

# MUNICIPAL ANNEX | Village of Marcellus







# 9.22 VILLAGE OF MARCELLUS

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Village of Marcellus. 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 municipality and who in the village participated in the planning process; an assessment of the Village of Marcellus' risk and vulnerability; the different capabilities utilized in the village; and an action plan that will be implemented to achieve a more resilient community.

## 9.22.1 Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

The following individuals have been identified as the Village of Marcellus' hazard mitigation plan primary and alternate points of contact.

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Name: William Reagan Title: Code Official Phone Number: 315-673-3112 Address: 6 Slocombe Avenue, Marcellus, NY 13108	Name: Robert Wicks Title: Police Chief Phone Number: 315-673-3112 Address: 6 Slocombe Avenue, Marcellus, NY 13108
Email: codes@villageofmarcellus.com Floodplain Administrator	Email:
Name: William Reagan Title: Code Official Phone Number: 315-673-3112 Address: 6 Slocombe Avenue, Marcellus, NY 13108 Email: codes@villageofmarcellus.com	

## 9.22.2 Municipal Profile

The Village of Marcellus lies within the Town of Marcellus in the southwestern interior of Onondaga County in western New York State. The Village of Marcellus has a total area of 0.6 square miles. Otisco Lake is to the south, Skaneateles Lake to the west, and Nine-Mile Creek, a noted trout stream, is to the north of the village. The Village of Marcellus is at the junction of NY-174 and NY-175 within the Town of Marcellus. Refer to Section 9.21 (Town of Marcellus) for their individual annex. The estimated 2016 population was 1,703, a 6.1 percent decrease from the 2010 Census (1,813).

The Village of Marcellus government is responsible for providing such services as police and fire protection, sewer, water supply, and highway services. The Village of Marcellus, since the election of 1899, has been governed by an elected Mayor and an elected Board of Trustees consisting of two members.

Data from the 2016 U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates that 2.3 percent of the village population is five years of age or younger, and 24.1 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.

## **History and Cultural Resources**

Situated between the cities of Syracuse and Auburn and a few miles from Otisco and Skaneateles Lakes, Marcellus was incorporated as a village on June 4, 1853. Marcellus developed at the crossroads of two major transportation routes, Nine Mile Creek and Seneca Turnpike, at one time called the Great Genesee Road. The water power provided by Nine Mile Creek, an outlet of Otisco Lake, attracted a variety of individuals who built a number of mills (grist, saw, barley and woolen) on the creek and the products of these mills attracted even





more individuals to the valley to work in the mills, as well as provide other services for neighboring farmers. Seneca Turnpike, an outgrowth of the Great Native American Trail that stretched across the State of New York, was a major highway in New York for people and products moving west. The original trail was practically a straight line through what would become Marcellus Village, but in 1802, when the (Seneca) Turnpike was laid out by New York State for improvement, the road-bed was changed to its present location on its way west out of the village in order to avoid the steep climb.

Stagecoach lines operating on the turnpike would help the area, particularly the valley of the Nine Mile, to develop as a trading and manufacturing center. There were a number of business establishments on the Turnpike, including the famous Alvord House, built in 1815 and located strategically in the valley for servicing those who traveled the highway.

The original corporation of the village consisted of a little over 282 acres of land, about 2/3's the present size of the village. The eastern and western boundaries of the village have changed little since 1853. Nine Mile Creek is basically the eastern boundary of the village, and the hills called the northern boundary of the village including what is commonly referred to today as Scotch Hill.

The Village of Marcellus retains some of the finest architectural and historic landmarks in Central New York, such as the Dan Bradley House (59 South Street), one of the oldest and least altered houses of the region.

## **Growth/Development Trends**

The Village of Marcellus did not note any residential/commercial development that has occurred since 2013 or any planned major residential or commercial development, or major infrastructure development anticipated in the next five years.

## Table 9.22-1. Growth and Development

Property or Development Name	Type (e.g. Res., Comm.)	# of Units / Structures	Location (address and/or Parcel ID)	Known Hazard Zone(s)	Description/Status of Development	
Recent Development from 2013 to present						
None						
Known or Anticipated Development in the Next Five (5) Years						
None anticipated						

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

# 9.22.3 Hazard Event History Specific to the Village of Marcellus

Onondaga County has a history of natural hazard events as detailed in Volume I, Section 5.0 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 Village of Marcellus' history of federally-declared (as presented by FEMA) and significant hazard events (as presented in NOAA-NCEI) is consistent with that of Onondaga County. Table 9.22-2 provides details regarding municipal-specific loss and damages the village experienced during hazard events. 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 9.22-2. Hazard Event History

Dates of	Event Type (Disaster Declaration if	Onondaga County		Municipal Summary of
Event	applicable)	Designated?	Summary of Event	Damages and Losses
April – May 2011	Severe Storms, Flooding, Tornadoes, and Straight-Line Winds (FEMA-DR- 1993)	Yes	A slow moving warm front pushed northward across central New York late in the afternoon on April 25th. Severe weather developed, and in addition to reports of severe wind damage and hail, plenty of wind shear in the vicinity of the warm front allowed for a few super-cell thunderstorms and tornadoes to develop. In addition, areas of heavy rain caused significant flash flooding in several locations of central New York.	The village sustained minor tree damage
			On May 26, a deep upper level low pressure system shifted east from the mid-Mississippi Valley region through the afternoon and evening, allowing numerous showers and thunderstorms to develop. Many reports of large hail and damaging winds occurred in central New York.	
June 30- July 1, 2015	Flash Flood	No	An unseasonably strong storm system tapping into above normal moisture sources across the Great Lakes and Northeast triggered multiple heavy rain producing thunderstorms across the region. Localized torrential rainfall in central New York caused serious urban flash flooding in the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area. Damages are estimated between three and five million dollars.	Although the county was impacted, the village did not report damages.
July 1, 2017	Flash Flood	No	A tropical moisture laden air mass produced numerous showers and thunderstorms which traveled repeatedly over the same areas of the Finger Lakes Region and Upper Mohawk Valley. Widespread flash and urban flooding developed in portions of Cayuga, Onondaga, Madison and Oneida counties. Hardest hit areas were the villages and towns of Moravia, Chittenango, Oneida, and Utica to name a few. Total rainfall amounts along a narrow corridor from Moravia to Utica generally ranged from 2.5 to 5 inches, most of which fell in less than 1 to 2 hours. Total damages from this event range from \$10-\$15 million dollars Countywide.	Debris cleanup in the village totaled \$1,486.18.

Notes:

EM Emergency Declaration (FEMA)

FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency

DR Major Disaster Declaration (FEMA)

N/A Not applicable

# 9.22.4 Hazard Ranking and Jurisdiction-Specific 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 hazards of greatest concern and risk to the Village of Marcellus. For additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction, refer to Section 5.0.

# Hazard Risk Ranking

This section includes 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 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 town or village may have differing degrees of risk exposure and vulnerability compared to Onondaga County as a whole. Therefore, each municipality 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 Village of Marcellus. The Village of Marcellus 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 village indicated the following:

- The village changed the risk ranking for drought from medium to low.
- The village changed the risk ranking for earthquake from high to low.
- The village changed the risk ranking for severe storm from high to medium.
- The village changed the risk ranking for flood from low to medium, based on stormwater flooding concerns outside of the floodplain.

## Table 9.22-3. Village of Marcellus Municipal Hazard Ranking Input

HAZARD	Drought	Earthquake	Flood	Geologic	Harmful Algal Bloom	Invasive Species	Severe Storm	Severe Winter Storm
RELATIVE RISK FACTOR	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High

Notes: The scale is based on the following hazard rankings as established in Section 5.3. High = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 5 and above

Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 3 and abo Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking of 3.9 – 4.9

Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 3.8

# **Critical Facilities Flood Risk**

New York Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Statute 6 CRR-NY 502.4 sets forth floodplain management criteria for State projects located in flood hazard areas. The law states that no such projects related to critical facilities shall be undertaken in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) unless constructed according to specific mitigation specifications, including being raised 2' above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). This statute is outlined at <u>http://tinyurl.com/6-CRR-NY-502-4</u>. While all vulnerabilities should be assessed and documented, the State places a high priority on exposure to flooding. Critical facilities located in an SFHA, or having ever sustained previous flooding, must be protected to the 500-year flood event, or worst damage scenario. For those that do not meet this criteria, the jurisdiction must identify an action to achieve this level of protection (NYSDHSES 2017).



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 9.22-4.	. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities	
---------------	---	--

		Exp	osure	Potential 1% Floc	Loss from od Event	
Name	Туре	1% Event	0.2% Event	Percent Structure Damage	Percent Content Damage	Addressed by Proposed Action
	Nor	ne identified	1			

Source: FEMA 2016, SOPA 2018

## **Identified Issues**

The municipality has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community:

- Highland Drive, Meadow Street, and Second Street area of the village is prone to flooding due to poor drainage issues; village is currently working on alleviating this problem
  - Single point of entry:
    - 3 Austindale Nine Mile Landing Apts.28 Maple Street Upper Crown Condominiums
    - 32 Maple Street Library
    - 33 Maple Street Upper Crown Landing Apts.
    - 60 North Street Creekwalk Apartments
    - Austindale Avenue
    - Academy Green
    - Bradley Street
    - Braeside Apartments
    - Chrisler Street
    - Flower Lane
    - Highland Drive
    - Park Street
    - Paul Street
    - Wilson Drive

## 9.22.5 Capability Assessment

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Planning and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability
- Community classification
- National Flood Insurance Program
- Integration of mitigation planning into existing and future planning mechanisms

## Planning and Regulatory Capability

The table below summarizes the regulatory tools that are available to the Village of Marcellus.





## Table 9.22-5. Planning and Regulatory Tools

Tool / Program (code, ordinance, plan)	Do you have this? (Yes/No) If Yes, date of adoption or update	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Dept. /Agency Responsible	Code Citation and Comments (Code Chapter, name of plan, explanation of authority, etc.)
Planning Capability				
Comprehensive Plan	Yes, 7/23/2007	Local	Codes	Village Comprehensive Plan
Capital Improvements Plan	No	-	-	-
Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	No	-	-	-
Stormwater Management Plan	Yes, 6/1/18	Local	Codes	Stormwater Management Plan
Open Space Plan	Yes	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 250
Stream Corridor Management Plan	Yes, 6/1/76	Local	Codes	Nine Mile Creel Corridor Plan
Watershed Management or Protection Plan	No	-	-	-
Economic Development Plan	No	-	-	-
Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan	Yes, 1999	Local	Police	V.M. Emergency Operations Plan
Emergency Operation Plan	Yes, 1999	Local	Police	V.M. Emergency Operations Plan
Evacuation Plan	Yes, 1999	Local	Police	V.M. Emergency Operations Plan
Post-Disaster Recovery Plan	No	-	-	-
Transportation Plan	No	-	-	-
Strategic Recovery Planning Report	No	-	-	-
Climate Adaptation Plan	No		-	-
Resilience Plan	No	-	-	-
Other Plans:	No	-	-	-
Regulatory Capability			L. C.	F
Building Code	Yes, 10/1/16	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 44
Zoning Ordinance	Yes, 12/27/2012	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 250
Subdivision Ordinance	Yes, 12/27/2012	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 223
NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Yes, 12/27/2012	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 89
NFIP: Cumulative Substantial Damages	No	-	-	-
NFIP: Freeboard	Yes	Local	Codes	State mandated BFE+2 for all construction, both residential and non-residential
Growth Management Ordinances	No	-	-	-
Site Plan Review Requirements	Yes, 12/27/2012	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 204
Stormwater Management Ordinance	Yes, 12/27/2012	Local	Codes	Village Code Chapter 217
Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)	Yes	Local	Codes	-





Tool / Program (code, ordinance, plan)	Do you have this? (Yes/No) If Yes, date of adoption or update	Authority (local, county, state, federal)	Dept. /Agency Responsible	Code Citation and Comments (Code Chapter, name of plan, explanation of authority, etc.)
Natural Hazard Ordinance	No	-	-	-
Post-Disaster Recovery Ordinance	No	-	-	-
Real Estate Disclosure Requirement	Yes	State	NYS Department of State, Real Estate Agent	NYS mandate, Property Condition Disclosure Act, NY Code - Article 14 §460-467
Other (Special Purpose Ordinances [i.e., sensitive areas, steep slope])	No	-	-	-

## Administrative and Technical Capability

The table below summarizes potential staff and personnel resources available to the Village of Marcellus.

#### Table 9.22-6. Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Resources	Is this in place? (Yes or No)	Department/ Agency/Position
Administrative Capability		
Planning Board	Yes	Codes
Mitigation Planning Committee	Yes	Codes
Environmental Board/Commission	No	-
Open Space Board/Committee	No	-
Economic Development Commission/Committee	No	-
Maintenance programs to reduce risk	Yes	-
Mutual aid agreements	Yes	-
Technical/Staffing Capability		•
Planner(s) or engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Yes	Codes
Engineer(s) or professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Yes	Codes/ Village Engineer
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Yes	Codes/ Village Engineer
NFIP Floodplain Administrator (FPA)	Yes	Codes
Surveyor(s)	Yes	MRB Group/ TDK Engineering
Personnel skilled or trained in GIS and/or Hazards United States (HAZUS) – Multi-Hazards (MH) applications	Yes	Codes/ MRB Group/ TDK Engineering
Scientist familiar with natural hazards	No	-
Warning systems/services	No	-
Emergency Manager	Yes	Police Chief
Grant writer(s)	Yes	MRB Group/ TDK Engineering
Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	Yes	MRB Group/ TDK Engineering
Professionals trained in conducting damage assessments	Yes	MRB Group/ TDK Engineering





## Fiscal Capability

The table below summarizes financial resources available to the Village of Marcellus.

#### Table 9.22-7. Fiscal Capabilities

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to Use (Yes/No)
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 - Sewer
Impact fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	No
Stormwater utility fee	No
Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
Incur debt through special tax bonds	Yes
Incur debt through private activity bonds	Yes
Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No
Other federal or state Funding Programs	Yes
Open Space Acquisition funding programs	No
Other	No

#### **Community Classifications**

The table below summarizes classifications for community programs available to the Village of Marcellus.

#### Table 9.22-8. Community Classifications

Program	Do you have this? (Yes/No)	Classification (if applicable)	Date Classified (if applicable)
Community Rating System (CRS)	No	-	-
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	Yes	4	11/4/2016
Public Protection (ISO Fire Protection Classes 1 to 10)	Yes	4	-
NYSDEC Climate Smart Community	NP	-	-
Storm Ready Certification	NP	-	-
Firewise Communities classification	NP	-	-
Natural disaster/safety programs in/for schools	NP	-	-
Organizations with mitigation focus (advocacy group, non-government)	No	-	-
Public education program/outreach (through website, social media)	Yes	-	-
Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues	No	-	-
Other	No	-	-

Note:

N/A Not applicable

NP Not participating

- Unavailable





The classifications listed above relate to the community's ability to provide effective services to lessen its vulnerability to the hazards identified. These classifications can be viewed as a gauge of the community's capabilities in all phases of emergency management (preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation) and are used as an underwriting parameter for determining the costs of various forms of insurance. The CRS class applies to flood insurance while the BCEGS and Public Protection classifications apply to standard property insurance. CRS classifications range on a scale of 1 to 10 with class 1 being the best possible classification, and class 10 representing no classification benefit. Firewise classifications include a higher classification when the subject property is located beyond 1000 feet of a creditable fire hydrant and is within 5 road miles of a recognized Fire Station.

Criteria for classification credits are outlined in the following documents:

- The Community Rating System Coordinators Manual
- The Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (<u>https://www.isomitigation.com/bcegs/</u>)
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO's Public Protection website at <a href="https://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/">https://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/</a>
- New York State Climate Smart Communities (http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/56876.html)
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at https://www.weather.gov/stormready/communities
- The National Firewise Communities website at http://firewise.org/

#### **Self-Assessment of Capability**

The table below provides an approximate measure of the Village of Marcellus' capability to work in a hazardmitigation capacity and/or effectively implement hazard mitigation strategies to reduce hazard vulnerabilities.

Table 9.22-9.	Self-Assessmer	nt Canability fo	r the Municipality
		it dupublility it	i the Flamerpuncy

	Degree of	Hazard Mitigation Capa	ability
Area	Limited (If limited, what are your obstacles?)	Moderate	High
Planning and regulatory capability			X
Administrative and technical capability			Х
Fiscal capability			Х
Community political capability			Х
Community resiliency capability			Х
Capability to integrate mitigation into municipal processes and activities			Х

## National Flood Insurance Program

This section provides specific information on the management and regulation of the regulatory floodplain.

#### NFIP Floodplain Administrator (FPA)

Bill Reagan, Code Official

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

The Village of Marcellus does not maintain lists/inventories of properties that have been flood damaged and does not make substantial damage estimates. The FPA noted that no properties have recently been flooded and no properties are interested in mitigation at this time.





The following table summarizes the NFIP statistics for the Village of Marcellus.

#### Table 9.22-10. NFIP Summary

Municipality	# Policies	# Claims (Losses)	Total Loss Payments	# RL Properties	# SRL Properties	# Policies in the 1% Flood Boundary
Village of Marcellus	8	4	\$0	0	0	4

Source: FEMA Region 2 2018.

(1) Policies, claims, RL, and SRL statistics provided by FEMA Region 2, and are current as of June 30, 2018. Total number of RL properties does not include SRL properties. Number of claims represents claims closed by July 31, 2018.

(2) Total building and content losses from the claims file provided by FEMA Region 2.

(3) Number of policies inside and outside of flood zones is based on latitude and longitude coordinates provided by FEMA Region 2 in the policy file. FEMA noted that for a property with more than one entry, more than one policy may have been in force or more than one Geographic Information System (GIS) specification was possible. Number of policies and claims, and claims total, exclude properties outside Otsego County boundary, based on provided latitude and longitude coordinates.

RL Repetitive Loss

SRL Severe Repetitive Loss

#### Resources

The FPA is the sole person responsible for floodplain administration, with the assistance of the Village Engineer as necessary. NFIP administration services and functions include permit review, inspections, damage assessments, record-keeping, GIS, education and outreach. When a project is proposed or a permit applied for, a thorough review of the NFIP requirements is done with the applicant. The FPA noted that they do not have access to resources to determine possible future flooding conditions from climate change. However, they feel adequately supported and do not feel there are any barriers to running an effective floodplain management program. The FPA noted they would consider attending continuing education and/or certification training on floodplain management if it were offered in the County for all local floodplain administrators.

#### **Compliance History**

The Village of Marcellus is in good-standing in the NFIP. According to information provided by NYSDEC, the village has not had a Community Assistance Visit (CAV).

#### Regulatory

**Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance:** The Village of Marcellus Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Chapter 89 of the municipal code) was adopted to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare, and to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions in specific areas by provisions designed to:

- regulate uses which are dangerous to health, safety and property due to water or erosion hazards, or which result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights or velocities;
- require that uses vulnerable to floods, including facilities which serve such uses, be protected against flood damage at the time of initial construction;
- control the alteration of natural floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers which are involved in the accommodation of flood waters;
- control filling, grading, dredging and other development which may increase erosion or flood damages;
- regulate the construction of flood barriers which will unnaturally divert flood waters or which may increase flood hazards to other lands, and;
- qualify and maintain for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program.

The objectives of this Chapter are:





- to protect human life and health;
- to minimize expenditure of public money for costly flood control projects;
- to minimize the need for rescue and relief efforts associated with flooding and generally undertaken at the expense of the general public;
- to minimize prolonged business interruptions;
- to minimize damage to public facilities and utilities such as water and gas mains, electric, telephone, sewer lines, streets and bridges located in areas of special flood hazard;
- to help maintain a stable tax base by providing for the sound use and development of areas of special flood hazard so as to minimize future flood blight areas;
- to provide that developers are notified that property is in an area of special flood hazard; and,
- to ensure that those who occupy the areas of special flood hazard assume responsibility for their actions.

The FPA noted that there are other local ordinances, plans or programs (e.g. site plan review) that support floodplain management and meeting the NFIP requirements. The FPA stated that the village has considered joining the Community Rating System (CRS) program to reduce flood insurance premiums for their insured and would attend a CRS seminar if offered locally.

#### Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms

For a community to succeed in reducing long-term risk, hazard mitigation must be integrated into the day-today local government operations. As part of this planning effort, each community was surveyed to obtain a better understanding of their community's progress in plan integration. A summary is provided below. In addition, the community identified specific integration activities that will be incorporated into municipal procedures, which is also indicated below.

Planning

## Existing Integration

**Comprehensive Plan:** The 2006 Village of Marcellus Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) addresses several components that influence village life and are important to the residents, merchants, and visitors to the Village of Marcellus, now and in the future. Relevant goals include the protection of natural resources (e.g., wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, woodlands, etc.), open space and water quality. Implementation of these goals include: creating zoning standards to protect environmental corridors; limiting development of impervious surfaces within the 100-year floodplain; adopting erosion control and storm water ordinances; improving storm water drainage to limit infiltration into the sewer system; and identifying and remediating environmentally compromised sites which may affect ground and/or surface waters in the village. The Village of Marcellus's Comprehensive Plan does not refer to the Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan.

**Stormwater Management Plan:** The Village of Marcellus is an MS4 Regulated Community and has a formal Stormwater Management Plan. The Plan specifies projects/actions/initiatives to reduce the volume of stormwater, or otherwise mitigate stormwater flooding.

The Village of Marcellus has a Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government (COOP/COG) plan(s). The village's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan does not refer to the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The village does not have a Re-Development Plan, Growth Plan, Economic Development Plan, Open Space Plan, Watershed or Stream Corridor Management Plan, Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan, Post-Disaster Recovery Plan/Strategic Recovery Plan, resilience plan/strategy, or Climate Adaptation Plan/strategy.





## Opportunities for Future Integration

Updates to existing plans or new plans could include additional information on natural hazard risk and resilience and refer to the Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan.

#### Regulatory and Enforcement (Ordinances)

#### **Existing Integration**

**Zoning Law:** The Village of Marcellus Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 250 of the municipal code) was enacted pursuant to the Village Law of the State of New York, Chapter 64 of the Consolidated Laws, Article 7, to protect and promote public health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience, economy, aesthetics, and the general welfare; to promote and effectuate the orderly development of the Village of Marcellus; to encourage the most appropriate use of land in the Village in order to conserve and enhance the value of property; to provide adequate and suitably located commercial facilities; to protect and enhance existing historic areas, scenic areas and waterways; to control development within the Village of Marcellus; to realize a development plan properly designed to conserve land the and the cost of municipal services; to assure privacy for residences and freedom from nuisances and things harmful to the senses; to protect the village and its inhabitants against unsightly, obtrusive and noisome land uses and operations. The ordinance references the establishment of Environmental Protection Overlay District (Chapter 73) which have not yet been adopted and are pending review. The potential adoption of the Environmental Protection Overlay District will preserve and protect unique environmental features, such as wetlands, floodplains, and water quality among others, within the Village of Marcellus.

The Village of Marcellus' municipal zoning, subdivision regulations, and site plan review process consider natural hazard risk and require developers to take additional actions to mitigate natural hazard risk. The Planning Board/ZBA is provided with flood maps and aerial photography to guide their decisions with respect to natural hazard risk management.

#### Opportunities for Future Integration

The Village of Marcellus will update ordinances as necessary with information on natural hazards.

## Operational and Administration

#### **Existing Integration**

**Planning Board:** The Planning Board of the Village of Marcellus consists of five members who are appointed by the Mayor of the village, with the consent of the Board of Trustees. This Planning Board meets once or twice a month, or as needed. The members of the board are not paid a salary, and volunteer their services for a renewable five year term. Planning Board members meet every 3rd Wednesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall. The Village of Marcellus Planning Board meets as needed on the 3rd Wednesday of each month at 7 p.m. The Board ensures that hazard mitigation is included in any proposed project.

**Zoning Board:** The Village of Marcellus Zoning Board meets as needed or when called by the Chair. The Board ensures that hazard mitigation is included in any proposed project.

The Village of Marcellus does not have a municipal planner, contract planning firm, or additional boards or committees that include functions with respect to managing natural hazard risk. Stormwater Management and NFIP Floodplain Management functions are performed by the Code Official. The village has staff or contracts with firms that have experience with developing Benefit-Cost Analysis, can perform Substantial Damage Estimates, and have experience in preparing grant applications for mitigation projects. No village staff have job descriptions that involve natural hazard risk or participate in associations, organizations, groups or other committees that support natural hazard risk reduction and build hazard management capabilities. village staff





receive training or continuing professional education which supports natural hazard risk reduction. The village DPW regularly inspects and cleans stormwater catch basins.

## **Opportunities for Future Integration**

Staff could participate in associations, organizations, groups or other committees that support natural hazard risk reduction and build hazard management capabilities.

## Funding

## **Existing Integration**

The Village of Marcellus does not have a line item for mitigation projects/activities in the municipal budget or have a Capital Improvements Budget. The village has not pursued or been awarded grant funds for mitigation-related projects. The village does not have any other mechanisms to fiscally support hazard mitigation projects.

Pre-disaster mitigation funds will be available upon FEMA approval of this plan, along with other funding available through the state and federal sources, such as the NYS Department of Conservation (Climate Smart Communities Grants, Water Quality Improvements Program, Trees for Tribes), NYS Environmental Facilities Corporation (Wastewater Infrastructure Engineering Planning, Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund, Green Innovation Grant Program), New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (Clean Energy Communities Program), and Empire State Development.

#### **Opportunities for Future Integration**

The village could apply for grants and allocate funding from the municipal budget funding to support hazard mitigation projects.

#### Education and Outreach

#### **Existing Integration**

The Village of Marcellus currently does not have any public outreach mechanisms/programs to inform citizens on natural hazards. The village operates a municipal website (<u>https://www.villageofmarcellus.com/</u>) which posts information regarding upcoming community events and important municipal decisions. The website provides information related to safety and hazard mitigation including local emergency response contact information, current project information, and links to related ordinances (see Regulatory and Enforcement).

## **Opportunities for Future Integration**

The village could include information on natural hazards on the village website and develop education and outreach programs.

#### Sheltering, Evacuation, and Temporary Housing

Temporary housing, evacuation routes, and sheltering measures must 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.

#### Temporary and Permanent Housing

The Village of Marcellus has identified the following potential sites for the placement of temporary housing for residents displaced by a disaster:

• Crown Mill Park: The site has capacity for 180 trailers.





- Crown Mill site: The site has capacity for 27 trailers.
- Crown Mill School: The school athletic fields have capacity for 225 trailers.

The village has not identified potential sites suitable for relocating houses of the floodplain and/or building new homes once properties in the floodplain are acquired. To accommodate longer term housing needs of permanently displaced residents, there is an existing supply of vacant housing units within the county which may be able to satisfy and absorb those housing needs. The county also has ample buildable land availability throughout its communities to satisfy construction of new housing units if needed, as mapped in Section 4, figure 4-20 in Volume I of this plan. Of note, given the nature of the hazards of concern to Onondaga County, the extent of housing need is also not likely to exceed currently available housing stock for all but the most extreme and widespread hazard events.

## **Evacuation and Sheltering Needs**

The Village of Marcellus has not established emergency shelters, evacuation routes, or evacuation procedures. Per the County Emergency Management Plan, in the event of a hazard occurrence, the Department of Emergency Management is tasked with coordinating evacuation procedures with the Sheriff's Department, the On-Scene Commander, the Transportation Coordinator, the ARC, hospitals, special facilities, the fire service and the Health Department. The Sheriff's Department is responsible for implementing traffic control procedures including coordination of vehicular traffic and protection of resources, facilities and services in the affected areas. As noted in Section 4, Figure 4-19 in Volume I of this plan, the primary roads and highways are the evacuation routes for Onondaga County; the county is fortunate to have a variety of well-connected arterial and collector roadways to provide a variety of routing options during times of large-scale evacuation.

The American Red Cross (ARC) has primary contractual responsibility to provide sheltering, including short term housing, for Onondaga County individuals and families during an emergency occurring in Onondaga County. Services of the ARC include emergency sheltering needs, mass care, feeding, information and referral, and special population assistance. A confidential shelters list is maintained by the Department of Emergency Management and the ARC which identifies capacity for 15,000+ residents across Onondaga County. The ARC is responsible for maintaining shelter and temporary housing agreements with selected facilities.

## 9.22.6 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 2013 Plan. 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 9.22-11. 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 (if project statu	of Success is is <u>complete</u> )	Ne 1 2 3	xt Steps . Project to be included in 2019 HMP or Discontinue 2. If including action in the 2019 HMP, revise/reword to be more specific (as appropriate). 3. If discontinue, explain why.
						Cost Level of Protection	-	1. 2.	Include in 2019 HMP
VLP-1	Highland Drive Drainage Improvements	Flooding	Localized flooding	DPW	In Progress	Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	-	3.	-
VLP-2a	Inventory all trees on village property and street rights-of-way.	Wind, snow,	Property damage and power outages	DPW	In Progress	Cost Level of Protection	\$2,000	1. 2.	Include in 2019 HMP Conduct inventory of trees on village property and rights- of-way to identify the health of the trees; have an arborist rate the condition of all trees and list hazardous conditions.
	Have arborist rate the condition of all trees and list hazardous conditions.	ice	due to tree failure			Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	-	3.	-
						Cost	\$10,000	1.	Include in 2019 HMP
	Prune or remove at risk trees on	Wind,	Property damage			Level of Protection	-	2.	
VLP-2b	village property and street rights-of- way.	snow, ice	and power outages due to tree failure	DPW	In Progress	Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	-	3.	-





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

The Village of Marcellus has identified the following mitigation projects/activities that have also been completed but were not identified in the previous mitigation strategy in the 2013 Plan:

• The Village of Marcellus has performed ongoing maintenance projects to reduce the impact of flooding but has not identified specific mitigation projects/activities that have been completed but were not identified in the previous mitigation strategy in the 2013 Plan.

#### **Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update**

The Village of Marcellus participated in a mitigation action workshop on January 14, 2019 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).

Table 9.22-12 summarizes the comprehensive-range of specific mitigation initiatives the Village of Marcellus 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 9.22-13 provides a summary of the prioritization of all proposed mitigation initiatives for the Plan update.





## Table 9.22-12. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Project Number	Project Name	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Critical Facility (Yes / No)	EHP Issues ?	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Cost	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS
v. Marcellus- 1 (previous action)	Highland Drive Drainage Improvements	<ul> <li>Problem: Marcellus</li> <li>valley surrounded l</li> <li>village and its reside</li> <li>in the northwest qu</li> <li>issue with water con</li> <li>into the village. This</li> <li>to be getting wor</li> <li>flooding reside</li> <li>downstream and als</li> <li>damage elsewhere in</li> <li>village is not sure</li> <li>farming practices of</li> <li>are contributing to</li> <li>erosion and wate</li> <li>definitely increased</li> <li>This is a problem f</li> <li>Marcellus as well,</li> <li>originates in the town</li> <li>the village. Unfortu</li> <li>the village owns and</li> <li>treatment plant, M</li> <li>eligible for Onondag</li> <li>the Rain Pr</li> </ul> The village has hireed firm to conduct a dr the area in question, <ul> <li>and neighboring str</li> <li>the recommendation</li> <li>uniform culvert pi</li> <li>driveways on Highla</li> <li>more easily capture</li> <li>coming off the hills</li> <li>water to larger pi</li> <li>Parkway, effectively</li> <li>Mile Creek. At pres</li> <li>keeps the ditches op</li> <li>Drive, which is th</li> <li>defense against flo</li> <li>culvert pipes are eit</li> <li>inadequate or non-eit</li> </ul>	Village fies in a by hills and the ents, particularly adrant, have an ning off the hills s problem seems se each year, nts' homes o causing much the the village. The how much the ' upland farmers this, but more er runoff has in recent years. For the Town of since the water n and comes into nately, because operates its own farcellus is not ga County's Save ogram. d an engineering rainage study of Highland Drive eets, and one of is, was to install ipes under the nd Drive so as to the water that is a and divert that is and divert that is and divert that is and divert that is and ivert that is and tiver that is is to Nine sent, the village pen on Highland per on Highland per to small or wistent to handle	Severe Storm	1.4	NO	No	I year	Village Highway and Engineer	\$100,00+	Reduce/ eliminate stormwater flooding and damages to homes in the area; increase water quality; reduce erosion and runoff	Village Budget, FEMA FMA and HMGP, CDBG, BridgeNY	High	SIP, NSP	PP, N R



Project Number	Project Name	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Critical Facility (Yes / No)	EHP Issues ?	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Cost	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS
		the water off the we estimated cost for th culvert pipes on H including storm s drainage structures, and road repair, restoration as well a approximately \$50, both the Town of Ma Department and the through an IMA t municipalities agreed the work, saving mu job has been com ditches seem to be h Solution: Additional this problem in the area will ir •Deepening of ditt rights-of-way – this going •Installation of re •Creation of swales Drive some of this has bee need to be i •Dredging c	estern hills. The ie installation of ighland Drive, sewer piping, stone, driveway grading and s soft costs, was ,000. However, urcellus Highway Village. D.P.W., to which both l, were able to do ich funding. The pleted and the olding, for now. work to alleviate Highland Drive iclude: ches in village is currently on- g tention ponds above Highland e installation of m water pipes - n done but more nstalled of ponds age districts in teds												
V. Marcellus- 2	Stormwater Drainage Issues throughout village	The following roads (Coon's Pond, Flower Lane, Seneca Turnpike, Reed Street, West Main, Kelly Avenue, Meadow Street, First Street, Second Street, Highland, and Limeledge) have stormwater	The village will conduct various stormwater improvements to alleviate stormwater flooding.	Flood, Severe Storm	1,4	No	No	1 year	Village Highway and Engineer	\$100,00+	Reduce/elim inate stormwater flooding and damages to homes in the area; increase water quality; reduce	Village Budget, FEMA FMA and HMGP, CDBG, BridgeNY	High	SIP, NSP	PP, N R
		rd Mitigation Plar	n Update – Onc												





Project Number	Project Name	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Critical Facility (Yes / No)	EHP Issues ?	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Cost	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
		flooding issues due to undersized culverts, debris accumulation, and inadequate drainage systems.									erosion and runoff				
V. Marcellus- 3 (previous action)	Prune or remove at risk trees on village property and street rights-of- way.	At risk trees on village property and street rights-of- way. Falling trees or limbs may cause loss of power, damage to assets, dangerous conditions for personnel, injury or death to persons or obstruction of emergency response.	Based on the tree inventory conducted for the village, remove or prune the trees identified as high priority. This will reduce or eliminate the significant damage fallen trees can have on residents and infrastructure in the village. For the trees removed, the village will replace with new trees.	Severe Storm and Severe Winter Storm	1, 3, 4	No	No	Within 1 year	Village Highway Dept.	\$10,000	Reduce or eliminate risk of fallen trees and damages associated with trees	Village Budget, FEMA HMGP, NYSDEC Environme ntal Protection Fund	High	SIP, NSP	PP, N R
V. Marcellus- 4	Backup power for the Village Hall	Village Hall serves as the village departments and police station. The hall currently does not have a generator to provide energy to power the building during emergencies. Having the village Hall open during emergencies is	Purchase and install a backup generator to power the entire Village Hall complex.	All	1, 3, 6	Yes	No	l year	Village Board, Village Engineer	\$10,000	Full power the Village Hall and provide services to community; continuity of operations	Village Budget, FEMA FMA and HMGP	Medium	SIP	РР



Project Number	Project Name	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Critical Facility (Yes / No)	EHP Issues ?	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Cost	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Cateporry
		essential as it serves as the police station and department offices. The hall needs to be operations during emergencies to take calls, dispatch police and emergency personnel, and provide a place of refuge for residents.													
V. Marcellus- 5	Backup power for the Village DPW garage	The Village DPW garage currently does not have backup power. This poses a problem in the event of a power outage. The facility needs to continuously operate during disasters to clear debris, plow roads, and be available for emergency calls. Without power, trucks cannot be fueled as well.	Purchase and install a backup generator at the DPW garage.	All	1, 3, 6	Yes	No	1 year	Village Highway Department	\$10,000	Provide power during power outages; continuity of operations	Village Budget, FEMA FMA and HMGP	Medium	SIP	РР
V. Marcellus- 6 (previous action)	Tree Inventory for Village	Property damage and power outages due to tree failure	Inventory all trees on village property and street rights- of-way. Have arborist rate the condition of all trees and list hazardous conditions.	Severe Storm and Severe Winter Storm	1, 3, 4	No	No	Within 1 year	Village Highway Dept.	\$2,000	Identifies at- risk tress; provides a guideline for the village to use to develop program	Village Budget	High	NSP	PP, N R



Project Number	Project Name	Description of the Problem	Description of the Solution	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals Met	Critical Facility (Yes / No)	EHP Issues ?	Estimated Timeline	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Cost	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Catepory
V. Marcellus- 7	Remove trees from Nine Mile Creek	Nine Mile Creek has downed trees, resulting in potential flooding from log jams	The village will remove downed trees from Nine Mile Creek and continue to monitor for additional falling trees.	Flood, Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	1, 3, 4	No	Permitt ing for work in Creek	1 year	DPW	\$20,000	Reduce likelihood of logjam and debris caused flooding in Nine Mile Creek	HMGP, PDM, village budget	High	NSP	N R

Notes:

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

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

Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources:

Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program

FMA

HMGP

PDM

#### Acronyms and Abbreviations:

- CAV Community Assistance Visit
- CRS Community Rating System
- DPW Department of Public Works
- 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

#### 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.

#### <u>Timeline:</u>

The time required for completion of the project upon implementation

#### <u>Cost:</u>

The estimated cost for implementation.

#### <u>Benefits:</u>

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



- 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

#### <u>Critical Facility:</u>

Yes • Critical Facility located in 1% floodplain





#### Table 9.22-13. 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	Total	High / Medium / Low
V. Marcellus-1 (previous action)	Highland Drive Drainage Improvements	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	11	High
V. Marcellus-2	Stormwater Drainage Issues throughout village	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	11	High
V. Marcellus-3 (previous action)	Prune or remove at risk trees on village property and street rights-of-way.	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	11	High
V. Marcellus-4	Backup power for the Village Hall	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	9	Medium
V. Marcellus-5	Backup power for the Village DPW garage	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	8	Medium
V. Marcellus-6 (previous action)	Tree Inventory for village	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	12	High
V. Marcellus-7	Remove trees from Nine Mile Creek	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	High

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





# 9.22.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

## 9.22.8 Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development

The Village of Marcellus 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 village departments, including: the Code Official and Police Chief. The Code Official represented the community on the Onondaga 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.

Additional documentation on the municipality's planning process through Planning Partnership meetings is included in Section 3 (Planning Process) and Appendix C (Meetings).

## 9.22.9 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the Village of Marcellus that illustrate the probable areas impacted within the municipality. These maps are based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this plan, and are considered to be adequate for planning purposes. Maps have only been generated for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies, and for which the Village of Marcellus has significant exposure. A map of the Village of Marcellus hazard area extent and location is provided on the following page. This map indicates the location of the regulatory floodplain as well as identified critical facilities within the municipality.







Figure 9.22-1. Village of Marcellus Hazard Area Extent and Location Map





	A Uighland Drive Drain	ction W	orksheet							
Project Name:	Highland Drive Drainage Improvements									
Project Number:	V. Marcellus-1 (previ	ous acti	on)							
	Ris	sk / Vul	nerabilit	у						
Hazard(s) of Concern:	Flood and Severe Sto	rm								
Description of the Problem:	Marcellus Village lies particularly in the no the village. This prob downstream and also sure how much the fa erosion and water ru the Town of Marcellu village. Unfortunately Marcellus is not eligil The village has hired question, Highland D to install uniform cu easily capture the wa on Reed Parkway, eff ditches open on High culvert pipes are eith the western hills. Th Drive, including stoo repair, grading and However, both the ' through an IMA to w much funding. The jo	the village. This problem seems to be getting worse each year, flooding residents' homes downstream and also causing much damage elsewhere in the village. The village is not sure how much the farming practices of upland farmers are contributing to this, but more erosion and water runoff has definitely increased in recent years. This is a problem for the Town of Marcellus as well, since the water originates in the town and comes into the village. Unfortunately, because the village owns and operates its own treatment plant, Marcellus is not eligible for Onondaga County's Save the Rain Program. The village has hired an engineering firm to conduct a drainage study of the area in question, Highland Drive and neighboring streets, and one of the recommendations, was to install uniform culvert pipes under the driveways on Highland Drive so as to more easily capture the water that is coming off the hills and divert that water to larger pipes on Reed Parkway, effectively taking it to Nine Mile Creek. At present, the village keeps the ditches open on Highland Drive, which is the first line of defense against flooding, but the culvert pipes are either too small or inadequate or non-existent to handle the water off the western hills. The estimated cost for the installation of culvert pipes on Highland Drive, including storm sewer piping, drainage structures, stone, driveway and road repair, grading and restoration as well as soft costs, was approximately \$50,000. However, both the Town of Marcellus Highway Department and the Village. D.P.W., through an IMA to which both municipalities agreed, were able to do the work, saving much funding. The job has been completed and the ditches seem to be holding, for now. <b>Action or Project Intended for Implementation</b>								
	Action or Projec	t Intend	led for In	nplementation						
Description of the Solution:	Additional work to al Deepening Installation Creation of Removal of has been do Dredging of Creation of	lleviate t of ditche of reten swales a and ins one but r f ponds drainag	his probles es in villag ation ponce above Hig tallation of nore neece e districts	em in the Highland Di ge rights-of-way – this ls hland Drive of properly sized stor l to be installed in watersheds	rive area will include: s is currently on-going m water pipes - some of this					
Is this project related to a	a Critical Facility?	Yes		No 🖂						
Is this project related to located within the 100-	a Critical Facility year floodplain?	Yes		No 🛛						
(If yes, this project must intend	to protect the 500-year f	lood ever	it or the ac	tual worse case damage	scenario, whichever is greater)					
Level of Protection:	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided): Estimated B									
Useful Life:	30-year		Goals M	et:	1,4					
Estimated Cost:	\$100,000+	Mitigation Action Type:     Structure     and       Natural Systems Protection								
	Plan	for Imp	lementat	tion						
Prioritization:	High		Desired Implem	Timeframe for entation:	Within 6 months					
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 year	Potential Funding Sources:         Village Budget, FEMA FM. and HMGP, CDBG, BridgeN								





Pagnangihla	Village Highway	Local Planning	Hazard Mitigation, Capital
Organization	Department and Village	Mechanisms to be Used	Improvement, Stormwater
organization:	Engineer	in Implementation if any:	Management
	Three Alternatives Conside	ered (including No Action)	
	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	
	Continue maintenance of and clearing culverts of debris	\$40,000	Not a long term solution to the current issue; with every storm, more debris accumulates
Alternatives:	Acquire homes and relocate to area outside of risk zone	\$1,000,000+	Limited land in the village to relocate homes; otherwise, residents would need to move out of the village and risk the losing the tax base of those properties.
	Progress Report (for	r plan maintenance)	
Date of Status Report:			
Report of Progress:			
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:			





	Acti	on Worksheet						
Project Name:	Highland Drive Drainag	e Improvements						
Project Number:	V. Marcellus-1 (previous	s action)						
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate						
Life Safety	1							
Property Protection	1	Project will protect Highland Drive area from flooding.						
Cost-Effectiveness	1							
Technical	1							
Political	1							
Legal	1	The village has the legal authority to conduct the project.						
Fiscal	0	Project will require funding assistance.						
Environmental	1							
Social	0							
Administrative	1							
Multi-Hazard	1	Flood, Severe Storm						
Timeline	1							
Agency Champion	1	Village Highway Department and Village Engineer						
Other Community Objectives	0							
Total	11							
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High							





Action Worksheet						
Project Name:	Stormwater Drainage Issues throughout Village					
Project Number:	V. Marcellus-2					
Troject Number.	Diels / Walnesselility					
	Elood and Savore Storm					
Hazard(s) of Concern:						
Description of the Problem:	The following roads (Coon's Pond, Flower Lane, Seneca Turnpike, Reed Street, West Main, Kelly Avenue, Meadow Street, First Street, Second Street, Highland, and Limeledge) have stormwater flooding issues due to undersized culverts, debris accumulation, and inadequate drainage systems. The village has done a lot of work to reduce the issues; however, more work needs to be done. The following is what has been done in these areas: • Coon's Pond, Flower Lane & Seneca Turnpike • Continuous removal of debris from Coon's Pond outlet • Continuous removal of debris from Coon's Pond outlet • Continued dredging of Coon's Pond to eliminate silt • Deepening of ditches in back of Flower Lane properties • Use of rip-rap in Flower Lane ditches • Keeping Flower Lane ditches lane ditches • Resizing of pipes in Flower Lane ditches • Keeping flower Lane ditches clear of debris • Reed Kelly, West Main & Seneca Turnpike • Deepening of ditches in back of Reed Street properties • Use of rip-rap in Reed Street properties • Use of rip-rap in Reed Street properties • Use of rip-rap in Reed Street properties • Keeping Reed Street ditches clear of debris • Reerouting storm water from Old Seneca Turnpike to West Main • Resizing west Main Street catch basins • Meadow, Second, Highland & Limeledge • Resizing inlet catch basins on Meadow and First • Enlarging ditches in back of Meadow Street properties • Deepening of catch basins in back of Meadow Street properties • Deepening of catch basins in Sceond Street • Installation of curbing on both sides of Meadow Street • Opening and deepening of ditches on Highland • Installation of swales above Highland, on the Limeledge • First, Reed Parkway, Meadow & Second • Resizing inlet catch basins on Second Street • Deepening of catch basins on Second S					
Description of the Solution:	<ul> <li>issues in these areas:</li> <li>Coon's Pond, Flower Lane &amp; Seneca Turnpike         <ul> <li>Conduct a drainage study to identify the best solutions</li> <li>Keeping ditches clear of debris in back of private properties - urge residents to do this</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					





	<ul> <li>Removal of and installation of properly sized storm water pipes - som of this loss have always</li> </ul>					me	
	of this has been done						
	<ul> <li>Dreaging of ponds</li> <li>Creation of drainage districts in watersheds</li> </ul>						
	Reed, Kelly, West Main & Seneca Turnpike						
	<ul> <li>Updated Drainage Study - we have done several of these</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Deepening of ditches in village rights-of-way - on-going</li> </ul>						
	Meadow, Second, Highland & Limeledge						
	0 UI	pdated D	Prainage S	Study - we hav	ve done	several of these	
	<ul> <li>Deepening of ditches in village rights-of-way - on-going</li> <li>Installation of naturalize</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Installation of retention ponds</li> <li>Creation of drainage districts in watersheds</li> </ul>						
	Creation of drainage districts in watersneds     First, Reed Parkway, Meadow & Second						
	o Up	pdated D	Prainage S	Study - we hav	ve done	several of these	
	0 Ke	eeping d	litches cle	ear of debris	in back	of private properties - u	rge
	re	sidents t	to do this	1		1	
		reation o	of drainag		watersn	eas	
Is this project related to a	a Critical Facility?	Yes		NO 🖂			
located within the 100-year floodplain? Yes				No 🛛			
(If yes, this project must intend	to protect the 500-year fl	lood even	it or the ac	tual worse case	e damage	scenario, whichever is greate	er)
	100-year event					Reduce/eliminate	nd
			Estimat	ed Benefits		damages to homes in t	the
Level of Protection:			(losses	avoided):		area; increase wa	ter
				-		quality; reduce erosion a	and
						runoff	
Useful Life:	30-year		Goals Met:		1,4		
	\$100,000+		Million Lines Antines Trees		Structure	1	
Estimated Cost			Mitigat	ion Action T		Infractructure Droi	and
Estimated Cost:			Mitigat	ion Action Ty	ype:	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti	and ect, ion
Estimated Cost:	Plan	for Imp	Mitigat lementa	ion Action Ty tion	ype:	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti	and ect, ion
Estimated Cost:	Plan High	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desireo	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months	and ect, ion
Estimated Cost: Prioritization:	Plan High	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation:	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months	and ect, ion
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project	Plan High 1 year	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation: al Funding	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMCP, CDBC, Bridge	and ect, ion MA
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	Plan High 1 year	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Source	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation: al Funding S:	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge	and ect, ion MA NY
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	Plan High 1 year Village DPW to i	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation: al Funding S: lanning	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA F and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap	and ect, ion MA NY ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan       High       1 year       Village DPW to i project; hired contri	for Imp nitiate ractors	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe nentation: al Funding s: lanning nisms to be U	ype: for	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa	and ect, ion MA NY ital ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan High 1 year Village DPW to i project; hired contr to complete the proje	for Imp nitiate ractors ect	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe lentation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation	ype: for (sed if any:	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management	and ect, ion MA NY ital ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan High 1 year Village DPW to i project; hired contr to complete the proje Three Alternatives	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion l Timeframe entation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation i cluding No Action	ype: for (sed if any: ction)	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management	and ect, ion MA NY ital ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan       High       1 year       Village DPW to i       project; hired contr       to complete the proje       Three Alternatives       Action       No Action	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe nentation: al Funding s: lanning tisms to be U ementation i duding No Ado stimated Cos	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA FI and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management Evaluation	And ect, ion MA NY ital ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan       High       1 year       Village DPW to i       project; hired contr       to complete the proje       Three Alternatives       Action       No Action	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino Es	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: lanning disms to be U ementation i duding No Action stimated Cos \$0	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management Evaluation	and ect, ion MA MA NY ital ital
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan High 1 year Village DPW to i project; hired contr to complete the proje Three Alternatives Action No Action Elevate the streets	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino E:	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: lanning isms to be U ementation i luding No Ac stimated Cos \$0	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures	MA MA NY ital tter
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contri         to complete the proje         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this and	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: al Funding s: lanning sisms to be U ementation i luding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fi and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads homes, and structures would need to be elevated	And ect, ion MA NY ital ital iter
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contribution         to complete the project         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation i eluding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA F and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som	MA MA NYY ital tter
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contrito complete the project         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe nentation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation i huding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA FI and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management Evaluation Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete	MA MA NY ital iter , s eed; ne
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contr         to complete the projet         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenand	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside and rea of nce of	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino E:	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: lanning isms to be U ementation i luding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue: with	MA ect, ion MA NY ital ital iter , s s eed; ne
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contrine         to complete the projecomplete the projecomplete         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenar         and clearing culver	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside and rea of nce of ts of	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implen Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation: al Funding s: lanning tisms to be U ementation i luding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: :tion) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr	And ect, ion MA MA NY ital ital ital tter , s ed; ne ito n cis
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contrist complete the projet complete the projet         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets structures in this ar the Village         Continue maintenar and clearing culver debris	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside and rea of nce of rts of	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implem Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe ientation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation i ruding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fr and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr accumulates	And ect, ion MA NY ital ital ital itar , s ed; ne i to n fis
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contrito complete the project         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenar         and clearing culver         debris         Progress Rep	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside and rea of ince of rts of	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implem Potenti Sources Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino Es	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe entation: al Funding s: lanning tisms to be U ementation i cluding No Action stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000 \$40,000	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA FI and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management Evaluation Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr accumulates	And ect, ion MA MA NY ital ital iter , s ed; ne ed; ne to n 'is
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives: Date of Status Report:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contripert to complete the project         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenar         and clearing culver         debris         Progress Rep	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implem Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino Es	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe tentation: al Funding s: al Funding s: lanning tisms to be U ementation i duding No Action stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000 \$40,000	ype: for sed if any: t t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA F1 and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr accumulates	And ect, ion MA NY ital ital ital itar , s ed; ne ito n ris
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives: Date of Status Report: Report of Progress:	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contribution         to complete the projection         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenar         and clearing culver         debris         Progress Rep	for Imp initiate ractors ect Conside and rea of rea of rts of	Mitigat lementa Desireo Implen Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (ino Es	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe nentation: al Funding s: lanning tisms to be U ementation i luding No Action stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000 \$50,000,000 \$40,000	ype: for (sed (f any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr accumulates	And ect, ion MA MA NY ital ital iter , s s eed; ne i to n ris
Estimated Cost: Prioritization: Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation: Responsible Organization: Alternatives: Date of Status Report: Report of Progress: Update Evaluation of the	Plan         High         1 year         Village DPW to i         project; hired contrist complete the project         Three Alternatives         Action         No Action         Elevate the streets         structures in this ar         the Village         Continue maintenar         and clearing culver         debris         Progress Rep	for Imp	Mitigat lementa Desirec Implem Potenti Source: Local P Mechar in Impl ered (inc E:	ion Action Ty tion I Timeframe eentation: al Funding s: lanning hisms to be U ementation i ruding No Ac stimated Cos \$0 \$50,000,000 \$40,000 hintenance)	ype: for (sed if any: ction) t	Infrastructure Proje Natural Systems Protecti Within 6 months Village Budget, FEMA Fl and HMGP, CDBG, Bridge Hazard Mitigation, Cap Improvement, Stormwa Management <b>Evaluation</b> Not feasible; all roads, homes, and structures would need to be elevate project would take som time to complete Not a long term solution the current issue; with every storm, more debr accumulates	and ect, ion MA NY ital tter , s ed; ne to n :is





Action Worksheet							
Project Name:	Stormwater Drainage Issues throughout Village						
Project Number:	V. Marcellus-2						
Criteria	Numeric RankProvide brief rationale for numeric rank whe (-1, 0, 1)						
Life Safety	1	Project will reduce flooding risk					
Property Protection	1	Project will reduce stormwater flooding issues					
Cost-Effectiveness	1						
Technical	1						
Political	1						
Legal	1	The village has the legal authority to conduct the project					
Fiscal	0						
Environmental	1						
Social	0						
Administrative	1						
Multi-Hazard	1	Flood, Severe Storm					
Timeline	1	1 year					
Agency Champion	1	Village DPW					
Other Community Objectives	0						
Total	11						
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High						

