

# Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool

## Cover Page

The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool (PRT) demonstrates how the local mitigation plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR § 201.6 and offers states and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the local governments, including special districts.

1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet is a worksheet that is used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the plan elements (Planning Process; Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Maintenance; Plan Update; and Plan Adoption).
2. The Plan Review Checklist summarizes FEMA’s evaluation of whether the plan has addressed all requirements.

*For greater clarification of the elements in the Plan Review Checklist, please see Section 4 of this guide. Definitions of the terms and phrases used in the PRT can be found in Appendix E of this guide.*

Plan Information	
Jurisdiction(s)	Albany County
Title of Plan	2025 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
New Plan or Update	Update
Single- or Multi-Jurisdiction	Multi-jurisdiction
Date of Plan	3/4/2025
Local Point of Contact	
Title	Patrick Curran, Climate Policy Analyst
Agency	Albany County Executive
Address	112 State St., Room 1200, Albany, NY 12207
Phone Number	518-447-5639
Email	<a href="mailto:patrick.curran@albanycountyny.gov">patrick.curran@albanycountyny.gov</a>

Additional Point of Contact	
<b>Title</b>	Sergeant David Poole, Deputy Director of Emergency Management
<b>Agency</b>	Albany County Sheriff's Office
<b>Address</b>	58 Verda Ave. Clarksville, NY 12041
<b>Phone Number</b>	518-487-5426
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:david.poole@albanycountyny.gov">david.poole@albanycountyny.gov</a>

Review Information	
State Review	
<b>State Reviewer(s) and Title</b>	Betsy Parmerter, Hazard Mitigation Planner, DHSES Contractor Michael Tarasoff, Planning Manager – Hazard Mitigation, DHSES Kevin Clapp, Supervisor - Hazard Mitigation Planning Scott Feuerstein, Planning Manager – Hazard Mitigation, DHSES
<b>State Review Date</b>	4/11/2025
FEMA Review	
<b>FEMA Reviewer(s) and Title</b>	Paul Hoole, Mitigation Planner
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region</b>	4/11/2025
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>	Click or tap to enter a date.
<b>Plan Approvable Pending Adoption</b>	4/18/2025
<b>Plan Approved</b>	Click or tap to enter a date.

## Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet

#	Jurisdiction Name	Requirements Met (Y/N)						
		A. Planning Process	B. Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Maintenance	E. Plan Update	F. Plan Adoption	G. State Requirements
1	Albany County	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
2	Albany, City of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
3	Altamont, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
4	Berne, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
5	Bethlehem, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
6	Coeymans, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
7	Cohoes, City of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
8	Colonie, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
9	Colonie, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
10	Green Island, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
11	Guilderland, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
12	Knox, Township of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
13	Menands, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
14	New Scotland, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
15	Ravena, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
16	Rensselaerville, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
17	Voorheesville, Village of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
18	Watervliet, City of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
19	Westerlo, Town of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	

## Plan Review Checklist

The Plan Review Checklist is completed by FEMA. States and local governments are encouraged, but not required, to use the PRT as a checklist to ensure all requirements have been met prior to submitting the plan for review and approval. The purpose of the checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the plan by element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been “met” or “not met.” FEMA completes the “required revisions” summary at the bottom of each element to clearly explain the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is “not met.” Sub-elements in each summary should be referenced using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each element and sub-element are described in detail in Section 4: Local Plan Requirements of this guide.

Plan updates must include information from the current planning process.

If some elements of the plan do not require an update, due to minimal or no changes between updates, the plan must document the reasons for that.

Multi-jurisdictional elements must cover information unique to all participating jurisdictions.

### Element A: Planning Process

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>A1. Does the plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(1))</b>		
A1-a. Does the plan document how the plan was prepared, including the schedule or time frame and activities that made up the plan’s development, as well as who was involved?	Section 1 and 3	Met
A1-b. Does the plan list the jurisdiction(s) participating in the plan that seek approval, and describe how they participated in the planning process?	Sections 1.4 and 3.2	Met

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>A2. Does the plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as businesses, academia, and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(2))</b>		
A2-a. Does the plan identify all stakeholders involved or given an opportunity to be involved in the planning process, and how each stakeholder was presented with this opportunity?	Section 3.3, Appendix C section 1.11	Met
<b>A3. Does the plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(1))</b>		
A3-a. Does the plan document how the public was given the opportunity to be involved in the planning process and how their feedback was included in the plan?	Sections 3.4, 3.6, and 8.2.4	Met
<b>A4. Does the plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(3))</b>		
A4-a. Does the plan document what existing plans, studies, reports and technical information were reviewed for the development of the plan, as well as how they were incorporated into the document?	Sections 1.5 and 11	Met
<b>ELEMENT A REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

## Element B: Risk Assessment

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>B1. Does the plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction? Does the plan also include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(i))</b>		
B1-a. Does the plan describe all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area, and does it provide the rationale if omitting any natural hazards that are commonly recognized to affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area?	Sections 5, 6.1.1, 6.2.1, 6.3.1, 6.4.1, 6.5.1  Appendix A – Section 4.1 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B1-b. Does the plan include information on the location of each identified hazard?	Sections 6.1.2, 6.2.2, 6.3.2, 6.4.2, 6.5.2  Appendix A – Sections 4.1 and 6 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B1-c. Does the plan describe the extent for each identified hazard?	Sections 6.1.3, 6.2.3, 6.3.3, 6.4.3, 6.5.3  Appendix A – Sections 4.1 and 6 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B1-d. Does the plan include the history of previous hazard events for each identified hazard?	Sections 6.1.6, 6.2.5, 6.3.5, 6.4.5, 6.5.5  Appendix A – Section 4.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B1-e. Does the plan include the probability of future events for each identified hazard, including the type, location and range of anticipated intensities?	Sections 6.1.7, 6.2.6, 6.3.6, 6.4.6, 6.5.6  Appendix A – Section 6 of each jurisdictional annex	Met

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
B1-f. For participating jurisdictions in a multi-jurisdictional plan, does the plan describe any hazards that are unique to and/or vary from those affecting the overall planning area?	Appendix A – Section 4.1 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>B2. Does the plan include a summary of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability and the impacts on the community from the identified hazards? Does this summary also address NFIP-insured structures that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(ii))</b>		
B2-a. Does the plan provide an overall summary of each jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the identified hazards?	Appendix A – Sections 4 and 6 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B2-b. For each participating jurisdiction, does the plan describe the potential impacts of each of the identified hazards on each participating jurisdiction?	Appendix A – Sections 4 and 6 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
B2-c. Does the plan address NFIP-insured structures within each jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods?	Section 6.1.5  Appendix A – Section 4.4 of each jurisdictional annex	Met

**ELEMENT B REQUIRED REVISIONS**

Required Revision:

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Element C: Mitigation Strategy**

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>C1. Does the plan document each participant’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3))</b>		
C1-a. Does the plan describe how the existing capabilities of each participant are available to support the mitigation strategy? Does this include a discussion of the existing building codes and land use and development ordinances or regulations?	Appendix A – Section 3 of each jurisdictional annex	Met

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
C1-b. Does the plan describe each participant's ability to expand and improve the identified capabilities to achieve mitigation?	Section 10  Appendix A – Section 3 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>C2. Does the plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))</b>		
C2-a. Does the plan contain a narrative description or a table/list of their participation activities?	Section 6.1.5  Appendix A – Section 4.4 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>C3. Does the plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(i))</b>		
C3-a. Does the plan include goals to reduce the risk from the hazards identified in the plan?	Section 9.1	Met
<b>C4. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))</b>		
C4-a. Does the plan include an analysis of a comprehensive range of actions/projects that each jurisdiction considered to reduce the impacts of hazards identified in the risk assessment?	Section 9.3.1	Met
C4-b. Does the plan include one or more action(s) per jurisdiction for each of the hazards as identified within the plan's risk assessment?	Appendix A – Section 7.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>C5. Does the plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including a cost-benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))</b>		
C5-a. Does the plan describe the criteria used for prioritizing actions?	Appendix A – Section 7.3 of each jurisdictional annex	Met

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
C5-b. Does the plan provide the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing/administrating the identified mitigation actions, as well as potential funding sources and expected time frame?	Section 10.5 Appendix A – Section 7.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>ELEMENT C REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

## Element D: Plan Maintenance

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>D1. Is there discussion of how each community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(iii))</b>		
D1-a. Does the plan describe how communities will continue to seek future public participation after the plan has been approved?	Section 10.4 Appendix A – Section 8 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>D2. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle)? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(i))</b>		
D2-a. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to track the progress/status of the mitigation actions identified within the Mitigation Strategy, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	Section 10	Met
D2-b. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to evaluate the plan for effectiveness? This process must identify the criteria that will be used to evaluate the information in the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible.	Section 10.2.2	Met
D2-c. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to update the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	Section 10.2.3	Met

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>D3. Does the plan describe a process by which each community will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(ii))</b>		
D3-a. Does the plan describe the process the community will follow to integrate the ideas, information and strategy of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms?	Section 10.3	Met
D3-b. Does the plan identify the planning mechanisms for each plan participant into which the ideas, information and strategy from the mitigation plan may be integrated?	Section 10.3	Met
D3-c. For multi-jurisdictional plans, does the plan describe each participant's individual process for integrating information from the mitigation strategy into their identified planning mechanisms?	Appendix A – Section 3.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>ELEMENT D REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

### Element E: Plan Update

Element E Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>E1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))</b>		
E1-a. Does the plan describe the changes in development that have occurred in hazard-prone areas that have increased or decreased each community's vulnerability since the previous plan was approved?	Section 2.4  Appendix A – Section 2.4 of each jurisdictional annex	Met

Element E Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>E2. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities and progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))</b>		
E2-a. Does the plan describe how it was revised due to changes in community priorities?	Sections 3.6 and 8.2  Appendix A – Section 6.5 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
E2-b. Does the plan include a status update for all mitigation actions identified in the previous mitigation plan?	Section 9.2  Appendix A – Section 7.1 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
E2-c. Does the plan describe how jurisdictions integrated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms?	Section 10.3  Appendix A – Section 3.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>ELEMENT E REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

## Element F: Plan Adoption

Element F Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
<b>F1. For single-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of the jurisdiction formally adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))</b>		
F1-a. Does the participant include documentation of adoption?	NA	Met
<b>F2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of each jurisdiction officially adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))</b>		
F2-a. Did each participant adopt the plan and provide documentation of that adoption?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Not Met

<b>ELEMENT F REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

### Element G: High Hazard Potential Dams (Optional)

<b>HHPD Requirements</b>	<b>Location in Plan (section and/or page number)</b>	<b>Met / Not Met</b>
<b>HHPD1. Did the plan describe the incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information for HHPDs?</b>		
HHPD1-a. Does the plan describe how the local government worked with local dam owners and/or the state dam safety agency?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
HHPD1-b. Does the plan incorporate information shared by the state and/or local dam owners?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
<b>HHPD2. Did the plan address HHPDs in the risk assessment?</b>		
HHPD2-a. Does the plan describe the risks and vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
HHPD2-b. Does the plan document the limitations and describe how to address deficiencies?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
<b>HHPD3. Did the plan include mitigation goals to reduce long-term vulnerabilities from HHPDs?</b>		
HHPD3-a. Does the plan address how to reduce vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs as part of its own goals or with other long-term strategies?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
HHPD3-b. Does the plan link proposed actions to reducing long-term vulnerabilities that are consistent with its goals?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
<b>HHPD4-a. Did the plan include actions that address HHPDs and prioritize mitigation actions to reduce vulnerabilities from HHPDs?</b>		
HHPD4-a. Does the plan describe specific actions to address HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
HHPD4-b. Does the plan describe the criteria used to prioritize actions related to HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met

HHPD Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
HHPD4-c. Does the plan identify the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing and administering the action to mitigate hazards to or from HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Met
HHPD Required Revisions		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

## Element H: Additional State Requirements (Optional)

Not Reviewed by FEMA - The “Met / Not Met” designations were as determined by NYS

Element H Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
H1. Do jurisdictions identify critical facilities, assess vulnerabilities and ensure protection to a 0.02% chance event or worst-case scenario?		
H1-a. Does the plan document the name of facility, type of facility, jurisdictional location, and exposure to a 1% (100-year) and 0.02% chance event?	Appendix J	Met
H1-b. Does the plan document those critical facilities are protected to a 0.02% flood event, or previous worst case flood event?	Appendix J	Met
H1-c. For those that do not meet this level of protection (0.02%), the plan must include an action to meet or go beyond this criterion or explain why it is not feasible to do so.	Appendix A – Section 7.2 of each jurisdictional annex  Appendix J	Met
H2. Does the plan include an annex for every jurisdiction within the County’s boundaries, including the County?		
H2-a. Is there an annex for each jurisdiction seeking FEMA approval within County’s boundaries, including the County?	Appendix A	Met

Element H Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
H2-b. Does the plan include a table in the introduction section clearly identifying all jurisdictions which are seeking FEMA approval?	Section 1.4	Met
<b>H3. Within each jurisdictional annex, are projects developed in accordance with the NYS DHSES Proposed Projects Table?</b>		
H3-a. Does the plan include a minimum of two (2) new or carryover (not started) proposed mitigation actions that include all information requested in the NYS DHSES LHMP Proposed Action spreadsheet?	Appendix A – Section 7.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
H3-b. For jurisdictions containing an SFHA, one (1) of these actions must be for a project that addresses flooding.	Appendix A – Section 7.2 of each jurisdictional annex	Met
<b>H4. Was the draft plan posted for public comment?</b>		
H4-a. Was the draft plan posted in full (except for discretionary sensitive information) for 30 days for public comment or the time prescribed by local law, whichever is greater.	Section 3.4.1 Appendix C	Met
H4-b. Is a description included of the efforts to gain feedback from underserved areas where residents may not have computer or internet access?	Section 3.4.1 Appendix C	Met
H4-c. Does the website clearly identify how the public can comment on the plan and include either specific contact information to send comments or a user-friendly form or survey?	Section 3.4.1 Appendix E	Met

## Plan Assessment

These comments can be used to help guide your annual/regularly scheduled updates and the next plan update.

### Element A. Planning Process

#### Opportunities for Improvement

- A2-a: The Albany County HMP presents two separate list of participating stakeholders that do not match. The first is in Appendix C, Table 2, page 3, lists. This first list is missing stakeholders that represent businesses, the largest employers, seniors, youth, and academia. The second list of stakeholders is presented in HMP Table 3-3 on page 40. The HMP can be improved if an explanation were provided that explains why the two tables, both of which list participating stakeholders, do not match. Or the tables can be edited for greater consistency. The HMP should also document how businesses, the largest employers, and other stakeholders were invited to participate in the HMP update process as a stakeholder.
- A3-a: The Albany County HMP reports on page 50, their second HMP public meeting had no public attendees. Page 47 of the HMP reports only one person from the public commented on the final draft of the HMP and only two responses were received from county employees. The HMP can be improved if the narrative added a discussion that troubleshoots potential reasons for the lack of attendance and community input. The HMP should then suggest steps that can be taken to promote better public participation.

### Element B. Risk Assessment

#### Strengths

- Element B: Each annex includes an exemplary table in section 4.3, that reports the number and value of structures exposed to the 1% and 0.2% annual flood risk. The table is thorough, easy-to-review, and complements the description of specific geographic areas of concern reported in annex sections 6.

#### Opportunities for Improvement

- B1-d: Each annex can be improved if an additional column were added to each jurisdictions' hazard event table. Content of the additional column could briefly describe each hazard event, to help put the event impact into better context. Narratives of hazard events are available from the NWS NCEI website: <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/stormevents/choosedates.jsp?statefips=36%2CNEW+YORK> These narratives report event damages more descriptively than the Property and Crop damages columns.

The Town of Colonie annex can be improved, if the Pine Bush fire were added to the hazard event table.

- B1-f: Several jurisdictions report they have many structures exposed to flood risk. For example, the Village of Green Island annex on page 13 reports 562 parcels are in the SFHA. The City of Watervliet annex on page 16 reports 358 structures are in the SFHA, and the Village of Menands annex on page 17 reports 144 structures are in the SFHA. Many at-risk structures may suggest villages within Albany County have greater risks and vulnerabilities than the remaining town areas. The annexes can be improved if circumstances that have led to elevated risks within

villages were put into context.

B1-f: The Town of Rensselaerville annex reports the Town has an unusually large concentration of senior residents. The annex can be improved if it described the special vulnerabilities of the seniors.

The Town of Westerlo annex page 14 currently identifies veterans as a vulnerable population group without quantifying the number of veterans. The annex can be improved if the number of veterans within the Town were reported. 2022 ACS statistics for this information is available from: <https://data.census.gov/table?t=Veterans&g=060XX00US3600179851> The ACS breaks out the total number of veterans by military event.

- B2-a: The annexes have not sufficiently quantified the number of socially vulnerable and under-represented population groups. Annexes can be improved if this information was added to their Community Snapshot and hazard profiles. Several examples follow.

Example 1: The Village of Colonie annex states on page 19, it is important for the Town to take a holistic assessment of seniors, individuals with disabilities, and lower-income individuals. Rather than report an estimated number of vulnerable persons residing in the Village, however, the village annex references the Town of Colony ACS estimates in their risk assessment for Extreme Temperatures. The annex can be improved if ACS town statistics were replaced with village statistics, which is available from ACS as a census designated place and the Village of Colonie profile: [https://data.census.gov/profile/Colonie\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3617332](https://data.census.gov/profile/Colonie_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3617332).

Example 2: The main HMP page 162/180 reports homeless persons are among the County's most vulnerable, which is especially true in regard to extreme temperatures. However, neither the HMP nor annexes discuss the potential causes of homelessness nor estimate the magnitude of homeless persons at risk. The HMP can be improved if it added a discussion regarding potential causes of local homelessness. Background information regarding homelessness in Albany County is available from: AlbanyNYhomeless.com and <https://caresny.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Homelessness-in-Albany-ACCH-IPH-15.pdf>

Example 3: Albany County action MH15 proposes to “partner with social service agencies, emergency managers, community organizations, and the public to assess impacts of hazards on vulnerable populations such as, “residents in frequently flooded areas, low-income families and residents, people with disabilities or health issues, children & parents with young kids.” The HMP can be improved if the number of low-income persons, persons with disabilities, and youth less than 5 years were reported in the annex community snapshot and risk assessments. This information is currently missing from the HMP.

Statistics of villages and persons socially vulnerable and under-represented are available from the following ACS links:

- Altamont, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Altamont\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3601517](https://data.census.gov/profile/Altamont_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3601517)
- Colonie, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Colonie\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3617332](https://data.census.gov/profile/Colonie_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3617332)
- Green Island, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Green\\_Island\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3630521](https://data.census.gov/profile/Green_Island_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3630521)

- Menands, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Menands\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3646536](https://data.census.gov/profile/Menands_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3646536)
- Ravena, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Ravena\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3660675](https://data.census.gov/profile/Ravena_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3660675)
- Voorheesville, Village Profile:  
[https://data.census.gov/profile/Voorheesville\\_village,\\_New\\_York?g=160XX00US3677684](https://data.census.gov/profile/Voorheesville_village,_New_York?g=160XX00US3677684)
- B2-b: This PRT element requires the HMP to discuss the impact of hazards on changing population patterns and migration. The American Community Survey reports 2,819 international residents have migrated into Albany County between 2020 to 2023. This is 2,000 more persons than changes attributable to natural births and deaths. Consequently, international migration is the most significant component impacting population change in Albany County. The Albany County HMP can be improved if it acknowledged and discussed the potential impact of hazardous events on international migration. Statistics association to migration patterns in Albany County are available from: <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/pepest/2020s-counties-total.html>
- B2-b requires jurisdictions to describe the potential impact hazardous events may have on community assets. The Village of Green Island annex page 13 reports more than 55% of the village is located within the SFHA and has 562 structures located in the SFHA. Yet annex page 11 reports the village has a low vulnerability to flooding. The Village Green annex can be improved if an explanation were provided that explains how the 562 structures within the SFHA are protected from potential flooding risks.
- B2-c: None of the annexes currently report the number of NFIP policy holders within their jurisdiction. Each annex can be improved if this information were reported. If the number of NFIP policy holders is low, the HMP can be improved by including a mitigation action to publicize the benefits of NFIP coverage. The annexes should also consider addressing all properties at high risk of flooding rather than limiting the discussion to only NFIP policy holders who have repetitive loss properties. This number of NFIP policy holders can logically be added to section 4.4 of each annex.

## Element C. Mitigation Strategy

### Opportunities for Improvement

- C1-a/C1-b: Each annex says the jurisdiction will “continue to comply with the NFIP by enforcing floodplain management requirements.” However, it is not clear how participating jurisdictions are able to successfully accomplish this. All annexes are reporting it is “unknown” if any development projects submitted for the Albany County Planning Board 239 review are exposed to the 1% or .2% annual flood risk. And none of the jurisdictions are currently able to report if any of their critical facilities exposed to the 0.2% annual flood risk are protected.

The HMP and annexes can be improved if the process they follow to monitor development within the SFHA and areas exposed to the 0.2% annual flood risk were described. If a procedural gap in

FDPL enforcement exists, for example, the jurisdiction could propose to add a question to application for 239 reviews and building permits. The new question could ask, for example, if the development site is exposed to the 1% or .2% annual flood risk. When appropriate, an engineer stamp could be required to verify the site development will be protected.

Or Albany County HMP can be improved if information reported in the annex capability assessment tables were expanded so that the process jurisdictions follow to enforce provisions of the FDPL were described. The FEMA 2023 Local Mitigation Handbook suggests questions to help verify this in “Worksheet 4: Capability Assessment,” pages 205/213 to 212/220. A few suggested questions are as follows:

- Land Use Planning and Ordinances or Development Approvals: Is the local ordinances an effective measure for reducing hazard impacts? It is adequately administered and enforced? How can these capabilities be expanded and improved to reduce risk?
- Administrative: Is staffing adequate to enforce regulations? Is staff trained on hazards and mitigation? Is coordination between agencies and staff effective? How can these capabilities be expanded and improved to reduce risk?
- Education and Outreach: How widespread are education and outreach activities in your community? How can these capabilities be expanded and improved to reduce risk?
- C4-a: The Village of Green Island annex can be improved if it described if any effort has been given to protect and restore sensitive environmental areas. This is especially relevant to the Village of Green Island because 55.42% percent of the village’s land is exposed to flood risk (Annex page 13). There has been a 12.9% population increase since 2010, (annex page 1). And 13 building permits were issued from 2019 to 2020, (annex page 4).
- C4-b: The Town of Berne Project # TBerneMH5 could benefit from specifically stating that the action will ensure that this public education campaign focuses on mitigation and how to mitigate against each hazard rather than preparedness.

## Element D. Plan Maintenance

### Strengths

- [insert comments]

### Opportunities for Improvement

- [insert comments]

## Element E. Plan Update

### Strengths

- [insert comments]

### Opportunities for Improvement

- E1-a: The Village of Menands annex reports the Village recently adopted new zoning and site plan regulations. The Village of Menands annex can be improved if it explains the motivation of the new regulations and how they facilitate flood damage prevention.

## Element G. HHPD Requirements (Optional)

**To ensure Clarity, the following information on Element G is provided:**

The following jurisdictions have met each of the HHPD planning requirements. The high hazard dams in these jurisdictions are eligible for HHPD grants.

- City of Albany
- Town of Colonie
- Town of Berne
- Town of Coeymans
- City of Cohoes
- Town of Guilderland
- Town of Knox
- Town of New Scotland
- Town of Rensselaerville
- City of Watervliet
- Town of Wasterlo

The high hazard dams in these jurisdictions are:

- *Rensselaer Lake Dam* – covered in the **City of Albany Annex**
- *Loudonville Reservoir Dam* – covered in **City of Albany** and **Town of Colonie Annexes**
- *Helderberg Lake Dam* – covered by in **Town of Berne Annex**
- *Alcove Dam* – covered in the **Town of Coeymans Annex**
- *Cohoes Reservoir #3 Dam* – covered in the **City of Cohoes Annex**
- *Watervliet Lower Dam* – covered in the **Town of Colonie Annex**
- *Watervliet Upper Dam* – covered in the **Town of Colonie Annex**
- *Watervliet Reservoir Dam* – covered in the **Town of Guilderland Annex**
- *Altamont Main Reservoir Dam* – covered in the **Town of Knox Annex**
- *Vly Creek Reservoir Dike* – covered in the **Town of New Scotland Annex**
- *Vly Creek Reservoir Dam* – covered in the **Town of New Scotland Annex**
- *Myosotis Lake Dam* – covered by the **Town of Rensselaerville Annex**
- *Watervliet Lower Dam* – covered in the **Town of Colonie** and the **City of Watervliet Annex**
- *Basic Creek Dam* – covered i the **Town of Westerlo Annex**
- *Crescent Lake Dam A* – This NYS owned dam is coved in the **NY State Hazard Mitigation Plan**
- *Crescent Lake Dam B* – This NYS owned dam is coved in the **NY State Hazard Mitigation Plan**

### Strengths

- [insert comments]

### Opportunities for Improvement

- SF: The HHPD review tool lists “Appendix A for relevant jurisdictions” in the “Location in Plan.” Appendix A simply states, “See individual file for each jurisdiction.” Citing a location that generally refers the reviewer to all the annexes is not very helpful. It would be best to cite a location that contains a comprehensive list of the dams, such as Table 7-1 of the plan.

## Element H. Additional State Requirements (Optional)

Not Reviewed by FEMA – comments below are from NYS

### Strengths

- [insert comments]

### Opportunities for Improvement

- H1-b/H1-c: None of the annexes thoroughly report whether critical facilities are protected to the 0.2% annual flood risk. The mitigation actions proposed in each annex say the “first step” to meet this requirement will be taken “after funding sources are secured.” Greater detail on the limited ca SF: The HHPD review tool lists “Appendix A for relevant jurisdictions” in the “Location in Plan.” Appendix A simply states, “See individual file for each jurisdiction.” Citing a location that generally refers the reviewer to all the annexes is not very helpful. It would be best to cite a location that contains a comprehensive list of the dams, such as Table 7-1 of the plan.
- pability of the county to address critical facilities would enhance the plan and the capabilities section.
- H1: Appendix J lists all critical facilities within Albany County. However, the review of the list can be awkward because it is inconsistently organized by participating jurisdiction. The table of critical facilities can be improved if were sorted by jurisdiction.

The Town of New Scotland annex refers readers to content that is not included in the HMP such as the Climate Resiliency Plan. Such content needs to be paraphrased and included in the HMP. The referenced content could be presented within either the Town of New Scotland annex, or an appendix to the HMP.

- H2-a: The introductory paragraph of each annex says the focus of the annex is on completing actions before a hazard event occurs, which is a commendable and valid focus. Annexes can be improved, however, if the introductory paragraph and annex content were expanded to also describe risks and vulnerabilities that are unique to the local jurisdiction. Each annex Community Snapshot is currently limited to the population change since the 2010 decennial census; the median age; the percentage of seniors 65 years and greater, and the jurisdictions’ median income. Each annex can be improved if additional demographic information was added to the Community Snapshot. This could include poverty rates, disability rates, and other statistics that have comparatively surprising high or low percentages. See comments for Technical Issues for suggestions for access to such supplemental content. Also see, Opportunity for Improvement comments for B1-f/B2-a.

## Technical Issues

- There are issues with the page numbering of the Albany County HMP. Page 154 is followed by page 179. All pages after page 154 are numbered page 179. Additionally, there are page numbering issues between pages 57 – 70, such as page 51 of 107 appearing multiple times. There are also differing total page numbers listed, such as “51 of 107,” “179 of 180” and “XX of 256.” The HMP issue with page numbering should be corrected.
- The first page of the Green Island annex refers to the jurisdiction as both a village and a town. The annex introduction should clarify if Green Island is both a village and town and if so if the boundaries are coterminous.
- SF: In section 4.4 of each annex, the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph reads, “...and the flood provisions of the International Codes when repairing or rebuilding the structure when repairing or rebuilding the structure.” The duplicative wording should be removed.
- SF: In the Mitigation Actions Spreadsheet, the Town of Colonie lists Project # “T Colonie F2” for two separate actions. The Town of Colonie Annex also lists this project number twice. Please choose a separate project number for either the “Cohoes Crescent Road Stabilization” or “Vulnerability Assessment and Flood Protection for Critical Facilities” project.