LUMPKIN COUNTY
HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN 2015

Including the City of Dahlonega



Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction……4

1.1 Purpose……..4

1.2 Organization of the Plan……....5

1.3 Participants in Planning Process……8

1.4 HRV Summary/Mitigation Goals……10

1.5 Multi-Jurisdictional Special Considerations……10

1.6 Adoption, Implementation, Monitoring, Evaluation……11

1.7 Review and Incorporation……12

1.8 Scope of Updates……..14

1.9 Brief County Overview……16

Chapter 2 – Local Natural Hazard, Risk and Vulnerability Summary…….24

2.1 Tornados……...…29

2.2 Severe Thunderstorms (incl. Hail and Lightning)……...….43

2.3 Flooding……48

2.4 Winter Storms……...……54

2.5 Wildfire……60

2.6 Drought……69

2.7 Earthquakes……...80

2.8 Landslides……95

Chapter 3 – Local Technological Hazard, Risk & Vulnerability Summary.99

3.1 Hazardous Materials Release……..101

3.2 Dam Failure…….....107

Chapter 4 – Land Use and Development Trends……113

Chapter 5 – Hazard Mitigation Goals, Objectives, and Actions…….116

Chapter 6 – Executing the Plan……...122

6.1 Action Plan Implementation……...…122

6.2 Evaluation……...…123

6.3 Multi-Jurisdictional Strategy and Considerations……...…123

6.4 Plan Update and Maintenance……..…123

Chapter 7 – Conclusion……...127

7.1 Summary…….127

7.2 References……...128

Appendices

Appendix A – Critical Facilities Database

Appendix B – Hazard History Database

Appendix C – Hazard Frequency Table

Appendix D – Other Planning Documents

Appendix E – Glossary

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 has helped to bring attention to the need for successful hazard mitigation planning throughout the United States. Section 322 of the Act emphasizes the importance of comprehensive multi-hazard planning at the local level, both natural and technological, and the necessity of effective coordination between State and local entities to promote an integrated, comprehensive approach to mitigation planning. The Hazard Mitigation Planning and Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) interim final rule published on February 26, 2002, identifies these new local mitigation planning requirements. According to this rule, state and local governments are required to develop, submit, and obtain FEMA approval of a hazard mitigation plan (HMP). Completion of an HMP that meets the new Federal requirements will increase access to funds for local governments and allow them to remain eligible for Stafford Act assistance.

The HMP becomes part of the foundation for emergency management planning, exercises, training, preparedness and mitigation within the County. Such a plan sets the stage for long-term disaster resistance through identification of actions that will, over time, reduce the exposure of people and property to identifiable hazards. This plan provides an overview of the hazards that threaten the County, and what safeguards have been implemented, or may need to considered for implementation in the future.

Hazards, for purposes of this plan, have been divided into two basic categories: natural and technological. Natural hazards include all hazards that are not caused either directly or indirectly by man and are frequently related to weather events, such as tornados and winter storms. Technological hazards include hazards that are directly or indirectly caused by man, including hazardous materials spills and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) events, although terrorism is not the particular focus of this Plan. This Plan also

makes some recommendations that transcend this classification of natural and technological hazards. In other words, some of the recommendations contained within this Plan apply to many or all hazards. This is commonly referred to as an "all-hazards approach". Most hazards throughout the United States could happen anytime and anywhere. However, the main focus of this plan is on those hazards that are most likely to affect Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega in the future.

1.2 Organization of the Plan

The Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) consists of four main components: 1) the narrative plan, 2) the Hazard History Database, 3) the Hazard Frequency Table, and 4) a Critical Facilities Database. The narrative plan itself is the main component of the HMP. This part of the Plan includes an overview of the planning process, a summary of the County's hazard history, hazard frequency projections, a detailed discussion of proposed mitigation measures, and a description of how future reviews and updates to the Plan will be handled. The Hazard History Database is attached as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and includes relevant information on past hazards within the County. The Hazard Frequency Table is derived from the hazard history and provides frequency-related statistics for each discussed hazard. This table is also attached as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Finally, the Critical Facilities Database is an online tool developed in part by UGA for GEMA that contains detailed information on critical facilities within the County. Critical facilities for the purposes of this plan are those facilities that are among the most important within a specific jurisdiction with regard to the security and welfare of the persons and property within that jurisdiction. Typical critical facilities include hospitals, fire stations, police stations, critical records storage locations, etc. These facilities will be given special consideration during mitigation planning. For instance, a critical facility should not be located in a floodplain if at all possible. Using the critical facilities information, including GPS coordinates and replacement values, along with different hazard maps from GEMA, this database becomes a valuable planning tool that can be used by Counties to help estimate losses and assess vulnerabilities. This interactive Critical Facilities Database will also help to integrate mitigation planning into their other planning processes.

The following GEMA map displays the location of critical facilities within Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega. These facilities may be viewed in much greater detail within the Critical Facilities Database. Access to this database is limited and can only be viewed with the permission of the EMA Director due to the sensitive nature of some of the information.

Lumpkin County Critical Facilities Map (GEMA)



A risk assessment, which is composed of elements from each of the four main HMP components, provides the factual basis for all mitigation activities proposed within this Plan.

Inventory of Critical Facilities: Critical facilities are defined as facilities that provide essential products and services to the public. Many of these facilities are government buildings that provide a multitude of services to the public, including most public safety disciplines such as emergency management, fire, police, and EMS. Other government buildings/facilities commonly classified as critical facilities are water distribution systems, wastewater treatment facilities, public works, public schools, administrative services, and post offices. For the purposes of this Plan, critical facilities have been

identified by the HMPC and important information gathered for each one. This information is located in the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

Hazard Identification: During the planning process, a hazard history was created based upon available records from the past fifty years. This hazard history includes the natural and technological hazards that are most likely to affect the County. Unfortunately, record keeping was not as accurate or detailed decades ago as it is now. Therefore, the most useful information relating to these hazard events is found within the last ten to fifteen years. This fact is obvious upon review of the Hazard History Database (Appendix B), and the Hazard Frequency Table (Appendix C).

Profile of Hazard Events: Each hazard identified was analyzed to determine likely causes and characteristics, and what portions of the County's population and infrastructure were most affected. However, each of the hazards discussed in this Plan has the potential to negatively impact any given point within the County. A profile of each hazard discussed in this plan is provided in Chapter 2.

Vulnerability Assessment: This step is accomplished with the Critical Facilities Database by comparing GEMA hazard maps with the inventory of affected critical facilities, other buildings, and population exposed to each hazard (see Worksheets 3a).

Estimating Losses: Using the best available data, this step involved estimating structural and other financial losses resulting from a specific hazard. This is also accomplished to some degree using the Critical Facilities Database. Describing vulnerability in terms of dollar amounts provides the County with a rough framework in which to estimate the potential effects of hazards on the built environment.

Based on information gathered, the Plan identifies some specific mitigation goals, objectives, and actions to reduce exposure or impact from hazards that have the most impact on each community. A framework for Plan implementation and maintenance is also presented within this document.

Planning grant funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, administered by GEMA, funded the HMP. The HMP was developed by the HMPC, with technical assistance from GEMA and North Georgia Consulting Group.

1.3 Participants in Planning Process

This Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) is designed to protect both the unincorporated areas of the County as well as the City. Though the County facilitated this planning process,

the City of Dahlonega provided critical input into the process. Without this mutual cooperation, the Plan would not exist in its present comprehensive form. Note: Please keep in mind that throughout this Plan, the term "county" typically refers to all of Lumpkin County, including the City of Dahlonega.

The process for updating Lumpkin County's Hazard Mitigation Plan can be found in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Hazard Mitigation Planning's "How To" Guides. According to "Getting Started: Building Support for Mitigation Planning;" the suggested process for preparing a Hazard Mitigation Plan is to 1) Organize resources and identify stakeholders and those holding technical expertise; 2) Access risks to the community; 3) Develop a Mitigation Plan and lastly; 4) Implement and Monitor that plan once it is adopted. (FEMA 386-1)

The Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) is made up of a variety of members. The Chairman of the HMPC is Lorraine Morris. The Chairman's responsibilities include all decisions relating to the overall direction of the Plan, retrieval of data from various departments, and serving as a central point of contact for all matters relating to the Plan. The consultant, NGCG, is responsible for facilitation of HMPC meetings, integration of updated data into the Plan, grant administration, and other administrative functions. Local government officials including County and City employees, representatives from Georgia Forestry and from the University of North Georgia represented the HMPC. Representatives for utilities and local businesses were also extended an invitation to participate. Potential participants were invited either verbally or by email, depending upon the participant. Some representatives provided important data requested by the HMPC without attending HMPC meetings. This diverse group provided valuable input into the planning process including identifying hazards and developing important mitigation measures to be considered in the future. The entire HMPC met several times over the course of this planning process. These meetings occurred on January 7, 2015, February 4, 2015, March 18, 2015, and June 3, 2015. Other meetings were held throughout this planning process at various times between two or more HMPC members in order to accomplish smaller tasks. Two public meetings relating to this Plan are required by FEMA: one during the drafting stages of the Plan, and one after the final version of the Plan is completed. The first of these two meetings occurred on July 15, 2015 during the drafting stages of the Plan. Once necessary revisions were made to the Plan, a second public meeting was held on XXX where it was adopted by Lumpkin County. A copy of the adoption resolution is included in the Appendices. Prior to adoption at the final public meeting, the public was provided with an additional opportunity to review and comment on the Plan. This final version was then submitted to GEMA and FEMA for review and approval. All public meetings were advertised in the local newspaper.

The Plan is the result of a community-wide effort put forth over the past several months utilizing FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Plan "How To" Guides to aid in laying out the planning process described above. Stakeholders and persons with technical expertise were identified early in the process. Full participation was provided by Lumpkin County

and the City of Dahlonega. Each jurisdiction had representatives on the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee and provided critical data to the HMPC for consideration.

The public involvement elements of this Plan were reviewed by the HMPC. They were determined to have remained effective and were approved for use in the current Plan update process.

HMPC members are listed alphabetically in the following table:

Name	Jurisdiction/Dept	Title/Position
Mark Buchanan	City of Dahlonega Public Works	Director
Kris Butler	Georgia Forestry Commission	Chief Ranger
Mark French	Lumpkin County Finance and Administration	Budget & Grant Analyst
John Jarrard	City of Dahlonega Water Department	Superintendent
Allison Martin	Lumpkin County Finance and Administration	Director
Lorraine Morris	Lumpkin County EMA	Deputy Director
Sean Phipps	Lumpkin County Water and Sewerage Authority	Director
Larry Reiter	Lumpkin County Planning and Public Works	Director
Adam Strzemienski	University of North Georgia	Captain, UNG Emergency Preparedness
David Wimpy	Lumpkin County Emergency Services	Director

Various County and City departments, schools, and others participated in conversations with the EMA Director that directly contributed to the development of this Plan. Due to limited resources within the County and City, attendance at HMPC meetings for many was not an option. Nevertheless, their direct input was utilized by the HMPC to develop this Plan.

The Plan was posted on the county's website during the planning process. This was done to allow the general public, including other nearby communities, as well as other agencies to review and comment on the Plan utilizing the contact information provided on the website.

1.4 HRV summary/Mitigation goals

Lumpkin County has experienced a number of hazard events throughout its history, most resulting in fairly localized damage. Flooding, tornados, winter storms, wildfire, drought, severe thunderstorms (including hail and lightning), earthquakes, landslides, dam failure and hazardous materials to varying degrees represent known threats to Lumpkin County. The Lumpkin County HMPC used information gathered throughout this planning process to identify mitigation goals and objectives as well as some recommended mitigation actions. Each potential mitigation measure identifies an organization or agency responsible for initiating the necessary action, as well as potential resources, which may include grant programs and human resources. An estimated timeline is also provided for each mitigation action.

1.5 Multi-Jurisdictional Special Considerations

The City of Dahlonega was an active participants and equal partner in the planning process as well as the previous planning process. As an active part of the HMPC, both jurisdictions contributed significantly to the identification of mitigation goals and objectives and potential mitigation measures contained within the HMP.

Participation in Mitigation Plan

Jurisdiction	*2015 Plan*	*2011 Plan*
Lumpkin County	☐	☐
City of Dahlonega	☐	☐

1.6 Adoption, Implementation, Monitoring, Evaluation

Upon completion of the Plan, it will be forwarded to GEMA for initial review. GEMA will then forward the Plan to FEMA for final review and approval. Once final FEMA

approval has been received, Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega will be responsible for initiating the appropriate courses of action related to this Plan. Actions taken may be in coordination with one another or may be pursued separately. The "Plan Update and Maintenance" section of this document details the formal process that will ensure that the Lumpkin County HMP remains an active and relevant document. The HMP maintenance process includes monitoring and evaluating the Plan annually, and producing a complete Plan revision every five years. Additionally, procedures will ensure public participation throughout the plan maintenance process. This Plan will be considered for integration into various existing plans and programs, including the Lumpkin County Comprehensive Plan at its next scheduled update. Mitigation actions within the HMP may be used by the County and City as one of many tools to better protect the people and property of Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega. Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega are each individually responsible for the processes necessary to formally adopt this Plan.

Adoption Status

Jurisdiction	*Date of Adoption*
Lumpkin County	Upon GEMA & FEMA Approval
City of Dahlonega	Upon GEMA & FEMA Approval

1.7 Review and Incorporation

The HMPC recognized the need to integrate other plans, codes, regulations, procedures and programs into this Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). Lumpkin County did not have the opportunity to incorporate the original HMP's strategy into other planning mechanisms, but will now ensure that during the planning process for new and updated local planning documents such as a comprehensive plan or Local Emergency Operations Plan, the EMA Director will provide a copy of the HMP to the appropriate parties, so incorporation will be considered in future updates. All goals and strategies of new and updated local planning documents should be consistent with, and support the goals of, the HMP and not contribute to increased hazards in the affected jurisdiction(s).

Record of Review

Existing planning mechanisms	Reviewed? (Yes/No)	Method of use in Hazard Mitigation Plan
Comprehensive Plan (multi-jurisdictional)	Yes	Development trends
Local Emergency Operations Plan	Yes	Identifying hazards; Assessing vulnerabilities
Storm Water Management / Flood Damage Protection Ordinance	Yes	Mitigation strategies
Building and Zoning Codes and Ordinances	Yes	Development trends; Future growth
Mutual Aid Agreements	Yes	Assessing vulnerabilities
State Hazard Mitigation Plan	Yes	Risk assessment
Land Use Maps	Yes	Assessing vulnerabilities; Development trends; Future growth
Critical Facilities Maps	Yes	Locations
Community Wildfire Protection Plan	Yes	Mitigation strategies

As set forth in the plan maintenance section of this plan (Section 6.4), the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee will meet during the plan approval anniversary date of every year to complete a review of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. It is during this review

process that the mitigation strategy and other information contained within the Hazard Mitigation Plan are considered for incorporation into other planning mechanisms as appropriate. Opportunities to integrate the requirements of this HMP into other local planning mechanisms will continue to be identified through future meetings of the HMPC on an annual basis. The primary means for integrating mitigation strategies into other local planning mechanisms will be through the revision, update and implementation of each jurisdiction's individual action plans that require specific planning and administrative tasks (e.g., plan amendments and ordinance revisions).

During the planning process for new and updated local planning documents such as a comprehensive plan or Local Emergency Operations Plan, the EMA Director will provide a copy of the HMP to the appropriate parties. It will be recommended that all goals and strategies of new and updated local planning documents be consistent with, and support the goals of, the HMP and will not contribute to increased hazards in the affected jurisdiction(s).

Although it is recognized that there are many benefits to integrating components of this plan into other local planning mechanisms, and that components are actively integrated into other planning mechanisms when appropriate, the development and maintenance of this stand-alone HMP is deemed by the committee to be the most effective method to ensure implementation of local hazard mitigation actions at this time. Therefore, the review and incorporation efforts made in this update and the last, which consisted of a simple review of the documents listed in the chart above by various members of the HMPC, are considered successful by the HMPC and will likely be utilized in future updates.

The County's EMA is committed to incorporating hazard mitigation planning into its Local Emergency Operations Plan and other public emergency management activities. As the EMA Director becomes aware of updates to other County or City plans, codes, regulations, procedures and programs, the Director will continue to look for opportunities to include hazard mitigation into these mechanisms.

1.8 Scope of Updates

Changes have been made to the HMP in this updated version. These changes are summarized in the following table.

Chapter or Section	Chapter or Section Description	Changes this Update
1.2	Organization of the Plan	Descriptions
1.3	Participants in Planning Process	Data
1.5	Multi-Jurisdictional Special Considerations	Data
1.6	Adoption, Implementation, Monitoring, Evaluation	Descriptions, Data
1.7	Review and Incorporation	Descriptions, Data
1.8	Scope of Updates	Descriptions, Data
1.9	Brief County Overview	Descriptions, Data
2	Introduction	Descriptions, Data
2.1	Severe Thunderstorm	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.2	Winter Storm	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.3	Flooding	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.4	Tornado	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.5	Wildfire	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.6	Drought	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
2.7	Earthquake	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
3.1	Hazardous Materials Rel.	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
3.2	Dam Failure	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
4	Land Use & Dev. Trends	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids
5	HM Goals Obj. & Actions	Descriptions, Data
6.1	Action Plan Implementation	Descriptions
6.2	Evaluation	Descriptions

6.3	Multi-Jurisdictional Strategy & Considerations	Descriptions
6.4	Plan Update & Maintenance	Descriptions, Data
7.2	References	Data
App. A	Critical Facilities Database	Data, Visual Aids
App. B	Hazard History Database	Data
App. C	Hazard Frequency Table	Data
App. D	Other Planning Documents	Descriptions, Data, Visual Aids

1.9 Brief County Overview



County Formed: December 3, 1832

County Seat: Dahlonega

Incorporated Cities: Dahlonega

U.S. Census Bureau Estimated Population:

Lumpkin County: 31,176 (2014)

City of Dahlonega: 6,049 (2013)

Total Area: 283 square miles

Proximity to Local Cities

Atlanta, GA	65 miles	south-southwest	via US 19/GA 400
Athens, GA	60 miles	southeast	via US 129
Chattanooga, TN	107 miles	northwest	via GA 52, 76, I-75
Cleveland, GA	18 miles	east	via GA 52, 115
Dalton, GA	75 miles	west	via GA 52, US 76
Gainesville, GA	30 miles	southeast	via GA 52
Blairsville, GA	35 miles	north	via US 129

County Origins

Lumpkin County was created on December 3, 1832 by an Act of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia (Ga. Laws 1832, p. 56). By 1830, the Cherokee Nation had been reduced to the current northwest corner of Georgia, plus adjoining areas in Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Even while Cherokee Indians remained on their homeland in Georgia, the General Assembly on Dec. 21, 1830 enacted legislation claiming "all the Territory within the limits of Georgia, and now in the occupancy of the Cherokee tribe of Indians; and all other unallocated lands within the limits of this State, claimed as Creek land" (Ga. Laws 1830, p. 127). The reason for the state of Georgia claiming the Cherokee ancestral lands for their own, was the discovery of gold in 1829. In the summer of 1829, Habersham County began to attract much attention with the announcement that gold had been discovered in that area. Lying on the Georgia / Cherokee Nation boundary, it wasn't long until prospectors from all over the southeast began to intrude into the Cherokee nation and found gold in large quantities. This actually helped fuel the nation's first gold rush.

By the winter of 1829, several thousand gold prospectors had crossed into the Nation. Initial attempts by the United States Army and later the Georgia militia failed to stop the rising tide of prospectors. By 1830, Governor George Gilmer initiated legislation to take possession of the Cherokee Nation despite the protests of the native inhabitants. The act provided for surveying the Cherokee lands in Georgia; dividing them into sections, districts, and land lots; and authorizing a lottery to distribute the land. On Dec. 26, 1831, the legislature designated all land in Georgia that lay west of the Chattahoochee River and north of Carroll County as "Cherokee County" and provided for its organization (Ga. Laws 1831, p. 74). However, the new county was not able to function as a county because of its size and the fact that Cherokee Indians still occupied portions of the land. On Dec. 3, 1832, the legislature added areas of Habersham and Hall counties to Cherokee County, and then divided the entire area into nine new counties: Cass (later renamed Bartow), Cobb, Floyd, Forsyth, Gilmer, Lumpkin, Murray, Paulding, and Union, plus a reconstituted and much smaller Cherokee County.

Early gold mining operations were so successful that the United States government authorized the building of a mint in Dahlonega, which was completed less than 10 years after the first strike. From 1838 to 1861 this mint produced over $6 million dollars in gold coins. When the Civil War broke out the Confederate government used the mint briefly, producing another $23,000 in gold coinage. The officials found running the mint too expensive and shut it down.

In 1849 the California Gold Rush began to attract miners from Lumpkin County. The highly respected assayer and state geologist Dr. Matthew Stephenson asked the miners to stay, however, miners began to search for the precious metal elsewhere.

During the Civil War, Lumpkin County gave its men to both sides, as did many counties in the North Georgia mountains. But the atmosphere in Lumpkin County alone was described as "contentious", possibly because the small band of Confederate Home Guard was kept busy repressing the pro-Union factions in the county.

Six years after the end of the war North Georgia College began as a land grant and military school. The people of Lumpkin County embraced the school especially during parades that reminded the citizens of their contribution to the bloody conflict.

In the 1880's interest in Lumpkin County revived briefly as a second, albeit smaller Gold Rush brought a few hardy souls back into the area. By 1900 this had "panned out" and once again the county watched an exodus of men to richer mines in Montana and Alaska. Dredging operations were popular until 1920 in Lumpkin and Dawson counties.

As early as 1910 the Federal Government began acquiring lands in Lumpkin County for the purpose of preservation. By 1920 this effort spread throughout the entire northern third of the state and in 1936 the federal government created the Chattahoochee National Forest out of the purchases that had begun in Lumpkin County 26 years earlier thanks, in part, to the efforts of Arthur Woody.

Electricity was not available to all Lumpkin County residents until after World War II. Many of the residents lived the home their daddy or granddaddy had built, often without water or a floor. The advent of the automobile brought another change to Lumpkin County. Previously accessible only to people on horseback or in carriages, the automobile opened up Lumpkin County to tourism, it's third gold rush.

Georgia's 82nd county was named for Georgia governor Wilson Lumpkin, who held office at the time of the county's creation. Formerly U.S. representative and later elected U.S. senator, Lumpkin was active in all three roles in seeking removal of Georgia's Cherokee Indians. In 1857, the southern portion of the Lumpkin County line was readjusted in the 13th District and incorporated into the newly created Dawson County. In 1858, the county line was again redrawn in the eastern part of Lumpkin's 1st District and added to White County.

(Credit: Lumpkin County Historical Society and RoadsideGeorgia.com)

Points of Interest

The University of North Georgia (UNG) is an educational institution that was established by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents on January 8, 2013 as a result of the consolidation of North Georgia College & State University and Gainesville State College. The combined institution has campus locations in Dahlonega, Oakwood (Gainesville Campus), Watkinsville (Oconee Campus), and Cumming. With just over 16,000 enrolled students, the University of North Georgia is the sixth largest public university in the state of Georgia. Within UNG, there are five colleges which collectively offer over one hundred bachelor's and associate degrees, as well as thirteen master's degrees and one doctoral degree. More than 750 students are involved in the university's ROTC program, which has given it the designation as The Military College of Georgia. It is one of only six senior military colleges in the United States. In addition, it is also designated by the University System of Georgia as a state leadership institution.

Dahlonega's Downtown District with its National Registered Historic Streets and Public Square, walking tours, and green space parks is one of the South's most quaint and active town centers. Downtown Dahlonega is an award-winning Main Street City and an exciting place to visit, shop, live, and do business.

The Dahlonega gold mines and the Dahlonega Gold Museum are popular day trip destinations for schools and families.

Local Events

Wine Highway Weekend: Every year the local wineries have a special weekend to tour the wineries, provide tastings and special events. For a fee you receive a passport for free admission to all member wineries for tastings.

Bear on the Square Festival: Held the 4th weekend in April. This is an old time mountain festival. Celebrating mountain music and crafts.

Wildflower Festival of the Arts: Held the 3rd weekend in May. Features artists representing visual arts and fine crafts in all mediums including painting, drawing, weaving, photography, jewelry and others. All works will be offered for sale. Also included is a wildflower awareness area, featuring specimens of native flora and fauna, with local experts to explain the growing conditions, tips for identification associated with native plants. Dahlonega Master Gardeners present wildflower displays, wildflower walks and wildflower tours.

Georgia Wine Country Festival at Three Sisters Winery: Every weekend in June. This event celebrates the many resources of "Georgia Wine Country." Offers wine tastings from Georgia wineries and around the globe, live music (bluegrass to classical to jazz), gourmet foods, folk art, farm exhibits, live demonstrations, hot air balloon rides, wagon rides.

6 Gap Century Bike Ride Across the Mountains: September 26th. A 100-mile bike ride

through the mountains.

Gold Rush Festival: Held the 3rd weekend in October. This is Dahlonega's largest festival. Thousands come to celebrate Dahlonega's 1828 discovery of gold. Over 300 art and craft exhibitors gather around the Square and Historic District in support of this annual event. Included are a 5K road race, fashion show, gold panning contest, wheelbarrow race, King and Queen Coronation, hog calling, buck dance contest, gospel singing, wrist wrestling and many other exciting events.

Hemlockfest: November 6th thru 8th. This festival supports conserving Hemlock Trees. Includes live bands, exhibits and more.

Old Fashion Christmas: The colorful and beautifully illuminated historic downtown square forms the backdrop for wonderful Christmas activities. One of Southeast Tourism's top 20 seasonal events with caroling, hospitality tables, and activities through the weekends before Christmas.

Chapter 2
Local Natural Hazard, Risk and Vulnerability (HRV) Summary

The Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) identified eight natural hazards the County is most vulnerable to based upon available data including scientific evidence, known past events, and future probability estimates. As a result of this planning process, which included an analysis of the risks associated with probable frequency and impact of each hazard, the HMPC determined that each of these natural hazards pose a threat significant enough to address within this Plan. These include tornados, severe thunderstorms (including hail & lightning), flooding, winter storms, wildfire, drought, earthquakes, and landslides. For this plan update, the HMPC reviewed the natural hazards listed in the 2011 Georgia Hazard Mitigation Strategy Standard Plan Update to assess the applicability of these hazards to Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega (See Table 2.1). Each of these natural hazards is addressed in this chapter of the Plan. An explanation and results of the vulnerability assessment are found in Tables 2-1 and 2-2.

Table 2.1 – Hazards Terminology Differences

Hazards Identified in 2011 Georgia State Plan	Equivalent/Associated Hazards Identified in the 2015 Lumpkin County Plan	Difference
Tornadoes	Tornados	Grammatical only.
Wind	Severe Thunderstorms	HMPC views as an associated hazard.
Severe Weather	Severe Thunderstorms	Difference in terminology.
Hailstorm	Severe Thunderstorms	HMPC views as an associated hazard.
Lightning	Severe Thunderstorms	HMPC views as an associated hazard.

Tropical Cyclonic Events	Severe Thunderstorms Flooding	Due to the County's inland location, not directly viewed as a threat. Tropical weather has limited effects within the County and is generally considered in terms of Severe Thunderstorms and Flooding, associated hazards.
Inland Flooding	Flooding	Difference in terminology.
Earthquake	Earthquake	None
Severe Winter Storms	Winter Storms	Difference in terminology.
Wildfire	Wildfire	None
Drought	Drought	None

Table 2.2 – Vulnerability Assessment - Natural Hazards *(see Keys below)*

HAZARD	Lumpkin	Dahlonega
Severe Thunderstorms (includes lightning & hail)		
Frequency	EX	EX
Severity	EX	EX
Probability	EX	EX
Tornados		
Frequency	H	H
Severity	EX	EX
Probability	H	H
Flooding		

HAZARD	Lumpkin	Dahlonega
Frequency	H	H
Severity	EX	EX
Probability	H	H
Winter Storms		
Frequency	H	H
Severity	H	H
Probability	H	H
Drought		
Frequency	M	VL
Severity	M	L
Probability	M	VL
Wildfire		
Frequency	M	VL
Severity	M	VL
Probability	M	VL
Earthquake		
Frequency	M	M
Severity	H	H
Probability	EX	EX
Landslides		
Frequency	L	L
Severity	M	M
Probability	M	M

Key for Table 2.2 – Vulnerability Assessment Frequency and Probability Definitions

NA = Not applicable; not a hazard to the jurisdiction
VL = Very low risk/occurrence
L = Low risk; little damage potential (for example, minor damage to less than 5% of the jurisdiction)
M = Medium risk; moderate damage potential (for example, causing partial damage to 5-15% of the jurisdiction, infrequent occurrence)
H = High risk; significant risk/major damage potential (for example, destructive, damage to more than 15% of the jurisdiction, regular occurrence)
EX = Extensive risk/probability/impact

Key for Table 2.2 – Vulnerability Assessment Severity Definitions

	Low	**Medium**	**High**	**Extensive**
Tropical Cyclonic Events		*(See Wind & Inland Flooding)*		
Wind – Wind Speed	38 MPH	39–50 MPH	50-73 MPH	73–91 MPH
Severe Thunderstorm		*(See Wind & Inland Flooding)*		
Tornado - Magnitude	< F3	F3	F4	F5
Inland Flooding - Water depth	3” or less	3 – 8”	8-12”	12”+
Severe Winter Storms – Ice/ Sleet	½” or less	½ – 4”	4-7”	7”+
Severe Winter Storms - Snow	1” or less	1-6”	6-12”	12”+

Drought – Duration	1 year	1 – 2 years	2-5 years	5+ years
Wildfire - # of Acres	<50	50-110	110-200	200+
Earthquake - Magnitude	1-2	3	4	5+

2.1 Tornados

A. Hazard Identification – A tornado is a dark, funnel-shaped cloud containing violently rotating air that develops below a heavy cumulonimbus cloud mass and extends toward the earth. The funnel twists about, rises and falls, and where it reaches the earth causes great destruction. The diameter of a tornado varies from a few feet to a mile; the rotating winds attain velocities of 200 to 300 mph, and the updraft at the center may reach 200 mph. A tornado is usually accompanied by thunder, lightning, heavy rain, and a loud "freight train" noise. In comparison with a hurricane, a tornado covers a much smaller area but can be just as violent and destructive. The atmospheric conditions required for the formation of a tornado include great thermal instability, high humidity, and the convergence of warm, moist air at low levels with cooler, drier air aloft. A tornado travels in a generally northeasterly direction with a speed of 20 to 40 mph. The length of a tornado's path along the ground varies from less than one mile to several hundred.

The Fujita Scale was the standard scale in the United States for rating the severity of a tornado as measured by the damage it causes from 1971 to 2007 (see table below).

The Fujita Scale of Tornado Intensity			
F-Scale Number	**Intensity Phrase**	**Wind Speed**	**Type of Damage Done**
F0	Gale tornado	40-72 mph	Some damage to chimneys; breaks branches off trees; pushes over shallow-rooted trees; damages sign boards.
F1	Moderate tornado	73-112 mph	The lower limit is the beginning of hurricane wind speed; peels surface off roofs; mobile homes pushed off foundations or overturned; moving autos pushed off the roads; attached garages may be destroyed.
F2	Significant tornado	113-157 mph	Considerable damage. Roofs torn off frame houses; mobile homes demolished; boxcars pushed over; large trees snapped or uprooted; light object missiles generated.
F3	Severe tornado	158-206 mph	Roof and some walls torn off well constructed houses; trains overturned; most trees in forest uprooted
F4	Devastating tornado	207-260 mph	Well-constructed houses leveled; structures with weak foundations blown off some distance; cars thrown and large missiles generated.
F5	Incredible tornado	261-318 mph	Strong frame houses lifted off foundations and carried considerable distances to disintegrate; automobile sized missiles fly through the air in excess of 100 meters; trees debarked; steel reinforced concrete structures badly damaged.

The Enhanced Fujita (EF) Scale for Tornado Damage is an update to the original Fujita Scale by a team of meteorologists and wind engineers that was implemented in the United States in 2007. The EF Scale is still a set of wind estimates (not measurements)

based on damage. It uses three-second gusts estimated at the point of damage based on a judgment of 8 levels of damage to 28 indicators. These estimates vary with height and exposure. The three-second gust is not the same wind as in standard surface observations. Standard measurements are taken by weather stations in open exposures, using a directly measured, "one-minute mile" speed.

Levels of the Enhanced Fujita scale

Grade, damage and windspeeds

Source: Fema

The NOAA map below represents the average annual number of NOAA Storm Prediction Center tornado watches (per county) from 1993 through 2012. This is the latest version of this NOAA Map. Lumpkin County averaged six per year during this time period. Although this 20 year time period does not match up exactly with the timelines reviewed within this Plan, the map is a valuable visual aid by providing a nationwide perspective on potential tornado activity.



The following NOAA maps represent the United States severe report database (tornadoes 1950-2014) converted into shapefile (.shp) file format along with a Geographic Information System (GIS) database. In other words, these maps show the estimated paths and intensities of recorded tornados over this time period. Although this 64-year time period does not match up exactly with the 50-year timeline reviewed within this Plan, the map remains a valuable visual aid by providing a regional perspective on historical tornado activity.



Close-up of Lumpkin County from the map above:

Tornados are considered to be the most unpredictable and destructive of weather events in Georgia, even though they are not the most frequently occurring natural hazard within Lumpkin County. Tornado season in Georgia is ordinarily said to run from March through August, with the peak activity being in April. However, tornados can strike at any time of the year when certain atmospheric conditions are met, including during the coldest months of the year. See the National Weather Service graph below, which covers the NWS Peachtree City Area of Georgia.



B. Hazard Profile – All areas within Lumpkin County are vulnerable to the threat of a tornado. There is simply no method to determine exactly when or where a tornado will occur. The Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) reviewed historical data from the Georgia Tornado Database, the National Climatic Data Center, and various online resources in researching the past effects of tornados within the County. With most of the County's recorded tornado events, only basic information was available. However, dozens of tornado watches have been recorded during this period, and certainly some tornados go undetected or unreported. Therefore, any conclusions reached based upon available information on tornados within Lumpkin County should be treated as the minimal possible threat.

In the Peachtree City County Warning Area (CWA), which includes Lumpkin County, the average number of tornado days per year is six, according to the National Weather Service. While tornadoes have been reported in all months of the year, most occur in the months of March, April, and May. During this "tornado season" the most likely time of occurrence is from mid-afternoon through early evening. Tornado intensities of F2 or greater are involved in 37% of the events when the data is broken down into a county-by-county basis. These strong tornados are more likely to occur during the month of April than in any other month.

(National Climatic Data Center) NCDC and other records show that eleven tornados occurred within the County over the past fifty years, which equates to a 22% annual frequency of reported events. However, three of the tornados have occurred within the past five years, which equates to a 60% annual frequency of reported events. It would appear that tornado activity has increased significantly over time within the County. This may be the case or it may simply be that record keeping and technology have improved significantly over the course of time, reflecting the higher numbers. It may also be a combination of these two factors. The following chart provides annual frequency of reported events over the past five, ten, twenty, and fifty-year periods. The most recent five-year period, covering the span of time since the last update to this Plan, is highlighted in gold.

Lumpkin County – Tornado Frequency
(based on Reported Events)

Time Period	5yrs (2010-2015)	10yrs (2005-2015)	20yrs (1995-2015)	50yrs (1965-2015)
Number of Reported Events	3	4	5	11
Frequency Average per Year	0.60	0.40	0.25	0.22
Frequency Percent per Year	60%	40%	25%	22%

The National Weather Service statewide map on the following page shows nine Lumpkin County tornados on record from the specific time period of 1950 to 2012. However, a total of eleven tornados have actually been recorded over the past fifty years (1965-2015). See the following chart which shows all eleven recorded tornados.

Lumpkin County - Recorded tornados 1965 to present		
Date	Time	Intensity
4/3/1974	7:00pm	F4
4/4/1977	7:00pm	F1
9/7/1977	2:30pm	F1
11/22/1992	12:10pm	F3
3/27/1994	2:17pm	F3
3/27/1994	3:23pm	F3
11/7/1996	11:50pm	F1
8/29/2005	5:45pm	F0
4/27/2011	9:30pm	EF2
4/11/2013	8:23pm	EF1
4/11/2013	8:25pm	EF1

The most recent version of this National Weather Service map below covers the period from 1950-2012. It demonstrates historic tornado activity of the County in relationship to surrounding counties, and the entire state.



A fairly recent tornado occurred on April 11, 2013 in Lumpkin County. An EF-1 tornado tracked across southeastern Lumpkin County and far northwestern Hall County just before 9:30pm damaging numerous homes. The radar images below show the strong storm bowing out on the left side of the image and very strong 85-95 MPH winds about 7,000 ft above the ground on the right, associated with the tornado.



<u>Lumpkin-Hall County Tornado</u>
Rating: EF-1
Max wind speed: 105 MPH
Path length: 4.1 miles
Path width: 250 yards
Injuries: 0
Deaths: 0
Start time: 9:23 PM EDT (April 11, 2013)
End time: 9:29 PM EDT (April 11, 2013)
Begin point: 34.4515N / 83.9300W (6.3 miles southeast of Dahlonega)
End point: 34.4879N / 83.8744W (2.5 miles southeast of Garland)

Damage started in Lumpkin County along Gold Ridge Road where numerous trees were snapped or uprooted. One small outbuilding had its roof blown off and two homes sustained minor roof damage. The tornado tracked northeast crossing Evergreen Court where trees were snapped and uprooted. The tornado reached maximum intensity shortly after and along Bridgestone Way where it paralleled the road. Numerous hardwood and softwood trees were snapped and uprooted. Some of the trees fell onto homes. Twelve homes were damaged on Bridgestone Way with two of them destroyed by trees. The tornado tracked northeast into Hall county where it crossed Old Whelchel Road snapping a few trees and downing power lines. Two homes sustained very minor roof damage. The tornado continued northeast crossing back into Lumpkin County crossing Old Dahlonega Highway, damaging a few trees. Falling trees along Mount Olive Church Road damaged

two mobile homes, and several power lines were downed. The tornado eventually weakened and lifted just before crossing Claude Perks Road and Starwood Drive. In all, 41 homes were affected, two of which were destroyed, three of which sustained major damage and three of which sustained minor damage.

Almost 20 years earlier on March 27, 1994, a much more severe tornado outbreak occurred known as the Palm Sunday Tornado Outbreak, which caused five fatalities, 40 reported injuries, and damaged 59 and destroyed 32 residences.





A long-tracked tornado touched down about 7 miles north-northwest of Dawsonville at 2:17 p.m. EST. Phil Castleberry, General Manager of WDGR-AM in Dahlonega (this radio station is no longer in business today) said they aired the first EBS warning at 2:30 p.m. and the second at 2:44 p.m. Their EBS transmissions came from WFOX-FM in Atlanta. The local radio station lacked a back-up generator and was off the air for an

hour or two after power was knocked out after 2:50 p.m. EST. The tornado initially downed power lines and trees as it produced F0 damage in rural locations, but grew in size and intensity as it entered Lumpkin County. Widening to 0.25 miles wide, the tornado caused widespread F2 damage to hilly terrain as it snapped 60-to-80-foot tall pine trees. Upon reaching an area near Gordon Seabolt Road, about 2.5 miles west-northwest of Dahlonega, an elderly man was killed by flying debris. Soon the tornado passed just 1.5 miles north of Dahlonega and later killed another elderly man in a mobile home 4 miles northeast of Dahlonega. In this area, the tornado destroyed many "brick and wood" homes. Thereafter, the tornado crossed out of Lumpkin County and moved along the northwest slope of Yonah Mountain in White County and then attained its peak intensity of F3 as it broadened to 1.25 miles wide and caused more severe damage and death. Along its path, the tornado caused over $17 million in property damage, killed more than 500,000 chickens, and snapped "hundreds of thousands" of trees. Overall the tornado killed three people, two of whom were located within Lumpkin County.

The second of two F3 tornadoes to hit near Dahlonega that day touched down 3.5 miles northwest of that City at 3:23 p.m. EST. Only a minute later, it intensified to F2 intensity and instantly killed two people in a mobile home that disintegrated. The tornado continued to intensify to F3 intensity as it caused a third and final death in a mobile home while snapping many large pines in rural areas north and northeast of Dahlonega. Then it fluctuated in intensity to F1 strength before passing out of Lumpkin County and north of Cleveland, causing additional significant damages. Overall the tornado killed three people, all located within Lumpkin County.

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard - Tornados are unpredictable and are indiscriminate as to when or where they strike. All public and private property including critical facilities are susceptible to tornados since this hazard is not spatially defined. The GEMA map below identifies critical facilities located within the hazard area, which in the case of tornados includes all areas within the County and City.



E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns - Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega have a design wind speed of 200 mph as determined by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). Since no part of the County is immune from tornados, any mitigation steps taken related to tornados will be undertaken on a countywide basis, including the City of Dahlonega. See the following ASCE design wind speed map.



F. Hazard Summary – Based on its history, Lumpkin County has a high exposure to potential damage from tornados. Should a tornado strike residential areas or critical facilities, significant damage and loss of life could occur. Due to the destructive power of tornados it is essential that the mitigation measures identified in this plan receive full consideration. Specific mitigation recommendations related to tornados are identified in *Chapter 5*.

2.2 Severe Thunderstorms (including Hail & Lightning)

A. Hazard Identification – A Severe Thunderstorm is defined as a thunderstorm producing wind at or above 58 mph and/or hail ¾ of an inch in diameter or larger. This threshold is met by approximately 10% of all thunderstorms. These storms can strike any time of year, but similar to tornados, are most frequent in the spring and summer months. They are nature's way of providing badly needed rainfall, dispersing excessive atmospheric heat buildup and cleansing the air of harmful pollutants. Not only can severe thunderstorms produce injury and damage from violent straight-line winds, hail, and lightning, but these storms can produce tornados very rapidly and without warning. Note: For the purposes of this Plan, severe thunderstorms that result from tropical storms and hurricanes are included in this section.

The most damaging phenomena associated with thunderstorms, excluding tornado activity, are thunderstorm winds. These winds are generally short in duration involving straight-line winds and/or gusts in excess of 50 mph. However, these winds can gust to more than 100 miles an hour, overturning trailers, unroofing homes, and toppling trees and power lines. Such winds tend to affect areas of the County with significant tree stands, as well as areas with exposed property, infrastructure, and above-ground utilities. Resulting damage often includes power outages, transportation and economic disruptions, and significant property damage. Severe thunderstorms can ultimately leave a population with injuries and loss of life. Thunderstorms produce two types of wind. Tornados are characterized by rotational winds. The other more predominant winds from a thunderstorm, downbursts, are small areas of rapidly descending air beneath a

thunderstorm that strike the ground producing isolated areas of significant damage. Every thunderstorm produces a downburst. The typical downburst consists of only a 25 mph gusty breeze, accompanied by a temperature drop of as much as 20 degrees within a few minutes. However, severe downburst winds can reach from 58 to 100 mph, or more, significantly increasing the potential for damage to structures. Downbursts develop quickly with little or no advance warning and come from thunderstorms whose radar signatures appear non-severe. There is no sure method of detecting these events, but atmospheric conditions have been identified which favor the development of downbursts. Severe downburst winds have been measured in excess of 120 miles per hour, or the equivalent of an F2 tornado, on the Fujita Scale. Such winds have the potential to produce both a loud "roaring" sound and the widespread damage typical of a tornado. This is why downbursts are often mistaken for tornados.

Hail can also be a destructive aspect of severe thunderstorms. Hail causes more monetary loss than any other type of thunderstorm-spawned severe weather. Annually, the United States suffers about one billion dollars in crop damage from hail. Storms that produce hailstones only the size of a dime can produce dents in the tops of vehicles, damage roofs, break windows and cause significant injury or even death. Unfortunately hail is often much larger than a dime and can fall at speeds in excess of 100 mph. Hailstones are created when strong rising currents of air called updrafts carry water droplets high into the upper reaches of thunderstorms where they freeze. These frozen water droplets fall back toward the earth in downdrafts. In their descent, these frozen droplets bump into and coalesce with unfrozen water droplets and are then carried back up high within the storm where they refreeze into larger frozen drops. This cycle may repeat itself several times until the frozen water droplets become so large and heavy that the updraft can no longer support their weight. Eventually, the frozen water droplets fall back to earth as hailstones.

Finally, one of the most frightening aspects of thunderstorms is lightning. Lightning kills nearly one hundred people every year in the United States and injures hundreds of others. A possible contributing reason for this is that lightning victims frequently are struck before or just after the occurrence of precipitation at their location. Many people apparently feel safe from lightning when they are not experiencing rain. Lightning tends to travel the path of least resistance and often seeks out tall or metal objects. With lightning however, it's all relative. A 'tall' object can be an office tower, a home, or a child standing on a soccer field. Lightning can and does strike just about any object in its path. Some of the most dangerous and intense lightning may occur with severe thunderstorms during the summer months, when outdoor activities are at their peak.

B. Hazard Profile – Severe thunderstorms, hail, and lightning are serious threats to the residents of Lumpkin County. Over the course of a year, the County experiences dozens of thunderstorms, with about one in ten being severe. Severe thunderstorms occur more frequently than any other natural hazard event within Lumpkin County. Most of these storms include lightning and/or hail. There have been dozens of severe thunderstorm events within Lumpkin County over the past fifty years according to available documentation. It is very likely this is a low estimate due to poor record keeping in

decades past. It is clear from information collected that more accurate record keeping related to severe thunderstorms developed over the past two decades, with even more detailed information available for the past ten years.

Most of the available information relating to severe thunderstorms, hail, and lightning occurrences within Lumpkin County fails to describe damage estimates in great detail. However, with each thunderstorm event it is likely there are unreported costs related to infrastructure and utilities repair and public safety costs, at a minimum. Severe thunderstorms have occurred in all parts of the day and night within Lumpkin County. They have also taken place in every single month of the year.

The Lumpkin County HMPC utilized data from the National Climatic Data Center, the National Weather Service, numerous weather-related news articles and various online resources, and the Lumpkin County Emergency Operations Plan in researching severe thunderstorms and their impact on the County. With most of the County's recorded severe thunderstorm events, only basic information was available. It is also likely that some severe thunderstorm events have gone unrecorded. Therefore, any conclusions reached based upon available information on severe thunderstorms within Lumpkin County should be treated as the minimal possible threat.

NCDC records show that 123 severe thunderstorms occurred within the County over the past fifty years, which equates to a 246% annual frequency based upon reported events. Over the past twenty years that frequency has more than doubled. It would appear that severe thunderstorm activity has increased over time within the County. This may be the case or it may simply be that record keeping and technology have improved significantly over the course of time, reflecting the higher numbers. It may also be a combination of these two factors. The following chart provides annual frequency of reported events over the past five, ten, twenty, and fifty-year periods. The most recent five-year period, covering the span of time since the last update to this Plan, is highlighted in gold.

Lumpkin County – Severe Thunderstorm Frequency including Hail & Lightning (based on Reported Events)

Time Period	5yrs (2010-2015)	10yrs (2005-2015)	20yrs (1995-2015)	50yrs (1965-2015)
Number of Reported Events	24	51	103	123
Frequency Average per Year	4.80	5.10	5.15	2.46
Frequency Percent per Year	480%	510%	515%	246%

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – All public and private property including critical facilities are susceptible to severe thunderstorms, hail, and lightning since this hazard is not spatially defined. The GEMA map below identifies critical facilities located within the hazard area, which in the case of severe thunderstorms includes all areas within the County and City.



D. Estimate of Potential Losses – For loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Any portion of Lumpkin County can be negatively impacted by severe thunderstorms, hail, and lightning. Therefore, any mitigation steps taken related to these weather events will be pursued on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega.

F. Hazard Summary – Overall, severe thunderstorm, hail, and lightning events pose one of the greatest threats to Lumpkin County in terms of property damage, injuries and loss of life. These weather events represent the most frequently occurring natural hazard within Lumpkin County and have a great potential to negatively impact the County each year. Based on the frequency of this hazard, as well as its ability to negatively impact any part of the County, the HMPC recommends that the mitigation measures identified in this plan for severe thunderstorm, hail, and lightning be aggressively pursued. Specific mitigation actions related to these weather events are identified in *Chapter 5*.

2.3 Flooding

A. Hazard Identification: The vulnerability of a river or stream to flooding depends upon several variables. Among these are topography, ground saturation, rainfall intensity and duration, soil types, drainage, drainage patterns of streams, and vegetative cover. A large amount of rainfall over a short time span can result in flash flood conditions. Nationally, the total number of flash flood deaths has exceeded tornado fatalities during the last several decades. Two factors seem to be responsible for this: public apathy regarding the flash flood threat and increased urbanization. A small amount of rain can also result in floods in locations where the soil is saturated from a previous wet period or if the rain is concentrated in an area of impermeable surfaces such as large parking lots, paved roadways, etc. Topography and ground cover are also contributing factors for floods in that water runoff is greater in areas with steep slopes and little or no vegetation.

B. Hazard Profile: Over the past fifty years, flood events on record in Lumpkin County have usually been associated with areas in the vicinity of the County's many creeks and lakes. The areas most affected or potentially most affected include locations in the vicinity of the Chestatee River, Etowah River, Yahoola Creek (which forms Ted Taft Copeland Dam), Cane Creek, Clay Creek, Hurricane Creek, Ward Creek, and other tributaries that empty into the Chestatee and Etowah Rivers. Relatively little information on flooding damage estimates, in terms of dollars, was available. However, with each of these events there were certainly significant costs related to road repair, infrastructure

repair, and public safety, at a minimum. Most of the flood damage that has occurred historically within the County appears to be "public" flood damage. More specifically, roads and culverts washing out have been the most common flooding problem on record.

NCDC records show that 10 flood events occurred within the County over the past fifty years, which equates to a 20% annual frequency based upon reported events. However, flooding events were obviously underreported during the first few decades of the fifty-year history since reported events for the twenty-year history also equal 10, equating to a 50% annual frequency. Since the number of events (0) in the five-year history also seems unusually low, it may be best to depend on the more consistent 10 and 20-year histories when considering the threat that flooding presents to the County. The following chart provides annual frequency of reported events over the past five, ten, twenty, and fifty-year periods. The most recent five-year period, covering the span of time since the last update to this Plan, is highlighted in gold.

Lumpkin County – Flooding Frequency
(based on Reported Events)

Time Period	5yrs (2010-2015)	10yrs (2005-2015)	20yrs (1995-2015)	50yrs (1965-2015)
Number of Reported Events	0	4	10	10
Frequency Average per Year	0.00	0.40	0.50	0.20
Frequency Percent per Year	0%	40%	50%	20%

Lumpkin County (CID No. 130354) and the City of Dahlonega (CID No. 130129) each participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and follow the Program guidelines to ensure future development is carried out in the best interests of the public. According to NFIP guidelines, each jurisdiction has executed a Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. The purpose of this ordinance is to minimize the loss of human life and health as well as to minimize public and private property losses due to flood conditions. The ordinance requires that potential flood damage be evaluated at the time of initial construction of structures, facilities and utilities, and that certain uses be restricted or prohibited based on this County evaluation. The ordinance also requires that potential homebuyers be notified that property is located in a flood area. In addition, all construction must adhere to the Georgia State Minimum Standard Codes (Uniform Codes Act). The minimum standards established by these codes provide reasonable protection to persons and property within structures that comply with the regulations for most natural hazards.

According to the National Flood Insurance Reform Act, a repetitive loss structure is defined as "…a building covered by a contract for flood insurance that has incurred flood-related damages on two occasions during a 10-year period ending on the date of the event for which a second claim is made, in which the cost of repairing the flood damage, on the average, equaled or exceeded 25 percent of the market value of the building at the

time of each such flood event." **As of Setpember 2015, there are no official residential "repetitive loss structures" on file for Lumpkin County.** *Specific addresses for repetitive loss structures cannot be included in this Plan, but a current list of these structures may be viewed in GMIS by authorized individuals, as determined by the EMA Director.*

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – In evaluating assets that may potentially be impacted by the effects of flooding, the HMPC determined that, although all critical facilities, public and private property are potentially susceptible to flooding, structures located within the vicinity of the Chestatee River, Etowah River, Yahoola Creek (which forms Ted Taft Copeland Dam), Cane Creek, Clay Creek, Hurricane Creek, Ward Creek, and other tributaries that empty into the Chestatee and Etowah Rivers are the most susceptible.

The following GEMA mapss identify the locations of critical facilities in relationship to the known flooding hazard areas located within the County and City.

Lumpkin County



City of Dahlonega



Estimate of Potential Losses – For loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Any portion of Lumpkin County can potentially be impacted by flooding, however, the areas most prone to flooding have historically been those areas located in the vicinity of the Chestatee River, Etowah River, Yahoola Creek (which forms Ted Taft Copeland Dam), Cane Creek, Clay Creek, Hurricane Creek, Ward Creek, and other tributaries that empty into the Chestatee and Etowah Rivers. Any mitigation steps taken related to flooding will be pursued on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega. According to GMIS flood maps, the County and each of the municipalities all have significant flood-prone areas within their jurisdictions.

F. Hazard Summary – Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage within Lumpkin County. Mitigation of flood damage requires the community to have knowledge of flood-prone areas, including roads, bridges, bodies of water, and critical facilities, as well as the location of the County's designated shelters. The Lumpkin County HMPC identified flooding as a hazard requiring mitigation measures and identified specific mitigation goals, objectives and action items they deemed necessary to lessen the impact of flooding. These findings are found in *Chapter 5*.

2.4 Winter Storms

A. Hazard Identification – The Lumpkin County HMPC researched historical data from the National Climatic Data Center, The National Weather Service, as well as information from past newspaper articles and various online resources relating to winter storms in Lumpkin County. Winter storms bring the threat of freezing rain, ice, sleet, snow and the associated dangers. A heavy accumulation of ice, especially when accompanied by high winds, devastates trees and power lines. Such storms make highway travel or any outdoor activity extremely hazardous due to falling trees, ice, and other debris.

B. Hazard Profile – Although winter storms occur relatively infrequently, they have the potential to wreak havoc on the community when they do strike. Winter storms within Lumpkin County typically cause damage to power lines, trees, buildings, structures, and bridges, to varying degrees. Portions of the County with higher elevations have highways with steep grades, resulting in very hazardous travel conditions when they are covered with frozen precipitation. Another hazard exists due to the large tree population. Trees and branches weighed down by snow and ice become very dangerous to person and property.

NCDC records show that 55 winter storms occurred within the County over the past fifty years, which equates to a 110% annual frequency based upon reported events. However, winter storm events were obviously underreported during the first few decades of the fifty-year history since reported events for the twenty-year history also equal 55, equating to a 275% annual frequency. It may be best to place higher consideration on the more consistent 5, 10 and 20-year histories when considering the threat that winter storm events present to the County. The following chart provides annual frequency of reported events over the past five, ten, twenty, and fifty-year periods. The most recent five-year period, covering the span of time since the last update to this Plan, is highlighted in gold.

Lumpkin County – Winter Storm Frequency (based on Reported Events)				
Time Period	**5yrs (2010-2015)**	**10yrs (2005-2015)**	**20yrs (1995-2015)**	**50yrs (1965-2015)**
Number of Reported Events	**11**	**24**	**55**	**55**
Frequency Average per Year	**2.20**	**2.40**	**2.75**	**1.10**
Frequency Percent per Year	**220%**	**240%**	**275%**	**110%**

The latest winter storm to affect Lumpkin County occurred in mid-February of 2015. A strong cold front pushed across Georgia by the morning of February 15th, bringing in plenty of below freezing temperatures to north Georgia. As a low pressure system approached the area from the west on February 16th, warmer temperatures surged northward, bringing much of the area above freezing. However, temperatures at the surface across parts of north and northeast Georgia hovered at or below freezing as the rainfall increased, thanks to a wedge of cold air. Freezing rain continued for these areas into the early morning hours of February 17th before coming to an end. Freezing rain totals reached from 1/4" to 1/2" in some areas, leading to widespread tree and power line damage. By the morning of February 17th, more than 200,000 customers were without power, generally for the northeast Atlanta metro area and points north and east. Lumpkin County was affected most severely in its southern portions. The following map shows ice accumulations in Lumpkin County and surrounding areas.




Observed Snowfall Totals
Inches
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.7
0.5
0.3
0.1
Trenton 2.1
Dalton 0.7
Blairsville 0.9
Dahlonega 0.3
Gainesville 0.1
Rome 0.6
Canton 0.2
Lawrenceville 0.0
Athens 0.0
Atlanta 0.1
Washington 0.0
Carrollton 0.1
Covington 0.0
Newnan 0.0
Eatonton 0.0
Warrenton 0.0
Griffin 0.0
LaGrange 0.0
Macon 0.0
Dublin 0.0
Columbus 0.0
Americus 0.0
National Weather Service
Peachtree City, GA
02/21/2015 07:24 PM EST
Follow Us:
weather.gov/atlanta

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard - All public and private property including critical facilities are susceptible to winter storms since this hazard is not spatially defined. The GEMA map below identifies critical facilities located within the hazard area, which in the case of winter storms includes all areas within the County and City.



D. Estimate of Potential Losses - For loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Any portion of Lumpkin County can be negatively impacted by winter storms. Therefore, any mitigation steps taken related to winter storms will be pursued on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega.

G. Hazard Summary – Winter storms, unlike other natural hazards, typically afford communities some advance warning. The National Weather Service issues winter storm warnings and advisories as these storms approach. Unfortunately, even with advance warning, some of the most destructive winter storms have occurred in the Southern United States, where buildings, infrastructure, crops, and livestock are not well-equipped for severe winter conditions. Motorists, not accustomed to driving in snow and icy conditions, pose an additional danger on roads and highways. The Lumpkin County HMPC recognized the potential threats of winter storms and identified specific mitigation actions. These can be found in *Chapter 5*.

2.5 Wildfire

A. Hazard Identification – The Lumpkin County HMPC utilized data from Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) and the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) in researching wildfires and their impact on the County.

A wildfire is defined as an uncontrolled fire occurring in any natural vegetation. For a wildfire to occur, there must be available oxygen, a supply of fuel, and enough heat to kindle the fuel. Often, these fires are begun by combustion and heat from surface and ground fires and can quickly develop into a major conflagration. A large wildfire may crown, which means it may spread rapidly through the topmost branches of the trees before involving undergrowth or the forest floor. As a result, violent blowups are common in forest fires, and on rare occasion they may assume the characteristics of a firestorm. A firestorm is a violent convection caused by a continuous area of intense fire and characterized by destructively violent surface indrafts. Sometimes it is accompanied by tornado-like whirls that develop as hot air from the burning fuel rises. Such a fire is beyond human intervention and subsides only upon the consumption of everything combustible in the locality. No records were found of such an event ever occurring within Lumpkin County, but this potential danger will be considered when planning mitigation efforts.

The threat of wildfire varies with weather conditions: drought, heat, and wind participate in drying out the timber or other fuel, making it easier to ignite. Once a fire is burning, drought, heat, and wind all increase its intensity. Topography also affects wildfire, which spreads quickly uphill and slowly downhill. Dried grass, leaves, and light branches are

considered flash fuels; they ignite readily, and fire spreads quickly in them, often generating enough heat to ignite heavier fuels such as tree trunks, heavy limbs, and the matted duff of the forest floor. Such fuels, ordinarily slow to kindle, are difficult to extinguish. Green fuels (growing vegetation) are not considered flammable, but an intense fire can dry out leaves and needles quickly enough to allow ready ignition. Green fuels sometimes carry a special danger: evergreens, such as pine, cedar, fir, and spruce, contain flammable oils that burst into flames when heated sufficiently by the searing drafts of a wildfire.

Tools for fighting wildfires range from the standard equipment of fire departments to portable pumps, tank trucks, and earth-moving equipment. Firefighting forces specially trained to deal with wildfire are maintained by local, state and federal entities including the Lumpkin County Fire Department, Georgia Forestry, and U.S. Forest Service. These trained firefighters may attack a fire directly by spraying water, beating out flames, and removing vegetation at the edge of the fire to contain it behind a fire line. When the very edge is too hot to approach, a fire line is built at a safe distance, sometimes using strip burning or backfire to eliminate fuel in the path of the uncontrolled fire or to change the fire's direction or slow its progress. Backfiring is used only as a last resort.

The control of wildfires has developed into an independent and complex science costing approximately $100 million annually in the United States. Because of the extremely rapid spreading and customary inaccessibility of fires once started, the chief aim of this work is prevention. However, despite the use of modern techniques (e.g., radio communications, rapid helicopter transport, and new types of chemical firefighting apparatus) more than 10 million acres of forest are still burned annually. Of these fires, about two thirds are started accidentally by people, almost one quarter are of incendiary origin, and more than 10% are due to lightning.

B. Hazard Profile – Wildfires are a serious threat to Lumpkin County.

GFC records show that 2,647 wildfires occurred within the County over the past fifty years, which equates to a 5,290% annual frequency based upon reported events. Over the course of the entire 50-year period that frequency has steadily declined. It would appear that wildfire activity has decreased over time within the County. The following chart provides annual frequency of reported events over the past five, ten, twenty, and fifty-year periods. The most recent five-year period, covering the span of time since the last update to this Plan, is highlighted in gold.

Lumpkin County – Wildfire (based on Reported Events)				
Time Period	**5yrs (2010-2015)**	**10yrs (2005-2015)**	**20yrs (1995-2015)**	**50yrs (1965-2015)**
Number of Reported Events	**163**	**422**	**1089**	**2647**
Frequency Average per Year	**32.6**	**42.2**	**54.5**	**52.9**
Frequency Percent per Year	**3260%**	**4220%**	**5450%**	**5290%**

As of September 24, 2015, Lumpkin County's threat of wildfire was classified as "moderate" by the U.S. Forest Service. However, this status can change from week to week. See the following map.



Another resource utilized during the planning process comes from the Georgia Forestry Commission. GFC forecasts a "low" to "moderate" level of fire danger for Lumpkin County for September 24, 2015. These results change daily. See map below.

Forecast Fire Danger for Tomorrow
Produced at September 23, 2015 130pm EST



C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – In evaluating assets that are susceptible to wildfire, the committee determined that all public and private property is susceptible to wildfire, including all critical facilities. The GEMA maps on the following pages display the wildfire risk potential for Lumpkin County and each of the municipalities, including locations of critical facilities within the hazard areas. The following key applies to each of the maps.

	Wildfire Threat Category	Description
	0	LOWEST THREAT: includes areas with no houses, areas with bodies of water, agricultural areas, and/or cities
	1	VERY LOW THREAT
	2	LOW THREAT
	3	MODERATE THREAT
	4	HIGH THREAT
	*****	ALL OTHER VALUES

The Wildfire Risk Layer was based on the USDA Forest Service, RMRS Fire Sciences Laboratory "Wildland Fire Risk to Flammable Structures, V 1.0" map. Although this data was not intended for use at a detail greater than state-wide analysis, it has been included as the best available data on wildfire risk. The scores are based on the risk value from the original layer. The horizontal positional accuracy is unknown for this layer.

Lumpkin County



City of Dahlonega



All portions of the County and City have been classified under Wildfire Threat Categories 0 (Lowest Threat), 1 (Very Low Threat) or 2 (Low Threat), among the lowest threats on a scale of 0 to 4. Nothing within the County or City has been classified under Wildfire Threat Category 3 (Moderate Threat) or Category 4 (High Threat). Nevertheless, the threat of wildfire certainly exists for all jurisdictions.

D. Estimate of Potential Losses – In most of the documented cases of wildfire within Lumpkin County, relatively little information on damages, in terms of dollars, was available. The potential commercial value of the land lost to wildfire cannot be accurately calculated, other than replacement costs of structures and infrastructure. With regard to the land itself, aside from the loss of timber and recreation, the damage is inestimable in terms of land rendered useless by ensuing soil erosion, elimination of wildlife cover and forage, and the loss of water reserves collected by a healthy forest. For available loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Despite low countywide wildfire threat classifications, any portion of Lumpkin County has to potential to be impacted by wildfire. One reason for this is the common interface between urban developments and the forest. Any steps taken to mitigate the effects of wildfire should be undertaken on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega.

F. Hazard Summary – Wildfires pose a serious threat to Lumpkin County in terms of property damage, as well as injuries and loss of life. Wildfires are one of the most frequently occurring natural hazards within the County each year. Based on the frequency of this hazard, as well as its ability to inflict devastation most anywhere in the County, the mitigation measures identified in this plan will be thoroughly pursued. Specific mitigation actions related to wildfire are identified in *Chapter 5*.

2.6 Drought

A. Hazard Identification –The term "drought" has various meanings, depending upon context. To a farmer, a drought is a period of moisture deficiency that affects the crops under cultivation (even two weeks without rainfall can stress many crops during certain periods of the growing cycle). To a water manager, a drought is a deficiency in water supply that affects water availability and water quality. To a meteorologist, a drought is a prolonged period when precipitation is less than normal. To a hydrologist, a drought is an extended period of decreased precipitation and streamflow.

Drought is a normal, recurrent feature of climate. It occurs almost everywhere, although its features vary from region to region. Droughts in Georgia historically have severely affected municipal and industrial water supplies, agriculture (including both livestock and crops), stream water quality, recreation at major reservoirs, hydropower generation, navigation, and forest resources. Drought is also a key factor in wildfire development by making natural fuels (grass, brush, trees, dead vegetation) more fire prone.

In Georgia, droughts have been documented at U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) streamflow gaging stations since the 1890's. From 1910 to 1940, about 20 streamflow gaging stations were in operation. Since the early 1950's through the late 1980's, about 100 streamflow gaging stations were in operation. Currently, the USGS streamflow gaging network consists of more than 135 continuous-recording gages. Groundwater levels are currently monitored at 165 wells equipped with continuous recorders.

B. Hazard Profile – The Lumpkin County HMPC reviewed historical data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GA DNR) and the Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) in researching drought events of the County and the State. Most historical information related to drought within this Plan has been derived from USGS streamflow data and NOAA precipitation data. Due to the nature of drought to affect large areas of the State simultaneously and the availability of only very limited County-specific drought information, the threat of drought is looked at within this Plan from a statewide perspective. Similarly, due to limited month-by-month information on drought, this hazard will be quantified on an annual basis (either there was a drought or there was not for any given year within the State). These guidelines are also used in Appendix B and Appendix C with regard to historical hazard information.

In the State of Georgia significant drought events, as identified by USGS, NOAA and other sources, have occurred in 22 of the last 50 years. Lumpkin County was affected to varying degrees in each of those years. Some of the most extreme droughts to affect the State include the following:

Note: When researching drought, one term that is frequently used is "recurrence interval". The recurrence interval is the average time between droughts of a given severity. For instance, in a drought with a 25-year recurrence interval the low streamflows occur, on average, once every 25 years.

1903-1905: According to the USGS, the 1903 to 1905 drought is "the earliest recorded severe drought in Georgia." In 1904, the U.S. Weather Bureau (today's National Weather Service) reported, "Levels in streams and wells were the lowest in several years. Many localities had to conserve water for stock and machinery and many factories were forced to close or operate at half capacity." When the 1903 drought struck, farm jobs dried up as quickly as the fields. The cities attracted many of these workers who migrated to Atlanta.

1924-1927: The drought that struck from 1924 to 1927 affected a wider area than simply north Georgia, affecting the Coosa River and Altamaha Basin as well at the Chattahoochee River. The U.S. Weather Bureau reported the lowest stream levels ever recorded in north Georgia in July-September of 1925, stating that the drought not only affected agricultural operations, but industrial operations as well. The scarcity of water had a profound influence on industrial and agricultural conditions in Georgia. This may have been the first time Georgia media used the term "Drought of the Century". Combined with the ongoing devastation from the boll weevil and technological advances in agriculture that increased efficiency and thereby reduced the number of farm jobs, migration from rural Georgia to urban Georgia increased significantly. The impact of this

drought, plus other natural events, helped send the Georgia economy into a depression well before the rest of the United States.

1930-1935: Although the drought of 1930-1935 had little long term impact on north Georgia, it contributed to the ongoing economic problems throughout the state and the United States as a whole. The USGS reports that the severity of this drought "exceeded a 25-year recurrence interval" in central and southwestern Georgia and affected much of the Country. In extreme northern and southeastern Georgia, the recurrence interval was 10–25 years. This period was also referred to as the "Drought of the Century."

Central Georgia - 1936

1938-1944: Many of the same areas that suffered during the 1930 to 1935 drought endured severe drought again from 1938 to 1944. The drought of 1938-1944 struck the upper Coosa River basin and the Chattahoochee River basin. According to USGS the recurrence interval exceeded 50 years in those areas. In extreme northern and southwestern Georgia, the drought had recurrence intervals of 10–25 years. It was this drought that convinced politicians to move towards massive hydroelectric projects that would supply power and keep water available to constituents throughout long dry spells. One of the key supporters of hydroelectric power in the United States was Senator Richard B. Russell, member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The first such dam in the State, Allatoona, was begun in 1941 and completed after World War II.

1950-1957: A large statewide drought lasted from 1950 to 1957. Most streamflows had recurrence intervals exceeding 25 years according to USGS. The catastrophic drought devastated crops by 1954. This event also earned the title as "Drought of the Century." This drought was most severe in southern Georgia, with most streamflows having recurrence intervals exceeding 25 years. In northeastern Georgia, the drought severity also exceeded the 25-year recurrence interval. The low rainfall affected the length of time it took to fill Lake Lanier for the first time since its creation in 1950 and completion

in 1956. In northwestern Georgia, the recurrence interval of the drought was between 10 and 25 years.

1976-1978: According to USGS, beginning in 1976, the weather over southwest Georgia turned towards a persistent pattern of late-summer drought including parts of the Chattahoochee Valley.

1980-1982: The 1980 to 1982 drought resulted in the lowest streamflows since 1954 in most areas, and the lowest streamflows since 1925 in others. Recurrence intervals of 10–25 years were common in most of Georgia. Pool levels at four major reservoirs receded to the lowest levels since first filling. Groundwater levels in many observation wells were lower than previously observed. Nearly continuous declines were recorded in some wells for as long as 20 consecutive months, and water levels remained below previous record lows for as long as nine consecutive months.

1985-1989: Many North Georgia residents remember the drought of 1985 to 1989 that saw Lake Lanier reach its lowest levels since it was filled in 1950. Streamflows touched the lows reached during the 1925 drought. Water-supply shortages occurred in Georgia in 1986. Shortages first occurred in a few Atlanta metropolitan systems, primarily because of large demand and small reservoir storage. As the drought continued, other systems in the southern part of the metropolitan area also had water-supply problems, as did several municipalities in northern and central Georgia. During 1986, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers significantly decreased the release of water from Lake Lanier, but reservoir levels continued to recede to about 2 feet above the record minimum lake level. Ground-water levels in northern Georgia were significantly less than normal during the 1985 to 1989 drought, and shortages in ground-water supplies from domestic wells occurred in the northern one-third of the State.

1998-2003: From 1998 until 2003, with a brief respite in 2000-2001, North Georgia suffered through a historic drought. The term "historic," in this instance, is used by weathermen to describe a drought of unusually long duration, one of the three measures of a drought. While the regional impact of a long-term drought is massive, in North Georgia's case, the drought's effect was mitigated, simply because of technology, mostly the dams built by the Corps of Engineers and others. Earlier droughts, however, did not have the benefit of these dams and had a "historic" impact on North Georgia. Shortages of surface-water supplies similar to those during 1986 occurred in the 1998 to 2003 drought. Water shortages during the summer of 2000 prompted the Georgia Department of Natural Resources to institute statewide restrictions on outdoor water use.

2006-2009: Beginning in late 2006 another drought struck north Georgia, on the heels of the earlier 5-year drought. River levels plummeted, causing lakes to fill up more slowly when water was released. Georgia politicians battled against the Army Corps of Engineers' continuous flow requirement for Lake Lanier due to the looming water shortages. The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) declared a level four drought response across the northern third of Georgia, including Lumpkin County, which prohibits most types of outdoor residential water use effective immediately.

Lake Lanier and Lake Allatoona 2007 (L to R)

Lake Hartwell 2008

2011-2012: Drought conditions were experienced once again throughout much of the State. However, significant rains beginning in the second half of 2012 and continuing through 2015 have all but eliminated drought conditions throughout Georgia for the time being.

Agricultural crop damage during periods of drought is difficult to estimate. Water supplies, industries, power generation, agriculture, forests, wetlands, stream water quality, navigation, and recreation for the State of Georgia have been severely impacted over time. Because of the extremely unpredictable nature of drought (to include duration), reliably calculating a recurrence interval is difficult. The Hazard Frequency Table in Appendix C analyzes historical data from the past fifty years to provide a general idea of the frequency of drought within the State.

The following four maps represent current and forecasted drought conditions. Each of these maps is updated on a regular basis. Drought conditions can change very rapidly and must be continuously monitored.

The Palmer Drought Severity Index map shows current drought conditions nationwide and is updated weekly. According to the map, the County's current drought status, as of September 19, 2015, is "near normal".



The U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook map, forecasts likely drought conditions through December 31, 2015, which indicates that drought conditions are not expected to develop in Lumpkin County within this time period.



The U.S. Drought Monitor indicates that as of September 22, 2015, Lumpkin County is not experiencing drought conditions at this time.

U.S. Drought Monitor

Georgia



oad: PNG PDF JPG

View drought planning resources

September 22, 2015

(Released Thursday September 24, 2015)

Valid 8 a.m. EDT

Statistics type: Traditional Percent Area

Export table: PNG CSV XLS

Week	None	D0-D4	D1-D4	D2-D4	D3-D4	D4
Current 2015-09-22	57.39	42.61	20.95	1.33	0.00	0.00
Last Week 2015-09-15	57.73	42.27	21.20	3.25	0.00	0.00
3 Months Ago 2015-06-23	58.04	41.96	10.07	2.82	0.00	0.00
Start of Calendar Year 2014-12-30	94.23	5.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Start of Water Year 2014-09-30	41.99	58.01	15.39	4.76	0.00	0.00
One Year Ago 2014-09-23	49.04	50.96	15.43	6.61	0.00	0.00

Estimated Population in Drought Areas: **941,428**

View More Statistics

Intensity:

D0 (Abnormally Dry) **D1** (Moderate Drought) **D2** (Severe Drought) **D3** (Extreme Drought) **D4** (Exceptional Drought)

*The Drought Monitor focuses on broad-scale conditions. Local conditions may vary. See accompanying **text summary** for forecast statements.*

Author(s):

Eric Luebehusen, U.S. Department of Agriculture

The USGS WaterWatch map, demonstrates below-normal 7-day average streamflow compared to historical streamflow for a particular day of the year (September 23, 2015). The map indicates portions of Lumpkin County are currently experiencing below normal streamflows.

Map of below normal 7-day average streamflow compared to historical streamflow for the day of year (Georgia)

Georgia

Wednesday, September 23, 2015



USGS

Click map to obtain more detailed drought information for the state

Explanation - Percentile classes				
Low	<=5	6-9	10-24	Insufficient data for a hydrologic region
Extreme hydrologic drought	Severe hydrologic drought	Moderate hydrologic drought	Below normal	

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – All public and private property including critical facilities are susceptible to drought since this hazard is not spatially defined. The danger of drought is compounded due to the fact that drought conditions create a heightened risk for wildfire. The GEMA map below identifies critical facilities located within the hazard area, which in the case of drought includes all areas within the County and City.



D. Estimate of Potential Losses – No damage to facilities is anticipated as a result of drought conditions, aside from the threat of wildfire. Crop damage cannot be accurately quantified due to several unknown variables: duration of the drought, temperatures during the drought, severity of the drought, rainfall requirements for specific crops and livestock, and the different growing seasons. There may also be financial losses related

to water system shortages. For loss estimate information, please refer to Appendix A, the Critical Facilities Database, and Appendix D, Worksheet 3a, for each jurisdiction.

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Agricultural losses associated with drought are more likely to occur in the rural, less concentrated areas of the County. Although the City of Dahlonega may be slightly less likely to experience agricultural-related drought losses than the County, they can be financially impacted by water resource-related drought losses.

F. Hazard Summary – Unlike other hazard events, drought causes damage slowly. A sustained drought can cause severe economic stress to the agricultural interests of the County and even the entire State or Region. The potential negative effects of sustained drought are numerous. In addition to an increased threat of wildfires, drought can affect water supplies, stream-water quality, water recreation facilities, hydropower generation, as well as agricultural and forest resources. The HMPC realized the limitations associated with mitigation actions for drought, but did identify some basic mitigation measures in *Chapter 5*.

2.7 Earthquakes



A. Hazard Identification – One of the most frightening and destructive natural hazards is a severe earthquake. An earthquake is a sudden movement of the Earth, caused by the abrupt release of strain that has accumulated over a long time. The forces of plate tectonics shape the Earth as the huge plates that form the Earth's surface slowly move over, under, and past each other. Sometimes the movement is gradual. At other times, the plates are locked together, unable to release the accumulating energy. When the accumulated energy grows strong enough, the plates break free. If the earthquake occurs in a populated area, it may cause many deaths, injuries and extensive property damage.

The goal of earthquake prediction is to give warning of potentially damaging earthquakes early enough to allow appropriate response to the disaster, enabling people to minimize loss of life and property. The U.S. Geological Survey conducts and supports research on the likelihood of future earthquakes. This research includes field, laboratory, and theoretical investigations of earthquake mechanisms and fault zones. A primary goal of earthquake research is to increase the reliability of earthquake probability estimates. Ultimately, scientists would like to be able to specify a high probability for a specific earthquake on a particular fault within a particular year. Scientists estimate earthquake probabilities in two ways: by studying the history of large earthquakes in a specific area and the rate at which strain accumulates in the rock.

Scientists study the past frequency of large earthquakes in order to determine the future likelihood of similar large shocks. For example, if a region has experienced four magnitude 7 or larger earthquakes during 200 years of recorded history, and if these

shocks occurred randomly in time, then scientists would assign a 50 percent probability (that is, just as likely to happen as not to happen) to the occurrence of another magnitude 7 or larger quake in the region during the next 50 years. But in many places, the assumption of random occurrence with time may not be true, because when strain is released along one part of the fault system, it may actually increase on another part.

Another way to estimate the likelihood of future earthquakes is to study how fast strain accumulates. When plate movements build the strain in rocks to a critical level, like pulling a rubber band too tight, the rocks will suddenly break and slip to a new position. Scientists measure how much strain accumulates along a fault segment each year, how much time has passed since the last earthquake along the segment, and how much strain was released in the last earthquake. This information is then used to calculate the time required for the accumulating strain to build to the levels that result in an earthquake. This simple model is complicated by the fact that such detailed information about faults is rare. In the United States, only the San Andreas Fault system has adequate records for using this prediction method.

Magnitude and intensity measure different characteristics of earthquakes. Magnitude measures the energy released at the source of the earthquake and is determined from measurements on seismographs. Intensity measures the strength of shaking produced by the earthquake at a certain location and is determined from effects on people, human structures, and the natural environment. The following two tables describe the Abbreviated Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale, and show intensities that are typically observed at locations near the epicenter of earthquakes of different magnitudes.

Magnitude / Intensity Comparison

Magnitude	Typical Maximum Modified Mercalli Intensity
1.0 - 3.0	**I**
3.0 - 3.9	**II - III**
4.0 - 4.9	**IV - V**
5.0 - 5.9	**VI - VII**
6.0 - 6.9	**VII - IX**
7.0 and higher	**VIII** or higher

Abbreviated Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

I. Not felt except by a very few under especially favorable conditions.

II. Felt only by a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of buildings.

III. Felt quite noticeably by persons indoors, especially on upper floors of buildings. Many people do not recognize it as an earthquake. Standing motor cars may rock slightly. Vibrations similar to the passing of a truck. Duration estimated.

IV. Felt indoors by many, outdoors by few during the day. At night, some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make cracking sound. Sensation like heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.

V. Felt by nearly everyone; many awakened. Some dishes, windows broken. Unstable objects overturned. Pendulum clocks may stop.

VI. Felt by all, many frightened. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of fallen plaster. Damage slight.

VII. Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well-built ordinary structures; considerable damage in poorly built or badly designed structures; some chimneys broken.

VIII. Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable damage in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse. Damage great in poorly built structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture overturned.

IX. Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb. Damage great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations.

X. Some well-built wooden structures destroyed; most masonry and frame structures destroyed with foundations. Rails bent.

XI. Few, if any (masonry) structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Rails bent greatly.

XII. Damage total. Lines of sight and level are distorted. Objects thrown into the air.

The following USGS map provides a historical view of earthquakes in the Eastern United States.

B. Hazard Profile – The first earthquakes recorded as being felt in Georgia were the great New Madrid earthquakes of 1811-1812 (also known as the Mississippi River Valley earthquakes) centered in northeast Arkansas and New Madrid, Missouri. There were hundreds of earthquakes during the two month period between December 16, 1811 and February 7, 1812. On the basis of the large area of damage (600,000 square kilometers), the widespread area of perceptibility (5,000,000 square kilometers), and the complex physiographic changes that occurred, this series of earthquakes rank as some of the largest in the United States since its settlement by Europeans. The area of strong shaking associated with these shocks is two to three times larger than that of the 1964 Alaska earthquake and 10 times larger than that of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. The first three major earthquakes occurred in northeast Arkansas on December 16, 1811 (three



shocks - Mfa 7.2/MSn 8.5; Mfa 7.0/MSn 8.0; and MSn 8.0). There were six aftershocks on December 16th and 17th alone in the range of M5.5 to M6.3 (Note: aftershocks actually *are* earthquakes). The fourth earthquake occurred in Missouri on January 23, 1812 (Mfa 7.1/MSn 8.4). The fifth earthquake occurred in New Madrid, Missouri on February 7, 1812 (Mfa 7.4/ MSn 8.8). This is the earthquake that created Reelfoot Lake,

located in northwest Tennessee. It was reported to have been formed as the Mississippi River flowed backward for 10–24 hours to fill the lake. As a result of this earthquake, the original town of New Madrid now lies under the Mississippi River.

This accounted for a total of five earthquakes of magnitude MSn 8.0 or higher occurring in a period of 54 days. The first earthquake caused only slight damage to man-made structures, mainly because the region was so sparsely populated. However, as the earthquakes continued, they began to open deep cracks in the ground, created landslides on the steeper bluffs and hillsides, large areas of land were uplifted, and sizable sink areas were created. These five main earthquakes, and several aftershocks, were felt over almost all of the eastern United States including the State of Georgia. In Georgia this series of earthquakes was strong enough to have shaken bricks from chimneys and other minor damage.

The great Charleston, South Carolina, earthquake of 1886 killed approximately 60 people. The magnitude 7.3 earthquake is the most damaging earthquake to occur in the Southeast United States and one of the largest historic shocks in Eastern North America. It damaged or destroyed many buildings in the old city of Charleston. Property damage was estimated at $5-$6 million. Structural damage was reported several hundred

kilometers from Charleston including in the State of Georgia. On August 31, 1886 at 9:25 pm, preceded by a low rumble, the shock waves reached Savannah. People had difficulty remaining standing. One woman died of fright as the shaking cracked walls, felled chimneys, and broke windows. Panic at a revival service left two injured and two more were injured in leaping from upper story windows. Several more were injured by falling bricks. Ten buildings in Savannah were damaged beyond repair and at least 240 chimneys damaged. People spent the night outside. At Tybee Island light station the 134 foot lighthouse was cracked near the middle where the walls were six feet thick, and the one-ton lens moved an inch and a half to the northeast. In Augusta the shaking was the most severe (VIII on the Modified Mercalli scale) in the State. An estimated 1000 chimneys and many buildings were damaged. The business and social life was paralyzed for two days. Brunswick and Darien were affected as well.

June 17, 1872: An earthquake on June 17, 1872 in Milledgeville, GA and had an intensity of at least V on the Modified Mercalli scale, the lowest intensity in which some damage may occur. It was reported as a sharp shock, jarring brick buildings and rattling windows.

November 1, 1875: On November 1, 1875, at 9:55 in the evening, an intensity VI earthquake occurred near the South Carolina border. It was felt from Spartanburg and Columbia, South Carolina, to Atlanta and Macon, Georgia, from Gainesville to Augusta, and generally over an area of 25,000 square miles.

October 18, 1902: A more local event occurred on October 18, 1902, with a sharp shock felt along the east face of Rocky Face Mountain, just west of Dalton, GA with intensity VI and at LaFayette, GA with intensity V. The earthquake was felt over an area of about 1500 square miles including Chattanooga, Tennessee.

January 23, 1903: The Savannah, GA area was shaken with an intensity VI earthquake on January 23, 1903. Centering near Tybee Island, it was felt over an area of 10,000 square miles including Savannah (intensity VI), Augusta (intensity III), Charleston (intensity IV-V), and Columbia (intensity III-IV). Houses were strongly shaken.

June 20, 1912: Another shock was felt on June 20, 1912, at Savannah with intensity V.

March 5, 1914: According to USGS, Georgia experienced another earthquake on March 5, 1914. Magnitude 4.5.

March 5, 1916: On March 5, 1916, an earthquake centered 30 miles southeast of Atlanta was felt over an area of 50,000 square miles, as far as Cherokee County, North Carolina, by several people in Raleigh, and in parts of Alabama and Tennessee.

March 12, 1964: An earthquake of intensity V or over occurred on March 12, 1964, centered near Haddock, GA less than 20 miles northeast of Macon. Intensity V was recorded at Haddock while shaking was felt in four counties over a 400-square-mile area.



INTENSITY	I	II-III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X+
SHAKING	Not felt	Weak	Light	Moderate	Strong	Very strong	Severe	Violent	Extreme
DAMAGE	none	none	none	Very light	Light	Moderate	Moderate/Heavy	Heavy	Very Heavy

April 29, 2003: On April 29, 2003 just before 5:00 a.m. a moderate earthquake, rated 4.9 on the Richter Scale, shook most of the northwest corner of Georgia, south to Atlanta. The epicenter was located in Menlo, GA, about 37 miles south of Chattanooga. See map to right.

August 23, 2011: On August 23, 2011 at 1:51pm, a 5.8 magnitude earthquake originated near Louisa and Mineral, Virginia. It struck Washington DC (about 100 miles away from epicenter) causing moderate shaking and potentially significant damage. The earthquake was recorded all along the Appalachians, from Georgia to New England. The earthquake was felt so widely because it was a shallow earthquake, and geologic conditions in the eastern U.S. allow the effects of earthquakes to propagate and spread much more efficiently than in the western United States. Only mild movement was felt in Lumpkin County. See map to the right.



PERCEIVED SHAKING	Not felt	Weak	Light	Moderate	Strong	Very strong	Severe	Violent	Extreme
POTENTIAL DAMAGE	none	none	none	Very light	Light	Moderate	Moderate/Heavy	Heavy	Very Heavy
PEAK ACC.(%g)	<.17	.17-1.4	1.4-3.9	3.9-9.2	9.2-18	18-34	34-65	65-124	>124
PEAK VEL.(cm/s)	<0.1	0.1-1.1	1.1-3.4	3.4-8.1	8.1-16	16-31	31-60	60-116	>116
INSTRUMENTAL INTENSITY	I	II-III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X+

To a large extent, the HMPC was unable to determine which of these earthquakes affected Lumpkin County and, if so, to what degree. Nevertheless, the HMPC has determined that most of the earthquakes documented above would have been strong enough or would have occurred close enough to Lumpkin County to merit consideration. Three of these earthquakes occurred within the 50-year study period and are included in the hazard history of this Plan. The threat of earthquakes in Lumpkin County may be more significant than the documented earthquake history would seem to indicate. Seismic activity for the State of Georgia is shown on the following USGS map for the period 1973 to 2012 which is the latest version of this map.



Based on U.S. Geological Survey estimations using the earthquake frequency method described in the section above, the probability of an earthquake of a magnitude over 5.0 within Lumpkin County over the next 25 years is between 0% and 1% (see map below). As discussed above, such predictions are based on limited information, and cannot necessarily be relied upon for their precision. However, they do help demonstrate that the threat of earthquakes cannot be overlooked especially in the northwestern portions of Georgia.



C. Assets Exposed to Hazard - All structures and facilities within Lumpkin County are susceptible to earthquake damage since they can occur in any portion of the County or City. The likelihood of an earthquake in Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega ranges from moderate to high. Most areas within the County and all areas within the City of Dahlonega are located within Seismic Threat Category 3, "moderate to high threat." The very southern portion of the County is located within Seismic Threat Category 2, "low to moderate threat."

The seismic hazard layer used in the GEMA maps that follow is based on the USGS Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Map, showing the percentage of gravity that the area has a 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. The score classification reflects that used by the IRC Seismic Design Categories. The horizontal positional accuracy is unknown for this layer.

	Seismic Threat Category	Original Value	Description
	1	A	0-17% gravity (lowest threat)
	2	B	17-33% gravity (low to moderate threat)
	3	C	33-50% gravity (moderate to high threat)
	4	D1	50-83% gravity (highest threat)
	*****	Not applicable	All other values

Lumpkin County



City of Dahlonega



Georgia has a few large faults. The Blue Ridge fault extends from Alabama through Georgia and into Tennessee. The Brevard Fault extends from Alabama through Georgia and into South Carolina. Lumpkin County is located between these two faults.



D. Estimate of Potential Losses – For loss estimate information, please refer to Appendix A, the Critical Facilities Database, and Appendix D, Worksheet 3a, for each jurisdiction.

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – All of Lumpkin County has the potential to be affected by earthquakes. The threat appears to be moderate and fairly uniform throughout the County and City. Any steps taken to mitigate the effects of earthquake will be undertaken on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega.

F. Hazard Summary – Scientific understanding of earthquakes is of vital importance to the Nation. As the population increases, expanding urban development and construction works encroach upon areas susceptible to earthquakes. With a greater understanding of the causes and effects of earthquakes, we may be able to reduce damage and loss of life from this destructive phenomenon. The HMPC was limited in its ability to develop mitigation measures associated with earthquakes, but did provide some guidance in *Chapter 5*.

2.8 Landslides

A. Hazard Identification – Landslides occur in every U.S. states and territory. In a landslide, masses of rock, earth, or debris move down a slope. Landslides can be small, large, slow or rapid. They can be activated by storms, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, fires, freeze/thaw cycles, and steep-slope erosion. Landslides are often more damaging and deadly than the triggering event. The dangerous conditions may be high even as emergency personnel are providing rescue and recovery services. Landslide problems can be caused by land mismanagement, particularly in mountain, canyon and coastal regions. In areas burned by forest and brush fires a lower threshold of precipitation may initiate landslides. Land-use zoning, professional inspections, and proper design can minimize many landslide, mudflow, and debris flow problems.

USGS Landslide Potential Map:



***Red**-Very High; **Yellow**- High; **Green**-Moderate*

B. Hazard Profile –Landslides are a serious threat to Lumpkin County. According to the USGS, Northern Georgia has a very high potential to experience landslides (see map above). The ridgeline of the Appalachian Mountains divides the counties in Northern Georgia, creating steeper slopes in the eastern portion of the state. Lumpkin County lies within the area with very high potential for landslide activity. Steep slopes, combined with the high potential for wildfires increase the probability of a landslide or mudslide occurring in Lumpkin County or the City of Dahlonega within any given year.


Lumpkin County, GA
Steep Slopes
Legend
Steep Slope (Slope > 25%)
State Highway
Stream / River
Waterbody
City of Dahlonega
County Boundary
0 1 2 3 4 5 Miles

Two relatively recent landslide events have affected portions of Lumpkin County. Both of these events were preceded by heavy rain events.

On August 26, 2008 the remnants of tropical storm Fay continued to move northeast into central and northern Alabama then finally into eastern Tennessee on the following day. This was the day when north and central Georgia experienced the maximum effects from tropical storm Fay. The Lumpkin County Emergency Management Director confirmed that flash flooding had occurred at several locations in eastern Lumpkin County as a result of very heavy rainfall caused by the remnants of tropical storm Fay. Five-day total rainfall for the eastern portion of the county was in the six to eight inch range, but three to four inches of this fell on August 26th alone, resulting in flash flooding. A mudslide was observed on Corporate Road upstream from the Chestatee River Bridge approximately 5.4 miles east- northeast of Dahlonega. This resulted in the temporary closure of Corporate Road in this area. The mudslide was 20 feet by 60 feet tall.

About a year later, in early September 2009, north Georgia experienced a period of heavy rains. This rainfall resulted in a small landslide near the campus of North Georgia College & State University in Dahlonega. The slide caused a portion of a local road to be closed for a short period of time. Higher than normal rainfall throughout the summer of 2009 led to ground saturation, adding to the instability of the slopes in Lumpkin County and throughout northern Georgia.

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – In evaluating assets that are susceptible to landslides, the HMPC determined that all public and private property is susceptible to landslides, including all critical facilities.

D. Estimate of Potential Losses – Landslide losses are difficult to estimate due to their unpredictable nature. For available loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – Due to topography, any portion of Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega can be negatively impacted by landslides. Therefore, any mitigation steps taken related to these weather events will be pursued on a countywide basis and include the City of Dahlonega.

F. Hazard Summary – Though not very common, landslide events do pose a threat to Lumpkin County in terms of property damage, injuries and loss of life. Specific mitigation actions related to these weather events are identified in *Chapter 5*.

Chapter 3
Local Technological Hazard, Risk and Vulnerability (HRV) Summary

In accordance with FEMA guidelines, the Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) also included information relating to technological or "human-caused" hazards into this plan. The term, "technological hazard" refers to incidents resulting from human activities such as the manufacture, transportation, storage, and use of hazardous materials. This plan assumes that hazards resulting from technological sources are accidental, and that their consequences are unintended. Unfortunately, the information relating to technological hazards is much more limited, due largely to the very limited historical data available. This causes a greater level of uncertainty with regard to mitigation measures. However, enough information has been gathered to provide a basic look at technological hazards within Lumpkin County.

The Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) identified two technological hazards the County is vulnerable to based upon available data including scientific evidence, known past events, and future probability estimates. As a result of this planning process, which included an analysis of the risks associated with probable frequency and impact of each hazard, the HMPC determined that each of these technological hazards pose a threat significant enough to address within this Plan. These include hazardous materials release and dam failure. Each of these technological hazards is addressed in this chapter of the Plan. An explanation and results of the vulnerability assessment are found in Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

Table 3.1 – Hazards Terminology Differences

Hazards Identified in 2008 Georgia State Plan	Equivalent/Associated Hazards Identified in the 2011 Lumpkin County Plan	Difference
Dam Failure	Dam Failure	None

Table 3.2 – Vulnerability Assessment - Technological Hazards *(see Keys below)*

HAZARD	Lumpkin	Dahlonega
Dam Failure		
Frequency	VL	VL
Severity	H	H
Probability	EX	EX
Hazardous Materials Release		
Frequency	H	H
Severity	EX	EX
Probability	EX	EX

Key for Table 3.2 – Vulnerability Assessment Frequency and Probability Definitions

NA = Not applicable; not a hazard to the jurisdiction
VL = Very low risk/occurrence
L = Low risk; little damage potential (for example, minor damage to less than 5% of the jurisdiction)
M = Medium risk; moderate damage potential (for example, causing partial damage to 5-15% of the jurisdiction, infrequent occurrence)
H = High risk; significant risk/major damage potential (for example, destructive, damage to more than 15% of the jurisdiction, regular occurrence)
EX = Extensive risk/probability/impact

3.1 Hazardous Materials Release

A. Hazard Identification – Hazardous materials (hazmat) refers to any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, may pose a real hazard to human health or the environment if it is released. Hazmat includes flammable and combustible materials, toxic materials, corrosive materials, oxidizers, aerosols, and compressed gases. Specific examples of hazmat are gasoline, bulk fuels, propane, propellants, mercury, asbestos, ammunition, medical waste, sewage, and chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive (CBRNE) threat agents. Specific federal and state guidelines exist on transport and shipping hazardous materials. Research institutes, industrial plants, individual households, and government agencies all generate chemical waste. Approximately one percent is classified as hazardous.

A hazmat spill or release occurs when hazardous material or waste gets into the environment in an uncontrolled fashion. Many manufacturing processes use hazardous materials or generate hazardous waste, but a hazardous spill doesn't always come from a chemical plant or a factory. Any substance in the wrong place at the wrong time in too large an amount can cause harm to the environment. The response to a spill depends on the situation. When the emergency response team is notified of a spill, it must quickly decide what sort of danger is likely. Members of the team collect appropriate clothing and equipment and travel to the scene. There they try to contain the spill, sometimes

testing a sample to identify it. If necessary, they decontaminate themselves before leaving the area. Once material has been identified, other personnel arrive to remove it.

B. Hazard Profile – Hazmat spills are usually categorized as either fixed releases, which occur when hazmat is released on the site of a facility or industry that stores or manufactures hazmat, or transportation-related releases, which occur when hazmat is released during transport from one place to another. Both fixed and transportation-related hazmat spills represent tremendous threats to Lumpkin County. Potential fixed hazmat spills within the County would come from local commercial and industrial establishments.

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) rail maps on the following two pages demonstrate that there are presently no rail lines running through Lumpkin County. This is fortunate in the sense that hazmat spills via rail are not a threat to the County. Nevertheless, the maps are included to provide statewide perspective.

Georgia Rail System



Georgia Rail Tonnage



Georgia Department of Transportation
Office of Intermodal Programs
Created: September 26, 2005
Visit us at: WWW.DOT.STATE.GA.US
Or Search for us online, enter: "GDOT RAIL"

COX

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – The environment is especially vulnerable to hazardous materials releases, with waterways being at greatest risk of contamination. Georgia EPD tracks information on waterways within Lumpkin County that have been contaminated to varying degrees due to hazmat spills. These incidents include contamination to creeks, lakes, storm sewers, wells, and drainage ditches. Such releases are also a potential threat to all property and persons within any primary highway corridors or railroad corridors of Lumpkin County since certain hazmat releases can create several square miles of contamination. The same holds true of property and persons located in the vicinity of facilities or industries that produce or handle large amounts of hazardous materials. The most common hazmat releases have generally included diesel, gasoline, oil, and sewage. Unfortunately, Georgia EPD no longer makes specific hazmat spill information available to the public as they once did. If at some point this changes, that data will be considered at the next Plan update.

All public and private property including critical facilities are susceptible to hazardous materials release since this hazard is not spatially defined. The GEMA map below identifies critical facilities located within the hazard area, which in the case of drought includes all areas within the County and City.



D. Estimate of Potential Losses - It is difficult to determine potential damage to the environment caused by hazardous materials releases. What can be calculated are the significant response costs incurred once a hazmat release does occur including emergency response, road closings, evacuations, watershed protection, expended man-hours, and cleanup materials and equipment. Corridors for US Routes 19 and 129 and State Routes 9, 11, 52, 60, 115, and 400 are most vulnerable to transportation-related releases. However, such releases can occur in virtually any part of the County accessible by road. Fixed location releases are not as likely to affect the more rural areas of the County. For additional loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – All of Lumpkin County, including the City of Dahlonega, is vulnerable to both fixed and transportation-related hazardous materials releases.

F. Hazard Summary – Hazardous materials releases are a significant threat to Lumpkin County. Unknown quantities and types of hazmat are transported through the County by truck and railroad on a daily basis. The main corridors of concern are US Routes 19 and 129 and State Routes 9, 11, 52, 60, 115, and 400. These hazmat shipments pose a great potential threat to all of Lumpkin County. The fact that the County is unable to track these shipments seriously limits the mitigation measures that can be put into place. Fixed hazmat releases are also considered to be a major threat to Lumpkin County due to the industries located therein. Therefore, the Lumpkin County HMPC has identified specific mitigation actions for hazardous materials releases in *Chapter 5*.

3.2 Dam Failure

A. Hazard Identification – Georgia law defines a dam as any artificial barrier which impounds or diverts water, is 25 feet or more in height from the natural bed of the stream, or has an impounding capacity at maximum water storage evaluation of 100 acre-feet (equivalent to 100 acres one foot deep) or more. Dams are usually constructed to provide a ready supply of water for drinking, irrigation, recreation and other purposes. They can be made of rock, earth, masonry, or concrete or of combinations of these materials.

Dam failure is a term used to describe the major breach of a dam and subsequent loss of contained water. Dam failure can result in loss of life and damage to structures, roads, utilities, crops, and livestock. Economic losses can also result from a lowered tax base, lack of utility profits, disruption of commerce and governmental services, and extraordinary public expenditures for food relief and protection. National statistics show that overtopping due to inadequate spillway design, debris blockage of spillways, or settlement of the dam crest account for one third of all U.S. dam failures. Foundation defects, including settlement and slope instability, account for another third of all failures. Piping and seepage, and other problems cause the remaining third of national dam failures. This includes internal erosion caused by seepage, seepage and erosion along hydraulic structures, leakage through animal burrows, and cracks in the dam. The increasing age of dams nationwide is a contributing factor to each of the problems above.

B. Hazard Profile – Congress first authorized the US Army Corps of Engineers to inventory dams in the United States with the National Dam Inspection Act (Public Law 92-367) of 1972. The Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662) authorized the Corps to maintain and periodically publish an updated National Inventory

of Dams (NID), with re-authorization and a dedicated funding source provided under the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-3). The Corps also began close collaboration with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and state regulatory offices to obtain more accurate and complete information. The National Dam Safety and Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-310) reauthorized the National Dam Safety Program and included the maintenance and update of the NID by the Corps of Engineers.

The most recent Dam Safety Act of 2006 reauthorized the maintenance and update of the NID.

The NID consists of dams meeting at least one of the following criteria:

1) High hazard classification - loss of one human life is likely if the dam fails,
2) Significant hazard classification - possible loss of human life and likely significant property or environmental destruction,
3) Equal or exceed 25 feet in height and exceed 15 acre-feet in storage,
4) Equal or exceed 50 acre-feet storage and exceed 6 feet in height.

The goal of the NID is to include all dams in the U.S. that meet these criteria, yet in reality, is limited to information that can be gathered and properly interpreted with the given funding. The inventory initially consisted of approximately 45,000 dams, which were gathered from extensive record searches and some feature extraction from aerial imagery. Since continued and methodical updates have been conducted, data collection has been focused on the most reliable data sources, which are the various federal and state government dam construction and regulation offices. In most cases, dams within the NID criteria are regulated (construction permit, inspection, and/or enforcement) by federal or state agencies, who have basic information on the dams within their jurisdiction. Therein lies the biggest challenge, and most of the effort to maintain the NID; periodic collection of dam characteristics from states, territories, and 18 federal offices. Database management software is used by most state agencies to compile and export update information for the NID. With source agencies using such software, the Corps of Engineers receives data that can be parsed and has the proper NID codes. The Corps can then resolve duplicative and conflicting data from the many data sources, which helps obtain the more complete, accurate, and updated NID.

The National Inventory of Dams Map for the State of Georgia is located below and displays the State's current inventory of 5,132 dams.

U.S Army Corps of Engineers National Inventory of Dams



The following five US Army Corps of Engineers charts are derived from NID information and present information related to number, hazard potential, type, ownership, purpose, and age of Georgia dams.











As you can see in the last chart above, most Georgia dams were built during the 1950's through the 1970's. This puts the average age of Georgia dams at about 50 years old.

The Lumpkin County HMPC reviewed data from the US Army Corps of Engineers National Inventory of Dams, the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) within the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR), as well as County records in their research involving dam failure within Lumpkin County. Fortunately, Lumpkin County has never experienced a total dam failure with a Category I dam. It is also possible that some small private dams have been breached at some point in the past, but no records have been found to indicate any type of emergency response related to such a failure, or even that such a failure has taken place. However, the potential for such a disaster does exist, and the appropriate steps must be taken to minimize such risks. The Georgia Safe Dams Program helps to accomplish that.

The Georgia Safe Dams Act of 1978 established Georgia's Safe Dams Program following the November 6, 1977 failure of the Kelly Barnes Dam in Toccoa, GA, in which 39 people lost their lives when the breached dam, which held back a 45-acre lake, sent a 30-foot-high wall of water sweeping through Toccoa Falls College. The Environmental Protection Division (EPD) within the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is responsible for administering the Program. The purpose of the Program is to *provide for the inspection and permitting of certain dams in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of all citizens of the state by reducing the risk of failure of such dams.* The Program has two main functions: (1) to inventory and classify dams and (2) to regulate and permit high hazard dams. Although a total Category I dam failure has never been recorded in Lumpkin County, a partial failure of Lookout Lake Dam did occur in 2004. Mitigation actions are not yet completed for the Dam.

Structures below the State minimum height and impoundment requirements (25 feet or more in height or an impounding capacity of 100 acre-feet or more) are exempt from regulation by the Georgia Safe Dams Program. The Program checks the flood plain of the dam to determine its hazard classification. Specialized software is used to build a computer model to simulate a dam breach and establish the height of the flood wave in the downstream plain. If the results of the dam breach analysis, also called a flood routing, indicate that a breach of the dam would result in a probable loss of human life, the dam is classified as Category I (high-hazard). As of December 2011, the Program's statewide inventory of dams consisted of 475 Category I dams, 3,410 Category II dams and 1,186 exempt dams. The Program noted that an additional 120 Category II dams needed to be studied for possible reclassification to Category I dams. The Safe Dams Program also approves plans and specifications for construction and repair of all Category I dams. In addition, Category I dams are continuously monitored for safety by Georgia EPD.

To date, the Safe Dam Program has identified six Category I dams within Lumpkin County. These include Etowah River Watershed Structure No. 25, Etowah River Watershed Structure No. 26, Rainbow Lake Dam, Roskin Lake Dam, Whitner's Lake Dam, and Yahoola Creek Reservoir Dam. The additional 23 classified dams within the County are Category II dams (21) or exempt dams (2). There may be a number of unclassified dams within the County as well. The Program requires all Category II dams to be inventoried at least every five years.

C. Assets Exposed to Hazard – Areas most vulnerable to the physical damages associated with dam failure within Lumpkin County, though such a risk appears to be relatively low, are the low-lying and downstream areas associated with Etowah River Watershed Structure No. 25, Etowah River Watershed Structure No. 26, Rainbow Lake Dam, Roskin Lake Dam, Whitner's Lake Dam, and Yahoola Creek Reservoir Dam. Although physical damages associated with dam failure would be limited to certain areas, the damage to the local economy and problems associated with delivery of water and other utilities could be felt Countywide and include all areas of the County and City.

D. Estimate of Potential Losses - Loss estimation due to dam failure is an approximate effort, at best. Direct loss to infrastructure, critical facilities and businesses in terms of repair and replacement can be roughly estimated. For additional loss estimate information, please refer to the Critical Facilities Database (Appendix A).

E. Multi-Jurisdictional Concerns – All of Lumpkin County, including the City of Dahlonega, is vulnerable to the negative impact of dam failure.

F. Hazard Summary – Even though a total failure of a Category I dam has never been recorded in Lumpkin County, the Lumpkin County HMPC has identified some specific mitigation actions for dam failure in *Chapter 5*.

Chapter 4
Land Use and Development Trends

Development within the County has been steadily increasing since 2011. Single-family residential permitting has increased from 17 in 2011 to 60 in 2014. Commercial permitting has held steady since 2011 averaging approximately 16 permits per year. The majority of the recent residential development has been in the southwestern portion of the county. This development is overwhelmingly in subdivisions that were originally developed prior to the economic downturn in 2007. The remaining single-family housing is scattered throughout the county on individual parcels. Commercial development has been mainly located along the SR 400 and SR 60 corridors in the southern portion of the County. Wedding/Special Event venues make up a large percentage of the commercial development in the county and are located throughout the county.

Development in the City of Dahlonega is centered around the University of North Georgia campus. This development consists mainly of multifamily housing and university-owned buildings. The remaining development is tourism oriented.

The Legend below applies to the Lumpkin County Future Land Use Map on the following page.

Future Land Use (27)

- AP - Agricultural Preservation
- CC - Commerce Corridor
- CV - Community Village
- GC - Gateway Corridor
- I - Industrial
- N - Neighborhood Village
- PI - Public / Institutional
- RG - Residential Growth
- ROC - Recreation / Open / Conservation
- RP - Rural Places
- TCU - Transportation / Communicaiton
- City Zoning

Lumpkin County Future Land Use Map



Areas of Recent Growth
& Anticipated Growth in Lumpkin County, GA



Chapter 5
Hazard Mitigation Goals, Objectives, & Actions

When Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega begin any large-scale planning effort, it is imperative that the planning process is driven by a clear set of goals and objectives. Goals and objectives are the foundation of an effective Hazard Mitigation Plan. They address the key problems and opportunities to help establish a framework for identifying risks and developing strategies to mitigate those risks. Lumpkin County's multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) reviewed and re-evaluated the four major goals and numerous objectives for the purposes of this Plan and determined that they all remain valid and effective. No changes were recommended.

In order to fully understand the hazard mitigation goals, objectives, and actions, it is necessary to clearly define the terms **"goal"**, **"objective"**, and **"action"**:

A **goal** is a broad-based statement of intent that establishes the direction for the Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Goals can essentially be thought of as the desired "outcomes" of successful implementation of the Plan.
An **objective** is the stated "means" of achieving each goal, or the tasks to be executed in the process of achieving goals.
An **action** is a project-specific strategy to mitigate a particular hazard event within the context of the overarching goals and objectives.

While specific mitigation actions are listed later in this chapter, it is important to note that the actions were selected and evaluated in relation to the overarching hazard mitigation goals and objectives of this plan, which are as follows:

Goal #1. Protect life and minimize loss of property damage.

Objective 1-1. Implement mitigation actions that will assist in protecting lives and property by making homes, businesses, public facilities, and infrastructure more resistant to vulnerable hazards.
Objective 1-2. Review existing ordinances, building codes, and safety inspection procedures to help ensure that they employ the most recent and generally acceptable standards for the protection of buildings.
Objective 1-3. Ensure that public and private facilities and infrastructure meet established building codes and enforce the codes to address any deficiencies.
Objective 1-4. Implement mitigation actions that encourage the protection of the environment.
Objective 1-5. Integrate the recommendations of this plan into existing land use plans and capital improvement programs.
Objective 1-6. Build upon past databases to ensure that vulnerable hazards' risks are accurate.

Goal #2. Increase Public Awareness.

Objective 2-1. Develop and implement additional education and outreach programs to increase public awareness of the risks associated with hazards and on specific preparedness activities available.
Objective 2-2. Encourage homeowners and businesses to take preventative actions and purchase hazard insurance.

Goal #3. Encourage Partnerships.

Objective 3-1. Strengthen inter-jurisdictional and inter-agency communication, coordination, and partnerships to foster hazard mitigation actions designed to benefit multiple jurisdictions.
Objective 3-2. Identify and implement ways to engage public agencies with individual citizens, nonprofit organizations, business, and industry to implement mitigation activities more effectively.

Goal #4. Provide for Emergency Services.

Objective 4-1. Where appropriate, coordinate and integrate hazard mitigation actions with existing emergency operations plans.
Objective 4-2. Identify the need for, and acquire, any special emergency services and equipment to enhance response capabilities for specific hazards.
Objective 4-3. Encourage the establishment of policies to help ensure the prioritization and implementation of mitigation actions designed to benefit critical facilities, critical services, and emergency traffic routes.

Format Utilized to Develop Mitigation Actions

The HMPC reviewed each jurisdiction's annual budget, multiyear work programs, and comprehensive plans to determine existing mitigation actions that met the goals and objectives of this Plan. The committee then developed a list of tentative mitigation actions based on committee members' personal knowledge, interviews with other officials of each jurisdiction, and knowledge of successful actions implemented in other communities.

The committee members developed a prioritized list utilizing the GEMA recommended STAPLEE prioritization methodology, with special emphasis on the following:

1. Cost effectiveness (and when potential federal projects are anticipated, cost-benefit reviews will be conducted prior to application);
2. Comprehensiveness, i.e. addresses a specific goal and objective;
3. Addresses reducing effects of hazards on new and existing buildings and infrastructure;
4. Addresses reducing effects of hazards on critical facilities where necessary; and,
5. Identification of future public buildings and infrastructure (Note: recognizing that the Plan may be modified and evaluated during the monitoring and evaluation period, and will definitely be completely updated within the federally mandated five year approval cycle, future development including future buildings will only include the five year period from Plan completion).

All rankings were composited to represent the consensus of the HMPC.

Members of the HMPC prioritized the potential mitigation measures identified in this Plan. A list of mitigation goals, objectives and related action items was compiled from the inputs of the HMPC, as well as from others within the community. The subcommittee prioritized the potential mitigation measures based on what they considered most beneficial to the community. Several criteria were established to assist HMPC members in the prioritization of these suggested mitigation actions. Criteria included perceived cost benefit or cost effectiveness, availability of potential funding sources, overall technical feasibility, measurable milestones, multiple objectives, determination of public and political support for the proposed actions, and the STAPLEE method described above. Through this prioritization process, several projects emerged as being a greater priority than others. Some of the projects involved expending considerable amounts of funds to initiate the required actions. Most projects allowed the community to pursue completion of the project using potential grant funding. Still others required no significant financial commitment by the community. All proposed mitigation actions were evaluated to determine the degree to which the County would benefit in relation to the project costs. After review by the HMPC, the prioritized list of mitigation measures, as presented within this Plan, was determined.

This same method of prioritization was utilized for the prior update to this Plan. Additionally, it was reviewed by the HMPC during the current plan update process and approved for continued use due to its effectiveness. No changes were recommended.

Mitigation Actions

Each mitigation action is presented by jurisdiction, or in the case of joint actions by multiple jurisdictions, or by independent public bodies (such as School System), or by private nonprofits (such as the Medical Center), in priority order (objective), by best estimate of cost, if applicable, by potential funding source if other than operating budgets, by department or agency that will administer the action, and by timeframe. Timeframes do not begin until funding is obtained for any particular project unless otherwise indicated.

Each mitigation action that follows may be supported by one or more jurisdictions below, as indicated by the corresponding letters as follows:

L = Lumpkin County (unincorporated)
D = City of Dahlonega

A = All of the above jurisdictions

The City of Dahlonega has a relatively small population. Due to limited financial and human resources, much support with regard to public safety is provided by Lumpkin County. This includes assistance with emergency management, fire protection, and law enforcement. The City does have some capability, but it is augmented by the County. Therefore, many mitigation actions included on behalf of the County in the Plan are likely to have an indirect benefit for the City of Dahlonega.

Each mitigation action that follows is designed to mitigate one or more hazards discussed in this Plan. Those specific hazards are listed for each mitigation action at the end of each mitigation action description. The term "All" as used in the mitigation action section below refers to all hazards discussed in this Plan (severe thunderstorm, winter storm, flooding, tornado, wildfire, drought, earthquake, hazardous materials release, and dam failure).

Each mitigation action that follows mitigates the effects of hazards on existing structures/infrastructure, future structures/infrastructure, or both, as indicated.

In addition, the status of each mitigation action that follows is indicated by one of the following three terms:

PRELIMINARY – unfunded projects or projects in planning stages.
IN PROGRESS – funded projects that have begun but aren't completed.
ONGOING – continuous projects that are never truly completed; may be funded or unfunded at any given time but are expected to continue unless removed from Plan.

**Note: Fully completed or deleted projects are not found below, but in Appendix D.*

Mitigation Action	Hazard(s) Addressed	Jurisdictional Participants	Project Status	Cost Estimate	Project Length	Goals and Objectives	Structures & Infrastructure Impacted
Public Awareness Campaign	All	A	Ongoing	$5K/year	5 years	2-1, 2-2, 3-2	Existing
Code Red System	All	A	Ongoing	$12.5K/yr	5 years	2-1, 3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing
Dam Breech Study – separate computer system/plotter	Dam Failure	A	In Progress	$22K	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-2, 4-1, 4-3	Existing and Future
Obtain Repeater Monitoring System	All	A	Preliminary	$40K	2 years	1-3, 3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Explore Creation of an LEPC	All	A	Preliminary	Staff time	2 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 2-1, 3-1, 3-2, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Floodplain Manager position	Flooding	L	In Progress	$60k/year	1 year	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-1, 2-2, 3-2, 4-1, 4-3	Existing and Future
Power line clearing	Winter Storms	A	Ongoing	NA	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 4-3	Existing
Generators for Critical Facilities (see Appendix D)	All	L	Preliminary	$197,878	5 years	1-1. 4-1	Existing and Future
Generators for Lift Stations (see Appendix D)	All	D	Preliminary	$224,500	5 years	1-1, 4-1	Existing and Future
Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)	Wildfire	A	Ongoing	$5K/year	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 2-1, 3-1, 3-2, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Water Use Ordinances	Drought	A	Ongoing	Staff time	5 years	1-4, 4-3	Existing
Participate in the NFIP	Flooding	A	Ongoing	Staff time	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4,	Existing and

Mitigation Action	Hazard(s) Addressed	Jurisdictional Participants	Project Status	Cost Estimate	Project Length	Goals and Objectives	Structures & Infrastructure Impacted
Community Rating System (CRS)						1-5, 1-6, 2-1, 2-2, 3-1, 3-2, 4-1, 4-3	Future
Road Culvert and Ditch Improvements	Flooding	A	Ongoing	$125K/year	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 4-2	Existing and Future
Bridge Maintenance	All	A	Ongoing	$35K/year	5 years	1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 4-2	Existing and Future
Weather Warning Equipment	Tornado, Severe Thunderstorm	A	Ongoing	$100K/year	5 years	1-3, 3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Make EOC more Disaster Resistant	All	A	Preliminary	$300K	3 years	3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Reverse 911	All	A	Preliminary	$350K	5 years	2-1, 3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
911 Center Alternate Site	All	A	Preliminary	$1.5 million	3 years	3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Emergency Services Vehicles/Equipment Replacement Program	All	L	Ongoing	$1 million per year	5 years	1-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
800mhz Radio System	All	A	Preliminary	$8 million	3 years	1-3, 3-1, 4-2, 4-3	Existing and Future
Looped Water System	All	A	Ongoing	$10 million	5 years	1-1, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 4-3	Existing and Future

Chapter 6
Executing the Plan

6.1 – Action Plan Implementation

The hazard mitigation planning process was overseen by the Lumpkin County Emergency Management Agency. Facilitation of the planning process was conducted by North Georgia Consulting Group, LLC. Once GEMA completes its initial review of this Plan, it will be presented to the Lumpkin County Board of Commissioners for consideration. Once adopted, the Lumpkin County EMA Director shall assume responsibility for the maintenance of the Plan. It shall be the responsibility of the EMA Director to ensure that this Plan is utilized as a guide for initiating the identified mitigation measures within the community. The EMA Director shall be authorized to convene a committee to review and update this Plan annually. The Plan will also have to be updated and resubmitted once every five years. Through this Plan updating process, the EMA Director shall identify projects that have been successfully undertaken in initiating mitigation measures within the community. These projects shall be noted within the planning document to indicate their completion. Additionally, the committee called together by the EMA Director shall help to identify any new mitigation projects that can be undertaken in the community.

Members of the HMPC prioritized the potential mitigation measures identified in this Plan. A list of mitigation goals, objectives and related action items was compiled from the inputs of the HMPC, as well as from others within the community. The subcommittee prioritized the potential mitigation measures based on what they considered most beneficial to the community. Several criteria were established to assist HMPC members in the prioritization of these suggested mitigation actions. Criteria included perceived cost benefit or cost effectiveness, availability of potential funding sources, overall feasibility, measurable milestones, multiple objectives, and both public and political support for the proposed actions. Through this prioritization process, several projects emerged as being a greater priority than others. Some of the projects involved expending considerable amounts of funds to initiate the required actions. Most projects allowed the community to pursue completion of the project using potential grant funding. Still others required no significant financial commitment by the community. All proposed mitigation actions were evaluated to determine the degree to which the County will benefit in relation to the project costs. After review by the HMPC, the prioritized list of mitigation measures, as presented within this Plan, was determined.

6.2 – Evaluation

As previously stated, the Lumpkin County EMA Director will be charged with ensuring that this plan is monitored and updated at least annually or more often if deemed necessary. The method of evaluation will consist of utilizing a checklist to determine what mitigation actions were undertaken, the completion date of these actions, the cost associated with each completed action, and whether actions were deemed to be successful. A committee, perhaps with much of the same membership as the existing HMPC, will convene in order to accomplish the annual plan evaluation. Additionally, the EMA Director is encouraged to maintain a schedule of regular meetings, either quarterly or semiannually to preserve continuity throughout the continuing process. These meetings will provide an opportunity to discuss the progress of the action items and maintain the partnerships that are essential for the sustainability of the HMP. The EMA Director will ensure the results of the evaluation(s) are reported to the Lumpkin County Board of Commissioners, as well as to any agencies or organizations having an interest in the hazard mitigation activities identified in the plan.

6.3 – Multi-Jurisdictional Strategy and Considerations

As set forth by Georgia House Bill 489, the Emergency Management Agency is the overall implementing agency for projects such as hazard mitigation. Lumpkin County will work in the best interests of the County as well as the City of Dahlonega. Each of these municipalities played an active role in the planning process. Participation from each jurisdiction was solicited and received by Lumpkin County EMA. As a result, a truly multi-jurisdictional plan was created for Lumpkin County and the City of Dahlonega, with ideas and viewpoints of all participants included.

6.4 – Plan Update and Maintenance

According to the requirements set forth in the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, Lumpkin County is required to update and revise the Hazard Mitigation Plan every five years. However, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee will meet on the plan approval anniversary date of every year, or within 30 days of said date as determined and scheduled by the EMA Director, to complete a review of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. At each such meeting, the HMPC will review the main facets of the HMP including the vulnerability assessment, critical facilities inventory, and mitigation goals, objectives, and actions. All revisions will be posted to the County website for public review and comment. Further revisions may take place based upon public comments received.

It is during this review process that the mitigation strategies and other information contained within the Hazard Mitigation Plan are considered for incorporation into other planning mechanisms as appropriate. Opportunities to integrate the requirements of this HMP into other local planning mechanisms will continue to be identified through future meetings of the HMPC on an annual basis.

The HMPC recognizes the need to integrate other plans, codes, regulations, procedures and programs into future Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) updates. This plan is multi-jurisdictional; therefore the mechanism for implementation of various mitigation plan items may vary by jurisdiction. This includes reviewing other local planning documents, processes or mechanisms for possible integration with the HMP.

To Be Reviewed in Future Update

Existing planning mechanisms	**Method of use in Hazard Mitigation Plan**
Comprehensive Plan (multi-jurisdictional)	Development trends
Local Emergency Operations Plan	Identifying hazards; Assessing vulnerabilities
Storm Water Management / Flood Damage Protection Ordinance	Mitigation strategies
Building and Zoning Codes and Ordinances	Development trends; Future growth
Mutual Aid Agreements	Assessing vulnerabilities
State Hazard Mitigation Plan	Risk assessment
Land Use Maps	Assessing vulnerabilities; Development trends; Future growth
Critical Facilities Maps	Locations
Community Wildfire Protection Plan	Mitigation strategies

It will be the responsibility of each participating jurisdiction to determine additional implementation procedures when appropriate.

During the planning process for new and updated local planning documents such as a comprehensive plan or Local Emergency Operations Plan, the EMA Director will provide a copy of the HMP to the appropriate parties. It will be recommended that all goals and strategies of new and updated local planning documents be consistent with, and support the goals of, the HMP and will not contribute to increased hazards in the affected jurisdiction(s).

Although it is recognized that there are many benefits to integrating components of this plan into other local planning mechanisms, and that components are actively integrated into other planning mechanisms when appropriate, the development and maintenance of this stand-alone HMP is deemed by the committee to be the most effective method to ensure implementation of local hazard mitigation actions at this time. Therefore, the review and incorporation efforts made in this update and the last, which consisted of a simple review of the documents listed in the chart above by various members of the HMPC, are considered successful by the HMPC and will likely be utilized in future updates.

The County's EMA is committed to incorporating hazard mitigation planning into its Local Emergency Operations Plan and other public emergency management activities. As the EMA Director becomes aware of updates to other County or City plans, codes, regulations, procedures and programs, the Director will continue to look for opportunities to include hazard mitigation into these mechanisms.

The Lumpkin County HMPC will reconvene not later than the fourth anniversary of the plan approval anniversary date, as determined and scheduled by the EMA Director, to begin planning for the formal Hazard Mitigation Plan revision process. The revision process will include a clear schedule and timeline, and identify any agencies or organizations participating in the plan revision. The committee will review the mitigation goals, objectives and actions to determine their relevance to changing situations within the different jurisdictions, as well as changes in State or Federal policy, and to ensure current and expected conditions are being addressed. The HMPC will also review the prior vulnerability assessments to determine if this information should be updated or modified, given any new available data.

Lumpkin County is dedicated to involving the public directly in reviews and updates of the HMP. During the plan revision process, the committee will conduct, at a minimum, two public hearings during the revision process. These public hearings will provide the public a forum for which they can express their concerns, opinions, or ideas about the Plan. Additionally, if persons from the community express interest in participation in the planning process, they will be provided the opportunity to suggest possible mitigation measures for the community. Documentation will be maintained to indicate all efforts at continued public involvement. All relevant information will be forwarded to GEMA and FEMA as a product of the proposed plan revision. Public involvement activities will continue throughout the 5-year planning cycle and will be evaluated for effectiveness by the HMPC next planning cycle.

The EMA Director will ensure the revised plan is presented to the governing body of each jurisdiction for formal adoption. In addition, all holders of the HMP will be notified of affected changes. The EMA Director shall submit a revised Hazard Mitigation Plan not later than the five-year anniversary of the most recently updated HMP to the Georgia Emergency Management Agency for review and subsequent submittal to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for ultimate approval.

Once approved by FEMA, copies of the Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Plan will be provided by the EMA Director to the appropriate governmental jurisdictions, agencies, and/or departments for review and possible inclusion into plans and programs. The HMP will be distributed by the EMA Director to the appropriate officials to allow them to review the Plan and determine to what extent the Plan should be integrated into, or referenced by, other plans and programs. Limitations may be placed on certain sensitive information by the EMA Director.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

7.1 – Summary

Lumpkin County has gained a great deal of knowledge relating to the County's disaster history and future potential for disaster as a result of the hazard mitigation planning process. This includes an extensive hazard history of recorded hazard events from the past fifty years, a detailed critical facilities database with valuable information on some of most critical county and city structures, as well as some valuable ideas from the community abroad concerning measures that should be considered for future hazard mitigation. Community involvement has been at the heart of this effort. Not only did the planning process include the creation of a Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee with representatives from all walks of life, but two public hearings were conducted to provide all Lumpkin County citizens with the opportunity to comment on, and offer suggestions concerning potential hazard mitigation measures within the community. Lumpkin County, the City of Dahlonega all worked in concert to ensure a broad range of citizens were represented. Elected officials, local government employees, public safety officials, Red Cross representatives, GA Forestry representatives, businesspersons, media, and other volunteers and interested parties provided important varying viewpoints to create a workable Plan. GEMA and NGCG provided valuable assistance as well. These efforts have all had the effect of better protecting our Community from the threats of nature and technology. While it would be naïve to believe this Plan provides complete protection to Lumpkin County and its residents, it is the hope of all parties involved in this planning process that the recommended mitigation measures contained within the Plan will provide some level of increased preparedness as well as spur further discussion and planning related to the important subject of Hazard Mitigation.

7.2 – References

Publications/Documents:

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000
Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act
FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation *How-to Guides #1, 2, 3, 7*
GEMA Supplements to FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation How-to Guides
Georgia Tornado Database 1808 – 2002 (Westbrook)
Earthquake Information Bulletin, Volume 3, Number 6, November-December 1971
Lumpkin County Hazard Mitigation Plan

Web Sites:

www.fema.gov (FEMA)
www.usfa.fema.gov (USFA)
www.fs.fed.us (USFS Fire Danger Class)
www.cpc.ncep-noaa.gov (Drought Severity Index)
www.ncdc.noaa.gov (National Climatic Data Center)
http://eqint.cr.usgs.gov (USGS Earthquake Probability Maps)
www.tornadoproject.com (Tornado Project Online)
www.disastercenter.com (The Disaster Center)
www.gema.state.ga.us (GEMA)
www.gfc.state.ga.us (GFC)
www.georgiadrought.org (Drought in Georgia)
www.weather.com (The Weather Channel)
www.accuweather.com (AccuWeather)

Other Sources:

American Red Cross
American Society of Civil Engineers
Lumpkin County
City of Dahlonega
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Georgia Emergency Management Agency
Georgia Forestry Commission
Georgia Safe Dams Program
National Climatic Data Center
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
National Weather Service
New Georgia Encyclopedia (www.georgiaencyclopedia.org)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Census Bureau
U.S. Fire Administration
U.S. Forest Service
U.S. Geological Survey

Appendices

Appendix A – Critical Facilities Database

Appendix B – Hazard History Database

Appendix C – Hazard Frequency Table

Appendix D – Other Planning Documents

Appendix E - Glossary