CHAPTER VI – EXISTING HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAMS

The next step involves identifying existing mitigation strategies for the hazards likely to affect the town and evaluating their effectiveness. This section outlines those programs and recommends improvements and changes to these programs to ensure the highest quality emergency service possible.

| Existing Protection | Area Covered | Responsible Local Agent | Effectiveness (Poor, Avg., Good) | Recommended Changes- Actions-Comments |
|--|--------------|---|--|--|
| 2018 Zoning Ordinance | Town-wide | Code Enforcement Officer | Good | Reviewed annually and updated as needed, contains wetland, floodplain, and stormwater regulations |
| 2018 Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Regulations | Town-wide | Planning Board/Town Planner | Good | Reviewed annually and updated as needed. |
| 2010 Master Plan | Town-wide | Planning Board | Good | Update underway |
| 2009 Capital Improvement Program | Town-wide | Planning Board | Average | Update needed |
| 2018 Building Codes | Town-side | Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer | Good | The code is in line with state and federal standards. |
| 2017 Vulnerability Assessment | Town-wide | Planning Board/Board of Selectmen | Good | Identifies infrastructure, buildings, and natural resources threatened by sea-level rise and storm surge |
| 2015 Emergency Operations Plan | Town-wide | EMD | Good | Updates as needed |
| Emergency Services: Police Department | Town-wide | Police Chief | Good | Local and regional training are required for all emergency service personnel |
| Emergency Services: Fire Department | Town-wide | Fire Chief | Good | Local and regional training are required for all emergency service personnel |
| Emergency Services: EMS | Town-wide | EMD/Fire Chief | Good | Service needs reviewed as needed |
| Emergency Services: EOC | Town-wide | EMD | Average | Located in second floor of police station |

Table 7: Existing Hazard Mitigation Programs for the Town of Newington

| Existing Protection | Area Covered | Responsible Local Agent | Effectiveness (Poor, Avg., Good) | Recommended Changes- Actions-Comments |
|------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| Police and Fire | Town-wide | Police Chief and Fire | Good | Participates in Seacoast |
| Mutual Aid | | Chief | | Chiefs and other regional |
| Agreements | | | | mutual aid agreements |
| Shelter Plan | Town-wide | EMD | Good | Updated 2012 |
| Public Works | Town-wide | Highway Manager | Good | Responsible for town stormwater infrastructure, tree maintenance in town ROW |
| Tree Trimming | Town-wide | Highway Manager | Good | DPW works with utilities |
| Program | | | | to identify and remove |
| | | | | hazard trees |
| State of NH | Town-wide | EMD | Good | Reviewed annually to |
| Reverse 911 | | | | insure system works. |
| Public Alerts, | Town-wide | EMD, Town | Good | Information in shared in |
| Outreach and | | Department Heads/ | | an effective and timely |
| Education | | Elementary School | | manner via Town and |
| | | | | School websites, social |
| | | | | media channels, and Town |
| | | | | newsletter; EMD |
| | | | | maintains phone list of |
| | | | | elderly residents and |
| | | | | others that may need |
| | | | | assistance |

CHAPTER VII – MITIGATION ACTIONS

The Action Plan was developed by analyzing the existing Town programs, the proposed improvements and changes to these programs. Additional programs were also identified as potential mitigation strategies. These potential mitigation strategies were ranked in five categories according to how they accomplished each item:

Prevention Property Protection Structural Protection Emergency Services Public Information and Involvement

Table 8: List of Hazard Mitigation Strategies or Actions Developed by the Natural Hazard Mitigation Committee

| Mitigation Strategies or | Mitigation | Hazard(s) Mitigated | Description | Status 2019: |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Action | Category | | | New/Completed/Deferred |
| | | | | /Removed |
| Repair Mott's Pond Dam | Prevention, | Flooding | Dam repair to mitigate flooding and | Completed |
| | Property Protection | | prevent dam breach | |
| Fire Suppression/Water | Emergency Services | All Hazards: | Ensure adequate water supply to | Completed |
| Supply in Historic District | | Flooding, Hurricane/High | historic district | |
| | | Wind/Severe Winter | | |
| | | Weather/Earthquake/Drought | | |
| | | /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | | |
| Investigate becoming a "Fire | Emergency | Wildfire | Fire Wise program designed to | Removed |
| Wise Community" | Services/Prevention | | increase awareness about fire risk | |
| Bank Stabilization at Town | Structural | Flooding | Stabilize bank to reduce shoreline | Removed |
| Marina | Protection | | erosion | |
| | /Prevention | | | |
| Replace culvert on Patterson | Structural | Flooding | Reduce road flooding | Deferred |
| Lane | Protection | | | |

| Mitigation Strategies or | Mitigation | Hazard(s) Mitigated | Description | Status 2019: |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Action | Category | | | New/Completed/Deferred |
| | | | | /Removed |
| Evaluate impact and assess | Prevention/Public | Flooding/Sea-Level Rise and | An assessment of the Town's | Completed |
| infrastructure and natural | | Coastal Storm Surge | sea-level rise would improve bazard | |
| resources related to sea level | Property Protection | | mitigation planning | |
| rise and storm surge | | | indigation planning. | |
| Evaluate stormwater systems | Prevention/ | Flooding | Large portions of Newington are | Deferred |
| and ensure proper | Structural | | located within the designated MS4 | Town has received MS4 |
| functionality, especially | Protection | | permit area. The Town will be | waiver |
| around Fox Run Mall, in | | | responsible to insure stormwater | |
| order to prepare for MSR | | | conveyed to town owned/maintained | |
| water quality requirements | | | and operated stormwater | |
| | | | infrastructure meets MS4 | |
| | | | requirements and is treated prior to | |
| | | | outtake to surface waters | |
| Off-shore oil spill protection | Prevention | All Hazards: | Continue to evaluate and incorporate | Completed |
| emergency response team | | Flooding, Hurricane/High | effective equipment training | |
| | | Wind/Severe Winter | initiatives for responding to an oil spill | |
| | | (Coastal Storm (Storm Surga | In the Piscataqua River | |
| Poviow EOC offectiveness | Drovention/ | All Hazarda: | Ensure the EOC operator officiently | Completed |
| including the wireless | Emorgonov Sorvicos | All Hazalus. | during omorgonov operations | Completed |
| computer canabilities table | All Hazards. | Wind/Severe Winter | during emergency operations | |
| ton drills and | Flooding, Hurricane/Hig | Weather/Farthquake/Drought | | |
| telecommunications | | /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | | |
| Insert cisterns or fire ponds | Prevention | All Hazards: | Ensure there is a water source near | Remove |
| near the Public Works | 1 i e i e i e i e i e i e i e i e i e i | Flooding, Hurricane/High | the Public Works building | |
| Building | | Wind/Severe Winter | | |
| | | Weather/Earthquake/Drought | | |
| | | /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | | |

| Mitigation Strategies or Action | Mitigation | Hazard(s) Mitigated | Description | Status 2019: New/Completed/Deferred |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Action | cutegory | | | /Removed |
| Provide residents with information on water conservation during periods of drought via Town social media channels and newsletter | Public Information and Involvement | Drought | Drought threatens public and private drinking water supplies and fire suppression | New |
| Purchase and use portable, electronic road sign to post information on hazard mitigation and emergency preparedness techniques | Public Information and Involvement/ Emergency Services | All Hazards: Flooding, Hurricane/High Wind/Severe Winter Weather/Earthquake/Drought /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | Using a portable, electronic sign to announce hazard mitigation and emergency preparedness information can increase town hazard mitigation efforts | New |
| Develop plan for sharing Town-owned resources between Town departments | Emergency Services | All Hazards: Flooding, Hurricane/High Wind/Severe Winter Weather/Earthquake/Drought /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | Access to Town-owned equipment by all departments would enable efficient use of Town resources during periods of emergency response | New |
| Work with the City of Portsmouth to upgrade water supply serving Little Bay Road, Nimble Hill Road, and Newington Road for fire suppression and domestic water use | Prevention/ Structural Protection | All Hazards: Flooding, Hurricane/High Wind/Severe Winter Weather/Earthquake/Drought /Coastal Storm/Storm Surge | Water infrastructure improvements are needed to improve water flow for fire suppression and for residential use | New |

CHAPTER VIII - FEASIBILITY AND PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSED MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The goal of each strategy or action is reduction or prevention of damage from a hazard event. To determine their effectiveness in accomplishing this goal, a set of criteria was applied to each proposed strategy. A set of questions developed by the Committee that included the STAPLEE method was developed to rank the proposed mitigation actions. The STAPLEE method analyzes the Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic and Environmental aspects of a project and is commonly used by public administration officials and planners for making planning decisions. The following questions were asked about the proposed mitigation strategies identified in Table 5:

- Does it reduce disaster damage?
- Does it contribute to other goals?
- Does it benefit the environment?
- Does it meet regulations?
- Will historic structures be saved or protected?
- Does it help achieve other community goals?
- Could it be implemented quickly?

STAPLEE criteria:

Social: Is the proposed strategy socially acceptable to the community? Are there equity issues involved that would mean that one segment of the community is treated unfairly?

Technical: Will the proposed strategy work? Will it create more problems than it solves?

Administrative: Can the community implement the strategy? Is there someone to coordinate and lead the effort?

Political: Is the strategy politically acceptable? Is there public support both to implement and to maintain the project?

Legal: Is the community authorized to implement the proposed strategy? Is there a clear legal basis or precedent for this activity?

Economic: What are the costs and benefits of this strategy? Does the cost seem reasonable for the size of the problem and the likely benefits?

Environmental: How will the strategy impact the environment? Will the strategy need environmental regulatory approvals?

Each proposed mitigation strategy was evaluated using the above criteria and assigned a score (Good = 3, Average = 2, Poor = 1) based on the above criteria. An evaluation chart with total scores for each strategy can be found in the collection of individual tables under Tables 6.

| Criteria | Score |
|---|-------|
| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 2 |
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 3 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 2 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 2 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 1 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 3 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 2 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 2 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 3 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 3 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 3 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 3 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 3 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 1 |
| SCORE | 33 |

Table 9a: Replace culvert at Patterson Lane

Table 9b: Evaluate stormwater systems in Newington

| Criteria | Score |
|---|-------|
| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 3 |
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 3 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 3 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 3 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 2 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 3 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 1 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 2 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 3 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 2 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 2 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 3 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 2 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 1 |
| SCORE | 33 |

Table 9c: Provide residents with information on water conservation during periods of drought

| Criteria | Score |
|---|-------|
| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 3 |
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 3 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 3 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 3 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 2 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 2 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 3 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 2 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 3 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 3 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 3 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 3 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 3 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 3 |
| SCORE | 39 |

Table 9d: Use portable electronic road sign to post hazard mitigation information and emergency preparedness techniques

| Criteria | Score |
|---|-------|
| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 2 |
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 2 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 1 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 3 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 1 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 3 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 1 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 2 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 2 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 1 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 2 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 2 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 1 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 3 |
| SCORE | 26 |

Table 9e: Develop plan for sharing Town-owned resources between Town departments

| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 3 |
|---|----|
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 2 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 2 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 1 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 2 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 2 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 2 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 3 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 3 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 3 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 2 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 3 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 3 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 3 |
| SCORE | 34 |
| | |

Table 9f: Work with City of Portsmouth to upgrade water supply

| Criteria | Score |
|---|-------|
| Does it reduce disaster damage? | 3 |
| Does it contribute to other goals? | 3 |
| Does it benefit the environment? | 2 |
| Does it meet regulations? | 3 |
| Will historic structures be saved or protected? | 3 |
| Does it help achieve other community goals? | 2 |
| Could it be implemented quickly? | 1 |
| S: Is it Socially acceptable? | 2 |
| T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful? | 3 |
| A: Is it Administratively workable? | 2 |
| P: Is it Politically acceptable? | 2 |
| L: Is there Legal authority to implement? | 2 |
| E: Is it Economically beneficial? | 1 |
| E: Are other Environmental approvals required? | 2 |
| SCORE | 31 |

CHAPTER IX - IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE FOR PRIORITY MITIGATION STRATEGIES

This step involves developing an action plan that outlines who is responsible for implementing each of the prioritized strategies determined in the previous step, as well as when and how the actions will be implemented. The following questions were asked to develop an implementation schedule for the identified priority mitigation strategies:

- **WHO?** Who will lead the implementation efforts? Who will put together funding requests and applications?
- **HOW?** How will the community fund these projects? How will the community implement these projects? What resources will be needed to implement these projects?
- WHEN? When will these actions be implemented, and in what order?

Table 10 is the Action Plan, and includes the responsible party (WHO), how the project will be supported (HOW), and what the timeframe is for implementation of the project (WHEN). Also included is a cost estimate for each project if available.

| STAPLEE Score | Project | Responsibility/ Oversight | Funding/ Support | Estimated Cost | Time frame |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| 39 | Provide residents with information on water conservation during periods of drought | Town Administration | Town | \$0 | Short term One year or less |
| 34 | Develop plan for sharing Town-owned resources between Town departments | EMD | Town | \$0 | Short term One year or less |
| 33 | Replace Patterson Road culvert | Highway Dept. | Town/EMPG | Unknown | Medium term 2-3 years |
| 33 | Evaluate stormwater systems in Newington | Planning Dept. | Town/DES | Unknown | Long term 3-5 years |
| 31 | Work with City of Portsmouth to upgrade water supply | Selectmen/City of Portsmouth | Town/DES | Unknown | Long term 3-5 years |
| 26 | Use portable electronic sign to post hazard mitigation information | Police Dept. | Town/EMPG | \$25,000 | Medium term 2-3 years |

Table 10: Action Plan for Proposed Mitigation Actions