



SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

8.1 Background

Section 201.6.a(4) of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44CFR) states: “Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g. watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan.” The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and New York State Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Services (NYS DHSES) both encourage multi-jurisdictional planning. Therefore, in the preparation of the Putnam County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP), a planning partnership was formed meet requirements of the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) for Putnam County and inclusive municipal governments.

In addition to the County’s participation, Putnam County Bureau of Emergency Services – Office of Emergency Management (PCBES-OEM) solicited the participation of all incorporated towns and villages within the County at the outset of this project. Jurisdictions that expressed interest signed a “Letter of Intent” and/or an authorizing resolution committing their participation and resources to the development of the Putnam County HMP.

Table 8-1 lists those jurisdictions that elected to participate in the 2014 Putnam County mitigation planning process, and have met the minimum requirements of participation as established by the County Management Team:

Table 8-1. Participating Putnam County Jurisdictions

Jurisdictions	
Putnam County	Town of Southeast
Town of Carmel	Town of Putnam Valley
Town of Kent	Village of Brewster
Town of Patterson	Village of Cold Spring
Town of Philipstown	Village of Nelsonville

8.1.1 Jurisdictional Annexes

This update is organized according to include a jurisdictional annexes for each participating jurisdiction. While the local annex format is designed to document and assure local compliance with the DMA 2000 regulations, its greater purpose and function includes:

- Providing a locally-relevant synthesis of the overall mitigation plan that can be readily presented, distributed, and maintained;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community’s risk to natural hazards;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community’s capabilities to manage natural hazard risk, including opportunities to improve those capabilities;
- Facilitating local understanding of the efforts the community has taken, and plans to take, to reduce their natural hazard risk;
- Facilitating the implementation of mitigation strategies, including the development of grant applications;



- Providing a framework by which the community can continue to capture relevant data and information for future plan updates.

It is recognized that each jurisdiction’s annex is a “living” document, and will continue to be improved as resources permit. As such, its design is intended to promote and accommodate continued efforts to maintain the currency and improve the effectiveness of the annex as the key tool, reference and guiding document by which the jurisdiction will implement hazard mitigation locally.

The following provides a description of the various elements of the jurisdictional annex.

Section 9.X.1: Hazard Mitigation Plan Points of Contact: Identifies the hazard mitigation planning primary and alternate(s) contacts, identified by the jurisdiction as of February, 2015.

Section 9.X.2: Jurisdictional Profile: Provides an overview and profile of the jurisdiction, including an identification of areas of known and anticipated future development and the vulnerability of those areas to the hazards of concern.

Section 9.X.3: Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Jurisdiction: Identifies hazard events that have caused significant impacts within the jurisdiction, including a summary characterization of those impacts as identified by the jurisdiction. The documentation of events and losses is critical to supporting the identification and justification of appropriate mitigation actions, including providing critical data for benefit-cost analysis. It is recognized that this “inventory” of events and losses is a work-in-progress, and may continue to be improved as resources permit. As such, the lack of data or information for a specific event does not necessarily mean that the jurisdiction did not suffer significant losses during that event.

Section 9.X.4: Hazard Vulnerabilities and Ranking: Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking: The Putnam County HMP identifies and characterizes the broad range of hazards that pose risk to the entire planning area; however each jurisdiction has differing degrees of risk exposure and vulnerability aside from the whole. The local risk ranking serves to identify each jurisdiction’s degree of risk to each hazard as it pertains to them, supporting the appropriate selection and prioritization of initiatives that will reduce the highest levels of risk for each community.

Full data and information on the hazards of concern, the methodology used to develop the vulnerability assessments, and the results of those assessments that serve as the basis of these local risk rankings may be found in Section 5.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary: Provides NFIP summary statistics for the jurisdiction.

Critical Facilities: Identifies potential flood losses to critical facilities in the jurisdiction, based on the flood vulnerability assessment process presented in Section 5.

Other Vulnerabilities Identified by the Jurisdiction: Presents other specific hazard vulnerabilities as identified by the jurisdiction.

Section 9.X.5: Capability Assessment:

This subsection provides an inventory and evaluation of the jurisdiction’s tools, mechanisms and resources available to support hazard mitigation and natural hazard risk reduction. Within the municipal annexes, Tables 9.x-6, -7 and -8 inventory the jurisdiction’s planning and regulatory, administrative and technical, and fiscal capabilities, respectively. Further, within the municipal annexes Table 9.x-9 identifies the municipality’s



level of participation in state and federal programs designed to promote and incentivize local risk reduction efforts.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP):

This subsection documents the NFIP as implemented within the jurisdiction. This summary was based on surveys prepared by, and/or interviews conducted with, the NFIP Floodplain Administrators for each NFIP-participating community in the County.

This subsection also identifies actions to enhance implementation and enforcement of the NFIP within the community.

Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing Planning Mechanisms:

This subsection identifies how the jurisdiction has integrated hazard risk management into their existing planning, regulatory and operational/administrative framework (“integration capabilities”), and/or how they intend to promote this integration (“integration actions”).

Further information regarding Federal, State and local capabilities may be found in the Capability Assessment portion of Section 6.

Section 9.X.6: Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization

Past Mitigation Initiative Status:

Completed or on-going mitigation activities are presented in this sub-section.

Proposed Mitigation Strategy:

Table 9.X-11 presents the jurisdiction’s proposed mitigation strategy. As indicated, applicable mitigation actions, projects and initiatives are further documented on an Action Worksheet which provides details on the project identification, evaluation, prioritization and implementation process.

Table 9.X-12 provides a summary of the local mitigation strategy prioritization process discussed in Section 6.

Section 9.X.8: Hazard Area Extent and Location Map: Each annex includes a map (or series of maps) illustrating identified hazard zones, critical facilities, and areas of NFIP Repetitive Loss/Severe Repetitive Loss (RL/SRL). Further, these maps show areas of known or anticipated future development, and mitigation project locations, as available and provided by the jurisdiction.

FEMA Action Worksheets: Appended to the end of annexes as applicable.