












MUNICIPAL ANNEX | Village of North Syracuse



 <p>Total Population (2010 Census)</p> <p>6,800</p>	 <p>Total Number of Buildings</p> <p>3,297</p>	 <p>Number of National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Policies and Percent in Regulatory Floodplain</p> <p>5 (%)</p>	 <p>Total Agricultural Land (acres)</p> <p>4.5</p>
 <p>Total Land (square miles)</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>Percent of Buildings in Regulatory Floodplain</p> <p><1%</p>	<p>Number of Repetitive Loss (RL) Properties</p> <p>0</p>	 <p>Harmful Algal Bloom Impacted Waterbody</p> <p>No</p>
 <p>Proposed Project Types</p>	<p>Local Plans and Regulations, Structure and Infrastructure Projects, and Education and Awareness Programs</p>	 <p>Mitigation Focus</p>	<p>Severe Storm Severe Winter Storm</p>



9.24 VILLAGE OF NORTH SYRACUSE

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Village of North Syracuse. 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 North Syracuse’s risk and vulnerability; the different capabilities utilized in the village; and an action plan that will be implemented to achieve a more resilient community.

9.24.1 Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

The following individuals have been identified as the Village of North Syracuse’s hazard mitigation plan primary and alternate points of contact.

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Name: Gary Butterfield Title: Mayor Phone Number: 315-458-0900 Address: 600 South Bay Rd., North Syracuse, NY 13212 Email: mayor@northsyracuse.ny.gov	Name: Ed Ware Title: DPW Superintendent Phone Number: 315-458-0790 Address: 600 South Bay Rd., North Syracuse, NY 13212 Email: dpw@northsyracuse.ny.gov
Floodplain Administrator	
Name: Brian Johnstone Title: Codes Enforcement Officer Phone Number: 315-458-4763 Address: 600 South Bay Rd., North Syracuse, NY 13212 Email: bjohnstone@northsyracuse.ny.gov	

9.24.2 Municipal Profile

The Village of North Syracuse lies in the northeastern interior of Onondaga County in western New York State. The Village of North Syracuse has a total area of 2.0 square miles. It is the first village approximately 7 miles north of the City of Syracuse and is situated on the road to Watertown and the North Country. US Route 11 passes through the village. Interstate 81 passes along the east side of the village. The Village of North Syracuse is located on the border the Towns of Cicero and Clay. US Route 11 passes through the village. Refer to Section 9.5 (Town of Cicero) and Section 9.6 (Town of Clay) for their individual annex. The estimated 2016 population was 6,679, a 1.8 percent decrease in population from the 2010 Census (6,800). The Village of North Syracuse is governed by a mayor and four trustees.

Data from the 2016 U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates that 7.7 percent of the village population is five years of age or younger, and 18.4 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

The region surrounding the Village of North Syracuse was first settled during the early nineteenth century. Written records indicate that James Millard first settled the area adjacent to the present-day village in 1810. Prior to this time, the area that is now Main Street served as part of an Indian footpath that extended from Pennsylvania to the St. Lawrence River. The Indian footpath, which was known as the Thousand Island Trail, was later utilized to transport salt from Onondaga Lake to Brewerton as the Onondaga Lake Salt Industry developed. The Salt Road, as it became known, was and continues to be an important transportation corridor. During the middle of





the nineteenth century, seasonal conditions prevented the Salt Road from being utilized year-round, so plans were made to create the nation’s first plank road.

The real beginning of the village was the activity aroused by the opening of this Plank Road and "Podunk" became "Centerville" in 1896 with two streets running off the Plank Road. The new post office was called the Plank Road Post Office in honor of the novel highway just completed and was located in the Palmer House, which was at 210 South Main Street. The village retained the name of "Centerville" until about 1880 when citizens requested the Postmaster General to grant a change to its present name of "North Syracuse." The Village of North Syracuse was incorporated on November 30, 1925, an area extending one-mile north, east, south and west from the village center at Church and Main Street.

Among the first settlers, the Ferguson family located there in 1826. They still occupy the same land located in what is now the village center. Many local streets are named in their honor. On July 18, 1846, the United States' first plank road opened in North Syracuse, primarily for salt transportation. The road cost \$23,000, was 16-1/2 miles long and planked its entire length. Thomas Alvord, State Legislator, who later became Lieutenant Governor helped secure the passage of an Act to construct, maintain and collect tolls. There were four tollgates about four miles apart that were operated by the company which was a profitable enterprise for many years.

In 1907, an important event affecting the village was the completion of the Syracuse and South Bay Trolley line. This ended the usefulness of the old stagecoach which for many years had carried mail and passengers to and from the City of Syracuse.

Growth/Development Trends

The Village of North Syracuse 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 9.24-1. 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.*

9.24.3 Hazard Event History Specific to the Village of North Syracuse

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 North Syracuse’s 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 9.24-2 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 9.24-2. Hazard Event History

Dates of Event	Event Type (Disaster Declaration if applicable)	Onondaga County Designated?	Summary of Event	Municipal Summary of Damages and Losses
April – May 2011	Severe Storms, Flooding, Tornadoes, and Straight-Line Winds (FEMA-DR-1993)	Yes	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Although the county was impacted, the village did not report damages.
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	<p>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.</p>	Although the county was impacted, the village did not report damages.

Notes:

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





9.24.4 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 North Syracuse. For additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction, refer to Section 5.0.

Hazard Risk Ranking

Table 9.24-3 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 North Syracuse. The Village of North Syracuse 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:

- Severe storms and severe winter storms affect the infrastructure due to downed trees as a result of high winds and ice on the utility lines. By inventory and maintenance of trees, the village hopes to reduce the economic impact of major wind and ice storms.
- The village adjusted the drought hazard ranking from high to low due to its lack of agricultural base and reliance on well or surface water.
- The village agreed with the remainder of the calculated risk rankings.

Table 9.24-3. Village of North Syracuse 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	High	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 of 3.9 – 4.9
 Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 3.8
 *The municipality changed the initial ranking of this hazard based on event history, municipal experience, and feedback from the municipality

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 <http://tinyurl.com/6-CRR-NY-502-4>. 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 (NYS DHSES 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 9.24-4. Potential Flood Losses to Critical Facilities

Name	Type	Exposure		Potential Loss from 1% Flood Event		Addressed by Proposed Action
		1% Event	0.2% Event	Percent Structure Damage	Percent Content Damage	
None identified						

Source: FEMA 2016, SOPA 2018

Identified Issues

The municipality has identified the following vulnerabilities within their community:

- The Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District is flat and heavily urbanized making the lowest areas extremely vulnerable to rain-event flooding that approach or exceed 5-year storms.
- Outdated communication system poses threat during all hazard events when communication is key.
- Overhead utilities vulnerable during severe storm and severe winter storm events on State Road

9.24.5 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 North Syracuse.

Table 9.24-5. 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, August 2004	Local	Village of North Syracuse	“Village of North Syracuse – Comprehensive Plan 2025”
Capital Improvements Plan	No	-	-	-





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.)
Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	No	-	-	-
Stormwater Management Plan	Yes, 10/11/2007	Local	DPW / Codes	Chapter 201 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
Open Space Plan	No	-	-	-
Stream Corridor Management Plan	No	-	-	-
Watershed Management or Protection Plan	No	-	-	-
Economic Development Plan	No	-	-	-
Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan	Yes	Local	Village of North Syracuse	Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan
Emergency Operation Plan	Yes	Local	Village	Emergency Operations Plan Updated 2018
Evacuation Plan	Yes	Local	Village	Emergency Operations Plan Updated 2018
Post-Disaster Recovery Plan	Yes	Local	Village	Emergency Operations Plan Updated 2018
Transportation Plan	No	-	-	-
Strategic Recovery Planning Report	No	-	-	-
Climate Adaptation Plan	No	-	-	-
Resilience Plan	No	-	-	-
Other Plans:	No	-	-	-
Regulatory Capability				
Building Code	Yes	State	Codes	NYS Building Code
Zoning Ordinance	Yes	Local	Codes	Chapter 240 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
Subdivision Ordinance	Yes	Local	Codes	Chapter 240 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Yes	Local	Codes	Chapter 21 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
NFIP: Cumulative Substantial Damages	No	-	-	-
NFIP: Freeboard	Yes	State	Codes	State mandated BFE+2 for all construction, both residential and non-residential
Growth Management Ordinances	No	-	-	-
Site Plan Review Requirements	Yes	Local	Planning	Planning Board
Stormwater Management Ordinance	Yes, 10/11/17	Local	Codes	Chapter 201 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)	Yes	Local	Codes	Chapter 201 of the Village of North Syracuse Code
Natural Hazard Ordinance	Yes	Local	Codes	Emergency Operations Plan Updated 2018



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.)
Post-Disaster Recovery Ordinance	Yes	Local	Codes	Emergency Operations Plan Updated 2018
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 North Syracuse.

Table 9.24-5. Administrative and Technical Capabilities

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



Fiscal Capability

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

Table 9.24-6. Fiscal Capabilities

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to Use (Yes/No)
Community development Block Grants (CDBG, CDBG-DR)	Yes – FFD – NSPD and Village Clerk
Capital improvements project funding	Yes – FFD – NSPD and Village Clerk
Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes	Yes
User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	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	No
Incur debt through private activity bonds	No
Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No
Other federal or state Funding Programs	Yes – FFD – NSPD and Village Clerk
Open Space Acquisition funding programs	No
Other	No

Community Classifications

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

Table 9.24-7. 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)	No	-	-
Public Protection (ISO Fire Protection Classes 1 to 10)	Yes	2	Village owned FFD
NYSDEC Climate Smart Community	No	-	-
Storm Ready Certification	No	-	-
Firewise Communities classification	No	-	-
Natural disaster/safety programs in/for schools	No	-	-
Organizations with mitigation focus (advocacy group, non-government)	No	-	-
Public education program/outreach (through website, social media)	Yes	-	Fire and Police Community Outreach Programs
Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues	Yes	-	Fire and Police Community Outreach Programs YES – FFD – NSPD and Village Clerk
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 (<https://www.isomitigation.com/bcegs/>)
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO’s Public Protection website at <https://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/>
- 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 North Syracuse’s capability to work in a hazard-mitigation capacity and/or effectively implement hazard mitigation strategies to reduce hazard vulnerabilities.

Table 9.24-8. Self-Assessment Capability for the Municipality

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

National Flood Insurance Program

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



NFIP Floodplain Administrator (FPA)

Brian Johnstone, Codes Enforcement Officer

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary

The Village of North Syracuse maintains lists/inventories of properties that have been flood damaged and identifies property owners who are interested in mitigation. The village does not make substantial damage estimates.

The following table summarizes the NFIP statistics for the Village of North Syracuse.

Table 9.24-9. NFIP Summary

Municipality	# Policies	# Claims (Losses)	Total Loss Payments	# RL Properties	# SRL Properties	# Policies in the 1% Flood Boundary
Village of North Syracuse	5	3	\$0	0	0	0

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 Onondaga 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. NFIP administration services and functions include permit review and inspections. The village does not provide education or outreach to the community regarding flood hazards/risk and flood risk reduction. The FPA noted that they do not have access to resources to determine possible future flooding conditions from climate change. 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 FPA is unsure if the Village of North Syracuse is in good-standing in the NFIP. According to data from NYSDEC, the village has not had a compliance audit [e.g. Community Assistance Visit (CAV)]. The village works to maintain compliance with and good-standing in the NFIP through adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements (e.g. regulating all new and substantially improved construction in Special Hazard Flood Areas), floodplain identification and mapping, and flood insurance outreach to the community.

Regulatory

The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance for the Village of North Syracuse meets FEMA and State minimum standards. 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.

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-to-day 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 Village of North Syracuse Comprehensive Plan and Generic Environmental Impact Statement 2025 (Comprehensive Plan) was adopted by the village in 2004. It envisions the future Village of North Syracuse as a vibrant, quaint place with beautiful parks and a village center that is inviting to both residents and shoppers. One primary goal of the Plan is to maintain and enhance the village's infrastructure and facilities, specifically recommending that the village collaborate more with local agencies for future improvements to water and sewer services. The plan also recommends that the village work with Cornell Cooperative Extension to create a village Forest Master plan, particularly focused on protecting, maintaining and replanting appropriate tree species within the village to help maintain its character. In particular, the Northern Transition Area located along Route 11 between Lyndhurst Avenue and Tuller Road is envisioned to be a tree-lined corridor with land uses focused on serving commuters and local residents' needs.

Stormwater Management Plan: The Village of North Syracuse 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.

Onondaga County Hazard Mitigation Plan: The Village of North Syracuse supports the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan. The village supports County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.

Emergency Plans: The Village of North Syracuse has a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. The village continues to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.

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, a Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government (COOP/COG) plan(s), 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 information on natural hazard risk and resilience and refer to the Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Regulatory and Enforcement (Ordinances)

Existing Integration

The village has multiple ordinances pertaining to the mitigation of hazards. These ordinances include the Establishment of Boards (see Operational and Administration below), Fire Prevention Ordinance, Floodplain Management Ordinance, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision of Land Ordinance. The village also adheres to the New York State Fire Prevention and Building Code. The municipal Code and ordinances are available on the village website (<http://northsyracuseny.org/>).

The Village of North Syracuse's 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 are provided with access to the County Planning/CHA to guide their decisions with respect to natural hazard risk management. The village has a tree ordinance which provides requirements regarding the management of dead and diseased tree on private property. Zoning also addressed the species of trees and where they can be planted.

Zoning Ordinance: The Village of North Syracuse Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 240), most recently updated in 2016, includes Planned Development Districts designed to address future development of sensitive environmental features.

Opportunities for Future Integration

The village has winter parking ordinances that address parking on village roads to allow snow removal during winter storm events as well as the above referenced tree ordinance so it has effectively addressed integration of mitigation in regulatory and enforcement of ordinances.

Operational and Administration

Existing Integration

Planning Board/Zoning Board of Appeals: The village has established a Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals to address land use decisions, public health and safety and assure compliance with regulations, ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan.

Retrofitting/Removal of Structures from Hazard Prone Areas: Where appropriate, the Village of North Syracuse supports the retrofitting, purchase, or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. The village works to identify facilities that are viable candidates for each strategy based on cost-effectiveness. Implementation of these actions are based on available funding.

Mutual Aid Agreements: The Village of North Syracuse works to create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities.

Stream Team Program: The Village of North Syracuse supports/participates in the Stream Team program offered by the Onondaga County SWCD, to assist in the removal of debris, log jams, etc. in flood vulnerable stream sections.

Tree Survey: The Village conducts a large and aging tree survey and has a tree maintenance/removal program.

The Village of North Syracuse has a Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Adjustments. The village does not have other boards or committees that include functions with respect to managing natural hazard risk. NFIP Floodplain Management functions are performed by the Codes Enforcement Officer. Stormwater Management functions are performed by the Department of Public Works. The village does not have staff or contract with firms that have experience with developing Benefit-Cost Analysis, can perform Substantial Damage Estimates, or have experience in preparing grant applications for mitigation projects. No village staff have job descriptions that involve natural hazard risk and no staff participate in associations, organizations, groups or other committees that support natural hazard risk reduction and build hazard management capabilities, but staff receive training or continuing professional education which supports natural hazard risk reduction. The village does not have other hazard management programs in place.



Opportunities for Future Integration

The village could hire staff or contract with firms that have experience with developing Benefit-Cost Analysis, can perform Substantial Damage Estimates, or have experience in preparing grant applications for mitigation projects.

Funding

Existing Integration

The Village of North Syracuse 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 state and federal sources, such as the NYS Department of Environmental 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 North Syracuse operates a municipal website (<http://northsyracuse.ny.org/>) 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, general information for village residents, and links to the Code of the Village of North Syracuse, Village of North Syracuse's Comprehensive Plan 2025, and related ordinances (see Regulatory and Enforcement).

The village conducts and facilitates community and public education and outreach for residents and businesses to include, but is not be limited to, the following to promote and effect natural hazard risk reduction:

- Provide and maintain links to the Onondaga County HMP website, and regularly post notices on the municipal homepage referencing the Onondaga County HMP webpages.
- Prepare and distribute informational letters to flood vulnerable property owners and neighborhood associations, explaining the availability of mitigation grant funding to mitigate their properties, and instructing them on how they can learn more and implement mitigation.
- Use the village email notification systems and newsletters to better educate the public on flood insurance, the availability of mitigation grant funding, and personal natural hazard risk reduction measures.
- Work with neighborhood associations, civic and business groups to disseminate information on flood insurance and the availability of mitigation grant funding.



Opportunities for Future Integration

The village could include information on natural hazards on the village website.

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 North Syracuse has not identified potential sites for the placement of temporary housing for residents displaced by a disaster or potential sites suitable for relocating houses of the floodplain and/or building new homes once properties in the floodplain are acquired. For temporary housing locations, the county identified potential locations throughout the county, as shown in Section 4 (County Profile), Table 4-3 and Figure 4-18. 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 North Syracuse 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.

9.24.6 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 9.24-10. Status of Previous Mitigation Actions

Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	Evaluation of Success (if project status is complete)		Next Steps 1. 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	
VNS-1a	Where appropriate, support retrofitting of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. Identify facilities that are viable candidates for retrofitting based on cost-effectiveness versus relocation. Where retrofitting is determined to be a viable option, consider implementation of that action based on available funding.	Flood, severe storm		Municipal officials and floodplain admins supported by SOCPA and EM	Ongoing Capability			1. Discontinue 2. 3. Ongoing capability
VNS-1b	Where appropriate, support purchase, or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. Identify facilities that are viable candidates for relocation based on cost-effectiveness versus retrofitting. Where relocation is determined to be a viable option, consider implementation of that action based on available funding.	Flood, severe storm		Municipal officials and floodplain admins supported by SOCPA and EM	Ongoing Capability			1. Discontinue 2. 3. Ongoing capability
VNS-2	Conduct and facilitate community and public education and outreach for residents and businesses to include, but not be limited to, the following to promote and effect natural hazard risk reduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and maintain links to the Onondaga County HMP website, and regularly post notices on the municipal homepage referencing the Onondaga County HMP webpages. • Prepare and distribute informational letters to flood vulnerable property owners and neighborhood associations, explaining the availability of mitigation grant funding to mitigate their properties, and instructing them on how they can learn more and implement mitigation. • Use the village email notification systems and newsletters to better educate the public on flood insurance, the availability of mitigation grant funding, and personal natural hazard risk reduction measures. • Work with neighborhood associations, civic and business groups to disseminate information on flood insurance and the availability of mitigation grant funding. Municipal outreach activities to be supported by the County, as identified at County initiative OC-0.							
	See above.	All Hazards	N/A	Municipal officials and floodplain admins	Ongoing Capability	Cost		1. Discontinue 2.





Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	Evaluation of Success (if project status is complete)		Next Steps 1. 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.
				supported by SOCPA and EM		Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-3	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0	All Hazards		Municipality	Ongoing Capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-4	Maintain compliance with and good-standing in the NFIP including adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements (e.g. regulating all new and substantially improved construction in Special Hazard Flood Areas), floodplain identification and mapping, and flood insurance outreach to the community. Further meet and/or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria through the following NFIP-related continued compliance actions identified as Initiatives VS-1a, 1b, 2, 8 and 9.	All Hazards		Municipal officials and floodplain admins supported by SOCPA and EM	Ongoing Capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-5	Continue to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.	All Hazards		Municipal EM with County EM support	Ongoing Capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-6	Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities.	All Hazards		Local EM and DPW	Ongoing Capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-7				Local Depts		Cost		1. Discontinue





Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	Evaluation of Success (if project status is complete)		Next Steps 1. 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.
						Level of Protection	Cost	
	Support County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.	All Hazards			Ongoing Capability	Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-8	Support/Participate in the Stream Team program offered by the Onondaga County SWCD, to assist in the removal of debris, log jams, etc. in flood vulnerable stream sections.	Flood, severe storm		County	Ongoing Capability	Level of Protection		1. Discontinue
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		2.
						Cost		3. Ongoing capability
VNS-9	The Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District is flat and heavily urbanized making the lowest areas extremely vulnerable to rain-event flooding that approach or exceed 5-year storms. Conduct /support a more detailed topographic study in the identified critical areas in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study to determine which individual properties are most at risk to assist with determining mitigation actions.	Flood, severe storm		OC Dept of Water Environment Protection, Village	In Progress	Level of Protection		1. Include in 2019 HMP
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		2.
						Cost		3.
VNS-10	Establish communication within the village between DPW, Fire and Police to new County radio system.	All Hazards		Municipality, Local EM	In Progress	Level of Protection		1. Include in 2019 HMP
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		2.
						Cost		3.
VNS-11	Secure all overhead utilities underground on State Road.	Severe storm, severe winter storm		Municipality, Local EM	In Progress	Level of Protection		1. Include in 2019 HMP
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		2.
						Cost		3.
VNS-12	Conduct a large and aging tree survey, and develop and implement	Severe storm, severe		Municipality, Local EM	Ongoing Capability	Level of Protection		1. Discontinue
						Cost		2.





Project #	Project	Hazard(s) Addressed	Brief Summary of the Original Problem	Responsible Party	Status (In Progress, Ongoing, No Progress, Complete)	Evaluation of Success (if project status is complete)		Next Steps
	an appropriate tree maintenance/removal program.	winter storm				Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		1. 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. 3. Ongoing capability



Completed Mitigation Initiatives Not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy

The Village of North Syracuse 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 North Syracuse 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 North Syracuse 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 9.24-11 summarizes the comprehensive-range of specific mitigation initiatives the Village of North Syracuse 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 9.24-12 provides a summary of the prioritization of all proposed mitigation initiatives for the Plan update.



Table 9.24-11. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Project Number	Project Name	Goals Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of Problem	Description of Solution?	Critical Facility (Yes/No)	Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Issues	Estimated Timeline	Lead Agency	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
V. North Syracuse-1 (former VNS-9)	Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District	1, 2, 3	Flood, Severe Storm	The Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District is flat and heavily urbanized making the lowest areas extremely vulnerable to rain-event flooding that approach or exceed 5-year storms. This occurs about three time a year. This flooding impacts Centerville Road creating unsafe conditions with about 18 inch deep water on the roadway. Although historically the village does not close the road, it presents a life safety issue which is expected to get worse in the future. This road provides access to senior	Phase 1: Conduct /support a more detailed topographic study in the critical area to identify the solution to lessen or eliminate flooding in the area based on the results of the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study to determine mitigation actions. Phase 2: Implement the identified solution.	No	None	2 years	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection, village	\$250,000	Reduce response costs, increase public safety, improve life of road, maintain access to critical facilities during flood events up to the 50-year event.	FEMA HMA; District/County/Local budgets	Medium	LPR, SIP	SP



Table 9.24-11. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Project Number	Project Name	Goals Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of Problem	Description of Solution?	Critical Facility (Yes/No)	Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Issues	Estimated Timeline	Lead Agency	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
				housing and senior living facility as well as the community center that can be used for sheltering. Location: 651 Centerville Place											
V. North Syracuse c-2	Tree Removal Program	1, 3	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	The Village of North Syracuse is a Tree City USA, as recognized by the Arbor Day Foundation. While the DPW maintains the street trees in the community, they do not have a program to remove dead trees in the village. Due to the numerous dead trees in the village, the infrastructure is at risk to tree damage. Downed trees can block roadways, impacting the response time of emergency	The village would like to train the DPW on the process of tree removal, purchase a bucket truck to implement the program, purchase safety equipment and associated tools to maintain the equipment.	No	None	1 year	Village DPW	\$100,000	Maintain uninterrupted power to all facilities including critical facilities, this also maintains life safety and emergency response routes to support life safety	Village budget, HMGP	Medium	LPR	PR



Table 9.24-11. Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives

Project Number	Project Name	Goals Met	Hazard(s) to be Mitigated	Description of Problem	Description of Solution?	Critical Facility (Yes/No)	Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Issues	Estimated Timeline	Lead Agency	Estimated Costs	Estimated Benefits	Potential Funding Sources	Priority	Mitigation Category	CRS Category
				personnel and lead to road closures. Trees can also fall on power lines, causing power outages.											
V. North Syracuse-3	Tree Mitigation Education Program	2, 4	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	Residents are unaware of the hazards of dead trees on their property	Develop an education and outreach program including brochures, website articles, Facebook outreach article through Village Police Department website and other social outlets	No	No	2 years	DPW	Approximately \$2,000 per mailer	High	Village operating budget or HMA grants	High	EAP	PI



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.

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

Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources:

FMA	Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program
HMGP	Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
PDM	Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program

Timeline:

The time required for completion of the project upon implementation

Cost:

The estimated cost for implementation.

Benefits:

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

Mitigation Category:

- Local Plans and Regulations (LPR) – These actions include government authorities, policies or codes that influence the way land and buildings are being developed and built.
- Structure and Infrastructure Project (SIP) - These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazard area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct manmade structures to reduce the impact of hazards.
- Natural Systems Protection (NSP) – These are actions that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems.
- Education and Awareness Programs (EAP) – These are actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. These actions may also include participation in national programs, such as StormReady and Firewise Communities

CRS Category:

- Preventative Measures (PR) - Government, administrative or regulatory actions, or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.
- Property Protection (PP) - These actions include public activities to reduce hazard losses or actions that involve (1) modification of existing buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or (2) removal of the structures from the hazard area. Examples include acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofits, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
- Public Information (PI) - Actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Such actions include outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and educational programs for school-age children and adults.
- Natural Resource Protection (NR) - Actions that minimize hazard loss and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. These actions include sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
- Structural Flood Control Projects (SP) - Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Such structures include dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.
- Emergency Services (ES) - Actions that protect people and property during and immediately following a disaster or hazard event. Services include warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities

Critical Facility:

Yes ♦ Critical Facility located in 1% floodplain





Table 9.24-12. 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. North Syracuse-1 (former VNS-9)	Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	8	Medium
V. North Syracuse-2	Tree Removal Program	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	6	Medium
V. North Syracuse-3	Tree Mitigation Education Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	13	High

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



9.24.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.24.8 Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development

The Village of North Syracuse 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 mayor, Code Enforcement and DPW. The mayor 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).

9.24.9 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the Village of North Syracuse 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 North Syracuse has significant exposure. A map of the Village of North Syracuse 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 9.24-1. Village of North Syracuse Hazard Area Extent and Location Map





Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District		
Project Number:	V. North Syracuse-1		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard(s) of Concern:	Flood, severe storm		
Description of the Problem:	The Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District is flat and heavily urbanized making the lowest areas extremely vulnerable to rain-event flooding that approach or exceed 5-year storms. This occurs about three time a year. This flooding impacts Centerville Road creating unsafe conditions with about 18 inch deep water on the roadway. Although historically the village does not close the road, it presents a life safety issue which is expected to get worse in the future. This road provides access to senior housing and senior living facility as well as the community center that can be used for sheltering. Location: 651 Centerville Place		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	Phase 1: Conduct /support a more detailed topographic study in the critical area to identify the solution to lessen or eliminate flooding in the area based on the results of the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study to determine mitigation actions. Phase 2: Implement the identified solution.		
Is this project related to a Critical Facility?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Is this project related to a Critical Facility located within the 100-year floodplain?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(If yes, this project must intend to protect the 500-year flood event or the actual worse case damage scenario, whichever is greater)			
Level of Protection:	50-year storm	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Reduce response costs, increase public safety, improve life of road, maintain access to critical facilities during flood events up to the 50 year event.
Useful Life:	30 years	Goals Met:	1, 2, 3
Estimated Cost:	\$250,000	Mitigation Action Type:	Local Plans and Regulations, Structure and Infrastructure Project
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	Medium	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	Within 5 years
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	2 years	Potential Funding Sources:	FEMA HMA; District/County/Local budgets
Responsible Organization:	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection, Village	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:	Hazard Mitigation Plan, HMGP and PDM funding, CHIPS
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	Conditions continue and affect access to facilities and prevent entry to the potential shelter.
	Upgrade storm water management system	\$200,000	Budget is not available for the study or implementation.
	Elevate road to the 20 year storm event.	\$250,000	It is not feasible to elevate the road as it would exacerbate property flooding in the vicinity.



Progress Report (for plan maintenance)	
Date of Status Report:	
Report of Progress:	
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	



Action Worksheet		
Project Name:	Bear Trap-Ley Creek Drainage District	
Project Number:	V. North Syracuse-1	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	This will maintain connectivity to the senior and shelter facilities.
Property Protection	0	
Cost-Effectiveness	1	The cost is in line with the life safety benefits.
Technical	1	This is a long term solution.
Political	1	The Village Board is supportive.
Legal	0	The road is owned by the village-need support of the County to connect to its stormwater system.
Fiscal	0	
Environmental	0	
Social	1	This will be helpful to the senior residents and will not have negative impacts.
Administrative	1	
Multi-Hazard	0	
Timeline	1	
Agency Champion	1	Village Board
Other Community Objectives	0	
Total	8	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	Medium	



Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Tree Removal Program		
Project Number:	V. North Syracuse-2		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard(s) of Concern:	Severe Storm and Severe Winter Storm		
Description of the Problem:	The Village of North Syracuse is a Tree City USA, as recognized by the Arbor Day Foundation. While the DPW maintains the street trees in the community, they do not have a program to remove dead trees in the village. Due to the numerous dead trees in the village, the infrastructure is at risk to tree damage. Downed trees can block roadways, impacting the response time of emergency personnel and lead to road closures. Trees can also fall on power lines, causing power outages.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	The village would like to train the DPW on the process of tree removal, purchase a bucket truck to implement the program, purchase safety equipment and associated tools to maintain the equipment.		
Is this project related to a Critical Facility?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Is this project related to a Critical Facility located within the 100-year floodplain?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(If yes, this project must intend to protect the 500-year flood event or the actual worse case damage scenario, whichever is greater)			
Level of Protection:	Not applicable.	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Maintain uninterrupted power to all facilities including critical facilities, this also maintains life safety and emergency response routes to support life safety
Useful Life:	Ongoing program once established	Goals Met:	1, 3
Estimated Cost:	\$100,000	Mitigation Action Type:	Local Plans and Regulations
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	Medium	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	1 year
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 year	Potential Funding Sources:	Village budget, HMGP
Responsible Organization:	Village DPW	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:	Hazard Mitigation Plan, Tree City Program
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	Potential interruption of power during wind and ice events.
	Bury all electrical utility lines.	Millions of dollars	Enormous cost is an obstacle to fund this project and low technical feasibility due to potential underground obstructions.
	Hire an arborist and company to provide tree trimming and inventory services.	\$2,000 per tree for removal and \$800 per tree to trim trees resulting in approximately \$80,000 per year.	This is not economically feasible due to the expense.
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)			
Date of Status Report:			





Report of Progress:	
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:	



Action Worksheet		
Project Name:	Tree Removal Program	
Project Number:	V. North Syracuse-2	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	Avoid interruption in power supply and unintentional road closures and obstruction of emergency response.
Property Protection	1	
Cost-Effectiveness	1	Performing services in house is cost effective.
Technical	0	
Political	0	
Legal	0	Potential issues with trees outside the right of way. Issues with private property owners.
Fiscal	0	Village needs outside, available funding
Environmental	0	
Social	0	
Administrative	0	Village employees need training to address this project
Multi-Hazard	1	Severe storm, severe winter storm and invasive species
Timeline	1	
Agency Champion	1	Village DPW
Other Community Objectives	0	
Total	6	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	Medium	