

8.13 - Jurisdictional Annex, Town of Petersburg

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Town of Petersburg. The jurisdiction's governing body passed a formal resolution to participate in this multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan update. A copy of their resolution is maintained at the local government offices and at the Rensselaer County Bureau of Public Safety.

8.13.1 Contact Information

The jurisdiction's resolution to participate identified a Primary Point of Contact and an Alternate for this hazard mitigation plan update. These individuals represented the jurisdiction on the county-wide Core Planning Group and led a local team of Jurisdictional Assessment Team Members who undertook various local activities related to the plan update.

HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT						
Primary Point of Contact				Alternate Point of Contact		
Name: Alan Webster Title: Supervisor Address: 65 Main Street, Petersburg, NY 12138-0130 Phone Number: 518-658-3777 E-mail Address: supervisor@petersburgh.org				Name: Deidra Michaels Title: Town Clerk Address: 65 Main Street, Petersburg, NY 12138-0130 Phone Number: 518-658-3777 E-mail Address: deidram@petersburgh.org		
Jurisdictional Assessment Team Members						
Local Jurisdiction Role/Position	Name	Email	Phone	Date of Invitation	Method of Invitation	Agreed to participate?
Land Use/Community Planner	Frank Sheldon	PlanningBoard@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
Emergency Manager	Alan Webster	Supervisor@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x12	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Floodplain Manager/Administrator	Code Enforcement Officer	BuildingDepartment@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x21	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Public Works Director / City Engineer	Ben Krahfost	BenK@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x19	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
Building Code Official	Fran Rogers	BuildingDepartment@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 X21	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Fiscal/Budget Officer	Charles Guntner	Town@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x11	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Manager/Administrator	Deidra A. Michaels	DeidraM@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Elected Officials (Supervisor)	Alan Webster	Supervisor@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x12	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
(Town Board Member)	Denise Jacon Church	TownBoard@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Board Member)	Jack Barnhill	TownBoard@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Board Member)	Dennis Smith	TownBoard@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Board Member)	Amy Schaaphok	TownBoard@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Justice)	Richard Snyder	PetersburghTownCourt@gmail.com	(518)658-3777 x15	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Justice)	Amy Manchester	PetersburghTownCourt@gmail.com	(518)658-3777 x14	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Tax Collector)	Emily Harrison	TaxCollector@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-0868	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Highway Superintendent)	Ray Hamison	Highway@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3541	March 7th, 2019	Email	Pending
(Town Clerk)	Deidra A. Michaels	DeidraM@Petersburgh.org	(518)658-3777 x10	March 7th, 2019	Email	Yes
Local Hospital	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Major University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Significant Business	Taconic Plastics	N/A	N/A	March 29th, 2019	Verbal	Pending
Neighboring County 1	Berkshire	N/A	N/A	March 29th, 2019	Verbal	Pending
Neighboring County 2	Bennington	N/A	N/A	March 29th, 2019	Verbal	Pending
Neighboring County 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Neighboring County 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tribal Group/Nation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

8.13.2 JURISDICTION PROFILE

8.13.2.1 Location and Land Area

The Town of Petersburg is located in eastern Rensselaer County, in the eastern part of New York State. It shares a border with the Town of Hoosick to the north; the Town of Berlin to the south; the State of Vermont to the east; and the Town of Grafton to the west.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau, Rensselaer County has a total area of 665 square miles (1,720 km²), of which 652 square miles (1,690 km²) is land and 13 square miles (34 km²) (1.9%) is water. Of that, the Town of Petersburg has a total area of 41.62 square miles (107.78 km²), of which 41.62 square miles (107.78 km²) is land. There are no waterbodies.

8.13.2.2 Population

According to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, the population of the Town of Petersburg is estimated to be 1,525 persons.

8.13.2.3 Demographics

Of a total area of 41.60 square miles (2010 Census data), the land area is 41.60 square miles and population per square mile is 37.6 persons.

Of the total population, there are 110.9 males per 100 females (all ages). Roughly 21% of the population are persons under 18 years of age, and 17.7% are persons 65 years and over (2010 Census). Young and old subsets of the population may have unique needs as far as care requirements and potential cognitive and/or mobility limitations before, during, and after a disaster.

The number of persons who speak a language other than English is 47, or 3.2%, of which 27.7% speak English less than "very well". Persons not speaking English well may have trouble understanding instructions regarding disaster preparation, response, and recovery.

Regarding education, of persons age 25 years and older, 80.6% are high school graduates or higher, and 21.6% have received their bachelor's degree or higher (2000 Census data). Higher education can help enhance skills associated with cognition and evaluation of risk. Higher education can, therefore, foster an overall improved perception of risk, particularly where individuals may not have prior direct experience preparing for, responding to, or recovering from a particular hazard in their daily lives.

Regarding families and living arrangements, from 2013 to 2017 there were 616 total households and 2.48 persons per household. Persons living alone sometimes have less of a direct social circle for support before, during, and after a disaster.

The Census Bureau classifies all people not living in housing units (house, apartment, mobile home, rented rooms) as living in group quarters. The two types of group quarters are

Institutional (correctional facilities, nursing homes, mental hospitals) and Non-Institutional (college dormitories, military barracks, group homes, missions, shelters). The Census Bureau maintains no group quarters information for this municipality. The needs of persons living in group quarters are unique, and residents are likely to have access and functional needs and unique care requirements before, during, and after a disaster.

According to 2017 ACS, the median household income was \$53,472; the per capita income in past 12 months (2017) was \$31,318; and the percentage of persons in poverty was 9.7%. Lower income persons have limited financial resources to draw from in both a pre- and post-disaster scenario and are likely to require support as they prepare for, and recover from, hazard events.

The total of noninstitutionalized civilians with a disability is 16.9%, and percentage of people with a disability over age 65 years is 33.2%. The total percentage of persons (civilian, noninstitutionalized) without health insurance is 6.8%. Persons with disabilities have access and functional needs such as cognitive or mobility limitations that may put them at greater risk before, during, and after a hazard event.

8.13.2.4 Brief History

The area that is now Rensselaer County was inhabited by the Algonquian-speaking Mohican Indian tribe at the time of European encounter. Kiliaen van Rensselaer, a Dutch jeweler and merchant, purchased the area in 1630, as part of the Dutch colony New Netherland. The land passed from English rule (1664) to Dutch control (1673), then back to English rule (1674), until American independence in 1776. Rensselaer County was created in 1790s from an area that was originally part of the very large Albany County. In 1807 the county reorganized.

The Town of Petersburg was settled around the middle of the 18th century and was part of the Manor of Rensselaerswyck. The Town of Petersburg was created in 1791 from the Town of Stephentown. Its size was diminished with the formation of other towns in the county, including the Towns of Berlin and Lansingburgh in 1806, and Grafton and Nassau in 1807.

8.13.2.5 Governing Body Format

The governing body of the municipality consists of a Town Board and various departments. This council serves as the municipal/local government, performing executive functions of different natures. Members of this governing body are elected by the people.

8.13.2.6 Growth/Development Trends

Performing an assessment of growth and development trends is one step of a hazard mitigation plan update. This look into the future is important because development in hazard areas could put more people and property in harm's way and, in turn, could work to increase potential disaster-related damages and losses at a time when the mitigation plan's purpose is to reduce the potential for damages emanating from natural disasters.

An evaluation of growth and development trends was undertaken by each participating

jurisdiction as part of the development of the initial plan in 2011. As part of this plan update, the Town of Petersburg reviewed and updated its prior feedback to reflect current conditions in the community as of early 2019.

The Town of Petersburg did not note any major residential or commercial development taking place, or any major infrastructure development planned for the next 5 years in the municipality. When limited development does sometimes occur, it is typically characterized by individual single-family construction on existing or subdivided lots.

New Development/Potential Development in the Municipality						
Property Name	Type (Residential or Commercial)	No. of Structures	Address	Block and Lot	Known Hazard Zone	Description /Status
Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

The Town of Petersburg enforces NYS State Building Codes, Local Laws for Subdivision and Site Plan Reviews to protect new development from the effects of natural hazards. SEQRA is required for subdivisions. SWPPP is required for major subdivisions. Site Plan Review is required for land use changes.

8.13.3 HAZARD IDENTIFICATION

The following hazards represent those that were deemed to be significant hazards of concern for the Town of Petersburg:

Profiled Hazards in the Town of Petersburg													
Jurisdiction	Atmospheric Hazards						Hydrologic Hazards			Geologic Hazards		Other Hazards	
	Extreme Temperatures (Coldwave/Heat Wave)	Hurricane / Tropical Storm	Lightning	Tornado	Wind	Winter Storm	Drought	Flood			Earthquake	Landslide ⁴	Wildfire ⁵
								Flooding ²	Dam Failure ¹	Ice Jam ³			
Petersburgh, Town of	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	

Notes: (1) Based on presence of a High hazard dam (NYSDEC classification) either in the municipality or close upstream on a watercourse flowing through that municipality and feedback from the County Planning Department. (2) Based on identification of improved property in mapped FEMA flood hazard zones. (3) Based on historical records, Flood Insurance Studies, and local information as well as feedback from the County Planning Department. (4) Based on identification of improved property in mapped high incidence or high susceptibility landslide risk zones, plus those municipalities in which details of individual landslide events are available. (5) Based on identification of improved property in mapped wildfire hazard zones.

8.13.4 NOTABLE HAZARD EVENT OCCURRENCES SINCE 2011

Rensselaer County has a long history of natural hazard events occurring, as detailed in Section 3 of this plan. A summary of historical events is provided in each of the hazard profiles of Section 3 and includes a chronology of events that have affected the County and its municipalities.

NOAAs NCDC records 1,141 hazard event occurrences from 1950 to 2018 causing 1 fatality, 116 injuries, \$27,679,000 in property damage, and \$305,800 in crop damage. The table below presents a summary of 415 events that are included in NOAA's NCDC records for Rensselaer County since the prior 2011 HMP was prepared to summarize the recent range and impact of natural hazard events potentially affecting the County and its municipalities. For details of events prior to 2011, refer to Section 3 of this plan.

Natural Hazard Event History (January 2011 through December 2018)					
Event Type	Count	Fatalities	Injuries	Property Damage	Crop Damage
Blizzard	2	0	0	\$0	\$0
Cold/Wind Chill	28	0	0	\$0	\$0
Excessive Heat	3	0	0	\$0	\$0
Extreme Cold/Wind Chill	8	0	0	\$0	\$0
Flash Flood	20	0	0	\$320,000	\$0
Flood	16	0	0	\$10,000	\$0
Frost/Freeze	6	0	0	\$0	\$0
Hail	29	0	0	\$0	\$0
Heat	17	0	0	\$0	\$0
Heavy Rain	1	0	0	\$0	\$0
Heavy Snow	13	0	0	\$0	\$0
High Wind	17	0	0	\$0	\$0
Lightning	1	0	0	\$50,000	\$0
Storm Surge/Tide	1	0	0	\$0	\$0
Strong Wind	22	0	0	\$48,000	\$4,000
Thunderstorm Wind	141	0	7	\$0	\$0
Tropical Storm	2	0	0	\$0	\$0
Winter Storm	28	0	0	\$0	\$0
Winter Weather	60	0	0	\$0	\$0
Total	415	0	7	\$428,000	\$4,000

Since 1954, Rensselaer County has been designated as eligible for at least one form of FEMA assistance in 16 Federally-declared major disasters and eight Federally-declared emergencies. Since the adoption of the 2011 HMP, Rensselaer County has been designated as eligible for at least one form of FEMA assistance in three of the state's 12 Federally-declared major disasters (2011 through 2018).

Rensselaer County Disaster Declarations, 2011-2018					
Declaration Year	Event Incident Period	Declaration Type	Disaster Type	Disaster Number	Rensselaer County Designation
2017	March 14-15, 2017	Major Disaster Declaration	Severe Winter Storm and Snowstorm	DR-4322	Declared for PA only
2011	September 7-11, 2011	Emergency Declaration	Tropical Storm Lee	EM-3341	Declared for PA Category B
2011	August 26, 2011 through September 5, 2011	Major Disaster Declaration	Hurricane Irene	DR-4020	Declared for PA and IA
2011	December 26-27, 2010	Major Disaster Declaration	Severe Winter Storm and Snowstorm	DR-1957	Declared for PA Category B

Source: FEMA, online at <https://www.fema.gov/disasters>, queried on July 11, 2019
PA= FEMA's Public Assistance Program
IA= FEMA's Individual Assistance Program
Category B= FEMA's Public Assistance Program Category B (Emergency Protective Measures)

Some more recent notable events in the Town of Petersburg since 2011 include:

August 28, 2011 – Irene

The remnants of Hurricane Irene brought heavy to extreme rainfall throughout Rensselaer County. Route 22 in Petersburg was closed due to flooding and a washout between Smith Road and Church Hollow Road.

October 29-30, 2012 – Sandy

Rainfall in Rensselaer County was not excessively heavy and did not cause notable flooding, thanks to dry antecedent conditions. Wind gusts of 40 to 60 mph were common from the afternoon of the 29th until the early morning hours of the 30th.

June 30, 2017 to July 1, 2017 - Severe Storms and Flooding

Numerous strong to severe thunderstorms occurred across Rensselaer County. Thunderstorm winds caused damages throughout the county, downing trees and power lines, and heavy rains caused flooding in many areas of the county.

8.13.5 NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Town of Petersburg has participated in FEMA's National Flood Insurance program (NFIP) since September 1, 1978.

- Total number of policies¹: 5
- Insurance in force²: \$860,700
- Total number of losses: 6
- Total claims paid: \$17,093
- Repetitive Loss Properties: 0
- Severe Repetitive Loss Properties: 0

The Town of Petersburg provided the following NFIP Administrator Input in 2019, for inclusion in the 2019 HMP.

¹ Policies in Force from www.fema.gov on 02/21/19, data current as of 09/30/18.

² Insurance in Force from www.fema.gov on 02/21/19, data current as of 09/30/18.

Section 8.13 - Jurisdictional Annex, Town of Petersburg

Name: Fran Rogers Title: Floodplain Manager/Floodplain Administrator/NFIP Coordinator

Community: Town of Petersburg Email and Phone: _____ and (518)658-3777 x 21

Worksheet 2 - NFIP

Note: This form should be filled out by your floodplain administrator. Submittals should be returned via email to Jay Wilson at jwilson@renseo.com. Feel free to contact Anna Foley of AECOM if you have questions, at anna.foley@aecom.com. All communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) provided FEMA with a floodplain management ordinance and a designated floodplain administrator as a prerequisite to enter the program. All participating communities must provide the information below. Please return a copy of your floodplain management ordinance to us with this submittal.

Adoption Date of your Current Floodplain Management Ordinance	Date of Entry into NFIP ¹	Position or Title of Your Jurisdiction's Designated Floodplain Manager/Administrator (may also be called NFIP Coordinator)	Is this person a Certified Floodplain Manager?	Is floodplain management an auxiliary function?	Is your community in good standing with the NFIP?		
6/30/75	9/1/78	Code Enforcement Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Provide an explanation of NFIP administration services (i.e., permit review, GIS, education or outreach, inspections, engineering capability, etc.):							
Permit Review, GIS, Inspections, Has taken required NYS Code Training.							
Describe barriers to running an effective NFIP program in the community (if applicable):							
None							
When was most recent FEMA Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC)?*	Is a CAV or CAC scheduled or needed?	Does the current floodplain management ordinance exceed FEMA or State minimum requirements? If so, describe how.	Is training of staff regarding NFIP issues planned?	Does your community intend to continue to enforce the floodplain management requirements including regulating new construction in Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs)?	Does your community participate in the CRS? If so, state your Class.	Does your community intend to continue its participation in the CRS program?	If your community is not currently participating in the CRS program, are you intending to initiate the process during the next planning cycle?
2018	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No * Class _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
*Describe any outstanding compliance issues (i.e., current violations):							
None that we are aware of at this time.							

¹ Your date of entry into the NFIP can be found at: <http://www.fema.gov/cjs/NY.html> (column "Reg-Emer Date").

Rensselaer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – NFIP Worksheet NFIP-1

Name: Fran Rogers Title: Floodplain Manager/Floodplain Administrator/NFIP Coordinator

Representing: Petersburgh Email and Phone: BuildingDepartment@Petersburgh.org (518)658-3777

Provide an explanation of your local floodplain permitting process:

Code Enforcement Officer always checks the GIS System before issuing a permit to assure that it is not in a floodplain zone. In cases where found to be in floodplain zone advises resident of the special requirements to build or denies permits if to extensive.

Does your community intend to continue floodplain identification and mapping services including any local requests for map updates?	Does your community intend to initiate/continue the buyouts of repetitive loss properties?	Does your community intend to commit staff or resources to improve local mapping or code administration in the future?	Does your community intend to provide local outreach to promote the sale of flood insurance?	Does your community intend to participate in RiskMAP meetings and planning initiatives?	Does your community intend to continue to implement structural improvements to mitigate against flooding - culverts, drainage basins, etc.?	Does your community intend to continue to implement home improvement programs designed to minimize basement flooding?	Does your community intend to continue to implement roadway improvements to reduce damage from future flooding events?	Does your community intend to implement plans and programs in coordination with a local or regional drainage/sewer authority?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does your community intend to adopt the new FEMA Advisory Base Flood Elevations?	As Floodplain Manager, did you (or your predecessor at the time) actively participate in the development of the initial Hazard Mitigation Plan?		As Floodplain Manager, are you actively participating in the development of this Hazard Mitigation Plan Update?		Have there been any changes to your community's local floodplain management program since the last version of the plan in 2011?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
* If you answered "yes", that there have been changes to your local program since 2011, please describe:								
Provide a description of your community assistance and monitoring activities:								
Our Town Clerk posts and monitors all communication with residents through social media and websites. Highway Superintendent communicates all roadway improvements needed to reduce damage from flooding. Water District Superintendent communicates any damage done on the Water System due to flooding.								
NFIP participating communities are required to update/revise their floodplain management ordinance to ensure that it complies with the latest FEMA regulations. Will your community continue to commit to this program requirement?				NFIP participating communities are also required to update/revise their floodplain management ordinance to be consistent with the latest FIRMs. Will your community continue to commit to this program requirement?				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				

Note: NFIP policy statistics by community are maintained at: <http://bsa.nfipstat.fema.gov/reports/1011.htm#NJT>
 NFIP claims data by community is maintained at: <http://bsa.nfipstat.fema.gov/reports/1040.htm#34>
 Information about structures at risk of flooding can be found in the current Hazard Mitigation Plan.
 All NFIP participating communities should encourage local residents to purchase and maintain flood insurance.

Rensselaer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update – NFIP Worksheet NFIP-2

8.13.6 ASSET IDENTIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION

An inventory of geo-referenced assets in Rensselaer County has been created in order to identify and characterize property and persons potentially exposed to the identified hazards. Section 3b of the plan presents the asset identification and characterization process in great detail. The following table presents an overview of assets in Rensselaer County³ and the subset of those assets that fall within the Town of Petersburg.

³ The County totals are included here for readers to understand the proportion of countywide assets that lie within this municipality.

Asset Inventory																			
Jurisdiction	Improved Property (RCV ⁴)	Emergency Facilities					Critical Infrastructure and Utilities										Other Key Facilities		Historic and Cultural Resources
		Fire Stations	Police Stations	EMS / Ambulance Stations	Hospitals	Shelters ⁵	Wastewater Facilities	Water Treatment Facilities	Airports	Railroads (Passenger/ Freight Station)	Electric Power Facilities	Communications Facilities	Oil Facilities	Hazardous Materials Sites	Natural Gas Facilities	Ports	Schools	Residential Senior Care Facilities ⁶	
Rensselaer County	\$33,333,947,000	44	9	19	2	33	8	1	0	13	1	6	5	60	1	12	64	3	84
Town of Petersburg	\$333,098,000	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Rensselaer County	Population, Census 2010:	159,429																	
Town of Petersburg	Population, Census 2010:	1,525																	
Rensselaer County	Vulnerable Population, Census 2010 (under 5 years, and over 64 years)	30,429																	
Town of Petersburg	Vulnerable Population, Census 2010 (under 5 years, and over 64 years)	345																	

⁴ Replacement Cost Value

⁵ Specific shelter data is protected information and is not released to the public unless and until necessary during a disaster.

⁶ * As per the County Department of Economic Development and Planning, these figures only encompass the senior centers which are not residential facilities.

Exposure – Assets in the Floodplain

Land. Approximately four percent of land in the Town of Petersburg is located in the 100-year floodplain.

Land in the 100-year Floodplain			
Municipality	Land Area of Municipality (Acres)	Land in the 100-year Floodplain (Acres)	Percent of Land in the 100-Year Floodplain (%)
Petersburgh, Town of	26,683	945	4%

Improved Property. Approximately seven percent of improved property in the Town of Petersburg is located in the 100-year floodplain.

Improved Property in the 100-year Floodplain			
Municipality	Replacement Cost Value (RCV) Structure and Contents (\$)	RCV in the 100-year Floodplain (\$)	Percent of RCV in the 100-Year Floodplain (%)
Petersburgh, Town of	\$333,098,000	\$22,930,876	7%

Population. Approximately nine percent of the population of the Town of Petersburg is located in the 100-year floodplain.

Population in the 100-Year Floodplain			
Municipality	Total Population (Census 2010)	Estimated Population in the 100 year Floodplain	Percent of Population in the 100 year Floodplain
Petersburgh, Town of	1,525	133	9%

Critical Facilities. No critical facilities (emergency facilities, critical infrastructure and utilities, and other key facilities, as presented in Section 3b) are located in the floodplain in the Town of Petersburg.

Historic and Cultural Resources. No listed historic or cultural resources are located in the floodplain in the Town of Petersburg.

8.13.7 POTENTIAL FUTURE DAMAGES

Estimated annual losses provided in this section are based on best available data, and the methodologies applied result in an approximation of risk. Loss estimates should be used to understand relative risk from hazards.

Uncertainties are inherent in any loss estimation methodology, arising in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning natural hazards and their effects on the built environment. Uncertainties also result from approximations and simplifications that are necessary for a comprehensive analysis (i.e., incomplete inventories, demographics or economic parameters

The following table provides estimated average annual losses from HAZUS-MH 4.0 runs, where available. For hazards for which HAZUS modules are not available, historic damages have been distributed across municipalities based on their proportion of improved property. It is important to note that this table reflects estimates of average annual damages. For any hazard, individual event damages could be substantially (orders of magnitude) higher.

For the Town of Petersburg, the hazard with the highest estimated average annual losses is flooding.

Summary of Annual Loss Estimates – Town of Petersburg ⁷													
Municipality	Replacement Cost Value of Improvements (\$)	Extreme Temperatures	Hurricane/ Tropical Storm - Wind	Hurricane/ Tropical Storm – Wind + Flood	Lightning	Tornado	Wind	Winter Storm (Ice Storm/ Snow Storm)	Drought	Flood	Earthquake	Landslide	Wildfire
		NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	HAZUS	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018	HAZUS	HAZUS	NOAA NCEI, 1996-2018
Petersburgh, Town of	\$333,098,000	\$14	\$1	\$863	\$107	\$4,735	\$1,199	\$336	\$0	\$61,700	\$937	\$0	\$1

⁷ * **It is important to note that this table reflects estimates of average annualized damages. For any hazard, individual event damages could be substantially higher.**

8.13.8 HAZARD RANKINGS AND KEY RISK FINDINGS

Hazard rankings for the Town of Petersburg are provided in the table below. Hazard priorities are based on each hazard's likelihood of occurrence, potential consequences, relative risk and average annualized losses. Rows are shaded red for High Hazard Priority; yellow for Moderate Hazard Priority; and green for Low Hazard Priority.

Flooding represents the highest hazard for the Town of Petersburg.

Hazard Rankings – Town of Petersburg					
Hazard	Future Probability	Potential Consequence	Relative Risk	Hazard Priority	Average Annualized Losses ⁸
Extreme Temperatures (Coldwave/ Heat Wave)	Low	Low	Low	Low	\$14
Hurricane/ Tropical Storm	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	\$1 Wind; \$863 Wind + Flood
Lightning	High	Low	Low	Low	\$107
Tornado	Low	High	High	High	\$4,735
Wind	High	Low	High	High	\$1,199
Winter Storm (Ice Storm/Snow Storm)	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	\$336
Drought	Low	High	Low	Low	\$0
Flood	High	High	High	High	\$61,700
Earthquake	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	\$937
Landslide	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	\$0
Wildfire	Low	Low	Low	Low	\$1

Key risk findings identified by the Town of Petersburg JAT as representing the highest local priorities for mitigation are:

- Petersburg has a population of 1,525 persons. Nineteen percent of the Town's population is either under the age of 5 or over the age of 65. This age group tends to be more vulnerable during hazard events. Town buildings are good locations to shelter residents, but it is imperative that power is maintained at each facility- particularly with heat is required during the winter months. In addition, this allows for improved continuity of operations of critical town services for its residents. The Petersburg Veterans Memorial Community Center (PVMCC) would be a good location for sheltering and to act as a control center, but it does not have a generator. It is located outside of the mapped floodplain.

⁸ Source: NOAA NCEI, except as noted. \$0 in average annualized losses had no damages recorded for events between 1996 and 2018. Actual annual damages are unquantifiable but higher.

- Dead trees pose a hazard to roads, structures, and people. Dead trees are more likely to fall during snowstorms, ice storms, and high wind events. Dead trees increase wildfire risk by providing dry fuel. The vast majority of land in Petersburg is forested with heavy fuels and areas of steep slopes that can facilitate the spread of wildfires. Dead trees also can cause power outages when they fall in whole or in part on power lines. Roadways blocked by trees can impact emergency service response times. It would be beneficial to get dead wood cleared away.
- Petersburg has only five NFIP policies with an insured value of \$890,700. However, there are 27 structures in the 100 year floodplain with an estimated replacement cost value of \$6,170,000 for a 100 year flood event damages (an average replacement cost value of about \$228,000 for each of the 27 structures on the floodplain). Owners of the 22 structures without flood insurance could be particularly vulnerable during a 100 year flood event as the costs to rebuild could exceed their ability to pay.
- The Town of Petersburg has many areas of steep slopes and terrain that supports the formation of landslides. Mapping shows large areas of high landslide incidence/susceptibility in Petersburg. Landslides have been documented in the past within the Town and are possible in the future.
- Communities are safer and more resilient when new construction and substantial improvements take into account the latest information on hazard vulnerabilities and measures to reduce risk.
- There can be a loss of institutional knowledge with staff changes. Even when staff is the same, continual training improves local capabilities and allows officials to better regulate activities in hazard areas to protect lives and property.
- Municipal staff would benefit from additional information on natural hazards and hazard mitigation. When municipal staff aren't armed with information on zoning and planning issues that sometimes arise regarding natural hazards and hazard mitigation, they may make decisions that don't foster community resiliency.
- FEMA flood insurance rate maps and regulations change over time. Outdated ordinances can mean that a community may not be regulating to the latest codes and standards or hazard information, and that does not foster community resiliency. It's important for Petersburg to keep its floodplain management ordinance current.
- Training is needed for staff administering the NFIP. Communities are safer when their floodplain management ordinances are administered properly.

Mitigation projects to address these key risks are included as part of the Town's overall hazard mitigation strategy.

8.13.9 OUTREACH TO THE PUBLIC AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

As part of this 2019 Plan Update, the Town of Petersburg undertook various activities to: (a) alert the public and other stakeholders to the fact that the HMP Planning Committee was working to develop the update; and (b) provide the public and other stakeholders with a forum to ask questions and submit comments and suggestions on the process. Outreach activities undertaken by the Town of Petersburg included:

Outreach Activities			
Date of Activity	Type of Activity	Activity Details	Lead Department and/or Staff Title Who Undertook Activity
March 18, 2019]	Open public meeting of the Town Board]	Board discussed the mitigation plan update and passed a resolution to participate]	Town Board]
April 2019]	Community Outreach]	Reached out to Bennington County & Berkshire County to discuss Hazardous Mitigation with no response as of yet]	Town Supervisor Alan Webster]
April 2019]	Community Outreach]	Broken Wheel Campground – Spoke with the Owner Ruth Seel and she does not feel that her campground is as any risk. None of her campers are along the riverbank or in the flood plain.]	Town Supervisor Alan Webster and Town Clerk – Deidra Michaels]
April 2019]	Community Outreach]	Taconic Plastics – Spoke with them in general but will have a general conversation.]	Town Supervisor Alan Webster]
July 24, 2019]	Posting of Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Fact Sheet]	Town Clerk has posted flyers on all the Town Websites, Town Facebook page; as well as the Post Office, Library and the Town Clerk Signboard]	Town Clerk – Deidra A. Michaels]

The Town of Petersburg has received no comments to date as a result of its outreach activities.

8.13.10 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section describes the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Legal and regulatory capability;
- Administrative and technical capability;
- Fiscal capability;
- Community resiliency;
- Community political capability; and
- Community classification.

8.13.10.1 Legal and Regulatory Capability

The table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available to the Town of Petersburg. The Town reviewed its responses from the 2011 HMP and has updated its prior feedback to reflect present-day conditions.

Legal and Regulatory Capability			
Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances, Plans)	Do you have this? (Y or N)	Enforcement Authority	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, Date of Adoption)
a. Building code	Y	Code Enforcement	
b. Zoning ordinance	N		
c. Subdivision ordinance or regulations	Y	Planning Board	Being revised
d. Special purpose ordinances (floodplain management, stormwater management, hillside or steep slope ordinances, wildfire ordinances, hazard setback requirements)	N		
e. Growth management ordinances (also called "smart growth" or anti-sprawl programs)	N		
f. Site plan review requirements	Y	Planning Board	
g. General, comprehensive or master plan	N		
h. A capital improvements plan	N		
i. An economic development plan	N		
j. An emergency response plan	N		
k. A post-disaster recovery plan	N		
l. A post-disaster recovery ordinance	N		
m. Real estate disclosure requirements	N		
n. Other			

8.13.10.2 Administrative and Technical Capability

The table below summarizes potential staff and personnel resources available to the Town of Petersburg. The Town reviewed its responses from the 2011 HMP and has updated its prior feedback to reflect present-day conditions.

Administrative and Technical Capability		
Staff / Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department / Agency / Position
a. Planner(s) or engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	N	
b. Engineer(s) or professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Code enforcement officer
c. Planners or Engineer(s) with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards	N	
d. Floodplain manager	Y	Code Enforcement officer
e. Surveyors	N	
f. Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards	N	
g. Personnel skilled in GIS and/or HAZUS	Y	Code Enforcement Officer

Administrative and Technical Capability		
Staff / Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department / Agency / Position
h. Scientists familiar with the hazards of the community	N	
i. Emergency manager	Y	Supervisor
j. Grant writers	Y	Outside Contract
k. Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis		
*All communities participate in the National Flood Insurance Program; as such, they are required by the regulations to have an appointed floodplain manager.		

8.13.10.3 Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the Town of Petersburg. The Town reviewed its responses from the 2011 HMP and has updated its prior feedback to reflect present-day conditions.

Fiscal Capability	
Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to use (Yes/No/Don't know)
a. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Don't know
b. Capital improvements project funding	Don't know
c. Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes	Yes
d. Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric service	Yes
e. Impact fees for homebuyers or developers for new developments/homes	Don't know
f. Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
g. Incur debt through special tax and revenue bonds	Don't know
h. Incur debt through private activity bonds	Don't know
i. Withhold spending in hazard-prone areas	Don't know
j. State mitigation grant programs	Don't know
k. Other	

8.13.10.4 Overall Capabilities

The Town of Petersburg's 2019 assessment of its overall capabilities to implement hazard mitigation strategies in each of the above categories, in addition to their local assessment of how these capabilities could be expanded and/or improved to reduce risk, is presented in the table below.

Overall Capabilities				
Overall legal and regulatory capability to implement hazard mitigation strategies	Overall technical capability to implement hazard mitigation strategies	Overall fiscal capability to implement hazard mitigation strategies	Overall administrative capability to implement hazard mitigation strategies	Community's willingness to enact policies and programs that reduce hazard vulnerabilities
Low	Low	Low	Low	High
How these capabilities can be expanded and/or improved to reduce risk*				
Probably would need more training in regard to all of this. It appears that we do not have anyone that is aware of all of this.				

8.13.10.5 Community Classifications

The table below summarizes classifications for community program available to the Town of Petersburg.

Community Classifications		
Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS) *	NP	
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	NP	
Public Protection	NP	
Storm Ready	NP	
FireWise	NP	

Notes:

- = Unavailable

N/A = Not applicable

NP = Not participating

* CRS Ranking as of April 2019

The classifications listed above relate to the Town of Petersburg's ability to provide effective services to lessen its vulnerability to the natural hazards identified. These classifications can be viewed as a gauge of the community's capabilities in all phases of emergency management (preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation) and are used as an underwriting parameter for determining the costs of various forms of insurance. The CRS Class applies to flood insurance, while the BCEGS and Public Protection classifications apply to standard property insurance. CRS classifications range on a scale of 1 to 10 with Class 1 being the best possible classification, and Class 10 representing no classification benefit.

FireWise classifications include a higher classification when the subject property is located beyond 1,000 feet of a creditable fire hydrant and is within five road miles of a recognized fire station.

Criteria for classification credits are outlined in the following documents:

- The Community Rating System Coordinators Manual
- The Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO's Public Protection website at <http://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/0000/ppc0001.html>
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at <http://www.weather.gov/stormready/howto.htm>
- The National FireWise Communities website at <http://firewise.org/>

8.13.11 PLAN FOR DISPLACED RESIDENTS

New York State requires that intermediate and long-term housing options must be available for relocating displaced residents to maintain post-disaster social and economic stability. Intermediate and long-term housing options for displaced residents was evaluated as part of the 2019 HMP Update. Additional information can be found in Appendix C.

8.13.12 PLAN FOR EVACUATION NEEDS AND SHELTERING

The Town of Petersburg does not have its own emergency response plan, post-disaster recovery plan, or post-disaster recovery ordinance⁹. Rensselaer County has an existing Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) documenting the County's plan for evacuation and sheltering measures during hazard events. The Plan is posted online at: <http://www.rensco.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Rensselaer-County-CEMP.pdf>. As part of this hazard mitigation plan update, the Rensselaer County reviewed their existing CEMP and determined that updates were necessary at this time. Updates to the CEMP are being completed at this time. Once finalized and approved, the County will post the updated CEMP at the same address and will follow procedures in its updated CEMP in all future disasters. The County BPS indicated that there are no designated evacuation routes.

Appendix B contains updated shelter data provided by the Red Cross in 2018. Shelter locations are not made public until facilities are actually opened for an event and therefore, pages of Appendix B that include shelter information are nonpublic. Since every possible shelter is not opened during every event, the data is not made public in order to ensure that individuals in need of shelter do not seek it at facilities which may remain closed during a particular event. The Town of Petersburg has access to shelter data and will coordinate with the Red Cross as part of their standard operating procedures if and when a need is identified for local shelters to be opened in the community.

⁹ Source: Local Capability Assessment

8.13.13 FUTURE NEEDS - RISK/VULNERABILITY

The Town of Petersburg has identified no future needs to better understand risk/vulnerability in the community.

8.13.14 PLAN INTEGRATION

For a community to succeed in reducing risk in the long term, the information and recommendations of the hazard mitigation plan must be integrated into day-to-day local government operations. Throughout the planning process, partnerships are formed between departments and agencies, and sustained actions between these partners will increase the community's resilience to disasters. "Plan integration" can be thought of as the process whereby a local government incorporates the mitigation plan findings and projects into other planning mechanisms (governance structures that are used to manage local land use development and community decision making).

It is the intention of the Town of Petersburg to incorporate mitigation planning as an integral component of daily municipal operations. The balance of this subsection describes local accomplishments over the last planning cycle (2011-2019), and targeted activities for the next planning cycle (2019-2024).

Demonstration of Progress over the Last Planning Cycle (2011-2019) – The Town of Petersburg undertook the following plan integration mechanisms over the last planning cycle:

- Issued a letter to each community department head to solicit their support and explore opportunities for integrating hazard mitigation planning objectives into daily activities.
- The municipality does not have a master, general, or comprehensive plan.
- Coordinated with the building department (via meeting with the code enforcement officer) to ensure that they have adopted and are enforcing the minimum standards established in the current State-adopted IBC. Code Enforcement Officers are currently trained in the State adopted IBC

Targeted Plan Integration Activities for the Next Planning Cycle (2019-2024) – The Town of Petersburg plans to implement the following plan integration mechanisms into local government operations from this point forward through the next planning cycle:

- Issued a letter to each community department head to solicit their support and explore opportunities for integrating hazard mitigation planning objectives into daily activities.
- Worked with the Planning Department to educate them on the Hazard Mitigation Plan and encourage that on the next update of the master plan, general or comprehensive plan, hazard mitigation for natural hazards is addressed.

- Coordinated with the building department (via meeting with the code enforcement officer) to ensure that they have adopted and are enforcing the minimum standards established in the current State-adopted IBC.
- Having participated in the NFIP and only enforcing minimum requirements at the time of the first plan's adoption. Join (or continue to maintain participation in) the NFIP's Community Rating System.
- Community currently has a local zoning ordinance.
- Worked with the local zoning board to educate them on the Hazard Mitigation Plan and encourage consideration of low occupancy, low-density zoning in hazard areas, when practicable.]
- Revised job descriptions to include mitigation-related duties to further institutionalize mitigation.
- Revised capital or operating budgets to include a line item for mitigation project funding.
- Modified the local comprehensive plan to add a hazard element.
- Worked with the Department of Public Works to adopt more rigorous procedures for inspecting and cleaning debris from streams and ditches (i.e., more frequently).
- Worked with Planning Department has added hazard vulnerability to subdivision and site plan review criteria.
- Reached out to partner groups in the community (i.e., nonprofit organizations, businesses, etc.) to identify those who may be willing to donate goods or services and create a database of contact information and indicated goods/services.
- Actively sought citizen volunteers to help implement mitigation programs and activities.
- Worked with local library staff members to discuss the mitigation plan so they are well-versed in its purpose and understand where to direct interested parties for more information, to provide feedback, or to become involved.

8.13.15 MITIGATION STRATEGY

This subsection sets forth the mitigation strategy for the Town of Petersburg. It describes:

- Progress on 2011 HMP Initiatives
- Past Mitigation Accomplishments
- Proposed 2019 HMP Mitigation Initiatives
- Action Worksheets

8.13.15.1 Progress on 2011 HMP Initiatives

The following table was completed by the Town of Petersburg HMP Committee Members. It summarizes the progress that was made on the local hazard mitigation initiatives that were set forth in the community's mitigation strategy from the initial HMP in 2011.

The Town of Petersburg has identified no major changes in local priorities regarding natural hazards since the last version of the HMP.

PROGRESS ON 2011 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN INITIATIVES												
2011 HMP Initiative Number	Mitigation Initiative Description	2011 HMP Priority	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Lead and Support Agencies	Status				Status Details	Relevance		Relevance Details
					Completed	Initiated but Not Completed	Ongoing Type of Activity	Not Initiated		Still Relevant - Carry Forward to Updated Mitigation Strategy	No Longer Relevant - Omit from Updated Mitigation Strategy	
PE-1	Replace bridge over Little Hoosick River at Broken Wheel Road. Bridge is due to be replaced, will prevent further deterioration to bridge and road	Medium	Flooding, damage to road	Highway Dept.	x				Completed		x	Completed
PE-2	Reconstruct Prosser Hollow Road (2 mile gravel Road bed). Road is a constant work-in-progress, Highway Department has spent a lot of time on repair. Condition of road continues to deteriorate due to washouts, etc., and a reconstruction would eliminate the need for time consuming repairs.	Medium	Flooding, deterioration of road bed	Highway Dept.	x				Completed		x	Completed
PE-CL-1	Public awareness program on Hazards, Prevention, and Mitigation: County will maintain a hazard mitigation and mitigation planning web presence (local municipal web sites to link up to this site, if they haven't already done so); all participating jurisdictions to support preparation of a joint annual hazard mitigation and mitigation planning fact sheet and its distribution; periodic discussion of hazard mitigation and the mitigation plan at other regular local meetings; use of annual flyers, newsletters, advertisements, or radio/tv announcements, etc. at the discretion of each jurisdiction (incorporating as much free information as possible from the FEMA Publications Warehouse and other appropriate sources). (public education)	High	All hazards	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Supervisor			x		Not Applicable	x		County is carrying forward this County-led activity with no changes; our municipality will carry it forward as well.
PE-CL-2	Code update: Review existing local codes and ordinances against the identified hazards to determine whether there need to be any amendments to address identified hazards and, where a need is identified, modify/amend the codes/ordinances as applicable. (prevention)	Medium	All hazards	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Supervisor			x		Code Enforcement Officer is going to look into this.	x		County is carrying forward this County-led activity with no changes; our municipality will carry it forward as well.
PE-CL-3	Code enforcement: Enforcement of NYS and Local Building Codes with Continual CEO training. (prevention)	Medium	All hazards	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Supervisor			x		Locally administered on an ongoing basis; our community <u>did</u> have a need to go to the county for support/training.	x		County is carrying forward this County-led activity with no changes; our municipality will carry it forward as well.
PE-CL-4	Ensure that local comprehensive plans incorporate natural disaster mitigation techniques through a courtesy review of draft plans by the County Planning Department (prevention)	High	All hazards	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Supervisor			x		The Town of Petersburg does not have a Comprehensive Plan	x		County is carrying forward this County-led activity with no changes; our municipality will carry it forward as well.

PROGRESS ON 2011 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN INITIATIVES												
2011 HMP Initiative Number	Mitigation Initiative Description	2011 HMP Priority	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Lead and Support Agencies	Status				Status Details	Relevance		Relevance Details
					Completed	Initiated but Not Completed	Ongoing Type of Activity	Not Initiated		Still Relevant - Carry Forward to Updated Mitigation Strategy	No Longer Relevant - Omit from Updated Mitigation Strategy	
PE-CL-5	Hold periodic workshops for municipalities regarding zoning and planning issues that arise regarding natural hazards and hazard mitigation. (prevention)	Low	All hazards	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Supervisor			x		County- led activity. Municipality attends meetings/workshops as offered by the County whenever municipal staff members have schedule availability.	x		County is carrying forward this County-led activity with no changes; our municipality will carry it forward as well.
PE-NFIP-1	Update/revise floodplain management ordinance to comply with latest FEMA regulations.	Medium	Flooding	Planning Board			x		Ordinance is dated We do not have any ordinances but we are checking into our local laws to see if there are any that may apply.	x		Ongoing type of activity; will be carried forward with no changes.
PE-NFIP-2	Designate/install a specific person to be your municipality's Floodplain Administrator.	Medium	Flooding	Town Board			x		We have designated our Code Enforcement officer as Flood Plain Administrator.	x		Ongoing type of activity (with staffing changes); will be carried forward with no changes.
PE-NFIP-3	Add/train sufficient members of staff to adequately enforce NFIP regulations/floodplain management ordinances.	Low	Flooding	Building Inspector			x		We are interested in seeking training for our Hazardous Mitigation Committee.	x		Ongoing type of activity (with staffing changes); will be carried forward with no changes.
PE-NFIP-4	Update/revise floodplain management ordinance to be consistent with potential future new FIRMs	Medium	Flooding	Town Board			x		FEMA has not issued new FIRMs since the last hazard mitigation plan was prepared.	x		Ongoing type of activity; will be carried forward with no changes.
PE-NFIP-5	Require staff involved in floodplain management and ordinance enforcement to become Certified Floodplain Managers (CFMs)	Medium	Flooding	Building Inspector				x	Not agency required; municipality opted not to require CFM certification.		x	Not agency required; municipality opted not to require CFM certification.
PE-NFIP-6	Join the Community Rating System (CRS)	Medium	Flooding	Building Inspector				x	Municipality opted not to enter CRS.		x	Municipality opted not to enter CRS.

8.13.15.2 Past Mitigation Accomplishments

NYS DHSES requires the documentation of local mitigation efforts and accomplishments since the previous hazard mitigation plan was prepared, regardless of funding source and regardless of whether the project was included in the prior plan. They note that the goal of this requirement is to provide a context for each jurisdiction's projects, act as a source of ideas for mitigation projects, and evaluate the accuracy of assumptions and engineering solutions to inform future projects, and to support future mitigation planning and its coordination with other planning, zoning, and environmental procedures within the jurisdiction.

The following table summarizes past mitigation accomplishments for the Town of Petersburg, from the time the 2011 HMP was approved through its first update in 2019.

Past Mitigation Accomplishments					
Project Number	Project Name	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem and the Solution (Project)	Evaluation of Success	
--	Generators for Municipal Buildings	All	The Town does not have sufficient backup power at its primary shelter facility. Generators will provide us with a building that will be able to act as a control facility in case of a natural disaster occurs or people need to seek a safe place.	Cost	Looking into this.
				Level of Protection	100 year (500 year for any sites located in floodplain per NYS DHSES criteria)
				Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	n/a- Town is presently looking into this no project has yet been implemented

8.13.15.3 Proposed 2019 HMP Mitigation Initiatives

The process for selection and prioritization of mitigation actions is described in greater detail in Section 5 of the main text. The outcomes of that overall process are summarized here.

This plan proposes the actions determined to be the most appropriate for the resources and capabilities of the community based on the experience of local officials, with input from the public and other stakeholders. The relatively large number of flood mitigation actions reflects the fact that flooding is the hazard of greatest concern. Actions determined to be appropriate for the plan were reviewed during public and committee meetings and there was consensus that those intended to mitigate the effects of flooding should be the highest priorities for most communities. As with the 2011 Plan, this 2019 Plan Update includes a series of County-led initiatives with municipal participation to address a wider range of hazards. In addition, each local mitigation strategy proposes actions reflecting the commitment of the County and local jurisdictions to compliance with requirements of the NFIP. Potential actions were reviewed relative to potential financial as well as administrative and legal costs and the degree to which they would be endorsed by the public. Potential actions were reviewed during the meetings relative to their potential benefit of effectiveness in saving lives, protecting the natural environment, and reducing disruption and damage. Actions selected by each jurisdiction include activities to protect existing and future structures and infrastructure and enhance community resilience.

Part of enhancing community resilience involves adapting to a changing climate. In accordance with NYS Mitigation Planning Standard 9, plans developed with NYS DHSES-administered funds must include information on climate change as part of the hazard vulnerability analysis and contain strategies/projects to address increased vulnerability that may result from climate change. This requirement was established to encourage jurisdictions to plan for and accommodate climate change and sea level rise. By developing mitigating strategies and/or projects for hazards that are exacerbated by climate change, jurisdictions will better protect residents, avoid, or reduce damage to property and public infrastructure, and reduce personal hardship. In accordance with this State Standard, previous sections of this plan have presented information on how climate change may affect jurisdictional vulnerability or increased frequency of occurrence and/or severity in exposure to flooding, wildfire, drought, and extreme temperatures. Climate change is addressed by mitigating the various hazards that it exacerbates. Rensselaer County and its communities have proposed a range of hazard mitigation initiatives to address their highest hazards including those hazards that are exacerbated by a changing climate.

Proposed 2019 HMP Mitigation Initiatives for Town of Petersburg are shown in the following table. These include both new initiatives and initiatives that were carried forward from the 2011 HMP.

PROPOSED 2019 HMP MITIGATION INITIATIVES														
Initiative Number	Initiative Name	HMP Goal(s)/ Objective(s) Being Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	CF ¹⁰ ?	EHP ¹¹ Issues?	Estimated Timeline	Project Lead (include relevant Department and Position Title)	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources ¹²	Priority ¹³	Action Worksheet Provided? ¹⁴
* NOTE: Projects related to Critical Facilities (CF) must protect the facility to the 500-year event or worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.														
1	Generators for Town Buildings *NEW*	2	All hazards	Petersburg has a population of Nineteen percent of the Town's population is either under the age of 5 or over the age of 65. This age group tends to be more vulnerable during hazard events. Town buildings are good locations to shelter residents, but it is imperative that power is maintained at each facility- particularly with heat is required during the winter months. In addition, this allows for improved continuity of operations of critical town services for its residents.	This project is currently in an exploratory phase. Generators would be placed at PVMCC to provide a place for safe harbor and Control Center. This will provide us with a building that will be able to act as a control facility in case of a natural disaster occurs or people need to seek a safe place.	Yes	No	2024 (grant applications would be submitted within one year, and thereafter until funding is received)	Town Supervisor	\$10,000 per generator #1 generators \$10,000 in all	Provides power for a shelter facility if needed in the case of any hazard.	FEMA PDM; FEMA HMGP could cover 75% if the application is approved	High	Yes
2	Tree Service for Dead Trees *NEW*	3	Snowstorm, Ice Storm, Wind, Wildfire	Dead trees pose a hazard to roads, structures, and people. Dead trees are more likely to fall during snowstorms, ice storms, high wind events. Dead trees increase wildfire risk by providing dry fuel. The vast majority of land in Petersburg is forested with heavy fuels and areas of steep slopes that can facilitate the spread of wildfires. Dead trees also can cause power outages when they fall in whole or in part on power lines. Roadways blocked by trees can impact emergency service response times.	The Town would like to arrange for a tree service to clear dead trees. This will help to keep the roads clear, reduce wildfire fuel loading, reduce the likelihood of power outages caused by fallen trees, and reduce the frequency of trees falling on roadways.	No	No	1 year to hire the service, and then ongoing thereafter	Town Supervisor	\$4,000	Trees have blocked the river way along the Little Hoosick River and caused a redirect of waterway on Route 22	Local budget	High	Yes

¹⁰ CF – Critical Facility. Please respond “Y” (yes) if the project’s purpose is to protect a critical facility, or “N” (no) if not.
¹¹ EHP – Environmental or Historic Preservation. Please respond “Y” (yes) if the project is expected to have environmental and/or historic preservation issues, or “N” (no) if not.
¹² Potential Funding Sources – A list of Federal and State sources of funding for hazard mitigation projects can be found in the latest NYS Hazard Mitigation Plan online at <https://mitigateny.avilabs.org/capabilities/administerfunding>. Jurisdictions should identify additional funding opportunities you may be aware of that are not on the state list.
¹³ Priority – See “Prioritization Methodology” on the next page.
¹⁴ Action Worksheet Provided. Please respond “Y” (yes) if you have filled out a detailed Action Worksheet, or “N” (no) if not. NYS DHSES State Standard 7 recommends that further consideration be given to all proposed actions by completing a NYS DHSES Action Worksheet, the State requires completion of a minimum of two NYS DHSES Action Worksheets for the jurisdiction’s highest priority projects. For jurisdictions containing a Special Flood Hazard Area, at least one of these Action Worksheets must be for a project that addresses flooding. Action Worksheets have been prepared for a minimum of two proposed mitigation initiatives. Action Worksheets are included at the end of this section, following the prioritization methodology.

PROPOSED 2019 HMP MITIGATION INITIATIVES														
Initiative Number	Initiative Name	HMP Goal(s)/ Objective(s) Being Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	CF ¹⁰ ?	EHP ¹¹ Issues?	Estimated Timeline	Project Lead (include relevant Department and Position Title)	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources ¹²	Priority ¹³	Action Worksheet Provided? ¹⁴
* NOTE: Projects related to Critical Facilities (CF) must protect the facility to the 500-year event or worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.														
3	Flood Risk Awareness and Mitigation Project *NEW*	1, 3	Flooding	Petersburgh has only 5 NFIP policies with an insured value of \$890,700. However, there are 27 structures in the 100 year floodplain with an estimated replacement cost value of \$6,170,000 for a 100 year flood event damages (an average replacement cost value of about \$228,000 for each of the 27 structures on the floodplain). Owners of the 22 structures without flood insurance could be particularly vulnerable during a 100 year flood event as the costs to rebuild could exceed their ability to pay.	Phase 1 – The Town will conduct an outreach program specifically to the property owners of structures in the floodplain to be sure that they are aware of their risks, and the availability of flood insurance. The Town will provide information about flood mitigation measures and assess homeowner interest in mitigation projects that may be eligible project types for Federal funding. Phase 2 – The Town will provide administrative support to homeowners by submitting grant applications under FEMA funding streams where the homeowner is not an eligible direct sub applicant.	No	Phase 1 – no Phase 2 – possibly	2020	Floodplain Manager	Phase 1- Costs would be low (staff time and limited local budget for reproduction of informational materials) Phase 2 – Cost depends on the nature of any future proposed project. Cost to the town would be low (staff time), but high for the property owners as even with a grant they would be responsible for 25% of the cost of any flood mitigation project	Phase 1 - Unquantifiable but high and expected to exceed project costs. Phase 2 – Depends on the nature of any future proposed project.	FEMA PDM; FEMA HMGP could cover 75% if the application is approved	Moderate	No
4	Landslide Mitigation Project *NEW*	3	Landslide	The Town of Petersburg has many areas of steep slopes and terrain that supports the formation of landslides. Mapping shows large areas of high landslide incidence/susceptibility in Petersburg. Landslides have been documented in the past and are possible in the future.	NO	No	No	2020 and ongoing over next 5 years.	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Board	Checking into	Unsure	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	Moderate	No
5	Public Awareness Program (2011 P-CL-1)	1	All hazards	Uneducated public. Residents could benefit from additional information on hazards, risks, and hazard mitigation measures they can take on their own properties to reduce damages and improve resident safety before, during and after a hazard event.	Series of public meetings to discuss hazard mitigation planning. Public awareness program on Hazards, Prevention, and Mitigation: County will maintain a hazard mitigation and mitigation planning web presence (local municipal web sites to link up to this site, if they haven't already done so); all participating jurisdictions to support preparation of a joint annual hazard mitigation and mitigation planning fact sheet and its distribution; periodic discussion of hazard mitigation and the mitigation plan at other regular local meetings; use of annual flyers, newsletters, advertisements, or radio/tv announcements, etc. at the discretion of each jurisdiction (incorporating as much free information as possible from the FEMA Publications Warehouse and other appropriate sources). (public education)	No	N	2020 and ongoing over next 5 years	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Board	Est. \$500 for printing; other costs are staff time only	Educated public; Enhance readiness, response and recovery efforts	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	Moderate	No

PROPOSED 2019 HMP MITIGATION INITIATIVES														
Initiative Number	Initiative Name	HMP Goal(s)/ Objective(s) Being Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	CF ¹⁰ ?	EHP ¹¹ Issues?	Estimated Timeline	Project Lead (include relevant Department and Position Title)	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources ¹²	Priority ¹³	Action Worksheet Provided? ¹⁴
* NOTE: Projects related to Critical Facilities (CF) must protect the facility to the 500-year event or worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.														
6	Land Use Regulation Update (2011 P-CL-2)	2	All Hazards	Communities are safer and more resilient when new construction and substantial improvements take into account the latest information on hazard vulnerabilities and measures to reduce risk.	On-going land use regulations to foster better hazard mitigation planning. Land use regulation amendments to continue proper land use hazard mitigation practices. Code update: Review existing local codes and ordinances against the identified hazards to determine whether there need to be any amendments to address identified hazards and, where a need is identified, modify/ amend the codes/ordinances as applicable. (prevention)	No	No	Ongoing over next 5 years	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Board	N/A – staff time only	Enhance readiness, response and recovery	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	High	No
7	Code Enforcement Training (2011 P-CL-3)	2	All Hazards	There can be a loss of institutional knowledge with staff changes. Even when staff is the same, continual training improves local capabilities and allows officials to better regulate activities in hazard areas to protect lives and property.	Training. Enforcement of NYS and Local Building Codes with Continual CEO training. (prevention)	No	No	One year and ongoing over next 5 years	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Code Enforcement Officer	N/A – staff time only max est. \$1000	Remain current on issue and solution; proper construction in the hazard areas fosters resiliency	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	High	No
8	HMP incorporated in Village Comprehensive Plan (2011 P-CL-4)	2	All hazards	Lack of hazard mitigation plan as part of the village comprehensive plan. A long term vision for the community that doesn't take into account hazard areas can put lives and property at risk. Taking into account natural hazards and hazard mitigation measures can make the community more resilient.	Review hazard mitigation plans and incorporate into village comprehensive plan. Ensure that local comprehensive plans incorporate natural disaster mitigation techniques through a courtesy review of draft plans by the County Planning Department (prevention)	No	No	2 years	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Board	N/A-staff time only	Reduce property flooding and related damages; smart plans for development in hazard areas enhances resiliency	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	Low	No
9	Attend County-led Mitigation Planning and Zoning Workshops (2011 P-CL-5)	2	All hazards	When municipal staff aren't armed with information on zoning and planning issues that sometimes arise regarding natural hazards and hazard mitigation, they may make decisions that don't foster community resiliency.	Attend County-led periodic workshops for municipalities regarding zoning and planning issues that arise regarding natural hazards and hazard mitigation. (prevention)	No	No	Ongoing over next 5 years	County-led action item. CPG Member, Town Board	N/A-staff time only	Reduce property flooding and related damages	Village participation in County-led effort; staff time only funded through local budget	High	No
10	Update Floodplain Management Ordinance per New FEMA Regulations (as needed) (2011 P-NFIP-1)	3,4	Flooding	Outdated ordinances mean that a community is not regulating to the latest codes and standards or hazard information, and that does not foster community resiliency.	Update/revise floodplain management ordinance to comply with latest FEMA regulations.	No	No	Ongoing	CPG Member, Town Board, Town Supervisor and Floodplain Manager	None	Compliance may led to additional funding to resolve issues	Local	High	No
11	Designate a Floodplain Administrator (2011 P-NFIP-2)	2, 3, 4	Flooding	Staff changes	Designate/install a specific person to be your municipality's Floodplain Administrator.	No	No	2019	CPG Member, Town Board, Town Supervisor and Floodplain Manager	None	Unsure	Local	Low	No

PROPOSED 2019 HMP MITIGATION INITIATIVES														
Initiative Number	Initiative Name	HMP Goal(s)/ Objective(s) Being Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	CF ¹⁰ ?	EHP ¹¹ Issues?	Estimated Timeline	Project Lead (include relevant Department and Position Title)	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources ¹²	Priority ¹³	Action Worksheet Provided? ¹⁴
* NOTE: Projects related to Critical Facilities (CF) must protect the facility to the 500-year event or worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.														
12	Staff Training in NFIP (2011 P-NFIP-3)	2	Flooding	Communities are safer when their floodplain management ordinances are administered properly.	Add/train sufficient members of staff to adequately enforce NFIP regulations/floodplain management ordinances.	No	No	2019-2024	CPG Member, Town Board, Town Supervisor	Staff salary would need to be budgeted for, or a volunteer will need to be found	Training in FEMA 480 would be an excellent asset and capability for the Village in ensuring that decisions are main in compliance with the NFIP	Local	High	No
13	Update Floodplain Management Ordinance when New FIRMs are Issued (2011 P-NFIP-4)	3,4	Flooding	Outdated ordinances mean that a community is not regulating to the latest codes and standards or hazard information, and that does not foster community resiliency.	Update/revise floodplain management ordinance to be consistent with potential future new FIRMs	No	No	Ongoing	CPG Member, Town Board, Town Supervisor and Floodplain Manager	None	Protection for the town and residents	Local	Low	No

Prioritization Methodology for Proposed 2019 HMP Mitigation Initiatives

To prioritize its mitigation initiatives, the community established a methodology to take into account several key factors. Priorities were determined by a qualitative prioritization process established by the community. A higher priority was assigned to projects where: the life/safety risk of taking no action was deemed to be unacceptably high; the project addresses one of the community's highest hazards and/or key risks; benefits were projected to equal or exceed project costs; critical facilities or key local assets were being protected; funding and staff resources were deemed to be sufficient and/or accessible for project implementation; negative impacts were not anticipated on environmental and/or historic resources or any segment of the population; and/or where there was overall support for the project from the local community (government officials, public, and stakeholders).

PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY FOR PROPOSED 2019 HMP MITIGATION INITIATIVES														Priority
Initiative Number	Initiative Name	Hazard(s) Addressed	Is the life/safety risk of taking no action deemed to be unacceptably high?	Does the project address one of the community's highest hazards and/or key risks?	Benefits	Costs	Are the project's benefits estimated to equal or exceed its costs?	Are critical facilities or key local assets being protected by the project?	Are funding resources sufficient and/or accessible for project implementation?	Are staff resources sufficient or available for project implementation?	Are negative impacts anticipated on environmental resources?	Are negative impacts anticipated on historic resources?	Are negative impacts anticipated on any segment of the population?	
1	Generators for Town Buildings *NEW*	All hazards	No	Yes	H	H	Yes	No	No- Likely will require grant funding to offset the costs	Yes	No	No	No	High
2	Tree Service for Dead Trees *NEW*	Snowstorm, Ice Storm, Wind, Wildfire	No	Yes	H	M	Yes	No	Yes-This can be budgeted for with Board approval	Yes	No	No	No	High
3	Flood Risk Awareness and Mitigation Project *NEW*	Flooding	No	Yes	H	Phase 1 - Low Phase 2 - High	Yes	No	Phase 1 - staff time Phase 2 - Municipal staff time yes; but owner funding availability for grant matching funds for any potential future project is unknown at this time	Yes	No	No	No	Moderate

4	Landslide Mitigation Project *NEW*	Landslide	No	Yes	H	M	Yes	No	No - We may need to apply for special funding for this through outside Funding	Yes	No	No	No	Moderate
5	Public Awareness Program (2011 P-CL-1)	All hazards	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Moderate
6	Land Use Regulation Update (2011 P-CL-2)	All Hazards	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	High
7	Code Enforcement Training (2011 P-CL-3)	All Hazards	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	High
8	HMP incorporated in Village Comprehensive Plan (2011 P-CL-4)	All hazards	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Low
9	Attend County-led Mitigation Planning and Zoning Workshops (2011 P-CL-5)	All hazards	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	High
10	Update Floodplain Management Ordinance per New FEMA Regulations (as needed) (2011 P-NFIP-1)	Flooding	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	High
11	Designate a Floodplain Administrator (2011 P-NFIP-2)	Flooding	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Low
12	Staff Training in NFIP (2011 P-NFIP-3)	Flooding	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	High
13	Update Floodplain Management Ordinance when New FIRMs are Issued (2011 P-NFIP-4)	Flooding	No	Yes	H	L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Low

Action Worksheets

NYS DHSES State Standard 7 recommends that further consideration be given to all proposed actions by completing a NYS DHSES Action Worksheet, the State requires completion of a minimum of two NYS DHSES Action Worksheets for the jurisdiction's highest priority projects. Furthermore, for jurisdictions containing a Special Flood Hazard Area, at least one of these Action Worksheets must be for a project that addresses flooding.

Action Worksheets prepared by the Town of Petersburg are included on the following pages.

Section 8.13 - Jurisdictional Annex, Town of Petersburg

NYS DHSES Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Generators for Town Building		
Project Number:	1		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard of Concern:	All Hazards		
Description of the Problem:	Petersburg has a population of Nineteen percent of the Town's population is either under the age of 5 or over the age of 65. This age group tends to be more vulnerable during hazard events. Town buildings are good locations to shelter residents, but it is imperative that power is maintained at each facility- particularly with heat is required during the winter months. In addition, this allows for improved continuity of operations of critical town services for its residents.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	This project is currently in an exploratory phase. Generators would be placed at PVMCC to provide a place for safe harbor and Control Center. This will provide us with a building that will be able to act as a control facility in case of a natural disaster occurs or people need to seek a safe place. PVMCC is located outside of the mapped floodplain. The generator supplier has indicated to the town that the generator will be guaranteed for life. The generator will be wired to supply backup power to the Town Hall and the community center.		
Is this project related to a Critical Facility?	Yes * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
* Projects related to critical facilities must intend to protect to the 500-year flood event or the actual worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.			
Level of Protection:	500 years	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Will provide a safe haven during all Hazards.
Useful Life:	100 + years		
Estimated Cost:	\$10,000		
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	2024 (grant applications would be submitted within one year, and thereafter until funding is received)
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	2024 (grant applications would be submitted within one year, and thereafter until funding is received)	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA PDM; FEMA HMGP could cover 75% if the application is approved
Responsible Party: (Department/ Organization)	Town Supervisor	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Part of the town government's day to day responsibilities.
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	In the past, power has been lost at the shelter and in turn the library has had to be used as a shelter because it presently has a generator. Also the capacity of the library is too small to accommodate the number of people seeking shelter in the Town.
	Generator at the community center	10,000	Best alternative because the building is already big enough for those in need.
	Larger generator for town hall, or keep using library as the main shelter	10000	Neither site provides enough space to accommodate those in need of shelter. And the cost of increasing the building sizes is too high, and there is not enough available space to do so.
Progress Report (this section to be completed at next plan update-do not fill in now)			
Date of Status Report:	July 10 th , 2019		
Report of Progress:	Getting Cost Estimates		
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:			

Section 8.13 - Jurisdictional Annex, Town of Petersburg

NYS DHSES Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Tree Service for Dead Trees		
Project Number:	2		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard of Concern:	Snowstorm, Ice Storm, Wind, Wildfire		
Description of the Problem:	Dead trees pose a hazard to roads, structures, and people. Dead trees are more likely to fall during snowstorms, ice storms, high wind events. Dead trees increase wildfire risk by providing dry fuel. The vast majority of land in Petersburg is forested with heavy fuels and areas of steep slopes that can facilitate the spread of wildfires. Dead trees also can cause power outages when they fall in whole or in part on power lines. Roadways blocked by trees can impact emergency service response times.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	The Town would like to arrange for a tree service to clear dead trees. This will help to keep the roads clear, reduce wildfire fuel loading, reduce the likelihood of power outages caused by fallen trees, and reduce the frequency of trees falling on roadways.		
Is this project related to a Critical Facility?	Yes * <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
* Projects related to critical facilities must intend to protect to the 500-year flood event or the actual worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.			
Level of Protection:	1 + years	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Will allow for less hazard flying through the air and injury to residents.
Useful Life:	1 + years		
Estimated Cost:	\$4,000 per year		
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Late 2019- early 2020 and annually thereafter
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 year to hire the service, and then ongoing thereafter	Potential Funding Sources:	Local Budget
Responsible Party: (Department/ Organization)	Town Supervisor	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Town Highway can perform the service but is not trained to do so. This puts people at risk. Town highway also does not have bucket trucks and would need to borrow or rent.
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	Not viable because the dead trees are still posing a risk.
	Town Highway staff trimming dead trees on an annual basis	Estimated to be somewhat less than \$4,000 per year for the bucket truck, plus an unknown training cost for the town employees who would do the work	Not viable because the town employees are not presently trained for this type of work and therefore there are safety concerns. Also the town does not have a bucket truck and would need to borrow through shared services, or rent.
	Hire an outside firm to trim the dead trees on an annual basis	\$4,000 per year	This is the best alternative because the cost is reasonable, and it allows the highway department employees to not be forced to work in areas they are not trained in while removing the hazards associated with the dead trees.
Progress Report (this section to be completed at next plan update-do not fill in now)			
Date of Status Report:	July 10 th , 2019		
Report of Progress:	Working on finding a tree service		
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:			