



## SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

This section provides a description of the Putnam County’s HMP update planning partnership, their responsibilities throughout the planning process, and the jurisdictional annexes developed from their plan update efforts.

### 8.1 Background

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) encourages multi-jurisdictional planning for hazard mitigation. All participating jurisdictions must meet the requirements of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR):

“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” [Section 201.6a (4)]

For Putnam County’s HMP update, a Planning Partnership was formed to leverage resources and to meet requirements for the federal Disaster Mitigation Action of 2000 (DMA) for as many eligible governments as possible. The DMA provides the following definition for a local government:

Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under state law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.

Each participating planning partner has prepared a jurisdictional annex to this plan. These annexes, as well as information on the process by which they were created, are contained in this Volume 2 of this HMP.

#### 8.1.1 Initial Solicitation and Letters of Intent

Putnam County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the County at the commencement of this project. All municipalities interested signed a *Letter of Intent* or a resolution committing their participation and resources to the development of the Putnam County HMP update (Appendix B). Table 8-1 lists the jurisdictions that elected to participate in the update process and have met the minimum requirements of participation as established by the county and the Steering Committee. Putnam County and eight municipalities participated in the HMP update.

Table 8-1. Participating Jurisdictions in Putnam County

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



## 8.2 Planning Partner Responsibilities

The Planning Committee agreed to the following list of expectations:

- Review 2015 HMP goals and re-establish HMP update goals and objectives.
- Establish a timeline for completion of the HMP update.
- Ensure the HMP update meets the requirements of the DMA 2000 and FEMA and NYS DHSES guidance.
- Solicit and encourage the participation of regional agencies, a range of stakeholders, and citizens in the HMP development process.
- Assist in gathering information for inclusion in the HMP, including the use of previously developed reports and data.
- Organize and oversee the public involvement process and support outreach efforts in the community.
- Develop, revise, adopt, and maintain Volume I of the HMP update in its entirety and the local jurisdictional annex in Volume II.

As described in Section 7 (Plan Maintenance), the planning partnership is intended to remain active beyond the regulatory update to support plan maintenance. Regarding the composition of the Steering and Planning Committees, it is recognized that individual commitments change over time, and it will be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

### 8.2.1 Jurisdictional Annex Preparation Process

As stated in the 2017 New York State Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards, jurisdictional annexes provide a unique, stand-alone guide to mitigation planning for each jurisdiction. The Putnam County HMP Update is organized so that there is an annex for Putnam County and for every jurisdiction within the County's borders. Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes) includes an annex for each jurisdiction in Putnam County, **including those that did not fully participate.**

During the Putnam County HMP planning process, the nation, the State of New York, and Putnam County were facing the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic was declared a major disaster on March 20, 2020 (DR-4480). The Governor issued a stay-at-home Executive Order beginning March 22, 2020, which remained in effect the duration of the planning process. With the stay-at-home orders in place, all meetings during the planning process were held virtually.

#### Annex Development

In order to facilitate update of the County and Jurisdictional Annexes, data from the 2015 Putnam County HMP annexes was transferred to the new annex format, developed to meet federal and state criteria. Clear instructions provided to the County and municipality. These instructions provided a basis to address the following:

- Document changes in capabilities and vulnerabilities
- Provide a current status of the 2015 HMP mitigation strategy
- Develop a new mitigation strategy to address identified issues and to increase community resiliency

The County invited all municipalities to participate in a municipal kick-off meeting held on May 27, 2020, to provide an overview of the planning process. Subsequently, the consultant convened a series of virtual workshop meetings to assist each municipality in updating, integrating and completing annex input. During the first round of meetings the consultant guided the municipal representatives through the annex document, focusing on growth and development trends; planning, legal, fiscal and regulatory capabilities; education and outreach capabilities;



NFIP information and capabilities; areas of integration; and updating the 2015 mitigation strategy. The consultant guided the municipal representatives through the annex document and updated information jointly where appropriate. Following the meeting, the municipalities were tasked with providing information that could not be determined during the call. The second round of meetings focused on the relative risk ranking of the hazards of concern including the community's adaptive capacity and included a follow-up on items flagged in the first meeting. In addition to the meetings, the consultant reviewed planning mechanisms including plans, regulations, and codes to identify gaps or mitigation actions as well as integration opportunities with the HMP.

A mitigation workshop was held on August 26, 2020 to provide an overview of developing a strong mitigation strategy. In preparation for this workshop the consultant provided a consolidated list of problem areas/vulnerabilities identified during the planning process and feedback from the citizen survey to support the development of relevant projects to form the mitigation strategy. Finally, the last round of support meetings addressed the development of the updated mitigation strategy as well the confirmation of sheltering, housing and evacuation route information.

### Hazard Ranking Exercise

---

The risk assessment and risk ranking for each jurisdiction was presented virtually on July 29, 2020, in a meeting including discussion of the overall risk assessment for the hazards of concern. At this meeting, each planning partner was asked to review the ranked risk specific for its jurisdiction. Refer to Section 5.3 (Hazard Ranking) for the methodology of the hazard ranking process.

The calculated ranking was presented to each jurisdiction during the meeting and by worksheet, and they were asked to review the ranking and revised based on history of events, probability of occurrence, and the potential impact on people, property, and the economy. The objectives of this exercise were to familiarize the partnership with how to use the risk assessment as a tool to support other planning and hazard mitigation processes and to help prioritize types of mitigation actions that should be considered. Hazards that were ranked as *high* for each jurisdiction as a result of this exercise were considered to be priorities for identifying appropriate mitigation actions, although jurisdictions also identified actions to mitigate *medium* or *low* ranked hazards, as appropriate.

### Mitigation Strategy Workshop

---

On August 26, 2020, a Mitigation Strategy Workshop was held virtually for Putnam County and its jurisdictions. At this meeting, the County and jurisdictions learned about the importance of developing mitigation actions. The purpose of this workshop was to guide the planning partnership in completing this portion of the planning process and how projects that are well developed and documented are more quickly identifiable for selection when grants become available. Information regarding consultant support prior to and subsequent to the meeting is provided in the Annex Development section, above.

### Municipal Support Meetings

---

In addition to the municipal kick-off meeting, virtual municipal support meetings were held in June, July, and August 2020. At these support meetings, the consultant worked one-on-one with the planning partners to complete their jurisdictional annex. Each section of the annex was discussed to ensure accuracy and completeness. This included, but not limited to, the following:

- Reviewing the calculated hazard ranking for the jurisdiction and provide input to adjust the ranking as necessary.
- Inspecting the list of critical facilities located in the jurisdiction and its exposure to the 1 percent and 0.2 percent flood hazard area. As required in the 2017 New York State Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards, critical facilities located in the Special Flood Hazard Area must document that critical



facilities are protected to the 500-year flood event, or worst damage scenario. For those that do not meet this level of protection, the plan must include an action to meet this criterion or explain why it is not feasible to do so. By reviewing the list, the jurisdictions could identify additional mitigation actions related to the critical facilities found in the municipality.

- Identifying mitigation initiatives that have reasonable potential to be accomplished within the lifespan of the County HMP (five years), including both FEMA-eligible projects and those projects using funds from non-FEMA sources.

### Jurisdictional Annexes

While the jurisdictional 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 HMP updates.

Each jurisdiction's annex is intended to be 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 annex to be current and to 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 Planning Team:** Identifies the hazard mitigation planning primary and alternate(s) contacts, as identified by the jurisdiction.

**Section 9.X.2: Municipal 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: Growth and Development Trends:** Provides a history of development permits during the performance period of the previous plan to provide an understanding how past, current, and projected development patterns have or are likely to increase or decrease risk in hazard areas.

**Section 9.X.4: Capability Assessment:** 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 provide an inventory of the municipality's planning, regulatory, administrative, technical, and fiscal capabilities. Further, another table 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):** Documents the NFIP as implemented within the jurisdiction. This summary was based on surveys prepared by or interviews conducted with the NFIP



Floodplain Administrators for each NFIP-participating community in the county. This subsection identifies actions to enhance implementation and enforcement of the NFIP within the community.

- **National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary:** Provides NFIP summary statistics for the jurisdiction.
- **Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms:** Identifies how the jurisdiction integrated hazard risk management into their existing planning, regulatory, and administrative framework (*integration capabilities*) and how they intend to promote this integration (*integration actions*). Further information regarding federal, state, and local capabilities can be found in the Capability Assessment portion of Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy).

**Section 9.X.5: Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality:** Identifies hazard events that 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. This *inventory* of events and losses is a work-in-progress and will 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.6: Hazard Ranking and Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities:** Provides information regarding each plan participant's vulnerability to the identified hazards. 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 Volume 1, Section 5 (Risk Assessment).

- **Critical Facilities Flood Risk:** Identifies potential flood losses to critical facilities in the jurisdiction based on the flood vulnerability assessment process presented in Section 5 (Risk Assessment).
- **Hazard Risk Ranking:** 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 locally, supporting the appropriate selection and prioritization of initiatives that will reduce the highest levels of risk for each community.
- **Identified Issues:** Presents other specific hazard vulnerabilities as identified by the jurisdiction.

**Section 9.X.7: Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization:** Discusses and provides the status of past mitigation actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and prioritization.

- **Past Mitigation Initiative Status:** Where applicable, reviews progress of the jurisdiction's prior mitigation strategy, identifying the disposition of each prior action, project, or initiative in the jurisdiction's updated mitigation strategy. Other completed or on-going mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy would be included in this sub-section.
- **Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update:** Table 9.X-11 presents the jurisdiction's updated 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 (Mitigation Strategy).

**Section 9.X.8: Proposed Action Types:** This indicates the range of proposed mitigation action categories.





**Section 9.X.9: Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development:** Provides details on which departments were involved throughout the development of the jurisdictional annex. Plans developed with the participation of the widest range of departments, stakeholders, and persons familiar with the jurisdiction should be involved in the development of the jurisdictional annexes. Further detail is provided in Section 3 (Planning Process), Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes), and Appendix B (Participation Matrix).

**Section 9.X.10: Hazard Area Extent and Location Map:** Includes a map (or series of maps) illustrating identified hazard zones, critical facilities, and areas of NFIP Repetitive Loss/Severe Repetitive Loss (RL/SRL) for each facility. Further, these maps show areas of known or anticipated future development, as available and provided by the jurisdiction.

**Action Worksheets:** Provides each municipality with a more developed starting point for project implementation should funding become available. Following NYS DHSES HMP Standards Guide, each municipality developed a minimum of two action worksheets. Workshops and additional meetings (in person, by email, or by teleconference) to complete the jurisdictional annexes were held with the Steering and Planning Committees throughout the planning process. In summary, all participating communities and the County completed the planning partner expectations and annex-preparation process. Details regarding these meetings are described further in Sections 3 (Planning Process) and 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are provided in Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes).

### 8.2.2 Coverage Under the Plan

Of the planning partners identified during the planning process, eight municipalities fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. Planning partners not having met principal requirements including completion of the jurisdictional data collection worksheets, completion of the jurisdictional annex, or participation in workshops or individual support meetings. Those that did not meet the requirements will not be able to seek FEMA or NYS DHSES approval at the time of plan submittal nor will they be eligible to obtain FEMA mitigation grant funding. Those jurisdictions can choose to complete their annex and adopt at a later time, working with Putnam County and NYS DHSES to ensure completeness. Any non-participating local government within the Putnam County planning area can “dock” to this plan in the future following the linkage procedures defined in Appendix K (Linkage Procedures).

Table 8-2 lists the status of each jurisdiction as well as their status in this plan update. It is noted that participation in scheduled planning partnership meetings provides only a partial indication of the level of participation of each jurisdiction. Throughout the bulk of the process, all municipalities resources were strained due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to this, the consultant provided support in the manner of numerous calls as well as virtual meetings to ensure each planning partner seeking approval for the HMP met the threshold for participation. Appendix B (Participation Matrix) and Appendix C (Meeting Documentation) provide details on participation and meeting attendance.

**Table 8-2. Jurisdictional Status**

Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent to Participate Date	Attended Workshops and/or Meetings?	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets requirements)
Putnam County	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Carmel	June 8, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Kent	June 18, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Patterson	May 4, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Philipstown	June 1, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent to Participate Date	Attended Workshops and/or Meetings?	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets requirements)
Town of Southeast	June 16, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Putnam Valley	May 5, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Village of Cold Spring	September 29, 2020	No	No	No	No
Village of Brewster	August 21, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Village of Nelsonville	July 15, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

DRAFT