



SECTION 8. PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

2022 HMP Changes

The 2022 HMP update maintained the two-volume approach with each jurisdiction having an individual annex (Section 9). Enhancements to the annex subsections is described below and in further detail in this section.

- Reorganization of information
- Expanded capability assessment to include integration in the tables and a subsection on adaptive capacity
- A streamlined presentation of the hazard ranking
- The mitigation of repetitive and severe repetitive flood loss properties is listed
- Problem statement is summarized in the updated mitigation strategy table
- A subsection dedicated to staff and local stakeholder involvement in annex development

This section provides a description of the Gloucester County's HMP update planning partnership, their responsibilities throughout the planning process, and the jurisdictional annexes developed as a result of their plan update efforts.

8.1 BACKGROUND

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) encourages multi-jurisdictional planning for hazard mitigation. All participating jurisdictions must meet the requirements of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR):

"Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan"
[Section 201.6a(4)]

Members of the Planning Partnership have the expertise to develop the plan and have their jurisdiction's authority to implement the mitigation strategy developed during the planning process. The Planning Partnership is responsible for developing and reviewing draft sections of the plan, updating their respective annex, creating the mitigation strategy for their jurisdiction, and adopting the final plan.

For the Gloucester County HMP update, a Planning Partnership was formed to leverage resources and to meet requirements for the federal Disaster Mitigation Action of 2000 (DMA) for as many eligible governments as possible. Members of the Planning Partnership consisted of representatives from each jurisdiction. The DMA defines a local government as follows:

Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality



of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.

Each participating planning partner has prepared a jurisdictional annex to this plan. These annexes, as well as information on the process by which they were created, are contained in this volume.

8.2 INITIAL SOLICITATION AND LETTERS OF INTENT

Gloucester County solicited the participation of all municipalities in the County at the commencement of this project. All municipalities interested signed a Letter of Intent to Participate (LOIP) committing their participation and resources to the development of the Gloucester County HMP update (Appendix B). Gloucester County **and all municipalities** in the County participated in the update process and have met the minimum requirements of participation as established by the County and Steering Committee.

8.3 PLANNING PARTNER EXPECTATIONS

The Planning Partners agreed to the following planning partner expectations, which were outlined in the letter sent by Gloucester County April 21, 2021 and confirmed at the kick-off meeting held on May 5, 2021 (see Appendix C [Meeting Documentation] for details):

- Provide representation at regular planning group meetings and workshops.
- Be responsible for providing data and information as requested.
- Review and comment on data and information compiled by the contract consultant relevant to their jurisdiction.
- Be responsible for completing plan documents specific to your municipality, using provided templates with guidance and assistance by the contract consultant.
- Assist with the identification of stakeholders within your community that should be informed and potentially involved with the planning process.
- Facilitate public outreach efforts with citizens and local stakeholders within your community using materials provided by the contract consultant.
- Assist with the identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and obstacles to implementing natural hazard mitigation within your community.
- Assist with the identification of past, ongoing and appropriate future mitigation strategies and activities within your municipality.
- Review and comment on plan documents, specifically the draft and final plans prior to submission to NJOEM and FEMA.



As described in Section 7 (Plan Maintenance), the planning partnership is intended to remain active beyond the regulatory update to support plan maintenance. Regarding the composition of the Steering and Planning Committees, it is recognized that individual commitments change over time, and it will be the responsibility of each jurisdiction and its representatives to inform the HMP Coordinator of any changes in representation.

8.4 JURISDICTIONAL ANNEX PREPARATION PROCESS

As in the 2016 HMP, the jurisdictional annexes were maintained and updated for the 2022 HMP. The jurisdictional annexes continue to provide a unique, stand-alone guide to mitigation planning for each jurisdiction. The Gloucester County HMP Update is organized so that there is an annex for Gloucester County and for every jurisdiction within the county's borders. Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes) includes an annex for every jurisdiction in Gloucester County.

8.4.1 Data Collection

Each jurisdiction was paired with a contract consultant mitigation planner to work with the primary POC, alternate POC, NFIP Floodplain Administrator and the mitigation team to update their annexes. Each jurisdiction was asked to participate in a municipal kick-off meeting, held on May 5, 2021 to review participant expectations and the updated information needed to support the annex update. It was made clear that the annexes are sections of the plan that can be enhanced if more information is available to further customize any and all aspects of mitigation planning. A concerted effort was made to have all plan participants document areas of flooding outside of the floodplain.

8.4.2 Hazard Ranking Exercise

The presentation of the risk assessment and hazard ranking for each jurisdiction was conducted June 30, 2021. At this meeting, the consultant presented the overall risk assessment for the hazards of concern and distributed jurisdiction-specific handouts with risk assessment results relevant to each plan participant. In addition, each planning partner was asked to review the ranked hazards specific for its jurisdiction. Refer to Section 4.4 (Hazard Ranking) for the methodology of the hazard ranking process. The calculated ranking was presented to each jurisdiction and they were asked to review the ranking and revise based on history of events, probability of occurrence, and the potential impact on people, property, and the economy. In addition, each jurisdiction was asked to rank their adaptive capacity for each hazard. Refer to Appendix B (Participation Matrix) for the input submitted by each municipality. The objectives of this exercise were to familiarize the partnership with how to use the risk assessment as a tool to support other planning and hazard mitigation processes and to help prioritize types of mitigation actions that should be considered. Hazards that were ranked as "high" for each jurisdiction as a result of this exercise were considered to be priorities for identifying appropriate



mitigation actions, although jurisdictions also identified actions to mitigate “medium” or “low” ranked hazards as appropriate.

8.4.3 Strengths Weaknesses Obstacles and Opportunities (SWOO) Exercise

After the draft risk assessment results were presented and hazard ranking exercise at the second Steering Committee Meeting on June 23, 2021, attendees participated in a facilitated SWOO session to identify strengths, weakness or challenges, obstacles and opportunities in hazard mitigation for the County’s high-ranked hazards. All SWOO results were compiled and provided as a resource to plan participants at the Mitigation Strategy Workshop in August 2021. Refer to Appendix B (Participation Matrix) which provides the information captured by meeting participants during the SWOO session.

8.4.4 Mitigation Strategy Workshop

A mitigation strategy workshop was conducted by the contracted planning consultant on August 26, 2021, for all participating jurisdictions to support the development of the updated mitigation strategy. Due to restrictions in place due to the coronavirus pandemic, this workshop was held virtually. To assist with the identification of implementable and action-oriented mitigation actions, a three-step process was followed for the 2022 HMP update: 1) Assemble a ‘mitigation toolbox’; 2) Identify problem statements through ‘mitigation brainstorming’ and 3) Update the mitigation action plan. The purpose of this workshop was to guide the planning partnership in completing this portion of the planning process and discuss how projects that are well developed and documented are more quickly identifiable for selection when grants become available. **The nearly 100 percent participation of the planning partners reflects the excellent outreach and dedication of the planning team.**

At the workshop, the Planning Partnership focused on developing problem statements based on the impacts of hazards in the County and their communities. The results of the updated risk assessment, challenges and opportunities identified during the capability assessment update and SWOO sessions, and information gathered from the citizen survey were used to inform problem statement development. At the workshop, the Planning Partnership heard from the County, NJOEM, and the consultant on how to develop a diverse mitigation strategy and action worksheets.

As a result, problem statement worksheets were developed to detail the problems/challenges/gaps/identified vulnerabilities the jurisdiction faces, then mitigation alternatives evaluated to best reduce future risk and address the identified problem. These problem statements were intended to provide a detailed description of the problem area, including impacts to the jurisdiction, past damages, and loss of service. These problem statements helped form a bridge between the hazard risk assessment, which quantifies impacts to each



community, with the development of achievable mitigation strategies. Mitigation development worksheets were filled out by each municipality to identify additional problem statements and draft action worksheets were developed.

8.4.5 Municipal Support Meetings

In addition to the municipal kick-off meeting, municipal support meetings were held throughout the planning process. At these support meetings, the consultant worked one-on-one with the planning partners to complete their jurisdictional annexes. Each section of the annex was discussed to ensure accuracy and completeness. This included, but not limited to, the following:

- Reviewing the calculated hazard ranking for the jurisdiction and provide input to adjust the ranking as necessary.
- Updating information regarding the jurisdiction's capabilities and past integration of hazard mitigation concepts.
- Identify mitigation initiatives that have reasonable potential to be accomplished within the lifespan of the County HMP (five years), including both FEMA-eligible projects and those projects using funds from non-FEMA sources.

8.4.6 Jurisdictional Annexes

While the jurisdictional annex format is designed to document and assure local compliance with the DMA 2000 regulations, its greater purpose and function includes:

- Providing a locally-relevant synthesis of the overall mitigation plan that can be readily presented, distributed, and maintained;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community's risk to natural hazards;
- Facilitating local understanding of the community's capabilities to manage natural hazard risk, including opportunities to improve those capabilities;
- Facilitating local understanding of the efforts the community has taken, and plans to take, to reduce their natural hazard risk;
- Facilitating the implementation of mitigation strategies, including the development of grant applications;
- Providing a framework by which the community can continue to capture relevant data and information for future plan updates.

It is recognized that each jurisdiction's annex is a "living" document and will continue to be improved as resources permit. As such, its design is intended to promote and accommodate continued efforts to maintain the annex to be current and to improve the effectiveness of the annex as the key tool, reference and guiding document by which the jurisdiction will implement hazard mitigation locally.



The following provides a description of the various elements of the jurisdictional annex.

Section 9.X.1: Hazard Mitigation Planning Team: Identifies the hazard mitigation planning primary and alternate(s) contacts and Floodplain Administrators as identified by the jurisdiction, as well as municipal representatives, stakeholders, and residents who provided input during the planning process. Further detail is provided in Section 2 (Planning Process), Section 9 (jurisdictional annexes) and Appendix B (Participation Matrix).

Section 9.X.2: Jurisdiction Profile: Provides an overview and profile of the jurisdiction, including an identification of areas of known and anticipated future development and the vulnerability of those areas to the hazards of concern.

Section 9.X.3: Jurisdictional Capability Assessment and Integration: This subsection provides an inventory and evaluation of the jurisdiction's tools, mechanisms and resources available to support hazard mitigation and natural hazard risk reduction. Within the municipal annexes, tables provide an inventory of the municipality's planning and regulatory, administrative and technical, and fiscal, capabilities, respectively. Further, another table identifies the municipality's level of participation in state and federal programs designed to promote and incentivize local risk reduction efforts. Further information regarding Federal, State and local capabilities may be found in the Capability Assessment portion of Section 5.

- **Adaptive Capacity:** A new addition to the capability assessment is a summary of the jurisdiction's adaptive capacity to each hazard.

Section 9.X.4: National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Compliance: A tabular summary of the specific information on the management and regulation of the regulatory floodplain, including current and future compliance with the NFIP.

Section 9.X.5: Growth/Development Trends: Identifies of areas of known and anticipated future development and the vulnerability of those areas to the hazards of concern.

Section 9.X.6: Jurisdictional Risk Assessment:

- **Hazard Extent and Location:** Each annex includes a map (or series of maps) illustrating identified hazard zones, critical facilities, and areas of NFIP Repetitive Loss/Severe Repetitive Loss (RL/SRL). Further, these maps show areas of known or anticipated future development, as available and provided by the jurisdiction. These maps may be found at the end of the annex.
- **Hazard Event History:** Identifies hazard events that have caused significant impacts within the jurisdiction, including a summary characterization of those impacts as identified by the jurisdiction. The documentation of events and losses is critical to supporting the identification and justification of appropriate mitigation actions, including providing critical data for benefit-cost analysis. It is recognized that this "inventory" of events and losses is a work-in-progress and may continue to be improved as



resources permit. As such, the lack of data or information for a specific event does not necessarily mean that the jurisdiction did not suffer significant losses during that event.

- **Hazard Ranking and Vulnerabilities:** This subsection provides information regarding each plan participant's vulnerability to the identified hazards. New to the 2022 HMP is a table summarizing the risk assessment results for the jurisdiction. Full data and information on the hazards of concern, the methodology used to develop the vulnerability assessments, and the results of those assessments that serve as the basis of these local risk rankings may be found in Section 4.

Section 9.X.7: Mitigation Strategy and Prioritization: This section discusses and provides the status of past mitigations actions and status, describes proposed hazard mitigation initiatives, and prioritization.

- **Past Mitigation Initiative Status:** Where applicable, a review of progress on the jurisdiction's prior mitigation strategy is presented, identifying the disposition of each prior action, project or initiative in the jurisdiction's updated mitigation strategy. Other completed or on-going mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy may be included in this sub-section as well.
- **Additional Mitigation Efforts:** Other completed or on-going mitigation activities that were not specifically part of a prior local mitigation strategy may be included in this subsection as well.
- **Proposed Hazard Mitigation Initiatives for the Plan Update:** Table 9.X-16 presents the jurisdiction's updated mitigation strategy. As indicated, applicable mitigation actions, projects and initiatives are further documented on an Action Worksheet which provides details on the project identification, evaluation, prioritization and implementation process. Table 9.X-17 provides a summary of the local mitigation strategy prioritization process discussed in Section 6.

Action Worksheets: FEMA-eligible mitigation actions, projects and initiatives are further documented on an Action Worksheet which provides details on the project identification, evaluation, prioritization and implementation process.

8.4.7 Annex Review

Workshops and additional meetings (via email and/or teleconference) to complete the jurisdictional annexes were held with the Steering Committee and Planning Partnership throughout the planning process. In preparation for the draft plan public review, each jurisdiction was asked to have their 'mitigation team' review their annex to ensure it was complete and accurate for posting to the Gloucester County Office of Emergency Management's mitigation website. To demonstrate broad and comprehensive review and input, each jurisdiction collected signatures from these representatives. Refer to Appendix B (Participation Matrix) to review the annex signature pages.

In summary, all participating communities and the County completed the planning partner expectations and annex-preparation process. Details regarding these meetings are described further in Sections 2 (Plan



Adoption) and 6 (Mitigation Strategy). Completed jurisdictional annexes are presented in Section 9 (Jurisdictional Annexes).

8.5 COVERAGE UNDER THE PLAN

All jurisdictions (County and municipalities) met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. Any non-participating local jurisdiction within the Gloucester County planning area can “dock” to this plan in the future following the linkage procedures defined in Appendix I (Linkage Procedures).

Table 8-1 lists the status of each jurisdiction, whether or not they submitted letters of intent to participate, and their ultimate status in this plan update. Refer to Appendix B (Participation Matrix) and Appendix C (Meeting Documentation) for details on participation and meeting attendance.

Table 8-1. Jurisdictional Status

Municipality	Letter of Intent to Participate	Attended Workshops and/or Meetings and Project Calls	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets all previous requirements)
Gloucester County	N/A	X	X		
Clayton (B)	X	X	X		
Deptford (Twp)	X	X	X		
East Greenwich (Twp)	X	X	X		
Elk (Twp)	X	X	X		
Franklin (Twp)		X	X		
Glassboro (B)	X	X	X		
Greenwich (Twp)	X	X	X		
Harrison (Twp)	X	X	X		
Logan (Twp)	X	X	X		
Mantua (Twp)	X	X	X		
Monroe (Twp)	X	X	X		
National Park (B)					
Newfield (B)	X	X	X		
Paulsboro (B)					
Pitman (B)	X	X	X		
South Harrison (Twp)	X	X	X		
Swedesboro (B)	X	X	X		
Washington (Twp)		X	X		
Wenonah (B)	X	X	X		
West Deptford (Twp)	X	X	X		



Municipality	Letter of Intent to Participate	Attended Workshops and/or Meetings and Project Calls	Provided Update on Past Projects	Submitted Mitigation Actions for Current Plan	Seeking Approval for Adoption (meets all previous requirements)
Westville (B)	X	X	X		
Woodbury (C)		X	X		
Woodbury Heights (B)					
Woolwich (Twp)	X	X	X		
Rowan University	X	X	X		

N/A = Not applicable.

*The Gloucester County Office of Emergency Management is the HMP Coordinator and managed the project and grant and served as Steering Committee chair. A letter of intent to participate was not required for Gloucester County.

***Note that municipalities that have not submitted a letter of intent but are marked as participating have provided a verbal intent to participate and thus have updated annexes and are counted in the hazard mitigation plan update for 2022.

DRAFT