9.14 LYNN TOWNSHIP

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for Lynn Township.

A. HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT

| F | Primary Point of Contact | Alternate Point of Contact |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Name Title Address | Janet Henritzy Administrative Secretary 7911 Kings Highway New Tripoli, PA 18066 | Name Title/ Department Address |
| Telephone Fax | (610) 298-2645 | Telephone Fax Email |
| Email | lynnzone@ptd.net | EIIIdii |

B. MUNICIPAL PROFILE

Lynn Township is the largest township in Lehigh County, encompassing an area of 41.7 square miles. It is located in the northwestern corner of the county, and has an estimated population of 4,171 (2006-2010 American Community Survey). As shown in Figure 1, Lynn Township is bordered by Heidelberg Township (Lehigh County) to the east; Weisenberg Township (Lehigh County) to the south; Albany Township (Berks County) to the west; and West Penn Township (Schuylkill County) to the north.

BOTHER LYNN

MEISENBERG

MASS

Figure 1

(Source: http://www.lvpc.org/pdf/maps/baseMap-LehighNorthamptonCounties.pdf)

Lynn Township is within the Delaware River watershed, and is mostly drained by the Ontelaunee Creek, Kistler Creek, and Maiden Creek into the Schuylkill River. One exception to this drainage pattern is the area near the boundary with Weisenberg Township, which is drained by the Jordan and Switzer Creeks into the Lehigh River.

Route 143 is the primary east-west route through the township, running from lower Heidelberg Township, through the center of Lynn, and continuing into Berks County. Route 863 runs north from Upper Macungie Township, and terminates at a "T" with SR 143 in the center of the Lynn Township. The other major north-south corridor in the township is SR 309, which runs from northern Philadelphia through the Lehigh Valley, and crosses over the eastern border of Lynn from Heidelberg Township, turning northwest towards Schuylkill County. Other local roads of note include Kistler Valley Road/Holbens Valley Road, which runs east-west across the southern portion of the township; and Mountain Road/Mosserville Road, which runs north-south in the northeastern corner of the township.

B.1 Known or Anticipated Future Development

The following table summarizes major residential/commercial development and major infrastructure development that are identified for the next five (5) to ten (10) years in the municipality. Refer to the map at the end of this annex which illustrates the hazard areas within the municipality.

| Property Name | Type (Residential or Commercial) | Number of Structures | Location | Known Hazard Zone* | Description / Status |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Penns View II | R | 78 | SR-4033 | No | Pending |
| Northwestern Self Storage | С | 4 | SR-0309 | No | On Hold |

^{*} Only location-specific hazard zones or vulnerabilities identified. With the exception of flood, wildfire, landslides, and land subsidence/sinkholes, all locations within the Lehigh Valley are exposed to the natural hazards addressed in this plan.

C. NATURAL HAZARD EVENT HISTORY SPECIFIC TO LYNN TOWNSHIP

| Type of Event and Date | FEMA Disaster # (if applicable) | Local Damage and Losses |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Stream Flooding | | Flooding in basements |
| Drainage & Flooding From Mountain | | Damage to Township dirt roads |
| Drainage Flooding from Open Fields in School Creek Watershed Area | | Flooded roads with damage to properties (erosion) |

D. HAZARD RISK/VULNERABILITY RISK RANKING

The following relative ranking of natural and non-natural hazard risks in this municipality was developed using PEMA's Risk Factor methodology described in Section 4, "Risk Assessment"

| HAZARD | NATURAL | | RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|--|--|--|
| RISK | HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | FACTOR (RF) | | | |
| нен | Winter Storm | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2.7 | | | |
| ¥ | Flood | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.5 | | | |
| | Radon Exposure | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2.4 | | | |
| | Extreme Temperatures | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.3 | | | |
| ĬΕ | Drought | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2.2 | | | |
| MODERATE | Wildfire | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.2 | | | |
| MOI | Hailstorm | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2.1 | | | |
| | Wind, incl. Tornado | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2.1 | | | |
| | Lightning | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | Earthquake | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1.9 | | | |
| LOW | Landslide | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1.7 | | | |
| _ | Subsidence / Sinkholes | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.4 | | | |

| HAZARD | MAN-MADE | | RISK ASS | ESSMENT C | ATEGORY | | RISK |
|----------|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|
| RISK | HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | FACTOR (RF) |
| | Fire (Urban/Structural) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2.6 |
| HGH | Environmental Hazard and | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2.6 |
| _ | Utility Interruption | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2.5 |
| ATE | Transportation Accident | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2.2 |
| MODERATE | Dam Failure | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2.2 |
| MOI | Mass Gathering and Civil Disturbance | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| | Terrorism | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1.9 |
| LOW | Building Collapse | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1.9 |
| 2 | Nuclear Incident | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1.4 |
| | Levee Failure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

E. CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Planning and Regulatory Capability
- Administrative and Technical Capability
- Fiscal Capability
- Community Classifications

E.1 Planning and Regulatory Capability

| | | Status | L | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| Tool / Program | In Place | Date Adopted or Updated | Under Develop- ment | Dept./Agency Responsible | Effect on Loss Reduction: + Support O Neutral - Hinder | Change Since Last Plan: + Positive - Negative | Comments |
| Hazard Mitigation Plan | Х | 2006 | Update in progress | Lehigh County | + | + | Plan update in progress 2012 |
| Emergency Operations Plan | X | 1/1/2006 | | | | | |
| Disaster Recovery Plan | | | | | | | |
| Evacuation Plan | | | | | | | |
| Continuity of Operations Plan | | | | | | | |
| NFIP | Х | 2011 | | | + | + | |
| NFIP – Community Rating System | X | 2011 | | | + | + | |
| Floodplain Regulations (spec. NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance) | х | | | | | | |
| Floodplain Management Plan | Х | | | | | | |
| Zoning Regulations | Х | 1982 | | Zoning | + | + | |
| Subdivision Regulations | Х | 1980 | | Zoning | + | + | |
| Comprehensive Land Use Plan (or General, Master or Growth Mgt. Plan) | х | 2006 | | Zoning | | | |
| Open Space Management Plan (or Parks/Rec or Greenways Plan) | Х | 2009 | | Zoning | | | |
| Stormwater Management Plan / Ordinance | х | 2010 | | Zoning | | | |

| | Status | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| Tool / Program | In Place | Date Adopted or Updated | Under Develop- ment | Dept./Agency Responsible | Effect on Loss Reduction: + Support O Neutral - Hinder | Change Since Last Plan: + Positive - Negative | Comments |
| Natural Resource Protection Plan | Х | 2002 | | Zoning | 0 | + | |
| Capital Improvement Plan | | | | | | | |
| Economic Development Plan | | | | | | | |
| Historic Preservation Plan | | | | | | | |
| Farmland Preservation | Х | 2006 | | Zoning | + | + | |
| Building Code | Х | 2009 | | Zoning | + | + | |
| Fire Code | | | | | | | |
| Firewise | | | | | | | |
| Storm Ready | Х | | | Lehigh County | | | Lehigh County |
| Other | | | | | | | |

E.2 Administrative and Technical Capability

| Staff/Personnel Resources | Yes | No | Department/Agency | Comments |
|--|-----|----|---|----------|
| Planners (with land use / land development knowledge) | Х | | Planning Commission | |
| Planners or engineers (with natural and/or human caused hazards knowledge) | | Х | | |
| Engineers or professionals trained in building and/or infrastructure construction practices (includes building inspectors) | Х | | Code Master (contracted) Keystone Consulting Engineers (KCE - contracted) | |
| Emergency Manager | X | | Volunteer | |
| NFIP Floodplain Administrator | Х | | Zoning Officer (currently KCE) | |
| Land Surveyors | | Х | | |
| Scientists or staff familiar with the hazards of the community | | X | | |
| Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or FEMA's HAZUS program | | Х | | |
| Grant writers or fiscal staff to handle large/complex grants | | Х | | |
| Staff with expertise or training in Benefit-Cost Analysis | | Х | | |
| Other | | | | |

E.3 Fiscal Capability

| Financial Resources | Yes | No | Department/Agency | Comments |
|---|-----|----|-------------------------|--|
| Capital Improvement Programming | | X | | |
| Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) | Х | | Township Administrator | |
| Special Purpose Taxes | | X | | |
| Gas / Electric Utility Fees | | X | | |
| Water / Sewer Fees | | Х | | |
| Stormwater Utility Fees | | Х | | |
| Development Impact Fees | | Х | | |
| General Obligation, Revenue, and/or Special Tax Bonds | | Х | | |
| Partnering Arrangements or Intergovernmental Agreements | Х | | Road Master / Road Crew | Heidelberg, Lowhill, Lynn, Weisenberg COG |
| Other | | | | |

E.4 Community Classifications

| Program | Classification | Date Classified |
|--|---|-----------------|
| Community Rating System (CRS) | NP | N/A |
| Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) | 5 for 1&2 Family Dwellings 4 for all other Construction | 2011 |
| Public Protection | TBD | TBD |
| Storm Ready | Lehigh County | TBD |
| Firewise | NP | N/A |

N/A = Not applicable. NP = Not participating. TBD = To Be Determined.

The classifications listed above relate to the community's effectiveness in providing services that may impact it's 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. Storm Ready communities are better prepared to save lives from the onslaught of severe weather through advanced planning, education and awareness.

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. MITIGATION STRATEGY

F.1 Past Mitigation Activities/Efforts

- Replaced old piping under Rabbit Run Road to allow for increased flow at stream bed and reduce flooding across Rabbit Run Road and adjacent property. The township road was being eroded away and our road crew had to periodically clean the old deteriorated pipe of debris. The road surface was collapsing due to the flooding. This was a bus route and repairs were critical to keep the route open.
- Regraded all dirt roads to improve drainage at road and reduce erosion on road.

F.2 Hazard Vulnerabilities Identified

It is estimated that in Lynn Township, 196 residents live within the 1% annual chance flood area (NFIP Special Flood Hazard Area). Of the municipality's total land area, 6.2% is located within the 1% annual chance flood area. \$28,251,857 (4.6%) of the municipality's general building stock replacement cost value (structure and contents) is located within the 1% annual chance flood area.

There are 27 NFIP policies in the community. While there are 77 structures located within the 1% annual chance flood area, there are only 14 policies issued to property owners in the 1% annual chance flood area. FEMA has identified no Repetitive Loss (RL) or Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) properties in the municipality.

HAZUS-MH estimates that for a 1% annual chance flood, \$5,626,176 (09%) of the municipality's general building stock replacement cost value (structure and contents) will be damaged, 298 people may be displaced, 46 people may seek short-term sheltering, and an estimated 1,041 tons of debris could be generated.

HAZUS-MH estimates the following damage and loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of a 1% annual chance flood event:

Critical Facilities Located in the DFIRM 1% and 0.2% Flood Boundaries and Estimated Potential Damage from the 1% Flood Event

| | | Expo | sure | Potential L | oss from 1% | Flood Event |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| Name | Type | 1% Event | 0.2% Event | Structure Damage | Content Damages | Days to 100- Percent Functional |
| Lynn Township Sewer Authority | WWTF | Х | Х | - | - | - |

Source: FEMA, 2004; FEMA, 2011; HAZUS-MH 2.1

Notes:

X = indicates the facility location as provided by Lehigh Valley is located in the DFIRM flood zone.

NA = HAZUS-MH 2.1 does not estimate the days to 100-percent functional for user-defined facilities.

- = There is no damage estimate either because the 0.2% annual chance flood event potential loss estimates were not run in HAZUS or HAZUS did not calculate potential loss estimates for some facilities located in the DFIRM flood hazard zone. This is because even though these facilities are located within the boundary of the flood depth grid generated by HAZUS the depth of flooding does not amount to any damages to the structure or contents according to the depth damage function used in HAZUS.

The following vulnerabilities have been identified by the community, within the risk assessment, or in other plan, reports and documents (e.g. FEMA Flood Insurance Studies, Act 167 Stormwater Management Plans):

- None identified.

Please refer to the Hazard Profiles for additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction.

F.3 Hazard Mitigation Strategy

Note some of the identified mitigation initiatives in Table F are dependent upon available funding (grants and local match availability) and may be modified or omitted at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in municipal priorities.

| Action No. | Action | Mitigation Technique Category | Hazard(s) Addressed | Priority (H/M/L) | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Lead Agency / Department | Implementation Schedule | Applies to New and/or Existing Structures* |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1 | Replacement of old steel corrugated drain pipes with new smooth corrugated plastic pipe at many locations. The new piping will improve drainage and limit blockages that cause flooding and erosion onto and across Township dirt roads leading to damages and road closings. Improved drainage with the installation of the plastic pipes of various diameters will reduce costs to the township long term and improve road safety to the citizens of Lynn Township. | Property Protection; Structural Projects | Flood | High | Medium | FEMA Grant Programs with local budget for match | Lynn Township | Short Term DOF | Existing |
| 2 | 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, continue to meet and/or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria | Property Protection | Flood | High | Low - Medium | Municipal Budget | Municipality (via Municipal Engineer/NFIP Floodplain Administrator) with support from PEMA, ISO FEMA | On-going | New & Existing |

| Action No. | Action | Mitigation Technique Category | Hazard(s) Addressed | Priority (H/M/L) | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Lead Agency / Department | Implementation Schedule | Applies to New and/or Existing Structures* | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | through the following NFIP- related continued compliance actions identified below. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Conduct and facilitate community and public education and outreach for residents and businesses to include, but not be limited to, the followard promote and effect natural hazard risk reduction: • Provide and maintain links to the HMP website, and regularly post notices on the Township homepage(s) referencing the HMP website, with neighborhood associations, civic and business groups to disseminate information on flood insurance and the availability mitigation grant funding. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | See above. | Public Education and Awareness | All Hazards | High | Low- Medium | Municipal Budget | Municipality with support from Planning Partners, PEMA, FEMA | Short Term | N/A | | | | | | |
| 4 | Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0 | All Categories | All Hazards | High | Low – High (for 5-year update) | Municipal Budget, possibly FEMA Mitigation Grant Funding for 5-year update | Municipality (via mitigation planning point of contacts) with support from Planning Partners (through their Points of Contact), PEMA | On-going | New & Existing | | | | | | |
| 5 | Complete the ongoing updates of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans | Emergency Services | All Hazards | High | Low | Municipal Budget | Municipality with support from PEMA | On-going | New & Existing | | | | | | |
| 6 | Create/enhance/ maintain mutual aid agreements with neighboring communities for continuity of operations. | Emergency Services | All Hazards | High | Low | Municipal Budget | Municipality with support from Surrounding municipalities and County | On-going | New & Existing | | | | | | |
| 7 | Identify and develop agreements with entities that can provide support with FEMA/PEMA paperwork after disasters; qualified damage | Public Education and Awareness, Emergency | All Hazards | High | Medium | Municipal budget | Municipality with support from County, PEMA, FEMA | Short Term | NA | | | | | | |

| Action No. | Action | Mitigation Technique Category | Hazard(s) Addressed | Priority (H/M/L) | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Lead Agency / Department | Implementation Schedule | Applies to New and/or Existing Structures* |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|--|----------------------------|---|
| | assessment personnel – Improve post-disaster capabilities – damage assessment; FEMA/PEMA paperwork compilation, submissions, record-keeping | Services | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Work with regional agencies (i.e. County and PEMA) to help develop damage assessment capabilities at the local level through such things as training programs, certification of qualified individuals (e.g. code officials, floodplain managers, engineers). | Public Education and Awareness, Emergency Services | All Hazards | Medium | Medium | Municipal budget, FEMA HMA and HLS grant programs | Municipality with support from County, PEMA | Short Term DOF | NA |

Notes:

*Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure? Not applicable (NA) is inserted if this does not apply.

Costs

Where actual project costs have been reasonably estimated:

Low = < \$10.000

Medium = \$10,000 to \$100,000

High = > \$100,000

Where actual project costs cannot reasonably be established at this time:

Low = Possible to fund under existing budget. Project is part of, or can be part of an existing on-going program.

Medium = Could budget for under existing work-plan, but would require a reapportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the project would have to be spread over multiple years.

High = Would require an increase in revenue via an alternative source (i.e., bonds, grants, fee increases) to implement. Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed project.

Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources:

PDM = Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program

FMA = Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program

RFC = Repetitive Flood Claims Grant Program

SRL = Severe Repetitive Loss Grant Program

HMGP = Hazard Mitigation Grant Program

Timeline:

Short = 1 to 5 years. Long Term= 5 years or greater. OG = On-going program.



DOF = Depending on funding.

G. ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

Municipal mitigation actions were evaluated and prioritized primarily using the PA STEEL methodology discussed in Section 6 of this plan. Per the cost-benefit weighted PA STEEL methodology, those actions receiving 20 or more favorable ratings were generally considered high-priority actions. However, other factors beyond the PA STEEL numeric ranking may have been considered by the municipality during project prioritization. For example, a project might be assigned a medium priority because of the uncertainty of a funding source, and could be changed to high once a funding source has been identified such as a grant.

| | | | PA STEEL CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS (+) Favorable (-) Less favorable (N) Not Applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Res | ults | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Mitigation Action | | P Political | | | A Administrative | | | S Social | | T Technical | | E Economic | | | E Environmental | | | | | L Legal | | | | (2) | | |
| NO. | Name | Political Support | Local Champion | Public Support | Staffing | Funding Allocation | Maintenance / Operations | Community Acceptance | Effect on Segment of Population | Technically Feasible | Long-Term Solution | Secondary Impacts | Benefit of Action (x3) | Cost of Action (x3) | Contributes to Economic Goals | Outside Funding Required | Effect on Land / Water | Effect on Endangered Species | Effect on HAZMAT / Waste Site | Consistent w/ Community Environmental Goals | Consistent w/ Federal Laws | State Authority | Existing Local Authority | Potential Legal Challenge | SUMMARY (EQUAL WEIGHTING) | SUMMARY (BENEFITS & COSTS PRIORITIZED) |
| 1 | Drain Pipe Replacement Project | + | + | + | N | N | N | + | + | + | + | N | N | N | N | N | - | - | N | - | + | + | N | N | 9(+) 3(-) 11(N) | 9(+) 3(-) 11(N |
| 2 | Maintain NFIP compliance | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | N | + | + | N | + | - | 19 (+) 2 (-) 2 (N) | 23 (+) 2 (-) 2 (N) |
| 3 | Public Education and Outreach | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | N | N | N | N | N | N | + | + | 17 (+) 0 (-) 6 (N) | 21 (+) 0 (-) 6 (N) |
| 4 | Support Plan Maintenance and Update | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | N | N | N | N | + | + | + | + | 19 (+) 0 (-) 4 (N) | 23 (+) 0 (-) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 (N) |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 5 | Update CEMP | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Z | Ν | + | Ν | + | + | + | + | 20 (+) 0 (-) 3 (N) | 24 (+) 0 (-) 3 (N) |
| 6 | Enhance Mutual Aid Agreements | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Z | Ν | + | Ν | + | Z | + | + | 19 (+) 0 (-) 3 (N) | 23 (+) 0 (-) 3 (N) |
| 7 | Identify Post- Disaster Capabilities | + | + | + | + | 1 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | N | Ν | Ν | + | Z | + | + | 18 (+) 1 (-) 4 (N) | 22 (+) 4 (-) 4 (N) |
| 8 | Develop Post- Disaster Capabilities | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | 1 | + | Z | Z | Z | + | Z | + | + | 15 (+) 4 (-) 4 (N) | 17 (+) 6 (-) 4 (N) |

H. FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/VULNERABILITY

A more detailed flood loss analysis could be conducted on a structural level (versus the Census block analysis conducted for the HMP). The location of each building, details regarding the building (see additional data needed below) and the assessed or fair market value could be included in HAZUS-MH. The FEMA DFIRM boundaries, FEMA Flood Insurance Study detailed studies, base flood elevations and available Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data or digital elevation models (DEM) could be used to generate a more accurate flood depth grid and then integrated into the HAZUS model. The flood depth-damage functions could be updated using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer damage functions for residential building stock to better correlate HAZUS-MH results with FEMA benefit-cost analysis models. HAZUS-MH would then estimate more accurate potential losses per structure.

Additional data needed to perform the analysis described above:

- Specific building information first-floor elevation (elevation certificates), number of stories, foundation type, basement, square footage, occupancy type, year built, type of construction etc.
- Assessed or fair market value of structure
- LiDAR or high resolution DEM

I. HAZARD AREA EXTENT AND LOCATION

A hazard area extent and location map has been generated and is provided below for Lynn Township to illustrate the probable areas impacted within Lynn Township. 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 Lynn Township has significant exposure. Regional hazard maps are provided in the hazard profiles within Section 4, Volume I of this plan.

J. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

No additional comments at this time.

