# Jurisdictional Annexes

## Town of Rodman

This jurisdictional annex to the Jefferson County Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) provides information to assist public and private sectors in the Town of Rodman with reducing losses from future hazard events. This annex is not guidance of what to do when a disaster occurs; its focus is on actions that can be implemented prior to a disaster to reduce or eliminate damage to property and people. The annex presents a general overview of Rodman, describes who participated in the planning process, assesses Rodman’s risk, vulnerability, and capabilities, and outlines a strategy for achieving a more resilient community.

## Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

The Town of Rodman identified primary and alternate HMP points of contact and developed this plan over the course of several months, with input from many Town departments.

Table A summarizes local officials who participated in the development of the annex. Additional documentation of the Town’s planning activities through Planning Partnership meetings is included in Volume I.

Table A. Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Primary Point of Contact | Alternate Point of Contact |
| Name/Title: Lisa Worden, Town Supervisor  Address:12509 School Street, Rodman, NY 13682  Phone Number:(315) 232-2522  Email: rodmansupv2020@gmail.com | Name/Title: Jamie Ackley, Town Clerk  Address:12509 School Street, Rodman, NY 13682  Phone Number:(315) 232-2522  Email: rodclerk13682@gmail.com |
| ***National Flood Insurance Program Floodplain Administrator*** | |
| Name/Title: Andy Ondrasek  Address: 12509 School Street, Rodman, NY 13682  Phone Number: (315) 232-2522  Email: rodmansupv2020@gmail.com | |

## Community Profile

### Community Classifications

Table B summarizes classifications for community programs available to Rodman.

Table B. Community Classifications

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Participating? (Yes/No) | Classification | Date Classified |
| Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) | Yes | 3 | 6/27/22 |
| Community Rating System (CRS) | No | - | - |
| Firewise Communities classification | No | - | - |
| National Weather Service StormReady Certification | No | - | - |
| Public Protection (ISO Fire Protection Classes 1 to 10) | Yes | 7 |  |
| NYSDEC Climate Smart Community | No | - | - |
| Other: Organizations with mitigation focus (advocacy group, non-government) | No | - | - |

*N/A = Not applicable*

### Community Profile

The Town of Rodman has an area of 42 square miles and is located in the southern part of the County. The Town is bordered by the Town of Watertown and Town of Rutland to the north, Lewis County to the east, the Town of Worth and Town of Lorraine to the south, and the Town of Adams to the west. New York State Route 177 runs through the Town.

According to the U.S. Census, the 2020 population for the Town of Rodman was 1,197 which makes up one percent of the county population. Data from the 2022 American Community Survey indicates that 3.8 percent of the population is 5 years of age or younger, 13.2 percent is 65 years of age or older, zero percent is non-English speaking, 15.5 percent is below the poverty threshold, and 14.4 percent is considered disabled.

## Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

The hazard profiles in Volume I provide detailed information regarding each planning partner’s vulnerability to the identified hazards, including summaries of Rodman’s risk assessment results and data used to determine the hazard ranking. Key local risk assessment information is presented below.

Each jurisdiction has unique assets, vulnerabilities and overall risk. A multi-jurisdictional plan needs to identify every hazard (from the whole planning area). In hazard mitigation planning, risk is the potential for damage or loss when natural hazards interact with people or assets. These assets may be buildings, infrastructure or natural and cultural resources. A risk assessment is a robust, data-driven analysis. It explains what might happen. It also finds where the local jurisdiction is vulnerable to hazards.

Each community must describe how the selected hazards affect its jurisdiction. Some hazards will have similar effects across the area: extreme temperatures, windstorms, winter weather, drought, heavy rain, etc. Some have a smaller location and will vary based on geography. Multi-jurisdictional plans must explain these differences.

A diagram of a risk

Description automatically generated

Risk is the relationship, or overlap, between hazards and community assets. The smaller the overlap, the lower the risk.

### Hazard Area

Hazard area maps provided below illustrate the probable hazard areas impacted within the Town are shown in Figure 1 through Figure 2. 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 are provided only for hazards that can be identified clearly using mapping techniques and technologies and for which Rodman has significant exposure. The maps show the location of potential new development, where available.

Figure 1. Rodman Flood and Coastal Erosion Hazard Area Extent and Location Map




Figure 2. Rodman Landslide and WUI Hazard Area Extent and Location Map

A screenshot of a map

Description automatically generated

### Previous Event History

The history of natural and non-natural hazard events in Rodman is detailed in Volume I, where each hazard profile includes a chronology of historical events that have affected the County and its municipalities. Table C provides details on loss and damage in Rodman during hazard events since the last hazard mitigation plan update.

Table C. Presidential Disaster Declaration History in Rodman

| Dates of Event | Event Type (Disaster Declaration) | Summary of Event | Summary of Damage and Losses in Rodman |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| November 18-22, 2022 | Severe Winter Storm (EM-3589) | A winter storm caused more than six feet of snow to accumulate in Jefferson County. This intense snowfall has created extremely dangerous travel conditions, and as a result, numerous road closures and travel bans. | The Town did not incur any documented damage or losses. |
| October 31 – November 1, 2019 | Severe Storm, Flood (DR-4472) | A storm system brought record breaking rains, damaging wind gusts (45 to 50 mph), a small Lake Ontario seiche, and river flooding to the region. Thousands of power outages occurred across the area, and wind-related damage closed hundreds of roads and did countless tree damage. High winds and lakeshore flooding continued into November 1. | The Town did not incur any documented damage or losses. |
| May 2 – August 6, 2017 | Flood (DR-4348) | Six months of wet weather led to an over-accumulation of waters in Lake Ontario. Flooding from the lake began impacting areas in May and continued until early autumn. Waves destroyed public and private break walls all along the lake shore. Thousands of homes and buildings were affected by flood waters. Several homes dropped off bluffs. In some areas shoreline erosion of 50 to 100 feet deep occurred. Sanitary sewer systems in lakeside communities were affected. Beaches, marinas, and state parks were closed all summer long with unknown economic losses to mainly seasonal businesses. In late May, the Governor imposed a 5-mph speed limit within 600 feet of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River shore. By summer’s end, damage estimates reached $10 Million in Jefferson County. | The Town did not incur any documented damage or losses. |
| November 17-26, 2014 | Severe Winter Storm, Flood (DR-4204) | A winter storm moved into the region, causing temperatures to drop tremendously. Lake effect snow impacted counties bordering Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. Travel restrictions were instituted due to whiteout conditions. The storm produced heavy snowfall, high winds, and blizzard-like conditions, resulting in road closures, travel disruptions, power outages, and damage to public and private property. | The Town did not incur any documented damage or losses. |
| October 27 – November 8, 2012 | Severe Storm (EM-3351) | Remnants of Hurricane Sandy brought strong winds and heavy rains. Rainfall amounts of two to five inches were measured across the area with some area creeks reaching bankful. High winds downed trees and power lines. Wind gusts were measured to 60 mph. Utilities reported tens of thousands of customers without power across the entire region. | The Town did not incur any documented damage or losses. |

*EM = Emergency Declaration (FEMA)*

*FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency*

*DR = Major Disaster Declaration (FEMA)*

*N/A = Not applicable*

### Local Hazard Impacts Assessment

In the table below representatives from the Town of Rodman Hazard Mitigation Planning Team assessed impacts of hazards on buildings, structures, facilities, infrastructure, community assets and systems, people and the local economy.

Table D. Local Hazard Impacts Assessment

| Hazard Name | Local Impacts |
| --- | --- |
| Dam Failure | There is no dam located within the Town and none are located nearby that would impact the Town. |
| Drought | The Town has one water system with only 70 houses connected, and the rest of Town is on wells. There are no known issues with the system or wells, however the water system was built in 1976 and is dated. |
| Extreme Temperature | The Town opens the Rodman Fire Hall during power outages as a warming and cooling station. The Town has also experienced freezing pipes from extreme temperature events. |
| Flood | The Town is the beginning of Tug Hill, and the only flood area is along one creek that goes through the Town. One homeowner had to get flood insurance because of the location of their house. |
| Geological Hazards | The Town has reported more earthquakes, but no issues with infrastructure. The Town does not have issues with landslides. |
| Severe Storm | The Town has had a microburst come through and has documented increasingly strong winds, most likely in relation to solar farms clear cutting. |
| Severe Winter Storm | Some barn roofs have caved in due to the weight of snow, however the Town is able to handle clearing and tending to snow related issues. |
| Wildfire | No known impacts |

### Vulnerable Community Assets

In the table below representatives from the Town of Rodman Hazard Mitigation Planning team assessed specific impacts to the assets included in the table below. If a community asset is not present in the municipality the Planning Team stated, ‘Not Applicable.’

Table E. Vulnerable Community Assets

| Community Asset | Hazard Impacts and Asset Vulnerabilities | Community Asset | Hazard Impacts and Asset Vulnerabilities |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agriculture | The Town has reported heavy snow and barn roofs caving in on animals. | Local Roads | The Town reports issues with Beaver Dam failures. |
| Airports | Not applicable | Major Employers | No known impacts |
| Area: Concentration of Businesses | Not applicable | Medical Centers (non-hospital) | Not applicable |
| Area: Concentration of Residences | The Town reported that some basements on School Street flood routinely in the spring. | Natural Resources | No known impacts |
| Bridges | No known impacts | Neighborhoods | See Residencies |
| City Hall/Courthouse | The Town Hall has backup power. | Parks and Recreational Sites | No known impacts |
| College/University | Not applicable | Place of Worship | No known impacts |
| Community Centers/Hubs | No known impacts | Private Property | Not applicable |
| Community Activities: major local events including festivals and economic drivers such as beaches, skiing, farming, fishing, etc. | The Town has a Christmas Festival in December, and in 2024 it was cancelled due to snow. | Public Transportation | Not applicable |
| Cultural/Historic Buildings/Sites | No known impacts | Schools (K-12) | Not applicable |
| Culverts | The Town fixes them as needed and installs liners in some culverts which has worked very well. | Small Businesses | No known impacts |
| Elder-care Facilities | Not applicable | Supermarkets/Grocery Stores | Not applicable |
| Fire/Police Stations | The Rodman Fire Department has a fixed backup generator and acts as an emergency heating and cooling center. | Transportation - Mobile Asset Storage | The Town reported that ice came off the roof and broke one of the doors to the Highway Garage. |
| Gas Stations | Not applicable | Utilities | Not applicable |
| Highways | No known impacts | Wastewater Treatment Plants | Not applicable |
| Hospitals | Not applicable | Waterfront | Not applicable |
| Other | Not applicable | Drinking Water Resources | Water District was put in in 1976 and is dated. |

### Hazard Ranking

The participating jurisdictions have differing degrees of vulnerability to the hazards of concern, so each jurisdiction ranked its own degree of risk to each hazard. The community-specific hazard ranking is based on problems and impacts identified by the risk assessment presented in Volume I.

The ranking process involves an assessment of the likelihood of occurrence for each hazard; the potential impacts of the hazard on people, property, and the economy; community capabilities to address the hazard; and changing future climate conditions. Impacts from a particular hazard may have decreased due to an implemented project or relocation of an asset that was previously at risk. Alternatively, risk may have increased because population has increased in a hazard prone area.

Table F. Hazard Ranking

| Hazard Name | Frequency (2011 – present):  Increased, Decreased, Stayed the Same | Impacts (2011 – present):  Increased, Decreased, Stayed the Same | Description of frequency and impacts (2011 – present): | Future Events (present – 2030):  Will Increase, Decrease, Stay the Same | 2025 Ranking |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dam Failure | Not applicable | Not applicable | - | Not applicable | Low |
| Drought | Stay the same | Stay the same | - | Stay the same | Low |
| Extreme Temperature | Stay the same | Stay the same | - | Stay the same | Low |
| Flood | Stay the same | Stay the same | - | Stay the same | Medium |
| Geologic Hazards | Earthquake- Increase  Landslide-Stay the same | Stay the same for both | - | Stay the same | Low |
| Severe Weather | Stay the same | Increase | Precipitation amounts are increasing | Stay the same | High |
| Severe Winter Weather | Decrease | Stay the same | - | Stay the same | High |
| Wildfire | Stay the same | Stay the same | - | Stay the same | Low |

### Critical Facilities

Table G. Critical Facilities Flood Vulnerability

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Type | Vulnerability | |
| 1% Annual Chance Event | 0.2% Annual Chance Event |
| None Identified | | | |

*Source: Jefferson County 2024; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 2023, 2024; Federal Communications Commission 2024; HIFLD 2023, 2024; NYS Department of Health 2024; National Plan and Provider Enumeration System 2023; USACE 2024; NYS Department of Transportation 2023*

The municipality does not have any identified high hazard potential dams within the jurisdiction.

## 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 appreciating a jurisdiction’s overall risk to its hazards of concern. Recent and expected future development trends, including major residential/commercial development and major infrastructure development, are summarized in Table H through Table L.

### Development and Permitting

Table H. Development and Permitting Capability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Answer |
| Does your municipality or the county issue building permits for development in your community? | Yes, Jefferson County |
| What is your process for tracking building permits? | Code Enforcement officer works with the County. The Town tracks via Zoning permits. |
| Are permits tracked by hazard area? (For example, floodplain development permits.) | County |
| Does your community have a buildable land inventory? If yes, please describe. | Goes by Zoning |

Table I. Number of Building Permits for New Construction Issued Since the Previous HMP

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | New Construction Permits Issued | | | |
|  | Single Family | Multi-Family | Other (commercial, mixed-use, etc.) | Total |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Permits within SFHA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Permits within SFHA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Permits within SFHA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Permits within SFHA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2023 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Permits within SFHA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2024 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Permits |  |  |  |  |
| Permits within SFHA |  |  |  |  |

*SFHA = Special Flood Hazard Area (1% flood event)*

Table J. Recent Major Development and Infrastructure from 2011 to 2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Property or Development Name | Type of Development | # of Units / Structures | Location (address and/or block and lot) | Known Hazard Zones | Description / Status of Development |
| None Identified | | | | | |

Table K. Recent Major Development and Infrastructure from 2019 to Present

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Property or Development Name | Type of Development | # of Units / Structures | Location (address and/or block and lot) | Known Hazard Zones | Description / Status of Development |
| None Identified | | | | | |

Table L. Known or Anticipated Major Development and Infrastructure in the Next Five Years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Property or Development Name | Type of Development | # of Units / Structures | Location (address and/or block and lot) | Known Hazard Zones\* | Description / Status of Development |
| None Identified | | | | | |

## National Flood Insurance Program Compliance

This section provides specific information on the management and regulation of the regulatory floodplain, including current and future compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The floodplain administrator listed in Table Ais responsible for maintaining this information.

### NFIP Statistics

Table M summarizes the NFIP policy and claim statistics for Rodman.

Table M. Rodman NFIP Summary of Policy and Claim Statistics

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # Policies | 3 |
| # Claims (Losses) | 0 |
| Total Loss Payments | $2,770 |
| # Repetitive Loss Properties (NFIP definition) | 0 |
| # Repetitive Loss Properties (FMA definition) | 0 |
| # Severe Repetitive Loss Properties | 0 |

*NFIP Definition of Repetitive Loss: The NFIP defines a repetitive loss property as any insurable building for which two or more claims of more than $1,000 were paid by the NFIP within any rolling 10-year period since 1978.*

*FMA Definition of Repetitive Loss: FEMA’s Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program defines a repetitive loss property as any insurable building that has incurred flood-related damage on two occasions, in which the cost of the repair, on average, equaled or exceeded 25 percent of the market value of the structure at the time of each such flood event.*

*Definition of Severe Repetitive Loss: A residential property covered under an NFIP flood insurance policy and: (a) That has at least four NFIP claim payments over $5,000 each, and the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeds $20,000; or (b) For which at least two separate claims payments have been made with the cumulative amount of the building portion of such claims exceeding the market value of the building. At least two of the claims must have occurred within any 10-year period, more than 10 days apart.*

*Source: FEMA 2024*

### National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Flood Vulnerability Summary

The HMP Team provided information on participation in and continued compliance with the NFIP in the table below.

Table N. NFIP Summary

| NFIP Topic | Comments |
| --- | --- |
| Describe areas prone to flooding in your jurisdiction. | Those by the water |
| Who is the Community Floodplain Administrator (FPA)? Do they serve any roles other than FPA? Do they have adequate training and capacity for this role? | Andy Ondrasek |
| What local department is responsible for floodplain management? | Zoning Enforcement/Code Enforcement |
| Are any certified floodplain managers on staff in your jurisdiction? | No |
| What is the local law number or municipal code of your flood damage prevention ordinance? | Local Law #2 of 1996 |
| When was the latest effective Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) adopted, if applicable? | 07/03/85 |
| Explain NFIP administration services (e.g., permit review, inspections, engineering capability, GIS, etc.) | Zoning Permit Review before going to County for building permit |
| What are the barriers to running an effective NFIP program in your community, if any? | No |
| Does your floodplain management staff need any assistance or training to support its floodplain management program?  If yes, what type of assistance/training is needed? | No |
| How do you make Substantial Damage determinations? What is the process to make sure these structures are brought into compliance? | No process |
| How do you determine if proposed development on an existing structure would qualify as a substantial improvement? | Based on the permit |
| How many Substantial Damage determinations were declared for recent flood events in your jurisdiction? | None |
| Does the community track the number of buildings in the floodplain? If so, how many structures are in special flood hazard area (SFHA)? | County |
| How many structures (residential and non-residential) are exposed to flood risk within the community outside of the regulatory maps? | None |
| Does the community maintain elevation records? If yes, please describe. | No |
| Are there any repetitive loss (RL) or severe repetitive loss (SRL) structures in the community? If yes, how many of each category? | None |
| Describe any areas of flood risk with limited NFIP policy coverage. | None |
| How does the community teach property owners or other stakeholders about the importance of flood insurance? | Bank informs them |
| What digital sources (like the FEMA Map Service Center,  National Flood Hazard Layer) or non-regulatory tools does your community use? | None |
| 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? | Zoning Enforcement reviews zoning permits |
| When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC)? | CAC: March 28, 1996  CAV: Not Documented |
| Does your community plan to join the CRS program or is your community interested in improving your CRS classification? | No |

## Jurisdictional Capability INVENTORY and ASSESSMENT

Rodman performed an inventory and analysis of existing capabilities, plans, programs, and policies that enhance its ability to implement mitigation strategies. Volume I describes the components included in the capability assessment and their significance for hazard mitigation planning. The jurisdictional assessment for this annex includes analyses of the following:

* Planning and regulatory capabilities
* Development and permitting capabilities
* Administrative and technical capabilities
* Fiscal capabilities
* Education and outreach capabilities
* Classification under various community mitigation programs
* Adaptive capacity to withstand hazard events

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into day-to-day local government operations. As part of the hazard mitigation analysis, planning and /policy documents were reviewed and each jurisdiction was surveyed to obtain a better understanding of their progress toward plan integration. Development of an updated mitigation strategy provided an opportunity for Rodman to identify opportunities for integrating mitigation concepts into ongoing Town procedures.

### Planning and Regulatory Capability and Integration

Planning and regulatory capabilities are the plans, policies, codes, and ordinances that prevent and reduce the impacts of hazards.

#### Ordinances

Jefferson County has an Emergency Management Ordinance which charges the County with maintaining a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan to identify local measures that may prevent disasters, to develop local mechanisms to coordinate local resources and personnel for service during and after disasters, support the facilitation of delivery of services to aid citizens and reduce human suffering resulting from disaster, and to provide for short- and long-term recovery and redevelopment after disasters.

Jefferson County has Site Plan and Subdivision Codes that are relevant to development within a certain distance of County interests. Development applications in the areas across the County are sent to County Planning for review to promote coordination of land use decisions and local/county impacts. These County capabilities are inclusive of Rodman and the jurisdiction often partners with the County. To learn more about these capabilities please see Jefferson County’s Jurisdictional Annex.

The HMP Team inventoried its existing ordinances against the full capability list of hazard mitigation-related capabilities. The absence of other kinds of ordinances was not considered a gap in local capabilities. The table below summarizes the ordinances currently in place in the Town.

Table O. Ordinances

| Capability Type | In Place in Municipality | Comments | Responsible Department / Agency / Organization |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Building Codes | Yes | All of the communities in Jefferson County regulate construction through the use of a building code. The Town of Rodman adhere to the building code through County Authority. Building codes regulate construction standards and are developed for specific geographic areas of the country. They consider the type, frequency, and intensity of hazards present in the region. Structures built to applicable building codes are inherently resistant to many hazards such as strong winds, floods, and earthquakes. Due to the location specific nature of the building codes, these are very valuable tools for mitigation. | Jefferson County, Zoning |
| Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance | Yes, Local Law #2 of 1996 | This ordinance is designed to protect communities from flood hazards by implementing regulations that ensures the land use and development practices account for the flood risks, requires vulnerable structures to be constructed to withstand flood damage, and to control changes to the natural floodplain and stream channels to prevent increased flood hazards. | Floodplain Administrator |
| Real Estate Disclosure Requirements | Yes, Property Condition Disclosure Act, NY Code - Article 14 §460-467 | 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. The amended Property Condition Disclosure Statement (PCDS) went into effect Wednesday, March 20, 2024. The amended PCDS includes language requiring the disclosure of issues related to flooding and removal of the $500 credit if sellers fail or refuse to provide the PCDS. Sellers no longer have the option of providing the $500 credit in lieu of the PCDS. | NYS Department of State, Real Estate Agent |
| Subdivision Code | Yes, Local Law No. 5, Amended & Adopted September 1998 | Subdivision ordinances offer an opportunity to account for natural hazards prior to the development of land as they formulate regulations when the land is subdivided. Subdivision design that incorporates mitigation principles can reduce the exposure of future development to hazard events. | Planning Board |
| Zoning/Land Use Code | Yes, Local Law No. 1, Amended & Adopted September 1998 | Zoning is a useful tool to consider when developing a mitigation strategy. It can be used to restrict new development, require low-density development, and designate specific uses (e.g. recreational) in the hazard prone areas. Private property rights must be considered, but enacting a zoning ordinance can reduce or potentially eliminate damages from future hazard events. | Zoning Enforcement Officer |

#### Plans

Jefferson County has an Agriculture Plan (Jefferson County Agricultural and Farmland Protection Plan, 2016); Climate Adaptation / Resilience Plan (North Country Regional Sustainability Plan, 2013); Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan; County Emergency Preparedness Assessment (CEPA); Continuity of Operations Plan (Jefferson County Government COOP – COG Plan, 2023); Economic Development Plan (Jefferson County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, 2021); Public Health Plan (Jefferson County Public Health Service Strategic Plan 2023-2027); Threat and Hazard Identification and Assessment (THIRA); Tourism Plan; Transportation Plan (Jefferson County Coordinated Transportation Plan for Mobility Services, 2021); and other recent plans that are all countywide in scope and implementation and are applicable to the Town of Rodman. To learn more about these capabilities please see Jefferson County’s Jurisdictional Annex.

The HMP Team inventoried its existing plans against the full capability list of hazard mitigation-related capabilities. The absence of other kinds of plans was not considered a gap in local capabilities. The table below summarizes the plans currently in place.

Table P. Plans

| Capability Type | In Place in Municipality | Comments | Responsible Department / Agency / Organization |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Comprehensive Plan | Yes, Comprehensive Plan 2025 | In process for the past two years: expected to be completed by end of 2025. | Town Planning |
| Economic Development Plan | No, Comprehensive Plan 2025 | Comprehensive Plan Element | Town Planning |
| Open Space Plan | No, Comprehensive Plan 2025 | Comprehensive Plan Element | Town Planning |
| Public Health Plan | No, Comprehensive Plan 2025 | Comprehensive Plan Element | Town Planning |

### Administrative and Technical Capability

Jefferson County Code, Fire Prevention and Building Code department currently enforces the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code in 31 municipalities that chose not to enforce the Code at the local level, including the Town of Rodman. The Department employs Code Enforcement Officers and clerical staff to ensure that new construction and areas of public assembly conform to the provisions of the State Uniform Code. Proper enforcement of the Code protects property and encourages quality development that enhances public safety and the economy of the County. The office's two major program responsibilities include existing and new building permit administration (i.e.: plan review, issuing permits, construction inspections and issuing certificates of occupancy) and mandated fire safety inspections.

Jefferson County has an Economic Development Commission (Jefferson County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy); Emergency Management (Jefferson County Office of Fire & Emergency Management), County Department of Planning; County Public Health Department (including Administration and Finance, Home Healthcare Services, Medical Examiner’s Office, Emergency Medical Services); County Highway Department, among others, whose programs and services serve the entire County, including the Town of Rodman To learn more about these capabilities please see Jefferson County’s Jurisdictional Annex.

The HMP Team inventoried its existing Administrative and Technical Capabilities against the full capability list of hazard mitigation-related capabilities. The absence of other staff was not considered a gap in local capabilities. The table below summarizes staff and personnel resources.

Table Q. Administrative and Technical Capabilities

| Capability Type | In Place in Municipality | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Code Enforcement Official | Yes | The Town has a code enforcement official. |
| Maintenance Programs | Yes | The Town Highway Department performs roadway maintenance and tree maintenance. |
| Mutual Aid Agreements | Yes | The Town has mutual aid agreements with Tug Hill and the County. |
| Planning Board | Yes | The Town’s Planning Board has five members. |
| Public Works/Highway Department | Yes | The Town’s Highway Department has six members. |
| Zoning Board of Appeals | Yes | The Zoning Board has three members. |

### Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to Rodman.

Table R. Fiscal Capabilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Capability Type | Has this funding capability been used since the last plan (2011)? If yes, please describe. |
| Community Development Block Grants (CDBG, CDBG-DR) | No |
| Capital improvement project funding | No |
| Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes | No |
| User fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric service | Yes, Water |
| Impact fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes | No |
| Stormwater utility fee | No |
| Incur debt through general obligation bonds | No |
| Incur debt through special tax bonds | No |
| Incur debt through private activity bonds | No |
| Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas | No |
| Other Federal (non-FEMA) funding programs | Yes, ARPA funds for water district |
| FEMA funding programs | Yes, HMP |
| Other 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 includes education and outreach programs and methods already in place that could be used to carry out mitigation activities and communicate information about hazards.

Table S. Education and Outreach Capabilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Capability Type | Is this education and outreach capability currently in use in the Municipality? If yes, please describe. |
| Community Newsletter | No |
| Hazard awareness campaigns (such as Firewise, Storm Ready, Severe Weather Awareness Week, school programs, public events) | No |
| Hazard mitigation information available on your website | Yes, if there is a long-term closure or an upcoming event, the site is updated |
| Local News | Yes |
| Natural disaster/safety programs in place for schools | N/A |
| Organizations that conduct outreach to socially vulnerable populations and underserved populations | No |
| Public information officer or communications office | No |
| Social media for hazard mitigation education and outreach | Yes, Facebook |
| Warning systems for hazard events | No |
| Other | No |

### Hazard Capability Assessment

Each jurisdiction has a unique combination of capabilities to adjust to, protect from, and withstand a future hazard event, future conditions, and changing risk. The HMP Team ranked the local government’s capability to address risks and impacts of each hazard based on the risk and capability assessments performed above.

* *Strong: Capacity exists and effectively manages the impacts of this hazard.*
* *Moderate: Capacity exists but is not used or needs some improvement.*
* *Weak: Capacity exists and needs substantial improvement*
* *None: Capacity does not exist.*

Table T. Adaptive Capacity

| Hazard | Strong, Moderate, Weak, None |
| --- | --- |
| Dam Failure | None- Hazard does not exist in Town |
| Drought | Moderate |
| Extreme Temperature | Moderate |
| Flood | Moderate |
| Geological Hazards | Moderate |
| Severe Storm | Moderate |
| Severe Winter Storm | Moderate |
| Wildfire | Moderate |

## Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization

This section discusses the status of mitigation actions from the previous HMP, describes proposed hazard mitigation actions, and prioritizes actions to address over the next five years.

### Past Mitigation Action Status

The Town did not participate in the last plan.

### Additional Mitigation Efforts

Since the adoption of the County’s first HMP, Rodman has made significant mitigation progress in the following areas:

* None identified.

### Identified Issues

**The Town of Rodman has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community for mitigation strategy development:**

* The current comprehensive plan does not incorporate hazard mitigation principles and does not have a strategy to streamline the consideration of the following hazards into its future development and growth: Dam Failure, Drought, Extreme Temperature, Flood, Geologic Hazards, Severe Weather, Severe Winter Weather, Wildfire.
* Recent storm events have resulted in severe rainfall which overwhelmed culverts and roadways which caused flooding. There are numerous culverts and roadways located in the Town that are of infrastructure and flooding concerns, including Williams Road, Shangraw road, and School Street. The Town knows that other culverts may also need to be upsized and mitigated.
* The Town’s current water district facility services 70 homes and was built in 1976 and is very dated and weathered. The original pumps were just replaced with ARPA funds. The Town wants to upgrade and weather-proof the facility but does not have the funding to be able to afford the upfront cost.

### Proposed Hazard Mitigation Actions for the HMP Update

Rodman participated in the mitigation strategy workshop and identified hazard mitigation actions to reduce the risks and impacts of hazards the community ranked as high-risk. Hazard risk ranking was specific to each community in the County and was based on quantitative (i.e, analysis of the best available data) and qualitative risk assessment processes (i.e., evaluation of previous occurrences, likelihood of future occurrences and vulnerabilities to people and community services; buildings and critical infrastructure; the natural environment and other local priorities.

Implementation of these actions are dependent upon available funding (grants and local match availability) and local capacity and may be modified or omitted at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in local priorities.

Volume I identifies fourteen evaluation criteria for prioritizing the mitigation actions. Below, Table U provides the prioritization criteria score for each proposed mitigation action.

Action 2025-RodmanT-01. Comprehensive Plan Update

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Agency: | Town Administration | |
| Supporting Agencies: | Town Planning | |
| Hazards of Concern: | Dam Failure, Drought, Extreme Temperature, Flood, Geologic Hazards  Severe Weather, Severe Winter Weather, Wildfire | |
| Description of the Problem: | The current comprehensive plan does not incorporate hazard mitigation principles and does not have a strategy to streamline the consideration of the following hazards into its future development and growth: Dam Failure, Drought, Extreme Temperature, Flood, Geologic Hazards, Severe Weather, Severe Winter Weather, Wildfire. | |
| Description of the Solution: | The Town will update its comprehensive plan. Ensure that the local comprehensive plan incorporates hazard mitigation techniques through a courtesy review or draft plans by the County Planning Department. | |
| Estimated Cost: | Staff Time | |
| Potential Funding Sources: | Town Budget | |
| Implementation Timeline: | Within 5 Years | |
| Goals Met: | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | |
| Benefits: | This action will have the Town update its comprehensive plan, which has not been updated in many years. The integration of hazard mitigation principles will present the opportunity for the Town to identify areas of the Town which may be impacted by hazards and plan for future land use accordingly. | |
| Impact on Socially Vulnerable Populations: | The inclusion of hazard mitigation principles into the comprehensive plan may include discussions on how hazard risks may impact socially vulnerable populations in the Town. | |
| Impact on Future Development: | This action will have a direct impact on future land use in the Town, as the comprehensive plan guides land use principles in the Town. | |
| Impact on Critical Facilities/Lifelines: | Updating the comprehensive plan to include hazard mitigation principles may present an opportunity to discuss hazard risks to critical facilities and lifelines in the Town. | |
| Impact on Capabilities: | This action will update an already existing planning capability of the Town, making it more resilient. | |
| Climate Change Considerations: | As impacts from climate change are increasingly felt, the contents in the Town’s comprehensive plan will need to be updated. | |
| Mitigation Category | Local Plans and Regulations | |
| CRS Category | Preventative Measures | |
| Priority | High | |
| Alternative | Action | Evaluation |
| No action | - |
| Integrate hazard mitigation principles in only plan elements | The plan will miss integration opportunities in the comprehensive plan main document |
| Integrate hazard mitigation principles in only comprehensive plan main document | The plan will miss integration opportunities in the plan elements |

Action 2025-RodmanT-02. Flood Study and Culvert Upsize

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Agency: | Town Highway Department | |
| Supporting Agencies: | Town Administration, County | |
| Hazards of Concern: | Flood, Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm | |
| Description of the Problem: | Recent storm events have resulted in severe rainfall which overwhelmed culverts and roadways which caused flooding. There are numerous culverts and roadways located in the Town that are of infrastructure and flooding concerns, including Williams Road, Shangraw road, and School Street. The Town knows that other culverts may also need to be upsized and mitigated. | |
| Description of the Solution: | The Town will contract an engineer to complete an engineering survey of the identified culverts in the Town that are undersized and contribute to flooding to determine the proper size that is necessary to eliminate or reduce flooding. The Town will acquire funding to upsize the culverts along Williams Road, Shangraw road, and School Street after the engineer determines the proper size for each culvert location. The Town will also continue to compile a Culvert Inventory that details the status and damage of culverts in the Town and will acquire necessary funding to ensure proper adjustments are made to protect the Town from flooding and collapsed culverts. | |
| Estimated Cost: | TBD after Survey and Inventory | |
| Potential Funding Sources: | HMGP, FMA, CHIPS, Town Budget | |
| Implementation Timeline: | Within 5 Years | |
| Goals Met: | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 | |
| Benefits: | Overall flooding will be reduced, which will result in less frequency of road closures and reduced damage occurring to culverts and roadways during severe events. Businesses are likely to remain in place if they are able to remain open, or re-open sooner following a flood. | |
| Impact on Socially Vulnerable Populations: | Areas that were previously vulnerable to frequency or severe flooding events will be less likely to be impacted by flooding events. | |
| Impact on Future Development: | Future development in the impacted area will be less likely to be flooded. | |
| Impact on Critical Facilities/Lifelines: | * Transportation routes are more likely to remain open * Evacuation routes will remain intact. * Access to health and medical facilities will be maintained, both for healthcare workers and the population who require treatment for injuries and illness. | |
| Impact on Capabilities: | Identifying the culverts that are at greatest risk of damage or failure can allow resource staging to take place where the need is greatest ahead of a flood event. | |
| Climate Change Considerations: | Climate change is likely to result in more frequent and severe rainfall events. This action is to increase culvert sizes to meet changing stormwater needs as the result of climate change. | |
| Mitigation Category | Structure and Infrastructure Project | |
| CRS Category | Preventative Measures, Property Protection, Structural Flood Control Projects | |
| Priority | High | |
| Alternative | Action | Evaluation |
| No action | - |
| Elevate affected roadways | Not cost effective |
| Raingardens | Raingardens are unlikely to be able to absorb enough stormwater to prevent flooding during severe rainfall events. |

Action 2025-RodmanT-03. Water District Upgrade

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Agency: | Water District Managers | |
| Supporting Agencies: | Town Administration | |
| Hazards of Concern: | Flood, Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm | |
| Description of the Problem: | The Town’s current water district facility services 70 homes and was built in 1976 and is very dated and weathered. The original pumps were just replaced with ARPA funds. The Town wants to upgrade and weather-proof the facility but does not have the funding to be able to afford the upfront cost. | |
| Description of the Solution: | The Town will acquire the funding to upgrade and weather proof the water district facility and ensure that it can also serve as a redundant water hauling source for those reliant on well water. | |
| Estimated Cost: | TBD after Study | |
| Potential Funding Sources: | HMGP, FMA, Town Budget | |
| Implementation Timeline: | Within 5 Years | |
| Goals Met: | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 | |
| Benefits: | The Town will have a better protected water district that can handle more intense hazard events. | |
| Impact on Socially Vulnerable Populations: | Residents that rely on this water source will have a better protected water district facility. | |
| Impact on Future Development: | New development may be able to connect to a water district facility that is protected from the increasing intensity of severe storms. | |
| Impact on Critical Facilities/Lifelines: | Critical facilities that rely on the water district will have a more reliable water source, especially during hazard events. | |
| Impact on Capabilities: | This action increases the Town’s access to a reliable, redundant, and safe water source. | |
| Climate Change Considerations: | Climate change is likely to result in more frequent and severe rainfall events. | |
| Mitigation Category | Structure and Infrastructure Project | |
| CRS Category | Preventative Measures, Property Protection, Structural Flood Control Projects | |
| Priority | High | |
| Alternative | Action | Evaluation |
| No action | - |
| Remove the water district when the facility collapses | Will not serve the Town residents if not maintained and upgraded as needed. |
| Build new water facility | Not cost effective |

Table U. Summary of Prioritization of Actions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Scores for Evaluation Criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Project Number | Project Name | Life Safety | Property Protection | Cost-Effectiveness | Political | Legal | Fiscal | Environmental | Social Vulnerability | Administrative | Hazards of Concern | Climate Change | Timeline | Community Lifelines | Other Local Objectives | **Total** | High / Medium / Low |
| Action 2025-RodmanT-01. | Comprehensive Plan Update | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **13** | High |
| Action 2025-RodmanT-02. | Flood Study and Culvert Upsize | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **13** | High |
| Action 2025-RodmanT-03. | Water District Upgrade | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **13** | High |

*Note: Volume I, Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy) conveys guidance on prioritizing mitigation actions. Low (0-6), Medium (7-10), High (11-14)*