9.9 Town of Edinburg

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

- Jurisdictional Annex Update Form (Contact Information, Profile, and Capability Assessment)
- NYS Mitigation Action Worksheets

9.9.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Jean Raymond / Supervisor	Janet Johansson / Deputy Supervisor
45 Military Road; Edinburg, NY 12134	45 Military Road; Edinburg, NY 12134
518-863-2034	518-863-2034
edinburg@roadrunner.com	edinburg@roadrunner.com
	-

9.9.2 Town Profile

Population

1,400 (American Community Survey 5-Year 2016 Estimates)

Location

The Town of Edinburg (formerly identified as Edinburgh) is located in the western part of the county. The town is inside of the Adirondack Park. It is bounded on the north by Day and Hamilton County, on the east by Day, Corinth and Greenfield, on the south by Providence, and on the west by the county line (connecting with Fulton County). The town is divided by the Great Sacandaga Lake and is linked by the Batchellerville Bridge carrying County Road 98 across the lake.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the town has a total area of 67.1 square miles, with 60.1 square miles of land and 7.0 square miles (10.45-percent) of 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 region was first settled around 1787. The town was formed in 1801 as the "Town of Northfield" from part of the Town of Providence. The name was changed to Edinburgh in 1808 to avoid confusion with another location named Northfield. In 1819, part of the town was used to form the Town of Day. When the Sacandaga Reservoir was formed in 1931, the town lost some of its communities and population as well as land area.

Governing Body Format

The Town of Edinburg is governed by a supervisor and four town board members.

Growth/Development Trends

The Town of Edinburg noted that the only growth and development is the possible replacement of Batchellerville Bridge.

9.9.3 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 9.9-1 summarizes the Town of Edinburg'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 Edinburg 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 Edinburg and the County is that severe winter weather is the Town's highest risk hazard, whereas the County ranked it a moderate hazard.

Rank #	Hazard Type	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Scoreª	Hazard Ranking ^ь	County Hazard Ranking ^ь
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

 Table 9.9-1 Town of Edinburg Hazard Ranking

Rank #	Hazard Type	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score ^a	Hazard Ranking ^b	County Hazard Ranking ^ь
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

b. 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 Edinburg did not rank the new hazards profiled in the 2019 HMP Update. The rankings in this table reflect the town's ranking of the hazards in the previous HMP.

9.9.4 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 9.9-2 Legal and Regulatory Capability of the Town of Edinburg

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	Y	Ν	APA - Y	Ν	1986
2) Zoning Ordinance	Y	Ν	APA - Y	Ν	1996
3) Subdivision Ordinance	Y	Ν	Ν	Ν	1996
4) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (if you are in the NFIP, you must have this.)	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Not provided

Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Saratoga County, New York September 18, 2019

Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances, Plans)	Local Authority (Y or N)	Prohibitions (State or Federal) (Υ or N)	Higher Jurisdictional Authority (Υ or N)	State Mandated (Y or N)	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, date of adoption)
5) Growth Management	Ν	Ν	Ν	N	(other than APA)
6) Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	N	Y	Y	N	Not provided
7) Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	N	N	Y	Y	Not provided
8) Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan/ General Plan	N	N	N	N	Not provided
9) Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)	N	N	N	N	Not provided
10) Site Plan Review Requirements	Y	Y	Y	N	In Zoning
11) Open Space Plan	Y	N	N	N	In APA
12) Economic Development Plan	N	N	N	N	Not provided
13) Emergency Response Plan	Y	N	Y	Y	In process of being updated
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	Ν	N	Not provided
17) Other [Special Purpose Ordinances (i.e., critical or sensitive areas)]	N	Y	Y	N	Not provided

Administrative and Technical Capability

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
 Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices 	Ν	Hired as needed
2) Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Code enforcement officer
3) Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	N	Not provided
4) Floodplain Administrator	Ν	Not provided
5) Surveyor(s)	Ν	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 Edinburg.	N	Not provided
8) Emergency Manager	Ν	Not provided
9) Grant Writer(s)	Ν	Not provided
10) Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	Ν	Not provided

Table 9.9-3 Administrative and Technical Capability of the Town of Edinburg

Fiscal Capability

Table 9.9-4 Fiscal Capability of the Town of Edinburg

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

Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Saratoga County, New York September 18, 2019

Community Classifications

	Table 7.7-5 Community Classifications of the Town of Edinburg								
Program	Classification	Date Classified							
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A							
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	NP	N/A							
Public Protection	NP	N/A							
Storm Ready	NP	N/A							
Firewise	NP	N/A							

Table 9.9-5 Community Classifications of the Town of Edinburg

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/.

9.9.5 Mitigation Strategy

Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Table 9.9-6 Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives of the Town of Edinburg

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support agencies	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TE-1a	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	Long Term

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support agencies	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TE-1b	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.	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	Long Term
TE-2	Consider participation in incentive- based programs such as CRS (see TE-4).	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
TE-3	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

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support agencies	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TE-4	Evaluate the benefits of participating 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	Long Term
TE-5	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	Long Term
TE-6	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	Long Term
TE-7	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	Long Term

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support agencies	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TE-8	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	Long Term
TE-9	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	Long Term
TE-10	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	Short Term
TE-11	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

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support agencies	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline
TE-12	With rainfall current T1 line consistently fails causing radio interruption. Replace antiquated T1 circuit with Fiber Optic technology that will carry 9-1-1 800 MHz radio traffic between radio sites.	Existing	All Hazards	1,3, 4	1-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 4-1	Town and County Emergency Management Personnel	Engineers, Public Works, Town Government, County Emergency Services, Private Service Providers	Medium	Grant Programs, Local Match	Short Term
TE-13	Construct a storage building with enhanced capacity that will lessen the impact of delivery delays for the Highway Department. The Town will construct a salt storage facility capable of storing approximately 4000 tons of salt and/or sand. This could be shared with neighboring jurisdictions.	New	Severe Winter Storm	1, 3	1-1, 3-6	Town of Edinburg Highway Department	N/A	Medium	Grant Programs, Local Match	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; PDM = Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program.

Analysis of Mitigation Actions

	Type of Mitigation Action								
Hazard of Concern	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education and Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects			
Drought	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Earthquake	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Extreme Temperatures	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Flooding (riverine, flash, coastal and urban flooding)	TE-2, TE-3, TE- 4, TE-7, TE-8, TE-11	TE-1a and b, TE-2, TE-3, TE- 4, TE-7	TE-1a and b, TE- 2, TE-3, TE-4, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-2, TE-3, TE- 5, TE-6, TE-7, TE-8, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 9			
Ground Failure	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Invasive Species	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Severe Storms (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning and tornados)	TE-2, TE-3, TE- 4, TE-7, TE-11	TE-1a and b, TE-2, TE-3, TE- 4, TE-7	TE-1a and b, TE- 2, TE-3, TE-4, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-2, TE-3, TE- 5, TE-6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Severe Winter Storm (heavy snow, blizzards, ice storms)	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			
Wildfire	TE-3, TE-7, TE- 11	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-7	TE-3, TE-5, TE- 6, TE-7, TE-10	TE-3, TE-7			

	Type of Mitigation Action							
Hazard of Concern	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education and Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects		

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, 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

-				0			8
LE-1a	# 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)
TE-1a	8	Н	Н	Y	Y	N	M-H*
TE-1b	8	Н	Н	Y	Y	N	M-H*
TE-2	8	М	L	Y	N	Y	Н
TE-3	28	М	М	Y	N (Yes for 5- year update)	Y	Н
TE-4	11	L	L	Y	Ň	Y	Н
TE-5	5	М	L	Y	N	Y	М
TE-6	35	М	L	Y	N	Y	Н
TE-7	28	Н	L-M	Y	Dependent on specific initiative	Dependent on specific initiative	M-H (dependent)
TE-8	6	М	M-L	Y	Y	Y (local match)	М
TE-9	3	М	М	Y	Y	Y (local match)	М
TE-10	6	М	М	Y	Y	Y (local match)	М
TE-11	6	М	М	Y	Ν	Y	Н

Table 9.9-7 Prioritization of Mitigation Initiatives of the Town of Edinburg

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

*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.

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 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

9.9.6 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.9.7 Additional Comments

No additional comments at this time.

9.9.8 NYS Mitigation Action Forms

See next page.

Saratoga County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Name of Jurisdiction: Town of Edinburg

NYS DHSES Action Worksheet									
Project Name:	Expand Interoperability								
Project Number:	TE-12								
Risk / Vulnerability									
Hazard of Concern: ALL Hazards									
Description of the Problem:	Replace antiquated T1 circuit with Fiber Optic technology that will carry 9-1-1 800 MHz radio traffic between radio sites. With rainfall current T1 line consistently fails causing radio interruption.								
	Action or Project Inte	ended for Implementation							
Description of the Solution:	Description of the Installation of fiber optic circuit to carry 800 MHz radio traffic between the Edinburg radio tower and a second radio site in close proximity to the Edinburg site.								
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 flood	event or the actual worst damage	scenario, whichever is greater.)						
Level of Protection:	100 year Flood Plain		Potential loss of life should radio site						
Useful Life:	50+ Years	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	go off line.						
Estimated Cost:	\$250,000	(losses avoided).							
	Plan for In	plementation							
Prioritization:	HIGH	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	ASAP						
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3-6 months	Potential Funding Sources:	Grant/Multiple Sources						
Responsible Organization:	Town of Edinburg	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	Engineers, Public Works, Town Government, County Emergency Services						
	Three Alternatives Consid	dered (including No Action)							
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation						
Alternatives:	No Action	\$0							
	Progress Report (f	or plan maintenance)							
Date of Status Report:									
Report of Progress:									
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:									

Saratoga County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Name of Jurisdiction: Town of Edinburg

NYS DHSES Action Worksheet										
Project Name:	Salt/Sand Storage Facility									
Project Number:	TE-13									
	Risk / Vulnerability									
Hazard of Concern:										
	There is currently inadequate salt storage for severe winter weather.									
Description of the Problem:	Description of the									
	Action or Project Inte	ended for Implementation								
Description of the Solution: Storage capacity enhancement will lessen the impact of delivery delays for the Highway Department. The Town will construct a salt storage facility capable of storing approximately 4000 tons of salt and/or sand. This could be shared with neighboring jurisdictions.										
Is this proje	ect related to a Critical Facility?	Yes X	No							
	ect must intend to protect to the 500-year flood	event or the actual worst damage s	scenario, whichever is greater.)							
Level of Protection:	100 year Flood Plain		Potential loss of life should radio site							
Useful Life:	50+ Years	Estimated Benefits	go off line.							
Estimated Cost:	400,000	(losses avoided):	C							
	Plan for Im	plementation								
Prioritization:	HIGH	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	ASAP							
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	3-6 months	Potential Funding Sources:	Grant/Multiple Sources							
Responsible Organization:	Town of Edinburg - Highway Department	n of Edinburg - Highway Department to be Used in Implementation, if any:								
	Three Alternatives Consid	dered (including No Action)								
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation							
	No Action	\$0								
Alternatives:	Develop MA agreements with County/neighboring jurisdictions for the use and delivery of salt	\$0	Less costly; agreements may not cover entire need							
	Construct a mutually accessible shared salt storage facility with the County and/or neighboring jurisdictions.	\$400,000	Cost burden shared with the County and/or surrounding jurisdictions.							
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)										
Date of Status Report:		1 /								
Report of Progress:										
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:										