



## SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

This section provides a description of the Onondaga County’s 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 Onondaga 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

Onondaga 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 Onondaga 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 Steering Committee. Onondaga County, OCWA and municipalities indicated in Table 8-1 participated in the HMP update.

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

Jurisdictions	
Onondaga County	Camillus (T)
Baldwinsville (V)	Cicero (T)
Camillus (V)	DeWitt (T)





Jurisdictions	
Clay (T)	Elbridge (T)
East Syracuse (V)	Fabius (T)
Elbridge (V)	Fayetteville (V)
Fabius (V)	Jordan (V)
Geddes (T)	Liverpool (V)
LaFayette (T)	Manlius (T)
Lysander (T)	Marcellus (T)
Manlius (V)	Minoa (V)
Marcellus (V)	Onondaga (T)
North Syracuse (V)	Salina (T)
Pompey (T)	Skaneateles (V)
Skaneateles (T)	Spafford (T)
Solvay (V)	Tully (T)
Syracuse (C)	Van Buren (T)
Tully (V)	OCWA

Note: The Town of Otisco and Onondaga Nation are not participating in the 2019 Update

### 8.2.1 Planning Partner Expectations

The Steering Committee developed the following list of planning partner expectations, which were confirmed at the kick-off meeting held on June 25, 2018 (see Appendix C [Meeting Documentation] for details):

- Complete administrative tasks:
  - Complete a letter of intent to participate and return to the Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency
  - 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 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 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 2013 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 Planning Coordinator; and
- 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 Onondaga County HMP Update is organized so that there is an annex for every jurisdiction with the county’s borders, including Onondaga County, that participated. Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes) does not include an annex for the Town of Otisco and the Onondaga Nation.

#### **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 25, 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 presentation of the risk assessment and risk ranking for each jurisdiction was done on September 19, 2018. 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**

---

NYS DHSES provided a mitigation strategy workshop to Onondaga County and its jurisdictions on January 14, 2019. 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. The nearly 100% participation of the planning partners reflects the excellent outreach and dedication of the planning team. 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. Staff members of NYS DHSES, FEMA, and the mitigation consultant team worked one-on-one with each jurisdiction to identify clear, implementable mitigation actions as well as to further support the completion of the jurisdictional annexes. The NYS DHSES action worksheet template and instructions are provided in Appendix J (NYS DHSES Planning Standards).

### **Municipal Support Meetings**

---

In addition to the municipal kick-off meeting, municipal support meetings were held on October 8, 2018 and January 14 and 15, 2019. At these support meetings, the consultant worked one-on-one with the planning partners to complete their jurisdictional annexes. 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 their exposure to the 1% and 0.2% 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, jurisdictions were able to identify additional mitigation actions related to the critical facilities found in the municipality.
- Identify 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 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 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: 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 Onondaga 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.



- **National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Summary:** Provides NFIP summary statistics for the jurisdiction.
- **Integration of Hazard Mitigation into Existing and Future 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, 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 on-going mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy may be included in this sub-section as well.
- **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 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.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:** 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. 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.9: Hazard Area Extent and Location Map:** 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:** 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 Sections 3 (Planning Process) and 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are presented in Section 9.

### 8.2.3 Coverage Under the Plan

Of the 37 planning partners, 36 fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. All planning partners are included in this volume. 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 grant funding.

Any non-participating local government within the Onondaga 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. Refer to Appendix B (Participation Matrix) and Appendix C (Meeting Documentation) for 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)
Onondaga County	N/A	X	X	X	Yes
Baldwinsville (V)	6/7/18	X	X	X	Yes
Camillus (T)	5/29/18	X	X	X	Yes
Camillus (V)	6/11/18	X	X	X	Yes
Cicero (T)	6/12/18	X		X	Yes
Clay (T)	6/12/18	X	X	X	Yes
DeWitt (T)	6/12/18	X	X	X	Yes
East Syracuse (V)	6/12/18	X	X	X	Yes
Elbridge (T)	6/8/18	X	X	X	Yes
Elbridge (V)	1/5/18	X	X	X	Yes
Fabius (T)	6/6/18	X	X	X	Yes
Fabius (V)	6/7/18	X	X	X	Yes
Fayetteville (V)	5/17/18	X	X	X	Yes
Geddes (T)	6/25/18	X	X	X	Yes
Jordan (V)	5/18/2018	X	X	X	Yes
LaFayette (T)	6/20/18	X	X	X	Yes
Liverpool (V)	6/25/18	X	X	X	Yes
Lysander (T)	6/22/18	X	X	X	Yes
Manlius (T)	6/29/18	X	X	X	Yes
Manlius (V)	6/21/18	X	X	X	Yes
Marcellus (T)	6/6/18	X	X	X	Yes
Marcellus (V)	6/8/18	X	X	X	Yes



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)
Minoa (V)	5/17/18	X	X	X	Yes
North Syracuse (V)	6/14/18	X	X	X	Yes
Onondaga Nation	Not participating				No
Onondaga (T)	5/29/18	X	X	X	Yes
Otisco (T)	Not participating				No
Pompey (T)	6/4/18	X	X	X	Yes
Salina (T)	6/1/18	X	X	X	Yes
Skaneateles (T)	5/29/18	X	X	X	Yes
Skaneateles (V)	6/14/18	X	X	X	Yes
Solvay (V)	6/8/18	X	X	X	Yes
Spafford (T)	Did not provide	X	X	X	Yes
Syracuse (C)	7/2/2018	X	X	X	Yes
Tully (T)	5/17/18	X	X	X	Yes
Tully (V)	6/6/18	X	X	X	Yes
Van Buren (T)	1/18/19	X	X	X	Yes
OCWA	5/22/18	X	X	X	Yes

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.