



## 9.11 TOWN OF LEICESTER

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Town of Leicester. It includes resources and information to assist public and private sectors to reduce losses from future hazard events. This annex is not guidance of what to do when a disaster occurs. Rather, this annex concentrates on actions that can be implemented prior to a disaster to reduce or eliminate damage to property and people. This annex includes a general overview of the Town of Leicester and who in the Town participated in the planning process; an assessment of the Town of Leicester’s risk and vulnerability; the different capabilities utilized in the Town; and an action plan that will be implemented to achieve a more resilient community.

### 9.11.1 Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

The following individuals have been identified as the Town of Leicester’s hazard mitigation plan primary and alternate points of contact. The Town of Leicester followed the planning process described in Section 3 (Planning Process) in Volume I of this plan update. This annex was developed over the course of several months with input from many Town departments, including: Code Enforcement. The Town Supervisor represented the community on the Livingston County Hazard Mitigation Plan Planning Partnership and supported the local planning process requirements by securing input from persons with specific knowledge to enhance the plan. All departments were asked to contribute to the annex development through reviewing and contributing to the capability assessment, reporting on the status of previously identified actions, and participating in action identification and prioritization.

The following table summarizes municipal officials that participated in the development of the annex and in what capacity. Additional documentation on the Town of Leicester’s planning process through Planning Partnership meetings is included in Section 3 (Planning Process) and Appendix C (Meeting Documentation).

**Table 9.11-1. Hazard Mitigation Planning Team**

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Name/Title: David Fanaro, Town Supervisor Address: 132 Main Street, Leicester, NY 14481 Phone Number: 585-202-6794 Email: Supervisor@townofleicester.org	Name/Title: Shawn Grasby Address: 132 Main Street, Leicester, NY 14481 Phone Number: 585-519-6289 Email: Codeofficer@townofleicester.org
NFIP Floodplain Administrator	
Name/Title: Address: Phone Number: Email:	

### 9.11.2 Municipal Profile

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the Town has an area of 33.5 square miles – 33.5 square miles of land and 0.03 percent water. The Town of Leicester shares a border with the Towns of Covington, Castile, Geneseo, Groveland, Mount Morris, York, and the Counties of Genesee and Wyoming.

According to the U.S. Census, the 2020 population for the Town of Leicester was 1,642, a 5.2 percent decrease from the 2010 Census. Data from the 2019 U.S. Census American Community Survey indicate that 3.4 percent of the population is 5 years of age or younger and 17 percent is 65 years of age or older. Communities must deploy a support system that enables all populations to safely reach shelters or to quickly evacuate a hazard area.



### 9.11.3 Jurisdictional Capability Assessment and Integration

The Town of Leicester performed an inventory and analysis of existing capabilities, plans, programs, and policies that enhance its ability to implement mitigation strategies. Section 5 (Capability Assessment) describes the components included in the capability assessment and their significance for hazard mitigation planning. This section summarizes the following findings of the assessment:

- An assessment of planning, legal and regulatory capabilities.
- Development and permitting capabilities.
- An assessment of administrative and technical capabilities
- An assessment of fiscal capabilities.
- An assessment of education and outreach capabilities.
- Classification under various community mitigation programs.
- The community’s adaptive capacity to withstand hazard events.

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into the day-to-day local government operations. As part of this planning effort, planning/policy documents were reviewed, and each jurisdiction was surveyed to obtain a better understanding of their progress in plan integration and how risk reduction is supported. Areas with current mitigation integration are summarized in this jurisdictional Capability Assessment (Section 9.11.3). The Town of Leicester’s identified opportunities for integration of mitigation concepts to be incorporated into municipal procedures are included in the updated mitigation strategy.

#### Planning, Legal, and Regulatory Capability

The table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available to the Town of Leicester. Section 5 (Capability Assessment) provides an overview of the planning, legal and regulatory capabilities. The following table summarizes what is present in the jurisdiction and discusses if the mechanisms have been or could be leveraged to reduce risk.

**Table 9.11-2. Planning, Legal, and Regulatory Capability**

	Jurisdiction has this? (Yes/No)	Required by State? (Yes/No)	Code Citation and Date (code chapter, name of plan, date of plan)	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Individual / Department / Agency Responsible
<b>Codes, Ordinances, &amp; Regulations</b>					
<b>Building Code</b>	Yes	Yes	Local Law 4-2007	State and Local	Code Officer
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Zoning/Land Use Code</b>	Yes	No	Local Law 2-2020	Local	Planning
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Subdivision Ordinance</b>	yes	No	Local Law 2-2020	Local	Planning
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Site Plan Ordinance</b>	Yes	No	Local Law 2-2020	Local and County	Planning
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Stormwater Management Ordinance</b>	N	Yes		Local	
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Post-Disaster Recovery/ Reconstruction Ordinance</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					



	Jurisdiction has this? (Yes/No)	Required by State? (Yes/No)	Code Citation and Date (code chapter, name of plan, date of plan)	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Individual / Department / Agency Responsible
<b>Real Estate Disclosure</b>	Yes	Yes	Property Condition Disclosure Act, NY Code - Article 14 §460-467	State	NYS Department of State, Real Estate Agent
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to facing potential liability for failing to disclose under the exceptions to “caveat emptor,” a home seller must make certain disclosures under the law or pay a credit of \$500 to the buyer at closing. While the PCDA requires a seller to complete a standardized disclosure statement and deliver it to the buyer before the buyer signs the final purchase contract, in practice, most home sellers in New York opt not to complete the statement and instead pay the credit.</li> </ul>					
<b>Growth Management</b>	n	No		Local	
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Environmental Protection Ordinance</b>	N	Yes			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance</b>	N	Yes - BFE+2 feet for all construction in the SFHA (residential and non-residential)		Federal, State, County and Local	
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Wellhead Protection</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Emergency Management Ordinance</b>	N	Yes			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Climate Change Ordinance</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Other</b>	N	-			
<b>Planning Documents</b>					
<b>Master Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Capital Improvement Plan</b>	Y	No	Rt 36 Water Dist	County	Town
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Disaster Debris Management Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Floodplain Management or Watershed Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Stormwater Management Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Open Space Plan</b>	N	Yes			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Urban Water Management Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Habitat Conservation Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					



	Jurisdiction has this? (Yes/No)	Required by State? (Yes/No)	Code Citation and Date (code chapter, name of plan, date of plan)	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Individual / Department / Agency Responsible
<b>Economic Development Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Shoreline Management Plan</b>	N	Yes, in jurisdictions with CEHA areas	Article 34, Environmental Conservation Law, Coastal Erosion Hazard Areas	Yes, in jurisdictions with CEHA areas	
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Community Wildfire Protection Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Community Forest Management Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Transportation Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Agriculture Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Climate Action/ Resiliency/Sustainability Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Tourism Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Business/ Downtown Development Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Other</b>	N				
<b>Response/Recovery Planning</b>					
<b>Emergency Operations Plan</b>	Y	Yes		County	Livingston County
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Strategic Recovery Planning Report</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Threat &amp; Hazard Identification &amp; Risk Assessment (THIRA)</b>	N	Yes			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Post-Disaster Recovery Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Continuity of Operations Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Public Health Plan</b>	N	No			
<i>How does this reduce risk?</i>					
<b>Other</b>	N	-			



### Development and Permitting Capability

The table below summarizes the capabilities of the Town of Leicester to oversee and track development.

**Table 9.11-3. Development and Permitting Capability**

Indicate if your jurisdiction implements the following	Yes/No	Comment
Do you issue development permits? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, what department is responsible?</li> <li>If no, what is your process for development?</li> </ul>	Y	Code Enforcement Officer
Are permits tracked by hazard area? (For example, floodplain development permits.)	N	-
Do you have a buildable land inventory? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes, describe.</li> <li>If no, quantitatively describe the level of buildout in the jurisdiction.</li> </ul>	N	-

### Administrative and Technical Capability

The table below summarizes potential staff and personnel resources available to the Town of Leicester and their current responsibilities which contribute to hazard mitigation.

**Table 9.11-4. Administrative and Technical Capabilities**

Resources	Available? (Yes/No)	Comments (available staff, responsibilities, support of hazard mitigation)
<b>Administrative Capability</b>		
Planning Board	Y	Planning Board
Zoning Board of Adjustments	Y	Zoning Board of Appeals
Planning Department	Y	Livingston County
Mitigation Planning Committee	N	-
Environmental Board/Commission	N	-
Open Space Board/Committee	N	-
Economic Development Commission/Committee	N	-
Public Works/Highway Department	Y	Highway Superintendent, Russell Page
Construction/Building/Code Enforcement Department	Y	Code Enforcement Officer, Shawn Grasby
Emergency Management/Public Safety Department	Y	Livingston County
Maintenance programs to reduce risk (stormwater maintenance, tree trimming, etc.)	N	-
Mutual aid agreements	N	-
Human Resources Manual	N	-
Other	N	-
<b>Technical/Staffing Capability</b>		
Planners or engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Clark Patterson
Engineers or professionals trained in building or infrastructure construction practices	y	Clark Patterson
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Y	Clark Patterson
Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	N	-



Resources	Available? (Yes/No)	Comments (available staff, responsibilities, support of hazard mitigation)
Professionals trained in conducting damage assessments	Y	Clark Patterson
Personnel skilled or trained in GIS and/or Hazards United States (HAZUS) – Multi-Hazards (MH) applications	N	Livingston County
Scientist familiar with natural hazards	N	-
Surveyor(s)	Y	Livingston County
Emergency Manager	Y	Livingston County
Grant writer(s)	Y	-
Resilience Officer	N	-
Other (this could include stormwater engineer, environmental specialist, etc.)	Y	Clark Patterson

### Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the Town of Leicester.

**Table 9.11-5. Fiscal Capabilities**

Financial Resources	Are these accessible or eligible to use for mitigation? (Yes/No) If yes, please describe. If no, can this be used to support in the future?
Community development Block Grants (CDBG, CDBG-DR)	Yes
Capital improvements project funding	Yes
Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes	Yes
User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	Yes
Impact fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	No
Stormwater utility fee	Yes
Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
Incur debt through special tax bonds	Yes
Incur debt through private activity bonds	No
Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No
Other federal or state Funding Programs	No
Open Space Acquisition funding programs	No
Other (for example, Clean Water Act 319 Grants [Nonpoint Source Pollution])	No

### Education and Outreach Capability

The table below summarizes the education and outreach resources available to the Town of Leicester.

**Table 9.11-6. Education and Outreach Capabilities**

Outreach Resources	Available? (Yes/No)	Does the jurisdiction have any public outreach mechanisms / programs in place to inform citizens on natural hazards, risk, and ways to protect themselves during such events? If yes, please describe.
Public information officer or communications office	No	-



Outreach Resources	Available? (Yes/No)	Does the jurisdiction have any public outreach mechanisms / programs in place to inform citizens on natural hazards, risk, and ways to protect themselves during such events? If yes, please describe.
Personnel skilled or trained in website development	No	-
Is hazard mitigation information available on your website?	No	-
Social media for hazard mitigation education and outreach	No	-
Citizen boards or commissions that address issues related to hazard mitigation	No	-
Other programs already in place that could be used to communicate hazard-related information	Yes	Livingston County
Warning Systems / Services (mass notification system, outdoor warning signals)	Yes	Livingston County
Natural disaster/safety programs in place for schools	No	-
Other	No	-

### Community Classifications

The table below summarizes classifications for community programs available to the Town of Leicester.

**Table 9.11-7. Community Classifications**

Program	Participating? (Yes/No)	Classification (if applicable)	Date Classified (if applicable)
Community Rating System (CRS)	No	N/A	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	No	N/A	N/A
Public Protection (ISO Fire Protection Classes 1 to 10)	No	N/A	N/A
NYSDEC Climate Smart Community	No	N/A	N/A
StormReady Certification	No	N/A	N/A
Firewise Communities classification	No	N/A	N/A
Other	No	N/A	N/A

Note:

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

### Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive capacity is defined as “the ability of systems, institutions, humans and other organisms to adjust to potential damage, to take advantage of opportunities, or respond to consequences” (IPCC 2014). In other words, it describes a jurisdiction’s current capabilities to adjust to, protect from, or withstand a future hazard event, future conditions, and changing risk. The table below summarizes the adaptive capacity for each hazard of concern and the jurisdiction’s rating.



**Table 9.11-8. Adaptive Capacity**

Hazard	Adaptive Capacity - Strong/Moderate/Weak*
Drought	Moderate
Earthquake	Moderate
Flood	Moderate
Hazardous Materials	Moderate
Invasive Species	Moderate
Landslide	Moderate
Mine Subsidence	Moderate
Pandemic	Moderate
Severe Storm	Strong
Severe Winter Storm	Strong
Wildfire	Moderate
Terrorism	Moderate
Utility Failure	Moderate

*\*Strong Capacity exists and is in use*  
*Moderate Capacity may exist; but is not used or could use some improvement*  
*Weak Capacity does not exist or could use substantial improvement*

**9.11.4 National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Compliance**

This section provides specific information on the management and regulation of the regulatory floodplain, including current and future compliance with the NFIP.

**Table 9.11-9. NFIP Summary**

Jurisdiction	# Policies	# Claims (Losses)	Total Loss Payments	# RL Properties	# SRL Properties	# Policies in the 1% Flood Boundary
Town of Leicester	13	5	\$31,666.94	0	N/A	12
NFIP Topic			Comments			
<b>Flood Vulnerability Summary</b>						
Describe areas prone to flooding in your jurisdiction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you maintain a list of properties that have been damaged by flooding?</li> </ul>			Genesee Valley, Yes			
Do you maintain a list of property owners interested in flood mitigation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many homeowners and/or business owners are interested in mitigation (elevation or acquisition)?</li> </ul>			Yes, 0			
Are any RiskMAP projects currently underway in your jurisdiction? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If so, state what projects are underway.</li> </ul>			-			
How do you make Substantial Damage determinations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many were declared for recent flood events in your jurisdiction?</li> </ul>			Yes, 0			
How many properties have been mitigated (elevation or acquisition) in your jurisdiction? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If there are mitigation properties, how were the projects funded?</li> </ul>			0,0			





Jurisdiction	# Policies	# Claims (Losses)	Total Loss Payments	# RL Properties	# SRL Properties	# Policies in the 1% Flood Boundary
Town of Leicester	13	5	\$31,666.94	0	N/A	12
NFIP Topic			Comments			
Do your flood hazard maps adequately address the flood risk within your jurisdiction? • If not, state why.			Yes			
NFIP Compliance						
What local department is responsible for floodplain management?			Code Officer			
Are any certified floodplain managers on staff in your jurisdiction?			No			
Do you have access to resources to determine possible future flooding conditions from climate change?			No			
Does your floodplain management staff need any assistance or training to support its floodplain management program? • If so, what type of assistance/training is needed?			Yes, Floodplain, and Floodway			
Provide an explanation of NFIP administration services you provide (e.g. permit review, GIS, education/outreach, inspections, engineering capability)			-			
How do you determine if proposed development on an existing structure would qualify as a substantial improvement?			Major Events			
What are the barriers to running an effective NFIP program in the community, if any?			Funding			
Does your jurisdiction have any outstanding NFIP compliance violations that need to be addressed? • If so, state the violations.			No			
When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC)?			2020			
What is the local law number or municipal code of your flood damage prevention ordinance? What is the date that your flood damage prevention ordinance was last amended?			-			
Does your floodplain management program meet or exceed minimum requirements? • If exceeds, in what ways?			Yes			
Are there other local ordinances, plans or programs (e.g. site plan review) that support floodplain management and meeting the NFIP requirements? For instance, does the planning board or zoning board consider efforts to reduce flood risk when reviewing variances such as height restrictions?			Yes			
Does your jurisdiction participate in CRS? • If yes, is your jurisdiction interested in improving its CRS Classification? • If no, is your jurisdiction interested in joining the CRS program?			Yes			

Source: FEMA - Q3 Data; Livingston County HMP 2014

Notes:

RL Repetitive Loss; SRL Severe Repetitive Loss





### 9.11.5 Evacuation, Sheltering, Temporary Housing, and Permanent Housing

Evacuation routes, sheltering measures, temporary housing, and permanent housing must all be in place and available for public awareness to protect residents, mitigate risk, and relocate residents, if necessary, to maintain post-disaster social and economic stability.

#### Evacuation Routes

The Town uses the main roads in and out of the community as evacuation routes if needed.

#### Sheltering

The Town of Leicester has not identified sites for potential shelter locations. In the event shelters are needed, the Town will work with the County to find suitable locations for sheltering.

#### Temporary Housing

The Town of Leicester has not identified sites for the placement of temporary housing for residents displaced by a disaster or potential sites suitable for relocating structures out of the floodplain and/or building new homes once properties in the floodplain are acquired. In the event temporary housing is needed, the Town will work with the County to find suitable locations.

#### Permanent Housing

While the Town of Leicester did not identify potential locations for permanent housing, as part of the planning process, a countywide buildable land analysis was conducted and presented in Section 4 (County Profile). The Town can utilize this analysis to identify potential locations.

### 9.11.6 Growth/Development Trends

Understanding how past, current, and projected development patterns have or are likely to increase or decrease risk in hazard areas is a key component to understanding a jurisdiction’s overall risk to its hazards of concern. Table 9.11-10 summarizes recent and expected future development trends, including major residential/commercial development and major infrastructure development. New and proposed development in the Town is not expected to impact vulnerability to hazards.

**Table 9.11-10. Recent and Expected Future Development**

Type of Development	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
Number of Building Permits for New Construction Issued Since the Previous HMP* (within regulatory floodplain/ Outside regulatory floodplain)														
	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA	Total	Within SFHA
Single Family	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
Multi-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (commercial, mixed-use, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Permits Issued</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Property or Development Name	Type of Development	# of Units / Structures		Location (address and/or block and lot)		Known Hazard Zone(s)*		Description / Status of Development						



<b>Recent Major Development and Infrastructure from 2015 to Present</b>
None
<b>Known or Anticipated Major Development and Infrastructure in the Next Five (5) Years</b>
None

SFHA Special Flood Hazard Area (1% flood event)

\* Only location-specific hazard zones or vulnerabilities identified.

### 9.11.7 Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

The hazard profiles in Section 5 (Risk Assessment) provide detailed information regarding each plan participant’s vulnerability to the identified hazards. Refer to Section 5.2 (Methodology and Tools) and Section 5.4 (Hazard Ranking) for a detailed summary for the Town of Leicester’s risk assessment results and data used to determine the hazard ranking discussed later in this section.

Hazard area extent and location maps were generated to illustrate the probable areas impacted within the jurisdiction. These maps are based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this plan and are adequate for planning purposes. Maps have been generated only for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies and for which the Town of Leicester has significant exposure. The maps also show the location of potential new development, where available. These maps are illustrated below.



Figure 9.11-1. Town of Leicester Flood and Mine Subsidence Hazard Areas






Figure 9.11-2. Town of Leicester Hazmat and Wildfire Hazard Areas







Figure 9.11-3. Town of Leicester Earthquake and Landslide Hazard Areas





### Hazard Event History

Livingston County has a history of natural and non-natural hazard events as detailed in Volume I, Section 5 (Risk Assessment) of this plan. A summary of historical events is provided in each of the hazard profiles and includes a chronology of events that have affected the county and its municipalities.

The Town of Leicester’s history of federally-declared (as presented by FEMA) and significant hazard events (as presented in NOAA-NCEI) is consistent with that of Livingston County. Table 9.11-11 provides details regarding municipal-specific loss and damages the Town experienced during hazard events since the last hazard mitigation plan update. Information provided in the table below is based on reference material or local sources. For details of these and additional events, refer to Volume I, Section 5.0 of this plan.

**Table 9.11-11. Hazard Event History**

Dates of Event	Event Type (Disaster Declaration if applicable)	County Declared?	Municipal Summary of Damages and Losses
2020 & 2021	COVID 19 Pandemic (DR 3434 and 4480)	Yes	Negative social, health, and economic impacts such as population loss, resident infections, resident deaths, mandatory business closures, school closings, decreases in the local labor market, and household supply shortages

Notes:

- EM      Emergency Declaration (FEMA)
- FEMA    Federal Emergency Management Agency
- DR      Major Disaster Declaration (FEMA)
- N/A      Not applicable

### Hazard Ranking and Vulnerabilities

The hazard profiles in Section 5.0 (Risk Assessment) of this plan have detailed information regarding each plan participant’s vulnerability to the identified hazards. The following summarizes the Town of Leicester’s risk assessment results and data used to determine the hazard ranking.

#### Hazard Ranking

This section provides the community specific identification of the primary hazard concerns based on identified problems, impacts and the results of the risk assessment as presented in Section 5 (Risk Assessment) of the plan. The ranking process involves an assessment of the likelihood of occurrence for each hazard, along with its potential impacts on people, property, and the economy as well as community capability and changing future climate conditions. This input supports the mitigation action development to target those hazards with highest level of concern.

As discussed in Section 5.3 (Hazard Ranking), each participating jurisdiction may have differing degrees of risk exposure and vulnerability compared to Livingston County as a whole. Therefore, each Town of Leicester ranked the degree of risk to each hazard as it pertains to their community. The table below summarizes the hazard risk/vulnerability rankings of potential natural hazards for the Town of Leicester. The Town of Leicester has reviewed the county hazard risk/vulnerability risk ranking table as well as its individual results to reflect the relative risk of the hazards of concern to the community.

During the review of the hazard/vulnerability risk ranking, the Town agreed with the calculated rankings.





**Table 9.11-12. Hazard Ranking Input**

<b>Drought</b>	<b>Earthquake</b>	<b>Flood</b>	<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	<b>Invasive Species</b>	<b>Landslide</b>	<b>Mine Subsidence</b>
Low	High	Low	High	Medium	Low	Low
<b>Pandemic</b>	<b>Severe Storm</b>	<b>Severe Winter Storm</b>	<b>Wildfire</b>	<b>Terrorism</b>	<b>Utility Failure</b>	
Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low	High	

Note: The scale is based on the hazard rankings established in Section 5.3 and modified as appropriate during review by the jurisdiction

**Critical Facilities**

The table below identifies critical facilities in the community located in the 1-percent and 0.2-percent floodplain and presents Hazards United States (HAZUS) – Multi-Hazards (MH) estimates of the damage and loss of use to critical facilities as a result of a 1-percent annual chance flood event.

**Table 9.11-13. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities**

Name	Type	Exposure		Addressed by Proposed Action
		1% Event	0.2% Event	
None in the floodplain				

Source: Livingston County Planning Partners 2021; HIFLD 2020

**Identified Issues**

After review of the Town of Leicester’s hazard event history, hazard rankings, jurisdiction specific vulnerabilities, hazard area extent and location, and current capabilities, the Town of Leicester has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community:

- Town Hall and Highway Building no backup generator, River Road Flooding and Beards Creek, New Trailor Park & Argenna Park has a single point entry and exit that may experience evacuation issues and also at Starr Park.
- The floodplain administrator for the Town is in need of training and resources to understand the NFIP program and flooding in the Town.
- There are 13 flood policies in the Town. 12 of the flood policies is located in the floodplain. Due to their location, the properties are prone to flooding and flood damages.
- The Town lacks an updated flood damage prevention ordinance.

Specific areas of concern based on resident response to the Livingston County Hazard Mitigation Citizen survey include:

- Lack of ground structural integrity from American Rock Salt mine blasting has caused and is causing subsidence. Outdated water purification systems for our local water sources (Mt. Morris in particular). Livingston County 911 system works improperly all the time, dispatchers and first responders routinely deal with system failures. We routinely deal with power outages all over the region.

**9.11.8 Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization**

This section discusses past mitigations actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and their prioritization.





### **Past Mitigation Initiative Status**

---

The following table indicates progress on the community’s mitigation strategy identified in the 2015 HMP. Actions that are carried forward as part of this plan update are included in the following subsection in its own table with prioritization. Previous actions that are now on-going programs and capabilities are indicated as such in the following table and may also be found under ‘Capability Assessment’ presented previously in this annex.



Table 9.11-14. Status of Previous Mitigation Actions

Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	Evaluation of Success 1. Cost 2. Level of Protection 3. Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	Next Steps 1. Project to be included in 2022 HMP or Discontinue 2. If including action in the 2022 HMP, revise/reword to be more specific (as appropriate). 3. If discontinue, explain why.
TL-1	Investigate and implement mitigation and flood control activities on River Road, which floods annually.	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Town Planning	Choose an item.	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. 3.
TL-2	Provide Back-up power generators for town halls	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	County Planning Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Include in the 2022 HMP 2. Purchase and install generator for the Town hall 3. -
TL-3	Develop materials and conduct education and outreach to work with farmers to implement best management practices (BMP) to address stormwater runoff from fields.	Flood, Severe Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	County Planning Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-4	Conduct a hydrilla management analysis to determine whether chemical treatments or the introduction of grass carp would be a more effective control measure.	Invasive Species	None provided in the 2015 HMP	County Planning Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-5	Implement hydrilla control measures to prevent the further spread of the invasive species and to eventually reduce its impact on the County's water systems.	Invasive Species	None provided in the 2015 HMP	County Planning Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-6	Support the mitigation of vulnerable structures via retrofit (e.g., elevation, flood-proofing) or acquisition/relocation to protect them from future damage; repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties should be a priority, when applicable.	Flood, Severe Storm, Wildfire, Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Town Engineering	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-7	Assess and prioritize feasible non-structural flood hazard mitigation alternatives for at-risk properties within the floodplain (including those that have been identified as repetitive loss) such as acquisition, relocation, or elevation. The parameters for feasibility for this initiative would include the following: funding, benefits versus costs, and willing participation of property owners. Implement as funding becomes available.	Flood, Severe Storm, Wildfire, Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Town Engineering	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.



Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	<b>Evaluation of Success</b> <b>1. Cost</b> <b>2. Level of Protection</b> <b>3. Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success</b>	<b>Next Steps</b> 1. Project to be included in 2022 HMP or Discontinue 2. If including action in the 2022 HMP, revise/reword to be more specific (as appropriate). 3. If discontinue, explain why.
TL-8	Develop and implement an enhanced all-hazards, public outreach / education / mitigation information program on natural hazard risks and what they can do in the way of mitigation and preparedness, including flood insurance.	All Hazards	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Town Supervisor's Office	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-9	Maintain compliance with and good-standing in the NFIP including adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements (e.g., regulating all new and substantially improved construction in special-hazard flood areas), floodplain identification and mapping, and flood insurance outreach to the community. Further meet or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria through the following NFIP-related continued compliance actions identified in subsequent initiatives.	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	NFIP FPA	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-10	Support and participate in county-led initiatives intended to build local and regional mitigation and risk-reduction capabilities (see Section 9.1).	All Hazards	None provided in the 2015 HMP	County Departments	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-11	Begin the process to promote or adopt higher regulatory and zoning standards to manage flood hazard risk; specifically through [examples]:	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	NFIP FPA	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-12	Develop and implement a post-event damage assessment program.	Flood; Severe Storm; Severe Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Town Engineering	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-13	Support participation in the NFIP Community Rating System (CRS) program by attending CRS workshops if offered in the county. Join the CRS program if adequate resources to support long term participation can be dedicated. See following related Community Assistance Visit (CAV) initiative.	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	NFIP FPA	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-14	Determine if a Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC) is needed, and schedule if needed. This is a part of the process of joining CRS (above initiative).	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	NFIP FPA	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.



Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	<b>Evaluation of Success</b> <b>1. Cost</b> <b>2. Level of Protection</b> <b>3. Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success</b>	<b>Next Steps</b> 1. Project to be included in 2022 HMP or Discontinue 2. If including action in the 2022 HMP, revise/reword to be more specific (as appropriate). 3. If discontinue, explain why.
TL-15	Designate a NFIP Floodplain Administrator (FPA), and other local officials who would benefit, become a Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM) through the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM) and New York State Stormwater and Floodplain Managers Association (NYSSFMA), and pursue relevant continuing education training such as FEMA Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) and Substantial Damage Estimation (SDE).	Flood	None provided in the 2015 HMP	NFIP FPA	Ongoing Capability	1. 2. 3.	1. 2. As needed 3.
TL-16	Develop and maintain mapping of all natural hazard risk areas in the Town, FEMA-delineated or otherwise, to support land use decision making (e.g., Planning Board, site plan review process,).	Flood, Wildfire	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Engineering Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-17	Work with County and power companies to identify roads within the Town considered "critical" would be the first priority for clearing after an event involving downed power lines.	Severe Storm; Severe Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Engineering Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-18	Enhance or expand tree maintenance program and coordinate with utility companies.	Severe Storm; Severe Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Engineering Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy
TL-19	Work with utility companies and developers to bury utility lines underground, wherever possible.	Severe Storm; Severe Winter Storm	None provided in the 2015 HMP	Engineering Department	No Progress	1. 2. 3.	1. Discontinue 2. - 3. This is a countywide action; therefore, the Town will not include in their mitigation strategy



**Completed Mitigation Initiatives Not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy**

Other than what is in the table above, the Town of Leicester did not complete any additional mitigation projects/activities since the 2015 HMP.

**Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the HMP Update**

The Town of Leicester participated in a mitigation action workshop in September 2021 and was provided the following FEMA publications to use as a resource as part of their comprehensive review of all possible activities and mitigation measures to address their hazards: FEMA 551 ‘Selecting Appropriate Mitigation Measures for Floodprone Structures’ (March 2007) and FEMA ‘Mitigation Ideas – A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards’ (January 2013).

The table below indicates the range of proposed mitigation action categories.

**Table 9.11-15. Analysis of Mitigation Actions by Hazard and Category**

Hazard	FEMA				CRS					
	LPR	SIP	NSP	EAP	PR	PP	PI	NR	SP	ES
Drought		X								X
Earthquake		X								X
Flood	X	X			X	X	X		X	X
Hazardous Materials		X								X
Invasive Species		X								X
Landslide		X								X
Mine Subsidence		X								X
Pandemic		X								X
Severe Storm		X								X
Severe Winter Storm		X								X
Wildfire		X								X
Terrorism		X								X
Utility Failure		X								X

Note: Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy) provides for an explanation of the mitigation categories.

Table 9.11-16 summarizes the comprehensive range of specific mitigation initiatives the Town of Leicester would like to pursue in the future to reduce the effects of hazards. Some of these initiatives may be previous actions carried forward for this plan update. These initiatives are dependent upon available funding (grants and local match availability) and may be modified or omitted at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in municipal priorities. Both the four FEMA mitigation action categories and the six CRS mitigation action categories are listed in the table below to further demonstrate the wide range of activities and mitigation measures selected.

As discussed in Section 6, 14 evaluation/prioritization criteria are used to complete the prioritization of mitigation initiatives. For each new mitigation action, a numeric rank is assigned (-1, 0, or 1) for each of the 14 evaluation criteria to assist with prioritizing your actions as ‘High’, ‘Medium’, or ‘Low.’ The table below summarizes the evaluation of each mitigation initiative, listed by Action Number.



Table 9.11-16. Summary of Prioritization of Actions

Project Number	Mitigation Initiative Name	Description of Problem and Solution	Critical Facility (Yes/No)	EHP Issues	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Goals Met	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Potential Funding Sources	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Costs	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
2022-Town of Leicester-001	Town Hall Generator	<b>Problem:</b> Town Hall does not have a source of backup power. Without proper backup power, the facility cannot function properly and provide essential services to the community.  <b>Solution:</b> Purchase and install a permanent generator at the Town hall. This provide continuity of operations to the municipal departments.	Yes	No	All	1, 2	3 years	Town Board	Local Budget, FEMA HMGP	Continuity of operations; provide essential services to the community	\$30,000	High	SIP	ES, PP
2022-Town of Leicester-002	NFIP Administrator Training	<b>Problem:</b> The floodplain administrator for the Town is in need of training and resources to understand the NFIP program and flooding in the Town.  <b>Solution:</b> The floodplain administrator will review the list of upcoming trainings on the NYSDEC website and sign up to attend. This will allow the administrator to understand their role in administering the program and learning about the NFIP.	No	No	Flood	1, 2, 3	Within 1 year	NFIP Floodplain Administrator, NYSDEC	Town Budget	Increase education and training on floods in the Town	Staff time	High	LPR	PR
2022-Town of Leicester-003	Floodprone Properties	<b>Problem:</b> There are 13 flood policies in the Town. 12 of the flood policies is located in the floodplain. Due to their location, the properties are prone to flooding and flood damages.  <b>Solution:</b> Conduct outreach to 13 floodprone property owners and provide information on mitigation alternatives. After preferred mitigation measures are identified, collect required	No	No	Flood	1, 2, 3	1 year	NFIP Floodplain Administrator, Town Board	Town Budget for outreach; FEMA FMA or HMGP for mitigation	Eliminates flood damage to homes, informs public of mitigation options	Staff time; mitigation depends on type chosen	Medium	LPR, SIP	PR, SP, PI



Project Number	Mitigation Initiative Name	Description of Problem and Solution	Critical Facility (Yes/No)	EHP Issues	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Goals Met	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Potential Funding Sources	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Costs	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
		property-owner information and develop a FEMA grant application and BCA to obtain funding to implement acquisition/purchase/moving/elevating residential homes in the Town.												
2022-Town of Leicester-004	Update Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	<b>Problem:</b> The Town lacks an updated flood damage prevention ordinance. <b>Solution:</b> The Town will adopt an updated flood damage prevention ordinance to meet state and federal NFIP standards.	No	No	Flood	1, 2	Within 6 months	NFIP Floodplain Administrator, Town Board	Town Budget	Meeting state and federal standards	Staff time	High	LPR	PR

**Notes:**

Not all acronyms and abbreviations defined below are included in the table.

Acronyms and Abbreviations:

- CAV Community Assistance Visit
- CRS Community Rating System
- DPW Department of Public Works
- EHP Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation
- FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency
- FPA Floodplain Administrator
- HMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance
- N/A Not applicable
- NFIP National Flood Insurance Program
- OEM Office of Emergency Management

Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources:

- FMA Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program
- HMGP Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- BRIC Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities Program

Timeline:

The time required for completion of the project upon implementation

Cost:

The estimated cost for implementation.

Benefits:

A description of the estimated benefits, either quantitative and/or qualitative.

Critical Facility:

Yes Critical Facility located in 1% floodplain

Mitigation Category:

- Local Plans and Regulations (LPR) – These actions include government authorities, policies or codes that influence the way land and buildings are being developed and built.
- Structure and Infrastructure Project (SIP) - These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazard area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct manmade structures to reduce the impact of hazards.





- *Natural Systems Protection (NSP) – These are actions that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems.*
- *Education and Awareness Programs (EAP) – These are actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. These actions may also include participation in national programs, such as StormReady and Firewise Communities*

CRS Category:

- *Preventative Measures (PR) - Government, administrative or regulatory actions, or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.*
- *Property Protection (PP) - These actions include public activities to reduce hazard losses or 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.*
- *Public Information (PI) - 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 educational programs for school-age children and adults.*
- *Natural Resource Protection (NR) - 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.*
- *Structural Flood Control Projects (SP) - 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.*
- *Emergency Services (ES) - 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*



**Table 9.11-17. Summary of Prioritization of Actions**

Project Number	Project Name	Life Safety	Property Protection	Cost-Effectiveness	Technical	Political	Legal	Fiscal	Environmental	Social	Administrative	Multi-Hazard	Timeline	Agency Champion	Other Community Objectives	Total	High / Medium / Low
2022-Town of Leicester-001	Town Hall Generator	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	9	High
2022-Town of Leicester-002	NFIP Administrator Training	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	10	High
2022-Town of Leicester-003	Floodprone Properties	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	8	Medium
2022-Town of Leicester-004	Update Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	10	High

Note: Refer to Section 6, which conveys guidance on prioritizing mitigation actions. Low (0-4), Medium (5-8), High (9-14).



### **9.11.9 Action Worksheets**

---

The following action worksheets have been developed by the Town of Leicester to aid in the submittal of grant applications to support the funding of high priority proposed actions.



Action Worksheet			
<b>Project Name:</b>	Town Hall Generator		
<b>Project Number:</b>	2022-Town of Leicester-001		
<b>Risk / Vulnerability</b>			
<b>Hazard(s) of Concern:</b>	All		
<b>Description of the Problem:</b>	Town Hall does not have a source of backup power. Without proper backup power, the facility cannot function properly and provide essential services to the community.		
<b>Action or Project Intended for Implementation</b>			
<b>Description of the Solution:</b>	Purchase and install a permanent generator at the Town hall. This provide continuity of operations to the municipal departments.		
<b>Is this project related to a Critical Facility?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Is this project related to a Critical Facility located within the Special Flood Hazard Area?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(If yes, this project must intend to protect to the 500-year flood event or the actual worse case damage scenario, whichever is greater)			
<b>Level of Protection:</b>	N/A	<b>Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):</b>	Continuity of operations; provide essential services to the community
<b>Useful Life:</b>	25 years	<b>Goals Met:</b>	1, 2
<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	\$30,000	<b>Mitigation Action Type:</b>	SIP
<b>Plan for Implementation</b>			
<b>Prioritization:</b>	High	<b>Desired Timeframe for Implementation:</b>	Within 6 months of funding award
<b>Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:</b>	Within 3 years	<b>Potential Funding Sources:</b>	Town Budget, FEMA HMGP
<b>Responsible Organization:</b>	Town Board	<b>Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:</b>	Hazard Mitigation
<b>Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)</b>			
<b>Alternatives:</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
	No Action	\$0	Problem continues.
	Install solar panels	\$10,000+	Weather dependent, may not be best solution for long-term outages
	Install generator	\$20,000+	Selected project
<b>Progress Report (for plan maintenance)</b>			
<b>Date of Status Report:</b>			
<b>Report of Progress:</b>			
<b>Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:</b>			



Evaluation and Prioritization		
<b>Project Name:</b>	Town Hall Generator	
<b>Project Number:</b>	2022-Town of Leicester-001	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	
Property Protection	1	
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Benefits outweigh the costs
Technical	1	
Political	1	There is political support for this projects
Legal	0	
Fiscal	0	Need funding to purchase and install generator
Environmental	0	
Social	0	
Administrative	1	
Multi-Hazard	1	All hazards
Timeline	1	To be completed within 3 years
Agency Champion	1	
Other Community Objectives	0	
<b>Total</b>	9	
<b>Priority (High/Med/Low)</b>	High	



Action Worksheet			
<b>Project Name:</b>	Floodprone Properties		
<b>Project Number:</b>	2022-Town of Leicester-003		
Risk / Vulnerability			
<b>Hazard(s) of Concern:</b>	All		
<b>Description of the Problem:</b>	There are 13 flood policies in the Town. 12 of the flood policies is located in the floodplain. Due to their location, the properties are prone to flooding and flood damages.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
<b>Description of the Solution:</b>	Conduct outreach to 13 floodprone property owners and provide information on mitigation alternatives. After preferred mitigation measures are identified, collect required property-owner information and develop a FEMA grant application and BCA to obtain funding to implement acquisition/purchase/ moving/elevating residential homes in the Town.		
<b>Is this project related to a Critical Facility?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Is this project related to a Critical Facility located within the Special Flood Hazard Area?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(If yes, this project must intend to protect to the 500-year flood event or the actual worse case damage scenario, whichever is greater)			
<b>Level of Protection:</b>	N/A	<b>Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):</b>	Eliminates flood damage to homes, informs public of mitigation options
<b>Useful Life:</b>	N/A	<b>Goals Met:</b>	1, 2, 3
<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	Staff Time	<b>Mitigation Action Type:</b>	LPR, SIP
Plan for Implementation			
<b>Prioritization:</b>	Medium	<b>Desired Timeframe for Implementation:</b>	Within 6 months of funding award
<b>Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:</b>	Within 1 year	<b>Potential Funding Sources:</b>	Town Budget for outreach; FEMA FMA or HMGP for mitigation
<b>Responsible Organization:</b>	NFIP Floodplain Administrator, Town Board	<b>Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:</b>	Hazard Mitigation
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
<b>Alternatives:</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
	No Action	\$0	Problem continues.
	Acquire all properties	\$1 million+	Loss tax base; not all residents will move
	Install flood walls	\$50,000+	Can be costly; might not be necessary
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)			
<b>Date of Status Report:</b>			
<b>Report of Progress:</b>			
<b>Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:</b>			



Evaluation and Prioritization		
<b>Project Name:</b>	Floodprone Properties	
<b>Project Number:</b>	2022-Town of Leicester-003	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	Protect residents from flooding
Property Protection	1	Protect structures from flooding
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Benefits outweigh the costs
Technical	1	
Political	1	
Legal	0	
Fiscal	0	Need funding
Environmental	0	
Social	0	
Administrative	1	The Town has the ability to complete project
Multi-Hazard	0	Flood
Timeline	1	To be completed within 1 year
Agency Champion	1	
Other Community Objectives	0	
<b>Total</b>	8	
<b>Priority (High/Med/Low)</b>	Medium	