

SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

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

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.” FEMA and NYS DHSES both encourage multi-jurisdictional planning. Therefore, in the preparation of the Rockland County HMP update, a planning partnership was formed meet requirements of the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) for as many eligible local governments in Rockland County as possible.

The DMA defines a local government as “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.”

8.1.1 Initial Solicitation and Letters of Intent

Rockland County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the County at the commencement of this project. All municipalities interested signed a “Letter of Intent” and/or a resolution committing their participation and resources to the development of the Rockland County HMP update (Appendix D). 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 Steering Committee. Rockland County and all its municipalities participated in the HMP update.

Table 8-1. Participating Jurisdictions in Rockland County

Jurisdictions		
Rockland County		
Airmont (Village)	Montebello (Village)	South Nyack (Village)
Chestnut Ridge (Village)	New Hempstead (Village)	Spring Valley (Village)
Clarkstown (Town)	New Square (Village)	Stony Point (Town)
Grand View on Hudson (Village)	Nyack (Village)	Suffern (Village)
Haverstraw (Town)	Orangetown (Town)	Town of Ramapo (Town)
Haverstraw (Village)	Piermont (Village)	Upper Nyack (Village)
Hillburn (Village)	Pomona (Village)	Wesley Hills (Village)
Kaser (Village)	Sloatsburg (Village)	West Haverstraw (Village)

8.1.2 Planning Partner Responsibilities

The Planning Committee agreed to the following list of expectations:

- Review 2010 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) it is intended that the planning partnership 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 shall be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

8.1.3 Jurisdictional Annexes

New to the Rockland County HMP update is a two-volume approach, including the development of a jurisdictional annex 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 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 Plan Points of Contact: 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: Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality: 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: This subsection 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 Section 5.

- **Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking:** The Rockland County HMP update 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.
- **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 Municipality:** 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 provide an inventory of the municipality’s planning and regulatory, administrative and technical, and fiscal, capabilities, respectively. 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):** 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: This section discusses and provides the status of past mitigations actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and prioritization.

Past Mitigation Initiative Status: Where applicable, a review of progress on the jurisdiction’s prior mitigation strategy is presented, 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 may be included in this sub-section as well.

Proposed Mitigation Strategy: 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.

Section 9.X.7: Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability: During the development of each annex, each jurisdiction identified if there are any anticipated needs in order to better understand risk and vulnerability going forward. If a jurisdiction identified such needs, they are captured in this section.

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, as available and provided by the jurisdiction.

Section 9.X.9: Additional Comments: Each annex contains an additional comments section to address identified issues or considerations that are not addressed in other annex sections.

Workshops and additional meetings (via in person, email and/or 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 presented in Section 9.