

9.32 CHAPMAN BOROUGH

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for Chapman Borough.


A. HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT

Primary Point of Contact		Alternate Point of Contact	
<u>Name</u>	John J Defassio	<u>Name</u>	Harold Kocher
<u>Title/</u>	Sect/Treasurer	<u>Title/</u>	Mayor
<u>Department</u>		<u>Department</u>	
<u>Address</u>	1400 Main St Chapman, Bath, PA 18014	<u>Address</u>	2580 7 th St, Chapman, Bath, PA 18014
<u>Telephone</u>	610-837-0842	<u>Telephone</u>	610-837-6867
<u>Fax</u>	610-837-1826	<u>Fax</u>	
<u>Email</u>	jjdcpa@johnjdefassiocpa.com	<u>Email</u>	hargizson@ptd.net

B. MUNICIPAL PROFILE

Chapman Borough is located in the northwestern part of Northampton County. It encompasses an area of approximately 0.4 square miles, and has a population of 199 (2010 Census). As shown in Figure 1, the borough is surrounded by Moore Township.

Figure 1



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

The Monocacy Creek passes through the southeast portion of the borough. There are also several small bodies of standing water in the center of the borough's geographic area.

PA Route 987 (Monocacy Drive) passes north-south through the western side of the borough. Main Street branches off from Monocacy Drive in the southwestern portion of the borough and travels north to the residential areas of Chapman. 5th Street travels from that area to the east.

B.1 Known or Anticipated Future Development

No known or anticipated development identified at this time.

D. NATURAL 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 RISK	NATURAL HAZARDS	RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY					RISK FACTOR (RF)
		PROBABILITY	IMPACT	SPATIAL EXTENT	WARNING TIME	DURATION	
HIGH	Winter Storm	3	2	4	1	3	2.7
	Flood	3	2	3	3	3	2.7
MODERATE	Radon Exposure	4	1	2	1	4	2.4
	Extreme Temperatures	4	1	2	1	3	2.3
	Drought	2	1	4	1	4	2.2
	Wildfire	3	1	2	3	3	2.2
	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	Subsidence / Sinkholes	2	1	1	2	1	1.4
	Landslide	1	1	1	4	1	1.3

HAZARD RISK	MAN-MADE HAZARDS	RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY					RISK FACTOR (RF)
		PROBABILITY	IMPACT	SPATIAL EXTENT	WARNING TIME	DURATION	
HIGH	Fire (Urban/Structural)	4	2	1	4	2	2.6
	Env. Hazard and Explosion	3	2	2	4	3	2.6
	Utility Interruption	3	1	3	4	3	2.5
MOD-ERATE	Transportation Accident	4	1	1	4	1	2.2
	Mass Gathering and Civil Disturbance	3	1	1	4	2	2
LOW	Terrorism	1	3	1	4	1	1.9
	Building Collapse	1	3	1	4	1	1.9
	Dam Failure	1	2	2	4	2	1.9
	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

Tool / Program	Status			Dept./Agency Responsible	Effect on Loss Reduction: + Support O Neutral - Hinder	Change Since Last Plan: + Positive - Negative	Comments
	In Place	Date Adopted or Updated	Under Development				
<i>EXAMPLE: Hazard Mitigation Plan</i>	X	1/1/2006		Hazard County EMA	+	+	Interim update in 2008 revised mitigation strategy; completed one action.
Hazard Mitigation Plan							
Emergency Operations Plan	X						
Disaster Recovery Plan							
Evacuation Plan							
Continuity of Operations Plan							
NFIP							
NFIP – Community Rating System							
Floodplain Regulations (spec. NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance)							
Floodplain Management Plan							
Zoning Regulations							
Subdivision Regulations							
Comprehensive Land Use Plan (or General, Master or Growth Mgt. Plan)							

Tool / Program	Status			Dept./Agency Responsible	Effect on Loss Reduction: + Support O Neutral - Hinder	Change Since Last Plan: + Positive - Negative	Comments
	In Place	Date Adopted or Updated	Under Development				
Open Space Management Plan (or Parks/Rec or Greenways Plan)							
Stormwater Management Plan / Ordinance							
Natural Resource Protection Plan							
Capital Improvement Plan							
Economic Development Plan							
Historic Preservation Plan							
Farmland Preservation							
Building Code							
Fire Code							
Other							

E.2 Administrative and Technical Capability

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

E.3 Fiscal Capability

Financial Resources	Yes	No	Department/Agency	Comments
Capital Improvement Programming		X		
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)		X		
Special Purpose Taxes		X		
Gas / Electric Utility Fees		X		
Water / Sewer Fees		X		
Stormwater Utility Fees		X		
Development Impact Fees		X		
General Obligation, Revenue, and/or Special Tax Bonds		X		
Partnering Arrangements or Intergovernmental Agreements		X		
Other				

E.4 Community Classifications

Program	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)	TBD	TBD
Public Protection	TBD	TBD
Storm Ready	NP	N/A
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 its 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. StormReady 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

The following table summarizes progress on the mitigation strategy identified by the Borough in the 2006 plan.

2006 Initiative		Status	Review Comments
Description	Location		
Install/replace/repair culvert	5th St. - repair drainage under slate piles.	No progress	Carry forward modified project to address problem in update

Further details on mitigation activities completed in the Borough include:



F.2 Hazard Vulnerabilities Identified

It is estimated that in Chapman Borough, 5 residents live within the 1% annual chance flood area (NFIP Special Flood Hazard Area). Of the municipality's total land area, 15% is located within the 1% annual chance flood area. \$609,672 (1.9%) of the municipality's general building stock replacement cost value (structure and contents) is located within the 1% annual chance flood area.

There are 2 NFIP policies in the community. While there are 2 structures located within the 1% annual chance flood area, there is only 1 policy issued to property owners in the 1% annual chance flood area. No Repetitive Loss (RL) properties have been identified in the municipality.

HAZUS-MH estimates that for a 1% annual chance flood, none of the municipality's general building stock replacement will be damaged, 10 people may be displaced, 1 person may seek short-term sheltering, and an estimated 2 tons of debris could be generated.

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):

When the quarries were working in the late 1800's a tunnel of approximately 2 tenths of a mile was built from the quarry to the road (5th St.) to facilitate mules for quarry work. Over the years the slate debris was dumped from the top of quarry holes onto that tunnel area, creating a mountain of slate and shale of a minimum of 25 to 35 feet high over the tunnel. The stream and land drainage came under 5th street and ran through that tunnel to a location on the other side of the quarries. At some point after the quarry closed for business, the culvert pipe began to collapse. The collapse was many years ago. Despite that collapse, the water and drainage continued through the same path but at a lower rate. It continues to drain to this day. The area of 5th street that now floods does so because the drainage basin area is filled with slate, trees, roots and natural debris (leaves, soil, etc).

The Borough's 2006 mitigation action, to remove all the slate and shale debris from the tunnel area, rebuild that culvert and replace the slate and shale, is just not a viable thing to do. We believe that clearing that drainage basin so it can retain storm water and drain as before is the answer. We are a very small borough and any undertaking would present a financial hardship on the borough and the residents. The borough has requested a site evaluation by a contractor or engineer, but we have had no luck in that request.

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	5 th Street Drainage Improvements – Have problem evaluated by an engineer, then develop and implement the identified project. It is believed that clearing that drainage basin so it can retain storm water and drain as before is the answer. Implementation of this project is clearly dependent on funding availability.	Structural Projects	Flood	Medium	Medium-High	TBD; Borough does not have funding for this	Borough Administration	Shortterm – engineer evaluation; Longterm DOF – project implementation	Existing
2	Retrofit structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority. Phase 1: Identify appropriate candidates for retrofitting based on cost-effectiveness versus relocation. Phase 2: Where retrofitting is determined to be a viable option, work with property owners toward implementation of that action based on available funding from FEMA and local match availability.	Property Protection	Flood	Medium-High*	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Municipality (via Municipal Engineer/NFIP Floodplain Administrator) with support from PEMA, FEMA	Long Term DOF	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*
3	<p>Purchase, or relocate structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties as priority.</p> <p>Phase 1: Identify appropriate candidates for relocation based on cost-effectiveness versus retrofitting.</p> <p>Phase 2: Where relocation is determined to be a viable option, work with property owners toward implementation of that action based on available funding from FEMA and local match availability.</p>	Property Protection	Flood	Medium-High*	High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs and local budget (or property owner) for cost share	Municipality (via Municipal Engineer/NFIP Floodplain Administrator) with support from PEMA, FEMA	Long Term DOF	Existing
4	<p>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.</p> <p>Further, continue to meet and/or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria through the following NFIP-related continued compliance</p>	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*
	actions identified below.								
5	Conduct and facilitate community and public education and outreach for residents and businesses to include, but not be limited to, the following to promote and effect natural hazard risk reduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and maintain links to the HMP website, and regularly post notices on the County/municipal homepage(s) referencing the HMP webpages. • Prepare and distribute informational letters to flood vulnerable property owners and neighborhood associations, explaining the availability of mitigation grant funding to mitigate their properties, and instructing them on how they can learn more and implement mitigation. • Use email notification systems and newsletters to better educate the public on flood insurance, the availability of mitigation grant funding, and personal natural hazard risk reduction measures. • Work with neighborhood associations, civic and business groups to disseminate information on flood insurance and the availability of mitigation grant funding. 								
	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
6	Begin the process to adopt higher regulatory standards to manage flood risk (i.e. increased freeboard, cumulative substantial damage/improvements).	Prevention	Flood	High	Low	Municipal Budget	Municipality (via Municipal Engineer/NFIP Floodplain Administrator) with support from PEMA, FEMA	Short Term	New & Existing
7	Determine if a Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC) is needed, and schedule if needed.	Prevention, Property Protection	Flood	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	NFIP Floodplain Administrator with support from PADEP, PEMA, FEMA	Short Term	N/A
8	Have designated NFIP Floodplain Administrator (FPA) become a Certified Floodplain Manager through the ASFPM, and pursue relevant continuing education training such as FEMA Benefit-Cost Analysis.	Public Education and Awareness	Flood	High	Low	Municipal Budget	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Short Term DOF	N/A
9	Participate in the Community	Prevention,	Flood	Medium	Low	Municipal	NFIP	Short Term	N/A

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*
	Rating System (CRS) to further manage flood risk and reduce flood insurance premiums for NFIP policyholders. This shall start with the submission to FEMA-DHS of a Letter of Intent to join CRS, followed by the completion and submission of an application to the program once the community's current compliance with the NFIP is established.	Property Protection, Public Education and Awareness				Budget	Floodplain Administrator with support from PADEP, PEMA, FEMA		
10	Archive elevation certificates	Public Education and Awareness	Flood	High	Low	Municipal Budget	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	On-going	N/A
11	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
12	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
13	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

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*
14	Identify and develop agreements with entities that can provide support with FEMA/PEMA paperwork after disasters; qualified damage assessment personnel – Improve post-disaster capabilities – damage assessment; FEMA/PEMA paperwork compilation, submissions, record-keeping	Public Education and Awareness, Emergency Services	All Hazards	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Municipality with support from County, PEMA, FEMA	Short Term	N/A
15	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/Long Term DOF	N/A

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 cannot reasonably be established at this time:

Low = < \$10,000

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

High = > \$100,000

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.

Mitigation Action		PA STEEL CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS																				Results				
		(+) Favorable						(-) Less favorable						(N) Not Applicable												
		P Political			A Administrative			S Social		T Technical			E Economic			E Environmental					L Legal			SUMMARY (EQUAL WEIGHTING)	SUMMARY (BENEFITS & COSTS PRIORITIZED)	
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				
1	5 th Street Drainage Improvements	+	+	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	N	N	-	-	N	-	+	+	N	N	9(+) 3(-) 11(N)	9(+) 3(-) 11(N)
2	Retrofit Vulnerable Properties	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	N	+	N	+	+	18(+) 3(-) 2(N)	22(+) 3(-) 2(N)	
3	Acquire Vulnerable Properties	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	17(+) 5(-) 1(N)	21(+) 5(-) 1(N)	
4	Maintain NFIP	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	N	+	-	19(+) 2(-)	23(+)	

15	Develop Post-Disaster Capabilities	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	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 Chapman Borough to illustrate the probable areas impacted within Chapman Borough. 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 Chapman Borough has significant exposure. Regional risk maps are provided in the hazard profiles within Section 4, Volume I of this Plan.

J. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

No additional comments at this time.

