9.39 Village of Port Chester

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Village of Port Chester.

9.39.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact

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

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Chris Ameigh, Assistant to the Village Manager	Jesica Youngblood, Planner
222 Grace Church Street, Port Chester, NY 10573	222 Grace Church Street, Port Chester, NY 10573
914-939-5200	914-939-5200
cameigh@portchesterny.com	jyoungblood@portchesterny.com

9.39.2 Municipal Profile

This section provides a summary of the community.

Population

According to the U.S. Census, the 2010 population for the Village of Port Chester was 28,967, with a very high population density of 12,427 persons per square mile. The population increased from the 2000 census (27,867).

Location

The Village of Port Chester is situated in southeastern Westchester County. The Village is bordered by the Village of Rye Brook to the north, the City of Rye to the southwest, and the Town of Greenwich, Connecticut to the northeast.

The Village of Port Chester is located within the Town of Rye, providing Port Chester residents with access to the Town's two parks, Crawford Park (located within Rye Brook) and Rye Town Park (in Rye City along Long Island Sound). The Town of Rye assesses and collects taxes on behalf of Port Chester and the Port Chester-Rye Brook Union Free school district.

Brief History

Port Chester's history began in 1640 as part of the history of Rye when land was purchased from Native American inhabitants. The first colonists to move into the area were settlers from Greenwich, Connecticut. In 1660 they negotiated a treaty with a Mohican chief for all the land along Long Island Sound between the Mamaroneck and Byram Rivers. It is supposed that the town was named after Rye, in Sussex, England, the former home of some of the settlers. The Town started as a small settlement on Manursing Island then developed Poningo Neck, which now is the business section of the City of Rye; and then Saw Pit, which now is Port Chester. Saw Pit was named for the saw-mill and boat building shop near the mouth of the Byram River where the community evolved. With its good harbor and growing shipbuilding industry, the port became a natural outlet for farm produce from the surrounding countryside.

During the Revolutionary War, Saw Pit was an important military outpost. Both armies vied for possession of the port, and the village was nearly destroyed in the crossfire. When the clamor of the Revolution settled, the area was rebuilt and its shipping and shipbuilding industries prospered. Before long it had become an

important steamboat stop, the eastern "port of Westchester." The name Port Chester was adopted in 1837. On May 4, 1868, Port Chester was incorporated as a village with specified limits within the Town of Rye.

The decline in agriculture and shipping came during the latter half of the 19th century, with the establishment of major railroads. Gradually the community changed from a port and trading center to a manufacturing center. Many well-known corporations had headquarters or production centers in the village, including Life Savers, Empire Brush Works, Arnold Bread, Fruit of the Loom and Russell Burdsall Nut & Bolt Co. During the 1970s, most of the factories began to move south or west and Port Chester struggled with a declining economic base.

Since then, Port Chester has revitalized itself with a growing retail and service economy. Port Chester's downtown "Restaurant Row" is renowned throughout the region, offering cuisine from around the world in dozens of top-rated establishments. "The Waterfront at Port Chester" retail center has brought a multiplex movie theater to the Byram River shore, Costco Shoppers Warehouse, Bed, Bath & Beyond, Super Stop & Shop, Marshall's and several other stores. Its commercial center serves Port Chester residents as well as residents of the Rye area and the west side of Greenwich, Connecticut.

Governing Body Format

Port Chester operates under the Mayor-Council form of municipal government. The Village board is comprised of the Mayor and six trustees who represent the governing and legislative body of the town. The Village Manager is appointed by the Village Board of Trustees. The Village Manager is the Chief Administrative Officer of Village government operations and is responsible to the Mayor and Board of Trustees for the administration of all Village affairs placed in the Manager's charge. The Village Manager exercises the administrative powers of the Village, including the appointment and dismissal of all the Village employees, except the Corporation Counsel and Village Clerk/Treasurer.

Growth/Development Trends

Port Chester is 2.4 square mile and largely built out. As described in the Village's adopted Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan, desirable (re)development locations surround the downtown-Port Chester train station area, Fox Island, the former United Hospital site, and other commercial corridors. Additionally, Port Chester has seen multi-family development within the downtown/train station area focused primarily on studios and one-bedrooms to help reduce additional impacts to infrastructure, the school district and transportation. The Village is currently undertaking a feasibility study for a new municipal center to house Village Staff, police, the court and ground-floor retail. The following table summarizes recent residential/commercial development since 2005 and any known or anticipated major development that has been identified in the next five years within the municipality.

Property or Development Name	Type (e.g. Res., Comm.)	Number of Units / Structures	Location (address and/or Parcel IDs)	Known Hazard Zones*	Description / Status		
Recent Development							
	None Reported						
Known or Anticipated Development							
Former Hospital	Mixed Use	730	999 High St and 406 Boston Post Road	Steep slopes	Planning phase		

Table 9.39-1. Growth and Development

Property or Development Name	Type (e.g. Res., Comm.)	Number of Units / Structures	Location (address and/or Parcel IDs)	Known Hazard Zones*	Description / Status
Fox Island	Mixed Use	NA	NA Fox Island		Wharf-type development, mixed uses
Municipal Center	Municipal	NA	Downtown/Central Business District	None	Planning, feasibility
Existing Village Hall	Municipal	NA	222 Grace Church Street	None	Could be converted to a use compatible with the Senior Center
Retail "D"	Mixed Use – Residential and commercial	60+	Westchester Ave, Abendtroth Ave, and North Main St	Flood zone; LWRP Boundary	Conceptual/ planning
Showboat	Restaurant	NA	Marina Parking Lot (end of Willett Avenue)	Flood zone; LWRP Boundary	Planning/design
The Castle	Mixed Use	100+	Willett Ave and Abendroth Place	None	Under construction
120 N Pearl Street	Residential	50	120 N Pearl Street	None	Planning
Willett Ave – MTA Bridge Replacement	Bridge	NA	Willett Ave	Flood zone	Planning
Sewer replacements	Sewers	NA	Various	Several flood zones	Under construction

 Table 9.39-1. Growth and Development

* Only location-specific hazard zones or vulnerabilities identified.

Several of the potential areas of development are located in flood zones or in areas that can be isolated during floods. Development and redevelopment in flood zones will be inevitable in Port Chester, as the village is located along the Byram River estuary and Long Island Sound. The Village will vigorously enforce its flood damage prevention codes when approving new projects.

9.39.3 Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality

Westchester 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, events that have occurred in the County from 2005 to present were summarized to indicate the range and impact of hazard events in 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. For details of these and additional events, refer to Volume I, Section 5.0 of this plan.

Dates of Event	Event Type	FEMA Declaration # (If Applicable)	County Designated?	Summary of Damages/Losses
February 8-9, 2013	Severe Winter Storm and Snowstorm	DR-4111	No	No specific damages; heavy snow loads and snow management required.
October 27- November 8,	Hurricane Sandy	DR-4085	Yes	Significant utility outages Village-wide; road closures along Main Street, Abendroth Avenue,

Table 9.39-2. Hazard Event History

Dates of Event	Event Type	FEMA Declaration # (If Applicable)	County Designated?	Summary of Damages/Losses
2012				King Street, Putnam Drive due to flooding; other streets for downed powerlines/trees. Bulkheads damaged along the Byram River. Village pump station (N Main St) damaged by lightning strike; Brooksville fire station (upper Willett Ave) damage to roof; wind damage to South End fire station on Grace Church St. In general, Village- wide small damage events due to wind, rain, downed trees and power lines. Significant flooding to buildings on Main Street. Evacuations were voluntary; shelters temporarily provided during event. Police and fire overtime, cost for clean-up and debris removal all covered by P.A. program.
August 26 - September 5, 2011	Hurricane Irene	DR-4020	Yes	Significant utility outages Village-wide; road closures along Main Street, Abendroth Avenue, King Street, Putnam Drive due to flooding; other streets for downed powerlines/trees. In general, Village-wide small damage events due to wind, rain, downed trees and power lines. Significant flooding to buildings on Main Street. Police and fire overtime, cost for clean-up and debris removal all covered by P.A. program.

Notes:

EM Emergency Declaration (FEMA)

FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency

DR Major Disaster Declaration (FEMA)

IA Individual Assistance

N/A Not applicable

PA Public Assistance

9.39.4 Hazard Vulnerabilities and Ranking

The hazard profiles in Section 5.0 of this plan have detailed information regarding each plan participant's vulnerability to the identified hazards. The following summarizes the hazard vulnerabilities and their ranking in the Village of Port Chester. For additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction, refer to Section 5.0.

Natural Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

The table below summarizes the natural hazard risk/vulnerability rankings of potential hazards for the Village of Port Chester.

Hazard type	Estimate of Potential Dollar Losses to Structures Vulnerable to the Hazard ^{a, c}	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score (Probability x Impact)	Hazard Ranking ^b
Earthquake	100-Year GBS: \$0 500-Year GBS: \$2,504,187 2,500-Year GBS: \$59,464,800	Occasional	24	Medium
Extreme Temperature	Damage estimate not available	Frequent	21	Medium

Table 9.39-3. Natural Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

Hazard type	Estimate of Potential I Structures Vulnerable	Dollar Losses to to the Hazard ^{a, c}	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score (Probability x Impact)	Hazard Ranking ^b
Flood	1% Annual Chance:	\$42,699,882	Frequent	36	High
Severe Storm	100-Year MRP: 500-year MRP: Annualized:	\$5,531,906 \$29,013,374 \$289,939	Frequent	48	High
Winter Storm	1% GBS: 5% GBS:	\$16,783,045 \$83,915,224	Frequent	51	High
Wildfire	Estimated Value in the WUI:	\$2,252,112,154	Frequent	48	High

Table 9.39-3. Natural Hazard Risk/Vulnerability Risk Ranking

a. Building damage ratio estimates based on FEMA 386-2 (August 2001)

b. The valuation of general building stock and loss estimates was based on the custom inventory developed for Westchester County and probabilistic modeling results and exposure analysis as discussed in Section 5.

c. The earthquake and hurricane wind hazards were evaluated by Census tract. The Census tracts do not exactly align with municipal boundaries; therefore, a total is reported for each Town inclusive of the Villages.

d. Frequent = Hazard event that is likely to occur within 25 years; Occasional = Hazard event that is likely to occur within 100 years; and Rare = Hazard event that is not likely to occur within 100 years

e. The estimated potential losses for Severe Storm are from the HAZUS-MH probabilistic hurricane wind model results. See footnote c. GBS = General building stock

MRP = Mean return period

RCV = Replacement cost value

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary

The following table summarizes the NFIP statistics for Port Chester.

Table 9.39-4.NFIP Summary

Municipality	# Policies (1)	# Claims (Losses) (1)	Total Loss Payments (2)	# Rep. Loss Prop. (1)	# Severe Rep. Loss Prop. (1)	# Policies in 1% Flood Boundary (3)
Port Chester (V)	114	119	1107265.66	5	5	38

Source: FEMA Region 2, 2014

(1): Policies, claims, repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss statistics provided by FEMA Region 2, and are current as of March 31, 2014. Please note the total number of repetitive loss properties excludes the severe repetitive loss properties. The number of claims represents the number of claims closed by March 31, 2014.

(2): Information regarding total building and content losses was gathered from the claims file provided by FEMA Region 2.

(3): The policies inside and outside of the flood zones is based on the latitude and longitude provided by FEMA Region 2 in the policy file. FEMA noted that where there is more than one entry for a property, there may be more than one policy in force or more than one GIS possibility.

Critical Facilities

The table below presents HAZUS-MH estimates of the damage and loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of a 1-percent and 0.2-percent annual chance flood events.

Table 9.39-5. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities

			Exposure		Pot 1	tential Loss fr .% Flood Ever	om nt
Name	Municipality	Туре	1% Event	0.2% Event	Percent Structure Damage	Percent Content Damage	Days to 100- Percent ⁽¹⁾
Champion Energy Corp. Wharf.	Port Chester (V)	Port	Х	Х	-	-	-

			Exposure		Potential Loss from 1% Flood Event		
Name	Municipality	Туре	1% Event	0.2% Event	Percent Structure Damage	Percent Content Damage	Days to 100- Percent ⁽¹⁾
No Name Provided	Port Chester (V)	Wastewater Pump	Х	Х	40.0	-	-
Our Lady Of The Rosary Church	Port Chester (V)	Pantry	Х	Х	7.4	-	-
Port Chester Senior Citizen	Port Chester (V)	Senior	Х	Х	-	-	-
Port Chester Wastewater Treatment Fac	Port Chester (V)	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Х	Х	5.3	-	-
Village of Port Chester M	Port Chester (V)	Marina	Х	Х	-	-	-
Westchester Ave Marina	Port Chester (V)	Marina	Х	Х	-	-	-
Westmore Fuel Co., Port Chester Wharf.	Port Chester (V)	Port	X	X	-	-	-

Table 9.39-5. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities

Source: HAZUS-MH 2.1

Note: x = Facility located within the 0.2-percent annual chance flood boundary.

Please note it is assumed that wells have electrical equipment and openings are three-feet above grade.

(1) HAZUS-MH 2.1 provides a general indication of the maximum restoration time for 100% operations. Clearly, a great deal of effort is needed to quickly restore essential facilities to full functionality; therefore this will be an indication of the maximum downtime (HAZUS-MH 2.1 User Manual).

(2) In some cases, a facility may be located in the DFIRM flood hazard boundary; however HAZUS did not calculate potential loss. This may be because the depth of flooding does not amount to any damages to the structure according to the depth damage function used in HAZUS for that facility type.

Other Vulnerabilities Identified by Municipality

The Village of Port Chester is vulnerable to a variety of hazards. Village staff believes that the effects of coastal storms, coastal erosion, and floods present the highest risk in the village. Dam failure, extreme heat and cold, hailstorms, hurricanes/tropical storms/nor'easters, lightning, severe storms, and severe winter storms present a medium risk to the community. Other hazards such as wildfire, earthquake, and tornado reportedly present low or negligible risks to the community. The following specific information about vulnerabilities was identified by the municipality, including some with medium risk and some with low risk:

All Hazards

The Village would like to obtain generators for all critical facilities. First and foremost, a generator is desired for the Village Hall because it serves as the Emergency Operations Center (EOC).

Wind Events

The Village has discussed with ConEd the possibility of placing power lines underground. The village does not prefer that power lines are overhead. A business was temporarily shut down recently because a vehicle crashed into a pole. Although this was not a natural hazard event, minimizing these kinds of losses is desired. If the new Municipal Center is developed, the Village would bury power lines.

Wind damage has occurred at the Brooksville Fire House on Willett Avenue. This indicates that critical facilities in Port Chester may be vulnerable to future wind events associated with hurricanes, downbursts, tornadoes, nor'easters, etc.

Flooding

Flooding in Port Chester is generally divided into the uptown and downtown areas, with the uptown flooding related to drainage toward an unnamed stream known informally as Bulkley Brook and the downtown flooding closely related to drainage that discharges to tidal waters. In both areas, much of the flooding is caused by, or made worse from, poor or impeded drainage. Consider the following:

- The downtown area experiences drainage-related flooding when tides are high or storm surges are occurring, as well as during heavy rainfall.
- Much of the Byram River frontage is protected with bulkeads, and the bulkheads downstream from the "Gut" (a bend in the Byram River estuary) are failing. The Village has received a NYSDOS grant for design of bulkhead repairs. Bulkley Brook flows into the Gut through a culvert.
- Coastal flooding may impact homes on Harbor Drive.
- Frequent minor flooding occurs uptown in the Bulkley Brook watershed and storm sewer shed. Areas of nuisance flooding include Betsy Brown Road, Glendale Place, and Barrett Lane. These areas are served by 1920s-vintage storm drainage systems and experience widespread ponding during storms. A study is needed to evaluate solutions for the flooding. Although properties are not suffering direct flood damage, sewage backups are occurring.

Detailed descriptions of areas with flood risk were provided to the County by the Village. These are listed below by watershed:

Bulkley Brook (tributary of Byram River extending from Rye Brook village line to the Gut)

Standing water to a depth of approximately one foot occurs in a low spot around a drain inlet in the back yard of a single-family residence at Upland Street and King Street. The standing water occurs during a two-year or greater storm event, about three or four times during the past decade. The cause may be a clogged or collapsed Village-owned pipe draining the inlet.

Betsy Brown Road is inundated to a depth of approximately six to eight inches due to undersized drainage structures or damaged pipes. The inundation begins after approximately two to three inches of rain and impacts approximately five single-family residences. The inundation lasts approximately one hour. This flooding may be closely related to shallow flooding that occurs in adjacent neighborhoods to the north in Rye Brook that drain toward the East Branch of Blind Brook.

During periods of heavy rain, stormwater runoff cannot be accommodated by the drainage structures along Barrett Lane. As a result, runoff overtops lip of private driveway, flows down driveway and gets into basement of a single-family residence. This area is near the drainage divide between Bulkley Brook and the Byram River.

Drains that are tributary to a large culvert back up and cause street flooding on Glendale Place when the culvert is filled and cannot evacuate. According to the Village, catch basins might be undersized and a trash grate at the outlet of the culvert has the ability to restrict flow. This conditions tends to cause the culvert to run full which prevents runoff from the previously mentioned catch basin from entering the culvert. Four single-family residences were impacted by some basement flooding during Hurricane Irene in 2011. About four to five inches of standing water are created that last up to two hours after rains stop during storms producing more than two to three inches of rainfall.

Byram River

The intersections of the New Haven Line railroad tracks/bridge, Willett Avenue and Marvin Place is a low point in the topography. A large tributary area accounting for up to three-quarters of the village's storm drain system combines at this location. Stormwater collects at this low point where subsurface drainage pipes are tidally-influenced. Therefore, ponding occurs at intersection of Willett Avenue and Marvin Place. The depth of inundation is approximately two to three inches and lasts for about an hour after storm events. The area is within a 500-year flood zone.

Road flooding and basement flooding impacts 10 to 12 commercial properties on Lower King Street. Flooding occurs when a large culvert is inundated with stormwater runoff and a rising tide in the Byram River combine to overwhelm the drainage infrastructure. High groundwater also contributes to basement flooding. Surface inundation reaches two to three feet in depth. The flooding recedes when the tide recedes and flooding has occurred multiple times over the past decade. The area is within 100-year and 500-year flood zones.

Road flooding and basement flooding impacts 10 to 12 commercial properties and sanitary sewer pipe(s) in the downtown area of Port Chester at North Main Street and along Westchester Avenue. Flooding occurs when stormwater backs up in drainage pipes and then surcharges from catch basins and manholes, inundating the area with stormwater. The problem is largely created by a rising tide in the Byram River, which combines with stormwater runoff to overwhelm the drainage infrastructure. Surface inundation reaches two to three feet in depth. The flooding recedes when the tide recedes and flooding has occurred multiple times over the past decade. The area is within 100-year and 500-year flood zones.

With its close proximity to the Byram River, the Abendroth Avenue area is constantly in danger of flooding due to storm surges and the high tides that occur during storm events. Storm drainage systems surcharge and then streets become inundated. The area is within the 100-year flood zone.

Tributary of Byram River

During periods of extraordinary heavy rain, a small stream in the vicinity of Brook Road and a nearby stormwater management basin overflow onto the road, flooding driveways and garages. The flooding has occurred once or twice over the past decade during storms dropping approximately six to eight inches of rain. The local drainage infrastructure cannot accommodate this degree of precipitation. The depth of inundation is approximately two feet to 2.5 feet but the inundation lasts less than five hours after the rain stops or significantly slackens.

Blind Brook Watershed

Existing drainage is inadequate to convey significant storm events resulting in inundation to a depth of approximately twelve inches at the intersection of Wesley Avenue and Irving Avenue.

9.39.5 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

The Village of Port Chester experiences political leadership that is "more than moderately willing" to enact policies and programs related to hazard mitigation that reduce hazard vulnerabilities. Village staff believe that the Village's capabilities to effectively implement hazard mitigation strategies to reduce hazard vulnerabilities is "moderate" for planning and regulatory capability, fiscal capability, administrative and technical capability, and community political capability. Village staff believe that the local capability with regards to community resiliency capability is "limited."

Planning and Regulatory Capability

The table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available to the Village of Port Chester.

Tool / Program (code, ordinance, plan)	Do you have this? (Y/N)	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Dept. /Agency Responsible	Code Citation and Comments (Code Chapter, date of adoption, name of plan, explanation of authority, etc.)
Building Code	Y	Local, State	Building Department	Chapter 151 and 153
Zoning Ordinance	Y	Local	Building Department, Planning Dept.	Chapter 345
Subdivision Ordinance	Y	Local	Building Department, Planning Dept.	Chapter 402
NFIP Flood Damage Protection Ordinance	Y	Federal, State, Local	Building Department	Chapter 181
NFIP - Freeboard	Y	Federal, State, Local	Building Department	State mandated BFE+2 for single and two-family residential construction, BFE+2 for all other construction types
NFIP - Cumulative Substantial Damages	Ν	Federal, Local	Building Department	Standard 50%
Special Purpose Ordinances (e.g. wetlands, critical or sensitive areas)	Y	Local	Planning Board, Public Works	Chapter 281 Stormwater Management, Chapter 304 Trees, Chapter 312 Underground Utilities
Growth Management	Y	Local	Village Manager, Planning Dept.	2014-2016 Strategic Plan; Comprehensive Plan (2012); Chapter 345 Zoning of Village Code
Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	Y	Local	Building Department	Chapter 181
Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	Y	Local	Public Works	Chapter 169 Sewer Ordinance; Chapter 281 Stormwater Management; Chapter 199 Illicit

Table 9.39-6. Planning and Regulatory Tools

				Code Citation and Comments
Tool / Program	Do you have this?	Authority (local, county, state,	Dept. /Agency	(Code Chapter, date of adoption, name of plan, explanation of
(code, ordinance, plan)	(Y/N)	federal)	Responsible	authority, etc.)
				Discharge Ordinance
Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan	Y	Local	Planning Board and Town Board	
Capital Improvements Plan	Y	Local	Public Works, Engineering and Town Board	
Site Plan Review Requirements	Y	Local	Zoning Board and Building Departments	Chapter 345 Zoning
Habitat Conservation Plan	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economic Development Plan	Y	Local	Board of Trustees	Not part of Village Code; 2-year strategic plan adopted by Board of Trustees (most recently in April 2014)
Emergency Response Plan	Ν	N/A	N/A	N/A
Post Disaster Recovery Plan	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
Post Disaster Recovery Ordinance	Ν	N/A	N/A	N/A
Real Estate Disclosure req.	Y	State		NYS mandate
Other (e.g. steep slope ordinance, local waterfront revitalization plan)	Y (LWRP)	Local	Planning, Building, Waterfront Commission	LWRP has been adopted; Also Chapter 332 Waterfront Consistency Review; Chapter 148 Boating and Waterfront Law
Coastal Erosion Control Districts	Ν	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shoreline Management Plan	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sediment Control	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mutual Aid Plan	Y	County	Police	Mutual Aid Plan in place for entire County

Table 9.39-6. Planning and Regulatory Tools

(1) NYS Subdivision laws provide a general framework, but allow room for local ordinances and interpretation.

Administrative and Technical Capability

The table below summarizes potential staff and personnel resources available to the Village of Port Chester.

Table 9.39-7. Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Planning Department and Village Engineer (contractual)
Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Building Department and Village Engineer (contractual)
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Y	Planning Department
NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Y	Building Inspector
Surveyor(s)	Ν	

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
Personnel skilled or trained in "GIS" applications	Y	Planning Department
Scientist familiar with natural hazards in the County.	Ν	
Emergency Manager	Y	Village Administrator
Grant Writer(s)	Y	Village Administrator
Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	Y	Village Administrator
Professionals trained in conducting damage assessments	Y	Building Inspector

Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the Village of Port Chester.

Table 9.39-8. Fiscal Capabilities

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to Use (Yes/No/Don't Know)
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	No. HUD is preventing funding to County administrators.
Capital Improvements Project Funding	Yes
Authority to Levy Taxes for specific purposes	Yes
User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	Yes
Impact Fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	No
Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
Incur debt through special tax bonds	No
Incur debt through private activity bonds	Yes
Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No
Mitigation grant programs	Yes
Other	N/A

Community Classifications

The table below summarizes classifications for community program available to the Village of Port Chester.

Table 9.39-9.	Community Classifications
---------------	----------------------------------

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)		
Public Protection		
Storm Ready	NP ⁱ	N/A
Firewise	NP ⁱⁱ	N/A

N/A = Not applicable. NP = Not participating. - = Unavailable. TBD = To be determined.

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 gauge of the community's capabilities in all phases of emergency management (preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation) and are used as an underwriting parameter for determining the costs of various forms of insurance. The CRS class applies to flood insurance while the BCEGS and Public Protection classifications apply to standard property insurance. CRS classifications range on a scale of 1 to 10 with class 1 being the best possible classification,

and class 10 representing no classification benefit. Firewise classifications include a higher classification when the subject property is located beyond 1000 feet of a creditable fire hydrant and is within 5 road miles of a recognized Fire Station.

Criteria for classification credits are outlined in the following documents:

- The Community Rating System Coordinators Manual
- The Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO's Public Protection website at http://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/0000/ppc0001.html
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at http://www.weather.gov/stormready/howto.htm
- The National Firewise Communities website at http://firewise.org/

National Flood Insurance Program

The following section provides details on the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) as implemented within the municipality:

NFIP Floodplain Administrator:

The Port Chester Floodplain Administrator is the Building Inspector and the Port Chester EMD is the Village Manager.

Flood Vulnerability Summary

The Village of Port Chester maintains lists/inventories of properties and streets that have been damaged by floods; some of these were described above. Currently, there are no residents interested in mitigation (elevation or acquisition) in the Village; however, the Village does welcome comprehensive flood-prevention measures.

Resources

The Floodplain Administrator is the sole person assuming responsibilities of floodplain administration and he feels that he is adequately supported and trained to fulfill his responsibilities. The Floodplain Administrator is supported by the staff of the Planning Department and the Village's contracted Village Engineer. Most administration services include permit review, inspections, recordkeeping, education, and outreach. The Floodplain Administrator regularly attends continuing education and/or certification training on floodplain management through various building code enforcement educational opportunities. The Planning Department and Building Department provide nominal education and outreach to the community regarding flood hazards/risk, and flood risk reduction through NFIP insurance, mitigation, etc.

Compliance History

The Village of Port Chester is believed to be in good standing with the NFIP.

Regulatory

The Village maintains local ordinances, plans and programs that support floodplain management and meet the NFIP requirements. The Village's floodplain management regulations/ordinances exceed the FEMA minimum requirements and are consistent with the State minimum requirements, except that cumulative improvements and damages are not counted for substantial damage/substantial improvement determinations. The Village may update this part of the code in the future to be more stringent that the NFIP.

Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into the day-today local government operations. As part of this planning effort, each community was surveyed to obtain a better understanding of their community's progress in plan integration. A summary is provided below. In addition, the community identified specific integration activities that will be incorporated into municipal procedures.

Planning

Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan, 1992

The Village adopted its Local Waterfront Revitalization Program in 1992 and anticipate an updated plan in 2015 to include some flood-related policies and recognizes the impacts of climate change such as sea level rise. The Village is currently undertaking an update to the LWRP, and the draft states, "Because the vast majority of Port Chester's waterfront is already protected with a hardened structure, and few natural areas remain along the water, it is likely that these structures will continue to be strengthened as sea levels rise."

Policy 4 of the draft updated LWRP is "Minimize loss of life, structures and natural resources from flooding and erosion." The following goals were established for this policy:

- 1. Minimize losses of human life and structures from flooding and erosion hazards.
- 2. Preserve and restore natural protective features.
- 3. Protect public lands and public trust lands and use of these lands when undertaking all erosion or flood control projects.
- 4. Manage navigation infrastructure to limit adverse impacts on coastal processes.
- 5. Ensure that expenditure of public funds for flooding and erosion control projects results in a public benefit.
- 6. Consider sea level rise when siting and designing projects involving substantial public expenditures.

LWRP Policy 4/Goal numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 are hereby incorporated into Port Chester's annex to the County Hazard Mitigation Plan, and the LWRP is therefore considered consistent with this Hazard Mitigation Plan annex. Sea level rise is considered in several of the hazard mitigation initiatives listed below.

Comprehensive Plan, 2012

The Village Board of Trustees adopted its first ever Chester Comprehensive Plan in December of 2012. Recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan related to hazard mitigation include the following three broad recommendations with several individual recommendations for each (underlined for emphasis):

- Provide for an efficient and effective stormwater collection system that adequately services the entire Village:
 - <u>Upgrade or replace, as necessary, the aging stormwater infrastructure</u>.
 - Update stormwater management policies, as well as parking and impervious surface requirements to agree with MS4 regulations to <u>ensure adequate runoff control and flood</u> <u>prevention</u>.
 - Consider incorporating Best Management Practices (BMPs) for stormwater flow into the Village's rivers and combined sewers, <u>reducing outfall</u>, flow and capacity issues.
 - Consider innovative ways to <u>manage stormwater runoff</u> such as rain gardens, green roofs and additional green space throughout the Village. Implement such practices, as feasible.
- Promote environmental sustainability and the stewardship of natural resources:
 - o Protect environmentally significant and sensitive areas, such as the Byram River.

- <u>Adopt design standards for tree planting and tree protection</u> for use in both public and private street tree planting efforts. Work with volunteers to prepare a 10-year tree management plan that addresses tree planting, tree health, and maintenance of trees.
- <u>Carry out policies set forth in the Village's updated LWRP</u>.
- Promote and implement environmentally sustainable design and development:
 - Improve the quality of development with respect to site planning, <u>runoff</u>, <u>erosion control and</u> <u>stream stabilization</u>, use of environmentally safe materials, energy efficiency, water conservation, use of green roofs and other measures.
 - Establish an improved process of local development review to strengthen environmental standards for development proposals.
 - Incorporate green design practices into new developments and retrofit projects.
 - Review and update current policies and regulations for environmental review of development projects.
 - Identify environmentally compromised or potentially compromised land and establish strategies to mitigate impacts.

Given the above discussion, elements of hazard mitigation are considered integrated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Upon adoption, this hazard mitigation plan will be made available by the Office of the Village Clerk to all applicable Village departments as a planning tool to be used in conjunction with existing documents and regulations. It is expected that revisions to other Village plans and regulations such as the Comprehensive Plan, department annual budgets, and the Village code may reference this plan and its updates. The Village Manager will be responsible for ensuring that the actions identified in this hazard mitigation plan are incorporated into existing planning documents within five years from the date of adoption or when other plans are updated, whichever is sooner. Refer to Table 9.39.10 for a cross-reference of which plans and regulations may be most important for updating relative to this hazard mitigation plan.

Table 9.39-10. Plans and Regulations to be potentially updated

Regulation or Plan	Status Relative to Hazard Mitigation Plan	Responsible Party
Comprehensive Plan	Adopted December 2012.	Planning Board

The Village Administrator will be responsible for assigning appropriate Village officials to update portions of the Comprehensive Plan, Emergency Management Plan, Local Waterfront Revitalization Program and the Village Code to include the provisions from this Plan if it is determined that such updates are appropriate. However, should a general revision be too cumbersome or cost prohibitive, simple addendums to these documents may be added that include the provisions of this hazard mitigation plan.

Operational and Administration

Emergency Communications

The Village uses the Nixle system for emergency notifications.

Wind Events, Tree Management, and Power Outages

The Village does not have a tree warden, but the Public Works Department handles tree trimming and maintenance. The Village conducted a tree study recently and is considered a "Tree City." Improved tree maintenance capabilities are desired to help reduce loss of power during storms.

Winter Storms

Snow removal is handled by 17 trucks. A new salt/brine is used for deicing as of 2014. Over the winter of 2013-2014, the village ran low just like many other communities, and sand was used. The salt shed roof was recently replaced, cutting down on the loss of salt from rainfall and runoff. The village also ran out of places to put snow over this past winter of 2013-2014, and one roof was lost to collapse at a private residence.

Flooding and Coastal Erosion

Drainage considerations are addressed prior to construction as part of the site plan review process. The Public Works Department conducts maintenance of drainage systems and clears bridges and culverts of debris to ensure proper conveyance of stormwater as needed. Drainage and flooding complaints are typically routed to the department.

The Village Engineer inspects for, and does not allow, illicit discharges.

Although 35% of the sanitary sewer system has been replaced, storm sewers in Port Chester have not been studied or replaced. The Villages wishes to conduct studies in the future to help determine appropriate repairs and modifications to drainage systems.

The Village of Port Chester is extremely concerned with the failing bulkhead lining the west side of the Byram River estuary, as damage occurred during Hurricanes Irene and Sandy. The Village is planning for a bulkhead replacement and revetment to include ecological restoration improvements. Addressing the bulkhead replacement will reportedly (a) provide flood control, (b) provide public access to the existing Village Promenade, and (c) restore the natural habitat by way of ecological design and construction features (i.e. provide on-site stormwater management techniques such as rain barrels and green infrastructure). Grant funding was awarded in fiscal year 2013 by the Department of State Local Revitalization Program for design documents and permits to replace the bulkhead. Grant funding has been sought for construction financing of the bulkhead and a revetment for fiscal year 2014-2015.

In the last few years, the Village hardened a pumping station to guard against future coastal storm events.

Wildfires

The village is completely served by a public water system and wildfires are not a concern in this urban community.

Regulatory and Enforcement

As noted above, drainage considerations are addressed prior to construction as part of the site plan review process. The Village Engineer inspects for, and does not allow, illicit discharges.

Fiscal

As noted above, grant funding was awarded in fiscal year 2013 for design documents and permits to replace the Byram River bulkhead. Grant funding has been sought for construction of the bulkhead and a revetment.

9.39.6 Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization

This section discusses past mitigations actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and prioritization.

Past Mitigation Initiative Status

The Village of Port Chester has no prior mitigation strategy.

Completed Mitigation Initiatives not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy

The Village of Port Chester has identified the following as mitigation projects/activities that have been completed, are planned, or on-going within the municipality:

- As noted above, the Village hardened a pumping station to guard against future coastal storm events.
- Bulkhead repairs are planned also the Byram River, and design has been funded.

Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update

The Village of Port Chester has identified mitigation initiatives that it would like to pursue in the future. These initiatives are dependent upon available funding (grants and local match availability) and may be modified or omitted at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in municipal priorities. Table 9.39-10 identifies the municipality's updated local mitigation strategy.

As discussed in Section 6, 14 evaluation/prioritization criteria are used to complete the prioritization of mitigation initiatives. For each new mitigation action, a numeric rank is assigned (-1, 0, or 1) for each of the 14 evaluation criteria to assist with prioritizing actions as 'High', 'Medium', or 'Low.' Table 9.39-11 below summarizes the evaluation of each mitigation initiative, listed by Action Number.

Table	Table 7.57 To. Troposea nazara mugation initiatives											
Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
PC-1	Replace overhead power line with buried power lines when opportunities arise.	Existing	All	2	Admin.	High	High	Municipal, ConED, HMA	DOF	Low	SIP	PR
PC-2	Repair Byram River bulkheads that require attention as outlined in this annex.	Existing	Flooding and Erosion	2	Admin.	High	High	Municipal, NYSDOS	Short	High	SIP	SP
PC-3	Upgrade Byram River bulkheads as needed to keep up with rising sea level.	Existing	Flooding and Erosion	2	Admin.	High	High	Municipal, NYSDOS	Long	Medium	SIP	SP
PC-4	Evaluate existing storm drainage systems to determine how they can be modified to reduce flooding while accounting for sea level rise.	Existing	Flooding	2	Public Works, Planning	High	High	Municipal	Short	High	SIP	SP
PC-5	Conduct a flood mitigation study of the uptown area (Betsy Brown Road, Glendale Place, etc.) with the goal of reducing drainage-related flooding in the Bulkley Brook watershed.	Existing	Flooding	1, 2	Public Works, Planning	High	High	Municipal, NYSDOS	Short	High	SIP	SP
PC-6	Conduct a flood mitigation study of the downtown area with the goal of reducing drainage-related flooding. Include consideration of sea level rise as it relates to reduced drainage capabilities and surcharging of storm sewers.	Existing	Flooding	1, 2	Public Works, Planning	High	High	Municipal, NYSDOS	Short	High	SIP	SP
PC-7	Obtain a generator for the Village Hall/EOC	Existing	All	1, 5	Admin.	High	High	Municipal, HMA	Short	High	SIP	ES
PC-8	Obtain generators for other critical facilities	Existing	All	1, 5	Admin.	High	High	Municipal, HMA	DOF	Medium	SIP	ES
PC-9	Relocate the Public Works facility to reduce the potential for lost access due to coastal flooding	Existing	Flooding	1, 2, 4, 5	Admin., Public Works	High	High	Municipal, NYSDOS	DOF	High	SIP	PR, ES
PC-10	Ensure that future development on Fox Island is compatible with the potential for isolation during coastal floods.	New	Flooding	2	Planning	High	Medium	Municipal, NYSDOS	Long	Medium	LPR	PR
PC-11	Consider adding cumulative	Existing	Flooding	1, 2	Planning	Medium	Low	Municipal	Short	High	LPR	PR

Table 9.39-10. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Table	Table 9.39-10. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives											
Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
	substantial damage/substantial improvements requirements to flood damage prevention code											
PC-12	Consider upgrading critical facilities to increase resistance to wind damage.	Existing	Wind	1, 2, 5	Admin., Public Works	High	High	Municipal, HMA	Long	Low	SIP	ES, PP
	Assess and prioritize non-structur acquisition/relocation, or elevatio owners. Implement as funding be • Highland Avenue • Mill Street • North Main Street • Eagles Bluff • Riverdale Avenue	al flood hazard r n depending on f comes available.	nitigation alterr feasibility. The Specifically ic	natives for a parameters lentified ar	at risk propertie s for feasibility e properties in t	s within the flood for this initiative he following area	plain, including would be: fund s:	those that have being, benefits versu	een identified as rep is costs and willing j	etitive loss, s	ich as of propert	ty
PC-13	See above.	Existing	All	1, 2	Village Engineering via NFIP FPA) with NYS DHSES, FEMA support	High	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Ongoing (outreach and specific project identification); Long term DOF (specific project application and implementation)	High	SIP	РР

Notes:

Not all acronyms and abbreviations defined below are included in the table.

*Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure? Not applicable (N/A) is inserted if this does not apply.

Acronyms and Abbreviations: Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources: Timeline: Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program CAVCommunity Assistance Visit FMAShort 1 to 5 years CRSCommunity Rating System HMGP Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Long Term 5 years or greater On-going program DPW Department of Public Works Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program PDM OG FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency RFC Repetitive Flood Claims Grant Program DOFDepending on funding FPAFloodplain Administrator (discontinued in 2015) HMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance SRL Severe Repetitive Loss Grant Program (discontinued N/ANot applicable in 2015)

Costs:

NFIP

OEM

Where actual project costs have been reasonably estimated:

National Flood Insurance Program

Office of Emergency Management

Benefits:

Where possible, an estimate of project benefits (per FEMA's benefit calculation methodology) has

<u>Costs:</u> Low < \$10,000 Medium \$10,000 to \$100,000 High > \$100,000

Where actual project costs cannot reasonably be established at this time:

- Low Possible to fund under existing budget. Project is part of, or can be part of an existing on-going program.
- Medium Could budget for under existing work plan, but would require a reapportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the project would have to be spread over multiple years.
- High Would require an increase in revenue via an alternative source (i.e., bonds, grants, fee increases) to implement. Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed project.

Benefits:

been evaluated against the project costs, and is presented as: Low = < \$10,000

Low= < \$10,000 Medium \$10,000 to \$100,000

High > \$100,000

Where numerical project benefits cannot reasonably be established at this time:

- Low Long-term benefits of the project are difficult to quantify in the short term.
- Medium Project will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property, or project will provide an immediate reduction in the risk exposure to property.
- High Project will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.

Mitigation Category:

- Local Plans 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 manmade structures to reduce the impact of hazards.
- Natural Systems Protection (NSP) These are actions that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems.
- Education and Awareness Programs (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

CRS Category:

- Preventative Measures (PR) Government, administrative or regulatory actions, or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.
- Property Protection (PP) These actions include public activities to reduce hazard losses or actions that involve (1) modification of existing buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or (2) removal of the structures from the hazard area. Examples include acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofits, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
- Public Information (PI) Actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Such actions include outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and educational programs for school-age children and adults.
- Natural Resource Protection (NR) Actions that minimize hazard loss and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. These actions include sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
- Structural Flood Control Projects (SP) Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Such structures include dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.
- Emergency Services (ES) Actions that protect people and property during and immediately following a disaster or hazard event. Services include warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities

Table 9.39-11. Summary of Prioritization of Actions

Mitigation Action / Project Number	Mitigation Action/Initiative	Life Safety	Property Protection	Cost-Effectiveness	Technical	Political	Legal	Fiscal	Environmental	Social	Administrative	Multi-Hazard	Timeline	Agency Champion	Other Community Objectives	Total	High / Medium / Low
PC-1	Replace overhead power line with buried power lines when opportunities arise.	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	6	Low
PC-2	Repair Byram River bulkheads that require attention as outlined in this annex.	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	High
PC-3	Upgrade Byram River bulkheads as needed to keep up with rising sea level.	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	Medium
PC-4	Evaluate existing storm drainage systems to determine how they can be modified to reduce flooding while accounting for sea level rise.	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	11	High
PC-5	Conduct a flood mitigation study of the uptown area (Betsy Brown Road, Glendale Place, etc.) with the goal of reducing drainage-related flooding in the Bulkley Brook watershed.	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	11	High
PC-6	Conduct a flood mitigation study of the downtown area with the goal of reducing drainage-related flooding. Include consideration of sea level rise as it relates to reduced drainage capabilities and surcharging of storm sewers.	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	11	High
PC-7	Obtain a generator for the Village Hall/EOC	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	11	High
PC-8	Obtain generators for other critical facilities	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	9	Medium
PC-9	Relocate the Public Works facility to reduce the potential for lost access due to coastal flooding	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	10	High
PC-10	Ensure that future development on Fox Island is compatible with the potential for isolation during coastal floods.	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	Medium
PC-11	Consider adding cumulative substantial damage/substantial improvements requirements to flood damage prevention code	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	10	High
PC-12	Consider upgrading critical facilities to increase resistance to wind damage.	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	Low
PC-13	Assess and prioritize non-structural flood hazard mitigation alternatives for at risk properties within the floodplain	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	High

Note: Refer to Section 6 which contains the guidance on conducting the prioritization of mitigation actions.

9.39.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.39.8 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the Village of Port Chester 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 Village of Port Chester has significant exposure. These maps are illustrated in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume I of this Plan.

9.39.9 Additional Comments

None at this time.



Figure 9.39-1. Village of Port Chester Hazard Area Extent and Location Map



Figure 9.39-2. Village of Port Chester Hazard Area Extent and Location Map

Name of Jurisdiction:	Village of Port Chester
Action Number:	PC-2
Action Name:	Repair Byram River bulkheads

Assessing the Risk					
Hazard(s) addressed:	Coastal flood and erosion				
Specific problem being mitigated:	The Village is concerned with the failing bulkhead lining the west side of the Byram River estuary, as damage occurred during Hurricanes Irene and Sandy. The Village is planning for a bulkhead replacement and revetment to include ecological restoration improvements. Addressing the bulkhead replacement will reportedly (a) provide flood control, (b) provide public access to the existing Village Promenade, and (c) restore the natural habitat by way of ecological design and construction features (i.e. provide on-site stormwater management techniques such as rain barrels and green infrastructure). Grant funding was awarded in fiscal year 2013 by the Department of State Local Revitalization Program for design documents and permits to replace the bulkhead. Grant funding has been sought for construction financing of the bulkhead and a revetment.				
]	Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects				
Actions/Projects Considered (name of project and reason	 No action – without taking actions, the bulkheads will continue to deteriorate and allow collapse of private and municipal property. 2. 				
for not selecting):	3.				
Ac	tion/Project Intended for Implementation				
Description of Selected Action/Project	This project would involve a bulkhead replacement and revetment to include ecological restoration improvements as described above.				
Mitigation Action/Project Type	SIP				
Objectives Met	2, 4				
Applies to existing structures/infrastructure, future, or not applicable	Existing				
Benefits (losses avoided)	High benefits expected if the bulkhead can continue to protect property while environmental benefits are incorporated.				
Estimated Cost	High				
Priority*	High Discourse to the second state of the seco				
	Plan for implementation				
Responsible Organization	Port Chester Village Manager				
Local Planning Mechanism	The Village Manager will work with the Assistant Village Manager				
Potential Funding Sources	Likely NYSDOS; FEMA mitigation funds unlikely.				
Timeline for Completion	DOF (Short preferred)				
Reporting on Progress					

Date of Status Report/	Date:
Report of Progress	Progress on Action/Project:

* Refer to results of Prioritization (page 2)

Action Number: Action Name:

PC-2 Repair Byram River bulkheads

Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	0	Life safety is not a factor.
Property Protection	1	Numerous public and private properties will be protected.
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Costs are high, but benefits may be high.
Technical	1	Project is feasible and would be effective.
Political	1	Political will to support project.
Legal	1	Village has investigated legal issues and believes that it can legally repair the structure.
Fiscal	0	Grant funding preferred or necessary.
Environmental	1	Environmental benefits have been incorporated into the design.
Social	1	Benefit to entire community.
Administrative	1	Community can implement action.
Multi-Hazard	0	Coastal flood and erosion.
Timeline	1	Planning and design are completed. Implementation may be possible in a few years.
Agency Champion	1	Village Manager is championing this action.
Other Community Objectives	1	Repair of the bulkhead will improve public access to the shoreline.
Total	11	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High	Relative to other ranked actions in Port Chester

Name of Jurisdiction:	Village of Port Chester
Action Number:	PC-7
Action Name:	Generator for Village Hall/EOC

Assessing the Risk		
Hazard(s) addressed:	All hazards	
Specific problem being mitigated:	The Village would like to obtain generators for all critical facilities. Foremost, a generator is desired for the Village Hall because it serves as the Emergency Operations Center (EOC).	
]	Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects	
Actions/Projects Considered (name of project and reason for not selecting):	 No action - power will not be available to support the EOC during power outages 3. 	
Action/Project Intended for Implementation		
Description of Selected Action/Project	A generator is desired for the Village Hall because it serves as the EOC.	
Mitigation Action/Project Type	SIP	
Objectives Met	1, 2, 5	
Applies to existing structures/infrastructure, future, or not applicable	Existing	
Benefits (losses avoided)	High benefits expected as Village Hall and EOC personnel will be fully able to respond to incidents throughout the community.	
Estimated Cost	High	
Priority*	High	
	Plan for Implementation	
Responsible Organization	Port Chester Village Manager	
Local Planning Mechanism	The Village Manager will work with the Assistant Village Manager	
Potential Funding Sources	HMGP; Local Match	
Timeline for Completion	DOF (Short preferred)	
	Reporting on Progress	
Date of Status Report/ Report of Progress	Date: Progress on Action/Project:	

* Refer to results of Prioritization (page 2)

Action	Number:
Action	Name:

PC-7

Generator for Village Hall/EOC

Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	Improved Village Hall and EOC functions can help protect life safety.
Property Protection	1	Improved Village Hall and EOC functions can help protect property at the Village Hall and throughout the community.
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Costs are high, but benefits may be higher.
Technical	1	Project is feasible and effective.
Political	1	Political will to support project.
Legal	1	Village owns the site and can legally make improvements.
Fiscal	0	Grant funding preferred.
Environmental	0	Does not improve or impact the environment.
Social	1	Benefit to entire community.
Administrative	1	Community can implement action.
Multi-Hazard	1	Benefit for all hazards.
Timeline	1	Short duration preferred.
Agency Champion	1	Village Manager is championing this action.
Other Community Objectives	0	
Total	11	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High	Relative to other ranked actions in Port Chester

Name of Jurisdiction:	Village of Port Chester
Action Number:	PC-8
Action Name:	Generators

Assessing the Risk		
Hazard(s) addressed:	All hazards	
Specific problem being mitigated:	The Village would like to obtain generators for all critical facilities. A generator for the Village Hall and Emergency Operations Center (EOC) is described on a separate worksheet.	
	Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects	
Actions/Projects Considered	1. No action – critical facilities would be inoperable during power outages	
(name of project and reason	2.	
for not selecting):	3.	
Action/Project Intended for Implementation		
Description of Selected Action/Project	The Village would like to obtain generators for all critical facilities.	
Mitigation Action/Project Type	SIP	
Objectives Met	1, 5	
Applies to existing structures/infrastructure, future, or not applicable	Existing	
Benefits (losses avoided)	Medium benefits expected as emergency management personnel will be able to respond to incidents throughout the community.	
Estimated Cost	High	
Priority*	Medium	
Plan for Implementation		
Responsible Organization	Port Chester Village Manager	
Local Planning Mechanism	The Village Manager will work with the Assistant Village Manager	
Potential Funding Sources	HMGP; Local Match	
Timeline for Completion	DOF (Short preferred)	
	Reporting on Progress	
Date of Status Report/ Report of Progress	Date: Progress on Action/Project:	

* Refer to results of Prioritization (page 2)

Action Number:	PC-8	
Action Name:	Generators	

Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	Improved critical facilities functions can help protect life safety.
Property Protection	0	Minimal additional property protection is anticipated.
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Costs are high, but benefits may be higher.
Technical	1	Project is feasible and effective.
Political	1	Political will to support project.
Legal	1	Village owns the critical facilities and can legally make improvements.
Fiscal	0	Grant funding preferred.
Environmental	0	Does not improve or impact the environment.
Social	1	Benefits to entire community.
Administrative	1	Community can implement action.
Multi-Hazard	1	Benefit for all hazards.
Timeline	0	Short duration preferred but priority is lower than obtaining a generator for the Village Hall/EOC.
Agency Champion	1	Village Manager is championing this action.
Other Community Objectives	0	
Total	9	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	Medium	Relative to other ranked actions in Port Chester.

Name of Jurisdiction:	Village of Port Chester
Action Number:	PC-9
Action Name:	Relocate Public Works Facility

Assessing the Risk		
Hazard(s) addressed:	All hazards	
Specific problem being mitigated:	The Public Works facility is located on Fox Island and can therefore be cut off during coastal flooding. This project would relocate the Public Works facility to reduce the potential for impaired access due to coastal flooding.	
1	Evaluation of Potential Actions/Projects	
Actions/Projects Considered (name of project and reason for not selecting):	 No action – without taking actions, the Public Works facility will continue to be cut off during severe storms that cause flooding from storm surges such as hurricanes and nor'easters. 2. 3. 	
Ac	tion/Project Intended for Implementation	
Description of Selected Action/Project	This project would relocate the Public Works facility to reduce the potential for impaired access due to coastal flooding.	
Mitigation Action/Project Type	SIP	
Objectives Met	1, 2, 4, 5	
Applies to existing structures/infrastructure, future, or not applicable	Existing	
Benefits (losses avoided)	High benefits expected if the Public Works facility remains able to respond appropriately during emergencies rather than being isolated by coastal flood events.	
Estimated Cost	High	
Priority*	High	
Plan for Implementation		
Responsible Organization	Port Chester Village Manager	
Local Planning Mechanism	The Village Manager will work with the Assistant Village Manager	
Potential Funding Sources	HMGP with Local Match; or FEMA DHS EOC grant (not currently active)	
Timeline for Completion	DOF (Short preferred)	
	Reporting on Progress	
Date of Status Report/ Report of Progress	Date: Progress on Action/Project:	

* Refer to results of Prioritization (page 2)

Action	Number:
Action	Name:

PC-9

Relocate Public Works Facility

Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	If the Public Works facility is not isolated, public works personnel and equipment can more appropriately respond during disasters and emergencies.
Property Protection	1	If the Public Works facility is not isolated, public works personnel and equipment can more appropriately respond during disasters and emergencies; this response may include protecting village property elsewhere.
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Costs are high, but benefits may be high.
Technical	1	Project is feasible and would be effective.
Political	1	Political will to support project.
Legal	1	Village owns the facility and can legally relocate its operations.
Fiscal	0	Grant funding preferred.
Environmental	1	A new Public Works facility would provide opportunities for environment benefits such as improved stormwater management.
Social	1	Benefit to entire community.
Administrative	1	Community can implement action.
Multi-Hazard	1	Benefit for all hazards.
Timeline	0	This will require several years of planning and implementation.
Agency Champion	1	Village Manager is championing this action
Other Community Objectives	1	Relocating the Public Works facility may allow other land uses on the site that is vacated.
Total	12	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High	Relative to other ranked actions in Port Chester

ⁱ http://www.stormready.noaa.gov/com-maps/ny-com.htm

ⁱⁱ http://submissions.nfpa.org/firewise/fw_communities_list.php