

Appendix B: Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool

Cover Page

The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool (PRT) 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 local governments, including special districts.

1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet is a worksheet that is used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the plan elements (Planning Process; Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Maintenance; Plan Update; and Plan Adoption).
2. The Plan Review Checklist summarizes FEMA’s evaluation of whether the plan has addressed all requirements.

For greater clarification of the elements in the Plan Review Checklist, please see Section 4 of this guide. Definitions of the terms and phrases used in the PRT can be found in Appendix E of this guide.

Plan Information	
Jurisdiction(s)	Crawford County and municipalities
Title of Plan	Crawford County 2025 Hazard Mitigation Plan
New Plan or Update	Update
Single- or Multi-Jurisdiction	Multi-Jurisdictional
Date of Plan	
Local Point of Contact	
Title	Allen Clark
Agency	Crawford County Department of Public Safety
Address	632 Pine Street, Meadville, PA 16335
Phone Number	814-724-2552
Email	aclark@co.crawford.pa.us

Additional Point of Contact	
Title	
Agency	
Address	
Phone Number	
Email	

Review Information	
State Review	
State Reviewer(s) and Title	Ernest Szabo State HM Planner
State Review Date	11/25/2024
FEMA Review	
FEMA Reviewer(s) and Title	Joshua Norris, Community Planner, MD FEMA Integration Team (FIT)
Date Received in FEMA Region	Submission #1: 11/27/2024 Submission #2: 1/27/2025
Plan Not Approved	Submission #1: 12/22/2024. Revisions required.
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	Submission #2: 1/28/2025. Required revisions addressed.
Plan Approved	

Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet

#	Jurisdiction Name	Requirements Met (Y/N)						
		A. Planning Process	B. Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Maintenance	E. Plan Update	F. Plan Adoption	G. State Requirements
1	Athens Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
2	Beaver Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
3	Bloomfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
4	Blooming Valley Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
5	Cambridge Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
6	Cambridge Springs Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
7	Centerville Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
8	Cochranton Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
9	Conneaut Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
10	Conneaut Lake Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
11	Conneautville Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
12	Cussewago Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
13	East Fairfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
14	East Fallowfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
15	East Mead Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
16	Fairfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
17	Greenwood Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
18	Hayfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
19	Hydetown Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
20	Linesville Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

21	Meadville, City of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
22	North Shenango Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
23	Oil Creek Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
24	Pine Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
25	Randolph Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
26	Richmond Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
27	Rockdale Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
28	Rome Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
29	Sadsbury Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
30	Saegertown Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
31	South Shenango Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
32	Sparta Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
33	Spartansburg Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
34	Spring Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
35	Springboro Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
36	Steuben Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
37	Summerhill Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
38	Summit Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
39	Titusville, City of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
40	Townville Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
41	Troy Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
42	Union Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
43	Venango Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
44	Venango Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

45	Vernon Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
46	Wayne Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
47	West Fallowfield Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
48	West Mead Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
49	West Shenango Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
50	Woodcock Borough	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
51	Woodcock Township	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Plan Review Checklist

The Plan Review Checklist is completed by FEMA. States and local governments are encouraged, but not required, to use the PRT as a checklist to ensure all requirements have been met prior to submitting the plan for review and approval. 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.” FEMA completes the “required revisions” summary at the bottom of each element to clearly explain the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is “not met.” Sub-elements in each summary should be referenced using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable.

Requirements for each element and sub-element are described in detail in Section 4: Local Plan Requirements of this guide.

Plan updates must include information from the current planning process.

If some elements of the plan do not require an update, due to minimal or no changes between updates, the plan must document the reasons for that.

Multi-jurisdictional elements must cover information unique to all participating jurisdictions.

Element A: Planning Process

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
A1. Does the plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(1))		
A1-a. Does the plan document how the plan was prepared, including the schedule or time frame and activities that made up the plan’s development, as well as who was involved?	Section 3 (Pg. 39-57)	Met
A1-b. Does the plan list the jurisdiction(s) participating in the plan that seek approval, and describe how they participated in the planning process?	Section 3.5 (Pg. 55-57)	Met
A2. Does the plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as businesses, academia, and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(2))		
A2-a. Does the plan identify all stakeholders involved or given an opportunity to be involved in the planning process, and how each stakeholder was presented with this opportunity?	Section 3.4 (Pg.54) Appendix C – Local Planning Team Attendance	Met

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
A3. Does the plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(1))		
A3-a. Does the plan document how the public was given the opportunity to be involved in the planning process and how their feedback was included in the plan?	Section 3.4 (Pg.54) Appendix C – Proof of Publications	Met
A4. Does the plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(3))		
A4-a. Does the plan document what existing plans, studies, reports and technical information were reviewed for the development of the plan, as well as how they were incorporated into the document?	Section 5.2.5 (Pg.363-365)	Met
Element A Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Executive Summary, correct SOG format, defined vulnerable and underserved for the county in section 2.</p> <p>Correct Table 8 with name, org, position</p> <p>No in person public meetings? Are they not cost effective? What are historical attendance rates at these?</p> <p>Required Revision:</p> <p>None</p> <p><u>FEMA:</u></p> <p>Requested Edits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve grammatic errors throughout the plan including the example below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 355: Update the sentence “Each of these municipalities conducts it daily operations and provides various community services according to local needs and limitations” as follows to improve clarity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change “conducts” to conduct” ▪ Remove “it” ▪ Change “provides” to “provide” <p>MCM Edit: Requested edits made.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions:</p> <p>A1: Section 1.4, Authority and References identifies specific FEMA guides and resources that were referenced to create this iteration of the Crawford County HMP. Update this section and any other applicable element of the plan based on the materials below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2022 FEMA Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide 		

- [2023 FEMA Local Mitigation Planning Handbook](#)

Element B: Risk Assessment

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
B1. Does the plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction? Does the plan also include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(i))		
B1-a. Does the plan describe all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area, and does it provide the rationale if omitting any natural hazards that are commonly recognized to affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area?	Section 4.2 (Pg.59-69) Section 4.2.2 (Pg.62-67.)	Met
B1-b. Does the plan include information on the location of each identified hazard?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Location and Extent subsection for each hazard.	Met
B1-c. Does the plan describe the extent for each identified hazard?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Location and Extent subsection for each hazard.	Met
B1-d. Does the plan include the history of previous hazard events for each identified hazard?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Past Occurrence subsection for each hazard.	Met

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page Metnumber)	Met / Not
B1-e. Does the plan include the probability of future events for each identified hazard? Does the plan describe the effects of future conditions, including climate change (e.g., long-term weather patterns, average temperature and sea levels), on the type, location and range of anticipated intensities of identified hazards?	Section 4.2.3 (Pg.68-69) Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Future Occurrence subsection for each hazard.	Met
B1-f. For participating jurisdictions in a multi-jurisdictional plan, does the plan describe any hazards that are unique to and/or vary from those affecting the overall planning area?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328)	Met
B2. Does the plan include a summary of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability and the impacts on the community from the identified hazards? Does this summary also address NFIP-insured structures that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(ii))		
B2-a. Does the plan provide an overall summary of each jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the identified hazards?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Vulnerability Assessment subsection for each hazard.	Met
B2-b. For each participating jurisdiction, does the plan describe the potential impacts of each of the identified hazards on each participating jurisdiction?	Section 4.3 (Pg.70-328) Vulnerability Assessment subsection for each hazard.	Met
B2-c. Does the plan address NFIP-insured structures within each jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods?	Section 4.3.5.3 (Pg.106-126) Table 24, Table 25, Table 26, and Table 27.	Met
Element B Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u> Required Revision: None</p> <p><u>FEMA:</u> Recommended Revisions: B2: Change the color coding for the “Electric Substation” and “Fire Department” points in the Appendix D Municipal Flood Maps to make it easier for readers to distinguish between these two asset type dots. MCM Edit: Map updated to use more easily distinguishable colors. FEMA: Addressed.</p> <p>B2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 158: “Research suggests that urbanization increases local climate and therefore increases the amount of lightning strikes in that area.” Clarify what element of local climate is being increased (temperature, storm frequency, etc.). • Page 206: “Since the population in Crawford County had an overall decrease between 2010 and 2020, it can be speculated that the built environment did not increase significantly.” 		

Integrate and analyze permitting data in the plan for each municipality across the County to confirm/substantiate stated development trends.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page Metnumber)	Met / Not
C1. Does the plan document each participant’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3))		
C1-a. Does the plan describe how the existing capabilities of each participant are available to support the mitigation strategy? Does this include a discussion of the existing building codes and land use and development ordinances or regulations?	Section 5 (Pg.348-365) Section 5.2.1 (Pg.349-354)	Met
C1-b. Does the plan describe each participant’s ability to expand and improve the identified capabilities to achieve mitigation?	Section 5.2.2 (Pg.355-358)	Met
C2. Does the plan address each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))		
C2-a. Does the plan contain a narrative description or a table/list of their participation activities?	Section 5.2.1 (Pg.349-354.) Appendix C – Forms and Survey Submission	Met
C3. Does the plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(i))		
C3-a. Does the plan include goals to reduce the risk from the hazards identified in the plan?	Section 6.2 (Pg.383-385) Table 89	Met
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 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))		
C4-a. Does the plan include an analysis of a comprehensive range of actions/projects that each jurisdiction considered to reduce the impacts of hazards identified in the risk assessment?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409) Table 91	Met
C4-b. Does the plan include one or more action(s) per jurisdiction for each of the hazards as identified within the plan’s risk assessment?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409) Table 92	Met
C5. Does the plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including a cost-benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))		
C5-a. Does the plan describe the criteria used for prioritizing actions?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409)	Met

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page Metnumber)	Met / Not
C5-b. Does the plan provide the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing/administrating the identified mitigation actions, as well as potential funding sources and expected time frame?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409.) Table 91	Met
Element C Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Added Goal for HHPD and objectives for Vulnerable and Underserved.</p> <p>Required Revision:</p> <p>None</p> <p><u>FEMA:</u></p> <p>Required Revisions:</p> <p>C2-a: To meet this requirement, add content to the plan describing “how participants implement the substantial improvement/substantial damage provisions of their floodplain management regulations after an event” (2022 Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide, page 26). In the next plan update, you are encouraged to have each plan participant complete an updated version of the NFIP survey forms found in Appendix C. The updated NFIP Survey form is located here.</p> <p>MCM Edit: Narrative added to section five of the plan.</p> <p>FEMA: Addressed.</p> <p>C4-b: “Each plan participant must identify one or more mitigation actions the participant(s) intends to implement for each hazard addressed in the risk assessment. The actions must be achievable and demonstrate how the mitigation activities reduce the risks identified in the risk assessment” (2022 Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide, page 27). Currently, the plan includes mitigation actions that will be implemented by “municipalities” for the Flooding, Flash Flooding, Ice Jam Flooding Hazard, but does not identify mitigation actions that will be implemented by the participating municipalities for the remaining hazards. Several mitigation actions that address “All Hazards” can benefit all municipalities, but are being implemented only by the “LEPC,” “County EMA,” and/or “County planning” according to Table 91 – 2025 Mitigation Action Plan.</p> <p>To meet this requirement, add information to the plan (ideally to Table 91 – 2025 Mitigation Action Plan) demonstrating that each municipal plan participant has identified at least one mitigation action that they plan to implement to address each of the following natural hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drought • Earthquake • Extreme Temperatures • Hurricane and Tropical Storm • Invasive Species • Landslide 		

- Lightning Strike
- Pandemic and Infectious Disease
- Radon Exposure
- Subsidence and Sinkholes
- Tornado/Windstorm
- Wildfire
- Winter Storm

MCM Edit: Mitigation action plan amended to reflect municipal involvement in multiple all-hazards mitigation actions. Actions 1.1.2., 3.3.2, 4.3.1, updated.

FEMA: Addressed.

Element D: Plan Maintenance

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page Metnumber)	Met / Not
D1. Is there discussion of how each community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(iii))		
D1-a. Does the plan describe how communities will continue to seek future public participation after the plan has been approved?	Section 7 (Pg.410-410) Section 7.3 (Pg.411-412)	Met
D2. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle)? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(i))		
D2-a. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to track the progress/status of the mitigation actions identified within the Mitigation Strategy, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	Section 7.2 (Pg.410)	Met
D2-b. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to evaluate the plan for effectiveness? This process must identify the criteria that will be used to evaluate the information in the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible.	Section 7 (Pg.410-412)	Met
D2-c. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to update the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	Section 7.2 (Pg.410)	Met

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
D3. Does the plan describe a process by which each community will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(ii))		
D3-a. Does the plan describe the process the community will follow to integrate the ideas, information and strategy of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms?	Section 5.2.5 (Pg.363-365)	Met
D3-b. Does the plan identify the planning mechanisms for each plan participant into which the ideas, information and strategy from the mitigation plan may be integrated?	Section 5.2.2 (Pg.355-358)	Met
D3-c. For multi-jurisdictional plans, does the plan describe each participant's individual process for integrating information from the mitigation strategy into their identified planning mechanisms?	Section 5.2.2 (Pg.355-358) Section 5.2.5 (Pg.363-365)	Met
Element D Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u> Required Revision: None</p> <p><u>FEMA:</u> Recommended Revision: D2-b: Add content to the plan explicitly listing the evaluation criteria that will be used to assess the effectiveness HMP implementation. D3-c: Add content to the plan elaborating on each plan participant’s plan integration process. What procedural and administrative actions are planned to take place to ensure that plan integration is occurring across the Crawford County municipalities?</p>		

Element E: Plan Update

Element E Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
E1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))		
E1-a. Does the plan describe the changes in development that have occurred in hazard-prone areas that have increased or decreased each community’s vulnerability since the previous plan was approved?	Section 2 (Pg.22-38)	Met
E2. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities and progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))		

E2-a. Does the plan describe how it was revised due to changes in community priorities?	Executive Summary (Pg.16-18) Section 4.4.2 (Pg.331-343) Section 6.1 (Pg.366-382)	Met
E2-b. Does the plan include a status update for all mitigation actions identified in the previous mitigation plan?	Section 6.1 (Pg.366-382)	Met

Element E Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page Metnumber)	Met / Not
E2-c. Does the plan describe how jurisdictions integrated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms?	Section 5.2.5 (Pg.363-365)	Met
Element E Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u> Required Revision: None</p> <p><u>FEMA:</u> Recommended Revision: E2-c: Page 365 states that “[p]revious successful mitigation and plan integration has occurred in the development of comprehensive plans at the local level and this information and integration should continue through the formal update process of all plans in Crawford County.” Add content to the plan specifying which comprehensive plans have been integrated with the Crawford County HMP and what information from the Crawford County HMP was integrated.</p>		

Element F: Plan Adoption

Element F Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
F1. For single-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of the jurisdiction formally adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))		
F1-a. Does the participant include documentation of adoption?		
F2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of each jurisdiction officially adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))		
F2-a. Did each participant adopt the plan and provide documentation of that adoption?		
Element F Required Revisions		
Required Revision:		

Element G: High Hazard Potential Dams (Optional)

HHPD Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
HHPD1. Did the plan describe the incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information for HHPDs?		
HHPD1-a. Does the plan describe how the local government worked with local dam owners and/or the state dam safety agency?	Section 3.2 (Pg.40-51)	Met
HHPD1-b. Does the plan incorporate information shared by the state and/or local dam owners?	Section 4.3.18 (Pg.241-256)	Met
HHPD2. Did the plan address HHPDs in the risk assessment?		
HHPD2-a. Does the plan describe the risks and vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs?	Section 4.3.18.5 (Pg.248-256)	Met
HHPD2-b. Does the plan document the limitations and describe how to address deficiencies?	Section 4.3.18.5 (Pg.248-256)	Met
HHPD3. Did the plan include mitigation goals to reduce long-term vulnerabilities from HHPDs?		
HHPD3-a. Does the plan address how to reduce vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs as part of its own goals or with other long-term strategies?	Section 6.2 (Pg.383-384) Table 89 – Goal 5, Objective 5.1, Objective 5.2, and Objective 5.3.	Met
HHPD3-b. Does the plan link proposed actions to reducing long-term vulnerabilities that are consistent with its goals?	Section 6.2 (Pg.383-384)	Met
HHPD4-a. Did the plan include actions that address HHPDs and prioritize mitigation actions to reduce vulnerabilities from HHPDs?		
HHPD4-a. Does the plan describe specific actions to address HHPDs?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409.) Table 91 Actions 5.1.1, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, and 5.3.1.	Met
HHPD4-b. Does the plan describe the criteria used to prioritize actions related to HHPDs?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409)	Met
HHPD4-c. Does the plan identify the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing and administering the action to mitigate hazards to or from HHPDs?	Section 6.4 (Pg.388-409) Table 91 Actions 5.1.1, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, and 5.3.1.	Met
HHPD Revisions		
<p><u>PEMA:</u> Required Revision: None</p>		

FEMA:

Recommended Revision:

HHPD1-b: Consider incorporating additional dam-related data into the plan, such as the following:

- The date of last inspection, construction materials, dimensions, storage capacity, and associated at-risk assets (population, infrastructure, cultural resources, habitats, cultural resources, systems) for each dam.
- HHPD-specific information from EAPs
- HHPD-specific vulnerabilities described in inspection reports
- HEC-RAS, DSS-WISEHCOM, DSS-WISE Lite, FLO-2D, or more detailed studies.

MCM Edit: Narrative added to the plan to explain the location and nature of dam EAPs.

FEMA: Addressed. Moving forward, relevant risk information from EAPs should be integrated into the dam failure risk assessment section of the Crawford County HMP. To protect sensitive information, consider including the dam failure risk assessment section as a separate appendix to the plan and only providing that annex to authorized entities upon request.

HHPD4-a: Add dam failure actions to the plan for specific HHPDs within Crawford County that further incorporate language from the eligible activities below.

Eligible Rehabilitation of HHPD Grant Program Activities

- Construction activities such as:
 - Repair or rehabilitation of the dam
 - Dam removal
 - Construction monitoring
 - Installation of early warning systems associated with the eligible dam project
- Planning activities such as:
 - Activities and studies that determine risks associated with eligible dams
 - Environmental studies for NEPA compliance
 - Development of operation and maintenance plans
 - Public education and awareness of flood risks associated with the eligible dam project
 - Dam risk and consequence assessments Feasibility studies
 - Preliminary engineering studies Alternatives analysis
 - Mapping, engineering survey, and inundation modeling
 - Development of evacuation plans, plans for flood fighting, or community response plans to include in the floodplain management plan
 - Coordination of EAP and EOPs for different release conditions
- Design activities such as:
 - Engineering design
 - Development of specifications

Source: Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 Rehabilitation of High Hazard Potential Dams (HHPD) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

Element H: Additional State Requirements (Optional)

Element H Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
This space is for the State to include additional requirements		

Plan Assessment

These comments can be used to help guide your annual/regularly scheduled updates and the next plan update.

Element A. Planning Process

Strengths

- **[Best Practice]** A diverse array of stakeholders were invited to participate in the planning process, including a variety of Pennsylvania state agencies such as the Crawford County Conservation, PennDot, PEMA, and PADEP, fire departments, utilities such as NW Rural Electric, National Fuel, AT&T First Net, and First Energy, private sector businesses including , hospitals, and special districts including the Titusville Area School District, Vernon Township Sanitary Authority, Meadville Area Water Authority, Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA), federal entities such as FEMA, US Army Reserve, USACE, and NWS, academic institutions such as Allegany College and Penn State, private non-profits such as the Salvation Army, and neighboring jurisdictions such as Erie County and Warren County
- The plan includes a clear executive summary.
- The HMP explicitly defines how it identified and worked to address the needs of underserved communities in the planning area.
- The HMP documented jurisdictional inputs using the FEMA R3 Capability Assessment workshop.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Future iterations of the plan should (when applicable) encourage more thorough municipal completion of the capability assessment worksheets.
- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element B. Risk Assessment

Strengths

- The plan examines 26 hazards—an increase from the 13 hazards identified and profiled in the 2020 installment of this HMP.
- The plan examines the hazard-specific vulnerability of historic and cultural assets throughout the county including museums, historic places, and historical societies.
- The plan includes the results of a HAZUS level 2 analysis for the Flooding Hazard.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Elaborate on land use impacts on asset vulnerability for at least each natural hazard profiled in the plan (include a higher level of impact description specificity).
- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element C. Mitigation Strategy

Strengths

- N/A

Opportunities for Improvement

- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element D. Plan Maintenance

Strengths

- N/A

Opportunities for Improvement

- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element E. Plan Update

Strengths

- *Table 3 - Population Change in Crawford County* describes the Countywide and municipality-specific population size changes in total and by percent change from 2010 to 2020.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element G. HHPD Requirements (Optional)

Strengths

- The plan includes a goal dedicated to participating in FEMA’s HHPD program and 3 objectives that operationalize the goal in question through education, risk reduction investment, and risk identification.
- The plan includes a diverse assortment of actions that address the reduction of vulnerabilities related to HHPDs.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Address any remaining recommended revisions for this Element.

Element H. Additional State Requirements

Strengths

- N/A

Opportunities for Improvement

- N/A