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**What is the Community Reconstruction Program?**

- Established by Governor Cuomo to provide rebuilding and revitalization assistance to communities severely damaged by Hurricanes Sandy and Irene and Tropical Storm Lee

- 45 Community plans completed May 2014
- Funded by $25 million in Federal CDBG recovery grants
- State will complete evaluation for competition funding
- State will help communities find additional funding
- Total appropriation of $4.4 billion for NY Rising Projects
What is the Community Reconstruction Program?

New York Rising
Community Reconstruction Program
(Formerly known as Community Reconstruction Zones)

“As we continue to adjust to the new normal of extreme weather, it is critically important that our communities are as safe and resilient as possible”

NY Rising is an unprecedented community driven participatory recovery process
Objectives

- Assist state in analyzing project benefits by providing comprehensive analysis on multiple dimensions
- Establish method and framework for evaluating alternative resiliency investments considering potential factors
- Understand and assess what types of storm recovery projects communities chose
- Improve knowledge about benefits of community-based recovery planning for global transfer
• Collected data by inventorying all 45 community reconstruction zone plans in Round 1 (over 1400 recovery projects)
• Created framework for assessing projects based on Community Development Block Grant criteria, New York State guidance and from academic literature
• Coded and evaluated projects based on consistent criteria
• Established aggregate "benefits" scoring based on CDBG, NYS & other criteria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure, Housing, Economic, Natural and Cultural Res, Comm Plan and Cap Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency with NYCRR</strong></td>
<td>Increase Resiliency of Key Assets, Addresses Risks, Econ Growth, Coordinate Reg Initiatives, Prot Vuln Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
<td>Short, Medium, Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPCC Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Accommodation, Prevention, Procedural, Protection, Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Administrative, Capital Investment, Education, Law, Pilot Project, Plan, Study,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Scale</strong></td>
<td>Building, Neighborhood, Municipality, Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Needed</strong></td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Adaptive Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Mitigation Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Performance (Cost Sav)</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vuln Pop/Social Justice Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Human Svcs Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk Reduction</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptive Val (Gen Risk Reduction)</strong></td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

COUNT AND AVERAGE AGGREGATE BENEFITS SCORE OF ALL PROJECTS BY TERM

PROJECT TERM

- Short/Emergency
- Medium
- Long

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Average Benefits Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short/Emergency</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS
COUNT AND AVERAGE AGGREGATE BENEFITS SCORES OF FEATURED AND PROPOSED PROJECTS BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOL

COUNT

- Fiscal Tools: 26
- Gray Infr & Green Infr: 52
- Education: 118
- Land Use Planning: 121
- Green Infr: 235
- Emergency Planning: 332
- Gray Infr: 437

AVERAGE BENEFITS SCORE

- Fiscal Tools: 8.9
- Gray Infr & Green Infr: 8.7
- Education: 6.9
- Land Use Planning: 9.9
- Green Infr: 10.3
- Emergency Planning: 7.6
- Gray Infr: 7.0
- Buildings/Structures: 7.3
RESULTS
MEDIAN AND TOTAL COSTS OF FEATURED AND PROPOSED PROJECTS BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOL

Percentage Distribution of Total Costs

Median Costs
RESULTS

MEDIAN AND SUM COST OF PROPOSED AND FEATURED PROJECTS BY CR COMMUNITY

Median Costs

Sum of Costs
RESULTS
MEDIAN AND SUM COST OF PROPOSED AND FEATURED PROJECTS BY REGION

Median Costs

Sum of Costs
RESULTS

AVERAGE AGGREGATE BENEFITS SCORES OF FEATURED AND PROPOSED PROJECTS BY REGION

[Bar chart showing average aggregate benefits scores by region, with specific scores for different projects across regions.]
• Bottom-up recovery planning has significant benefits
• Projects concentrated on infrastructural solutions although a substantial number integrated social justice and environmental concerns
• Low cost solutions could have been better utilized (Regulations were under-emphasized; only 20 projects out of 840 concerned legal tools)
• Plans, predictably, were largely a vehicle for federal spending instead of building local autonomy for adaptation
• Types of benefits emphasized vary by region – L.I. highest in environmental; NYC highest in social justice/vulnerable populations; Capital Region highest in health and human services; Southern Tier had lowest average benefits scores in most categories
**Recommendations**

- In many cases, plans could benefit from clearer implementation strategies.
- Benefit prioritization targets could be included.
- Claims of benefits should be more precise and standardized.
- Data such as public preferences should be made public in plans.
- Greater emphasis could be placed on longer time horizons and climate change responsiveness.
- Greater emphasis could be placed on town-driven, autonomous and low-cost strategies.