This Working Draft Submittal is a preliminary draft document and is not to be used as the basis for final design, construction or remedial action, or as a basis for major capital decisions. Please be advised that this document and associated deliverables have not undergone internal reviews by URS.

## **APPENDIX J**

## APPENDIX J –

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This appendix includes various mapping needed to address FEMA Region 2's minimum requirements for a hazard mitigation plan (as of May 2010).

## 100-Yr Residential Property Exposure Mapping from the NY State Hazard Mitigation Plan

Exposure Mapping (see subsequent pages of this appendix): The New York State Hazard Mitigation Plan (January 2008) contains detailed tables of residential property values located in the high risk (1% annual chance) floodplain, as defined by FEMA Q3 data, using a methodology for which 100% of the value of residential property was deemed to be in the floodplain if the parcel centroid was located within the floodplain boundary, and 0% was deemed to be in the floodplain if the parcel centroid was located outside of the floodplain boundary. FEMA has recommended that this data should be directly incorporated into the Plan. After consideration of this recommendation, the 100 year floodplain exposure information from the State Plan was not incorporated into the main text directly, because it was deemed more prudent to conduct a similar analysis using more recent data and an alternative methodology. There were three main factors contributing to this decision. First, the GIS parcel/assessed value data provided by the County for this plan, along with the latest equalization rates provided by the New York State Office of Real Property Services, provides more recent property values. Second, the most recent parcel/assessed value data available for the County planning project has been used to quantify exposure to other delineable hazards, therefore consistent use of this data in the flood hazard profile, as well, allows for more meaningful comparisons between profiled hazards. Finally, the County Plan's approach involves an analysis of improvements within the 100 year floodplain using an alternate methodology for which a percentage of improved property within the floodplain was calculated as a percentage of parcel area covered by the floodplain (i.e., if the floodplain was found to cover 20% of the parcel area, then it was estimated that 20% of the value of all improved property on the parcel was also exposed to the flood hazard – differing from the State Plan which used older data and a methodology which assumed an "all or nothing" approach to exposure). This was done to account for uncertainties in the location of improvements in relation to the parcel centroids. These different methodologies have been used for several other NYS plans, often showing a fairly strong correlation. However, in this case, the same cannon be said. The total value of residential property in the 100-year floodplain calculated for this plan varies from that calculated for the State Plan by about 75% (\$785,887,538 versus \$203,786,543). It should be noted that one contributing factor to this difference (abeit a small one) is the fact that the Village of Schaghticoke was not analyzed in the State Plan due to stated data availability issues from the New York State Real Property System or FEMA O3. While the individual results are not altogether consistent between one another, when one looks at the percentage of improved property value in the floodplain as compared to the value of all improved property countywide, one finds that even though the two results differ substantially on county-wide basis dollar for dollar, the high value of improved property county wide diminishes the effects of this difference. When one compares the percentage of improved property in the floodplain, using a total value of improvements of \$12,433,183,925, the percentages are 6% and 2%, respectively - a fairly consistent result for planning purposes, considering that the two analyses used different approaches and possibly different assessed values and equalization rates, the overall results are fairly consistent, as the table on the next page shows.

<u>Implications to the Participating Jurisdictions</u>: While Participating jurisdictions have used the exposure tables presented in Appendix A in their evaluation of risks and in their consideration of future projects, and while the dollar values in this Appendix J represents data which is superseded by other more recent



This Working Draft Submittal is a preliminary draft document and is not to be used as the basis for final design, construction or remedial action, or as a basis for major capital decisions. Please be advised that this document and associated deliverables have not undergone internal reviews by URS.

data used for this planning project, in conjunction with an alternate methodology to calculate exposure, it does provide a handy visual when used to supplement information already included in the Main Text Section 3 and Appendix A.

Comparison of Exposed Improved Property Values (100-year Floodplain): Rensselaer County Plan versus NY State Hazard Mitigation Plan		
	<b>Rensselaer County Plan</b>	NYSEMO
Municipality	Estimated Residential 100-year Exposure	Estimated Residential 100-year Exposure (Market Value, calculated using Year
	(Market Value, calculated using Year 2008 Equalization Rates and estimating exposure as a percentage of parcel area covered by the floodplain)	2006 Equalization Rates and estimating exposure as 100% where centroid is in floodplain and 0% where centroid is outside of floodplain)
Berlin, Town of	\$7,360,983	\$3,831,628
Brunswick, Town of	\$41,246,252	\$8,068,869
Castleton-on-Hudson, Village of	\$42,107,756	\$2,913,104
East Greenbush, Town of	\$40,485,331	\$5,564,136
East Nassau, Village of	\$3,574,931	\$1,722,293
Grafton, Town of	\$4,706,800	\$2,400,000
Hoosick, Town of	\$6,462,770	\$2,251,883
Hoosick Falls, Village of	\$16,069,381	\$4,380,326
Nassau, Town of	\$6,404,721	\$4,106,920
Nassau, Village of	\$6,880,164	\$2,166,821
North Greenbush, Town of	\$54,158,943	\$12,527,118
Petersburgh, Town of	\$5,892,023	\$3,228,768
Pittstown, Town of	\$9,976,431	\$2,484,857
Poestenkill, Town of	\$17,127,575	\$8,886,898
Rensselaer, City of	\$123,812,754	\$14,029,712
Sand Lake, Town of	\$33,867,439	\$13,242,777
Schaghticoke, Town of	\$16,952,644	\$11,829,560
Schaghticoke, Village of	\$990,359	*
Schodack, Town of	\$18,401,402	\$10,824,832
Stephentown, Town of	\$5,411,373	\$3,606,490
Troy, City of	\$323,453,520	\$85,460,082
Valley Falls, Village of	\$543,986	\$259,469
Rensselaer County Totals:	\$785,887,538	\$203,786,543
Estimated value of all improvements Countywide:	\$12,433,183,925	
Percentage of improvements in the floodplain, county- wide:	6%	2%

\* = Not Analyzed by NYSEMO due to stated data availability issues from the New York State Real Property System or FEMA Q3













