

APPENDIX B: LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

This appendix contains a copy of the plan review tool that describes the location of the required sections of the plan per §201.6.



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: Adams County, PA	Title of Plan: Adams County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2020 Update)	Date of Plan: 2020
Local Point of Contact: Warren P. Bladen		Address: 230 Greenamyer Lane Gettysburg, PA 17325
Title: Director		
Agency: Adams County Department of Emergency Services		
Phone Number: 717-334-8603		E-Mail: wpbladen@adamscounty.us

State Reviewer: Ernie Szabo	Title: State HM Planner	Date: 24 June 20
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Joshua Norris	Title: Maryland FIT Hazard Mitigation Planner	Date: 9/11/2020
Date Received in FEMA Region <i>(insert #)</i>	July 15, 2020	
Plan Not Approved	Minor Revisions Required.	
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))	Sec. 3.0, pp. 41-50; see Table 3.5-1, p. 50, for municipal participation; App. 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))	Sec. 3.4, pp. 47-49; App. 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))	Sec. 3.4, pp. 47-49; App. C	X		
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Sec. 1.4, pp. 2-4; Sec. 5.2.6, pp. 242-247; see also App. E for list of citations used in HIRA	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))	Sec. 7.3, p. 286	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))	Sec. 7.2, pp. 285-286	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
<u>ELEMENT A:</u>				
<u>REQUIRED REVISION</u>				
A1. Section 3.1 states that “Latimore Township did not participate in the [Plan] update.” Did this Township participate in the previous Plan update? Does the County plan to engage Latimore Township during the annual plan review(s)? Include information in the Plan explaining why this Township did not participate in Plan development. Latimore Township agreed to participate late in the process per the ACDES Director. See revisions to this effect on p. 41 and p. 49.				
<u>RECOMMENDED REVISION</u>				
A2. Include a narrative description of the source or a citation to support the statement that “[c]ompared to other areas in the region, Adams County is rural, and residents are proud of that image,” page 13. Was this gleaned from interviews with County Staff, were residents surveyed, or was this question perhaps posed at a public meeting? This sentiment came from a document produced by Penn State Extension. We added a citation to this effect, pointing to Appendix A: Bibliography for the full reference. See p. 17 for the citation.				
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))	Sec. 4.2.2, pp. 53-55 (for list); Sec. 4.3, pp. 55-206 (for profiles)	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))	Sec. 4.3, pp. 55-206 (see “Past Occurrences,” “Future Occurrences,” and “Vulnerability Assessment” subsections of each profile)	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))	Sec. 4.3, pp. 55-206 (each profile describes impacts, see “Location & Extent,” “Range & Magnitude,” and “Vulnerability Assessment” subsections of each profile)	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))	Sec. 4.3.4.1, pp. 89-92			X

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST

Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)

Location in Plan
(section and/or
page number)

Met Not
Met

ELEMENT B:

REQUIRED REVISIONS

B4: Page 90 states that “[t]he Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA grant and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) both track losses due to flooding. Each agency defines repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties slightly differently.” Please address this discrepancy by changing agency to program and adding the second parentheses bracket after “FMA.” Both edits made on p. 90.

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS

B1: For the Dam Failure risk assessment section, include definitions of Significant, High, and Low Hazard Potential and Categories I, II, and III. We added footnote citations from an April 2004 FEMA document on p. 172; we added the FEMA document in question to the bibliography in Appendix A.

B1: Improve the resolution of Figure 4.3.10.1-1. We attempted to improve the resolution on the picture; it is improved (see p. 141), though some of the small text remains difficult to read.

B1: Streamline the formatting of text (such as font and column size) for Table 4.3.9.2-2 Adams County Vaccination Rates, 2015-2019. We updated all fonts to Arial Narrow; however, there was little to be done to allow the chart to fit on one page. See p. 135.

B2: For most hazards, a countywide probability of future hazard events value is provided within the frequency row of the Vulnerability Summary tables. Ensure that all hazards clearly express a probability value or estimated occurrence rate and work closely with the municipalities to identify when community-specific probabilities differ from the countywide probabilities. The inclusion of such granular data will improve the utility and implementation of the Plan. Adams County will take this recommendation under advisement during future updates.

B2: Include a map in Section 4.3.7.1 that identifies the location of invasive species (such as those in Tables 4.3.7.3-1 and 4.3.7.3-2) within Adams County and its municipalities. Adams County will take this recommendation under advisement during future updates.

B3: Include damage information concerning each of the Hurricanes that impacted Adams County, as the Plan does for each Thunderstorm Event in Adams County from 1955-2019 (Table 4.3.6.2-1). The narrative preceding Table 4.3.6.2-1 details the three primary hurricanes and tropical storms to impact the area. No change made, but the recommendation will be under advisement during the next update.

B3: Define and introduce the term “fruit belt” referenced on page 12 and consider including Figure 4.3.1.1-1 at the outset of the plan to allow the reader to grasp the Pennsylvania Fruit Belt’s location with respect to Adams County. We added a footnote with a definition on p. 5; we updated Appendix A: Bibliography to include the reference.

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))

Sec. 5.2, pp. 237-242; Table 5.2.6-1, pp. 243-245

X

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
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))	Sec. 5.2, pp. 237-238, see Table 5.2-1; Sec. 4.3.4.1, pp. 89-92; Sec. 4.4.3, <i>Flood, Flash Flood, Ice Jam</i> subsection, pp. 211-213	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Sec. 6.2; p. 259; see Table 6.1-1 for changes to goals & objectives, pp. 249-250	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))	Sec. 6.3, pp. 259-262; see Table 6.1-2 for status updates to actions, pp. 252-258	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))	Sec. 6.4, pp. 262-283 (see Tables 6.4-2 and 6.4-3 and the surrounding narrative for prioritization explanation, pp. 265-271)	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))	Sec. 5.2.6, pp. 242-246	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST

Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)

Location in Plan
(section and/or
page number)

Met Not
Met Met

ELEMENT C:

REQUIRED REVISIONS

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS

C1: Include narrative to support the information contained within Table 5.2-1. For instance, explain how each jurisdiction’s Comprehensive Plan, NFIP, Zoning Ordinance, etc., capabilities are demonstrated. In addition, include narrative information regarding the capability deficiencies identified in the table. Adams County hosted a survey of municipalities to capture this information. The narrative that follows on pp. 238-242 provides qualitative information on those capabilities.

C1: According to Table 5.2-1, Adams County and New Oxford Borough do not have NFIP capabilities. Include a mitigation action or actions to address such capability gaps. NFIP concerns are handled at the municipal level in Adams County; Table 5.2-1 updated to reflect this. See p. 237. According to FIRM data, there are no flood hazard areas of concern in New Oxford Borough.

C1: Update the Adams County Asset Inventory Appendix to include data of construction data for each identified asset. Adams County will take this recommendation under advisement during future updates.

C4: Update Action 4.D.8 (“Work with PEMA, FEMA, and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to stay abreast of developments in procedures for identifying and determining benefits/costs for potential mitigation actions for terrorist activities”) to pertain to all hazards profiled in the Plan as opposed to only Terrorism. Revision made; see p. 282.

C5: Include a mitigation action that supports the enforcement and adoption of building codes (for at least the two most recent editions of International Building Codes). We revised Action 3.A.3, which targeted monitoring municipal ordinances from a mitigation perspective, to include this recommendation. See p. 276.

C6: Update Table 5.2.6-1 Integration of Mitigation Plan Into the Local Planning Framework to include information regarding the status of plan integration actions identified in previous versions of the plan, and additional or updated actions for each of the plans identified. The existing table shows completed actions; Adams County will take this recommendation under advisement during future updates.

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))	Sec. 4.4.4, pp. 218-235	X	
---	-------------------------	---	--

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))		Sec. 6.1, pp. 248-; see Table 6.1-1 for changes to goals & objectives, pp. 249-250; see Table 6.1-2 for status of mitigation actions, pp. 252-258; see Table 7.1-1 for general plan maintenance efforts, p. 285	X	
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))		Sec. 3.1, pp. 41-43; Sec. 4.1, pp. 51-52; Sec. 5.1, pp. 236-237; Sec. 6.1, pp. 248-258; Sec. 7.1, pp. 284-285	X	
<u>ELEMENT D:</u>				
<u>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))		TBD		
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))		TBD		
<u>ELEMENT E:</u>				
<u>REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				
F1.				
F2.				
<u>ELEMENT F:</u>				
<u>REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

SECTION 2: PLAN ASSESSMENT

INSTRUCTIONS:

Plan Strengths

The Plan...

- Is well organized.
- Effectively employs maps to visually illustrate hazard risk.
- Includes excellent summary charts at the beginning of each hazard's risk assessment section.
- Connects discrete conversations held during the planning process to mitigation strategies developed.
- Contains a mitigation action plan that addresses each identified hazard.
- Includes Hazard Vulnerability Summaries that provide a clear and comprehensive assessment of risk.
- Clearly provides the methodology for the analysis of each identified hazard's vulnerability across 7 dimensions/considerations.
- Identifies a comprehensive and diverse range of mitigation actions.
 - Notable action: 2.A.2: Identify green infrastructure/low-impact development in Hamilton Township.
- Includes potential loss estimates sections provide excellent data for developing mitigation grant application benefit cost analyses.
- Identifies and assesses a comprehensive list of hazards.
- Utilizes a USDA Resources Conservation Center Soil Survey of Adams County to inform land subsidence and geologic hazards.
- Includes Table 2.2.2-1 which provides a clear depiction and breakdown of Adams County Industry Sectors by Establishments and Employees.
- Integrates information from the Adams County Municipal Solid Waste Management Plan (2019 Update) among other countywide and municipality-specific plans.
- Identifies historical assets in Adams County throughout Section 2.4.3 and notably via the integration of National Register of Historic Places data (Table 2.4.3-1).
- Includes Table 3.4-1 which clearly conveys stakeholder participation and the involvement of neighboring jurisdictions.
- Includes asset inventories for site-specific hazards (Flood, Landslide, Subsidence, and Hazardous Materials)

Opportunities for Improvement

- Include an executive summary. **Executive summary added; see pp. iv-vii.**
- Address minor spelling and grammatical errors, including but not limited to the following:
 - o Page 9: Change "Gettysburg **in** the largest municipality by population" to "Gettysburg **is** the largest..." **Revision made; see p. 9.**
 - o Page 38: Change "...and other similar weather events **annual**, perhaps as many as four

- per year.” to “...and other similar weather events **annually**, perhaps as many as four per year.” **Revision made; see p. 38.**
- o Page 53: Change “... or \$354,924.50 **or** Adams County...” to “...or \$354,924.50 **in** Adams County...” **Revision made; see p. 53.**
 - o Page 151: Remove one “also” from the sentence “Figure 4.3.11.2-2 **also** appears in Section 4.3.6 (Hurricane, Tropical Storm, Nor’easter Hazard Profile), but it is **also** relevant to the severe wind discussion.” **Second “also” removed per suggestion; see p. 151.**
 - Update the legend of Figure 2.4.1-1 titled Existing Land Use (2016) to detail what the dark gray patches on the map represent. **Dark gray areas are building footprints; explanatory narrative added to preceding paragraph. See p. 18.**
 - In Section 2.5 Data Sources and Limitation, HAZUS-MH is explained as a valuable planning tool that estimates disaster damages. Add to this section information on Level II and Level III HAZUS-MH analyses that can use higher resolution or engineering data to produce more accurate results. **Notation added per suggestion; see p. 40.**
 - Expand the Planning Team to include at least one representative from each municipality. **Each municipality was invited to participate; Adams County will again invite them to participate as planning team members during future updates.**
 - Update each Public Sentiment Table to more clearly convey the information associated with the blue boxes of the table. For instance, consider separating the last two questions of each table (in the blue boxes) to create an additional table and include columns that more accurately reflect the content to the right of the questions (i.e. “INCREASE,” “NO CHANGE,” and DECREASE” do not express the “Total Responses” as the column title states).
 - Figure 4.3.6.4-1 Age of Housing Units in Adams County provides 2014 estimate data. Update this Figure to include more recent data.
 - Include more information concerning the impact of Nor’easters on Adams County. **Adams County will take this recommendation under advisement during future updates.**
 - Page 98: Include a higher resolution version of Figure 4.3.4.5-2 to more clearly display the Flood Hazard Areas of Adams County. **The narrative refers readers to Appendix D, which contains much more detailed flood hazard area maps. No change; however, Adams County will keep this recommendation under advisement for future updates.**

Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

- Risk Map Green Infrastructure and Nature-Based Solutions Guidance.
- Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) Mitigation Action Portfolio
- NFIP Guide
- Risk Assessment Guide
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection with Agriculture
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection with Public Health
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection to Municipal Financing
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection to Arts & Culture
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection to Electric Power
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection to Equity
- Guide to Expanding Mitigation: Making the Connection to Transportation

--

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 (OPTIONAL)**

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).

Requirements Met (Y/N) -- **A** = Planning Process; **B** = Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment; **C** = Mitigation Strategy; **D** = Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation; **E** = Plan Adoption; **F** = State Requirements

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET										
#	Jurisdiction Name Jurisdiction Type Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
					A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.
1	Abbottstown Borough David W. Bolton	241 High Street Abbottstown, Pa 17301	abbottstown@comcast.net	717-259-0965	Y	Y	Y	Y		
2	Arendtsville Borough Jay A. Johnson	1 Chestnut Street, P.O. Box 508 Arendtsville, Pa 17303	officemgr@arendtsville.org	717-677-6009	Y	Y	Y	Y		
3	Bendersville Borough Ricky E. Kime	125 B Rampike Hill Rd, P.O. Box 448 Bendersville, Pa 17306	secretary@bendersvilleborough.net	717-677-8112	Y	Y	Y	Y		
4	Berwick Township Billy Scott	85 Municipal Road Hanover, Pa 17331	office@berwicktp.org	717-465-0614	Y	Y	Y	Y		
5	Biglerville Borough Sandra Vazquez	33 Musselman Avenue Biglerville, Pa 17307	biglerville@comcast.net	717-677-9488	Y	Y	Y	Y		
6	Bonneauville Borough Michael Shanebrook	46 E. Hanover Street Gettysburg, Pa 17325	bonnborooffice@embarqmail.com	717-334-2662	Y	Y	Y	Y		
7	Butler Township Danielle Helwig	2379 Table Rock Road, P.O. Box 339 Biglerville, Pa 17307	butlertwp@comcast.net	717-677-6712	Y	Y	Y	Y		

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

#	Jurisdiction Name Jurisdiction Type Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
					A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.
8	Carroll Valley Borough David A. Hazlett	5685 Fairfield Road Fairfield, Pa 17320	manager@carrollvalley.org	717-642-8269	Y	Y	Y	Y		
9	Conewago Township Barbara Krebs	541 Oxford Avenue Hanover, Pa 17331	bkrebs@conewagotwp.org	717-637-0411	Y	Y	Y	Y		
10	Cumberland Township David Sanders	1370 Fairfield Road Gettysburg, Pa 17325	dave@ivancdutterer.com	717-334-9724	Y	Y	Y	Y		
11	East Berlin Borough Christopher Warner	128 Water Street East Berlin, Pa 17316	eastberlinboro@comcast.net	717-259-9224	Y	Y	Y	Y		
12	Fairfield Borough Susan E. Wagle	108 W. Main St., P.O. Box 263 Fairfield, Pa 17320	borofairfieldpa@comcast.net	717-642-5640	Y	Y	Y	Y		
13	Franklin Township Susan Plank	55 Scott School Road, P.O. Box 309 Cashtown, Pa 17310	info@franklintwp.us	717-334-4901	Y	Y	Y	Y		
14	Freedom Township Zach Gulden	2184 Pumping Station Road Fairfield, Pa 17320	zgulden@freedomtwp.org	717-873-0475	Y	Y	Y	Y		
15	Germany Township Susan Hansen	136 Ulricktown Road Littlestown, Pa 17340	germanytwp@comcast.net	717-359-7537	Y	Y	Y	Y		
16	Gettysburg Borough Dave Sanders	59 E. High Street Gettysburg, Pa 17325	dave@ivancdutterer.com	717-752-6115	Y	Y	Y	Y		
17	Hamilton Township Timothy D. Beard	272 Mummerts Church Road Abbottstown, Pa 17301	saehamilton@twphamilton.com	717-259-7237	Y	Y	Y	Y		
18	Hamiltonban Township Robert Gordon	23 Carrolls Tract Road, P.O. Box 526 Fairfield, Pa 17320	hamiltonban@embarqmail.com	717-642-8509	Y	Y	Y	Y		
19	Highland Township Mary Sherman	3641 Fairfield Road Gettysburg, Pa 17325	highlandtownship@comcast.net	717-642-8410	Y	Y	Y	Y		
20	Huntington Township Patricia V. Davis	70 Trolley Road, P.O. Box 247 York Springs, Pa 17372	huntington@pa.net	717-528-4027	Y	Y	Y	Y		
21	Latimore Township Dan Worley	559 Old US Route 15 York Springs, Pa 17372	latimore@latimore.org	717-528-4614	Y	Y	Y	Y		

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

#	Jurisdiction Name Jurisdiction Type Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
					A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.
22	Liberty Township Walter Barlow	39 Topper Road Fairfield, Pa 17320	Twp.secretary@comcast.net	717-642-3780	Y	Y	Y	Y		
23	Littlestown Borough Charles G. Kellar	41 S. Columbus Avenue Littlestown, Pa 17340	ckellar@littlestownboro.org	717-359-5101	Y	Y	Y	Y		
24	McSherrystown Borough Scott J. Cook	338 Main Street McSherrystown, Pa 17344	mcstownsUPER@comcast.net	717-637-1838	Y	Y	Y	Y		
25	Menallen Township Kenneth C. Wolf	170 Memory Lane Aspers, Pa 17304	menallentwp@centurylink.net	717-677-6635	Y	Y	Y	Y		
26	Mt. Joy Township Sheri Moyer	902 Hoffman Home Road Gettysburg, Pa 17325	smoyer@mtjoytwp.us	717-359-4500 Ext. 307	Y	Y	Y	Y		
27	Mt. Pleasant Township Diane L Groft	1035 Beck Road Gettysburg, Pa 17325	mptsecretary@comcast.net	717-624-8049	Y	Y	Y	Y		
28	New Oxford Borough Dorothy M. Robinson	124 North Peters Street New Oxford, Pa 17350	borooFnewoxford@comcast.net	717-624-2188	Y	Y	Y	Y		
29	Oxford Township Verna Feeser	557 Poplar Road New Oxford, Pa 17350	oxftwp@comcast.net	717-624-2259	Y	Y	Y	Y		
30	Reading Township Kimberly Beard	50 Church Road East Berlin, Pa 17316	readingtownship@comcast.net	717-624-4222 Ext. 4	Y	Y	Y	Y		
31	Straban Township David Clapsaddle	1745 Granite Station Road Gettysburg, Pa 17325	zoning@strabantownship.com	717-334-4388	Y	Y	Y	Y		
32	Tyrone Township Russell Raub	5280 Old Harrisburg Road York Springs, Pa 17372	Tyrone.township@comcast.net	717-528-4012	Y	Y	Y	Y		
33	Union Township Carol J. Bollinger	255 Pine Grove Road Hanover, Pa 17331	uniontownship@pa.net	717-359-7811	Y	Y	Y	Y		
34	York Springs Borough Catherine J. Jonet	311 Main Street York Springs, Pa 17372	boroughofyorksprings@comcast.net	717-528-4032	Y	Y	Y	Y		

