9.8 Town of Day

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Town of Day. The town provided the following updates that were incorporated into this annex:

NYS Mitigation Action Worksheets

9.8.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Preston Allen - Supervisor	Ken Metzler – Code Enforcement
1650 North Shore Road	1650 North Shore Road
Hadley; NY 12835	Hadley; NY 12835
518-696-3789	518-696-3789

9.8.2 Town Profile

Population

752 (American Community Survey 5-Year 2016 Estimates)

Location

The Town of Day is located in the northwest part of the county and is northeast of Amsterdam. The town is inside of the Adirondack Park and borders Great Sacandaga Lake. Its northern boundary is the county line (connecting with Warren County); it is bounded on the east by Hadley, on the south by Corinth and Edinburgh, and on the west by Edinburgh and the western boundary of the county (connecting with Hamilton County). The western part of the village of Conklingville lies in Day. Besides this village, West Day (Huntsville) is a hamlet on the river in the southwest corner.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the town has a total area of 69.6 square miles (180.1 km²), with 64.3 square miles (166.6 km²) of it land and 5.2 square miles (13.6 km²) of it (7.53-percent) water.

Climate

Saratoga County, with all its municipalities, generally experiences seasonable weather patterns characteristic of the northeastern U.S. Warm summers are typically experienced, with occasional high temperatures and humidity. Midsummer temperatures typically range from 60°F to 83°F (Fahrenheit). The winters of Saratoga County are long and cold, with temperatures typically ranging from 12°F to 30°F (Fahrenheit). During the winter, temperatures are cooler than the temperatures in areas located near large bodies of water. Snow accumulates to an average depth of 68.7 inches each year.

Brief History

The town was first settled around 1797. The town was formed in 1819 from parts of the Towns of Edinburg and Hadley. The original name of the town was "Concord." The name was changed in 1827 in honor of Eliphaz Day, a prominent lumberman. Part of the town was flooded in 1930 when the Conklingville dam created the Sacandaga Reservoir (now Great Sacandaga Lake). Some of the historic buildings were saved by moving them to higher ground, while others are now under the surface of the lake.

Governing Body Format

The Town of Day is governed by a supervisor and four town councilors.

Growth/Development Trends

No development is anticipated at this time.

9.8.3 Town-Specific Hazard Information

Detailed hazard event histories can be found in the Previous Occurrences and Losses sections of each hazard profile in Section 5. Table 9.8-1 summarizes the Town of Day's ranking of the natural hazards compared to the overall County rank, based on probability of occurrence and impacts to the town. The Town of Day did not revise their hazard ranking for this plan update, therefore hazard rankings are not available for the newly added hazards (drought, extreme temperature, and invasive species). Based on the old ranking, the most notable difference between the Town of Day and the County is that severe winter weather is the Town's highest risk hazard, whereas the County ranked it a moderate hazard.

Table 9.8-1 Town of Day Hazard Ranking

Rank #	Hazard Type	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score ^a	Hazard Ranking ^b	County Hazard Ranking ^b
N/A	Drought	No information provided	No information provided	No information provided	Low
4	Earthquake	Rare	11	Low	Low
N/A	Extreme Temperature	No information provided	No information provided	No information provided	High
2	Flood (riverine, flash, coastal and urban flooding)	Frequent	51	High	High
3	Ground Failure	Rare	6	Low	Medium
N/A	Invasive Species	No information provided	No information provided	No information provided	Medium

Rank #	Hazard Type	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score ^a	Hazard Ranking ^b	County Hazard Ranking ^b
2	Severe Storm (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning and tornados)	Frequent	51	High	High
1	Severe Winter Storm (heavy snow, blizzards, ice storms)	Frequent	54	High	Medium
N/A	Wildfire	No information provided	No information provided	No information provided	Low

a. Risk ranking score = Probability x Impact

9.8.4 Capability Assessment

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

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

Legal and Regulatory Capability

Table 9.8-2 Legal and Regulatory Capability of the Town of Day

Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances, Plans)	Local Authority (Y or N)	Prohibitions (State or Federal) (Y or N)	Higher Jurisdictional Authority (Y or N)	State Mandated (Y or N)	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, date of adoption)
1) Building Code	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	NYS Building Code 2007
2) Zoning Ordinance	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Not provided
3) Subdivision Ordinance	Υ	N	N	N	Not provided

High = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 31 and above; Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking of 16-30; and Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 15

c. N/A = Not available. The Town of Day did not rank the new hazards profiled in the 2019 HMP Update. The rankings in this table reflect the village's ranking of the hazards in the previous HMP.

Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances, Plans)	Local Authority (Y or N)	Prohibitions (State or Federal) (Y or N)	Higher Jurisdictional Authority (Y or N)	State Mandated (Y or N)	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, date of adoption)
4) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (if you are in the NFIP, you must have this.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Not provided
5) Growth Management	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Not provided
6) Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	Υ	Υ	Y	N	Not provided
7) Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	N	N	N	Υ	Not provided
8) Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan/ General Plan	Υ	N	N	N	Not provided
9) Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)	Υ	N	N	N	Not provided
10) Site Plan Review Requirements	Υ	Υ	Y	N	Not provided
11) Open Space Plan	N	N	N	N	Not provided
12) Economic Development Plan	N	Υ	Y	N	Not provided
13) Emergency Response Plan	Υ	N	N	Y	Not provided
14) Post Disaster Recovery Plan	N	N	N	N	Not provided
15) Post Disaster Recovery Ordinance	N	N	N	N	Not provided
16) Real Estate Disclosure req.	N	N	N	N	Not provided
17) Other [Special Purpose Ordinances (i.e., critical or sensitive areas)]	N	Y	Y	N	Not provided

Administrative and Technical Capability

Table 9.8-3 Administrative and Technical Capability of the Town of Day

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Gary Robinson, P.E.

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Gary Robinson, P.E.
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Υ	Gary Robinson, P.E.
4) Floodplain Administrator	Υ	Mary Ann Johnson - Supervisor
5) Surveyor(s)	N	Not provided
6) Personnel skilled or trained in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) applications	N	Not provided
7) Scientist familiar with natural hazards in the Town of Day.	N	Not provided
8) Emergency Manager	Υ	Ken Metzler
9) Grant Writer(s)	N	Not provided
10) Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis		Not provided

Fiscal Capability

Table 9.8-4 Fiscal Capability of the Town of Day

Table 7.0 4 Fiscar Capability of the Town of Day						
Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to use (Yes/No/Don't know)					
1) Community development Block Grants (CDBG)	Don't Know					
2) Capital Improvements Project Funding	Yes					
3) Authority to Levy Taxes for specific purposes	Yes					
4) User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	No					
5) Impact Fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	No					
6) Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes					
7) Incur debt through special tax bonds	Yes					
8) Incur debt through private activity bonds	No					
9) Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No					
10) State sponsored grant programs such as Flood Control Assistance Account Program (FCAAP)	Don't Know					
11) Other	Not provided					

Community Classifications

Table 9.8-5 Community Classifications of the Town of Day

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	NP	N/A

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Public Protection	NP	N/A
Storm Ready	NP	N/A
Firewise	NP	N/A

N/A = Not applicable. NP = Not participating. - = Unavailable.

The classifications listed above relate to the community's effectiveness in providing services that may impact 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 one 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 1000 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: https://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/;
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at https://www.weather.gov/stormready/; and,
- The National Firewise Communities website at http://firewise.org/.

9.8.5 Mitigation Strategy

Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Table 9.8-6 Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives of the Town of Day

							<u> </u>			
Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead	Support	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TD-1	Where appropriate, support retrofitting of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. Identify facilities that are viable candidates for retrofitting based on cost- effectiveness versus relocation. Where retrofitting is determined to be a viable option, consider implementation of that action based on available funding.	Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 2, 3, 5	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 3-1, 3-5	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	NYS DHSES, FEMA	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Ongoing

2-DT Initiative	Where appropriate, support purchase, or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. Identify facilities that are viable candidates for relocation based on cost-effectiveness versus retrofitting. Where relocation is determined to be a viable option, consider implementation of that action based on available funding	Applies to New for and/or Existing Structures*	Severe Storm Witigated	1, 2, 3, 5	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 3-1, 3-5	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	NYS DHSES, FEMA	H dei HEstimated Cost	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Ongoing
TD-3	Consider participation in incentive-based programs such as CRS.	New & Existing	Flood	1, 2, 5	1-1, 1-3, 1-6, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 5-2	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	NYS DHSES, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Short Term
TD-4	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0	New & Existing	All Hazards	All	All	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	County (through Mitigation Planning Coordinator), NYS DHSES	Low – High (for 5- year update)	Local Budget, possibly FEMA Mitigation Grant Funding for 5- year update	Short Term
TD-5	Strive to maintain compliance with, and good standing in the National Flood Insurance program.	New & Existing	Flood	1, 2, 4	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-8, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	NYS DHSES, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead	Support	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TD-6	Continue to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1, 3	1-1, 1-7, 3-2, 3-4, 3-5	Emergency Management with support from County OEM and NYS DHSES	County Emergency Management, NYS DHSES	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
TD-7	Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities.	New & Existing	All Hazards	3, 5	3-4, 5-1, 5-3	Emergency Management, DPW and Roads	Surrounding municipalities and County	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Short Term
TD-8	Support County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.	New & Existing	All Hazards	All	All	Appropriate Departments	County and Regional agencies (as appropriate for initiative)	Low - High	Existing programs and grant funding where applicable	Short Term
TD-9	Create/update the Emergency Action Plans for all dams located within the municipality	Existing	Flood	1, 3	1-1, 1-6, 1-7, 3-1, 3-2, 3-4	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Watershed districts (if applicable); neighboring municipalities; County (if applicable); NYS	Medium to Low	FEMA HMA	Ongoing
TD-10	Implement dam structure repairs as required by dam safety report/protocols	Existing	Flood	3	3-1, 3-3, 3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator; Engineering Department	Watershed districts (if applicable); neighboring municipalities; County (if applicable); NYS	Medium	FEMA HMA	Short Term

Saratoga County, New York July 18, 2019

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead	Support	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TD-11	Support the Installation/Implementation of Community Emergency Alert System	New & Existing	All Hazards	1, 3, 5	1-1, 3-1, 3-3, 3-5, 3-6, 5-1	LEMC	Watershed districts (if applicable); neighboring municipalities; County (if applicable); NYS	Medium	FEMA HMA	Ongoing
TD-12	Create a mitigation support fund to provide matching funds on an ongoing basis for municipality and residential mitigation projects which will fund cost-sharing portions of projects and be replenished during the annual budget cycle	New & Existing	All Hazards	1, 2, 3, 5	1-3, 1-9, 2-5, 3-1, 5-2	Town Board		Medium	Operating budget	Short Term
TD-13	Mitigate annual washout of Shipple Road by replacing culverts and purchasing easements for draining	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1, 3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short Term
TD-14	Mitigate annual washout of Turner Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term
TD-15	Mitigate annual washout of Sand Lake Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term
TD-16	Mitigate washout of Kroetch Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term
TD-17	Mitigate washout of Walter Maxfield Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term

Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Saratoga County, New York July 18, 2019

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead	Support	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TD-18	Mitigate washout of Yates Hill Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term
TD-19	Mitigate washout of Hadley Hill Road by replacing culvert.	Existing	Flood	1,3	1-1,3-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator		Medium	Multiple sources; Grant	Short- term

^{*}Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure?

Notes: Short term = 1 to 5 years; Long Term= 5 years or greater; OG = Ongoing program; DOF = Depending on funding; NA = Not applicable;

Analysis of Mitigation Actions

This table summarizes the participant's mitigation actions by hazard of concern and the six mitigation types to illustrate that the Town has selected a comprehensive range of actions/projects.

Table 9.8-7 Analysis of Mitigation Actions of the Town of Day

	Type of Mitigation	n Action				
Hazard of Concern	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education and Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects
Drought	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8
Earthquake	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8
Extreme	TD-4, TD-8, TD-	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7,	TD-4, TD-8
Temperatures	12				TD-8, TD-11	

PDM = Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program.

	Type of Mitigation	n Action				
Hazard of Concern	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education and Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects
Flooding (riverine, flash, coastal and urban flooding)	TD-3, TD-4, TD- 5, TD-8, TD-9, TD-12	TD-1, 2 TD-3, TD-4, TD-5, TD- 8	TD-1, 2 TD-3, TD-4, TD-5, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-3, TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-9, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 10, TD-13, TD- 14, TD-15, TD- 16, TD-17, TD- 18, TD-19
Ground Failure	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8
Invasive Species	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8
Severe Storms (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning and tornados)	TD-3, TD-4, TD- 5, TD-8, TD-12	TD-1, 2 TD-3, TD-4, TD-5, TD- 8	TD-1, 2 TD-3, TD-4, TD-5, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-3, TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD- 11	TD-4, TD-8
Severe Winter Storm (heavy snow, blizzards, ice storms)	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8
Wildfire	TD-4, TD-8, TD- 12	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-8	TD-4, TD-6, TD-7, TD-8, TD-11	TD-4, TD-8

Notes:

- 1. **Prevention:** Government, administrative or regulatory actions or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. These actions also include public activities to reduce hazard losses. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.
- 2. **Property Protection:** Actions that involve (1) modification of existing buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard, or (2) removal of the structures from the hazard area. Examples include acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofits, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
- 3. **Public Education and Awareness:** Actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Such actions include outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and school-age and adult education programs.
- 4. **Natural Resource Protection:** Actions that minimize hazard loss and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. These actions include sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
- 5. **Emergency Services:** Actions that protect people and property, during and immediately following, a disaster or hazard event. Services include warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities.
- 6. **Structural Projects:** Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Such structures include dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.

Prioritization of Mitigation Initiatives

Table 9.8-8 Prioritization of Mitigation Initiatives of the Town of Day

	I	I				the rown or Buy	
L-DT Initiative #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits equal or exceed Costs? (Yes or No)	ls project Grant eligible? (Yes or No)	Can Project be funded under existing programs/budgets? (Yes or No)	Priority (High, Med., Low)
TD-1	8	Н	Н	Υ	Υ	N	M-H*
TD-2	8	Н	Н	Υ	Υ	N	M-H*
TD-3	8	М	L	Υ	N	Υ	Н
TD-4	28	M	M	Y	N (Yes for 5-year update)	Υ	Н
TD-5	11	L	L	Υ	N	Υ	Н
TD-6	5	М	L	Υ	N	Υ	M
TD-7	35	М	L	Υ	N	Υ	Н
TD-8	28	Н	L-M	Υ	Dependent on specific initiative	Dependent on specific initiative	M-H (dependent)
TD-9	6	М	M-L	Υ	Υ	Y (local match)	М
TD-10	3	М	М	Υ	Υ	Y (local match)	М
TD-11	6	М	М	Υ	Υ	Y (local match)	M
TD-12	6	М	М	Υ	N	Υ	Н
TD-13	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-14	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-15	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-16	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-17	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-18	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
TD-19	2	Н	М	Υ	Υ	N	Н
Notoo, LL - LI	بدرها حاميز	N1 - N10 div	NI - NI - N	$J/\Delta = Not applicable V$	/ - \/	·	·

Notes: H = High. L = Low. M = Medium. N = No. N/A = Not applicable. Y = Yes.

Explanation of Priorities

High Priority - A project that meets multiple objectives (i.e., multiple hazards), benefits
exceeds cost, has funding secured or is an on-going project and project meets eligibility

^{*}This initiative has a Medium priority based on the prioritization scheme used in this planning process (implementation based on grant funding), however it is recognized that addressing repetitive and severe repetitive loss properties is considered a high priority by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (NYS DHSES) (as expressed in the State HMP), and thus shall be considered a High priority for all participants in the planning process.

- requirements for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) or Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program (PDM) programs. High priority projects can be completed in the short term (1 to 5 years).
- Medium Priority A project that meets goals and objectives, benefits exceeds costs, funding has not been secured but project is grant eligible under, HMGP, PDM or other grant programs. Project can be completed in the short term, once funding is completed. Medium priority projects will become high priority projects once funding is secured.
- Low Priority Any project that will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits do not exceed the costs or are difficult to quantify, funding has not been secured and project is not eligible for HMGP or PDM grant funding, and time line for completion is considered long term (1 to 10 years). Low priority projects may be eligible other sources of grant funding from other programs. A low priority project could become a high priority project once funding is secured as long as it could be completed in the short term.

Prioritization of initiatives was based on above definitions: Not provided

Prioritization of initiatives was based on parameters other than stated above: Not provided

9.8.6 National Flood Insurance Program Compliance

The Town of Day (Town) participates in the NFIP and draws on a number of capabilities to carry out program requirements. The Town maintains a number of jurisdictional ordinances that ensure all construction is appropriate for the areas considered at risk to flooding: NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance; a Floodplain Management/Basin Plan; and Site Plan Review Requirements.

The Town is staffed with professionals whose expertise supports a high standard of floodplain management. In addition to employing a floodplain administrator, included on Town staff are planners and engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices; engineers and professionals trained construction practices related to buildings and infrastructure; technical staff with an understanding of natural hazards; and an emergency manager. Project review input from professionals serving in these technical positions provides guidance to property owners about how to build or rebuild in ways that minimize flood damage to persons and property.

The community also developed three mitigation actions to enhance NFIP program management. These include reviewing the vulnerability of facilities in hazard prone areas and determining the appropriate course of action (e.g. retrofitting vs relocation); reviewing the feasibility of becoming a member of the Community Rating System; and mitigate annual washout of Shipple Road by replacing culverts and purchasing easements for draining.

The town does not currently have any properties that have experienced repetitive loss (RL) or severe repetitive losses (SRL) from flood. The town will continue to proactively mitigate at-risk properties and monitor NFIP claims for RL and SRL properties.

9.8.7 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.8.8 Additional Comments

No additional comments at this time.

9.8.9 NYS Mitigation Action Worksheets

See next page.

	NYS DHSES A	Action Worl	kshe	eet				
Project Name:	Shipple Road Culvert Replacement							
Project Number:	TD-13							
		ulnerability						
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout from water running o	ver roadway a	nnua	ally.				
	Existing culvert is under size for heavy rains, h	nead walls are	also	collapsing.				
Description of the								
Problem:								
	1	1 1 C T	1	:		_	_	
	Action or Project Inte		_		male mand Dumehani		_	
	30 inch culvert by 40 foot for drive way, and 30 drainage. (Pertaining to critical facility section					ng e	as	ement for
Description of the				, ,	,,			
Solution:								
			1			_	_	
	ect related to a Critical Facility?	Yes	Х		No	丄	L	
(If yes, this proj	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year flood	d event or the	actu	al worst damage	e scenario, whicheve	r is	gre	eater.)
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain	Fetin	nated	d Benefits				
Useful Life:	50+ years			avoided):				
Estimated Cost:	\$12,000	`		,			_	
	Plan for In	nplementation						
Prioritization:	High	Desired Ti Implement			Within the next ye	Within the next year		
Estimated Time	1 week					FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program; FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant		
Required for Project		Potential F	und	ing Sources:	Program; NYSDC			
Implementation:	Town of Day	Local Dlam		Mechanisms	Engineers/public	•		
Responsible	Town or Day			mplementation,		NOIF	15,	Government
Organization:		if any:	111 11	inprementation,	,			
	Three Alternatives Consi	dered (includ	ing	No Action)				
	Action	Est	ima	ted Cost	Ev	alua	ıtic	on
	No Action		\$	50				
	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as	\$200-300			PRO: low cost; im			
Alternatives:	needed				CON: temporary s reoccurring proble		llor	i to a
	Stormwater study to evaluate green	\$15,000			Pro: lower cost; q		er '	to implement:
	infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge	4 . 6 , 6 6			greater understan	ding	g of	f the
	in culvert during heavy rainstorms.				stormwater syster projects.	n to	inf	orm alternative
	Progress Report (1	for plan mair	ntens	ance)	projects.			
Date of Status	N/A	ioi pian man	псп	inee)				
Report:	, , ,							
	N/A							
D (CD								
Report of Progress:								
Update Evaluation of	N/A							
the Problem and/or								
Solution:								
						—	_	

	NYS DHSES A	Action Worksheet						
Project Name:	Tuner Road Culvert Replacement							
Project Number:	TD-14							
		ulnerability						
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout from water running o	ver roadway annually.						
	Existing culvert is under size for heavy rains, c	connecting seams are coming apart,	and head walls are also collapsing.					
Description of the Problem:								
	Action or Project Inte	ended for Implementation						
12-foot-wide by 6-foot-high open bottom by 40 foot. For trout stream, fill in road bed 8 feet, 30 feet long and 25 feet wide. (Pertaining to critical facility section below we answered yes for public roadway). Description of the Solution:								
Is this proje	ect related to a Critical Facility?	Yes X	No					
	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year floor	l event or the actual worst damage	scenario whichever is greater)					
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain	event of the actual worst damage	section, whichever is greater.)					
Useful Life:	50+ years	Estimated Benefits						
Estimated Cost:	\$45,000	(losses avoided):						
Estimated Cost.	,	1						
	Plan for Implementation							
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within the next year					
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3 weeks	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program; FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; NYSDOT (ex. BRIDGE NY)					
Responsible Organization:	Town of Day	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Engineers/public works; Government officials					
	Three Alternatives Consi	dered (including No Action)						
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation					
	No Action	\$0						
Alternatives:	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed	\$200-300	PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to reoccurring problem					
	Stormwater study to evaluate green infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge in culvert during heavy rainstorms.	\$15,000	Pro: lower cost; quicker to implement; greater understanding of the stormwater system to inform alternative projects.					
	Progress Report (f	for plan maintenance)						
Date of Status Report:	N/A							
	N/A							
Report of Progress:								
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	N/A							

	NYS DHSES A	Action Worksheet							
Project Name:	Sand Lake Culvert Replacement								
Project Number:	TD-15								
		ulnerability							
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout from water running of	over roadway annually.							
Description of the Problem:	Existing culvert is under size for heavy rains, he Existing culvert is too short resulting in insuffic	nead walls are also collapsing. Cree ient shoulder stability.	k runs along road in need of 80 feet.						
	A stion on Duciest Int.	and ad fan Immlamantation							
Action or Project Intended for Implementation 18 foot wide by 8 foot high open bottom by 80 foot. For trout stream. (Pertaining to critical facility section below, we answered yes for public roadway). Description of the Solution:									
T 41 '	1 1 1 C C T 1 F T C 2	Yes X	No I						
2 -	ect related to a Critical Facility?								
	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year floor	d event or the actual worst damage	scenario, whichever is greater.)						
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain	Estimated Benefits							
Useful Life: Estimated Cost:	50+ years \$45,000	(losses avoided):							
Estimated Cost.	, ,	1							
		nplementation	harri e						
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within the next year						
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3 weeks	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program; FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; NYSDOT (ex. BRIDGE NY)						
Responsible Organization:	Town of Day	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Engineers/public works; Government officials						
	Three Alternatives Consi	dered (including No Action)							
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation						
	No Action	\$0							
Alternatives:	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed	\$200-300	PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to reoccurring problem						
	Stormwater study to evaluate green infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge in culvert during heavy rainstorms.	\$15,000	Pro: lower cost; quicker to implement; greater understanding of the stormwater system to inform alternative projects.						
	Progress Report (1	for plan maintenance)							
Date of Status Report:	N/A								
	N/A								
Report of Progress:									
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	N/A								

	NYS DHSES A	Action Worksheet						
Project Name:	Kroetch Road Culvert Replacement							
Project Number:	TD-16							
	Risk / V	ulnerability						
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout							
	Existing culvert is under size for heavy rains, a	nd is also falling apart. Shoulders ar	nd head walls are also collapsing.					
Description of the								
Problem:								
		-	20 16 20 0 1					
Description of the	anomorou you for public roadmay).							
Solution:								
Is this proje	ct related to a Critical Facility?	Yes X	No					
(If yes, this proje	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year flood	l event or the actual worst damage s	scenario, whichever is greater.)					
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain	Estimated Renefits						
Useful Life:	50+ years							
Estimated Cost:	,		Į					
	Plan for In							
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within the next year					
Estimated Time	3 weeks		FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program;					
Required for Project		Potential Funding Sources:						
Implementation:	Town of Day	I I Dl i Mli						
Responsible	Town or Day		officials					
Organization:		if any:						
	Three Alternatives Consideration	dered (including No Action)						
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation					
	No Action	\$0						
		\$200-300						
Alternatives:	needed							
	Action or Project Intended for Implementation 12 foot wide by 6 foot high open bottom by 60 foot. For trout stream. (Pertaining to critical facility section below, we answered yes for public roadway). Is this project related to a Critical Facility? If yes, this project must intend to protect to the 500-year flood event or the actual worst damage scenario, whichever is greater.) Protection: 100 Year Floodplain 100: Sol+ years 100 Year Floodplain 100: Plan for Implementation Plan for Implementation Tation: High Desired Timeframe for Implementation: Potential Funding Sources: Potential Funding Sources: Potential Funding Sources: Potential Funding Sources: FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Progress to be Used in Implementation, if any: Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action) Action Sol No Action Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed Stormwater study to evaluate green infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge in culvert during heavy rainstorms. Progress Report (for plan maintenance) Status N/A							
	infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge		greater understanding of the					
	in culvert during heavy rainstorms.		,					
	Progress Report (f	or nlan maintenance)	projects.					
Date of Status		or plan manifemence)						
Report:								
	N/A							
D								
Report of Progress:								
Update Evaluation of	N/A							
the Problem and/or								
Solution:								

	NYS DHSES A	Action Worksheet								
Project Name:	Walter Maxfield Road Culvert Replacement									
Project Number:	TD-17									
		ulnerability								
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout									
Description of the	Existing culvert is under size for heavy rains, a	and is also following apart. Shoulder	s and head walls are collapsing.							
Problem:										
	Action or Project Intended for Implementation 12 foot wide by 6 foot high open bottom by 80 foot. For trout stream. (Pertaining to critical facility section below we									
Description of the Solution:	answered yes for public roadway).									
Is this proje	ect related to a Critical Facility?	Yes X	No							
	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year floor	d event or the actual worst damage	scenario, whichever is greater.)							
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain		, , ,							
Useful Life:	50+ years	Estimated Benefits								
Estimated Cost:	\$45,000	(losses avoided):								
	Plan for Implementation									
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within the next year							
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3 weeks	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program; FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; NYSDOT (ex. BRIDGE NY)							
Responsible Organization:	Town of Day	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Engineers/public works; Government officials							
	Three Alternatives Consi	dered (including No Action)								
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation							
	No Action	\$0								
Alternatives:	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed	\$200-300	PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to reoccurring problem							
	Stormwater study to evaluate green infrastructure measures to mitigate discharge in culvert during heavy rainstorms.	\$15,000	Pro: lower cost; quicker to implement; greater understanding of the stormwater system to inform alternative projects.							
	Progress Report (1	for plan maintenance)								
Date of Status Report:	N/A									
Report of Progress:	N/A									
Report of Progress:										
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	N/A									

	NYS DHSES A	Ac	tion Works	she	eet				
Project Name:	Yates Hill Road Culvert Replacement								
Project Number:	TD-18								
		ulı	nerability						
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding. Road washout								
Description of the Problem:		Six foot culvert is too small. Beaver dams are in place up stream. Culvert is six foot, creek bottom to black top road is wenty feet and has been up in a foot of going over.							
Action or Project Intended for Implementation									
12 foot wide by 8 foot high open bottom by 60 foot. For trout stream. (Pertaining to critical facility section below we answered yes for public roadway). Description of the Solution:									
Is this proje	ect related to a Critical Facility?		Yes	Х		No l			
	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year floor	1 ~							
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain	1 6	veni or the ac	iu	ai worst damage	scenario, winchever is greater.)			
Useful Life:	50+ years	-	Estima	iteo	d Benefits				
Estimated Cost:	\$45.000	1	(losse	es a	avoided):				
	, -,	nn	lementation						
	High Desired Timeframe for Within the next year								
Prioritization:		Implementation:				Within the next year			
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3 weeks	Potential Funding Sources: FEMA Pre-Dis.			FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Progra FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; NYSDOT (ex. BRIDGE NY	Mitigation Grant			
Responsible Organization:	Town of Day	1			Mechanisms nplementation,		Engineers/public works; Government officials		
	Three Alternatives Consi	de	red (includir	ng]	No Action)				
	Action	Τ	Estir	na	ted Cost	Evaluation			
	No Action			\$	60				
Alternatives:	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed	\$2	200-300			PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to reoccurring problem	ng		
	Recurring excavation and beaver dam destruction as needed	\$2	200-300			PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to recurring problem			
	Progress Report (1	for	plan mainte	ena	ance)				
Date of Status Report:	N/A				,		_		
Report of Progress:	N/A N/A								
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:									

NYS DHSES Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Hadley Hill Road Culvert Replacement		
Project Number:	TD-19		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard of Concern:	Flooding danger due to enlarged beaver pond. Land owner refuses to the removal of the beaver.		
	Existing culvert is under size, should the dam fall.		
Description of the Problem:			
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Existing culvert is 18 inches in diameter, would like to replace with 48 inch culvert 50 feet long. (Pertaining to critical facility section below we answered yes for public roadway). Description of the Solution:			
Is this proje	ect related to a Critical Facility?	Yes X	No
(If yes, this proj	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year floor	d event or the actual worst damag	ge scenario, whichever is greater.)
Level of Protection:	100 Year Floodplain		
Useful Life:	50+ years	Estimated Benefits	
Estimated Cost:	\$5,000	(losses avoided):	
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within the next year
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 week	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program; FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; NYSDOT (ex. BRIDGE NY)
Responsible Organization:	Town of Day	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:	Engineers/public works; Government officials
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	
	Maintaining and clearing existing culverts as needed	\$200-300	PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to reoccurring problem
	Recurring excavation and beaver dam destruction as needed	\$200-300	PRO: low cost; immediate CON: temporary solution to recurring problem
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)			
Date of Status Report:	N/A	•	
Report of Progress:	N/A		
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	N/A		