

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA’s evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The Plan Assessment identifies the plan’s strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

Jurisdiction: Lehigh and Northampton Counties	Title of Plan: Lehigh Valley Hazard Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: August 21, 2018
Local Point of Contact: Geoffrey Reese, PE	Address: 961 Marcon Blvd, Suite 310, Allentown, PA 18109	
Title: Director of Environmental Planning		
Agency: Lehigh Valley Planning Commission		
Phone Number: 610-264-4544		

State Reviewer: Ernest Szabo	Title: State Hazard Mitigation Planner	Date: 27 Aug 2018
--	--	-----------------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Jack Heide	Title: Community Planner	Date: October 4, 2018
Date Received in FEMA Region (insert #)	September 10, 2018	
Plan Not Approved	October 4, 2018	
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption		
Plan Approved		

**SECTION 1:
REGULATION CHECKLIST**

INSTRUCTIONS: The Regulation Checklist must be completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the Plan by Element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met.’ The ‘Required Revisions’ summary at the bottom of each Element must be completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is ‘Not Met.’ Sub-elements should be referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each Element and sub-element are described in detail in this *Plan Review Guide* in Section 4, Regulation Checklist.

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)			
ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS			
A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))	Section 3; Municipal and County Annexes; Appendix C		X
A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))	Section 3.2-3.4; Section 6.1: pg.250; Section 6.4: pg. 255; Pgs. 272-274; Municipal Annexes; Appendix C	X	
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	Section 3.3-3.4; Section 6.1: pg. 250; Section 6.4: pg. 255; Pgs. 273-274; Municipal Annexes; Appendix C	X	
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Section 2; 4.2-4.3; 4.4.3; Section 5; Appendix A	X	
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))	Section 7.3	X	
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))	Section 7	X	
ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS			
A.1. Revision: Upper Mt. Bethel does not list any points of contact for who participated in the plan representing the municipality. In order to be approved there must be an indication someone representing the interests of the jurisdiction actually participated in the planning process.			

Question. On p. 22 it says "\$16 saved..." Is that right? I thought FEMAS said \$6? Make sure this is fixed with edited update.

ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT			
B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4; County Annex		X
B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4; Municipal and County Annexes	X	
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard's impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community's vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Section 4.3-4.4; Municipal Annexes; Appendix D; Appendix F	X	
B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Section 4.3.4: pgs. 97-100; Municipal Annexes	X	
<u>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>			
ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY			
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))	Section 5; Municipal Annexes		X
C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Section 4.3.4: pgs. 97-100; Section 5.2.1: pgs. 223-228; Section 6.4: pgs. 255-258; Municipal Annexes		X
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Executive Summary: pg. 18; Section 6.1-6.2	X	
C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Section 6.3-6.4: pgs. 253-258; Municipal and County Annexes		X

C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	Section 6.4; Municipal and County Annexes	X	
C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))	Section 4.4.4; 5.2.5; 7.2; Municipal and County Annexes	X	

ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS

C.1. Revisions: Upper Mt. Bethel did not complete a review of their capabilities assessment. In order to be approved the municipality must complete the spreadsheet tool used to assess capabilities for all the other jurisdiction.

C.1. Comment: The capabilities assessment holistically was a great start towards understanding the jurisdictions ability to implement a comprehensive disaster risk reduction program. There was several areas where the plan went deeper than just listing plans, programs, and policies which is fantastic. In future iterations work on going beyond the standard list of plans and policies and really have an open discussion about where other planning mechanisms are promoting risk reduction and how the same mechanisms are actually hindering risk reduction.

C.2. Revisions: Each jurisdiction needs to provide greater clarity on their continued compliance with NFIP requirements. The “Compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)” questionnaire is a good tool to use for understanding each jurisdictions current status; however, the tool needs to be completely and correctly filled out for every jurisdiction, if appropriate. Several jurisdictions do not answer the questions or provide half answers. As it appears all the communities in both counties participate in the NFIP, each jurisdiction must completely and accurately fill out the questionnaire (if the questionnaire is to remain the method of meeting the C2 requirement).

C.3. Comment: Great goals for reducing long-term risks; however, listing the NFIP/flooding as the main driver for so many of these goals does not address the holistic needs for reducing risk across all hazards. Many of the goals could be applicable to many of the hazards not just the NFIP/flooding.

C.4. Revisions: Each jurisdiction wishing to participate in the plan and become approved must have at least one mitigation action. The municipalities of Alburtis, Slatington, and Washington (LC) do not have any mitigation actions. The actions listed are related to preparedness and recovery but not mitigation.

C.4. Comment: Most of the actions provided address only the flood hazard impacting the jurisdictions. There are a number of a great actions for reducing flood risk, however, some of the actions listed claim to address multiple hazards when the action only relates to flood hazard risk. Future updates should continue to more thoroughly explore a more comprehensive strategy to addressing the risks for all the hazards identified in the plan and for each jurisdiction.

There are numerous other risks the jurisdiction as whole face and yet the actions do not address most of the identified hazards. The wildfire related mitigation, #27, simply states “Wildfire Mitigation,” with no explanation of what an action might look like. Within the municipal annexes several jurisdictions propose actions simply stating actions like, “stormwater management programs, mitigation efforts” (Bethlehem Township). In of themselves these are not actions, in future please ensure fully fleshed out mitigation actions that specifically target reducing a risk to a specific hazard.

ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only)

D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 2.4; Municipal Annexes	X	
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 6.4: pgs. 263-264; Municipal and County Annexes	X	

D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Executive Summary: pg. 19; Section 6.4: pgs. 256-263; Municipal and County Annexes	X	
<u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>			
ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION			
E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Section 8 (description of process)		
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Section 8 (description of process)		
<u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>			
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)			
F1.			
F2.			
<u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>			

SECTION 2: PLAN ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of the Plan Assessment is to offer the local community more comprehensive feedback to the community on the quality and utility of the plan in a narrative format. The audience for the Plan Assessment is not only the plan developer/local community planner, but also elected officials, local departments and agencies, and others involved in implementing the Local Mitigation Plan. The Plan Assessment must be completed by FEMA. The Assessment is an opportunity for FEMA to provide feedback and information to the community on: 1) suggested improvements to the Plan; 2) specific sections in the Plan where the community has gone above and beyond minimum requirements; 3) recommendations for plan implementation; and 4) ongoing partnership(s) and information on other FEMA programs, specifically RiskMAP and Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs. The Plan Assessment is divided into two sections:

1. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement
2. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement is organized according to the plan Elements listed in the Regulation Checklist. Each Element includes a series of italicized bulleted items that are suggested topics for consideration while evaluating plans, but it is not intended to be a comprehensive list. FEMA Mitigation Planners are not required to answer each bullet item, and should use them as a guide to paraphrase their own written assessment (2-3 sentences) of each Element.

The Plan Assessment must not reiterate the required revisions from the Regulation Checklist or be regulatory in nature, and should be open-ended and to provide the community with suggestions for improvements or recommended revisions. The recommended revisions are suggestions for improvement and are not required to be made for the Plan to meet Federal regulatory requirements. The italicized text should be deleted once FEMA has added comments regarding strengths of the plan and potential improvements for future plan revisions. It is recommended that the Plan Assessment be a short synopsis of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Plan (no longer than two pages), rather than a complete recap section by section.

Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan provides a place for FEMA to offer information, data sources and general suggestions on the overall plan implementation and maintenance process. Information on other possible sources of assistance including, but not limited to, existing publications, grant funding or training opportunities, can be provided. States may add state and local resources, if available.

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

Element A: Planning Process

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the planning process with respect to:

- *Involvement of stakeholders (elected officials/decision makers, plan implementers, business owners, academic institutions, utility companies, water/sanitation districts, etc.);*
- *Involvement of Planning, Emergency Management, Public Works Departments or other planning agencies (i.e., regional planning councils);*
- *Diverse methods of participation (meetings, surveys, online, etc.); and*
- *Reflective of an open and inclusive public involvement process.*

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

In addition to the requirements listed in the Regulation Checklist, 44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans identifies additional elements that should be included as part of a plan's risk assessment. The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of:

- 1) *A general description of land uses and future development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions;*
- 2) *The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas; and*
- 3) *A description of potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures, and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate.*

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment with respect to:

- *Use of best available data (flood maps, HAZUS, flood studies) to describe significant hazards;*
- *Communication of risk on people, property, and infrastructure to the public (through tables, charts, maps, photos, etc.);*
- *Incorporation of techniques and methodologies to estimate dollar losses to vulnerable structures;*
- *Incorporation of Risk MAP products (i.e., depth grids, Flood Risk Report, Changes Since Last FIRM, Areas of Mitigation Interest, etc.); and*
- *Identification of any data gaps that can be filled as new data became available.*

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Mitigation Strategy with respect to:

- *Key problems identified in, and linkages to, the vulnerability assessment;*
- *Serving as a blueprint for reducing potential losses identified in the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment;*
- *Plan content flow from the risk assessment (problem identification) to goal setting to mitigation action development;*
- *An understanding of mitigation principles (diversity of actions that include structural projects, preventative measures, outreach activities, property protection measures, post-disaster actions, etc);*
- *Specific mitigation actions for each participating jurisdictions that reflects their unique risks and capabilities;*
- *Integration of mitigation actions with existing local authorities, policies, programs, and resources; and*
- *Discussion of existing programs (including the NFIP), plans, and policies that could be used to implement mitigation, as well as document past projects.*

Element D: Plan Update, Evaluation, and Implementation (Plan Updates Only)

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the 5-year Evaluation and Implementation measures with respect to:

- *Status of previously recommended mitigation actions;*
- *Identification of barriers or obstacles to successful implementation or completion of mitigation actions, along with possible solutions for overcoming risk;*
- *Documentation of annual reviews and committee involvement;*
- *Identification of a lead person to take ownership of, and champion the Plan;*
- *Reducing risks from natural hazards and serving as a guide for decisions makers as they commit resources to reducing the effects of natural hazards;*
- *An approach to evaluating future conditions (i.e. socio-economic, environmental, demographic, change in built environment etc.);*
- *Discussion of how changing conditions and opportunities could impact community resilience in the long term; and*
- *Discussion of how the mitigation goals and actions support the long-term community vision for increased resilience.*

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Ideas may be offered on moving the mitigation plan forward and continuing the relationship with key mitigation stakeholders such as the following:

- *What FEMA assistance (funding) programs are available (for example, Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA)) to the jurisdiction(s) to assist with implementing the mitigation actions?*
- *What other Federal programs (National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), Community Rating System (CRS), Risk MAP, etc.) may provide assistance for mitigation activities?*
- *What publications, technical guidance or other resources are available to the jurisdiction(s) relevant to the identified mitigation actions?*
- *Are there upcoming trainings/workshops (Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA), HMA, etc.) to assist the jurisdictions(s)?*
- *What mitigation actions can be funded by other Federal agencies (for example, U.S. Forest Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Smart Growth, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities, etc.) and/or state and local agencies?*

SECTION 3: MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: For multi-jurisdictional plans, a Multi-jurisdiction Summary Spreadsheet may be completed by listing each participating jurisdiction, which required Elements for each jurisdiction were 'Met' or 'Not Met,' and when the adoption resolutions were received. This Summary Sheet does not imply that a mini-plan be developed for each jurisdiction; it should be used as an optional worksheet to ensure that each jurisdiction participating in the Plan has been documented and has met the requirements for those Elements (A through E).

Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Type	Plan Point of Contact	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met? (Y/N)				
						Planning Process	Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	Mitigation Strategy	Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	Plan Adoption
Lehigh County										
Alburtis	B	Tracy Malinowski	260 Franklin St, PO Box 435, Alburtis, PA 18011	tracym@alburtis.org	610-966-4777	Y	Y	N	Y	
Allentown	C	Lee Laubach, Jr.	641 South 10th Street, Allentown, PA 18103	lee.laubach@allentownpa.gov	610-437-7765	Y	Y	M	Y	
Catasauqua	B	Joseph Carl	90 Bridge St, Catasauqua, PA 18032	carljm@rcn.com	610-264-0571	Y	Y	M	Y	
Coopersburg	B	Timothy Paashaus	5 North Main Street, Coopersburg, PA 18036	tpaashaus@coopersburgborough.org	610-282-3307	Y	Y	M	Y	
Coplay	B	Sandra Gycsek	98 S. 4th Street, Coplay, PA 18037	sandyg@coplayborough.org	610-262-6088	Y	Y	M	Y	
Emmaus	B	James Krippe	28 South 4th Street, Emmaus, PA 18049	ema@borough.emmaus.pa.us	610-966-7522/ 610-428-6441	Y	Y	M	Y	
Fountain Hill	B	Anthony Branco	941 Long Street, Fountain Hill, PA 18015	abranco@fhboro.org	610-867-0301	Y	Y	M	Y	
Hanover	T	Chris Garges	2202 Grove Road, Allentown, PA 18109	cgarges@hanleco.org	610-264-1069	Y	Y	M	Y	
Heidelberg	T	Janice Meyers	6272 Route 309, Suite A, New Tripoli, PA 18066	jmeyers75@ptd.net	610-767-9297	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lower Macungie	T	Vince Tranguch	3400 Brookside Road, Macungie, PA 18062	vtranguch@lowermac.com	610-966-4343	Y	Y	M	Y	

Lower Milford	T	Zack Cooperman	7607 Chestnut Hill Church Road, Coopersburg, PA 18036	assistmanager@lowermilford.org	610-967-4949	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lowhill	T	Brian Carl	2175 Seipstown Rd, Fogelsville, PA 18051	brian@weisenbergtownship.org	610-285-6660	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lynn	T	Tammy White	7911 Kings Highway, New Tripoli, PA 18066	tammyw@ptd.net	610-298-2645	Y	Y	M	Y	
Macungie	B	Chris Boehm	21 Locust Street, Macungie, PA 18062	clboehm@macungie.pa.us	610-966-2503	Y	Y	M	Y	
North Whitehall	T	Jeff Bartlett	3256 Levans Rd, Coplay, PA 18037	jbartlett@northwhitehall.org	610-799-3411	Y	Y	M	Y	
Salisbury	T	Cynthia Sopka	2900 South Pike Avenue, Allentown, PA 18103	csopka@salisburytownship.org	610-797-4000	Y	Y	M	Y	
Slatington	B	Ronald Hausman	125 S Walnut Street, Slatington, PA 18080	general413@lycos.com	610-597-7351	Y	Y	N	Y	
South Whitehall	T	Renee Bickel	4444 Walbert Ave, Allentown, PA	bickelr@southwhitehallwp.org	610-398-0401	Y	Y	M	Y	
Upper Macungie	T	Duane Dellecker	8330 Schantz Road, Breinigsville, PA 18031	ddellecker@uppermac.org	610-395-4892	Y	Y	M	Y	
Upper Milford	T	Edward Carter	P.O. Box 210, Old Zionsville, PA 18068	ecarter@uppermilford.net	610-966-3223	Y	Y	M	Y	
Upper Saucon	T	Chuck Castetter	4445 West Hopewell Road, Center Valley, PA 18034	usfd2701@rcn.com	610-791-0266	Y	Y	M	Y	
Washington	T	Sherry Graver	7951 Center Street, Emerald, PA 18080	washtwpemc@ptd.net	610-462-5249	Y	Y	M	Y	
Weisenberg	T	Brian Carl	2175 Seipstown Rd, Fogelsville, PA 18051	brian@weisenbergtownship.org	610-285-6660	Y	Y	M	Y	
Whitehall	T	Christopher Grim	3219 MacArthur Road, Whitehall, PA 18052	cgrim@whitehalltownship.com	610-437-5524	Y	Y	M	Y	

Northampton County

Allen	T	Gary Krill	26 Debbie Road, Northampton, PA 18067	garykrill@gmail.com	610-262-0293	Y	Y	M	Y	
Bangor	B	Nathaniel Dysard	197 Pennsylvania Aveune, Bangor, PA 18013	ndysard@bangorborou gh.org	610-588-2216	Y	Y	M	Y	
Bath	B	Bradford Flynn	215 East Main Street, Bath, PA 18014	manager@boroughofba th.org	610-837-6525	Y	Y	M	Y	
Bethlehem	C	Wade Haubert	10 E. Church Street, Bethlehem, PA 18018	whaubert@bethlehem- pa.gov	610-997-5008	Y	Y	M	Y	
Bethlehem	T	Angela Kelly	4225 Easton Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18020	akelly@bethlehemtp.o rg	610-814-6441	Y	Y	M	Y	
Bushkill	T	Brian Harris	1114 Bushkill Center Road, Nazareth, PA 18064	harr3271@gmail.com	610-759-1250	Y	Y	M	Y	
Chapman	B	Curtis Fehnel	1453 Main St, Bath, PA 18014	cwfehnelcpa@epix.net	610-837-0971	Y	Y	M	Y	
East Allen	T	James Milot	5344 Nor-Bath Boulevard, Northampton, PA 18067	jmilot@hanovereng.com	610-691-5644	Y	Y	M	Y	
East Bangor	B	Pete Zazulak	220 Blaine Street, East Bangor, PA 18013	firechief3151@yahoo.co m	610-462-1132	Y	Y	M	Y	
Easton	C	Tina Roseberry	123 S. Third Street, Easton, PA 18042	troseberry@easton- pa.gov	610-250-6651	Y	Y	M	Y	
Forks	T	Tim Weis	1606 Sullivan Trail, Easton, PA 18040	tweis@forkstownship.or g	610-250-2264	Y	Y	M	Y	
Freemansburg	B	Gerald Gasda	600 Monroe St, Freemansburg, PA 18017	manager@boroughoffre emansburg.org	610-866-2220; (c) 484-510- 0232	Y	Y	M	Y	
Glendon	B	Theresa Sidor	24 Franklin Street, Glendon, PA 18042	glendonboro@rcn.com	610-253-1577	Y	Y	M	Y	
Hanover	T	Vincent Milite	3630 Jacksonville Road, Bethlehem, PA 18017	vmilite@hanovertwp- nc.org	610-866-1140	Y	Y	M	Y	

Hellertown	B	Bryan Smith	85 S. Route 100 & Kessler Lane, Trexlertown, PA 18087	bsmith@barryisett.com	610-398-0904	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lehigh	T	Alice Rehrig	1069 Municipal Road, Walnutport, PA 18088	arehrig@lehigh township .com	610-767-6771	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lower Mt Bethel	T	Susan Disidore	P.O. Box 257, Martins Creek, PA 18064	susanlmbt@frontier.co m	610-252-5074	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lower Nazareth	T	Lori Seese	623 Municipal Drive, Nazareth, PA 18064	lseese@lowernazareth.com	610-759-7434	Y	Y	M	Y	
Lower Saucon	T	Leslie Huhn	3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA 18015	manager@lowersaucon township.org	610-865-3291	Y	Y	M	Y	
Moore	T	Henry VanBlargan	763 Point Phillips Rd, Bath, PA 18014	hankvb@entermail.net	610-837-1182	Y	Y	M	Y	
Nazareth	B	Jessica Teel	41 South Pine Street, Nazareth, PA 18064	jessicagteel@gmail.com	717-554-5292	Y	Y	M	Y	
North Catasauqua	B	Gregory Scheirer	640 Penn Street, North Catasauqua, PA 18032	scheirerg@gmail.com	484-553-5085	Y	Y	M	Y	
Northampton	B	LeRoy Brobst	1401 Laubach Avenue, Northampton, PA 18067	leroyb@enter.net	610-262-2576	Y	Y	M	Y	
Palmer	T	Christopher Christman	3 Weller Place, Palmer, PA 18045	cchristman@palmertwp.com	610-253-7191	Y	Y	M	Y	
Pen Argyl	B	Robin Zmoda	11 N. Robinson Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072	manager@penargylboro ugh.com	610-863-1822	Y	Y	M	Y	
Plainfield	T	Thomas Petrucci	6292 Sullivan Trail, Nazareth, PA 18064	manager@twp.plainfield .pa.us	610-759-6944	Y	Y	M	Y	
Portland	B	Lance Prator	206 Division Street, P.O. Box 476, Portland, PA 18351	mrlance66@yahoo.com	570-897-0559	Y	Y	M	Y	
Roseto	B	Cathy Martino	164 Garibaldi Avenue, Roseto, PA 18013-1371	rosbor@epix.net	610-588-0695	Y	Y	M	Y	

Stockertown	B	John Soloe	301 State Street, Stockertown, PA 18083	stockpolice@rcn.com	610-759-3232	Y	Y	M	Y	
Tatamy	B	Kim Albert	164 Bushkill St, P.O. Box 12, Tatamy, PA 18085	tatamy1@rcn.com	610-730-2100	Y	Y	M	Y	
Upper Mt Bethel	T	Lindsey Manzi	493 Slateford Road, Mount Bethel, PA 18343	lindseymanzi@gmail.co m	570-897-6127	N	Y	M	Y	
Upper Nazareth	T	EJ Mentry	100 Newport Avenue, Nazareth, PA 18064	untmanager@rcn.com	610-759-5341	Y	Y	M	Y	
Walnutport	B	Michael Wentz	417 Lincoln Avenue, Walnutport, PA 18088	mike2902@msn.com	610-767-1322	Y	Y	M	Y	
Washington	T	James Krome	1021 Washington Boulevard, Bangor, PA 18013	wtpd3807@frontier.com	610-588-2040	Y	Y	N	Y	
West Easton	B	Pete Mammana	220 10th Street, West Easton, PA 18042	coolrunnings@ptd.net	610-252-1387	Y	Y	M	Y	
Williams	T	Richard Adams	655 Cider Press Road, Easton, PA 18042	radams@williamstwp.or g	610-258-0522	Y	Y	M	Y	
Wilson	B	Monica Wall	74 W. Broad Street, Bethlehem, PA 18018	mwall@tandmassociate s.com	610-625-2999	Y	Y	M	Y	
Wind Gap	B	Louise Firestone	545 East West Street, Wind Gap, PA 18091	louise@windgap-pa.gov	610-863-2157 / 610-863-7288	Y	Y	M	Y	

