

SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

This section describes Wyoming County’s Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update Planning Partnership, their responsibilities throughout the planning process, and the jurisdictional annexes developed as a result of their plan update efforts.

8.1 BACKGROUND

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) encourages multi-jurisdictional planning for hazard mitigation. All participating jurisdictions must meet the requirements of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR):

“Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan” [Section 201.6a(4)]

For the Wyoming County HMP Update, a Planning Partnership was formed to leverage resources and to meet requirements for the federal Disaster Mitigation Action of 2000 (DMA) for as many eligible governments as possible. Members of the Planning Partnership consisted of representatives from each jurisdiction. The DMA defines a local government as follows:

Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.

Members of the planning partnership have the expertise to develop the plan and have their jurisdiction’s authority to implement the mitigation strategy developed during the planning process. The planning partnership is responsible for developing and reviewing draft sections of the plan, creating the mitigation strategy for their jurisdiction, and adopting the final plan.

Each participating planning partner has prepared a jurisdictional annex to this plan. These annexes, as well as information on the process by which they were created, are contained in this volume.

8.2 INITIAL SOLICITATION AND LETTERS OF INTENT

Wyoming County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the county at the commencement of this project. All municipalities interested signed a “Letter of Intent” and/or a resolution committing their participation and resources to the development of the Wyoming County HMP update. Table 8-1 lists the jurisdictions that elected to participate in the update process and have met the minimum requirements of participation as established by the county and the Steering Committee. Wyoming County and the municipalities indicated in Table 8-1 participated in the HMP update.

Table 8-1. Participating Jurisdictions in Wyoming County

| Jurisdictions | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Wyoming County | |
| Arcade (T) | Java (T) |
| Arcade (V) | Middlebury (T) |
| Attica (V) | Orangeville (T) |

| Jurisdictions | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Bennington (T) | Perry (T) |
| Castile (T) | Pike (T) |
| Castile (V) | Sheldon (T) |
| Covington (T) | Silver Springs (V) |
| Eagle (T) | Warsaw (T) |
| Gainesville (T) | Warsaw (V) |
| Gainesville (V) | Wyoming (V) |
| Genesee Falls (T) | |

8.2.1 Planning Partner Expectations

The Steering Committee developed the following list of planning partner expectations, which were confirmed at the kickoff meeting held on November 20, 2019 (see Appendix C [Meeting Documentation] for details):

- Complete administrative tasks:
 - Complete a letter of intent to participate and return to the Wyoming County Office of Emergency Management
 - Designate points of contact
- Provide representation at Planning Partnership meetings.
- Provide information about jurisdictional assets (critical facilities, plans/ordinances, hazard events/damages, new development, etc.) as requested.
- Support public outreach efforts within the jurisdictions, including posting of notices and plan links on websites and local media sources, advertising and supporting public meetings, and supporting outreach to National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss property owners, where applicable.
- Solicit and encourage the participation of regional agencies, a range of stakeholders, and citizens in the HMP development process.
- Assist with the identification of stakeholders within the jurisdiction that should be informed and potentially involved with the planning process.
- Prepare and submit a jurisdictional annex:
 - Attend the mitigation workshop.
 - Perform a capability assessment.
 - Review the risk assessment.
 - Involve local NFIP Floodplain Administrator in the planning process and have them complete the NFIP portion of the annex.
 - Review the 2014 mitigation strategies and provide a status of each.
 - Identify jurisdiction-specific mitigation strategies to address each of the natural hazards posing a risk to the jurisdiction.
- Review draft plan sections when requested and provide comment and input as appropriate.
- Ensure the HMP update meets the requirements of the DMA 2000 and FEMA and NYS DHSES guidance.
- Adopt the plan by resolution of local governing body after FEMA conditional approval.
- Provide information regarding progress on identified initiatives as requested by the County Hazard Mitigation Plan Coordinator.
- Participate, as able, in additional opportunities:
 - Attend municipal support meetings.
 - Participate in and advertise the public review and comment period prior to adoption.

By adopting this plan, each planning partner also agrees to the plan implementation and maintenance protocol established in Volume I. As described in Volume I, Section 7 (Plan Maintenance), it is intended that the Planning Partnership remain active beyond the regulatory update to support plan maintenance. Regarding the composition of the Steering Committee and Planning Partnership, it is recognized that individual commitments change over time, and it shall be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

8.2.2 Jurisdictional Annex Preparation Process

As stated in the 2017 New York State Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards, jurisdictional annexes provide a unique, stand-alone guide to mitigation planning for each jurisdiction. The Wyoming County HMP update is organized so that there is an annex for every participating jurisdiction (the county and participating municipalities).

Data Collection

Data collection worksheets were created to help the Planning Partnership prepare their jurisdiction-specific annexes. The worksheets were created so that all federal and state criteria would be met, based on a jurisdiction's capabilities and mode of operation. Each partner was asked to participate in the Planning Partnership Kickoff Meeting, held on January 13, 2020, during which key elements of the worksheets were discussed and subsequently completed by the appropriate jurisdictional personnel for each worksheet. The worksheets were collected, and the information was incorporated into each jurisdictional annex. In the event additional information was needed, the jurisdictional point of contact was contacted to provide more input into their annex.

Hazard Ranking Exercise

The presentation of the risk assessment and risk ranking for each jurisdiction was done on September 17, 2020. At this meeting, the consultant presented the overall risk assessment for the hazards of concern. In addition, each planning partner was asked to review the ranked risk specific for its jurisdiction. Refer to Section 5.3 (Hazard Ranking) for the methodology of the hazard ranking process. The calculated ranking was presented to each jurisdiction, and they were asked to review the ranking and revise based on history of events, probability of occurrence, and the potential impact on people, property, and the economy. The objectives of this exercise were to familiarize the partnership with how to use the risk assessment as a tool to support other planning and hazard mitigation processes and to help prioritize types of mitigation actions that should be considered. Hazards that were ranked as "high" for each jurisdiction as a result of this exercise were considered to be priorities for identifying appropriate mitigation actions, although jurisdictions also identified actions to mitigate "medium" or "low" ranked hazards as appropriate.

Mitigation Strategy Workshop

The consultant conducted a mitigation strategy workshop for Wyoming County and its jurisdictions on September 24, 2020. The purpose of this workshop was to guide the Planning Partnership in completing this portion of the planning process and discuss how projects that are well developed and documented are more quickly identifiable for selection when grants become available. At this meeting, the consultant discussed the importance of developing mitigation actions and worked with attendees to help identify mitigation actions and develop action worksheets.

Jurisdictional Annexes

While the jurisdictional annex format is designed to document and assure local compliance with the DMA 2000 regulations, its greater purpose and function includes:

- Providing a locally relevant synthesis of the overall mitigation plan that can be readily presented, distributed, and maintained;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community’s risk to natural hazards;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community’s capabilities to manage natural hazard risk, including opportunities to improve those capabilities;
- Facilitating local understanding of the efforts the community has taken, and plans to take, to reduce their natural hazard risk;
- Facilitating the implementation of mitigation strategies, including the development of grant applications;
- Providing a framework by which the community can continue to capture relevant data and information for future plan updates.

It is recognized that each jurisdiction’s annex is a “living” document and will continue to be improved as resources permit. As such, its design is intended to promote and accommodate continued efforts to maintain the annex to be current and to improve the effectiveness of the annex as the key tool, reference, and guiding document by which the jurisdiction will implement hazard mitigation locally.

The following provides a description of the various elements of the jurisdictional annex.

Section 9.X.1: Hazard Mitigation Planning Team: Identifies the hazard mitigation planning primary and alternate(s) contacts and Floodplain Administrators as identified by the jurisdiction.

Section 9.X.2: Municipal Profile: Provides an overview and profile of the jurisdiction, including identification of areas of known and anticipated future development and the vulnerability of those areas to the hazards of concern.

Section 9.X.3: Growth/Development Trends: Summarizes recent and expected future development trends, including major residential/commercial development and major infrastructure development.

Section 9.X.4: Capability Assessment: This subsection provides an inventory and evaluation of the jurisdiction’s tools, mechanisms, and resources available to support hazard mitigation and natural hazard risk reduction. Within the municipal annexes, tables provide an inventory of the municipality’s planning and regulatory capabilities, administrative and technical capabilities, and fiscal capabilities, respectively. Further, another table identifies the municipality’s level of participation in state and federal programs designed to promote and incentivize local risk reduction efforts. This subsection also documents the NFIP as implemented within the jurisdiction. This summary was based on surveys prepared by and/or interviews conducted with the NFIP Floodplain Administrators for each NFIP-participating community in the county. This subsection also identifies actions to enhance implementation and enforcement of the NFIP within the community.

Section 9.X.5: Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality: Identifies hazard events that have caused significant impacts within the jurisdiction, including a summary characterization of those impacts identified by the jurisdiction. The documentation of events and losses is critical to supporting the identification and justification of appropriate mitigation actions, including providing critical data for benefit-cost analysis. It is recognized that this “inventory” of events and losses is a work-in-progress and may continue to be improved as

resources permit. As such, the lack of data or information for a specific event does not necessarily mean that the jurisdiction did not suffer significant losses during that event.

Section 9.X.6: Hazard Ranking and Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities: This subsection provides information regarding each plan participant’s vulnerability to the identified hazards. Full data and information on the hazards of concern, the methodology used to develop the vulnerability assessments, and the results of those assessments that serve as the basis of these local risk rankings may be found in Section 5.

- **Critical Facilities Flood Risk:** Identifies potential flood losses to critical facilities in the jurisdiction, based on the flood vulnerability assessment process presented in Section 5.
- **Hazard Risk Ranking:** The Wyoming County HMP identifies and characterizes the broad range of hazards that pose risk to the entire planning area; however, each jurisdiction has differing degrees of risk exposure and vulnerability aside from the whole. The local risk ranking serves to identify each jurisdiction’s degree of risk to each hazard as it pertains to them, supporting the appropriate selection and prioritization of initiatives that will reduce the highest levels of risk for each community.
- **Identified Issues:** Presents other specific hazard vulnerabilities as identified by the jurisdiction.

Section 9.X.7: Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization: This section discusses and provides the status of past mitigations actions and status and describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives and prioritization.

- **Past Mitigation Initiative Status:** Where applicable, a review of progress on the jurisdiction’s prior mitigation strategy is presented, identifying the disposition of each prior action, project, or initiative in the jurisdiction’s updated mitigation strategy. Other completed or ongoing mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy may be included in this subsection as well.
- **Completed Mitigation Initiatives Not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy:** Other completed or ongoing mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy may be included in this subsection as well.
- **Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update:** Table 9.X-11 presents the jurisdiction’s updated mitigation strategy. As indicated, applicable mitigation actions, projects, and initiatives are further documented on an Action Worksheet, which provides details on the project identification, evaluation, prioritization, and implementation process. Table 9.X-12 provides a summary of the local mitigation strategy prioritization process discussed in Section 6.

Section 9.X.8: Proposed Mitigation Action Types: Indicates the range of proposed mitigation action categories.

Section 9.X.9: Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development: This section in each annex provides details on which departments were involved throughout the development of the jurisdictional annex. Further detail is provided in Section 3 (Planning Process), Section 9 (jurisdictional annexes), and Appendix B (Participation Matrix).

Section 9.X.10: Hazard Area Extent and Location Map: Each annex includes a map (or series of maps) illustrating identified hazard zones and critical facilities. Further, these maps show areas of known or anticipated future development, as available and provided by the jurisdiction.

Action Worksheets: Developed action worksheets actions that jurisdictions identified as high priorities for applying for FEMA funding support are included at the end of each annex.

8.2.3 Coverage Under the Plan

Of the planning partners identified during the planning process, 21 fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. Three planning partners did not meet principal requirements, which included completion of the jurisdictional data collection worksheets, completion of the jurisdictional annex, or participation in meetings. Those who did not meet the requirements will not be able to seek FEMA or NYS DHSES approval at the time of plan submittal nor will they be eligible to obtain FEMA mitigation grant funding. Those jurisdictions can choose to complete their annex and adopt at a later time, working with Wyoming County and NYS DHSES to ensure completeness. Any non-participating local government within the Wyoming County planning area can “dock” to this plan in the future following the linkage procedures defined in Appendix H (Linkage Procedures).

Table 8-2 lists the status of each jurisdiction, whether or not they submitted letters of intent to participate, and their ultimate status in this plan update. Appendix B (Participation Matrix) and Appendix C (Meeting Documentation) provide details on participation and meeting attendance.

Table 8-2. Jurisdictional Status

| Municipality | Letter of Intent to Participate Date | Attended Workshops and/or Meetings and Project Calls | Provided Update on Past Projects | Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan | Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets all previous requirements) |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Arcade (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Arcade (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Attica (T) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Attica (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Bennington (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Castile (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Castile (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Covington (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Eagle (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Gainesville (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Gainesville (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Genesee Falls (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Java (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Middlebury (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Orangeville (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Perry (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Perry (V) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pike (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Sheldon (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Silver Springs (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Warsaw (T) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Warsaw (V) | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wethersfield (T) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wyoming (V) | X | X | X | X | X |

In summary, all participating communities and the county completed the planning partner expectations and annex preparation process. Details regarding these meetings are described further in Section 3 (Planning Process) and Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are presented in Section 9.