

9.24 VILLAGE OF NORTH SYRACUSE

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Village of North Syracuse.

A.) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Gary Wilmer, Superintendent of Public Works 600 South Bay Rd; North Syracuse, NY 13212 (315) 458-0790 dpw@northsyracuse.org	Diane Browning, Mayor 600 South Bay Rd; North Syracuse, NY 13212 (315) 458-0900 mayor@northsyracuse.org and Fred Wilmer; fredwilmer@gmail.com

B.) VILLAGE PROFILE

Population

6,627 (estimated 2007 U.S. Census)

Location

The Village of North Syracuse is located in the Towns of Cicero and Clay in Onondaga County. 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.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the village has a total area of 2.0 square miles (5.1 km²), all of it land.

Climate

Onondaga County generally experiences seasonable weather patterns characteristic of the northeastern U.S. Cyclonic systems and cold air masses affect the County's weather, making winters cold with snow. During the summer and parts of spring and autumn, temperatures rise during the daytime and fall rapidly after sunset. Summer temperatures typically range from about 76°F to 81°F (Fahrenheit). Winter high temperatures are usually in the middle to upper 30°F, with minimum temperatures of 14°F expected. Overall, the average high temperature for the County is approximately 57°F and the average low temperature is approximately 37°F. Snow accumulates to an average depth of 121 inches each year.

Brief History

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 Fergerson 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.

Governing Body Format

The Village of North Syracuse is governed by a mayor and four trustees.

Growth/Development Trends

At this time, no major residential/commercial development or major infrastructure development has been identified for the next five (5) years.

C.) NATURAL HAZARD EVENT HISTORY SPECIFIC TO THE VILLAGE

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster # (if applicable)	Date	Preliminary Damage Assessment
Snowstorm / Extreme Cold	Not applicable	February, 1961	\$80,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	July, 1970	\$250,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm	Not applicable	March, 1971	\$806,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm / Extreme cold	Not applicable	February, 1972	\$803,000 (countywide)
Flood (Tropical Storm Agnes)	DR-338	June, 1972	\$1,600,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	March, 1973	\$200,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm	Not applicable	December, 1973	\$83,000 (countywide)
Severe Storms and Flooding	DR-447	July, 1974	\$7,200,000 (countywide)
Severe Storms, Heavy Rain, Landslides, Flooding	DR-487	September, 1975	\$6,300,000 (countywide)

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster # (if applicable)	Date	Preliminary Damage Assessment
Flood	Not applicable	April, 1976	\$313,000 (countywide)
Blizzard	Not applicable	January, 1977	\$2,100,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	October, 1981	\$833,000 (countywide)
Tornado (F3)	Not applicable	May, 1983	\$2,500,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm	Not applicable	February, 1984	\$156,000 (countywide)
Tornado (F1)	Not applicable	July, 1986	\$250,000 (countywide)
Blizzard and Extreme Cold	EM-3107	March, 1993	\$455,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm	Not applicable	April, 1993	\$100,000 (countywide)
Thunderstorm / Winds	Not applicable	August, 1993	\$600,000 (countywide)
Severe Storm and Flooding	DR-1095	January, 1996	\$7,600,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	November, 1996	\$100,000 (countywide)
Thunderstorm / Winds / Tornado	Not applicable	May, 1998	\$200,000 (countywide)
Thunderstorm / Winds	Not applicable	August, 1998	\$200,000 (countywide)
Severe Storm	DR-1244	September, 1998	\$90,000,000, 3 fatalities, 7 injuries (countywide)
Thunderstorm / Winds	Not applicable	July, 1999	\$750,000 (countywide)
Severe Storms	DR-1335	May/September, 2000	Not available
Snowstorms	Not applicable	December, 2002 / January, 2003	\$353,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	June, 2002	\$2,000,000 (countywide)
Snowstorm (President's Day Storm)	Not applicable	February, 2003	\$153,000 (countywide)
Ice Storm	DR-1467	April, 2003	\$2,900,000 (countywide)
Severe Storms and Flooding	DR-1564	August / September 2004	\$2,000,000 (countywide)
Severe Storm and Flooding	Not applicable	April, 2005	\$100,000 (countywide)
Flood	Not applicable	July, 2005	\$500,000 (countywide)
Severe Storms and Flooding	Not applicable	June/July, 2006	\$29,000 (countywide)
Lake Effect Snowstorm / Extreme Cold	Not applicable	February, 2007	\$3,000,000 (countywide)

Number of FEMA Identified Repetitive Flood Loss Properties: 0

Number of FEMA Identified Severe Repetitive Flood Loss Properties: 0

Source: FEMA Region II, 2009

Note: Repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss data as of February 2009.

D.) NATURAL HAZARD RISK/VULNERABILITY RISK RANKING

Rank #	Hazard type	Estimate of Potential Dollar Losses to Structures Vulnerable to the Hazard ^{a,c}	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score (Probability x Impact)	Hazard Ranking ^b
2	Earthquake	\$28,103,555 ^{c,e}	Rare	16	Low
3	Flood	\$1,204,000 ^{c,e}	Occasional	12	Low
4	Ground Failure	Not available ^f	Rare	6	Low
1	Severe Storm	\$0 ^{c,d,g}	Frequent	48	High
1	Severe Winter Storm	\$26,663,650 ^{c,d}	Frequent	48	High

- a. Building damage ratio estimates based on FEMA 386-2 (August 2001)
- b. High = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 40 and above
Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking of 20 - 39
Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 20
- c. The valuation of general building stock and loss estimates determined in Onondaga County were based on the default general building stock database provided in HAZUS-MH MR3 (RSMeans 2006).
- d. Severe storm and severe winter storm hazard 500-year MRP loss estimate is structural value only; does not include the value of contents. For severe winter storm, the loss estimate is 5% of total general building stock value.
- e. Loss estimates for both structure and contents (500-year MRP for the flood hazard and 2,500-year MRP for the earthquake hazard).
- f. Approximately 100% of the Village's general building stock is located within the landslide hazard area.
- g. Potential losses for severe storm are underestimated by HAZUS.

E.) CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Legal and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability
- Community classification.

E.1) Legal and Regulatory Capability

Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances., Plans)	Local Authority (Y or N)	Prohibitions (State or Federal) (Y or N)	Higher Jurisdictional Authority (Y or N)	State Mandated (Y or N)	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, date of adoption)
1) Building Code	Y	N	Y	Y	Chapter 91, Adopted 8/9/2007
2) Zoning Ordinance	Y	N	N	N	Chapter 240, Adopted 1/28/1999
3) Subdivision Ordinance	Y	N	N	N	Chapter 205, Adopted 1/28/1999
4) NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Y	Y	Y	Y	TBD
5) Growth Management	N	N	N	N	
6) Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	N	Y	Y	N	
7) Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	Y	N	N	Y	Chapter 201, Adopted 10/11/2007
8) Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan/ General Plan	Y	N	N	N	"Village of North Syracuse – Comprehensive Plan 2025" (August 2004)
9) Capital Improvements Plan	N	N	N	N	
10) Site Plan Review Requirements	N	Y	Y	N	
11) Open Space Plan	N	N	N	N	
12) Economic Development Plan	N	N	N	N	
13) Emergency Response Plan	Y	N	N	Y	
14) Post Disaster Recovery Plan	Y	N	N	N	
15) Post Disaster Recovery Ordinance	N	N	N	N	
16) Real Estate Disclosure req.	N	N	Y	N	
17) Other [Special Purpose Ordinances (i.e., critical or sensitive areas)]	N	N	N	N	

E.2) Administrative and Technical Capability

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/Position
1) Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Clough Harbor & Associates, James Trasher
2) Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Clough Harbor & Associates, James Trasher
3) Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	N	
4) NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Y	James A. Hotchkiss, Mayor
5) Surveyor(s)	N	
6) Personnel skilled or trained in "GIS" applications	N	
7) Scientist familiar with natural hazards in the Village of North Syracuse.	N	
8) Emergency Manager	N	
9) Grant Writer(s)	N	
10) Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	N	

E.3) Fiscal Capability

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to use (Yes/No/Don't know)
1) Community development Block Grants (CDBG)	No
2) Capital Improvements Project Funding	Yes
3) Authority to Levy Taxes for specific purposes	No
4) User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	Yes
5) Impact Fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	No
6) Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes
7) Incur debt through special tax bonds	No
8) Incur debt through private activity bonds	No
9) Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	No
10) State mitigation grant programs (e.g. NYSDEC, NYCDEP)	No
11) Other	No

E.4) Community Classifications

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	TBD	---
Public Protection	TBD	---
Storm Ready	NP	N/A
Firewise	NP	N/A

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

The classifications listed above relate to the community's effectiveness in providing services that may impact its vulnerability to the natural 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 one (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
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO's Public Protection website at <http://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/0000/ppc0001.html>
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at <http://www.weather.gov/stormready/howto.htm>
- The National Firewise Communities website at <http://firewise.org/>

F.) PROPOSED HAZARD MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Initiative #	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals / Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Time-line
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.	Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1-1, 1-2, 1-6; 2-5, 2-6; 3-2, 3-5, 6-1	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local match	Long-term
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.	Existing	Flood, Severe Storm	1-1, 1-2, 1-6; 2-5, 2-6; 3-2, 3-5; 6-1	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local match	Long-term
VNS-2	<p>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:</p> <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 							

Initiative #	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals / Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Time-line
	<p>funding, and personal natural hazard risk reduction measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with neighborhood associations, civic and business groups to disseminate information on flood insurance and the availability of mitigation grant funding. <p>Municipal outreach activities to be supported by the County, as identified at County initiative OC-0.</p>							
	See above.	N/A	All Hazards	All Goals	Municipal officials and floodplain administrators supported by the County (through SOCPA and EM)	Low	County and Municipal Budgets; grant eligible for a defined outreach program	Short
VNS-3	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0	New & Existing	All Hazards	All Goals and Objectives	Municipality (through mitigation planning point of contacts)	Low	Local Budget, possibly FEMA Mitigation Grant Funding for 5-year update	Ongoing
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.	New & Existing	Flood	2-4; 3-5, 3-6	Municipality (likely through NFIP Floodplain Administrator)	Low	Local Budget	Ongoing

Initiative #	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals / Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Time-line
VNS-5	Continue to develop, enhance, and implement existing emergency plans.	New & Existing	All Hazards	1-4; 5-5; Goal 6 – All Objectives	Municipal Emergency Manager with support from County OEM and SEMO	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
VNS-6	Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities.	New & Existing	All Hazards	3-3; 5-2, 5-3, 5-5, 5-6; 6-5, 6-6	Local Emergency Management, DPW and Roads	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
VNS-7	Support County-wide initiatives identified in Section 9.1 of the County Annex.	New & Existing	All Hazards	All Goals and Objectives	Local departments (as applicable for specific initiative)	Low - Medium	Local Budget	Ongoing
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.	N/A	Flood, Severe Storms	1-3, 1-7; 2-3; 4-1,4-4; 5-1, 5-2, 5-3	County, OCSWCD (Mark Burger)	Medium	Local Budget	Short-term
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.	N/A	Flood, Severe Storms	1-2, 1-3; 5-1	OC Dept of Water Environment Protection; Beartrap-Ley Creek Drainage District; Village	Low-Medium	FEMA HMA; District/Cou nty/Local budgets	DOF
VNS-10	Establish communication within the Village between DPW, Fire and Police to new County radio system.	N/A	All Hazards	1-4, 1-5, 1-6; 3-4; 6-3, 6-5	Municipality – Local Emergency Management	Low-Medium	District/Cou nty/Local Budgets; DHS and/or State EM	Longterm DOF

Initiative #	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals / Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Time-line
							funding as available	
VNS-11	Secure all overhead utilities underground on State Road.	Existing (infrastructure)	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	1-2, 1-6; 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-7; 6-5	Municipality – Local Emergency Management working with local utilities	High	FEMA HMA; District/County/Local Budgets; DHS and State EM funding as available	Longterm DOF
VNS-12	Conduct a large and aging tree survey, and develop and implement an appropriate tree maintenance/removal program.	N/A	Severe Storm, Severe Winter Storm	1-2, 1-6; 3-2, 3-4, 3-5, 3-7; 5-1; 6-1, 6-5	Municipality – Local Emergency Management working with local utilities	High	FEMA HMA; District/County/Local Budgets; DHS and State EM funding as available	Longterm DOF

Notes: DOF = Depending on Funding. FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency. Long = 5 years or greater. N/A = Not applicable. Short = 1 to 5 years. TBD = To be determined

*Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure?

G.) ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

This table summarizes the participant's mitigation actions by hazard of concern and the six mitigation types to illustrate that the Village has selected a comprehensive range of actions/projects.

Hazard of Concern	Mitigation Type					
	1. Prevention	2. Property Protection	3. Public Education and Awareness	4. Natural Resource Protection	5. Emergency Services	6. Structural Projects
Earthquake	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-2, VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-5, VNS-6, VNS-7, VNS-10	VNS-3, VNS-7
Flooding (riverine, flash, coastal and urban flooding)	VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7, VNS-8, VNS-9	VNS-1a and b, VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7	VNS-1a and b, VNS-2, VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7, VNS-8	VNS-3, VNS-5, VNS-6, VNS-7, VNS-10	VNS-3, VNS-7
Ground Failure	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-2, VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-5, VNS-6, VNS-7, VNS-10	VNS-3, VNS-7
Severe Storms (windstorms, thunderstorms, hail, lightning and tornados)	VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7, VNS-8, VNS-9	VNS-1a and b, VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7, VNS-11, VNS-12	VNS-1a and b, VNS-2, VNS-3, VNS-4, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7, VNS-8	VNS-3, VNS-5, VNS-6, VNS-7, VNS-10, VNS-11, VNS-12	VNS-3, VNS-7
Severe Winter Storm (heavy snow, blizzards, ice storms)	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7, VNS-11, VNS-12	VNS-2, VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-7	VNS-3, VNS-5, VNS-6, VNS-7, VNS-10, VNS-11, VNS-12	VNS-3, VNS-7

Notes:

- 1. Prevention:** Government, administrative or regulatory actions or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. These actions also include public activities to reduce hazard losses. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.
- 2. Property Protection:** 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.
- 3. Public Education and Awareness:** 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 school-age and adult education programs.
- 4. Natural Resource Protection:** 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.
- 5. Emergency Services:** 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.
- 6. Structural Projects:** 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.

H.) PRIORITIZATION OF MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Initiative #	# of Objectives met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits equal or exceed Costs? (Yes or No)	Is project Grant eligible? (Yes or No)	Can Project be funded under existing programs/budgets? (Yes or No)	Priority (High, Med., Low)
VNS-1a	8	H	H	Y	Y	N	M-H*
VNS-1b	8	H	H	Y	Y	N	M-H*
VNS-2	38	M	L	Y	Y (for defined outreach project)	Y	H
VNS-3	38	M	M	Y	N (Yes for 5 year update)	Y	H
VNS-4	3	H	L	Y	N	Y	H
VNS-5	8	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
VNS-6	7	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
VNS-7	38	M-H	L-M	Y	Dependant on specific initiative	Dependant on specific initiative	M-H (dependant)
VNS-8	8	H	L - H	Y	Y	Dependant on specific initiative	M
VNS-9	3	M	L-M	Y	Y	Local Match Dependant on specific initiative	M
VNS-10	6	M	L-M	Y	Y (not HMA)	N	M-H
VNS-11	7	H	H	Y	Y	N	M
VNS-12	9	M	M	Y	N	N	M

Notes: H = High. L = Low. M = Medium. N = No. N/A = Not applicable. Y = Yes.

* This initiative has a “Medium” priority based on the prioritization scheme used in this planning process (implementation dependent on grant funding), however it is recognized that addressing repetitive and severe repetitive loss properties is considered a high priority by FEMA and SEMO (as expressed in the State HMP), and thus shall be considered a “High” priority for all participants in this planning process.

Explanation of Priorities

- **High Priority** - A project that meets multiple objectives (i.e., multiple hazards), benefits exceeds cost, has funding secured or is an on-going project and project meets eligibility

requirements for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) or Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program (PDM) programs. High priority projects can be completed in the short term (1 to 5 years).

- **Medium Priority** - A project that meets goals and objectives, benefits exceeds costs, funding has not been secured but project is grant eligible under, HMGP, PDM or other grant programs. Project can be completed in the short term, once funding is completed. Medium priority projects will become high priority projects once funding is secured.
- **Low Priority** - Any project that will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits do not exceed the costs or are difficult to quantify, funding has not been secured and project is not eligible for HMGP or PDM grant funding, and time line for completion is considered long term (1 to 10 years). Low priority projects may be eligible other sources of grant funding from other programs. A low priority project could become a high priority project once funding is secured as long as it could be completed in the short term.

Prioritization of initiatives was based on above definitions: Yes

Prioritization of initiatives was based on parameters other than stated above: Not applicable.

I.) FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/VULNERABILITY


None at this time.

J.) HAZARD AREA EXTENT AND LOCATION

A hazard area extent and location map has been generated and is provided below for the Village of North Syracuse to illustrate the probable areas impacted within the Village. This map is based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this Plan, and is 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. The County maps are provided in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume I of this Plan.

K.) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

No additional comments at this time.



Sources: FEMA Q3; FEMA Region II, 2008; HAZUS-MH MR3; NYSDPC, 2008

Notes: Est. = Estimated; NFIP = National Flood Insurance Program

The entire municipality is vulnerable to the following hazards: earthquake, severe storm, and severe winter storm.