MEETING NOTES

Meeting
Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee Kick-off Meeting

Title
June 20, 2015

Place
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendees
Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (OEM), Rochester, NY
Fred Ron, Monroe County OEM
Dale Alman, Monroe County OEM
Katherine Drexel, Monroe County OEM
Audra Calk, Monroe County Geographic Information System (GIS) Services Division
Tom Stouffer, Monroe County Planning
Reid M. Grotheer, Monroe County Department of Environmental Services
John Rigs, Monroe County Department of Public Health
Terry Sabin, Terra Tech, Inc.

Purpose
The purpose of the kickoff meeting was to initiate the planning process to update the Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). The meeting provided an opportunity for the Steering Committee to meet Terra Tech, Inc.’s (Terra Tech) project manager, and to discuss the project.

Discussion Points
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the kickoff meeting.

Introduction
Mr. Ron briefly summarized background information regarding the HMP and the procurement process used to assign Terra Tech as the County’s vendor. The plan was first created in 2003, and updated in 2011. Some members of the current Steering Committee were involved in the 2011 update. The HMP was last updated by the County on November 15, 2011. The updated plan will go into effect in March 2015 and is expected to be adopted by the County in November 2016.

Members of the Steering Committee introduced themselves.

Community Rating System (CRS) Program
Mr. Sabin discussed the discussion of the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) Program. The CRS Program provides discounts to flood insurance premiums within a participating jurisdiction. Every Town in Monroe County participates in the CRS Program. The town is ranked in a scale from 1 to 5, with the highest score indicating the best rating.

A jurisdiction’s Floodplain Management Plan can earn at least 400 CRS points for a jurisdiction. A FEMA-approved HMP can count as a Floodplain Management Plan. The planning process is conducted in accordance with CRS requirements. The CRS requirements are more robust than the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), which enacts FEMA’s judgment on HMP. For instance, under the CRS, all Planning Committee meetings must be publicly advertised and open to the public. The County will be conducting this HMP update in accordance with the CRS requirements, with the goal of achieving up to approximately 450 CRS points for participating jurisdictions.

Project Scope Review
This section summarizes each task of the project discussed at the kickoff meeting.

Task 1 - Project Management and Planning Committee Facilitation
Mr. Sabin described the role of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will provide strategic direction to the planning process, and will review documents before they are shared with the Planning Committee. The group discussed after stakeholders to addition to the Steering Committee. Mr. Ron will reach out to the Damarion Coalition for representation on the Steering Committee.

The Planning Committee will be comprised of representatives of each participating municipality, as well as other groups. These other stakeholders may include the Town Service Agency, Soil and Water Conservation Service, school districts, the Chamber of Commerce, institutions of higher education, and the American Red Cross. Each organization represented on the Planning Committee will identify a primary and alternate member.

Planning Committee members will complete a set of workshops to provide information for the planning process. Mr. Sabin reviewed these workshops will the Steering Committee. Mr. Ron mentioned that the March 2014 workshop, the wind event is from a few years ago, and the storm is valid under a state action in 2013 or 2014. He added the list of events on Worksheet 1 (storms and losses), and that summary sheets be added for those events. Mr. Ron will provide specific data for these events to Mr. Sabin. Mr. Sabin will update Worksheet 2 (Municipal Capacity Assessment) to show that Monroe County is a StormReady County under the National Weather Service’s (NWS) StormReady program. Planning Committee members representing the municipalities will complete all of the workshops. Members representing other groups will also be asked to complete Worksheets 4 (Action Review) and 7 (Hazards of Concern).

Terra Tech will conduct a set of Risk Reduction Meetings as part of the planning process. These meetings will provide an opportunity for the municipalities to bring several representatives—including the floodplain administrator, zoning officer, code enforcement officer, and public works staff—to the planning process. The meetings will be located in a series of workshops with a multi-day meeting, one per week, and will address all of the workshops and collect additional information.

Mr. Sabin described the public outreach efforts that will be conducted during the planning process. Terra Tech will establish a project website. The site will include announcements, draft materials, and a calendar of events. In addition, Terra Tech will develop and post to the site a simple Citizen’s Preparedness Survey, so that the Planning Committee can see the level of public awareness of mitigation practices.

Finally, Terra Tech will conduct a set of public meetings conducted throughout the process. There will be a public informational meeting conducted at the end of July 2015, to introduce the public to the concept of mitigation and the planning process, and to solicit information and participation. Public meetings will then be held to review drafts of the risk assessment, mitigation strategy, and final draft of the HMP.

Task 2 - Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment
Mr. Sabin discussed the hazard analysis that will be used to update the risk assessment portion of the HMP. The existing HMP includes many hazards, with the following identified as high or moderately high risks:
- Ice Storm
- Flood
- Severe Storms
- Hurricane (in threat)
- Winter Storms (severe)
- Fire
- Tornado
- Utility Failure
- Explosion
- Structural Collapse
- Civil Unrest

These hazards are included on the Hazards of Concern worksheet. Planning Committee members will indicate their level of concern for these hazards, and the Steering Committee will identify the hazards of concern to analyze more closely.

Mr. Sabin discussed FEMA’s Hazards U.S. hazard analysis that is used for the earthquake, flood, and wind scenarios; these hazards are expected by New York State and FEMA to be analyzed in the HMP. Terra Tech will analyze the 100- and 200-year event Return Period (RP) earthquake events and the 1% and 2% annual chance fixed events, and the 100 and 500 year wind events.

Terra Tech will develop the hazard profiles, and will discuss them with the Planning Committee at the August 2015 meeting. Terra Tech will then conduct the vulnerability assessment, and will share the results at the December 2015 Planning Committee meeting. The public meeting to review the risk assessment will be held at that time as well.

Terra Tech’s analysis has been working with Mr. Calk to gather the geographic information system (GIS) data required for the analysis. Terra Tech will request additional data from municipal and county organizations through the Steering Committee.

Task 3 - Mitigation Strategies and Activities
Mr. Sabin described the Steering Committee will deliberate the mitigation strategies and mitigation activities, and will review them with the Planning Committee. Through the workshops and data collection meetings, the Planning Committee members will provide information on the following:
- Their capabilities to implement hazard mitigation
- How mitigation actions are incorporated into their normal operations
- The status of the mitigation actions included in the 2011 HMP
- New mitigation actions to include in the updated HMP

Terra Tech will conduct a Mitigation Solutions Workshop in conjunction with a Planning Committee meeting. The workshop will be led by a representative of FEMA Region II, and will help jurisdictions identify mitigation projects to include in the HMP.

Terra Tech will complete the mitigation strategy and review it with the Steering Committee. The strategy will then be reviewed with the Planning Committee and general public.

Task 4 - Draft and Final Plans
Draft plans will be shared with the Steering Committee for review and comment. After making any required changes, Terra Tech will present the HMP to the public for review. The public review period will be advertised, and will last for 30 days. Terra Tech will then conduct public meetings to gather feedback on the plan draft, and will make any required changes.

Terra Tech will then submit the draft for the State’s formal review. NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (DHSES) mitigation planners for information and review. The draft will then be sent to NYS DHSES. Terra Tech will address any comments from the State in the documents.

The draft plan will be shared with the Steering Committee for review and comment. After making any required changes, Terra Tech will present the HMP to the public for review. The public review period will be advertised, and will last for 30 days. Terra Tech will then conduct public meetings to gather feedback on the plan draft, and will make any required changes.

Terra Tech will then submit the draft for the State’s formal review. NYS DHSES will review the draft. Changes are required. Terra Tech will make changes, and submit the updated HMP to the State. The State will review the HMP, and will return the updated HMP with comments within 45 days. Changes are required. Terra Tech will make them. If the updated HMP is submitted with the final HMP, the NYS DHSES will grant the HMP “approvable pending adoption” status, to indicate that it meets all requirements.

The County and participating jurisdictions will formally adopt the HMP by resolution. Mr. Ron will review the resolutions to the NYS DHSES for processing and sharing with FEMA Region II. Each jurisdiction will receive a letter from FEMA stating that the HMP is formally approved.

Project Schedule Review
The Steering Committee reviewed the draft project schedule. The remaining dates identified on the schedule will be added. Mr. Ron requested that Terra Tech provide meeting materials ahead of time in advance of the meetings for his review.

Next Steps
The following next steps were discussed at the meeting:
- Terra Tech will develop a list of interim deadlines with a timeframe for when they will be completed.
- The list will show the expectations for Steering Committee and Planning Committee members in terms of document review.
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- Mr. Ron will send the Steering Committee Meeting Invitation to the committee members via email.
- Mr. Ron will send the Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting Invitation via email by July 3, 2015.
- The Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting will be held at the end of July 2015.
- Mr. Ron will work with the County staff to develop a cruise code so that their time can be recorded and counted towards the local match requirement of the FEMA-funded planning grant.
- Mr. Ron will email State personnel for the list of historic sites.
- Terra Tech will develop a data request letter to send to municipal authorities and private entities.
- Mr. Allen will work with the Water Authority to request GIS data.
- Mr. Ron will contact the County Office of Mental Health to request a list of alcohol and drug rehabilitation facilities.
- Mr. Ron will develop a short presentation that can be given to the Council of Governments (COG), mayors, supervisors, and County Executive to describe the mitigation planning process.
- Terra Tech will develop a one-page document introducing the mitigation planning process to stakeholders.
- Terra Tech will begin developing the risk assessment.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
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Purpose
The purpose of the meeting was to update the community on the progress of the Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan update and to provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions and provide feedback.

Discussion Points
This section summaries each discussion point addressed during the Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting.

Welcome and Introductions
Mr. Ron welcomed meeting attendees to the Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting and provided a brief summary of the background information about the HMP update. He explained that the meeting would be a chance for County employees and stakeholders to contribute to the planning process. He emphasized the importance of involving the public in the planning process and the need for transparency and accountability.

Community Rating System (CRS) Program
Mr. Sabulo explained the CRS program and how it could help the County achieve the goal of achieving a CRS rating of 5 or higher. He highlighted the importance of community involvement in the planning process and the benefits of achieving a higher CRS rating.

Planning Process
Planning (Organization)
Mr. Sabulo reviewed the planning process that would be used to update the Monroe County HMP. He explained that the committee would be working with the County Planning Department and other stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan that would be reviewed by the public for feedback and input.
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Data Collection
Mr. Subbco met with the different methods of data collection for the flood update. To facilitate information collection from municipal representatives, Tetra Tech will be providing each municipality with a series of worksheets. Although these worksheets are substantial, they will facilitate the plan process and jurisdictional reviews in a way that will ultimately make the plan update process faster and more smoothly. Mr. Subbo received each of the seven worksheets briefly and explained that the worksheets would be reviewed with municipal representatives, as well as being posted on the project website. If a municipal representative prefers a hard-copy version of the worksheets, they can be made available online for downloading. All worksheets are to be submitted in digital form as of August 15, 2015. Those areas not completed will be coordinated with the submission of one set of County worksheets, as the County will participate as one entity rather than as individual departments. Mr. Subbo received the final worksheet with the codes enforcement officer, zoning officer, municipal manager, and floodplain administrator to help gather all necessary information. In response to a question, Mr. Subbo clarified that all completed village officials should still complete their own set of worksheets, even if they are fully surrounded by a town. In response to another question, Mr. Subbo also noted that the stormwater management plan should be represented on both County and municipal worksheets.

Because of the extensive, detailed information required on the worksheets, Monroe County will be holding a series of workshops for municipal representatives. During each workshop, Tetra Tech will explain how to complete the surveys, answer any questions, and discuss the hazards inherent to vulnerable areas. Meetings will be held on August 18, 20, 2015. Mr. Subbo asked whether any municipal representatives would be interested in hosting a meeting; the Village of Churchville and the Towns of Perinton, Chili, and Brighton all volunteered to host a municipal workshop. Dates of the workshops will be posted on the project website and will be evaluated by Mr. Ron.

In addition, Mr. Subbo requested that all municipalities and community leaders share any reports, plans, strategic documents, or other information that would be relevant to the mitigation project and community goals. Frequently, these documents include master plans, subdivision and land development ordinances, after-action reports for incidents or experiences, stormwater management plans, emergency operations plans, caps, and improvement plans/projects, and summaries of the local budget.

Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment
Mr. Subbo then reviewed the process for incorporating all the information from the worksheets and additional information into the HMP. He first focused on the Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment. The County of Monroe HMP must provide, at a minimum, the hazards that are included in the State of New York HMP. These include:

- Unought
- Earthquake
- Extreme Temperatures
- Hazardous Materials (Toxics)
- Flooding
- Landslide

As part of the process of developing the mitigation strategy, TDMA Region II will host a Mitigation Solutions Workshop to discuss methods to develop comprehensive and detailed actions. Once the actions have been set, the Planning Committee will review the mitigation strategy, and the Steering Committee will conduct a public meeting to inform residents of the current mitigation strategy.

MEETING NOTES

No new topics were identified. The following next steps were identified:

- Municipalities and stakeholders will identify and share any reports, plans, or other strategic documents relevant to the HMP update and mitigation plans.
- Municipalities will complete and submit the HMP worksheets by mid-October 2015.
- Tetra Tech will post the HMP worksheets and mitigation workshop dates and locations on the project website.
- Mr. Ron and other Planning Committee members will promote the project website, which will contain information about the HMP, planning process, and outreach opportunities, including a Citizens Call Center.
- The Steering Committee will coordinate with the County to determine whether Tetra Tech or a County representative can present at a stormwater management plan update meeting.
- The Steering Committee will check to see whether Monroe County Community College is represented on the Planning Committee. If not, the Steering Committee will reach out to them.
- Tetra Tech will post the HMP update and risk assessment portion of the HMP.
- The initial Steering Committee meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. on August 29, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Subbo and Mr. Ron thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:30 a.m.
AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, July 29, 2010 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Introductions
2. Community Rating System (CRS) Program
   a. Organization
   b. Data Collection
   c. Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment
   d. Mitigation Strategy and Activities
   e. Draft and Final Plans
3. Planning Process
   a. Review of previous actions
4. Project Schedule Review
5. Participation
   a. Complete worksheets
   b. Provide reports and plans
   c. Risk assessment update
   d. Municipal meetings
   e. Next Planning Committee Meeting – Hazard Profiles
6. Next Steps
   a. Complete worksheets
   b. Provide reports and plans
   c. Risk assessment update
   d. Municipal meetings
   e. Next Planning Committee Meeting – Hazard Profiles
7. Questions

Thank you for your time!
MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #1 – Events and Losses

Municipality:

Who can provide information about events and losses: OEM Coordinator, Police, Fire, DPW, and municipal Engineer. Refer to FEMA Project Worksheets (PWs). DPW records, police response records.

In the table below, please identify events in which your community sustained significant damage/losses and describe these losses (e.g., flooded roads, road closures, DPF Police evacuations, debris management, opened shelter for two days, etc.). Please add other non-declared events that affected your community that are not noted.

Then, please fill out an "Event and Loss Summary Sheet" for the two disasters in 2014. Feel free to add additional sheets for other major events in your community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Event</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>FEMA Declaration</th>
<th>Municipality Description</th>
<th>Did your community suffer losses/events from this event? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>If yes, please indicate any Event Loss Summary Sheet needed from this event?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
<td>High Wind</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20 – May 8, 2011</td>
<td>Storm Surge, Flooding, Wind Damage/Structural Damage</td>
<td>DR-168</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2011</td>
<td>High Wind</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2012</td>
<td>High Wind</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27 – November 7, 2012</td>
<td>Hurricane Sandy</td>
<td>ES-351</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26 – July 11, 2013</td>
<td>Storm Surge and Flooding</td>
<td>DR-128</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 21, 2013</td>
<td>Ice Storm</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2014</td>
<td>Blizzard</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #2 – Municipal Capability Assessment

Municipality:

1. Planning and Regulatory Capability: Please indicate whether the following planning or regulatory tools and programs are currently in place or under development for your jurisdiction by placing an "X" in the appropriate box, followed by the date of adoption/update. For each activity item in bold, identify the department/agency responsible for its implementation. In addition, indicate for code chapters, and names of plans any explanation of ambiguity in the rightmost column.

Who can assist with completing this table: Municipal Planner, Clerk, Code Official. Refer to your municipal codes and ordinances, Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool / Program (code reference)</th>
<th>Does your Jurisdiction (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Date of Adoption/Update</th>
<th>Authority (City, County, State, Federal), Enforcement</th>
<th>Fiscal Responsibility</th>
<th>Code Citation and Commentary (Explain any phrases, explanation of ambiguity, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planner/Code Official</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>City, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate/Disaster Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>City, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>City, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>City, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>City, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid Agreement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOES Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Development Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Emergency Planning Guide</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Planning Guide</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOES Planning Guide</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPF Flood Damage Prevention Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPF Comprehensive Substantive Damage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>State, County</td>
<td>Code Official</td>
<td>Code Citation and Commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #3 – NFIP Floodplain Administrator Questionnaire

Municipality:

NFIP Floodplain Administrator Name:

Flood Vulnerability Summary

1. Does the municipality maintain lists/inventories of properties that have been flood damaged? (Yes/No)
2. Characteristics of the number of structures damaged during flood, wind, Sandy or other events.
3. If possible, can you provide a table of the structures that are flood damaged?
4. Do you make Substantial Damage estimates, and how many are excluded for flood, wind, Sandy or other events?
5. How many are not included in mitigation (e.g., elevation, acquisition)?
6. What is the funding source for those being mitigated (e.g., property owner, Federal insurance and RCF, grant funding)?

Resources

1. Are you the only person assuming the responsibilities of floodplain administration, or do you have other staff or use contracted staff if needed?
2. Provide an explanation of the NFIP administration services and functions and your department provide (e.g., permit review, inspections, damage assessments, record-keeping, GIS, education and awareness).
MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #5 - Capability Assessment and Plan Integration

Please complete responses below and send electronic Word version by August 30, 2015 to:
Tom Schild
Phone: 717-545-3580 E-mail: tschild@tcetech.com

Municipality:

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into the day-to-day day government operations. We would like to gather an understanding of your community's progress in plan integration, as well identify potential integration opportunities that your community may pursue in the future.

Who can assist with completing this table: The HMP/IOF point of contact should discuss with the Engineer, Clerk, Mayor/Administrator, Planner, CTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Department/Agency</th>
<th>Task/Program/Initiative, etc.</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor (Staff Contact)</td>
<td>Planning Board; Zoning Board/Advisories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you currently have a Master/Comprehensive Plan (Bond-put-in-place), or are you currently working on an update or your Master/Comprehensive Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, do you utilize, or are you considering, areas of natural hazard risk (e.g., flood-prone areas, steep slopes)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your Master/Comprehensive plan refer to a local or Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Chair/Staff/Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you an AILACR Community, and do you have a formal Stormwater Management Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, does this plan specify protective actions/requirements to reduce the volume of stormwater, or otherwise mitigate stormwater flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #6 - Potential New Development

Please complete responses below and send electronic Word version by August 30, 2015 to:
Tom Schild
Phone: 717-545-3580 E-mail: tschild@tcetech.com

Municipality:

Please indicate any recent development within your community from 2010 to present. Additionally, please indicate known or anticipated major residential or commercial development and major infrastructure development that is anticipated for the next five (5) years in your community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Known or Anticipated Development in the Next Five (5) Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MOHA

MOHR

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #4 - Project Management and Planning Committee Formation

Please complete responses below and send electronic Word version by August 30, 2015 to:
Tom Schild
Phone: 717-545-3580 E-mail: tschild@tcetech.com

Municipality:

Please indicate any recent development within your community from 2010 to present. Additionally, please indicate known or anticipated major residential or commercial development and major infrastructure development that is identified for the next five (5) years in your community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Known or Anticipated Development in the Next Five (5) Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #3 - Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Schedule

Please complete responses below and send electronic Word version by August 30, 2015 to:
Tom Schild
Phone: 717-545-3580 E-mail: tschild@tcetech.com

Municipality:

Please indicate any recent development within your community from 2010 to present. Additionally, please indicate known or anticipated major residential or commercial development and major infrastructure development that is identified for the next five (5) years in your community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Known or Anticipated Development in the Next Five (5) Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Site</th>
<th>Type (Residential, Commercial)</th>
<th>% of City/County</th>
<th>Address and Block(s)</th>
<th>Recent Major Hazards (E.g., Flood)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
Worksheet #2 - Capability Assessment and Plan Integration

Please complete responses below and send electronic Word version by August 30, 2015 to:
Tom Schild
Phone: 717-545-3580 E-mail: tschild@tcetech.com

Municipality:

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into the day-to-day day government operations. We would like to gather an understanding of your community's progress in plan integration, as well identify potential integration opportunities that your community may pursue in the future.

Who can assist with completing this table: The HMP/IOF point of contact should discuss with the Engineer, Clerk, Mayor/Administrator, Planner, CTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Department/Agency</th>
<th>Task/Program/Initiative, etc.</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor (Staff Contact)</td>
<td>Planning Board; Zoning Board/Advisories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you currently have a Master/Comprehensive Plan (Bond-put-in-place), or are you currently working on an update or your Master/Comprehensive Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, do you utilize, or are you considering, areas of natural hazard risk (e.g., flood-prone areas, steep slopes)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your Master/Comprehensive plan refer to a local or Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Chair/Staff/Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you an AILACR Community, and do you have a formal Stormwater Management Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, does this plan specify protective actions/requirements to reduce the volume of stormwater, or otherwise mitigate stormwater flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monroe County’s Office of Emergency Management will host a public meeting to discuss hazard mitigation and the planning process on July 29, 2015 from 6:00-7:00 p.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management located at 1790 Scottsville Road.

The County has begun updating its Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) which documents the County’s vulnerability to hazards and its strategy to reduce vulnerability. The Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee will also meet from 9:00-11:00 a.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management on 8/26, 9/23, 10/20, 11/19, and 12/16.

A full meeting schedule of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee is available at www.monroecountyhmp.com. For more information contact Frederick J. Rion, Jr., Emergency Preparedness Administrator, at 753-3810.

---

**MONROE COUNTY TO HOST PUBLIC MEETING ON HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

**News From:**

Monroe County Department of Communications

**For Immediate Release**

Monday, July 27, 2015

Monroe County’s Office of Emergency Management will host a public meeting to discuss hazard mitigation and the planning process on July 29, 2015 from 6:00-7:00 p.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management located at 1790 Scottsville Road.

The County has begun updating its Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) which documents the County’s vulnerability to hazards and its strategy to reduce vulnerability. The Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee will also meet from 9:00-11:00 a.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management on 8/26, 9/23, 10/20, 11/19, and 12/16.

A full meeting schedule of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee is available at www.monroecountyhmp.com. For more information contact Frederick J. Rion, Jr., Emergency Preparedness Administrator, at 753-3810.

###

**Media inquiries, contact:**

Department of Communications at 753-1080

---

**MEETING NOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>July 22, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Frederick Rion, Vice President of Emergency Management (OEM); Shana Smith, Monroe County Department of Public Health; Tony Sibley, Tierra Tech (Tierra Tech); Althea Stahl, Tierra Tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The purpose of the public meeting was: (1) to provide information about the Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update planning process, and public engagement opportunities to residents of Monroe County; and (2) to obtain public input on the natural hazards that affect the County, the hazards associated problems, and possible solutions.

**Discussion Points**

Although initial notice of the meeting was distributed via e-mail invitations went to the homes, business, and other stakeholders associated with Monroe County, (2) advertisements broadcast throughout the community, and (3) on the Monroe County OEM Facebook page, no County residents attended the meeting. Mr. Rion, Mr. Sibley, and Ms. Smith visited until 6:15 p.m. to verify that no County residents would be in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Rion, Mr. Sibley, Ms. Smith, and Mr. Sharpe also discussed the information that the Department of Public Health could contribute to the HMP, with a particular emphasis on public health impacts from natural hazards (for example, disease outbreaks from sewage backups after a flood, and extreme cold and heat issues).

**Next Steps**

Mr. Rion and other Planning Committee members will promote the project website, which will contain information about the HMP, planning process, and outreach opportunities such as a Citizen Preparedness Survey. All future public meetings will continue to be advertised by multiple methods to encourage resident participation in the HMP update.
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 18, 2015  Time: 9:00 a.m. — 10:00 a.m.

Meeting: Municipal Meeting – 1 of 5

Attendees: Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY
           Kristina Doughty, Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (MOEM)
           Greg Emerance, Village of Henrietta Falls
           Charlie Johnson, Village of Henrietta Falls
           Felipe Hernandez, Rochester Fire Department
           Steve Bush, Rochester Fire Department
           Jamie Hnirner, Rochester Fire Department
           Tony Sabino, Tetra Tech Inc. (Tetra Tech)
           Becky Sotnik, Tetra Tech

Purpose
The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for Monroe County and municipal staff and Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) staff to discuss the planning process, and for Tetra Tech staff to gather information from County and municipal representatives.

Discussion Points
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Major Incidents and Their Impacts
In the City of Rochester, ice storms and wind storms that cause power outages are a major concern. The City generally uses little to no storage from these storms. Some areas may have a potentiometer for flooding, but flooding has not been a problem in the City since the construction of the Mt. Morris Dam in the 1850s.

In the Village of Henrietta Falls, flooding is a problem. The Henrietta Creek waterfront levee often causes the bank to erode. The levee causes overflows as well. The Village is relatively flat. Much of the flooding problem is a result of an inadequate stormwater management system. Rain events in recent years have caused more intense than in the past. The Village's sanitary sewer system was built in 1956, and approximately 50% of the system has been upgraded since then. The system has effluent problems, which result in sewer backups into homes. Village officials have been discussing alternative methods for dealing with these problems. The July 7, 2015, monsoon event downsized water through the Village, and took approximately 1 week to clear up.

Problem Areas
County staff identified two areas particularly vulnerable to flooding: the area along the Black Creek, and an area in Elton Park.

MEETING NOTES

Several areas in the City are often closed due to natural hazards. In Henrietta Falls, Ontario Street and Paper Mill Street frequently have flood problems. City and Village representatives will provide a list of these and other vulnerable locations to Tetra Tech. Uplift action plan can then be developed to address these problem areas.

Projects Completed
Monroe County and a StormReady County under the national Weather Service's StormReady program. SkyWARN training has been conducted in the County. Village representatives requested that more training be conducted throughout the County.

In Henrietta Falls, a group of residents on Creekside Drive built a dirt barrier along the Henrietta Creek to prevent flooding on their property. The Village partnered with National Grid to address tree trimming and tree removal more aggressively. Residents have been helping to keep weeds under the frequency of power outages in the Village. Likewise, the Village has developed a list of trees that can be planted near power lines.

In addition, the Village conducts a sump pump discount program. In 2015, the Village conducted inspections in every home in the Village to check the sump connections. The Village requires that sump pumps be disconnected from the sewer system. Approximately 40% of the Village's homes had that connection in place.

Questions on Worksheets
There were no questions on the worksheets.

Outreach Conducted
The County Department of Environmental Services conducts a program called "Litter the NOL" event, which provides information geared towards understanding water quality and stormwater management issues.

The City of Rochester has a website, a 3-1-1 Information line for residents to report and request information, and a code channel dedicated to City issues. The City also sponsors a Code Red information system. Landfills are automatically entered into the system; cell phones can be used voluntarily. The City has a Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program in the high school, conducts cooking safety classes for senior citizens, and conducts regular fire prevention and safety programs in schools.

The Village of Henrietta Falls has a website and Facebook page, which are the main avenues for communicating with the public. The City's Preparedness Survey developed for the mitigation planning process was linked to the Facebook page. The Village does not conduct any outreach specific to the floodplain. Community meetings were conducted during the Village's Comprehensive Plan update.

Next Steps
Mr. Subbio reviewed the following next steps with attendees:
- County staff will reach out to Charlie Heidt in the Monroe County Department of Health to request his expertise on flooding issues in the County.
- County staff will reach out to the Bedford Technology Staff and professors at SUNY Brockport to solicit their participation in the planning process.
- Municipal representatives will provide copies of surveys to the floodplain management ordinances to Tetra Tech.

SIGNS-IN
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NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

PHONE

EMAIL

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2015
9:00 a.m. — 10:00 a.m.

MONROE COUNTY OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
ROCHESTER, NY 14610

 Molinari, Greg Emerance, Village of Henrietta Falls
 Charlie Johnson, Village of Henrietta Falls
 Felipe Hernandez, Rochester Fire Department
 Steve Bush, Rochester Fire Department
 Jamie Hnirner, Rochester Fire Department
 Tony Sabino, Tetra Tech Inc. (Tetra Tech)
 Becky Sotnik, Tetra Tech
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 18, 2015  
Time: 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Meeting:  
Municipal Building - 2nd FL

Attendees:  
David Miller, Code Enforcement, Village of Brookport  
Jean Lappone, Village of Brookport  
Joe Lee, Mayor, Village of Hilton  
Mike Lorenc, Code Enforcement, Village of Hilton  
Mike Schumacher, Superintend, Village of Hilton  
Jackie Sullivan, Clerk, Village of Spencerport  
Tony Sudko, Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)  
Emily Stobacki, Tetra Tech

Purpose:  
The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for municipal and Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) staff to discuss the planning process, and for Tetra Tech staff to gather information from municipal representatives.

Discussion Points:  
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Major Incidents and Their Impacts:  
Attendees reported that many of the major events that affected the region did not affect Monroe County very much. Flooding and ice storms were the greatest threats for the three villages (Hilton, Brookport, and Spencerport). Ice storms are especially problematic because of the power outages they cause.

Problem Areas:  
In the Village of Hilton, the area that is the most vulnerable is the area with an apartment complex, supermarket, and bank. Only the bank is in the floodplain. In Brookport, Cedar Street is often flooded with a few inches of water, which then dries out after the rain. National Grid cut several trees away from power lines, but not well. The trees could become a problem after they die. Hilton staff noticed that the utility companies are not maintaining the power lines like they used to.

Projects Completed:  
The Hilton Fire Department was relocated after Hurricane Frances in 2004. Hilton has installed on-site water treatment, and is planning to improve the sewer infrastructure. The Village has also implemented tree-trimming and drainage programs.

MEETING NOTES

Drainage has been a problem caused by tree cover. Village Department of Public Works staff also uses tree shears. The Village does regular storm drain maintenance and storm catch basins. No sand is used for increased snow in the Village because the sand stops the stormwater maintenance system.

Storm sewers in the three villages are regularly upgraded. All three villages are members of the stormwater coalition.

Questions on Worksheets:  
There were no questions on the worksheets.

Outreach Conducted:  
Brookport advertised its status on the Village newsletter.

Next Steps:  
Mr. Stobacki reviewed the following next steps with attendees:

- Municipal representatives will provide copies of or hyperlinks to their floodplain management ordinances to Tetra Tech.
- Municipal representatives will complete the set of worksheets. Tetra Tech staff will remain available to answer questions or provide assistance.
- Municipal representatives will provide a list of sanitary sewer and stormwater system for review during the public review period (April - May 2016).
- The next Planning Committee meeting will be conducted at the Monroe County OEM on August 25, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Sudko and Mr. Stobacki thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 2:05 p.m.
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 18, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Meeting: Municipal Meeting – 3 of 8
Location: 2015 Town of Chili Town Hall, Rochester, New York
Dawn Forte, Town of Chili
Mark Avni, Town of Gates
Daryll Sabin, Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)
Betty Bouch, Tetra Tech
Attendees: Municipal staff and Tetra Tech

Purpose:
The purpose of this Municipal Meeting was to provide an opportunity for municipal staff and Tetra Tech to discuss the planning process, and for Tetra Tech staff to gather information from municipal representatives.

Discussion Points:
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Major Incidents and Their Impacts:
Tetra Tech provided an update on the meeting subjects regarding major hazard incidents and the impact on their respective municipalities.

Ms. Avni stated that there seems to be more rain falling in normal incidents.

Mr. Forte reported that the June 17, 2015 wind event involved down many trees in the Town of Chili, particularly on Portage Road and the Ontario Way area. Once worked up to a week until they were being removed from the debris. Rochester Gas and Electric (RG&E) is studying the installation of a new substation in either the Town of Chili or the Town of Henrietta. This substation would benefit the Towns of Chili, Gates, and Henrietta.

Mr. Forte and Mr. Avni both reported that RG&E does not have the resources required to quickly clean up storm debris. Monthly bills are passed on before RG&E crews removed trees that were leaning on power lines.

Problem Areas:
The attendees discussed the main problem areas in their respective municipalities.

Mr. Avni described the problems that the Town of Gates has been having with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA is not giving insurance to homes located just above the floodplain. He stated that the maps are greatly incorrect, but FEMA will not listen. Lloyd's of London is offering flood insurance for certain properties in the Town. The Town does not have funding available to rebuild. The hydrology and hydrology of the Town during heavy downpours, several areas of the Town of Gates experience culvert overflows, which fill with water and overflow into residents' yards. Mr. Avni left the meeting for a prior commitment at 9:10 a.m.

MEETING NOTES

Ms. Forte reported that the Town of Chili Town Hall has drainage issues, and the Town has stormwater management issues. Also, the Town is susceptible to flooding from the Black Creek. Black Creek goes under Beaver Road, Bald Eagle Road, and sometimes floods the roadway. Flooding is not as bad since a gate was installed on the Genesee River. The Mt. Morris Dam was built. The Indian Hill substation is flooded during very heavy rain events.

The Town of Chili has seven natural crossovers. Both Amtrak and CSX have tracks through the Town, traveled by both commuter and freight trains. The trains are sometimes so long that emergency vehicles cannot access parts of the Town when there is a train on the tracks. Trains run through the Town every 30-60 minutes. Ms. Forte believes that the Village of Fairport and the Village of East Rochester also have problems with the trains.

The bridge over I-490 becomes icy often during the winter. Traffic backs up from the intersection of Chili Avenue and Union Street. This intersection frequently experiences car accidents.

The Town of Chili is diligent with clearing snow from the roads, but the Town sometimes runs out of salt to treat the roadsides. The tax cap required by the State makes it very difficult to purchase adequate supplies. The salt distributors have run out of salt in the past as well.

There are many areas in the Towns, which are not accessible by the general public. The Town hires a contractor for snow removal.

Projects Completed:
Ms. Forte summarized completed mitigation projects completed in the Town of Chili.

The Town of Chili has had power outages because of extreme heat events. Backup power generators have been installed at the Town Hall and Highway Garage. There is probably a generator at the fire department too.

The senior center in the Town of Chili is designated as an emergency shelter for the American Red Cross. The town also established a Points of Distribution (POD). Father's House and Roberts Wesleyan College. Agreements are in place with these facilities, and are updated annually. The Town is building a new community center.

Chili is Highway Department maintains the culverts in the Town. The Town has completed no excavations or installations.

Chili maintains an emergency plan, a comprehensive plan, and a stormwater pollution prevention plan.

Questions on Worksheets:
Ms. Forte had no questions on the worksheets.

Outreach Conducted:
Ms. Forte described outreach initiatives conducted by the Town of Chili.

The Town of Chili is the primary source of outreach to residents. The Town provides public input on the site. The Supervisor and the Recreation Department have Facebook pages. A quarterly newsletter is distributed to all homes in the Town. Each year, the Town holds Chili Fest, a large community event.

MEETING NOTES

Next Steps:
The following next steps were discussed at the meeting:

- Municipal representatives will complete the set of worksheets. Tetra Tech staff will remain available to answer questions or provide assistance.
- Municipal representatives will identify opportunities and events for outreach regarding the mitigation planning process.
- The next Planning Committee Meetings will be held at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (OEM) on August 26, 2015.

With no further questions, Ms. Sudick and Ms. Stinchfield thanked Ms. Forte for her time. The meeting concluded at 10:02 a.m.
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 19, 2015  Time: 1:00 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

Meeting: Municipal Meeting – 4 of 6
Location: Village of Churchville Office, Churchville, New York

Attendees: Roberta Arens, Village of Churchville
Megan Lodge, Clerk/Treasurer, Village of Churchville
David Foote, Mayor, Village of Churchville
Paul Robinson, Public Works Superintendent, Village of Churchville
Nancy Streeter, Mayor, Village of Churchville
Lyle Warren, Zoning Board Administrator, Village of Churchville
Deborah Camparelli, Town of Riga
Robert Parks, Town of Riga
Tony Sabato, Tette Tech, Inc. (Tette Tech)
Emil Schneck, Tette Tech

Purpose
The purpose of this Municipal Meeting was to provide an opportunity for municipal staff and Tette Tech, Inc. (Tette Tech) staff to discuss the Monroe County hazard mitigation planning process, and for Tette Tech staff to gather information from municipal representatives.

Discussion Points
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Major Incidents and Their Impacts
Representatives from the Village of Churchville and the Town of Riga present at the meeting shared information regarding major hazard incidents and the impact on their respective municipalities.

No major incidents were reported for the Village of Churchville.

Problem Areas
The Village and Town representatives discussed the major problem areas in their respective municipalities.

The Village of Churchville has flooding and erosion problems along the Black Creek. Erosion is a problem along Willowbank Drive. Water from the river creeps close to houses but does not cause damage. All roads that intersect the Black Creek have issues at the crossings.

MEETING NOTES

Both the Town and Village conduct public board meetings that include an opportunity for public comment. The Village and the Town conduct joint meetings to discuss community issues. They send a survey to residents every 5 years in preparation for the next Comprehensive Plan update. Both municipalities maintain neighborhood parks and a community bulletin board at their offices. There is an active SCORE chapter in the area, and chapter meetings are very well attended.

Next Steps
The following next steps were discussed at the meeting:

- Municipal representatives will complete the set of worksheets. Tette Tech staff will remain available to answer questions or provide assistance.
- Municipal representatives will meet to identify organizations and events for outreach regarding the mitigation planning process.
- The next Planning Committee meeting will be held at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (OEM) on August 28, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Sabato and Mr. Schneck thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 2:45 p.m.

In addition, trains travel through the Village all day (approximately 45 trains per day), but the Village does not know what is being carried on the trains. CSX has repaired train crossings in the Village. A rail storage area is located in the middle of the Village. There is a potential for explosions in this area, which could result in a secondary hazard from a train derailment nearby. There are no active train tracks in the Village.

The Town of Riga has flooding problems. The Black Creek floods Abigail Road near the bridge, and also floods at Mill Road and Palmer Road South. The black Creek floods north of Roberton Road; the water gets close to houses but does not cause severe damage.

In addition, large trees along Roberton Road at the corner of Abigail Road are leaning towards the road.

Projects Completed
Attendees summarized mitigation projects that have been completed in the Village of Churchville and the Town of Riga.

Churchville maintains an aggressive tree trimming program to prevent power outages from downed trees. The Village code was changed five years ago to not require hedges. The Village built a new power substation, but would like to get power lines across I-490 and across the Black Creek. Routine maintenance of meters and electric lines is performed to ensure stormwater management. The Village maintains its sewer pump stations in good condition. Some stations also have backup power generators. The Village is also adding its codes.

In Riga, the Highway Department continues maintenance and upgrades to the roadways. The Town is encouraging National Grid to bury power lines. The Town conducts outreach to the school regarding emergency procedures.

The Town and Village are preparing their joint comprehensive plan. Both maintain brush cleanup programs to keep stormwater management areas clear.

The Black Creek Watershed Coalition just completed a water shed management plan that is awaiting State approval.

Questions on Worksheets
Attendees had no questions on the worksheets.

Outreach Conducted
Village and Town representatives summarized their respective hazard mitigation outreach initiatives.

In the Village, storm drains are marked with the logo from the Larry the Lion's program conducted by the County Stormwater Coalition. Brush pickup is advertised on the Village website. The Village sends a newsletter to residents once a year, but does not include much information on prevention activities. Village officials interact directly with residents often. The Village held community workshops on home security, but no residents attended. Administration is sometimes involved with utility issues. During storm events, the Village set up a phone for residents to obtain information.

The Town of Riga sends a bi-monthly newsletter to residents, which contains regular articles on how to clean up roadways, fire safety, and pool safety.
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Date: August 20, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Meeting: Municipal Meeting – 5 of 6
Location: Town of Penfield
Tom Tenney, Town of Penfield
Deb Derna, Town of Penfield
Eric Williams, Town of Penfield
Geoff Borrill, Town of Webster
Rob Borrill, Town of Webster
Tom Slocum, Town of Webster
Emily Slocum, Town of Webster
Tetta Tech (Tetta Tech Inc.)

Purpose
The purpose of this Municipal Meeting was to consider an opportunity for municipal staff and Tetta Tech Inc. (Tetta Tech) staff to discuss the Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Planning process, and for Tetta Tech staff to gather information from municipal representatives.

Discussion Points
The following summarises each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Major Events and Their Impacts
The following summary contains information on major events and their impacts:

- Storms:
  - Supercell storms caused significant damage in the Town of Penfield.
  - In the Town of Webster, snow storms were the most significant events, and no severe weather events stood out more than others.
- Flooding:
  - The area is prone to flooding and erosion issues. The water levels in the Penfield area are high, and the area is prone to flooding and erosion issues.

Problems Areas:
The following summarises the major problems areas in their respective municipalities:

- Flooding:
  - Frequent flooding in the Town of Webster is a result of stormwater runoff that overflows the creeks and streams, causing flooding problems that only occur along the wetland.
  - Flooding in the Town of Penfield can be attributed to rising water levels from the Penfield Bay, Lake Ontario, and the Seneca River. All three municipalities represented at the meeting have trouble spots where drainage regularly blocks stormwater management infrastructure.

Next Steps:
The following next steps were discussed at the meeting:

- Municipal staff will complete the set of worksheets. Tetta Tech staff will remain available to answer questions or provide assistance.
- Municipal representatives will identify organizations and events for outreach regarding the mitigation planning process.

The next Planning Committee Meetings will be conducted at the Town of Webster Office of Environmental Management (OEM) on August 29, 2016.

For any further questions, Mr. Sudlow and Mr. Slocum thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:30 a.m.
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 20, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Meeting:
Municipal Meeting - 8 of 8
Location:
Town of Brighton, Town Hall, Eastchester, New York

Attendees:
Mike Ouyon, Town of Brighton
Chad Rosson, Town of Brighton
Chuck Marsden, Town of Hennefer
Kathy Zita, Town of Pittsford and Village of Pittsford
Paul Schenkel, Town of Pittsford
Tom Sabots, Tita Tech, Inc. (Tita Tech)
Emil Schuck, Tita Tech

Purpose:
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Monro County Hazard Mitigation Planning process and for Tita Tech staff to gather information from municipal representatives.

Discussion Points:
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the meeting.

Mr. Marshall arrived near the end of the meeting. Tita Tech staff interviewed him after the meeting to gather information related to the discussion points he missed. His responses are incorporated into the applicable sections below.

Major Incidents and Their Impacts:
The representatives present at the meeting discussed the major hazard incidents and the impact on their respective municipalities. No major events stood out to the attendees, with the exception of Mr. Marshall who stated that snow events in the last 2 years seemed especially bad.

Problem Areas:
The town representatives discussed the major problem areas in their respective municipalities.

Village of Pittsford has several railroad crossings. The Town of Pittsford has one crossing, and the Town of Brighton has three at grade crossings. The main line runs through the Town of Pittsford. The Town of Pittsford and Village of Pittsford each have a few overhead crossings. Citizens are concerned about CSX's inspection program for these crossings. Dead trees along the rail lines could fall and block the tracks.

The electrical infrastructure lacks clear. Attendees reported having difficulty getting Rochester Gas and Electric (RG&E) personnel to address the infrastructure. RG&E's response to emergency incidents is slow. This was not an issue before the company was bought.

MEETING NOTES

The Town of Brighton has a few flood-prone areas, but the Town has significantly reduced flooding by installing several absorber and reseal areas. The Town is a Municipal Separate Stormwater System (MS4) community with regional stormwater management facilities. In the Town of Brighton, flooding is no nuisance ponding.

In the Town of Pittsford, the Monroe County Water Authority town may be training.

In the Town of Hennefer, flood problems usually occur along Jefferson Road, Colfax Road, and Lehigh Station Road (where culverts go under the roadway). Power lines are located in all development that occurred since the 1970s. There are five railroad crossings off CSX lines on the west shore of the Town. The Lakeville, Lounis, and Avon Railroad have six crossings through the Town, but only one view each day.

Projects Completed:
Town representatives present at the meeting summarized mitigation projects that have been completed in their respective municipalities. All projects are included in the meeting report. The attendees are requested not to discuss the meeting realigned with issues relating to an agent in the Town of Hennefer. The Town of Brighton and Monroe County upgraded some culverts along Monroe Road. The Town of Brighton has added some stormwater management improvements to Monroe Avenue and Clover Street. Brighton has good results with getting elevation certificates and amending the floodplain maps to remove structures from the floodplain.

The Town of Pittsford focuses on regular maintenance. The Town checks dams from the creeks in the Town, and just finished Evergreen Creek. The Town of Pittsford has established requirements for 39% of open space to be developed in the floodplain and 20-foot setbacks. The Town of Brighton has added some stormwater management improvements to Monroe Avenue and Clover Street. Brighton has good results with getting elevation certificates and amending the floodplain maps to remove structures from the floodplain.

Questions on Worksheets:
None had no questions on the worksheets.

Outlook:
The representatives discussed the mitigation outreach initiatives conducted in their respective communities.

The Town of Pittsford has a Town website, and sends emails to address events to approximately 6,000 to 6,500 e-mail addresses (35,000 residents) in 2 times per week. The Town publishes a quarterly newsletter sent to all homes in the Town. The Town Facebook page has over 660 likes. Direct mailings are sent to all residents about flood disaster pickup, hazardous waste pickup, and major projects. The Town shares access to cable channel 12, and has a newsletter column in the Brighton-Pittsford Post.

The Town of Hennefer has a website. Its Facebook page has 2,300 fans (out of 40,000 residents). A quarterly newsletter is sent to residents, as well as direct mailings to send them about special projects.
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No further questions. Mr. Rubino and Ms. Grubman thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 3:00 p.m.
MEETING NOTES

Date: August 25, 2014
Time: 9:00 a.m. — 10:45 a.m.

Location: Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY

Attendees:
- Frederick Rice, Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (MOEM)
- Tom Dungan, Monroe County
- Jason Kennedy, Monroe County Department of Environmental Services (MDES)
- Bill Ford, MDE
- Michelle Vito, MDE
- Tom Gochenour, Monroe County Department of Planning
- John Rice, Monroe County Department of Public Health
- Shane Speck, Monroe County Department of Public Health
- Jen Hetzel, Monroe County Department of Public Safety
- Justin Cole, Monroe County Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Scott Smith, Monroe County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO)
- Richard Kestner, Monroe County Water Authority (MCWA)
- Brad Smith, MCWA
- Michael Stalnaker, Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOOT)
- Chad Ronder, Town of Brighton
- John LaRosa, Village of Brockport
- David Miller, Village of Brockport
- Dawn Forte, Town of Chili
- Paul Robinson, Village of Churchville
- Nancy Steeneman, Village of Churchville
- Fred Hahn, Village of Honeoye Falls
- Joan Lococo, Village of Lodi
- Greg Emerick, Village of Honeoye Falls
- Louise Johnson, Village of Honeoye Falls
- Kent Bonam, Town of Greece
- Gregory D. Miana, Town of Greece
- Tom Tette, Town of Penfield
- Mike Baker, Town of Penfield

MEETING NOTES

Purpose:
The purpose of the Planning Committee Meeting was to review the hazards of concern that will be outlined in the Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HM). This meeting is intended to: 1) Review the Hazard section of the plan.

Discussion Points:
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the Planning Committee Meeting.

Outreach:
- At the meeting, attendees were asked to review the draft plan and make comments to be included in the final document. Attendees were asked to share any potential hazards that were not addressed in the plan.

Notes from the meeting will be available on the Monroe County website.

MEETING NOTES

Review of the Municipal Meetings

Mr. Lubbock reviewed the hazards of concern with the Planning Committee. Though some hazards do not affect the City and very much, they will be included in the HMP to meet Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements.

Civil Emergencies

- Power outages from extreme weather conditions are a major concern in the region.
- Stormwater management issues cause flooding problems in many jurisdictions.
- Flooding from the Black River is an issue.
- Many homeowners have connected their sump pumps into their sewer connections, which overloads the sewage treatment infrastructure during periods of heavy rain.

Notes from the meeting will be available on the Monroe County website.

Hydraulic Materials

Since 2010, 47 flood events have occurred in the County, 4 of which resulted in Presidential Disaster Declaration. Flooding is expected within the 10-year and 20-year annual average floodplains, including along the coast of Lake Ontario. Flooding is also caused by ice jams, dam failures, and heavy rain (flood events). A flood in the Town of Rush occurred just a few months ago. In the 1920s, the Town of Penfield and the Village of Penfield (200 feet of floodwater from the bottom of the Erie Canal). Stormwater runoff that enters the Canal increases the risk of flooding from the Canal. The coast of Lake Ontario is extremely sensitive to fluctuations in the water level of the 34.5-mile lake in the future.

According to the National Weather Service, since 1960, flooding in the County has caused approximately $4.4 million in reported property damage. Some type of flooding occurs in the County every year.

Hazards and Materials

Since 2010, approximately 40 hazardous material incidents have occurred in the County. Most were handled by the local fire department. However, 3 of the 40 incidents required some level of response by the County. Hazardous material incidents occur at fixed facilities or roadside. Impacts of a release of hazardous material include environmental contamination, road closures, property damages, and cleanup costs. For security reasons, the HMP will not show the location of the hazardous facilities, except for the Great Nuckel Power Plant. The HMP will identify the area of the underground material from the plant. Monroe County is outside of the 10-mile plant exposure pathway emergency planning zone (EPZ), but parts of the County lie within the 10-mile underground emergency pathway EPZ.

Information:
The interagency interaction of the HMP will focus on the: 1) water system bore, the true emergency, Loch for the spin name (Lynne Disease), and recreation (exposure to West Nile Virus). The water system bore is a logging site within the County, and state laws are at risk of selling on public lands during storms. The true emergency caused such crop damage in 2012 that the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued an disaster declaration to help farmers recover. Lynne Disease field tests have been increasing over the last few years. The density of ticks and the proportion carrying Lyme Disease have increased. Between 2012-2013, four cases of IEN in humans and one case in a horse were reported in the County, though incidence of IEN in the County is now very.
MEETING NOTES

The Town of Verona identified the Great-Hopewell as an issue in the Town of Verona, Bay, and reported that the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC) is monitoring the plant.

Landslides
Small landslides reported in the County have affected one structure each in 1993, 1997, 1998, and 2004. The Lake Ontario shoreline and bluffs are especially vulnerable to landslides due to undercutting. Landslides may result in structure collapse or expose underground utilities.

Severe Storms
The severe storm hazard encompasses hail, wind, lightning, thunderstorms, tornadoes, and hurricanes and tropical storms. A total of 38 severe storm events have occurred in the County since 2010 alone. Five of the County’s Presidential Disaster Declarations were made in response to severe storm events. Since 1994, 3 tornadoes, 28 hurricanes, $500 million in reported property damage, and $1.6 million in reported crop damage have resulted from these storms. Severe storms may also down trees and power lines, resulting in widespread outages. The County can expect severe storms every year.

Severe Winter Storms
Severe winter storms include heavy snow, blizzards, and ice storms. A total of 14 major winter storm events have occurred in the County since 1999. Four of the County’s Presidential Disaster Declarations were made in response to severe winter storm events. Approximately $1.1 billion in property damage, and $6.5 million in crop damage has been reported from these storms. Winter storms also result in traffic accidents and travel delays.

Generally, the County receives no snow each year that predation is not overly concerned about snowfall. Firefighting efforts are a major problem in the County.

Tornadoes
One incident of tornadoes is on record as directly affecting the County. In 2014, a man was arrested for trying to support OSS and attempting to murder government officials. Government facilities and critical infrastructure are most vulnerable to tornadoes.acts of terrorism can result in fatalities, injuries, property damage, and disruption of operations. The likelihood of a tornado incident is difficult to quantify.

The tornado profile is the HMP will include an examination of cyberterrorism and agricultural terrorism.

Utility Failures
Utility failures, which include power outages, are generally caused by other hazards. Since 2010, a total of 26 storm events have caused power outages in the County. Monroe County was included in the Presidential Disaster Declaration for the Northeast Blackout of 2003. Utility failures can result in the failure of heating and cooling equipment, communications systems, food spoilage, and basement flooding when power fails during a storm or flash flood event and sump pumps are not operational.

Wildfires
Since 2010, a total of 14 wildfires have occurred in the County. According to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC), 99% of all wildfires are caused by human activity. The Town of Greece and City of Rochester have the most wildfires in the County. Locations near a large manmade and wooded area in the river gorge.
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Wednesday, August 26, 2015 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Review Results of Municipal Meetings
4. Review Hazards of Concern
   a. Civil Unrest
   b. Drought
   c. Earthquake
   d. Extreme Temperature
   e. Flood
   f. Hazardous Materials
   g. Infestation
   h. Landslide
   i. Severe Storm
   j. Severe Winter Storm
   k. Terrorism
   l. Utility Failure
   m. Wildfire
5. Next Steps
   a. Complete worksheets by August 31, 2015
   b. Provide reports and plans
   c. Vulnerability assessment
   d. Need Planning Committee Meeting – Vulnerability Assessment
   e. Risk Assessment Public Meeting
6. Questions
Purpose
The purpose of the Planning Committee meeting was to review the vulnerability assessment of the hazards of concern. This meeting aligns with the ‘Assess the Problem’ step of the mitigation planning process.

Discussion Points

Outreach
Mr. Ron reported that he spoke about hazard mitigation and the plan update at a Village Mayor’s Association meeting, at the Council on Governments (COG) meeting, and at a meeting of the Lucas County Planning Committee (LCPC).

He has also regularly posted to the County Office’s Facebook page about the HMP update process, and is in discussion with the Town Supervisors’ Association to include the HMP update in their meeting agendas.

Mr. Stokoski reported that he spoke to the Chamber of Commerce about the HMP update. He will send a copy of the meeting agenda and other documentation to Mr. Subbaswamy.

Review Vulnerability Assessment
Mr. Subbaswamy reviewed the results of the vulnerability assessment for the hazards of concern. He noted that the assessment for the flood and severe storms hazards is not complete due to a delay in obtaining data from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The vulnerability assessment for these two hazards will be presented to the Planning Committee at the October 2015 meeting. Mr. Subbaswamy also noted that the information provided during the meeting is a high-level summary of the hazard analysis. The full analysis can be found in the hazard profile documents, which Terra Tech will post to the project website within the next 2 weeks.

Civil Unrest
Injuries or fatalities would only be expected if a protest, march, or rally became violent. If that occurs, any building near the crowd could be vulnerable to damage. Critical facilities such as municipal buildings, schools, or other government facilities may be targeted. The economy of the entire county will be jeopardized by this hazard, because it may result in people not being able to work or spend money at businesses near the locations involved.

Drought
The entire population is vulnerable to a drought, which is considered a non-structural or lesser risk hazard. Firefighting capability may be reduced during drought. There would be no direct impact to structures; however, buildings may be more vulnerable to wildfires. There are 247 farms in the county, with a total area of 79,978 acres. A drought would have a severe impact on the agricultural economy of the county.

Earthquake
The county’s entire population is exposed to the effects of an earthquake. Urban areas are more vulnerable than rural areas due to the increased number of buildings. The elderly and individuals below the poverty line are more vulnerable than other segments of the population.

The vulnerability assessment for the earthquake hazard was conducted using FEMA’s House software. Hazards identifies areas of low risk as vulnerable to the earthquake hazard. Over 420,000 people in Illinois (6.6% of the population) reside in or near soft soils. There are 754,000 buildings present on these soils (91.0% of the total number of buildings in the county). A total of $17,113 million in property replacement cost, along with 1,170 critical facilities, are located on these soft soils.

According to Harris, a 500-year Mean-Retum Period (MRP) earthquake event would destroy 153 households and 1,103 people would need shelter. There would be 444 injuries, 78 hospitalizations, and 129 deceased persons expected from this hazard, depending on the time of day in which the earthquake occurred. The County can expect $33.6 million in property damage, with $9.3 million in insurance loss. Most critical facilities would experience damage to moderate damage, with delays of service for up to 30 days. The 500-year MRP earthquake would generate 56,800 tons of block, debris, and 32,288 tons of uncontrolled debris. Mr. Ron reported that the county does not have a debris management plan in place.

Extreme Temperatures
The entire population is vulnerable to this hazard. The elderly, ill, infants, and children who cannot afford heating/cooling are especially vulnerable. Over-exertion is also a possibility during extreme heat or extreme cold.

Economic impacts can occur from a loss of business while repairs are completed, as well as the cost of the repairs themselves.

Hazards Materials
Because hazardous materials mishaps can occur in varying degrees from fixed facilities or in transit, the entire county is vulnerable to a hazardous materials incident. Injuries and fatalities may occur from exposure to the spilled chemicals. Structures may be inaccessible, contaminated, or damaged from a resulting fire or explosion.

Infestation
The infestation hazard includes the spread of vector-borne illnesses (VBI) from mosquitoes, so the entire population is at risk to this hazard. Individuals 65 years of age and older are most susceptible to VBI, and one in every seven people in the county fall into this group. Structures are not directly vulnerable to the infestation hazard. However, insects (particularly the eastern tent caterpillar) will still cause trees, which could then fall onto structures.

The Extended Axis Corridor was discussed during the meeting in August 2015 as particularly damaging in the County. The issue of traffic has associated with this area in recent times which add significant acute, increased density, and increased land use. The United States Department of Agriculture modeled the spread of the Emerald Ash Borer, and found that the duration to affect the need to replace 17 million ash trees across 25 states, at a cost of $12.7 billion.

Other effects of infestations include crop loss, and a decrease in the value of the timber in the area.

Mr. Sharp pointed out that Lyme disease from ticks is a health issue in the County than is from mosquitoes, and asked Terra Tech to incorporate the information. Mr. Sharp provided the current hazard level.

Landslide
Landslides: “Landslide” is the name given to the movement of land, and is also used to describe high, moderate, or low. Landslide “susceptibility” is a function of the slope and geology, and is also related to high, moderate, or low. For the HIIP, the areas of the County identified as vulnerable to landslides are those areas with a moderate level of susceptibility, or with a high incidence of moderate susceptibility.

In the moderate-susceptibility areas, there are over 230,000 people, nearly 72,000 buildings, and $11,71 billion in property replacement cost. In the low-susceptible/moderate-susceptible areas, there are over 316,000 people, nearly 106,000 buildings, and $83,358 billion in property replacement cost. About 1,591 critical facilities would be exposed.

Severe Winter Storms
Severe winter storms include heavy snow, blizzards, and ice storms. Because these events are regional in nature, the entire County is vulnerable. These events bring with them increased risk of traffic accidents, movement (from snowdrifts, etc.), and hypothermia, and also a decrease in emergency response capabilities. All buildings in the County are exposed to severe winter storms, representing $50,743 billion in replacement cost. Critical facilities may lose functionality, and loss of business will result from these events.

Tornadoes
Due to the population and property distribution, urban areas are more vulnerable to tornadoes than rural areas. All buildings in the County are exposed to the tornado hazard, either as direct targets or by collateral damage from an event. The exposure factors vary depending on the size and other characteristics. Urban centers, such as institutional buildings, have the highest risk of collateral attack.

Utility Failures
Utility failures focus on power outages, but also include water main breaks, loss of communications, and other events. The entire population is vulnerable to utility failures. Power outages can result in food spoilage,carbon monoxide exposure from running portable generators. Water bodies can be affected, and lack of access to potable water. Individuals who are dependent on electric powered medical equipment are especially vulnerable. Expected losses from utility failures include the cost of replacing spoiled foodstuffs, and the costs incurred by community service groups in assisting vulnerable populations.

Utilities
The utility corridor focuses on the utility-urban interface. The area is made up of the interface (where urban areas and industrial areas border each other) and the interior (where some development has occurred within urban areas). Nearly 9,000 people reside in these areas. Over 35,000 buildings are present in these areas, representing $26.2 billion in property replacement cost value.

Next Steps
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:

• Municipalities will compile and submit the HMP worksheets as soon as possible.
• Municipalities and stakeholders will identify and share any reports, plans, or other strategic documents relevant to the HMP and mitigation projects.
• Terra Tech will conduct the vulnerability assessment for the flood and severe storms hazards.
• The October 2015 Planning Committee meeting will be held from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on October 20, 2015. The vulnerability assessments for the flood and severe storms hazards, and the updated mitigation goals and objectives will be reviewed during this meeting.
• A public meeting to review the risk assessment will be conducted in the evening of October 20, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Subbaswamy and Mr. Ron thanked the attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:20 a.m.
Outreach
- Officials involved in the Reassessing Process
- Organizations contacted
- Presentations defined

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Drought
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of water resources
  - Infrastructure failure
  - Historic events
  - Water resources

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Fire
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of fire resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Flooding
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of flood resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Hurricane
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of hurricane resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Tornado
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of tornado resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Severe Winter Storm
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of severe winter storm resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Tuberculosis
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of tuberculosis resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Earthquake
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of earthquake resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Extreme Temperatures
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of extreme temperatures resources
  - Historic events

Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Disease outbreaks
  - Inadequate planning and implementation of disease outbreaks resources
  - Historic events

Contact:
Fred Van
413-250-2600

Tony Link
413-250-2600

Next Steps
- Complete Workshops
- Publish Reports and Plans
- Next Planning Committee Meeting
  - Date: October 26, 2015
  - Time: 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM
- Risk Assessment Workshop Meeting
  - Date: October 26, 2015
  - Time: 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM

Questions?
Thank you for your time!
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Agenda
Wednesday, September 23, 2015 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Review Vulnerability Assessment
   a. Civil Unrest
   b. Drought
   c. Earthquake
   d. Extreme Temperatures
   e. Hazards/Weaknesses
   f. Infection
   g. Landslide
   h. Severe Winter Storm
   i. Terrorism
   j. Utility Failure
   k. Wildfire
4. Next Steps
   a. Complete worksheets
   b. Provide reports and plans
   c. Head Planning Outreach Meeting
      i. Flood and Severe Storm Vulnerability Assessment
      ii. Goals and Objectives
   d. Risk Assessment Public Meeting
5. Questions
**MEETING NOTES**

**Purpose**
The purpose of the Steering Committee meeting was to review progress on the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update, and to review the participation status of the County’s municipalities and stakeholders.

**Discussion Points**
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the Steering Committee meeting.

**Outreach**
Mr. Ron reported that he spoke about hazard mitigation and the plan update at a Village Mayor’s Association meeting, at the Council of Governments (COG) meeting, and at a meeting of the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC). He also spoke regularly at the Monroe County’s Facebook page about the HMP update progress, and is in discussions with the Town Supervisor’s Association to include the HMP update in their meeting agenda.

Ms. Daugherty reported that she discussed the HMP update at a meeting of the Irondequoit Bay Technical Staff on August 27, 2015.

**Review Status of Worksheet Completion**
Mr. Sublio reviewed the Worksheet Completion Status handbook with the group. The handbook shows the worksheets completed by each municipality. Mr. Sublio also mentioned that the documents provided by Mr. Ron are discussed in the HMP, and that any future Worksheet Completion Status handbooks include the documents as applicable.

Mr. Ron will reach out to the municipalities that have not yet completed their worksheets. Municipalities will be asked to return their worksheets within 15 to 14 days.

Dr. Hall asked which worksheets, if any, the college should complete. Mr. Sublio stated that it would be beneficial to the planning process for the college to complete Worksheets 1, 4, and 7. Dr. Hall will review Worksheet 2 to see if the college can offer technical expertise in any of the areas listed on the worksheet.

---

**Reference: Planning Committee Minutes**

During the meeting, the Planning Committee members pointed out that while the worksheets indicated that there are two villages in East Rochester and a Village of East Rochester, there is only one municipality. It is a municipality, Town and Village, and is generally identified as a Village. Notes will adjust planning materials accordingly.
MEETING NOTES

Next Steps
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:

- Mr. Ron will reach out to municipal representatives to solicit them to complete and submit their worksheets within 10 to 14 days.
- Municipalities and stakeholders will identify and share any events, plans, or other strategic documents relevant to the HMP and mitigation projects.
- Tetra Tech will complete the vulnerability assessment for floods and severe storms.
- A Steering Committee meeting will be held in mid-October to identify the goals and objectives for the updated HMP.
- The OCMF 2012 Planning Committee meeting is scheduled from 8:00 AM to 11:00 AM on October 20, 2015.
- A public meeting to review the full risk assessment will be conducted on October 20, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Sibbio and Mr. Ron thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 11:50 AM.

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, September 23, 2015 | 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Review Status of Worksheet Completion
4. Review Planning Participation
5. Schedule
6. Next Steps
   a. Complete worksheets
   b. Provide reports and plans
   c. Complete Vulnerability Assessment – flood and severe storm
   d. Next Steering Committee Meeting – Conference Call
      i. Goals and Objectives
      ii. October 14, 2015
   e. Next Planning Committee Meeting
      i. Vulnerability Assessment and Goals and Objectives
      ii. October 20, 2015
   f. Risk Assessment Public Meeting – October 20, 2015
7. Questions and Concerns

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE – Worksheet Completion Status
The following table shows the worksheets that have been submitted by each jurisdiction as of September 18, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Worksheet 1: Events and Losses</th>
<th>Worksheet 2: Community Research</th>
<th>Worksheet 3: Mitigation Cost and Risk</th>
<th>Worksheet 4: Risk Mitigation Plan</th>
<th>Worksheet 5: Plan Integration</th>
<th>Worksheet 6: Plan Implementation</th>
<th>Other data or information provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CENP and Stormer Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chili</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Churchville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Clarkson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of East Rochester</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Fairport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Owasco</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hazleth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Marvinia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Milton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Monroe Falls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Newfane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Niskayu</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Palmore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Parma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Parkfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pavilion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pittsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Pittsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Prattsburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Heat Sweep Plan, Cold Sweep Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status

The following table shows the jurisdictions that have participated in the project, as of September 18, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Submitted Worksheets</th>
<th>Attended Meetings Hazard</th>
<th>Planning Committee – Hazard Profile 08/18/15</th>
<th>Planning Committee – Vulnerability Assessment 09/13/15</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Brockport</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chili</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Churchville</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Clarkson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of East Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Fairport</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hamlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Henrietta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Honoraque Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Irondequoit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moore County HMU Update – Participation Status
As of 09/18/15

### Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status

The following table shows the stakeholder agencies that have participated in the project, as of September 17, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakesholder</th>
<th>Attended Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Fire</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rochester International Airport</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itrist2012</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County Community College, Agricultural and Health Sciences Institute</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County Water Resource Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Water Bureau</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-Genesee Regional Transportation Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toms River Cable</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moore County HMU Update – Participation Status
As of 09/18/15
The purpose of the Planning Committee meeting was to complete the review of the vulnerability assessment and to review the mitigation goals and objectives set by the Steering Committee for the update plan. This meeting aligned with the “Assess the Problem” and “Set Goals” steps of the mitigation planning process.

Discussion Points
Discussion points addressed during the Planning Committee meeting are summarized below.

Outreach
Mr. Subba and Mr. Ron informed the group that outreach letters have been sent to the school districts, neighboring counties’ planning committees, and the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, and Monroe County’s fire district commissioners. Mr. Scovill informed the group that the Village of Webster has added a link to the project website in their village website.

Mr. Steedman reported that the Village of Churchville will be conducting a meeting for property owners in the floodplain to discuss flooding issues along Black Creek, and to determine mitigation measures for residents.

Review Vulnerability Assessment
Mr. Subba reviewed the results of the vulnerability assessment for the flood and severe storms hazards. He noted that Tek-Tech was not able to obtain certain flood data for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Consequently, the vulnerability assessment for the flood and severe storms hazards was completed using available data.

The updated plan will include an action to incorporate updated flood data in the next vulnerability assessment. Mr.

Goals and Objectives
Mr. Subba then reviewed the set of updated mitigation goals and objectives that will be included in the HWP. Mr. Ron pointed out that although the new goals are different than the existing plan’s goals, the new goals encompass all of the existing goals, and are aligned with the current New York State HWP.

During the discussion of the new goals and objectives, Mr. Godbole shared the benefits being in the Community Rating System (CRS) program. Mr. Pratt discussed and Mr. Ron reiterated the assistance that the American Red Cross can provide in promoting personal and family preparedness (Objective 4.4).

The Planning Committee unanimously accepted the new goals and objectives, which include separating Protections Structures in Hazard Areas (Objective 2.3) from Protecting Non-essential Loss Properties (Objective 3.3).

Next Steps
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:

- Municipalities will complete and submit the HWP workforms as soon as possible.
- Municipalities and members will identify and share reports, plans, or other strategic documents relevant to the HWP and mitigation projects.
- A joint meeting was arranged to discuss the assessment process in churchville at the Churchville Fire Hall.
- Tek-Tech will begin to develop a hydrological analysis and work with jurisdiction representatives to complete them.

With no further questions, Mr. Subba and Mr. Ron thanked the attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

Subba also noted that the information provided during the meeting is a high-level summary of the hazard analysis. The full analysis can be found in the hazard profile documents, which Tek-Tech has posted to the project website.

Flood
Mr. Subba reviewed the results of the vulnerability assessment for the flood hazard. The 1% annual chance flood is expected to affect 51,174 people, and cause $44.6 million in damage to structures and contents of $2,670 buildings. There are 46 critical facilities within the 1% annual chance flood zone. This flood scenario will generate 65,000 tons of debris.

Tek-Tech did not conduct a detailed analysis of expected damages in the 0.2% annual chance floodplain, however, there are 28,079 people, 4,264 buildings with a replacement cost value of $75.5 million, and 55 critical facilities within that floodplain. Mr. Subba pointed out that the 0.2% annual chance floodplain includes the 1% annual chance floodplain.

Mr. Subba then reviewed the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) statistics for Monroe County. As of June 30, 2013, 1,610 NFIP policies were in effect in the county, 1,108 of which are in the 1% annual chance floodplain. There have been 556 NFIP claims since 1978, with $3.1 million in insurance payments.

Mr. Subba then discussed repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties. Repetitive loss properties are those with less than 2% of fence insurance payments and 1% of claims in any 10-year period since 1978. In Monroe County, there are 227 repetitive loss properties that are those groups in any 10-year period since 1978, have received four or more NFIP claims payments over $5,000 each, or less or more payments for which the cumulative amount of the building is less than 10% of the 1% annual chance floodplain. Therefore, this floodplain is considered a repetitive loss area. The Towns of Macedon, Brighton, Webster, and Gates each contain one additional repetitive loss area. These repetitive loss areas are comprised of single structures or a group of structures that have flood damage from stormwater runoff.

Mr. Godbole, of the Town of Greece, stated that he believed that the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) identify less than one-fifth of the “actual” floodplain. He reported that many NFIP policies are in effect in the “actual” floodplain. Currently, the Town of Greece requires developers to delineate the floodplain as part of their permit applications.

Severe Storms
The severe storms hazard includes hail, wind, lightning, thunderstorms, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Tropical storms. Based on the Monroe County’s history, the county can expect 0.4 million in crop damage and $12,000 in crop damage from severe storms each year. Due to the nature of the hazard, every structure in the county is vulnerable to some extent. The risk model for this hazard, which was based on wind alone, showed no expected damage for the 100 year or 50 year wind-Return Period (RPR) events. These events were associated with maximum wind gusts between 40 and 50 miles per hour.
MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Planning Committee Meeting – Vulnerability Assessment and Goals & Objectives

AGENDA
Tuesday, October 28, 2014 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Review Vulnerability Assessment
   a. Flood
   b. Severe Storms
4. Goals and Objectives
   a. Existing
   b. Updated
5. Next Steps
   a. Complete worksheets
   b. Provide reports and sites
   c. Risk Assessment Public Meeting
   d. Next Planning Committee Meeting – Mitigation Actions
   e. Develop jurisdictional areas
6. Questions

Review Vulnerability Assessment

- Flood
- Severe Storms

Outreach
- Outreach
- Review Vulnerability Assessment
- Flood
- Severe Storms

Questions?
Thank you for your time!
**New Goals and Objectives**

These new goals and objectives are aligned with the New York State HAP goals and objectives.

Goal 1: Coordinate hazard mitigation programs that affect the county

Objective 1.1: Develop and maintain multi-jurisdictional coordination efforts related to hazard mitigation

Objective 1.2: Develop and maintain partnerships with external federal, state, municipal, and stakeholder agencies that have a role in hazard mitigation

Objective 1.3: Track and/or recommend local, county, state, and federal legislation and regulations related to hazard mitigation

Goal 2: Prevent hazards from impacting life, property, and the environment

Objective 2.1: Develop and maintain local plans that reduce vulnerability to hazards

Objective 2.2: Develop and maintain local plans that reduce vulnerability to hazards

Objective 2.3: Improve the county’s stormwater management systems

Goal 3: Protect life, property, and the environment from hazard impacts

Objective 3.1: Encourage homeowners, renters, and businesses to secure their properties against all hazards, including flood coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)

Objective 3.2: Acquire, relocate, elevate, and/or retrofit existing structures located in hazard areas

Objective 3.3: Acquire, relocate, elevate, and/or retrofit properties located in flood-prone areas

Objective 3.4: Encourage local participation in the Community Rating System (CRS) Program

Objective 3.5: Maintain emergency response capability

Goal 4: Increase public awareness of hazards, their impacts, and ways to reduce vulnerability

Objective 4.1: Increase public awareness of hazards, their impacts, and ways to reduce vulnerability

Objective 4.2: Conduct a coordinated public information program related to hazards and their impacts throughout the county

Objective 4.3: Encourage residents to implement hazard mitigation and preparedness measures on their properties

Objective 4.4: Promote personal and family preparedness

Goal 5: Protect, preserve, and restore the functions of natural systems

Objective 5.1: Encourage the use of green and natural infrastructure

Objective 5.2: Coordinate with local, county, state, federal, international, and other stakeholder agencies to maintain natural systems, including wetlands, parks, and reserves and coastal areas

1 Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Goals and Objectives

---

**Existing Goals and Objectives**

Goal 1: Reduce vulnerability to life safety threats

Objective 1.1: Increase public awareness by identifying ways to increase public knowledge of threats and preparedness measures

Objective 1.2: Enhance public awareness and notification systems

Goal 2: Reduce property and economic losses

Objective 2.1: Increase public awareness

Objective 2.2: Enhance public awareness and notification systems

Objective 2.3: Identify appropriate insurance for vulnerabilities

Objective 2.4: Identify protective measures

Goal 3: Keep emergency plans current

Objective 3.1: Review plans for accuracy

Objective 3.2: Maintain resource databases and contacts

Objective 3.3: Acknowledge and practice within county risk and regulatory requirements

Goal 4: Maintain readiness for an effective and safe response

Objective 4.1: Provide state-of-the-art training programs and equipment for Public Safety providers

Objective 4.2: Identify needs in the public safety infrastructure

Objective 4.3: Coordinate resources for effective and efficient response

Goal 5: Expedite the recovery process

Objective 5.1: Identify and deploy resources

Objective 5.2: Ensure accurate and timely communication with the public

Objective 5.3: Promote neighbor helping neighbor concepts

Goal 6: Strive to be “the best we can be”

Objective 6.1: Seek professional accreditation

Objective 6.2: Continue personal and professional development opportunities

Objective 6.3: Seek additional community partnerships

Objective 6.4: Inform municipal officials about activities and assist their support

Objective 6.5: Seek funding sources to assist program goals and objectives

---

**Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Goals and Objectives**
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MEETING NOTES

Purpose
The purpose of this meeting was to review the results of the risk assessment with the general public, and to solicit input on the National Standard Risk Assessment process.

Discussion Points
- Although public notice of the meeting was distributed via email invitations to the towns, villages, and other stakeholder groups associated with Monroe County, the email list included the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management and the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (CEMA) Facebook page, no residents attended the meeting. Mr. Ron and Mr. Subba waited until 6:15 p.m. to verify that no residents would attend.

Next Steps
- Ms. Ron and other Planning Committee members will promote the project website, which will contain information about the HMP and the planning process. Additional public meetings will continue to be advertised by multiple methods to encourage resident participation in the HMP update.

AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Risk Assessment Review Public Meeting
Agenda
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 | 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

1. Welcome
2. Review Risk Assessment
   - Civil Unrest
   - Drought
   - Earthquakes
   - Extreme Temperatures
   - Floods
   - Hazardous Materials
   - Infestations
   - Landslides
   - Severe Storms
   - Severe Winter Storms
   - Terrorism
   - Utility Failure
   - Wildfires
3. Next Steps
   - Next Planning Committee Meeting – Mitigation Actions
4. Questions
**Review Risk Assessment**

- **Introduction**
  - Hazard
  - 2015 flood risk management program
  - NREAP (Non-Residential Emergency Preparedness Act)
  - Public education
  - Community awareness
  - Planning
  - Property damage
  - Financial costs
  - Legal consequences

- **Hazards**
  - Floods
  - **continued**
    - Flooding increases with climate change
    - Effects on infrastructure
    - Economic impacts
    - Transportation
    - Security
  - **continued**

- **Mitigation**
  - Mapping
  - Planning
  - Public engagement
  - Property damage
  - Financial costs
  - Legal consequences

- **Questions?**
  - Thank you for your time!

**Next Steps**

- **Real estate marketing strategies**
  - Poster, brochure, advertisement
  - Web-based tools
  - Social media
  - Public engagement

**Contacts**

- Contact information

---

**MEETING NOTES**

- **Meeting**
  - Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Project: Risk Assessment
  - Planning Committee Meeting

- **Date**
  - November 20, 2015
  - Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

- **Location**
  - Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, New York

- **Participants**
  - Krysta Daugherty, Program Specialist, Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (MCEM)
  - Tina Cadeo, Monroe County 9-1-1
  - Michelle Lepper, Monroe County Department of Environmental Services (MDES)
  - Jodi Fournier, Monroe County Department of Planning and Development
  - Eric Annemans, Monroe County Department of Public Health (MCPH)
  - Kathy Camacho, Emergency Management Coordinator, Monroe County (MCEM)
  - Charles May, Monroe County Department of Public Health (MCPH)
  - Sean Stengel, Monroe County OPR
  - Justin Gonsalves, Monroe County GIS
  - Rodney Cooney, Monroe County Office of Mental Health
  - Bennet Hackett, Monroe County Parks Department
  - Jeff Conley, Monroe County Sheriff's Office
  - Los Taranacwski, Monroe County Sheriff's Office
  - Michael Silvestri, Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT)
  - Chad Roscoe, Town of Brighton
  - Dawn Forrester, Town of Chili
  - Paul Robinson, Village of Churchville
  - John DeSantis, Village of Chili
  - Bill Moore, Village of Fairport
  - John Gahr, Town of Greece
  - Jason Hall, Town of Greece Police Department
  - Tom Mullin, Fire Marshal, Town of Webster
  - Mike McNally, Village of Hilton
  - Greg Emerson, Administrator, Village of Honeoye Falls
  - Charlie Johnson, Code Enforcement Officer, Village of Honeoye Falls
  - Steven Scarlette, Building and Development Coordinator, Town of Fairport
  - Greg Saffield, Town of Penfield
  - Kelly Olm, Town of Pittsford
  - Jeff Smith, Village of Pittsford
  - Katie Adams, Village of Pittsford
  - Michael Safford, Village of Pittsford
  - Stephen Belz, Battalion Chief, City of Rochester Fire Department

---

**SIGN IN**

- Name
- E-mail
- Telephone
- Residence Municipality
- Age Group
- Organization

---

**MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT**

- Risk Assessment
  - Planning Committee Meeting
MEETING NOTES

Purpose
The purpose of the Planning Committee meeting was to discuss FEMA's strategy for identifying mitigation actions to include in the updated MHP. This meeting aligns with the 'Review Possible Activities' step of the mitigation planning process.

Discussion Points
Discussion points addressed during the Planning Committee meeting are summarized below.

Outreach
The Planning Committee reported no outreach efforts. The Village of Churchville's meeting with property owners to discuss flooding issues—discussed during the October Planning Committee Meeting—had to be canceled.

Mitigation Actions
Mr. Sobeck introduced himself and the role in the GCEO's division of FEMA Region II. He discussed the FEMA RiskMAP program and its goal of identifying areas vulnerable to flooding. He described the planning process and the ways the process can be used to help a community implement its strategy. Mr. Sobeck introduced his role and how the residents could help implement the strategy. The residents were encouraged to provide feedback to the GCEO's Division of FEMA Region II.

Mr. Hode welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated that copies of his slides would be provided via email after the meeting. He discussed the efficiencies realized in developing multi-jurisdictional HMPP, differences between an updated MHP and a newly created MHP, and the concept of planning versus the plan document itself. He stated that he had reviewed the County's mitigation goals and objectives, and said that they look appropriate to him.

MEETING NOTES

AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Planning Committee Meeting – Mitigation Actions

Meeting

Thursday, November 19, 2015 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

1. Welcome

2. Outreach

3. Mitigation Actions
   a. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Presentation
   b. Categories

4. Next Steps
   a. Outreach Plan
   b. Annex Workshops
   c. Next Planning Committee Meeting – Mitigation Strategy Review
   d. Public Meeting – Mitigation Strategy Review

5. Questions

With no further questions, Mr. Subillo thanked the attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 11:00 a.m.
Mitigation Strategy Workshop Notes

Hazard Mitigation Planning
A Workshop for Updating your Mitigation Strategy
Monroe County, NY 11/19/15

Welcome!
FEMA Region II has prepared this workshop to present the key points needed for the county and each city, town and village to prepare or update their mitigation strategy. Notice that I say “your” mitigation strategy because each jurisdiction is unique, and the mitigation strategy for each jurisdiction should be unique. In fact, it is appropriate to think of this multi-jurisdictional plan as separate plans for each jurisdiction.

Working together saves tax dollars through the sharing of a single consultant. Placing all the plans together in one binder allows common elements identical to all the plans to be included only once. Some of the common elements include the documentation of the planning process and the general profiling of hazards that affect the entire county, such as severe storms. The unique elements are each jurisdiction’s vulnerabilities and the actions each jurisdiction will take to reduce these vulnerabilities.

The mitigation strategy is the section in the hazard mitigation plan where goals are set, the mitigation actions selected by each jurisdiction are listed, and the basic elements of the plan for implementing each mitigation action is noted. To keep the body of the plan more focused and readable, the details captured in Action Worksheets can be included in an Appendix.

A two-hour workshop can only cover the essential points in brief. A more thorough explanation is available in FEMA’s publications, Local Mitigation Planning Handbook. You are encouraged to review the Handbook: [http://www.fema.gov/tools-library/natural-disasters/5198573-7206](http://www.fema.gov/tools-library/natural-disasters/5198573-7206) [Beyond the Basics](http://www.fema.gov/). For information from the FEMA Handbook online in a more user-friendly format. This web site is designed by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) to help guide local communities through the process of developing or updating their local hazard mitigation plan. In addition to covering the material from the FEMA Handbook, it includes additional material on best practices and addresses weaknesses or shortcomings commonly found in hazard mitigation plans. Suggestions are given on ways plans could be strengthened, hence the name, Beyond the Basics.

It is important to keep the mitigation plan in perspective. It is a means to an end. FEMA’s overarching goal for mitigation is to encourage and assist communities in becoming more resilient to the effects of natural hazards. Resilient communities are less vulnerable to losses and are able to recover faster. Mitigation plans can also be an important part of making a community more resilient. Well thought-out plans that get implemented include actions that address specific problems or vulnerabilities, and actions that will integrate mitigation into daily governance.

Addressing current problems and vulnerabilities is important, but the integration of mitigation into daily operations should not be underestimated. Changes in policies, procedures, and plans (such as revised zoning and land use plans) will pay dividends decades to come. We will be talking about both types of actions during this workshop.

A Few Basics

Let’s set the stage for today by reviewing some basic items. We will go over how a multi-jurisdictional plan compares to a single jurisdictional plan, how an updated plan compares to the previous or original mitigation plan prepared by a jurisdiction, and how planning differs from the plan itself, which is a written document.
The Multi-Jurisdictional Plan is an effort to develop separate plans for each jurisdiction participating in the plan's development, with all these plans being combined under one cover to take advantage of the grant overlap at risk among jurisdictions in the same general geographical area. Combining the planning effort also allows each jurisdiction to follow the same planning process (public outreach) once the parameters are set as a single planning committee.

However, multi-jurisdictional plans only work when they recognize the uniqueness of each jurisdiction, each city, town, and village is unique. You have to plan for that at the mitigation plan. The integration of plans, such as mitigation plans being integrated with land use plans, supports both planning efforts and increases the likelihood of their mutual implementation.

Each jurisdiction also has its own unique set of capabilities (strengths & limitations), unique vulnerabilities (been areas specific to the jurisdiction, and structure & jurisdiction at particular risk). This all leads to the identification of unique problems with unique solutions.

This is why it is critical that each jurisdiction contribute in a meaningful way to the identification and selection of mitigation actions that will make their community more resilient.

Updated Plans vs. Ongoing Plans

- Updated Plans
  - Include new projects, repair projects, and new mitigation projects.
  - Include new criteria for the evaluation of projects.
  - Update the list of completion dates for all mitigation projects.
  - Update the list of past projects in some cases.

- Ongoing Plans
  - Identify current projects, repair projects, and new mitigation projects.
  - Include new criteria for the evaluation of projects.
  - Update the list of completion dates for all mitigation projects.
  - Update the list of past projects in some cases.

All the requirements for an original plan apply to the updated plan. There must be an outreach to the public, a draft (i.e., updated assessment of risk), and all likelihood received set of mitigation actions. In addition, updated plans must report on the status of actions identified in the previous plan on the contract, the effort to reduce development on vulnerable sites, and project in a manner that the plan would affect vulnerabilities. Updated plans must also list and best information available to assess risk and the documentation of the planning process will be new because this is a new planning effort. Updated plans should stand on their own. They are new plans.

**Goals**

There are no wrong goals; the best goals guide the selection of mitigation actions. Goals which are very general may not provide enough guidance, unless they are supplemented by objectives.

Confirm your goals and objectives before selecting mitigation actions.

**Actions / Action Plan**

After confirming or revising your goals, follow this common sense thought process and document this process using the Action Worksheet. We will be going over today.

These are logical steps you intuitively do in your head when working on a small problem at home: a weekend project. For an extensive project and its more deliberate and systematic planning, a more formalized process is necessary to meet federal planning requirements, but it is still the same common sense process. A deliberate process gradually paces prioritizing the first step that comes to mind when a better solution might exist. While these thoughts are often the first, the extra time required to think does not require a great deal of time.
The planning process requires assessment of local capabilities. This is for concurrency:

1. First, communities act anticipated to go beyond their capabilities when developing the number of mitigation actions to take and the amount of work required to carry out those actions.
2. Second, steps taken to strengthen local capabilities are mitigation actions.

Capabilities are existing authorities, policies, programs, and resources, which are sometimes called “planning mechanisms.” This slide includes a generic list of capabilities that local communities might have. Documenting municipal and county capabilities is a plan requirement.

- Plans: Comprehensive plans, rezoning or land use plans, or Master Plans — when issuing the plans, more community has, because for their formal name. Assumed some pressure on
- Policies: Others that indicate who is to be in the community to develop applications.
- Ordinances — For example, the zoning code.
- Programs — again the National Flood Insurance Program will be among the programs cited for most communities in New York State.
- Studies — give the name of studies that have been completed or are underway.
- Staffing / Equipment — skills, abilities, the number of staff, and equipment.
- Financial Resources — could be the annual budget, taxing authority, etc.

The description of local capabilities provides a foundation for mitigation planning. It can describe what amounts are already in place to manage risk and allows small jurisdictions with limited resources and capabilities to distinguish themselves from larger and more capable communities. Since each jurisdiction is unique, their capabilities are unique and should be documented in the plan jurisdiction by jurisdiction. A generic list of capabilities is not appropriate.
- Consider your critical facilities. Are they sufficiently protected? Critical facilities can be thought of as facilities that need to be operational during and immediately after a hazardous event. Remember, NYS requires mitigation actions for any critical facility that has ever sustained flooding. Critical facilities should be protected to a 500-year flood event.

- Vulnerabilities also will change when a well-known development or changes in land use occur. Consider the effect of new development and whether mitigation actions should be taken. Also consider what new development is planned in hazard prone areas and whether this development should go forward and if so, can mitigation measures be both designed into the construction.

- Are there locations that have been damaged more than once? Give these locations special consideration. Particularly consider how NHPI properties that have been repeatedly damaged might be mitigated. Consideration of “Repetitive Loss Properties” is a federal planning requirement.

- Finally, do your best to not overlook hazards that occur less frequently, but nevertheless you need a plan. There is often little awareness of these immense disasters, when they occur.

Summarize the general assessments of risk by describing specific vulnerabilities or problems facing your community. It is this summary that converts the general risk assessment to a specific risk assessment.

**Vulnerabilities Summarized as Problem Statements**

This slide provides examples of a few problem statements, but let’s look at problem statement in more detail.

---

- After identifying problems it’s a moment to make sure no other problems were overlooked. For example, when completing the Risk Assessment portion of the plans hazards of concern were identified by you. If the hazard is truly of concern, then there likely will be a problem statement under that hazard. This is not a requirement, but it makes sense. Perhaps in hindsight the hazard is not truly of concern and the Risk Assessment should be revised accordingly.

- Problem statements are the starting point for deciding on mitigation actions. The process includes identifying potential alternative mitigation actions, evaluating these potential actions, and selecting the best action to address the problem. The Action Workshop is the place to determine if the actions considered and why they were or were not selected for implementation.

- Before identifying mitigation actions, let’s review how mitigation actions differ from other types of emergency management actions.

**Mitigation Actions - Defined**

Mitigation actions (as defined by federal regulations) are different from other emergency management actions, such as emergency preparedness actions and emergency response actions. The official definition of mitigation actions is provided on the slide. Mitigation actions should be specific actions/projects/activities. For example, elevating or acquiring a home for removal is a mitigation action.
Step 3 is to evaluate the potential actions. Step 4 is the result of the evaluation, the selection of the best action or project. These steps are repeated together since they are closely tied to each other.

### Evaluate Potential Actions

The evaluation of potential actions is the process used to select the best action or project for a given problem. The evaluation criteria used are unique to the jurisdiction, except that federal requirements state that benefits versus costs of a mitigation action must be considered. Normally, many other factors should be used as well.

In comparing costs versus benefits, rough estimates may be used. FEMA refers to this as a Benefit-Cost Review to distinguish it from a formal Benefit-Cost Analysis (B/C). When applying the formal Benefit-Cost Analysis may be required but it is not a requirement when preparing a hazard mitigation plan.

As the reason for not selecting a project because apparent, document this consideration by adding a note on the Action Worksheet next to the potential action. This will complete the required documentation that a range of potential actions was considered.

### Benefit-Cost Review

Benefits are the savings from losses avoided. For example:
- Lives saved / injuries avoided
- Structural damage avoided
- Business downtime avoided (or any negative impacts from the loss of a function)
- Additional costs avoided, like avoiding long-term or avoiding emergency management costs.

Costs are the total cost for the action or project. For example:

- Pre-construction costs and non-construction costs like design costs
- Construction costs
- Ancillary costs like permit and review fees
- Administrative costs

Costs are not just the cost to the jurisdiction (e.g., the match for a grant). They are the total cost.

### Other Considerations

- Technical feasibility
- Political support
- Legal authority
- Environmental impacts
- Social - positive or negative
- Willing & Able to improve Resilience
- Other Community Objectives

In addition to considering the benefits and costs, other factors should be considered:

- Technical - is it technically feasible
- Political - will the public support the action? Is there political will to implement the action?
  - Communities may want to include an action even if political will is currently lacking. Political will often changes immediately following a disaster and if the project is in the plan, it can be quickly endorsed and implemented. Where money was not previously available, it may be made available.
- Legal Authority - is this action or project something that you have the legal authority to do? If it is up to some other entity to take the mitigation action, then the action for the municipality might be to encourage them to take this mitigation action.
- Environmental Impacts - obvious negative impacts could be a flood plain. Even if not obvious, many mitigation actions may require environmental reviews as the project is developed. There could also be positive environmental impacts from some actions, such as storm restoration that improve recreational fishing.
- Social - positive social impacts are good, like creating a park as a floodplain by removing structures located there. Actions could also be negative, like adversely affecting one segment of the population or nearby neighborhoods.
- Willing & Able - is there a local champion for the project? Is the jurisdiction or responsible department administratively able to take on this project?
- Other - Communities are unique and may want to consider other factors.

The evaluation process is straightforward. Decide on your evaluation criteria and be sure to include an assessment of benefits and costs in the selection.

After the evaluation and selection of the best solution for mitigating the process, complete the appropriate sections of the worksheet. For potential actions considered but not selected, provide a very brief comment on why.

The action selected should be documented on its own row on the worksheet. Here a more extensive description should be given. The action should be specific. It should be clear when the action has been completed. Give the selected action a unique number and name, and summarize the benefits and costs, and any other criteria of special significance.

In the end make sure that the mitigation action selected represents a real solution for a real problem.

### Evaluate an Action

- Identified & Evaluate Potential Actions
- Selected best action for implementation
- Document Rejected Actions Consideration
- Action Worksheet
- Document Action for Implementation
- Check Service Provider Information
- Check the action using the adjuster
- Amend service provider information
- Ensure service provider information is complete

The 5th and final step is preparing for implementation.
An Action Plan is the final element of a Risk Management Strategy. It is a brief administrative plan for implementation. The required elements are:

- **Responsible Organization/Agency:** An agency or department must be named to oversee the implementation. Most actions or projects fall within the purview of an agency or department. If this organization will periodically provide status reports, it should be named here.

- **Revised Financial Plan:** The revised financial plan for the project/program must be attached to this plan. The plan should include a detailed description of the project and its elements.

- **Local Planning Mechanism:** This mechanism is used by local jurisdictions to manage land use development and community decisions-making, such as comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, and other long-range plans. These plans and other documents can be used to advance implementation actions. If necessary, multiple localities can use this flowchart mechanism that will be used to facilitate implementation of a mitigation action.

Some examples will illustrate the point.

**Planning Mechanisms are governance structures used by local jurisdictions to manage land use development and community decisions-making, such as comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, and other long-range plans. These plans and other documents can be used to advance implementation actions. If necessary, multiple localities can use this flowchart mechanism that will be used to facilitate implementation of a mitigation action.**

Where possible, the community should implement mitigation actions through existing plans and policies, which already have the support of the community and policymakers. The Action Worksheet has a space to name the local planning mechanism to be used in implementation.

For example, if the action selected for implementation was “Increase Culvert Size on Silver River,” then on the line for local planning mechanism you might have: “Add this project to the capital improvement plan.” Other examples are included on the slide.

**Up to this point in the worksheet we have been focused on mitigation actions that address specific problems. These are very important and the Action Worksheet was designed to accommodate these projects.**

Integration Actions are another important type of mitigation action. These actions are used to leverage integration, alignment, and coordination among existing planning mechanisms. They may integrate mitigation with the fabric of governing. For example, when appropriate, mitigation goals may be aligned with the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan or its capital improvement plan. Integration Actions do not go on an Action Worksheet because they are fairly simple to implement. They should be included in the plan as a simple list. An explanation of why Integration Actions are important and simple listing of Integration Actions follow on the next slide.

**Integration increases efficiency and avoids conflicting outcomes.**

At the end of the planning process, existing plans, studies, and reports should be leveraged to determine what information they contained should be incorporated into the hazard mitigation plan. Now that the Hazard Mitigation Plan is nearly complete, the final consideration should take place: that community remains eligible for certain mitigation grants. At that time the status of each action from this plan will need to be summarized in the updated plan.
Functionally Diverse Jurisdictional Planning Team

FEMA Region II and/or NYSGEM require that each local jurisdiction invite the participation of their elected officials, local land use planners, and planning consultants, if applicable; local emergency management (fire, police and airport) officials; local hazard mitigation coordinator and floodplain administrator; local code enforcement officers; local highway superintendent/public works director; and local engineers for engineering consultants, if applicable.

These jurisdictional personnel will be summarizing the specific problems that their jurisdiction faces. For each problem they will develop and assemble (evaluate) a range of potential mitigation actions before selecting the final mitigation actions for implementation. The important prerequisite items they bring to the table are as follows:

- **Electrical and service officials** are mindful of the community as a whole and communicate how the mitigation plan can support other critical services or infrastructure needs for the community.
- **Local community planners** can help the jurisdiction understand past, current, and future community development trends, the policies and activities that affect development, and the relationship between hazards and development, and how hazard mitigation can be incorporated into various planning mechanisms, as a key to successful mitigation planning.
- **Emergency managers** are first responders to disasters, have information on past occurrences and existing preparedness measures, and have a direct line of communication with the NYS Office of Emergency Management.
- **GIS operators** can analyze and map data to support the planning process and communicate complex information, such as the locations of areas at risk in flooded prone areas and estimates of damage for a particular disaster scenario. [This might be done in consultation with County GIS staff.]
- **Floodplain administrators** provide information on local flood hazard maps, floodplain delineation, repetitive loss properties, and actions to conform compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and reduce flood losses.
- **Public works officials** can help identify structural and nonstructural solutions for the community’s infrastructure that can be addressed through capital improvements supported by the mitigation plan.

---

5 County’s representatives should include Hazard Mitigation Coordinators and Floodplain Professionals; County Emergency Managers, Planners, and GIS staff; representatives from County Soil & Water Conservation Districts; and representatives of the Department of Transportation Planning Organizations.

FEMA Region II requires that a portion of the plan (e.g., plan appendix) document that discussions were extended. A Sample Table at the end of this Guidance could be used for this purpose. It is understood that not all participating jurisdictions have such a position filled, and that some individuals may be multiple and/or part-time duties in smaller communities. At a minimum, staff, stakeholders, and leaders in these key jurisdictions at the jurisdictional level should be aware of the Hazard Mitigation Plan and engaged in the planning process when possible.
A Guide for Identifying Integration Actions

Introduction:

Hazard Mitigation Plans analyze risk, identify vulnerabilities (problems), and propose mitigation strategies (actions) to reduce risk. The mitigation planning process also points to possible interagency coordination and collaboration. The incorporation of mitigation strategies with local decision-making, other agencies, etc., can be beneficial, and this process by which local governments will bring about that integration/inclusion. The recommended way of meeting this requirement is by bringing integration actions into the planning process. The list of actions in a multi-jurisdictional plan would be community by community.

The intent of this plan requirement is that each community capitalizes on available mechanisms at their disposal to accommodate mitigation actions and reduce risk. Each community has its unique experiences in working with mitigation strategies, and the integration actions will vary accordingly.

Examples:

- The format for listing integration actions is optional. Examples of integration actions in an acceptable format for single and multi-jurisdictional plans follow.

For a single jurisdictional plan:

**Integration Actions**

- Planned Actions to Incorporate Mitigation into the Daily Decision-Making

Emergency Response Plan – The estimated frequency of tested events and their worst-case scenarios developed by the Emergency Management Plan will be added to the Emergency Response Plan as an appendix.

Water Management Plan – Planned flood mitigation actions and their intended effect will be described in the Water Management Plan.

**Footnotes:**

1. Integration of mitigation can be described as the routine consideration and management of hazards in a community's existing planning framework – that is, the collection of plans, policies, codes, and programs that guide development in a community. These are maintained and implemented, and the roles of people, agencies and departments in existing and updating these are described through Community Guidance, FEMA, March 3, 2013.
Table 3.1
Integration Actions
Planning Actions to Incorporate Mitigation into Early Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Planned Integration Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Alpha</td>
<td>Emergency Response Plan - The estimated frequency of historic events and their worst case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes developed by the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be added to the Emergency Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan as an appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater Management Plan - Planned flood mitigation actions and their intended effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>were evaluated in the environmental assessment report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Bette</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance - A policy will be established for reviewing the zoning ordinance each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updated Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are adopted by the Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan - The Hazard Mitigation Plan goals for protecting the Village’s most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vulnerable citizens will be added to the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Superintendent Job Description - The Highway Superintendent’s job description will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be updated to include flood mitigation, protecting a village needs from severe hazards, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an area of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Committee Ordinance - The Village will use the Hazard Mitigation Plan to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>floodplain management actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Zeta</td>
<td>Great Appraisals - Items and maps will be used as supporting documentation in great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plans - Mitigation goals and actions will be incorporated into the Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building &amp; Zoning Code - Prior to land use, zoning changes, or development permits the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will review the Hazard Mitigation Plan and other relevant analysis to ensure consistent and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compatible land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Economic Development - The County Economic Development Committee will utilize the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identification of hazard areas when assisting new businesses in finding a location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Plan - The hazard identification and profiling from the Hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Plan will be incorporated into the County’s Emergency Preparedness Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Plan - The Hazard Mitigation Plan will be used as a resource for the development of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future Fire Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three-Year Capital Program - The consideration of new capital projects will include the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consideration of a potential project’s effect on Community resilience to hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There will be a mitigation criterion added to the other criteria applied when making capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budget decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great Lakes Coastal Resilience Planning Guide

The Great Lakes Coastal Resilience Planning Guide shows how coastal communities are using science-based information to address coastal hazards such as flooding, shoreline erosion, and lake-level fluctuations. This new online resource connects people with the tools and data needed to consider natural hazards and climate change in local planning efforts.

The planning guide features the following resources:

- **Local Stories** - Learn what’s happening in Great Lakes communities, information ranges from news articles to outreach materials.
- **Case Studies** - Discover specific solutions and tested strategies communities are applying to land use and zoning concerns, habitat and environmental protection issues, and infrastructure planning needs.
- **Maps, Data, and Tools** - Access geospatial data, tools, applications, and Web map services available in the region.
- **People and Organizations** - Connect with others working to address coastal hazard and climate change impacts in the region.
- **Events and Funding** - Identify events and funding sources related to coastal resilience and hazards.
- **Climate and Environment** - Learn about the Great Lakes and its coastal hazards and climate.
- **Library** - Uncover relevant publications that include legal and regulatory documents, best practices, ordinances, comprehensive plans, and more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Kreher</td>
<td>RERTR</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>dkreher.myths.com</td>
<td>664-0313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hene</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703-7115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Matt</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>309-367270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Ammonet</td>
<td>Health Dept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231-985700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Clae</td>
<td>Town / Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703-476211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Vieris</td>
<td>P&amp;Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>309-756-7283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Robb</td>
<td>Town / Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703-756-7283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Wivel</td>
<td>R &amp; T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703-756-7283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McHenry</td>
<td>Village of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>309-756-7283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Sheets</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>703-756-7283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEETING NOTES

Purpose:
The purpose of the Steering Committee meeting was to review progress on the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update, examine the participation status of the County’s municipalities and stakeholders, and discuss evacuation, shelter, and temporary housing issues.

Discussion Points:
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the Steering Committee meeting.

Outreach:
Mr. Ron discussed the community meeting held in the Village of Churchville on December 10, 2015. Approximately 20-25 people were present, but only a few attended. The meeting was held to raise awareness of the flood risk in the area. The Village is working on creating a plan to protect homes near the Black Creek, which are threatened by flooding. The Village also discussed the potential for a flood warning system.

Review Status of Worksheet Completion:
Mr. Subbio reviewed the worksheet completion status with the group. It is anticipated that the worksheets will be completed by the end of the year. The Steering Committee members are aware of the status and will be monitoring the progress.

Review Planning Participation/Non-participating Jurisdictions:
Mr. Subbio reviewed the participation status of the municipalities. The Towns of Mendon and Ogden have not participated in the planning process to date. The Town of Rush and Sweden are represented at the planning committee meetings.

Evacuation Routes:
Mr. Subbio discussed the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (NYSDHSES) requirement to identify the evacuation routes in each jurisdiction and to ensure that they are clear and accessible. The HMP may also include a reference to evacuation plans that include the information. Mr. Ron stated that the County works with the American Red Cross (ARC) as the County’s sheltering agent. ARC identifies and certifies facilities for use as emergency shelters.

Temporary Housing:
Mr. Subbio discussed the NYS DHSES requirement to identify areas that can be used for temporary housing of residents following a flood event. These areas can include dormitories at local colleges or universities, or large areas where temporary housing can be provided. The Steering Committee requested that identifying these areas and collecting the information required by NYS DHSES be included as a mitigation action in the updated HMP. The County will incorporate this information into the Evacuation Plan.

Schedule:
Mr. Ron asked when the HMP would be available for adoption by the County Legislature. Mr. Subbio stated that the plan would be ready for approval by the County Legislature. The Steering Committee and Planning Committee will review and finalize the draft before submission for approval.

Next Steps:
The following next steps were identified:
- Mr. Ron and Mr. Subbio will work with representatives of the Towns of Mendon, Ogden, Rush, and Sweden to ensure the plan is reviewed by the County Legislature.
- Each jurisdiction will identify mitigation actions for inclusion in the plan.
- Tetra Tech will work with the jurisdictions to complete their portions.

AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Steering Committee Meeting

Monday, December 14, 2015 | 8:30 – 10:30 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Review Status of Worksheet Completion
4. Review Planning Participation
5. Non-participating Jurisdictions
6. Evacuation Routes
7. Temporary Housing
8. Schedule
9. Next Steps
   a. Identify mitigation actions with each jurisdiction
      i. Finalize jurisdictional actions
      ii. Finalize mitigation actions
   b. Next planning committee meeting
      i. Review Mitigation Strategy
      ii. December 16, 2015
   c. Mitigation strategy public meeting
      i. Next planning committee meeting
      ii. Review draft
10. Questions and Concerns
### Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status

The following table shows the jurisdictions that have participated in the project, as of December 4, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Submitted Worksheets</th>
<th>Planning Committee Meetings 07/29/13</th>
<th>Municipal Meetings 06/10/13-07/09/13</th>
<th>Planning Committee Hazard Mitigation Workshops 08/20/13</th>
<th>Planning Committee Vulnerability Assessment 08/21/13</th>
<th>Planning Committee Vulnerability Assessment 09/05/13</th>
<th>Mitigation Solutions Workshops 11/14/13</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lotian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schoharie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Delmar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Canajohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Stohnen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of East Rochester</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Fairport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Goshen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lenox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Milton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Cohoes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Oriskany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Victorian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Nunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status
As of 12/04/13
### MEETING NOTES

**Meeting**
Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Annex Workshop II

**Date**
December 15, 2015

**Location**
Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY

**Attendees**
- Chad Roos, Town of Brighton
- Nancy Soule, Village of Churchville
- Fred May, Village of Gates
- Chuck VanHorn, Town of Henrietta
- Mike Louden, Village of Hilton
- Mikel Meehan, Village of Hilton
- Greg Siegel, Town of Penfield
- Eric Williams, Town of Pittsford
- Jody Clark, Town of Pittsford and Village of Penfield
- Debbe Campbell, Town of Riga
- R. C. Oden, Village of Scotland
- Justin Sullivan, Village of Spencerport
- Wil Graham, Village of Webster
- Joe Smiley, Village of Webster
- Jay Coon, Town of Chili
- Terry Reeth, Town of Wheatland
- Tony Dubke, Tech Data. Inc. (Tech Data)

### Purpose
- The purpose of the Annex Workshop was to review the layout of the jurisdictional annexes and answer Planning Committee members' questions regarding completing the annexes. This was the first of two identical workshops.

### Discussion Points
**This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the workshop.**

#### Jurisdictional Annex Layout
- The HMP Point of Contact section should list the primary and alternate individuals responsible for development of the annexes that will serve the planning committee for the next 5 years.
- The Municipal Profile section describes the jurisdiction based on existing data and the information provided on the New Development Worksheet.

### Action Worksheet
- Mr. Subbotin provided a copy of Tech Data's version of the Action Worksheet, which Paul Herold from FEMA Region II discussed at the November 2015 Planning Committee meeting.
- Mr. Subbotin suggested that Tech Data staff will work with each jurisdiction to ensure that the Action Worksheets are completed. The Action Worksheets will be included at the end of each jurisdictional annex.

### Next Steps
- The following next steps were identified during the meeting:
  - Each jurisdiction will identify mitigation actions for inclusion in the plan.
  - Tech Data will work with the jurisdictions to complete their annexes.
  - The December 2015 Planning Committee meeting will be held from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on December 18, 2015.
  - A minor revision to the presentation schedule will be made subject to the actions of December 18, 2015.
9.1 MUNICIPALITY NAME

This section presents the jurisdictional extent for the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

9.1.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact

The following individuals have been identified as the hazard mitigation plan’s primary and alternate points of contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Point of Contact</th>
<th>Alternate Point of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME ADDRESS PHONE</td>
<td>NAME ADDRESS PHONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.2 Municipal Profile

PUT TOGETHER A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE MUNICIPALITY — INCLUDE THE SIZE OF THE MUNICIPALITY (SQUARE MILES), THE 2010 CENSUS, UNINCORPORATED AREAS, AND BORDERS OF WATER. ALSO INCLUDE ITS LOCATION WITHIN THE COUNTY AND WHAT MUNICIPALITIES BORDER IT.

Growth/Development Trends

The following table summarizes recent residential/commercial development since 2010 and any known or anticipated major residential/commercial development or major infrastructure development that has been identified in the past five years within the municipality. Refer to the map in Section 9.1.1 of this plan which illustrates the hazard areas along with the location of permitted new development.

The MUNICIPALITY NAME did not note any recent residential/commercial development since 2010 or any major residential or commercial development, or major infrastructure development planned for the next five years in the municipality.

Table 9.2-1. Growth and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Name</th>
<th>Type of Use (Residential, Commercial, Infrastructure)</th>
<th># of Units or Structures</th>
<th>Location (within municipality)</th>
<th>Known Hazard Zone(s)</th>
<th>Description/Status of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property 1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Zone A</td>
<td>Developed but subject to flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property 2</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>Zone B</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.3 Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality

Monroe County has a history of natural and man-made hazards as detailed in Volume 1, Section 5.0 of this plan. A summary of historical events is provided in each of the hazard profiles and includes a chronology of events that have affected the County and its municipalities. For the purpose of this plan update, to the extent possible, all events that have occurred in the County were summarized to indicate the range and impact of hazards that occurred in the community. Information regarding specific disasters is included if available, based on reference material or local sources. This information is presented in the table below.

Table 9.2-2. Hazard Event History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Event</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>FEMA Identification #</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>County Impacted</th>
<th>Description of Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-11-28</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA-365</td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>Flooding event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-12-21</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA-365</td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>Flooding event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.4 Hazard Vulnerabilities and Ranking

The hazard profiles in Section 5.9 of this plan have detailed information regarding each plant participant’s vulnerability to the identified hazards. The following summarizes the hazard vulnerabilities and their ranking in the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

For additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction, refer to Section 5.0.

Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

The table below summarizes the highest vulnerability rankings of potential hazards for the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

Table 9.2-3. Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard Type</th>
<th>Estimated Probability of Occurrence (within the Hazard Area)</th>
<th>Probability of Occurrence (Probability of Impact)</th>
<th>Hazard Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Facilities

The table below presents 1AUSG-3M estimates of the change and loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of a 1- and 0.2-percent annual chance flood events.

Table 9.2-4. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Exposed</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>0.1% Expected</th>
<th>0.2% Expected</th>
<th>0.2% Incremental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section 9.4 MUNICIPALITY NAME

Other Vulnerabilities Identified

The municipality has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community:

- Tsunamis
- Earthquakes
- Wildfires
- Flooding

EXCLUDE INFORMATION IDENTIFIED IN THE FS FOR FLOODING AREAS IN THE MUNICIPALITY

Section 9.5 MUNICIPALITY NAME

9.1.5 Capability Assessment

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Planning and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability
- Community classification
- National Flood Insurance Program
- Integration of Mitigation Planning into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms

Planning and Regulatory Capability

This table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available to the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool / Program</th>
<th>Code (Reference Plan)</th>
<th>Capabilities (Venn Diagram)</th>
<th>Authority (Local, County, State, Federal)</th>
<th>Dept / Agency Responsible</th>
<th>Code Citation and Comments (Code Chapter, name of plan, explanation of authority, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Disaster Recovery Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Recovery Planning Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regulatory Capability

Building Codes
- Zoning Ordinance
- Code Enforcement
- code enforcement
- code enforcement

Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Resources</th>
<th>Available or Eligible to the MUNICIPALITY NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development activities (Code CR101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG-DR Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees for services, such as electric service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fees for infrastructure and development of new facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-agency agreements with other municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of revenue bonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal or State Funding Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Acquisition Funding Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Classifications

The table below summarizes classifications for community programs available to the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Code (Applicable)</th>
<th>Classification (Code)</th>
<th>Date Classified (Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Rating System (CRS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Rating</td>
<td>(CRS-000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection (USD) Fire Protection Classes</td>
<td>3-5 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster/Relief Programs for Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations with Mitigation Focus (emergency, recovery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education Program/Outreach (through outreach, social media)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classifications listed above relate to the community's ability to provide effective services to lessen its vulnerability to the hazards identified. These classifications can be viewed as a measure of the community's capabilities in all phases of emergency management (preparation, response, recovery, and mitigation) and are used as an underlying parameter for determining the cost of various forms of insurance. The CRS class...
Self-Assessment of Capability

The table below provides an approximate measure of the MUNICIPALITY NAME’s capability to work in a hazard mitigation capacity and effectively implement hazard mitigation strategies to reduce hazard vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Low/Moderate Mitigation Capability</th>
<th>Moderate Mitigation Capability</th>
<th>High Mitigation Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Mitigation Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Technical Capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability (regional mitigation into buildings, parks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Flood Insurance Program

NAME. TITLE

ADDS FROM PDF HERE

Resources

ADDS FROM PDF HERE

Compliance History

ADDS FROM PDF HERE

9.3.6 Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization

This section discusses past mitigation actions and notes, describes proposed mitigation initiatives, and prioritizes.

Past Mitigation Initiative Status

The following table indicates progress on the community’s mitigation strategy identified in the 2010 Plan. Actions that are carried forward as part of this plan cycle are included in the following subsections in their own table with prioritization. Previous actions that are now on-going programs and capabilities are indicated as such in the following table and may also be found under ‘Capability Assessment’ presented previously in this section.
Table 9-2: Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Required Participation</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Priority Score (1-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Improve flood resiliency</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations Training</td>
<td>Increase community preparedness</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Emergency Management Department</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness Campaigns</td>
<td>Inform residents about disaster risks</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Mapping</td>
<td>Enhance property protection</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all entries are in the table format.

Risks:
- The project has potential for benefiting the community.
- The project has potential for reducing the impact of hazards.
- The project has potential for increasing the community's resilience.
- The project has potential for improving the community's preparedness.

Sustainability:
- The project has potential for sustainability in the long term.
- The project has potential for community involvement.
- The project has potential for public engagement.

Future Work:
- Continued monitoring of the project's progress.
- Regular evaluations of the project's effectiveness.
- Ongoing community engagement.

Notations:
- The project is a collaboration between multiple agencies.
- The project is supported by community volunteers.
- The project is in compliance with local regulations.

Conclusion:
- The project will have a positive impact on the community.
- The project will improve the community's resilience.
- The project will enhance the community's preparedness.

Table 9-3: 2018 Mitigation Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Next Step</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement new flood control措施</td>
<td>County Planning Department</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete community warning system</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expand emergency response protocols</td>
<td>Emergency Management Department</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A: Additional Information

Additional details on the project's scope, timeline, and budget are available in the project's comprehensive report.
9.1.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.1.8 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the MUNICIPALITY NAME that illustrate the probable areas impacted within the municipality. These maps are based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this plan, and are considered to be adequate for planning purposes. Maps have only been generated for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies, and for which the MUNICIPALITY NAME has significant exposure. These maps are illustrated in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume 1 of this Plan.

9.1.9 Projection/Limitations

None at this time.
### GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Objectives Met</th>
<th>Est. Benetits</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop and implement an enhanced natural hazard, public outreach, education, and mitigation training program on natural hazard risks and what to do in the wake of a large-scale earthquake.</td>
<td>All Hazards</td>
<td>Town/Village</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Municipal Budget: FEMA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain compliance with floodplain management by implementing and enforcing floodplain management requirements to ensure that new and substantially improved constructions are not located in known flood plains.</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Municipal Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Objectives Met</th>
<th>Est. Bnetits</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support all participants in county-wide initiatives to build local and regional mitigation and risk-reduction capabilities (see Section 3.3, specifically):</td>
<td>All Hazards</td>
<td>Town/Village/</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Municipal Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Objectives Met</th>
<th>Est. Benetits</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement the mitigation of vulnerable structures via the retrofit (e.g., seismic, flood-proofing) or acquisition and relocation to reduce them from future damage (e.g., flood loss).</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Municipal Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Objectives Met</th>
<th>Est. Benetits</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implement the mitigation of vulnerable structures via the retrofit (e.g., seismic, flood-proofing) or acquisition and relocation to reduce them from future damage (e.g., flood loss).</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Municipal Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Objectives Met</th>
<th>Est. Benetits</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implement the mitigation of vulnerable structures via the retrofit (e.g., seismic, flood-proofing) or acquisition and relocation to reduce them from future damage (e.g., flood loss).</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Municipal Budget</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONROE COUNTY 2015 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN
Mitigation Action Worksheet

Guidance to Complete the Mitigation Action Worksheet

The following provides additional guidance on how to complete the Mitigation Action Worksheet. If you have any questions, please contact Tom Smith at ts@monroecountywa.gov or 360-792-4750 or afsten@stellalaw.com at 715-545-3580 or Tom Tech.

Assessing the Risk

Hazard(s) addressed: Please enter the hazard or concern you are mitigating. For this plan, the hazards of concern identified for the County are:

- Drought
- Earthquakes
- Extreme Temperatures
- Flooding
- Infestation
- Lavaflow
- Sudden Storms (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning, and tornadoes)
- Sudden Water Storms (hurricane surge, floods, ice storms)
- Wildlife
- Civil Unrest
- Hazardous Materials Incidents
- Terrorism
- Utility Failure (power, water, communications)

Specific problem being mitigated: Please describe the specific problem being mitigated.

Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects

Actions/Projects Considered: Please consider different options to mitigate the problem identified. One alternative is always to accept the current level of risk (tolerate the vulnerability/problem) by deciding to take no action at this time.

Please include the name of the action considered and a brief reason as to why the action was not selected. The remaining columns document the consideration of these alternatives.

Action/Project Intended for Implementation

Description of the Selected Project: Please provide a brief description of the selected project.

Mitigation Action Type:

- Local Plans and Regulations (JPUR): These actions include government authorities, policies, or codes that influence the way land and buildings on lands are developed and built.
- Structure and Infrastructure Protection Plan (SIP): These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazardous area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct new structures to reduce the impact of hazards.
- Natural Areas Protection Plan (NAPP): These are actions that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve and restore the function of natural systems.

Guidance to Complete the Prioritization Table

Complete this table to help evaluate and prioritize each mitigation action being considered by your municipality. Please enter into the criteria below risk, vulnerability, and prioritization scores for each action. For each criterion, enter a score of 1.0 for the highest impact, 0.5 for moderate impact, and 0.0 for low or no impact. The priority rating is the product of the three scores.

- Risk: 0 = Very Low; 1 = Low; 2 = Medium; 3 = High
- Vulnerability: 0 = None; 1 = Low; 2 = Moderate; 3 = High
- Prioritization: 0 = Not a Priority; 1 = Low Priority; 2 = Medium Priority; 3 = High Priority

Potential Funding Source: Please identify the anticipated funding source, which could be “Grant funding” or “Local cost share.” Sources may include federal, state, and local sources.

Timeline for Completion: < 5 years

Reporting on Progress:

For the current planning period, this section does not need to be filled out. Each jurisdiction will have to update this section for each of its actions in an annual basis, prior to the annual Planning Committee meeting, at section 7 (Plan Maintenance) of the HMP.

Please provide a status update for the selected action project. Along with this description, please indicate if the action project is complete or not completed. Actions which are not complete may be denied with a national withheld (i.e., project deemed unfeasible). Other incomplete actions should be clearly indicated as continuing, indicate percent complete, and identify any feasible efforts to revise or change in schedule. Even actions that have had no progress to date can be identified as continuing. For any action that is not yet complete and will continue, always consider modifying the action to promote implementation.
MEETING NOTES

Meeting
Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Annex Workshop IC
Date
December 13, 2015
Time
10:00 - 12:00 p.m.
Location
Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY
Attendees
David Miller, Village of Brockport
Debra Fintel, Town of Chili
Gregory D. Osmundson, Town of Irondequoit
Tony Subbo, Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)

Purpose:
The primary purpose of the Annex Workshop was to review the layout of the jurisdictional annexes and answer Planning Committee members' questions regarding completing the annexes. This was the second of two identical workshops.

Discussion Points
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the workshop.

Jurisdictional Annex Layout
Mr. Subbo reviewed the different sections of the jurisdictional annexes as follows:

- The HMP Point of Contact section should list the primary and alternate individuals responsible for development of the annex that will serve as the Planning Committee for the next 5 years.
- The Municipal Profile section describes the jurisdiction based on existing plans and the information provided on the New Development Worksheet.
- The Natural Hazard Event History summarizes hazard impacts listed in the hazard profiles, specific to the jurisdiction. It is based on the E-wells and Losses Worksheet and research conducted by Tetra Tech.
- Planning Committee members should review the information captured for accuracy.
- The Hazard Vulnerability and Ranking table is completed by Tetra Tech. It shows the expected losses and risk priority of each of the hazards of concern.
- The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary table shows NFIP statistics for the jurisdiction.
- The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided the number of property losses, severe repetitive loss (SRL) properties, and serious repetitive loss (SRL) properties. Properties that mitigate the flood hazard for these properties may be eligible for an increased flood share under NFIP or Federal Mitigation Assistance (FMA) programs. A property must have a federal insurance policy in effect to be classified as an SRL or SRL property.
- The critical facilities within the 1% and 0.2% annual chance floodplains are shown in the Critical Facilities table.
- The Capability Assessment section is populated with information provided on the Municipal Capability Assessment Worksheet. Planning Committee members should ensure that all applicable items are filled in.
- Tetra Tech staff will work with each jurisdiction to ensure that they are.
- The Post Mitigation Initial Status table is completed with information from the Action Review Worksheet. Planning Committee members should review the table to ensure it is accurate.

Action Worksheet
Mr. Subbo provided a copy of Tetra Tech's version of the Action Worksheet, which is used to identify mitigation actions for inclusion in the plan.

- Each planning committee will identify mitigation actions for inclusion in the plan.
- Tetra Tech will work with the jurisdictions to complete the annexes.
- The December 13 Planning Committee meeting will be held on the 19th from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on December 19, 2015.
- A public meeting to review the mitigation strategy will be conducted on the evening of December 19, 2015.

With no further questions, Mr. Subbo thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 12:00 p.m.
AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Annex Workshop - Afternoon

Tuesday, December 15, 2015 | 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

1. Welcome
2. Jurisdictional Annex Layout
   a. Permit Rules and Standards
   b. Municipal Profile
   c. Natural Hazard Event History
   d. Hazard Vulnerability and Ranking
   e. Capability Assessment
   f. Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms
   g. Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization
   h. Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability
   i. Hazard Area Select and Location
3. Action Worksheet
4. Next Steps
   a. Identify mitigation actions with each jurisdiction
   b. Finalize jurisdictional annexes
   c. Host Planning Committee Meeting
   d. Review Mitigation Strategy
   e. December 16, 2015
   d. Mitigation Strategy Public Meeting December 16, 2015
5. Questions

Jurisdictional Annex Layout

• Capability Assessment
  - Permitting and Standards
  - Administrative and Technical
  - Field
  - Classification
  - Self-Assessment
  - Multi-hazard Capability
  - Other capabilities
  - Other actions that are areas of regular operation

• Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms
  - Planning
  - Mitigation Strategy
  - Hazard Mitigation Plan
  - Federal, State, Local
  - Public
  - Public Engagement Facilities
  - Coordination
  - Other actions that are areas of regular operation

• Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability
  - Jurisdictional annexes
  - Geographic information systems
  - Hazard Area Zones and Location
  - Overall hazard zone map

Action Worksheet

Questions?

Thank you for your time!
## 9.1 MUNICIPALITY NAME

This section presents the jurisdictional area for the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

### 9.1.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact

The following individuals have been identified as the hazard mitigation plan’s primary and alternate points of contact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Point of Contact</th>
<th>Alternate Point of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.1.2 Municipal Profile


### Growth/Development Trends

The following table summarizes recent residential/commercial development since 2010 to present and any known or anticipated major residential/commercial development and major infrastructure development that has been identified in the last five years within the municipality. Refer to the map in Section 9.2.1 of this plan which delineates the hazard zones along with the location of permitted new development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property or Development Name</th>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Gross (Lands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent Development from 2010 to present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known or Anticipated Development in the Next Five (5) Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.1.3 Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality

Monroe County has a history of natural and non-natural hazard events as detailed in Volume I, Section 5.0 of this plan. A summary of historical events is provided in each of the hazard profiles and includes a chronology of events that have affected the County and its municipalities. For the purpose of this plan update, the extent and impact of events that have occurred in the County were summarized to indicate the range and impact of damages to the community. Information regarding specific damages is included, if available, based on reference material or local sources. This information is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>County Affected</th>
<th>Summary of Damages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 9.1.4 Hazard Vulnerabilities and Ranking

The hazard profiles in Section 5.9 of this plan provide detailed information regarding each plan’s vulnerability to the identified hazards. This section summarizes the hazard vulnerabilities and their ranking in the MUNICIPALITY NAME. For additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction, refer to Section 5.9.

#### Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

The table below summarizes the hazard risk/vulnerability rankings of potential hazards for the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard Type</th>
<th>Potential Dollar Damage to Structures by Level of Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Ranking</td>
<td>Hazard Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Occurrence</td>
<td>Value Risk Gradient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary

The following table summarizes the NFIP statistics for the MUNICIPALITY NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Policies in Effect</th>
<th># of Policies</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation in Year 0</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation in Year 1</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation in Year 2</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation in Year 3</th>
<th># of Policies with NFIP Participation in Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Critical Facilities

The table below presents IHAUS-MHR estimates of the change and loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of 1- and 0.25 percent annual chance flood events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Value of Structure</th>
<th>FIRM (annual chance)</th>
<th>FIRM (0.25% chance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: iHAUS-MHR provides an estimate of the change and loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of 1- and 0.25 percent annual chance flood events. The iHAUS-MHR method accounts for the location and function of critical facilities, the value of structures and equipment, and the potential for damage due to flooding. The method uses a set of hazard impact models to estimate the potential for damage to critical facilities and the resulting impact on the community. The models take into account the location and function of critical facilities, the value of structures and equipment, and the potential for damage due to flooding. The models are based on the latest scientific understanding of the hazards and their impacts on critical facilities. The models are also continually updated to reflect the latest scientific understanding of the hazards and their impacts on critical facilities. The models are also continually updated to reflect the latest scientific understanding of the hazards and their impacts on critical facilities.

For more information, please visit the iHAUS-MHR website at [iHAUS-MHR website](https://www.iHAUS-MHR.com).
Other Vulnerabilities Identified

The municipality has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community:

- Earthquake
- Storms

USE INFORMATION IDENTIFIED IN THE FS FOR FLOODING AREAS IN THE MUNICIPALITY.

9.1.5 Capability Assessment

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Planning and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability
- Community classification
- Natural Hazard Mitigation Program
- Integration of Mitigation Planning into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms

Planning and Regulatory Capability

This table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available in the Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool / Program (code reference plan)</th>
<th>Local Planning (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Authority (local, county, state, federal)</th>
<th>Dept/Agency Responsible</th>
<th>Code Citation and Comments (Code Chapter, name of plan, explanation of authority, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIP Coverage for Municipal Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIP Flood Insurance Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Resources</th>
<th>Accountability (Vesla)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to levy taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees for parks, recreation services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fees for new development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Utility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street maintenance/operation obligations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer debt through special tax bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of revenue bonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of property in bankruptcy auction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal or State Funding Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Acquisition Funding Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.7 Community Classification

The table below summarizes classifications for community programs available to the Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Do you have? (or Plans to)</th>
<th>Classification (Available)</th>
<th>Land Use Classification (Available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Rating System (CRS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Code (Environmentally Oriented)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention (or related)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance Programs for low-income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Hazard Mitigation Programs (administered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management (or related)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazard Mitigation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classifications listed above are related to a community’s ability to provide effective services to lessen its vulnerability to the hazards identified. These classifications can be viewed as a measure of the community’s capabilities in all phases of emergency management (pre準備, response, recovery, and mitigation) and are used as an underwriting parameter for determining the costs of various forms of insurance. The CRS class...
Section 9.2 MUNICIPALITY NAME

9.2.6 Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization

This section discusses past mitigation actions and future, describes proposed mitigation initiatives, and prioritizes.

Past Mitigation Initiative Stages

The following table indicates progress on the community’s mitigation strategy identified in the 2010 plan. Actions that are carried forward as part of this plan cycle are included in the following subsections in its own table with prioritization. Previous actions that are now on-going programs and capabilities are indicated as such in the following table and may also be found under ‘Capability Assessment’ presented previously in this report.
## Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update

The MUNICIPALITY NAME participated in a mitigation action workshop in YYYY and was provided the following FEMA publications to use as a resource as part of their comprehensive review of all possible activities and mitigation measures to address their hazards. FEMA’s SHEL “Selecting Appropriate Mitigation Measures for High-Risk Communities” (March 2007) and FEMA’s CHAP “A Resource for Reducing Risk in High-Risk Areas” (January 2012). In YYYY, the MUNICIPALITY NAME participated in a second workshop and was provided the results of the risk assessment further aiding with the identification of mitigation actions.

Table 5-2.4 summarizes the comprehensive range of specific mitigation initiatives the MUNICIPALITY NAME would like to pursue in the future to reduce the effects of hazards. Some of these initiatives may be previous actions carried forward for this plan update. These initiatives are dependent on available funding sources and local match availability and may be modified or cancelled at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in municipal priorities. Both the first FEMA mitigation action categories and the six CSS mitigation action categories are listed in the table below to further demonstrate the wide range of activities and mitigation measures selected.

As discussed in Section 6, 14 “evaluation/projection criteria” are used to complete the prioritization of mitigation initiatives. For each mitigation initiative, a numeric rank is assigned (1, 2, or 3) for each of the 14 evaluation criteria to justify prioritizing initiatives. The table below summarizes the evaluation of each mitigation initiative, listed by Action Number.

Table 5-2.5 provides a summary of the prioritization of all proposed mitigation initiatives for the Plan update.

---

### Table 5-2.4: Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Initiative</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>Action 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Action 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Action 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 5-2.5: Summary of Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Number</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 5-2.6: Venn Diagram, Color-coding, Legend

- **Red**: High
- **Orange**: Medium
- **Green**: Low
9.1.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.1.8 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the municipality that illustrate the probable areas impacted within the municipality. These maps are based on the best available data at the time of publication of this plan, and are considered to be adequate for planning purposes. Maps have only been generated for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies, and for which the municipality has significant exposure. These maps are illustrated in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume 1 of this Plan.

9.1.9 Mitigation Initiatives

None at this time.
Please review the following suggested initiatives for inclusion into your mitigation strategy. At a minimum, we highly recommend that you include:

- An initiative identifying how your community will support efforts to mitigate vulnerable private property via elevation and/or acquisition.
- At least one public outreach/education initiative that outlines specific ways that you intend to expand or enhance your current outreach efforts.
- At least one initiative that addresses continued and enhanced participation in the NFIP, with specific details of those activities that will enhance your local NFIP program.
- An initiative identifying how the findings and recommendations of this Hazard Mitigation Plan can be applied to other related planning and regulatory programs within your municipality.

If you choose to incorporate an initiative, please expand/progress it for your municipality, use any of operating your capabilities, etc.

---

### Table: General Mitigation Strategies for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Recommended Initiative(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting vulnerable private property via elevation and/or acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach/education initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced participation in the NFIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing findings and recommendations from this Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Diagram: Risk Mitigation Strategies

- **Mitigation Strategies**
  - Enhancing community preparedness
  - Improving emergency response capabilities
  - Strengthening infrastructure and critical systems

- **Expected Benefits**
  - Reduced risk to human life and property
  - Increased community resilience

- **Mitigation Measures**
  - Education and awareness campaigns
  - Enhanced communication systems
  - Improved maintenance and repair of public facilities

---

### Additional Notes

- Consideration of long-term sustainability and community involvement in the planning process.
- Integration of local cultural and environmental factors in mitigation strategies.
- Regular review and adjustment of mitigation plans to reflect changing conditions and priorities.
### Mitigation Action (ID):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Numeric Rank (1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Possible outcome measures rank when applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Champion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Community Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guidance to Complete the Mitigation Action Worksheet

#### Assessing the Risk

**Hazard(s) addressed:** Please enter the hazard of concern you are mitigating. For this plan, the hazards of concern identified for the County are:

- Drought
- Earthquakes
- Extreme Temperatures
- Flooding
- Infection
- Lightning
- Storms (hurricanes, thunderstorms, hail, lightning, and tornadoes)
- Severe Winter Storms (hurricane, blizzard, ice storms)
- Wildfire
- Civil Unrest
- Intergovernmental Inconsistencies
- Terrorism
- Utility Failure (power, sewer, water, communications)

**Specific problem being mitigated:** Please describe the specific problem being mitigated.

#### Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects

**Actions/Projects Considered:** Please consider different options to mitigate the problem identified. One alternative is always to accept the current level of risk (eliminate the vulnerability/problem) by deciding to take no action at this time. Please include the name of the action considered and a brief reason as to why the action was not selected. The remaining documents the consideration of these alternatives.

**Action/Project Intended for Implementation**

#### Description of the Selected Project:

Please provide a brief description of the selected project.

**Mitigation Action Type:**

- **Local Plan and Regulations (LPR):** These actions include government authorities, policies, or codes that influence the way land and buildings are being developed and built.
- **Structure and Infrastructure Project (SIP):** These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazard area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct new structures to reduce the impact of hazards.
- **Natural Areas Protection (NAP):** These actions involve that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve or restore the function of natural systems.

---

**MONROE COUNTY 2015 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

**Mitigation Action Worksheet**

- **Education and Awareness Program (EAP):** These are actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. These actions may also include participation in national programs, such as StormReady and Firewise Communities.

**Goals:** Please insert the goals that would be met if the action/project is implemented.

- **Goal 1:** Coordinate hazard mitigation programs that affect the County.
- **Goal 2:** Prevent hazards from impacting life, property, and the environment.
- **Goal 3:** Protect life, property, and the environment from hazard impacts.
- **Goal 4:** Increase public awareness of hazards, their impacts, and ways to reduce vulnerability.

**Benefits:** Please describe the benefits avoided when the project is implemented. This includes physical property damage, loss of function, real destruction, etc.

**Estimated Cost:**

- **Low:** $<100,000
- **Medium:** $100,000 to $100,000
- **High:** $>100,000

**Priority:** Please enter Tier I, II, or III. Refer to the prioritization exercise and table.

**Plan for Implementation**

- **Potential Funding Source:** Please identify the anticipated funding source, which could be the “Great grants” with local cost share.” Sources may include federal, state, and local sources.

**Timeline for Completion:** Short = 1 to 5 years, Long Term = 5 years or more, Ongoing = Ongoing project.

**Reporting on Progress**

For the current planning effort, this section does not need to be filled out. Each jurisdiction will have to update this section for each of their actions on an annual basis, prior to the annual Planning Committee meeting, as outlined in Section 7 (Planning Maintenance of the HMP).

Please provide a status update on the selected action/project. Along with this description, please indicate if the action/project is completed or not completed.

Actions which are not complete must be done with a reason noted (e.g., action deemed unfunded...). Other incomplete actions should clearly be indicated as continuing; indicate percent complete, and identify any barriers to completion/next steps in schedule. Even actions that have had no progress to date can be identified as continuing. For any action that is not yet complete and will continue, always consider modifying the action to promote implementation.
Meeting
Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Planning Committee Meeting

Date: December 16, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Location: Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (MOCDEM), Rochester, New York

Attendees:
- Mike Varghese, Fire Marshal, Town of Sweden
- Rob Bouldier, Fire Marshal, Town of Webster
- John Savagey, Superintendent of Public Works, Village of Webster
- Jay Cudlitz, Fire Marshal, Town of Wheatland
- Eric DePana, Assistant Fire Chief, Town of Webster
- William Platt, Disaster Specialist, American Red Cross
- Tad Dore, Onondaga County Transportation Authority
- Dave Yoder, Chief, Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority
- Tony Subbiah, Project Manager, Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)

Purpose
The purpose of the Planning Committee meeting was to discuss the mitigation actions that are part of the updated HMP. This meeting aligned with the "Draft an Action Plan" step of the mitigation planning process.

Discussion Points
Discussion points addressed during the Planning Committee meeting are summarized below.

Outreach
Mr. Varghese discussed the current meeting that occurred in the Village of Churchville on December 16, 2015. Approximately 20-25 residents of the Village attended the meeting to discuss the expansion of the banks of Black Creek along Willowbrook Drive. Natural erosion is threatening to destroy the residences along the creek. Representatives from the Village, MOCDEM, and the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation were present to discuss the issue.

Mr. Varghese also discussed that he has posted the MOCDEM’s Facebook page to provide information to the public.

No other outreach activities have been conducted.

Mitigation Actions Review
Mr. Subbiah led a discussion regarding the mitigation actions that each jurisdiction may include in its plans, and actions that have already been identified by some jurisdictions for inclusion. He pointed out the difference between hazard mitigation action categories for the Hazard Mitigation Plan of 2015 (HMP) and the Community Rating System (CRS). The following categories of mitigation actions identified by MOCDEM:

- Prevention
- Mitigation
- Public Information
- Preparedness

Other emerging emergency services include developing a flood warning and response plan, working with power companies to prioritize roads for clear follow-up on events that divers power lines, and monitoring natural disaster evacuation routes and shelters, and document the adequacy of those shelters for use during an emergency. Mr. Savagey shared that the jurisdiction would call upon the American Red Cross if disaster shelters are needed in the future, and the jurisdiction would call upon the American Red Cross for emergency shelters during an emergency. Mr. Platt asked about the jurisdiction’s representatives to help coordinate with local schools and other facilities to ensure preparedness for any potential shelters, stating that it is much easier to open a shelter under these guidelines and assess them on their own.

Other emergency services include developing a flood warning and response plan, working with power companies to prioritize roads for clear follow-up on events that divers power lines, and monitoring natural disaster evacuation routes and shelters, and document the adequacy of those shelters for use during an emergency. Mr. Savagey shared that the jurisdiction would call upon the American Red Cross if disaster shelters are needed in the future, and the jurisdiction would call upon the American Red Cross for emergency shelters during an emergency. Mr. Platt asked about the jurisdiction’s representatives to help coordinate with local schools and other facilities to ensure preparedness for any potential shelters, stating that it is much easier to open a shelter under these guidelines and assess them on their own.
MEETING NOTES

- Structural Projects: These projects include upgrading stormwater management infrastructure, designing and building detention/retention basins, designing floodwalls and levees, and other activities in which physical structures are constructed. Each jurisdiction needs to be specific about the work to be done and the location of the project. Specific projects, such as bridges, sidewalks of roadway, and other structural elements need to be identified.

Mr. Meaco discussed an issue in the Town of Oglethorpe in which former railroad culverts cause Monroe Road and Washington Street to flood, and pointed out that actions may require coordination among local, County, and possibly State. When dealing with State needs, he suggested agencies to carry them out. Mr. Stobbs discussed the possibility of each jurisdiction establishing a drainage district where the jurisdiction would levy taxes or fees to a club or facility to address the problem, in the same way that a jurisdiction can charge fees to areas unable to pay the cost of the power used to light homes.

The Village of Churchville wanted to install a lift station with a fence to protect it.

- Public Information: Those interested in conducting outreach to footprint properties on the ways residents can protect their homes, developing a crisis-specific page on the municipal website, and linking from town/village/government websites to the County’s website, including mitigation information in a municipal newsletter. Mr. Stobbs pointed out that each jurisdiction should have at least once public information session in its area.

Next Steps

The following steps were identified during the meeting.

- Tetra Tech will work with jurisdiction representatives to complete the jurisdictional analyses.
- A public meeting to review the full mitigation strategy will be conducted on the morning of December 15, 2015.
- Tetra Tech will work with the County to develop the full draft of the HMP by the end of January 2016. The HMP will then enter the 30-day public comment period.
- Following the public comment period, Tetra Tech will make any required revisions and submit the plan to the State and FEMA for final review.

With no further questions, Mr. Ron and Mr. Subsai thanked all for attending for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.
GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR CONSIDERATION BY ALL PARTICIPANTS

Please review the following suggested initiatives for inclusion into your mitigation strategy. At a minimum we highly recommend that you include:

- An initiative identifying how your community will support efforts to mitigate vulnerable private property via elevation and/or acquisition.
- At least one public outreach/education initiative that outlines specific ways that you intend to expand or enhance your current outreach efforts.
- At least one initiative that addresses continued and enhanced participation in the NIPF, with specific details of those activities that will enhance your local NIPF program.
- An initiative identifying how the findings and recommendations of this Hazard Mitigation Plan can be applied to other related planning and regulatory programs within your municipality.

If you choose to incorporate an initiative, please email information at your municipality’s, your way of operating, your capabilities, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Strategy</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Hazard Mitigation</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>Reduce flood damage</td>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Municipal budget</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Reduce erosion damage</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Private funds</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>Reduce wildfire damage</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Community donations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**

- **Objective:** Identify and prioritize mitigation strategies to reduce the impacts of natural hazards in the region.
- **Hazard Mitigation:** Focus on reducing damage caused by floods, erosion, and wildfires.
- **Estimated Cost:** Varies from high to low.
- **Source of Funding:** Includes municipal budgets, private funds, and community donations.
- **Timeframe:** Strategies range from short to long-term, with some ongoing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Town of Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Laster</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Pratt</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Sullivan</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Johnson</td>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Nursing Director</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Sullivan</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Johnson</td>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Nursing Director</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Sullivan</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Johnson</td>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Nursing Director</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONROE COUNTY TO HOST PUBLIC MEETING ON HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Monroe County's Office of Emergency Management will host a public meeting for its Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) on Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 from 6:00-7:30 p.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management located at 2190 Scottsville Road.

The County has begun updating its HMP, which documents the County's vulnerability to hazards and its strategy to reduce vulnerability.

For more information contact Frederick J. Rien, Jr., Emergency Preparedness Administrator, at 753-3840 or visit www.monroecountyhmp.com.

Media Inquiries, contact:
Department of Communications at 753-1090
Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Coordinate hazard mitigation programs that affect the county

Objective 1.1: Develop and maintain multi-jurisdictional coordination efforts related to hazard mitigation

Objective 1.2: Develop and maintain partnerships with external federal, state, municipal, and stakeholder agencies that have a role in hazard mitigation

Objective 1.3: Track and/or recommend local, county, state, and federal legislation and regulations related to hazard mitigation

Goal 2: Prevent hazards from impacting life, property, and the environment

Objective 2.1: Develop and maintain local regulations that reduce vulnerability to hazards

Objective 2.2: Develop and maintain local plans that reduce vulnerability to hazards

Objective 2.3: Improve the county’s stormwater management systems

Goal 3: Protect life, property, and the environment from hazard impacts

Objective 3.1: Encourage homeowners, renters, and businesses to ensure their properties are protected against all hazards, including flood coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)

Objective 3.2: Ameliorate, relocate, elevate, and/or retrofit existing buildings located in hazard areas

Objective 3.3: Ameliorate, relocate, elevate, and retrofitted properties located in flood-prone areas

Objective 3.4: Encourage local participation in the Community Rating System (CRS) Program

Objective 3.5: Maintain emergency response capability

Goal 4: Increase public awareness of hazards, their impacts, and ways to reduce vulnerability

Objective 4.1: Improve public alert, warning, and communications systems by promoting redundant and multi-faceted communications methods

Objective 4.2: Conduct a coordinated public information program related to hazards and their impacts throughout the county

Objective 4.3: Encourage residents to implement hazard mitigation and preparedness measures on their properties

Objective 4.4: Promote personal and family preparedness

Goal 5: Protect, preserve, and restore the functions of natural systems

Objective 5.1: Encourage the use of green and natural infrastructure

Objective 5.2: Coordinate with local, county, state, federal, international, and other stakeholder agencies to maintain natural systems, including wetland areas and islands and coastal areas

Meeting
Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Steering Committee Meeting

Date: Monday, January 8, 2018

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: Monroe County Office of Emergency Management, Rochester, NY

Introductions
Fred Bonn, Emergency Preparedness Administrator, NCDMR
Kathleen Dougherty, Emergency Management ESL, Program Specialist, NCDMR
Judith Cox, Senior GIS Analyst, Monroe County Geographic Information System (GIS)
Tom Stockman, Planning Manager, Monroe County Department of Planning
Mark Nall, Ph.D., State University of New York (SUNY) - Southtown
Terry Collins, Tofia Tool, Inc. (Tofia Tool) via webcamera

Purpose
The purpose of the Steering Committee meeting was to review progress on the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update, examine the participation status of the County’s municipalities and stakeholders, and discuss options for maximizing participation.

Discussion Points
This section summarizes each discussion point addressed during the Steering Committee meeting.

Outreach
Mr. Bonn summarized outreach efforts that were conducted over the last month. Mr. Bonn discussed the HMP during the meeting of the Monroe County Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) on January 8, 2018, during a training portion of the Baskin Drive (sub) scribne exercise on January 8, 2018, and to a community group on January 21, 2018.

Mr. Goodman stated that the County’s planning board is beginning to update the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and will be meeting regularly. Mr. Subbo encouraged Mr. Goodman to review the jurisdiction’s annexe for projects to include in the updated CIP.

Review Status of Worksheet Completion
Mr. Subbo reviewed the Worksheet Completion Status with the group. The handout shows the worksheets completed by each municipality.

Review Planning Participation/Non-participating Jurisdictions
Mr. Bonn stated that his office will conduct one more round of outreach to jurisdictions that still need to provide information, and that the HMP will reflect participation by all of the County’s jurisdictions. Mr. Subbo reported that every jurisdiction that participated to some degree for inclusion, either attended a meeting or provided information to meet the participation requirement of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2006. However, not all jurisdictions have done everything they need to do in order to meet those requirements.

Dr. Hill said a discussion of the possibility of having student interns from SUNY Brockport reach out to jurisdictions to complete their participation requirements. There would be a limit for each jurisdiction that works with one jurisdiction.
MEETING NOTES

The committee agreed that if jurisdictions still do not participate after being offered an intern to help complete their requirements, the County has concluded its due diligence to ensure 100% participation in the planning process.

Schedule
The final public meeting to review the draft plan will be scheduled after outreach by the students is complete. The updated HMP needs to be approved by the County Legislature in October 2018 to ensure that the plan is approved before the existing vendor expires. Mr. Subbio stated that the plan would have to be submitted to the state and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for formal review no later than mid-April 2019 to meet that deadline.

Next Steps
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:
- The next Planning Committee meeting will be held from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on February 2, 2018.
- Two Towns, Monroe County, and students from SUNY-Buffalo will work with the jurisdictions to complete their reviews.
- The public review period will be announced, and the public draft review meeting will be scheduled at a later date.

With no further questions, Mr. Subbio and Mr. Ron thanked attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 9:50 a.m.

AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

Monday, February 1, 2018 | 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Status of Worksheet Completion
4. Planning Participation
5. Non-participating Jurisdictions
6. Schedule
7. Next Steps
   a. Next Planning Committee Meeting
      i. Review Draft
      ii. February 2, 2018
   b. Public Review Period
   c. Public Draft Review Meeting – March 2018
   d. Finalize Jurisdictional Assessments
   e. Finalizing Thresholds
   f. Submit to NYSDHSSE and FEMA
   g. Adcock
8. Questions and Concerns

Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Worksheet Completion Status

The following table shows the worksheets that have been submitted by each jurisdiction, as of January 22, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet 1: Events</th>
<th>Worksheet 2: Goal Assessment</th>
<th>Worksheet 3: HMP Assessment</th>
<th>Worksheet 4: Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Worksheet 5: Plan Improvement</th>
<th>Worksheet 6: Implementation</th>
<th>Workshop 7: Hazard Mitigation Community Other data or information provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Additional documentation for Worksheets #1 and #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CEMP and Stormwater Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Brockport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chili</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Churchville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Clarkson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Village of East Aurora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Farport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Greece</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hannibal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Henrietta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hilton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Monroe Falls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Middletown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Mendon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ogdensburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Parma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Penfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pittsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Pittsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Riga</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Heat Sweep Plan, Cool Sweep Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table shows the stakeholder agencies that have participated in the project, as of January 22, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Attendance Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Region II</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Johnstown International Airport</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County Community College, Agriculture and Life Sciences Institute</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Water Bureau</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-Geneves Regional Transportation Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Bingham</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Warner Cable</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Stakeholder Participants: 21

---

Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status Report

The following table shows the jurisdictions that have participated in the project, as of January 22, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Attendance Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Bingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Clifton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/Village of East Rochester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Homer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Randolph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Riga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rushville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Scotts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Sparta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Whiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Municipal Participants: 122

---

Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – Participation Status Report

As of 01/22/16
MEETING NOTES

Meeting: Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Planning Committee Meeting

Date: February 2, 2016
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.

Attendees (continued):
- Jay Cowles, Fire Marshal, Town of Rhoadesdale
- William Platt, Disaster Specialist, Amherst Fire
- Duke Kufler, Safety, Rochester Genesee RPO Regional Transportation Authority Regional Transit Service
- Lynn Dady, Director, Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT)
- Mark Hult, State University of New York (SUNY)-Brockport
- Tony Sabo, Project Manager, Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)

Purpose:
The purpose of the Planning Committee meeting was to discuss the updated draft of the HMP.

Discussion Points:
Discussion points addressed during the Planning Committee meeting are summarized below.

Outreach:
Mr. Ron discussed three presentations he gave in the previous month regarding the HMP update to a community group, the Monroe County Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), and attendees of a tabletop exercise that the County conducted. Mr. Ron reported that information on the HMP was shared at the Village of Fairport’s meeting on February 1, 2016.

No further outreach activities have been conducted.

Draft Plan Review:
Mr. Sabo led a discussion of the sections of the HMP. These sections are available on the project website.

- Section 1: Introduction describes mitigation planning, identifies the participating jurisdictions, and provides an overview of the HMP.
- Section 2: Plan Adoption describes the plan adoption process.
- Section 3: Planning Process identifies the participants in the planning process, describes the planning activities undertaken during the HMP update process, and details how the planning process will continue after the draft is approved.
- Section 4: County Profile describes the history of the County, its physical features, the population and demographics, building stock, land use and trends, and critical facilities.
- Section 5: Risk Assessment identifies the hazards of concern, describes how each hazard is prioritized based on the level of risk it poses to the County and its jurisdictions, and includes full profiles of each hazard of concern.
- Section 6: Mitigation Strategies describes past accomplishments in implementing hazard mitigation initiatives throughout the County; lists the hazard mitigation goals and objectives; describes the federal, State, County, and local capabilities that can be leveraged to reduce vulnerability to hazards; and describes how mitigation actions were identified, evaluated, and prioritized at the jurisdiction.

How mitigation actions were identified, evaluated, and prioritized at the jurisdiction.

- Section 7: Planning Partnership describes the planning process and provides an overview of the HMP development process.
- Section 8: Planning Committee provides an overview of the HMP development process and includes a list of meeting dates and agendas.
- Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes describes the planning process and provides an overview of the HMP development process and includes a list of meeting dates and agendas.

Mr. Ron discussed the jurisdictions that need to provide more information to complete their Annexes. He discussed a planned partnership with SUNY-Brockport in which student interns will assist those jurisdictions in gathering the required information and provide them to the County and Tetra Tech for inclusion in the updated HMP.

Community Rating System:
Mr. Sabo reiterated the benefits of obtaining the Community Rating System (CRS) status. He discussed the CRS points that are available to jurisdictions through the State Uniform Mitigation Credits, and the additional CRS points that a jurisdiction is eligible to earn for State programs if they can demonstrate enforcement of certain regulations. He pointed out that the HMP was updated in accordance with the CRS Program requirements for “Floodplain Management Plans,” and that each participating jurisdiction could earn 250-300 CRS points from the HMP.

He discussed a CRS project that Tetra Tech is conducting for Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, and pointed out that the municipalities in Dauphin County would see a Class II rating (A 10% premium discount for participants in the Floodplain) based almost entirely on their Floodplain management and stormwater management ordinances. Monroe County’s municipalities may be in a similar position.

He then discussed the hazards and load estimates of potential savings that policyholders in each jurisdiction would see at different class ratings. Mr. Sabo encouraged all jurisdictions to consider joining the CRS Program.

Next Steps:
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:

- The County GIS will work with SUNY-Brockport to arrange for student interns to work with jurisdictions.
- The public review period and site of the public draft review meeting will be announced at a later date.
- Tetra Tech will work with jurisdiction representatives to complete the jurisdictional services.
- Following the public comment period, Tetra Tech will make any required revisions and submit the plan to the State and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for formal review.

With no further questions, Mr. Ron and Mr. Sabo thanked the attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 10:10 a.m.

AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Planning Committee Meeting – Draft Plan Review

Agenda:
Tuesday, February 2, 2016 | 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

1. Welcome
2. Outreach
3. Draft Plan Review
   a. Section 1: Introduction
   b. Section 2: Plan Adoption
   c. Section 3: Planning Process
   d. Section 4: County Profile
   e. Section 5: Risk Assessment
   f. Section 6: Mitigation Strategies
   g. Section 7: Plan Maintenance
   h. Appendices
   i. Section 8: Planning Partnership
   j. Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes
4. Community Rating System
   a. Points
   b. Discounts
5. Next Steps
   a. Public Review Period
   b. Public Draft Review Meeting
   c. Finalize Jurisdictional Annexes
   d. Planning Process
   e. Submit to NYS DMHSE and FEMA
   f. Adoption
6. Questions

Outreach:
- CRAs included in the planning process
- Organizations contacted
- Participants interested

Draft Plan Review:
- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Plan Adoption
- Section 3: Planning Process
- Section 4: County Profile
- Section 5: Risk Assessment
- Section 6: Mitigation Strategies
- Section 7: Plan Maintenance
- Section 8: Planning Partnership
- Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes

Questions:
SUMMARY

The Community Rating System (CRS) provides Uniform Minimum Credit (UMC) for certain state laws, regulations, and standards that support floodplain management and have proven effective in reducing flood damage. The following table summarizes UMC credit available to all communities. It also includes possible additional credit available for selected areas or state activities.

The range of credit available to communities within the state is shown below, following an explanation of each activity. The credit is based on the 2013 CRS Coordinator's Manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit Without Additional Credit</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS Uniform Minimum Credit With Additional Credit</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit for activities in the 450 series can increase based on the Community Growth Adjustments. The CRS requires participating communities to obtain elevation certifications, which provide an additional 15 points. Five hundred points are needed for Class A.
Activity 450. Stormwater Management

Stormwater Management Regulation (SMR) - From 2015 - 289 points are awarded for SMR based on requirements for all communities to manage new development of over one acre or more (25 = 60) and to prevent increases in peak flows from the 10- and 100-year storms (25 = 114). Additionally, LEID is used as a first step to reducing runoff (LEID = 25).


Verification: The community’s ordinance provision and copies of drainage permits are needed to verify credit and will be provided to the technical reviewer for verification.

Annual UMC verification: The technical reviewer will verify that the requirement remains in effect.

POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL CREDIT

Some state standards are eligible for CRS credit, but may not be in effect in every community. These standards are addressed below. ISO/CRS Specialists and the communities need to determine whether they are creditable in their area.

Activity 430. Higher Regulatory Standards


Legal basis: Exec. Law, Sections 370-380

Verification: ISO/CRS Specialists will verify that communities have adopted the relevant sections of the International Code Series, as described in the 2013 CRS Coordinator’s Manual.

Annual UMC verification: ISO/CRS Specialists and IRC Technical Reviewer will verify that the regulations are still in effect.

Local Drainage Protection (LDP) - Up to 10 points may be awarded for providing positive drainage away from the foundation. IRC requires drainage away from all buildings, not just those in special hazard areas (IRC R401.3). IRC Chapter 18 has various requirements about foundation drainage, drainage for foundations, or property to slop (Sec. 3808.7), but does not explicitly require loss to be guided to drain away. IRC Appendix J addresses drainage, but it is effective only if it explicitly adopted.

Legal basis: IRC Chapter 18: IRC Chapter 4 (e.g. R 403.3 and R100).

Verified by: ISO/CRS Specialists will review permits, site plans, and similar documents that demonstrate enforcement.

Annual UMC verification: ISO/CRS Specialists will verify that the regulations still are in effect.

Floodproof (FPF) - 7.5 to 20 points may be given for regulations in the 2010 edition of the New York State Residential Building Code requiring that three feet of floodproof be added to the design flood elevation and mechanical equipment of residential buildings in the numbered A and V zones.

The 2014 edition, which is currently effective, refers to ASCE 24-05 which contains a floodproof requirement for all structures not covered by the residential building code.

Activity 630. Dams

State Dam Safety (SDS) - Up to 30 points of credit for State Dam Safety Program activities based on the Dam Safety Program Management Tool, 15 points awarded for Risk Communications and Public Awareness and 15 points for Emergency Action Planning.

Verification: DRAIN SPECIALISTS will verify that the community is in compliance with the State Dam Safety Program. DDS credit is limited to communities that would be affected by a failure of a high-hazard potential dam. This must be documented with a description and a map.

Annual UMC verification: The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Dam Safety Office annually verifies DDS credit.

MODEL ORDINANCE

New York has three model ordinances. The ordinances may contain additional creditable UMC provisions. The model ordinances are available from the state.
Monroe County – Estimated Community Rating System (CRS) Program Discounts on Flood Insurance

The following table presents National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) policy statistics as of November 30, 2015 (the most current data available). It also shows the number of structures in the 0.2% annual chance floodplain in the Special Flood Hazard Area. The table reflects the estimated savings that NFIP policyholders from each jurisdiction will realize if the jurisdiction participates in the CRS Program as a Class 9 or Class 8 community. The estimated savings are based on the assumption that all of the NFIP policies in each jurisdiction are in effect on structures in the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. Where the number of policies exceeds the number of structures in the 0.2% annual chance floodplain, the analysis assumes that the excess policies are on structures in the 0.3% annual chance floodplain. Jurisdictions can contact the Federal Insurance Management Agency (FEMA) Region II to request a "What If" analysis, which will show the actual savings at each CRS class, based on the actual policies in effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Average Premium</th>
<th>Average Annual Discount</th>
<th>Est. Class 9 Discount (1%/1%)</th>
<th>Est. Class 8 Discount (1%/1%)</th>
<th>Structures in the 0.2% Floodplain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ogden</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>$2,908</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Parma</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$100,666</td>
<td>$90,666</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$90,666</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Peoria</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>$131,384</td>
<td>$121,384</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$121,384</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pullman</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$51,483</td>
<td>$46,483</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$46,483</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pittsford</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$71,715</td>
<td>$67,715</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$67,715</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Pittsfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,265</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rye</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$8,146</td>
<td>$7,051</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$7,051</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Rye</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$154,377</td>
<td>$154,377</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$154,377</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rush</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$6,824</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Scottville</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$14,233</td>
<td>$13,233</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$13,233</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Spencerport</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$48,979</td>
<td>$46,979</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$46,979</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Sands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,601</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Webster</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$79,162</td>
<td>$75,162</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$75,162</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Webster</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$10,559</td>
<td>$10,059</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$10,059</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wheatland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$9,575</td>
<td>$9,075</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>$9,075</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monroe County NFIP Update – Estimated CRS Program Discounts on Flood Insurance

As of 11/30/15
MONROE COUNTY TO HOST PUBLIC MEETING ON HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Monroe County’s Office of Emergency Management has completed a draft update to its Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). The HMP documents the County’s vulnerability to hazards, and its strategy to reduce that vulnerability. The completed draft can be found at www.monroecountyhmp.com.

There will be a public meeting to discuss the draft HMP on Monday, April 18, 2016, from 6:00-7:00 p.m. at the Monroe County Office of Emergency Management located at 1190 Scottsville Road.

For more information contact Frederick J. King, Jr., Emergency Preparedness Administrator, at 753-3810 or visit www.monroecountyhmp.com.

---
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MEETING NOTES

Meeting: Monroe County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Draft Plan Review Public Meeting
Date: April 18, 2016
Time: 6:00 - 7:15 p.m.
Location: Monroe County Office of Emergency Management (MCREM), Rochester, New York
Attendees: Tracy Collins, Monroe County Legislator
          David Miler, Monroe County Resident

Purpose
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the completed draft of the updated HMP with the general public and other interested parties.

Discussion Points
Discussion points addressed during the meeting are summarized below.

Draft Plan Review
- Mr. Ron let a discussion of the sections of the HMP. These sections are available on the Monroe County website.
- Section 1: Introduction describes mitigation planning, identifies the participating jurisdictions, and provides an overview of the HMP.
- Section 2: Plan Adoption describes the plan adoption process.
- Section 3: Planning Process identifies the participants of the planning process, describes the planning activities undertaken during the HMP update process, and describes how the planning process will continue after the draft is approved.
- Section 4: County Profile describes the history of the County, its physical features, the population, and demographics, building stock, land use, and trends, and critical facilities.
- Section 5: Risk Assessment identifies the hazards of concern, describes how each hazard is prioritized based on the level of risk exposure to the County and its jurisdictions, and includes full profiles of each hazard of concern.
- Section 6: Mitigation Strategies describes past accomplishments in implementing hazard mitigation initiatives throughout the County to reduce the hazards to mitigate and objectives: describes the federal, state, county, and local capabilities that can be leveraged to reduce vulnerability to hazards, and describes how mitigation actions were identified, evaluated, and prioritized by each jurisdiction.
- Section 7: Plan Maintenance identifies Mr. Ron as the HMP Coordinator and describes his responsibilities. It also identifies members of the Planning Committee that will maintain the plan over the next 5 years, and describes how the plan will be monitored, evaluated, and updated. This section also describes how the HMP is integrated into other planning mechanisms and vice versa.
- Section 8: Planning Partnership lists the participating jurisdictions and introduces the content of the jurisdictional annexes.
- Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes contain an overview for each participating jurisdiction. Each annex identifies the primary and alternate point of contact for the jurisdiction, describes the jurisdiction, assesses

Agenda
- Welcome
  - Public/Advocate Review
  - Next Steps
  - Questions

MEETING NOTES

Next Steps
The following next steps were identified during the meeting:
- The County, and Town, will work with jurisdiction representatives to complete the jurisdictional annexes.
- The draft plan will be presented in April 2016.
- The draft plan will be submitted to the State and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for formal review.
- The plan should be ready for adoption by the County and participating jurisdiction in the summer of 2016.

With no further questions, Mr. Ron thanked the attendees for their time. The meeting concluded at 7:15 p.m.

Thank you for your time!

Contact:
Fred Ron
631-786-2033
Email: fron@monroecounty.ny.us

Thank you for your time!
AGENDA

MONROE COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
Public Draft Plan Review Meeting

Agenda
Monday, April 18, 2016 | 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

1. Welcome

2. Draft Plan Review
   a. Section 1: Introduction
   b. Section 2: Plan Adoption
   c. Section 3: Planning Process
   d. Section 4: County Profile
   e. Section 5: Risk Assessment
   f. Section 6: Mitigation Strategies
   g. Section 7: Plan Enforcement
   h. Section 8: Planning Partnership
   i. Section 9: Jurisdictional Annexes
   j. Appendices

3. Next Steps
   a. Finalize Jurisdictional Annexes
   b. Finishing Touches
   c. Submit to NYS DigiSC and FEMA
   d. Adoption

4. Questions