



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	Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-3	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0				Ongoing capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						VBV-4 Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-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 VES-1a, 1b, 2, and 8 through 13.				Ongoing capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-5	Continue to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.				Ongoing capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-6	Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities.				Ongoing capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		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.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-7	Support County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.				Ongoing capability.	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-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.				Ongoing capability	Cost		1. Discontinue
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3. Ongoing capability
VES-9	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study, support the return of the Contract No. 5 Basin, detention basin located in the Village of East Syracuse at West 2 nd Street to its original design grades and capacity. Since 1976, the basin has lost some of its capacity through sedimentation and organic deposition. This may include removal of accumulated sediment; however further investigation needs to be conducted to determine project requirements.				In Progress	Cost		1. Include in 2019 HMP
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3.
VES-10	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study, support improvement of conveyance conditions by removing remaining obstructions from the watercourse where the abandoned				In Progress	Cost		1. Include in 2019 HMP
						Level of Protection		2.
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		3.





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	Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success	
	CSX Railroad crossing washed out in the July 12, 2005 storm.							
VES-11	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study, support the increase of culvert crossing size and capacity between Thompson Road and CSX Railroad crossing to improve conveyance capacity of the Ley Creek- South Branch watercourse. These improvements would lower upstream water surface elevations and improve flooding conditions. Culvert crossings identified to increase size and capacity include the following crossing locations: 1) Exeter Street; 2) Thompson Road; 3) two private access roads identified in the Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study; and 4) washed-out abandoned CSX Railroad crossing					Cost		1. Include in 2019 HMP 2. 3.
						Level of Protection		
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		
VES-12	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study, support continue existing maintenance and inspection activities of Ley Creek-South Branch and its culverts to ensure they remain clear of debris, structurally sound and operable.				In Progress	Cost		1. Include in 2019 HMP 2. 3.
						Level of Protection		
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		
VES-13	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 critical areas to determine which individual properties are most at				In Progress	Cost		1. Include in 2019 HMP 2. 3.
						Level of Protection		
						Damages Avoided; Evidence of Success		





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.
	risk to assist with determining mitigation actions.						



Completed Mitigation Initiatives Not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy

The Village of East 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 East 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 East Syracuse 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: 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 9.8-13 summarizes the comprehensive-range of specific mitigation initiatives the Village of East 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 9.8-14 provides a summary of the prioritization of all proposed mitigation initiatives for the Plan update.



Table 9.8-12. 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. East Syracuse e-1	Drainage Improvements Block 200 of E. Street	1	Severe Storm, Flood	This area floods causing water to spill over the road at the intersection of E. Frist St. & Second St. and proceeds west to the bridge over CSX. The rail bed of CSX also contributes to flooding in several spots and the ditch formerly maintained by the railroad no longer is maintained, so the water does not exist.	The village will install stormwater pipe. The linear feet of piping would be approximately 800'. Basins would be placed per engineering.	No	None	2 years	Village DPW	\$375,000	Reduction in stormwater flooding	HMGP, PDM, CHIPS	High	SIP	SP
V. East Syracuse e-2	Remove high risk trees	1, 4	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	There are many dead trees throughout the village. In the event of strong winds or heavy snow, trees may fall onto power lines or roadways. This can lead to village-wide power outages, create a safety hazard, or close roadways which impacts access	The village will survey the trees in the village to determine those that are high risk. The village DPW will then remove or trim high risk trees.	No	None	1 year	Public Works	\$75,000	Reduction in downed trees and power losses	Village budget, HMGP	High	NSP	NR



Table 9.8-12. 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. East Syracuse-3 (former VES9)	Contract No. 5 Basin	1, 3, 5	Flood, Severe Storms	to areas in the village. Since 1976, the basin has lost some of its capacity through sedimentation and organic deposition.	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study, support the return of the Contract No. 5 Basin, detention basin located in the Village of East Syracuse at West 2nd Street to its original design grades and capacity. This may include removal of accumulated sediment; however further investigation needs to be conducted to determine project requirements.	No	No	2 years	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection; Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village OC Dept of Water Environment Protection; Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village	\$200,000	Water Quality Improvements	FEMA HMA; County/local budgets	Medium	SIP	SP
V. East Syracuse-4 (former VES10)	Removing remaining obstructions from the watercourse at abandoned	4, 5	Flood, Severe Storms	Obstructions exist in the watercourse where the abandoned CSX Railroad	As identified in the 2006 Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study,	No	Could require permitting.	2 years	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection;	\$100,000	Water Quality Improvements	FEMA HMA/District/County or Local Budgets	Medium	NSP	NR





Table 9.8-12. 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
	CSX Railroad crossing.			crossing washed out in the July 12, 2005 storm.	support improvement of conveyance conditions by removing remaining obstructions from the watercourse.				Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village						
V. East Syracuse-5 (former VES11)	Increase of culvert crossing size and capacity between Thompson Road and CSX Railroad crossing	1, 4, 5	Flood, Severe Storms	Culverts are undersized.	Support the increase of culvert crossing size and capacity between Thompson Road and CSX Railroad crossing to improve conveyance capacity of the Ley Creek-South Branch watercourse. These improvements would lower upstream water surface elevations and improve flooding conditions. Culvert crossings identified to increase size and capacity	No	Could require DEC review/permitting	3 years	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection; Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village	\$275.00	Reduce flooding	FEMA HMA/ District/ County or Local Budgets	Medium	SIP	SP



Table 9.8-12. 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
					include the following crossing locations: 1) Exeter Street; 2) Thompson Road; 3) two private access roads identified in the Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District Study; and 4) washed-out abandoned CSX Railroad crossing										
V. East Syracuse e-6 (former VES12)	Maintenance and inspection activities of Ley Creek-South Branch and its culverts	1, 5	Flood, Severe Storms	Creek and culverts become clogged with debris.	Support continue existing maintenance and inspection activities of Ley Creek-South Branch and its culverts to ensure they remain clear of debris, structurally sound and operable.	No	Could require permitting	3 years	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection; Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village	\$125,000	Decrease flooding, better control of runoff water	County/District/Local Budgets	High	SIP, NSP	SP, NR
V. East Syracuse e-7 (former VES13)	Topographic study for Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District	1, 5	Flood, Severe Storms	The Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District is flat and heavily urbanized	Conduct /support a more detailed topographic study in the critical areas to	No	None	1 year	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection;	\$40,000	Flow rate, and determining high spots	FEMA HMA; District/County/Local budgets	Medium	LPR	SP



Table 9.8-12. 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
				making the lowest areas extremely vulnerable to rain-event flooding that approach or exceed 5-year storms.	determine which individual properties are most at risk to assist with determining mitigation actions.				Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village						
V. East Syracuse-8	Protect the Village DPW to the 500-year flood level.	1, 3	Flood	The DPW is located in the 100-year floodplain	The village will contact the facilities manager and discuss options for protecting the facility to the 500-year flood level	Yes	None	4 years	Facilities manager, Town	\$80,000	DPW protected to the 500-year flood level	HMGP	High	SIP	PP
V. East Syracuse-9	Protect the Wep Burnet Avenue Pump Station to the 500-year flood level.	1, 2, 6	Flood	The Pump Station is located in the 100-year floodplain	Refer to Section 9.1 for the county annex for the project.	Yes	None	Ongoing until complete	OC WEP	\$1+ million	Reduction in flood exposure	FEMA HMGP and PDM, WQIP, county budget	High	SIP	PP
V. East Syracuse-10	Protect the Wep Phelps Street Pump Station to the 500-year flood level.	1, 2, 6	Flood	The Pump Station is located in the 100-year floodplain	Refer to Section 9.1 for the county annex for the project.	Yes	None	Ongoing until complete	OC WEP	\$1+ million	Reduction in flood exposure	FEMA HMGP and PDM, WQIP, county budget	High	SIP	PP



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 9.8-13. 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. East Syracuse-1	East and West First Street Flood Mitigation	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	12	High
V. East Syracuse-2	Remove high risk trees	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	High
V. East Syracuse-3 (former VES9)	Contract No. 5 Basin	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	Medium
V. East Syracuse-4 (former VES10)	Removing remaining obstructions from the watercourse at abandoned CSX Railroad crossing.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	Medium
V. East Syracuse-5 (former VES11)	Increase of culvert crossing size and capacity between Thompson Road and CSX Railroad crossing	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	Medium
V. East Syracuse-6 (former VES12)	Maintenance and inspection activities of Ley Creek-South Branch and its culverts	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	9	High
V. East Syracuse-7 (former VES13)	Topographic study for Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	Medium
V. East Syracuse-8	Protect the Village DPW to the 500-year flood level.	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	High
V. East Syracuse-9	Protect the Wep Burnet Avenue Pump Station to the 500-year flood level.	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	High
V. East Syracuse-10	Protect the Wep Phelps Street Pump Station to the 500-year flood level.	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	High

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





9.8.7 Future Needs To Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability

None at this time.

9.8.8 Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development

The Village of East 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 Department of Public Works, the Codes Department, and the Clerk. The Department of Public Works 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).

9.8.9 Hazard Area Extent and Location

Hazard area extent and location maps have been generated for the Village of East 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 East Syracuse has significant exposure. A map of the Village of East 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 9.8-1. Village of East Syracuse Hazard Area Extent and Location Map



Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Drainage Improvements Block 200 of E. Street		
Project Number:	V. East Syracuse-1		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard(s) of Concern:	Flood and Severe Storm		
Description of the Problem:	This area floods causing water to spill over the road at the intersection of E. Frist St. & Second St. and proceeds west to the bridge over CSX. The rail bed of CSX also contributes to flooding in several spots and the ditch formerly maintained by the railroad no longer is maintained, so the water does not exist.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	The village will install stormwater pipe. The linear feet of piping would be approximately 800'. Basins would be placed per engineering.		
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:	25 year event	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Reduction in stormwater flooding
Useful Life:	50 years	Goals Met:	1
Estimated Cost:	\$375,000	Mitigation Action Type:	Structure and Infrastructure Project
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	2 years
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 year	Potential Funding Sources:	HMGP, PDM, CHIPS
Responsible Organization:	Village DPW	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:	
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	Problem continues
	Build retention basins	N/A	Not enough room
	Install portable floodwall barriers during flood events	\$25,000	Not permanent solution, cuts off access to roadways
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)			
Date of Status Report:			
Report of Progress:			
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:			



Action Worksheet		
Project Name:	Drainage Improvements Block 200 of E. Street	
Project Number:	V. East Syracuse-1	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	
Property Protection	1	Reduction in flood risk
Cost-Effectiveness	1	
Technical	1	
Political	1	
Legal	1	The village has the legal authority to conduct the project
Fiscal	0	
Environmental	1	
Social	1	
Administrative	1	
Multi-Hazard	1	Flood, Severe Storm
Timeline	0	
Agency Champion	1	Village DPW
Other Community Objectives	1	Stormwater improvements
Total	12	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High	



Action Worksheet			
Project Name:	Remove high risk trees		
Project Number:	V. East Syracuse-2		
Risk / Vulnerability			
Hazard(s) of Concern:	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm		
Description of the Problem:	There are many dead trees throughout the village. In the event of strong winds or heavy snow, trees may fall onto power lines or roadways. This can lead to village-wide power outages, create a safety hazard, or close roadways which impacts access to areas in the village.		
Action or Project Intended for Implementation			
Description of the Solution:	The village will survey the trees in the village to determine those that are high risk. The village DPW will then remove or trim high risk trees.		
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:	N/A	Estimated Benefits (losses avoided):	Reduction in downed trees and power losses
Useful Life:	5 years	Goals Met:	1, 4
Estimated Cost:	\$75,000	Mitigation Action Type:	Natural Systems Protection
Plan for Implementation			
Prioritization:	High	Desired Timeframe for Implementation:	1 year
Estimated Time Required for Project Implementation:	1 year	Potential Funding Sources:	Village budget, HMGP
Responsible Organization:	Public Works	Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation if any:	
Three Alternatives Considered (including No Action)			
Alternatives:	Action	Estimated Cost	Evaluation
	No Action	\$0	
	Remove trees as calls come in	\$10,000	Reactive rather than preventative
	Remove all trees near power lines	\$250,000	Negative environmental impact, costly
Progress Report (for plan maintenance)			
Date of Status Report:			
Report of Progress:			
Update Evaluation of the Problem and/or Solution:			



Action Worksheet		
Project Name:	Remove high risk trees	
Project Number:	V. East Syracuse-2	
Criteria	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	1	Protects critical infrastructure
Property Protection	1	Protects utilities from damages during storm events
Cost-Effectiveness	1	
Technical	1	
Political	1	
Legal	1	
Fiscal	0	Village would seek funding assistance
Environmental	1	
Social	1	
Administrative	1	
Multi-Hazard	1	Severe storm, Severe winter storm
Timeline	1	
Agency Champion	1	Village DPW
Other Community Objectives	1	Protect utility lines
Total	13	
Priority (High/Med/Low)	High	