



SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

This section provides a description of the Genesee County’s Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) planning partnership, their responsibilities throughout the planning process, and the jurisdictional annexes developed as a result of their plan update efforts.

8.1 Background

Section 201.6.a(4) of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44CFR) states: “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.” The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (NYS DHSES) both encourage multi-jurisdictional planning.

The federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) defines a local government as, “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.”

In the preparation of the Genesee County HMP, a planning partnership was formed to meet requirements of the DMA to include all local governments in Genesee County except for the Village of Attica, which participates in the Wyoming County HMP.

8.1.1 Initial Solicitation

Genesee County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the County at the commencement of this project. 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 Steering Committee. Genesee County and all of its municipalities (except the Village of Attica, which participates in the Wyoming County HMP) participated in the HMP update.

Table 8-1. Participating Jurisdictions in Genesee County

Jurisdictions		
Genesee County		
Town of Alabama	Town of Bethany	Village of Le Roy
Town of Alexander	Town of Byron	Town of Oakfield
Village of Alexander	Village of Corfu	Village of Oakfield
City of Batavia	Town of Darien	Town of Pavilion
Town of Batavia	Town of Elba	Town of Pembroke
Town of Bergen	Village of Elba	Town of Stafford
Village of Bergen	Town of Le Roy	



8.1.2 Planning Partner Responsibilities

The Planning Partnership agreed to the following list of expectations:

- Review 2008 HMP goals and update the HMP goals and objectives.
- Establish a timeline for completion of the HMP update.
- Ensure the HMP meets the requirements of the DMA 2000, and FEMA and 2017 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), it is intended that the planning partnership 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 shall be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

8.1.3 Jurisdictional Annexes

New to the Genesee County HMP update is a two-volume approach, including the development of a jurisdictional annex for each participating jurisdiction. While the local annex format is designed to document and ensure 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; and
- 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 an evolving 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 elements of the jurisdictional annex.

Section 9.X.1: Hazard Mitigation Planning Team: 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 overview of the history and cultural resources, identification of areas of known and anticipated for future development, and the vulnerability of those areas to the hazards of concern.

Section 9.X.3: 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 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. 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.4: 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.

- **Hazard Risk Ranking:** The Genesee County HMP update 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.
- **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.
- **Identified Issues:** Presents other specific hazard vulnerabilities as identified by the jurisdiction.

Section 9.X.5: 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, administrative and technical, 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.

- **National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP):** This subsection 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.
- **Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing Planning Mechanisms:** This subsection identifies how the jurisdiction has integrated hazard risk management into their existing planning, regulatory, and operational/administrative framework (“integration capabilities”) and/or how they intend to promote this integration (“integration actions”). Further information regarding Federal, State, and local capabilities may be found in the Capability Assessment portion of Section 6.
- **Shelter, Evacuation, and Temporary Housing:** This subsection describes the planning conducted for identifying evacuation routes and emergency shelters for residents displaced by hazard impacts (notably flooding). It also describes the areas in the jurisdiction, and/or coordinated by the County, where temporary housing (e.g., FEMA trailers) can be placed for evacuees and describes areas suitable for development of new permanent housing.



Section 9.X.6: 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.
- **Completed Mitigation Initiatives Not Identified in the Previous Mitigation Strategy:** Other completed or on-going 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:** The Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives table presents the jurisdiction’s updated mitigation strategy. The Summary of Prioritization of Actions table provides a summary of the local mitigation strategy prioritization process discussed in Section 6.

Section 9.X.7: Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability: During the development of each annex, each jurisdiction identified if there are any anticipated needs in order to better understand risk and vulnerability going forward. If a jurisdiction identified such needs, they are captured in this section.

Section 9.X.8: Staff and Local Stakeholder Involvement in Annex Development: This section describes the jurisdiction’s participation in the overall mitigation planning process and in developing the jurisdiction’s annex in particular.

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

Action Worksheets: Each mitigation action described in Section 9.X.6 is documented on an Action Worksheet. Including Action Worksheets in the HMP facilitates implementation of mitigation actions when funding becomes available. The worksheets document the problem being solved/addressed, alternatives considered, the solution chosen, and other key details.

Workshops and additional meetings (via in person, email and/or 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 Section 3 (Planning Process) and Section 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are presented in Section 9.