



5.1 METHODOLOGY AND TOOLS

This section describes the methodology and tools used to support the risk assessment process.

5.1.1 Methodology

The risk assessment process used for this Plan is consistent with the process and steps presented in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 386-2, State and Local Mitigation Planning How-to-Guide, Understanding Your Risks – Identifying Hazards and Estimating Losses (FEMA, 2001). This process identifies and profiles the hazards of concern and assesses the vulnerability of assets (population, structures, critical facilities and the economy) at risk in the community. A risk assessment provides a foundation for the community’s decision makers to evaluate mitigation measures that can help reduce the impacts of a hazard when one occurs (Section 9 - Annexes of this plan).

Step 1: The first step of the risk assessment process is to identify the hazards of concern. FEMA’s current regulations only require an evaluation of natural hazards. Natural hazards are natural events that threaten lives, property, and many other assets. Often, natural hazards can be predicted, where they tend to occur repeatedly in the same geographical locations because they are related to weather patterns or physical characteristics of an area.

Step 2: The next step of the risk assessment is to prepare a profile for each hazard of concern. These profiles assist communities in evaluating and comparing the hazards that can impact their area. Each type of hazard has unique characteristics that vary from event to event. That is, the impacts associated with a specific hazard can vary depending on the magnitude and location of each event (a hazard event is a specific, uninterrupted occurrence of a particular type of hazard). Further, the probability of occurrence of a hazard in a given location impacts the priority assigned to that hazard. Finally, each hazard will impact different communities in different ways, based on geography, local development, population distribution, age of buildings, and mitigation measures already implemented.

Steps 3 and 4: To understand risk, a community must evaluate what assets it possesses and which assets are exposed or vulnerable to the identified hazards of concern. Hazard profile information combined with data regarding population, demographics, general building stock, and critical facilities at risk, located in Section 4 – County Profile, prepares the community to develop risk scenarios and estimate potential damages and losses for each hazard.

5.1.2 Tools

To address the requirements of DMA 2000 and better understand potential vulnerability and losses associated with hazards of concern, Washington County used standardized tools, combined with local, state, and federal data and expertise to conduct the risk assessment. Our standardized tools used to support the risk assessment are described below.

Hazards U.S. - Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH)

In 1997, FEMA developed a standardized model for estimating losses caused by earthquakes, known as Hazards U.S. or HAZUS. HAZUS was developed in response to the need for more effective national-, state-, and community-level planning and the need to identify areas that face the highest risk and potential for loss. HAZUS was expanded into a multi-hazard methodology, HAZUS-MH with new models for estimating potential losses from wind (hurricanes) and flood (riverine and coastal) hazards. HAZUS-MH is a Geographic Information System (GIS)-based software tool that applies engineering and scientific risk calculations, which have been



developed by hazard and information technology experts, to provide defensible damage and loss estimates. These methodologies are accepted by FEMA and provide a consistent framework for assessing risk across a variety of hazards. The GIS framework also supports the evaluation of hazards and assessment of inventory and loss estimates for these hazards.

HAZUS-MH uses GIS technology to produce detailed maps and analytical reports that estimate a community's direct physical damage to building stock, critical facilities, transportation systems and utility systems. To generate this information, HAZUS-MH uses default HAZUS-MH provided data for inventory, vulnerability, and hazards; this default data can be supplemented with local data to provide a more refined analysis. Damage reports can include induced damage (inundation, fire, threats posed by hazardous materials and debris) and direct economic and social losses (casualties, shelter requirements, and economic impact) depending on the hazard and available local data. HAZUS-MH's open data architecture can be used to manage community GIS data in a central location. The use of this software also promotes consistency of data output now and in the future and standardization of data collection and storage. The guidance *Using HAZUS-MH for Risk Assessment: How-to Guide (FEMA 433)* was used to support the application of HAZUS-MH for this risk assessment and plan. More information on HAZUS-MH is available at <http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/hazus/index.shtm>.

In general, probabilistic analyses were performed to develop expected/estimated distribution of losses (mean return period losses) for the flood and earthquake hazards. The probabilistic hazard generates estimates of damage and loss for specified return periods (e.g., 100- and 500-year). For annualized losses, HAZUS-MH version 3.1 calculates the maximum potential annual dollar loss resulting from various return periods averaged on a "per year" basis. It is the summation of all HAZUS-supplied return periods (e.g., 10, 50, 100, 200, 500) multiplied by the return period probability (as a weighted calculation). In summary, the estimated cost of a hazard each year is calculated.

Custom methodologies in HAZUS-MH version 3.1 (HAZUS-MH) were used to assess potential exposure and losses associated with hazards of concern for Washington County:

Inventory: The 2010 U.S. Census data at the Census-block level was used to estimate hazard exposure at the municipal level. The default demographic data in HAZUS-MH 3.1, based on the 2010 U.S. Census, was used to estimate potential sheltering and injuries for this analysis.

Census blocks do not follow the boundaries of hazard areas and can over or under estimate the population exposed when using the centroid or intersects of the Census block with the hazard zone. For the purposes of this assessment, the population/demographic data presented include only those blocks whose geometric centers fall within the identified hazard areas. The limitations of these analyses are recognized, and as such the results are only used to provide a general estimate.

The default building inventory in HAZUS-MH 3.1 is based on 2010 U.S. Census estimates at the block level. Washington County compared the default inventory available in HAZUS-MH with parcel-specific tax data maintained by Washington County Real Property Tax. In most cases, the project team felt that the differences between the default data and the most current Real Property data maintained by the County were not significant, and the default building inventory was used for the HAZUS-MH based analyses.

The critical facility inventory (essential facilities, utilities, transportation features and user-defined facilities) was updated by Washington County GIS. The critical facility inventory was then reviewed by the Planning Committee. Once approved, the data was formatted to be compatible with HAZUS-MH and the updated inventories were used for the risk assessment.



Flood: FEMA has not developed digital DFIRM flood data or flood depth grids for Washington County. Due to the lack of digital flood data, a quantitative exposure analysis was not possible. Information from the 2014 New York State Hazard Mitigation Plan was summarized qualitatively for the Flood Vulnerability Assessment in this plan. However, to provide a general vulnerability estimate of building stock and critical facilities, an analysis was performed using a 500-foot buffer abutting named streams using the Linear Hydrography Shapefile from the NYS GIS Clearinghouse. The resulting intersection of buildings and facilities within the 500-foot buffer provides a possible dataset of structures that may be vulnerable to flooding and may be used in the interim until DFIRMs are available for the County. Upon receipt of new mapping, the County intends to perform an analysis using the regulatory floodplain data to determine an accurate exposure.

Earthquake: A probabilistic assessment was conducted for Washington County for the 100-, 500- and 2,500-year MRPs through a Level 2 analysis in HAZUS-MH 3.1 to analyze the earthquake hazard and provide a range of loss estimates for Washington County. The probabilistic method uses information from historic earthquakes and inferred faults, locations and magnitudes, and computes the probable ground shaking levels that may be experienced during a recurrence period by Census tract.

As noted in the HAZUS-MH Earthquake User Manual ‘*Uncertainties are inherent in any loss estimation methodology. They arise in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning earthquakes and their effects upon buildings and facilities. They also result from the approximations and simplifications that are necessary for comprehensive analyses. Incomplete or inaccurate inventories of the built environment, demographics and economic parameters add to the uncertainty. These factors can result in a range of uncertainty in loss estimates produced by the HAZUS Earthquake Model, possibly at best a factor of two or more.*’ However, HAZUS’ potential loss estimates are acceptable for the purposes of this HMP.

Ground shaking is the primary cause of earthquake damage to man-made structures and soft soils amplify ground shaking. One contributor to the site amplification is the velocity at which the rock or soil transmits shear waves (S-waves). The NEHRP developed five soil classifications defined by their shear-wave velocity that impact the severity of an earthquake. The soil classification system ranges from A to E, where A represents hard rock that reduces ground motions from an earthquake and E represents soft soils that amplify and magnify ground shaking and increase building damage and losses.

When unchanged, HAZUS-MH default soil types are class “D”. However, for this analysis HAZUS-MH was updated with the specific NEHRP soil types for Washington County as provided by the New York State Office of Emergency Management.

Severe Storm: After reviewing historic data, the HAZUS-MH methodology and model were used to analyze the severe storm hazard for Washington County. Data used to assess this hazard include data available in the HAZUS-MH 3.1 wind model, professional knowledge, and information provided by the Steering and Planning Committees.

A probabilistic scenario was run for Washington County for annualized losses and the 100- and 500-year MRPs were examined for the wind hazard using HAZUS version 3.1. HAZUS-MH contains data on historic hurricane events and wind speeds. It also includes surface roughness and vegetation (tree coverage) maps for the area. Surface roughness and vegetation data support the modeling of wind force across various types of land surfaces. Hurricane and inventory data available in HAZUS-MH were used to evaluate potential losses from the 100- and 500-year MRP events (wind impacts).

Wildfire: The WUI (interface and intermix) obtained through the SILVIS Lab, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, University of Wisconsin-Madison was used to define the wildfire hazard areas. The University of Wisconsin-Madison wildland fire hazard areas are based on the 2010 Census and 2006 National



Land Cover Dataset and the Protected Areas Database. For the purposes of this risk assessment, the high-, medium- and low-density interface areas were combined and used as the ‘interface’ hazard area and the high-, medium- and low-density intermix areas were combined and used as the ‘intermix’ hazard areas.

The asset data (population, building stock and critical facilities) presented in Section 4 - County Profile was used to support an evaluation of assets exposed and the potential impacts and losses associated with this hazard. To determine what assets are exposed to wildfire, available and appropriate GIS data was overlaid upon the hazard area. The limitations of this analysis are recognized, and as such the analysis is only used to provide a general estimate.

Other Hazards: For many of the hazards evaluated in this risk assessment, historic data are not adequate to model future losses at this time. For some of the other hazards of concern, areas and inventory susceptible to specific hazards were mapped and exposure was evaluated to help guide mitigation efforts discussed in Section 9 - Annexes. For other hazards, a qualitative analysis was conducted using the best available data and professional judgment.

For this risk assessment, the loss estimates, exposure assessments, and hazard-specific vulnerability evaluations rely on the best available data and methodologies. Uncertainties are inherent in any loss estimation methodology and arise in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning natural hazards and their effects on the built environment. Uncertainties also result from the following:

- 1) Approximations and simplifications necessary to conduct such a study
- 2) Incomplete or dated inventory, demographic, or economic parameter data
- 3) The unique nature, geographic extent, and severity of each hazard
- 4) Mitigation measures already employed by Washington County and the amount of advance notice residents have to prepare for a specific hazard event

These factors can result in a range of uncertainty in loss estimates, possibly by a factor of two or more. Therefore, potential exposure and loss estimates are approximate. These results do not predict precise results and should be used to understand relative risk. Over the long term, Washington County will collect additional data to assist in developing refined estimates of vulnerabilities to natural hazards.