

## 9.16 TOWN OF PERTH

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Town of Perth.

### A.) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Greg Fagan, Supervisor 1849 Co. Hwy 107, Amsterdam, NY 12010 (518) 843-6977 ext. 17 <a href="mailto:atownofperthn@nycap.rr.com">atownofperthn@nycap.rr.com</a>	Tom Korona, Councilman 1849 Co. Hwy 107, Amsterdam, NY 12010 (518) 843-6977

### B.) TOWN PROFILE

#### Population

3,580 (estimated 2008 U.S. Census)

#### Location

The Town of Perth is located in Fulton County and is in the eastern part of the county, north of Amsterdam, New York. The town is east of the City of Johnstown. The eastern town line borders Saratoga County and the southern boundary borders Montgomery County.

According to the United States Census Bureau, the town has a total area of 26.1 square miles (67.5 km<sup>2</sup>), of which, 26.1 square miles (67.5 km<sup>2</sup>) of it is land and 0.04 square miles (0.1 km<sup>2</sup>) of it (0.08%) is water.

#### Climate

Fulton County, located in the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains 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 temperature high is 80°F. The winters of Fulton County are long and cold, with January temperature low of 9°F.

The Adirondacks have four distinct seasons that range from normal to severe winters and cool summers. The summer climate is cool in the Adirondacks. It is not uncommon for temperatures to approach the freezing level in the Adirondacks during June and the latter half of August. The average length of the freeze free season in New York State varies from 100 to 120 days in the Adirondacks. Fulton County gets on average 44 inches of rain and about 80 inches of snow per year.

#### Brief History

The Town of Perth was first settled around 1772 by pioneers from Scotland. The town was formed from part of the Town of Amsterdam in 1838, when Fulton County was created. In 1842, the size of the town was increased by land from the Towns of Broadalbin and Mayfield.

#### Governing Body Format

The Town of Perth is governed by the Town Supervisor and members of the Town Board.



**Growth/Development Trends**

There is no major residential/commercial or major infrastructure development identified for the next five (5) years.

**C.) NATURAL HAZARD EVENT HISTORY SPECIFIC TO THE TOWN**

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster # (if applicable)	Date	Preliminary Damage Assessment
Severe Storms and Flooding	DR-1148	November 8-15, 1996	Between November 8 and 9, the storm produced 4 to 5.5 inches of rain across Fulton County. Several bridges were damaged in the County. According to SHELDUS and NOAA-NCDC, Fulton County had approximately \$400 K in property damage.
Severe Storm	DR-1244	September 7, 1998	A cluster of fast-moving thunderstorms developed and moved through Rochester and Syracuse, then on into the Mohawk River Valley during the early morning of September 7 <sup>th</sup> . The Derecho continued into southern sections of Vermont and New Hampshire. Fulton, Herkimer, and Montgomery Counties were declared disaster areas. The County experienced approximately \$1.5 million in damages, which included 350 homes that were destroyed.
Severe Storms, Tornadoes and Flooding	DR-1486	July 21 – August 11, 2003	The storms struck Fulton County in August 2003. According to SHELDUS and NOAA-NCDC, Fulton County had approximately \$135 K in property damages.
Severe Storms and Flooding	DR-1650	June 26 – July 10, 2006	Between June 28 and 29, in Fulton County, East Canada Creek flooded within the vicinity of the Town of Stratford and the Village of Dolgeville. Damages for Fulton County were not available.

***Number of FEMA Identified Repetitive Flood Loss Properties:*** 0  
***Number of FEMA Identified Severe Repetitive Flood Loss Properties:*** 0

Source: FEMA Region 2, January 2010

## D.) NATURAL HAZARD RISK/VULNERABILITY RISK RANKING

Rank #	Hazard type	Estimate of Potential Dollar Losses to Structures Vulnerable to the Hazard <sup>a,c</sup>	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score (Probability x Impact)	Hazard Ranking <sup>b</sup>
3	Earthquake	500-Year MRP: \$625,472 <sup>c, e</sup> 2,500-Year MRP: \$6,002,180 <sup>c, e</sup>	Rare	16	Low
2	Flood	100-Year MRP: \$1,020,000 <sup>c, e</sup> 500-Year MRP: \$1,181,000 <sup>c, e</sup>	Frequent	27	Medium
1	Severe Storm	500-Year MRP: \$125,317 <sup>c, d, f</sup>	Frequent	48	High
1	Severe Winter Storm	1% - \$2,061,550 <sup>c, d</sup> 5% - \$10,307,750 <sup>c, d</sup>	Frequent	48	High

- a. Building damage ratio estimates based on FEMA 386-2 (August 2001)
- b. High = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 40 and above  
Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking of 20-40  
Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 20
- c. The valuation of general building stock and loss estimates determined in Fulton County were based on the default general building stock database provided in HAZUS-MH MR4 (RSMeans 2006).
- d. Severe storm and severe winter storm hazard loss estimates are structural values only; does not include the value of contents.
- e. Loss estimates represent both structure and contents for the flood hazard and earthquake hazards.
- f. No general building stock damages were calculated by HAZUS for the 100-year MRP severe storm event.

## E.) CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

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

## E.1) Legal and Regulatory Capability

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	N	Y	Y	Local Law #1-1985, 6-4-1985
2) Zoning Ordinance	Y	Y	Y	N	Local Law #1-2002, 1-2-2002
3) Subdivision Ordinance	Y	N	N	N	Resolution #60, 3-7-2006
4) NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (if you are in the NFIP, you <b>must</b> have this.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Local Law #1-1984, 5-30-1984
5) Growth Management	Y	N	N	N	
6) Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	Y	Y	Y	N	Local Law #1-1975, 1-1975
7) Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	Y	N	N	Y	
8) Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan/ General Plan	Y	Y	Y	N	Adopted by Resolution, 12-6- 2000
9) Capital Improvements Plan	Y	N	N	N	
10) Site Plan Review Requirements	Y	Y	Y	N	Local Law #1-2002, 1-22-2002
11) Open Space Plan	Y	N	N	N	
12) Economic Development Plan	N	Y	Y	N	
13) Emergency Response Plan	Y	N	N	Y	Resolution 12-28-1993, Updated 4-1-2003
14) Post Disaster Recovery Plan	Y	N	N	N	
15) Post Disaster Recovery Ordinance	Y	N	N	N	
16) Real Estate Disclosure req.	N	N	N	N	
17) Other [Special Purpose Ordinances (i.e., critical or sensitive areas)]	Y	Y	Y	N	

## E.2) Administrative and Technical Capability

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
1) Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Contract with Fulton County Planning Department
2) Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Contract per project as needed
3) Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Y	Contract per project as needed
4) NFIP Floodplain Administrator (if you are in the NFIP, you <b>must</b> have one.)	Y	Judy English, Town Clerk
5) Surveyor(s)	Y	Contract per project as needed
6) Personnel skilled or trained in "GIS" applications	Y	Contract with Fulton County Planning Department
7) Scientist familiar with natural hazards in the Town of Perth	N	
8) Emergency Manager	N	
9) Grant Writer(s)	Y	Contract
10) Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	Y	Contract

## E.3) Fiscal Capability

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to use (Yes/No/Don't know)
1) Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Yes
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	Yes
5) Impact Fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	Yes
6) Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
7) Incur debt through special tax bonds	Don't Know
8) Incur debt through private activity bonds	No
9) Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	Don't Know
10) State mitigation grant programs (e.g. NYSDEC, NYCDEP)	
11) Other	

#### E.4) Community Classifications

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	-	-
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 (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 1000 feet of a creditable fire hydrant and is within 5 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/>

## F.) PROPOSED HAZARD MITIGATION INITIATIVES

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
TP-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, 1-4, 1-6, 1-8, 2-4, 2-5, 3-1, 3-4, 5-2	Municipality (via NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, FEMA	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Long-term DOF
TP-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, 1-4, 1-6, 1-8, 2-4, 2-5, 3-1, 3-4, 5-2	Municipality (via NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, FEMA	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Long-term DOF
TP-2	Consider participation in the Community Rating System (CRS) to further manage flood risk and reduce flood insurance premiums for NFIP policyholders.	New & Existing	Flood	1, 2, 3	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 3-1, 3-6	Municipality (via NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Short

**SECTION 9.16: TOWN OF PERTH**

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
TP-3	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0. This includes gathering additional demographic, general building stock, critical facility, and event loss data (damages, high water marks, etc.) needed to enhance the County's vulnerability analysis (i.e., Level 2 HAZUS analysis) in future plan updates.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1 through 5	All	Municipality (via mitigation planning point of contacts)	County (through Mitigation Planning Coordinator), SEMO	Low – High (for 5-year update)	Local Budget, possibly FEMA Mitigation Grant Funding for 5-year update	Ongoing
TP-4	Maintain compliance with and good-standing in the NFIP including adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements including regulating all new and substantially improved construction in Special Hazard Flood Areas, floodplain identification and mapping, and flood insurance outreach to the community.  Further, continue to meet and/or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria through the following NFIP-related continued compliance actions identified as Initiatives 4a through 4e.	New & Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 2, 3, 5	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 3-1, 3-6, 5-2	Municipality (via NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
TP-4a	Consider the adoption of higher regulatory standards to manage flood risk (i.e. increased freeboard, cumulative substantial damage/improvements).	New & Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 4	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-6; All of 4	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low	Local Budget	Short



**SECTION 9.16: TOWN OF PERTH**

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
TP-4b	Develop and implement an enhanced public outreach/education/information program for example: develop a flood risk management webpage where information and mapping can be posted, include NFIP information in regular newsletter and mailings, etc	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	2, 5	All of 2; 5-2	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget; FEMA HMA	DOF
TP-4c	Determine if a Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC) is needed, and schedule if needed.	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 5	1-4, 1-6, 1-7; 5-2	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Short
TP-4d	Have designated NFIP Floodplain Administrator become a Certified Floodplain Manager through the ASFPM, and consider relevant continuing education training such as FEMA Benefit-Cost Analysis.	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 3	1-4; 3-3	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Short
TP-4e	Require and archive elevation certificates.	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 3	1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 1-7; 3-1	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	SEMO, ISO, FEMA	Low	Local Budget	Short
TP-5	Continue to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1, 2, 3, 5	1-1, 1-6, 1-9, 2-2, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 5-2, 5-3	Municipality	County Emergency Management, SEMO	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
TP-6	Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities for continuity of operations.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1, 2, 3, 5	1-1, 1-6, 1-9, 2-2, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 5-1, 5-2, 5-3	Municipality	Surrounding municipalities and County	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
TP-7	Support County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1 through 5	All	Municipality	County and Regional agencies (as appropriate)	Low - High	Existing programs and grant funding	Ongoing – Long-term depending on initiative



**SECTION 9.16: TOWN OF PERTH**

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
							for initiative)		where applicable	
TP-8	Bible Dam, which is privately owned, is in need of new overflow culvert and dam repair.	Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 2, 5	1-1; 2-4; 5-2	Bible Dam (Private Owner)	Town (if needed and applicable)	Dependent on initiative	Federal, State, or Local funding where available and applicable.	DOF
TP-9	Improve drainage ability (increase size of culverts carrying various streams under Town roads) to handle heavy rain events and mitigate stormwater flooding in several locations throughout the town.	Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1, 3	1-1; 3-4, 3-5	Municipality		Low – High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Long-term depending on initiative and funding
TP-10	Enhance community resilience to severe storms (incl. severe winter storms) by joining the NOAA “Storm Ready” program. “StormReady” communities are better prepared to save lives from the onslaught of severe weather through advanced planning, education and awareness. Participation in the NOAA “StormReady” program shall include providing information on the “StormReady” program, facilitating public outreach and awareness programs, and supporting community storm risk reduction activities as appropriate. Specific actions addressed by “StormReady” participation include establishing a 24 hour Warning Point, increase number of ways EOC receives NWS warnings, increase number of ways to disseminate warnings, monitoring hydrometeorological data, providing annual weather safety talks, train weather spotters, create a formal hazardous weather plan, host annual visits by NWS to communities, etc.									
	See above description	NA	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	1, 2, 5	1-2, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 5-2	Municipal Administration	Fulton County Office of Emergency Services	Low	Local Budget	Short

Notes: Short term = 1 to 5 years. Long Term= 5 years or greater. OG = On-going program. DOF = Depending on funding.

\*Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure? Not applicable (NA) is inserted if this does not apply.



## G.) 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.

Hazard of Concern	Mitigation Type					
	1. Prevention	2. Property Protection	3. Public Education and Awareness	4. Natural Resource Protection	5. Emergency Services	6. Structural Projects
Earthquake	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-5, TP-6, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7
Flooding (riverine, flash, coastal and urban flooding)	TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7	TP-1a and b, TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7 - TP-9	TP-1a and b, TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7	TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7	TP-2, TP-3, TP-5, TP-6, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7, TP-10
Severe Storms (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning and tornados)	TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7, TP-10	TP-1a and b, TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7 - TP-9	TP-1a and b, TP-2, TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7	TP-3, TP-4, TP-4a to 4e, TP-7	TP-2, TP-3, TP-5, TP-6, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7, TP-10
Severe Winter Storm (heavy snow, blizzards, ice storms)	TP-3, TP-7, TP-10	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7	TP-3, TP-5, TP-6, TP-7	TP-3, TP-7

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.

## H.) PRIORITIZATION OF MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Initiative #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits equal or exceed Costs? (Yes or No)	Is project Grant eligible? (Yes or No)	Can Project be funded under existing programs/budgets? (Yes or No)	Priority (High, Med., Low)
TP-1a	11	H	H	Y	Y	N	M-H*
TP-1b	11	H	H	Y	Y	N	M-H*
TP-2	14	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	H
TP-3	27	M	M	Y	N (Yes for 5 year update)	Y	H
TP-4	15	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	H
TP-4a	8	H	L	Y	N	Y	H
TP-4b	6	M	L-M	Y	Y	N	M
TP-4c	4	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	H
TP-4d	2	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	H
TP-4e	5	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
TP-5	10	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	M
TP-6	11	M	L-M	Y	N	Y	H
TP-7	27	H	L-M	Y	Dependant on specific initiative	Dependant on specific initiative	M-H (dependant)
TP-8	3	M	M	Y	Y	N	M
TP-9	3	H	M-H	Y	Y	N	M
TP-10	7	L	L	Y	Y	N	M

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 FEMA and SEMO (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: Yes

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

**I.) FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/VULNERABILITY**


**J.) HAZARD AREA EXTENT AND LOCATION**

A hazard area extent and location map has been generated and is provided below for the Town of Perth to illustrate the probable areas impacted within the Town. This map is based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this Plan, and is considered to be adequate for planning purposes. Maps have only been generated for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies, and for which the Town of Perth has significant exposure. The County maps are provided in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume I of this Plan.

**K.) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

The Town of Perth performed a Public Land Use Analysis in 2008.

Most damage in recent years has been flooding due to heavy rain and wind storm damage. The culvert at the Bible Dam (Perthshire) needs to be replaced and the dam may need repair.



Sources: FEMA Region II, 2010; HAZUS-MH MR4; NYSDFC, 2008

Notes: NFIP = National Flood Insurance Program. The entire municipality is vulnerable to the following hazards: earthquake, severe storm, and severe winter storm.