



## SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

This section provides a description of the Broome County’s HMP update planning partnership, their responsibilities throughout the planning process, and the jurisdictional annexes developed from 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 Broome 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. The DMA provides the following definition for a local government:

*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.*

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 2 of this HMP.

#### 8.1.1 Initial Solicitation and Letters of Intent

Broome County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the county at the commencement of this project. All municipalities interested signed a *Letter of Intent* or a resolution committing their participation and resources to the development of the Broome County HMP update (Appendix B). 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. Broome County and 21 municipalities participated in the HMP update.

**Table 8-1. Participating Jurisdictions in Broome County**

Jurisdictions	
Broome County	
Barker, Town of	Binghamton, City of
Binghamton, Town of	Chenango, Town of
Conklin, Town of	Deposit, Village of*
Dickinson, Town of	Endicott, Village of
Fenton, Town of	Johnson City, Village of
Kirkwood, Town of	Lisle, Town of**
Lisle, Village of	Maine, Town of
Nanticoke, Town of	Port Dickinson, Village of



Jurisdictions	
Sanford, Town of	Triangle, Town of
Union, Town of	Vestal, Town of
Whitney Point, Village of	Windsor, Town of
Windsor, Village of	

*\*The Village of Deposit is participating in the Delaware County HMP; \*\* Participation has not been documented at this time*

## 8.2 Planning Partner Responsibilities

The Planning Committee agreed to the following list of expectations:

- Review 2013 HMP goals and re-establish HMP update goals and objectives.
- Establish a timeline for completion of the HMP update.
- Ensure the HMP update meets the requirements of the DMA 2000 and FEMA and NYS DHSES guidance.
- Solicit and encourage the participation of regional agencies, a range of stakeholders, and citizens in the HMP development process.
- Assist in gathering information for inclusion in the HMP, including the use of previously developed reports and data.
- Organize and oversee the public involvement process and support outreach efforts in the community.
- Develop, revise, adopt, and maintain Volume I of the HMP update in its entirety and the local jurisdictional annex in Volume II.

As described in Section 7 (Plan Maintenance), the planning partnership is intended to remain active beyond the regulatory update to support plan maintenance. Regarding the composition of the Steering and Planning Committees, it is recognized that individual commitments change over time, and it will be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

### 8.2.1 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 Broome County HMP Update is organized so that there is an annex for Broome County and for every jurisdiction within the county’s borders. Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes) includes an annex for every jurisdiction in Broome County, including those that did not fully participate.

#### 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 a municipal kick-off meeting held on June 12, 2018, 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 risk assessment and risk ranking for each jurisdiction was presented on September 19, 2018, in a meeting including discussion of the overall risk assessment for the hazards of concern. At this meeting, 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 revised 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

---

NYS DHSES provided a mitigation strategy workshop to Broome County and its jurisdictions on October 17, 2018. At this meeting, NYS DHSES discussed the importance of developing mitigation actions and worked in small groups to help each jurisdiction identify mitigation actions and develop action worksheets. The purpose of this workshop was to guide the planning partnership in completing this portion of the planning process and how projects that are well developed and documented are more quickly identifiable for selection when grants become available. The NYS DHSES action worksheet template and instructions are provided in Appendix G (Plan Review Tools).

### Municipal Support Meetings

---

In addition to the municipal kick-off meeting, municipal support meetings were held on October 17 and 18, 2018. At these support meetings, the consultant worked one-on-one with the planning partners to complete their jurisdictional annex. Each section of the annex was discussed to ensure accuracy and completeness. This included, but not limited to, the following:

- Reviewing the calculated hazard ranking for the jurisdiction and provide input to adjust the ranking as necessary.
- Inspecting the list of critical facilities located in the jurisdiction and its exposure to the 1 percent and 0.2 percent flood hazard area. As required in the 2017 New York State Hazard Mitigation Planning Standards, critical facilities located in the Special Flood Hazard Area must document that critical facilities are protected to the 500-year flood event, or worst damage scenario. For those that do not meet this level of protection, the plan must include an action to meet this criterion or explain why it is not feasible to do so. By reviewing the list, the jurisdictions could identify additional mitigation actions related to the critical facilities found in the municipality.
- Identifying mitigation initiatives that have reasonable potential to be accomplished within the lifespan of the County HMP (five years), including both FEMA-eligible projects and those projects using funds from non-FEMA sources.

### 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 HMP updates.

Each jurisdiction’s annex is intended to be 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 Plan Point of Contact:** Identifies the hazard mitigation planning primary and alternate(s) contacts, as identified by the jurisdiction.

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

**Section 9.X.3: Natural Hazard Event History Specific to the Municipality:** Identifies hazard events that caused significant impacts within the jurisdiction, including a summary characterization of those impacts as 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. This *inventory* of events and losses is a work-in-progress and will 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.4: Hazard Ranking and Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities:** 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 Volume 1, Section 5 (Risk Assessment).

- **Hazard Risk Ranking:** 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 locally, supporting the appropriate selection and prioritization of initiatives that will reduce the highest levels of risk for each community.
- **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 (Risk Assessment).
- **Identified Issues:** Presents other specific hazard vulnerabilities as identified by the jurisdiction.

**Section 9.X.5: Capability Assessment:** 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, regulatory, administrative,



technical, and fiscal capabilities. Further, another table identifies the municipality's level of participation in state and federal programs designed to promote and incentivize local risk reduction efforts.

- **National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP):** Documents the NFIP as implemented within the jurisdiction. This summary was based on surveys prepared by or interviews conducted with the NFIP Floodplain Administrators for each NFIP-participating community in the county. This subsection identifies actions to enhance implementation and enforcement of the NFIP within the community.
- **National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary:** Provides NFIP summary statistics for the jurisdiction.
- **Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future Planning Mechanisms:** Identifies how the jurisdiction integrated hazard risk management into their existing planning, regulatory, and administrative framework (*integration capabilities*) and how they intend to promote this integration (*integration actions*). Further information regarding federal, state, and local capabilities can be found in the Capability Assessment portion of Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy).

**Section 9.X.6: Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization:** Discusses and provides the status of past mitigations actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and prioritization.

- **Past Mitigation Initiative Status:** Where applicable, reviews progress of the jurisdiction's prior mitigation strategy, identifying the disposition of each prior action, project, or initiative in the jurisdiction's updated mitigation strategy. Other completed or on-going mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy would be included in this sub-section.
- **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 (Mitigation Strategy).

**Section 9.X.7: Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability:** Identifies any anticipated needs in order to better understand future risk and vulnerability raised during the development of each annex.

**Section 9.X.8: Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development:** Provides details on which departments were involved throughout the development of the jurisdictional annex. Plans developed with the participation of the widest range of departments, stakeholders, and persons familiar with the jurisdiction should be involved in the development of the jurisdictional annexes. Further detail is provided in Section 3 (Planning Process), Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes), and Appendix B (Participation Matrix).

**Section 9.X.9: Hazard Area Extent and Location Map:** Includes a map (or series of maps) illustrating identified hazard zones, critical facilities, and areas of NFIP Repetitive Loss/Severe Repetitive Loss (RL/SRL) for each facility. Further, these maps show areas of known or anticipated future development, as available and provided by the jurisdiction.

**Action Worksheets:** Provides each municipality with a more developed starting point for project implementation should funding become available. Following NYS DHSES HMP Standards Guide, each municipality developed a minimum of two action worksheets. Workshops and additional meetings (in person, by email, or by teleconference) to complete the jurisdictional annexes were held with the Steering and Planning Committees throughout the planning process. 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 Sections 3 (Planning Process) and 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are presented in Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes).

### 8.2.2 Coverage Under the Plan

Of the planning partners identified during the planning process, 21 fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. Planning partners not having met principal requirements including completion of the jurisdictional data collection worksheets, completion of the jurisdictional annex, or participation in workshops or individual support meetings. Those that 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 Broome County and NYS DHSES to ensure completeness. Any non-participating local government within the Broome County planning area can “dock” to this plan in the future following the linkage procedures defined in Appendix K (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?	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets requirements)
Broome County	X – 6/11/18	X	X	X	X
Barker, Town of	X – 5/31/18	X	X	X	X
Binghamton, City of	X – 6/12/18	X	X	X	X
Binghamton, Town of	-	X	X	X	X
Chenango, Town of	X – 5/29/18	X	X	X	X
Colesville, Town of	X – 5/29/18	X	X	X	X
Conklin, Town of	-	X	-	X	X
Deposit, Village of	Not participating in Broome County Plan				
Dickinson, Town of	X – 6/12/18	X	X	X	X
Endicott, Village of	X – 5/29/18	X	X	X	X
Fenton, Town of	-	X	-	X	X
Johnson City, Village of	X – 5/29/18	X	X	X	X
Kirkwood, Town of	-	X	-	X	X
Lisle, Town of	-	-	-	-	-
Lisle, Village of	-	X	X	X	X
Maine, Town of	-	X	X	X	X
Nanticoke, Town of	-	-	-	-	-
Port Dickinson, Village of	X – 6/11/18	X	-	X	X
Sanford, Town of	-	X	X	X	X
Triangle, Town of	X – 5/30/18	X	-	X	X
Union, Town of	X – 6/7/18	X	-	X	X
Vestal, Town of	X – 6/5/18	X	X	X	X



**SECTION 8: PLANNING PARTNERSHIP**

Municipality	Letter of Intent to Participate Date	Attended Workshops and/or Meetings?	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets requirements)
Whitney Point, Village of	-	X	X	X	X
Windsor, Town of	X – 6/21/18	X	X	X	X
Windsor, Village of	X – 6/12/18	-	X	X	X