
<i>future buildings, infrastructure and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area.</i>	The Steering Committee defined “critical facilities” for the planning area, and these were inventoried by exposure. Each hazard chapter provides a discussion on future development trends.	presented in Section 5 (Risk Assessment). In addition, critical facilities considered lifelines in accordance with FEMA’s definition were identified.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate.</i>	Loss estimates were generated for all hazards of concern. These were generated by HAZUS-MH-MH for the severe storm, earthquake, and flood hazards. For the other hazards, loss estimates were generated by applying a regionally relevant damage function to the exposed inventory. In all cases, a damage function was applied to an asset inventory. The asset inventory was the same for all hazards and was generated in HAZUS-MH.	Quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted using the updated hazard and inventory data as presented in Section 4 (Risk Assessment). Estimated potential losses are reported in both Volume 1, Section 5.3 and Volume II Section 9 for each jurisdiction.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.</i>	There is a summary of anticipated development in the County profile, as well as in each individual annex.	The same methodology was deployed for the 2020 plan update using new and updated data. In Volume 1, Section 5.3, projected changes in population and development are discussed in each hazard section and how these projected changes may lead to increased vulnerability, or plans/regulations/ordinances in place to implement mitigation to protect the development.
<i>§201.6(c)(3):[ The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.]</i>	The 2014 plan contained a mission statement, goals, objectives and actions. The guiding principal, goals and objectives were regional and covered all planning partners. Each planning partner identified actions that could be implemented within their capabilities. The actions were jurisdiction-specific and strove to meet multiple objectives. All objectives met multiple goals and stand alone as components of the plan. Each planning partner completed an assessment of its regulatory, technical, and financial capabilities.	The same methodology for setting goals, objectives, and actions was applied to the 2020 plan update. The Steering Committee reviewed and reconfirmed the mission statement, goals, and objectives for the plan. Each planning partner used the progress reporting from the plan maintenance and evaluated the status of actions identified in the 2014 plan. Actions that were completed or no longer considered to be feasible were removed. The balance of the actions was carried over to the 2020 plan, and in some cases, new actions were added to the action plan.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.</i>	The Steering Committee identified a mission statement, goals, and objectives targeted specifically for this hazard mitigation plan. These planning components supported the actions identified in the plan.	The same methodology for setting goals, objectives, and actions was applied to the 2020 plan update. The Steering Committee reviewed and updated the mission statement, goals, and objectives for the plan to include a focus on increased resiliency. This resulted in the finalization of eight goals and nineteen objectives to frame the plan.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being</i>	The 2014 plan includes a hazard mitigation catalog that was developed through a facilitated process. This catalog identifies actions that manipulate the hazard, reduce	The mitigation catalog was reviewed and updated by the Steering Committee for the 2020 update. As with the 2014 plan, the catalog has been included in the 2020 plan to



44 CFR Requirement	2014 Plan	2020 Updated Plan
<i>considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.</i>	exposure to the hazard, reduce vulnerability, or increase mitigation capability. The catalog further segregates actions by scale of implementation. A table in the action plan section analyzes each action by mitigation type to illustrate the range of actions selected.	represent the comprehensive range of alternatives considered by each planning partner. The table with the analysis of mitigation actions was used in jurisdictional annexes to the plan.
<i>Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction’s participation in the National Flood Insurance Program, and continued compliance with the program’s requirements, as appropriate.</i>	All municipal planning partners that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program identified an action stating their commitment to maintain compliance and good standing under the program.	The same methodology was deployed for the 2020 plan update, using new and updated data.
<i>Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): [The mitigation strategy shall describe] how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.</i>	Each recommended action was prioritized using a qualitative methodology based on the objectives the project will meet, the timeline for completion, how the project will be funded, the impact of the project, the benefits of the project, and the costs of the project.	A revised methodology based on the STAPLEE criteria and using new and updated data was used for the 2020 plan update. The 14 criteria were used to evaluate each potential mitigation action. The evaluation included a qualitative benefits and cost review. The results of the evaluation were used to identify the actions to include in the plan and assist with the prioritization. An emphasis was placed on benefits and costs (quantified where possible and listed in the mitigation action worksheets), as well as timeline for implementation (also documented in the mitigation action worksheets for FEMA-eligible projects).
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.</i>	The 2014 plan outlined a detailed maintenance strategy.	The 2020 plan an enhanced plan maintenance strategy. The update provides a roadmap for the annual monitoring of the plan. This includes the inclusion of a summary plan maintenance matrix that provides an overview of the planning partner responsibilities for monitoring, evaluation, and update of the plan.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.</i>	The 2014 plan details recommendations for incorporating the plan into other planning mechanisms.	The 2020 plan details recommendations for incorporating the plan into other planning mechanisms such as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>• Emergency Response Plan.</li> <li>• Capital Improvement Programs.</li> <li>• Municipal Code.</li> </ul>
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.</i>	The 2014 plan details a strategy for continuing public involvement.	The 2014 plan maintenance strategy was carried over to the 2020 plan. In addition, the County will use a proprietary online tool to support the annual progress reporting of mitigation actions. Section 7 (Plan Maintenance) also details the continued public participation in the plan maintenance process.
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan shall include]</i>	46 planning partners participated in the 2014 planning process.	The 2020 plan achieves DMA compliance for 45 planning partners.



<b>44 CFR Requirement</b>	<b>2014 Plan</b>	<b>2020 Updated Plan</b>
<i>documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).</i>		Resolutions for each partner adopting the plan can be found in Appendix A of this volume.

DRAFT