



## Appendix W. Survey Results



## Appendix W. Survey Results

This Appendix provides a summary of the responses from the New Jersey Association for Floodplain Management (NJAFM) conference survey and the New Jersey County Coordinators survey.

### NJAFM CONFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES

Note: Not all questions were answered by each respondent; therefore, the percentage presented has been calculated based on the number of respondents that answered the specific question and not the overall number of questionnaires submitted either online or via hard-copy.

**Total Responses: 46**

**Question #1: What is your role with respect to mitigating natural and other hazard risks in your community? (46 Responses)**

Role	Response Percent
Floodplain Administrator	28.3%
Emergency Manager	2.2%
Code Enforcement Official	15.2%
Mayor/Board Member	8.7%
Other	45.7%

**Question #2: Do you feel that you are adequately trained/certified and locally supported to fulfill your role with respect to mitigation? (45 Responses)**

Not Enough Training or Support	Adequately Trained and/or Supported
37.8%	62.2%

Though respondents indicated that they were adequately trained, many indicated an area in which they would like further training. Training regarding understanding planning mechanism, such as regulations, benefit-cost analysis, and building codes was the most noted additional training opportunity that respondents indicated would assist in fulfilling their roles in respect to mitigation. In addition to planning mechanisms, respondents identified the importance of additional training opportunities for specific programs for officials (such as CFM), training on maximizing public outreach efforts, and training regarding identifying and applying for grant funding opportunities. Respondents also indicated that general training opportunities better prepare them for mitigation support.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
Need support to find more funding for mitigation projects
Floodplain regulations, Stormwater management, Emergency Response. HMGP Cost Benefit Analysis, Building Codes,
More emphasis on utility infrastructure/mechanicals safeguarding/placement post Sandy mitigation-and relations to “special” exemptions form state authorities.
More outside training opportunities.
I need more instruction on BMP, land use controls, funding mechanisms, and public outreach
Local Floodplain Administrators need mandatory base training like CFM.
There is always more to learn. We need informed people to be part of the discussion.
Many local ordinances assign the position of Floodplain Administrator to the Construction Official. Many if not most Construction Officials either are not aware they are the FA or know they are, but think the position only involves looking at a flood map to determine what the requirements will be for the proposed construction. I was one of these for 20 years until this past year. There needs to be a better approach to assigning the position of Floodplain Administrator.
Training by UCC that’s all I have received.
Could use training on managing public outcry with respect to any changes.
Specific mitigation options beyond the standard ones.
Not trained, but a lot of old experience.

**Question #3: Are you familiar with your local or county multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan and how are you involved in its development? (45 Responses)**

Familiar	Not Familiar
71.1%	28.9%

Most respondents indicated that they had some level of participation in the development of their local or county hazard mitigation plan, with the majority of open end respondents having had moderate involvement in such development. Moderate involvement includes providing specific subject matter expertise during the planning process, providing technical support, and participation in the overall planning process. Other respondents specified the amount of participation from none, having not seen the plan or not asked to participate in the planning process, to major contributions to the plan, having served as project manager. Some respondents identified the need for an updated plan.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
Only in having seen our township plan.
The county did not directly seek floodplain administrator input.
Worked with & provided info during planning process. Participated in county plan.
Project Manager. Survey/planning technical support.
Again – not enough focus/detail for local utilities and coordination with the Flood Plain Administrators – as MUA’s in NJ are NOT under Township/City/Borough and after cover more than one municipality. And Municipality Floodplain Administrators do not interact with us.
Helping to create local mitigation plan.
The plan for my town (Blairswood) is outdated and need revision especially with regards to flood mitigation measures.
Provided input. Provided data on area. Main flood subject matter author of local plan.
There is much discussion going on in the local, State, Federal, private, academic, and other platforms. I have followed it in the news, in discussion and at events.
Rutgers Seminars, Ongoing Planning Board discussions that pertain to New Gretna’s unique geography and circumstances.
Planning staff providing our professional assistance to County OEM upon their request.
Reviewed some County plans –appear too general, unlike former municipal flood mitigation plans which were more detailed for the community affected.
Somewhat familiar. Field research/plan review. Served on the steering committee.
Not involved at all. No involvement in County Plan. It was just released in draft from.
Reviewing and providing comments about local flooding and environmental damages.
Wayne Twsp prepared its own All Hazard plan and staff have been involved in the County Plan Development.
Unfortunately for Cumberland County, this was pretty much a cookie cut plan.

**Question #4: Do you feel there was adequate participation and input to the development and/or update of your local hazard mitigation plan form others in your community, county and region that have a role in hazard mitigation planning (ex. Planning , engineering, code enforcement, other stakeholders)? (44 Responses)**

Adequate Involvement	Not Enough Involvement
54.5%	47.7%

A little over half of the respondents to this question said that there was adequate involvement from others within their communities. According to the open ended questions, some respondents requested better interagency coordination as well as coordination across municipal or county lines. Other organizations/agencies that respondents believe should have been part of the planning process include Construction departments, planning departments, and emergency services. Despite this request for additional involvement from the aforementioned organizations, many respondents indicated a well-organized, multi-faceted approach and participation during the planning process.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
I have had no contact with Warren County regarding this.
Had a committee of 15, including public works, police dept., fire dept., architect, insurance agent, members of planning board, realtor, local builders, and homeowners.
Engineering, better communication among all parties involved.
County Emergency Management Coordinator and adjoining county's Emergency Management Coordinator, Watershed Managers both local and adjoining county.
Now joining countywide plan, we may have different experience in update.
Should add: Planning Board, Emergency services, Construction Departments
We all need to be involved and understand. There seems to be involvement by a variety of public, private and groups. This discussion needs to be participated in by an informed public as it will determine the future of urban Hoboken and other nearby communities in Hudson County.
Additional public involvement and consolidation of all emergency planning would enhance the process.
Doing plan on county level is too general to get detailed input from each municipality, including citizens affected. Should build from grass roots up, not top down.
Received no involvement from county level.
Planning, Engineering, State OEM, UCC, Sustainability
Although notice was given to municipalities, for some reason many did not actively participate. I do not think the urgency/relevance of the mitigation plans was fully explained.
The structural elevation industry is seldom brought in to give advice during plan updates.
For Wayne's plan, OEM, police, DPW, and Administration all took active roles
No because the responsible county department has not demonstrated a background or knowledge of how the planning process produces a workable document, also input at the municipal level was ignore and rebuffed because they are still using the same old method to prepare and mitigate flood disaster and they do not want interference.
Hazards research community.

**Question #5: Do you feel the State and FEMA provided adequate support and guidance during the plan development and/or update process? If so, how? (39 Responses)**

Adequate Support	Not Enough Support	No Support
48.7%	46.2%	5.1%

Respondents to this question indicated varying levels of support from the State and FEMA. Many specified that FEMA supported the planning process while receiving little to no support from the State. Some respondents requested additional communication and outreach efforts from the State and FEMA in order to increase interagency cooperation and augment the planning process.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
FEMA gave support, None from the State
Only when I needed & asked for info
Information was provided, but provided while communities were still recovering from Sandy.
Accurately watershed mapping by using GIS mapping.
Not enough focus on underground utilities- with above ground control centers- crossing multiple jurisdictions.
Meeting system OK
More communication regarding funding available to implement mitigation improvement and programs.
We had FEMA DAE as major participant/author in our Plan
More surveys needed such as this.
I have not been part of the direct conversation between FEMA and the City of Hoboken. I know they were a great resource during our immediate recovery from the storm. They have great resources from which we can benefit. FEMA's NFIP does "not fit" the realities of flooding in densely pre-firm urban areas. This discussion need to be reviewed and studied.
Local meeting, open houses and adequate telephone support
I do not recall meeting with the State or FEMA, only Baker, the consultant for the Ocean County Plan.
Sat on the steering committee and offered to provide feedback throughout.
FEMA did a good job of advertising and reaching its market. The State did not do enough outreach, or explained and just blamed FEMA for any shortcomings.
Flood hazard workshops and technical support.
Initially NJ State Police were very helpful.
Yes, but without having the county and municipality work together the plan became cookiecut. What happened to the flood plain management committee that was to be established at the municipal level.

**Question #6: Do you feel that relevant planning and regulatory mechanisms within your community are mutually supportive with respect to hazard mitigation (ex. Building coded and enforcement, land use/comprehensive planning and regulation, zoning and subdivision ordinances, emergency management plans, capital improvement plans/budgets, etc.)? Please explain why? (38 Responses)**

The majority of respondents to Question 6 indicated a disconnect on interagency communications. In addition, these respondents noted the importance of communication and coordination outside of county lines in order to address issues that span the region instead of a single county. A large portion of respondents also specified that current codes and regulations are not supportive of mitigation efforts through inconsistencies between local/federal requirements and current regulations, plans, and codes and the cost of updating such planning mechanisms.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
Yes, mutually supportive. Planned zoning recognizes flood hazard areas.
No. Silos exist and leadership is not bringing all the pieces together.
They are, but they have to start me and/or be update by me, then run the proposal/changes through the planning board. Sometimes that is an uphill battle, that is why I have two board members on the Hazard Mitigation Committee
All municipalities participated.
Not enough focus on underground utilities - with above ground control centers - crossing multiple jurisdictions
No. Local and county emergency management plans should provide for communication with adjoining county's emergency management plan to outline cooperative flood mitigation measures. eg: Blairstow's flooding is a result of outflow from the Paulins Kill Watershed primarily in Sussex County. Cooperative Emergency Management Plans in the Paulins Kill Watershed should include prereleases from lakes equipped with dams in the watershed. Pre-releases timed properly could reduce or eliminate flooding events in Blairstown.
More needs to be done with UCC consistency and the NFIP regulations
No , not enough involvement bringing code together with Plan and resolving conflicts with Building code and FEMA requirements
Yes, there is a significant focus on the need for hazard mitigation.
No. Further integration is necessary. Look to City of Hoboken's leadership on this.
Replacement mechanicals should be required to be relocated above the BFE, to prevent future losses!
The City of Hoboken is presently proposing new building codes which will reflect the needs and exposures here. It will shortly be put before the City Council measures to reflect the adoption of ABFE and freeboard requirements.
New Gretna is a rural, low density community with restrictive development policies. The communities historical relationship with waterways, bays and marine environments has influenced our master plans and development throughout my 17 year tenure.
NO - the issue is ratebels. There is an over emphasis on continued development in hazardous area (especially Hudson River Waterfront). In particular, there seems to be little coordination of traffic and transportation issues and little regard for pedestrians. This is critical in the congested waterfront and communities across from NY. This would potentially affect emergency service and access to areas. The waterfront development that has changed old industrial waterfront areas into high-rise residential buildings along the Hudson River waterfront increase the potential for future response and disaster assistance necessary as a result of future storms.
I'm not certain how many municipal or regional plans reference the Hazard Mitigation Plan or use the hazard mitigation plan in their land use decisions. I Would like comprehensive plans to address hazard mitigation and make land use/zoning recommendations in support of mitigation activities or hazard prevention measures.
Sometimes there is a disconnect. Don't know of any comprehensive comparison for conflicts.
There are sufficient regulations. There should be "required" training for Floodplain Administrators. See my notes in item #2.
Yes, we are small but have active participation of Planning Board, Environmental Commission, Public Works, OEM, municipal professionals and elected officials. Our size may make it easier for us to interact with one another on these issues.
yes, the problem is putting the tools in place for the City to use for planning and enforcement.
I feel there are many inconsistencies with what the DEP regulations require, and the result it will have on associated flood insurance rates
I am not sure that they are coordinated in all the ways they should be.
No. Very, very few municipalities have taken this opportunity to change their land use and zoning codes to keep construction away from stream corridors and enact adequate flooding, drought or other environmental safeguards. Communities also feel they have no role in enforcing state environmental rules, such as riparian zone limits, wetlands rules, etc. This is a serious loophole concern since DEP does not have the staff to follow up with most enforcement.
No. There is not enough administrative initiative & guidance to coordinate multiple department missions & regulation. The flood plain administrator (Engineering Director) receives little support.
UCC is not consistent with flood rules. Construction code officials don't want to deal with anything other than the UCC
No. Updating plans, zoning, ordinances and budgets is time consuming and expensive. In the world of 2% caps, municipalities do not have the resources to do this without state and federal support.
After Hurricane Sandy, they are improving under Mayor Dawn Zimmer's leadership, but Hoboken has a long way to go.
No, the Code Officials are not involved enough in the process.
In my experience these elements are not brought together



Open Ended Responses
All involved in development, & we continue to have a very active OEM with regular meetings, with or without emergencies
Not really, there are a lot of loose wheels. A meeting is needed.

**Question #7: Has your county or community been reviewing progress on and effectiveness of your local mitigation plan on a regular basis per your local plan’s maintenance and review strategy? (41 Responses)**

Yes	No
61%	39%

Most respondents indicated that their county or community reviews progress of the HMP based on the plan maintenance procedures delineated in their respective plans. This maintenance is either the result of local initiatives to address specific hazards within their area or as part of CRS participation. The respondents who said that progress based on plan maintenance procedures are not followed said that this is the result of either initial development of an original plan or that plans are not used until a disaster occurs.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.

Open Ended Responses
We meet bi-annually, spring & fall to discuss what we have accomplished and what needs to be done
It is my understanding that it is an ongoing process. The local hazard mitigation office has provided some information.
Plan is being developed
The last revision to Blirstown's plan was several years ago. Since that time the Township has taken an aggressive position with respect to learning more about the causes for flooding events, and toward getting the attention of various agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, to make a determination of what measures can be used to mitigate the flooding that results from rainfall runoff in Sussex County.
Per approved Flood hazard mitigation plan reviewed by NJOEM and FEMA Region 2.
The communities have continues to meet with legislators and policy leaders to develop and implement mitigation plans.
Yes, as part of CRS, we have annual updates. We have implemented projects such as backflow prevention with FMA grant.
County OEM stays in constant touch and provides support!
Ongoing discussions
I believe it is being done as part of the county HMP update.
Fulfilling the floodplain management requirements achieves the desired results.
The Counties have, but not the towns.
In a lot of communities the plan sits on the shelf till the disaster.
Not as far as I know, they keep things close.
CRS recertification requires it.

**Question #8: Has there been adequate support from the county and/or state level to support the review of your mitigation strategies? (37 Responses)**

Yes	No
48.6%	54.1%

Respondents to Question 8 said that County and State support for mitigation strategies could be improved.



Many respondents indicated the availability of technical information from the county and state (including GIS specialists and engineers), but required additional communications in regards to overall plan funding and review.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.

Open Ended Responses
We initially had to present our plan to Co. & State for review, but since then no, so the answer is no we are not getting support from them
Seems to be poor communications and unclear assignment of responsibility.
Support is needed from The County Emergency Management Coordinators, Warren and Sussex, to listen to Blairstown's suggestions.
County OEM has a GIS specialist that has always made mapping available.
Easy access to county OEM
There has been limited response to specific HMGP applications by the County or the State.
We have volunteer expertise and don't need aid, but new engineer in NJOEM will be a good peer to discuss ideas
GIS support provided.
I hope so. As I private citizen, I am not part of these discussions.
Support has been great since Storm Sandy. Prior to the storm, a FA was on their own to do whatever. Most FA's do not know what they are looking for so they are left to do whatever seems best. The position of Floodplain Administrator needs to be closely examined with hopefully some changes in the future.
HMGP has not yet been announced: I found out about FHA grant opportunities a week before they are due.
State is in crisis mode to rebuild as things were, instead of developing long-term strategies for the next disaster, which will cause the same types of damage.
Interaction & support comes mostly through Essex County OEM
Yes, but there needs to be a way to make the municipality more accountable
Grant money

Question #9: Are you provided adequate notification of available mitigation grant opportunities, as well as guidance and support with grant application development? (38 Responses)

Yes	No
42.1%	57.9%

Respondents indicated an overall lack of notification and guidance regarding grant opportunities and development. Many respondents said that they were unaware of certain opportunities until shortly before an application due date and suggested a clearinghouse of opportunities for counties/municipalities to find such opportunities. In addition, respondents requested additional availability of information for grant opportunities for individuals recovering from disaster. Respondents also noted the importance of seminars/trainings that guide applicants through the application process.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.



Open Ended Responses
Need more "Advance" notification for Mitigation Grants.
Atl. Co. OEM has been very helpful in answering all questions as well as DEP Dam safety Jim Watt/ no problem at either end
Information is circulated within my company to advise our municipal clients.
again not allot of focus on MUA's
State and FEMA need a Sandy Specific Grant website for residents and Municipalities
Yes, but September 2013 round too quick (not NJ fault) and Sandy HMGP not well followed up from LOI
Education on the grants needs to be earlier as we are the front line with the public and need to be able to answer questions.
Our property was not damaged by the storm. My understanding is that the City has applied for mitigation grant opportunities. I am not sure what the opportunities have been for individual property owners but as very few of our multi-storied buildings were considered substantially damaged we have a different scenario then what might be typical elsewhere.
Unknown at State/community level
A central notice and clearing house (with forms, links to information, etc. would be good to have.
have not received any mitigation grant info or seminars on preparing mitigation grants.
HMGP has not yet been announced: I found out about FHA grant opportunities a week before they are due.
have not heard about any support from any source
I expect the city of Hoboken receives notification
Very little grant knowledge out here for FEMA-FMA grants. These are critical for property owners impacted by BW-12
I went direct to the state, my town does not know
Lack of time to apply.

**Question #10: Which policies, programs initiatives or projects, identified within your hazard mitigation plan or other planning mechanisms have been the most effective at reducing losses? (30 Responses)**

Respondents to Question 10 noted a variety of mechanisms that reduce losses. Floodplain regulation was identified as the top method for reducing losses, followed by acquisition/elevation, and CRS participation. Additional methods for reducing losses included public outreach/notification, construction projects, and funding through grant opportunities, though viewed as limited.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.

Open Ended Responses
Notifying residents when flooding is imminent. Lately, giving guidance on BFEs for raising structures.
We don't build in flood plains.
raising homes but this costs money which is limited
**higher regulatory standards, including 2' of freeboard, 40% market value for Sub Improv./Sub.Dam. & over 7 years. additionally, annual outreach projects through a safety bag distributed to all borough residents
Hazard Mitigation Grants
Having local towns adopt hazard mitigation ordinances. That way, they clearly have jurisdiction to enforce them. But, they are skeptical of have more regulations.
None. The plan needs to be revisited. New information has come to light that can be used to update the plan.
Home elevations and buyouts. Acquisitions. Raising the elevation of roadways
CRS program, Building code
Entry in CRS program; Ely Creek Backflow Prevention Project providing future damage mitigation for 29 houses and 5



commercial properties; addition of newer gage for local National Weather Service flood projections
Still a work in progress - see answer to #6. Presently only "new" installations are required to be above the BFE, replacements can go right back where they were located and probably be damaged with the next serious storm even.
Harden, protect and raise our edges (the Hudson waterfront) to prevent a tidal surge similar to what we had in Sandy. Upgrade our combined storm and sanitary systems to accommodate "normal" flooding events and better accommodate the eventuality of surge events. Systematically work towards elevating critical systems within our structures, using wet and dry floodproofing systems in our buildings and review our exposures and weak links. Hoboken will not move or be abandoned. There is too much value and critical infrastructure here. and It is impractical to elevate our whole city so we have to learn how to live where we are and protect ourselves.
Established flood plain maps and approved building elevations
State and local prioritization to remove structures from harms way and update of code to prevent damages
Minimum elevation requirements in flood zones. Planning for backup power.
Maybe off topic a bit, but I am pursuing CFM status. My studies have taught me much about what a Floodplain Administrator's responsibilities are. Maybe I should not say this but, I have been a floodplain administrator for 20 years and Now I am learning what I should have known for the past 20 years.
I do not know. Benchmarks have not been established.
ordinances prohibiting development in the flood plain
There is not enough state and federal funding or support to implement the projects and programs identified in the hazard mitigation plan.

**Question #11: Please provide any other relevant feedback concerning hazard mitigation planning in your community? (28 Responses)**

The culmination of responses to the previous questions were reiterated in Question 11. Respondents emphasized the effects of hazards on their community/county in addition to the need for additional training opportunities, interagency coordination, and availability/notification of funding opportunities on the local level. These issues can further be broadened into a general need for greater understanding of hazard mitigation.

The table below shows the responses received through the survey. Particularly relevant responses have been highlighted in dark blue.

Open Ended Responses
The Township is not made aware of \$\$ coming until it is "upon us". Not sure if the county lets the township make the decision for which projects to fund with \$\$.
DCA and DEP need to get on the same page. DCA has no regard for flood regulations and has failed in Sandy recovery efforts from exempting permits in the beginning to the joke of the RREM and other grants.
*** CRS class 8 to a 5 * first barrier island community to be designated STORM READY by NWS ***Key point is the mitigation committee, have them become a part of the process, it makes going up-hill with the recommendations much more easier because they are invested! ***Annual outreach projects - exceptional **** initially, the higher regulatory standards were very difficult to sell, a lot of negative comments about how much it would cost vs the savings within CRS...why do I have to go up 2' that is going to cost me thousands..etc..a real struggle...when SANDY hit we had 5 years of homes elevated, new & substantial with 2' of freeboard, about 150 dwelling units, almost 10% of our housing stock....none were damaged, except for wet garages...now we are getting the thanks...like...thank you for MAKING ME...build to that height.... NOW...let's see what happens as I am trying to go with a 3' foot of freeboard across all zones..to be determined!
Clients get discouraged when hazard mitigation grants are not received.
Obstacle. The Paulins Kill River Watershed is about 177 square miles in area. Two thirds of the watershed is in Sussex County where the flood plain is very wide. In the Town of Newton, sussex County there is considerable commercial and retail development. Large parking lots and parking lots associated with the Sussex County Community College drain into a marsh area adjacent to the town center. This marsh area is about 1,000 acres. The marsh stores the runoff from the college and commercial ares. All of the runoff and outflow from the wide flood plains and numerous lakes in the upper portion of the Paulins Kill Watershed exit Sussex County into a section of the watershed in Warren County that has extremely narrow flood plains. Several miles further downstream at the end of the narrow flood plains, the Paulins Kill passes through Blairstown. The result is repeated



Open Ended Responses

flooding events in the Historic Village area and business area of town. The town has suffered 4 floods in the past 5 years. In at least 2 of the floods river flow at the USGS gauge on the Paulins Kill, upstream of the town has been measured in excess of 7,000 cubic feet per second at peak flow. It is my opinion that pre-releases upstream, properly timed, could reduce these extremely high flows. These peaks are only a few hours in duration after which the river flow recedes relatively quickly.
Notification of impending events, reverse 911 and website updates
Flood Hazard Mitigation plan identified review and progression program working, noting committee includes OEM , Mun. Engineer , Public works director and residents. Obstacles are typically funding issues
Municipal all Hazard Mitigation Plans are better, but understand NJOEM/FEMA RII push to countywide plans. This update round NJOEM MUST put emphasis on fleshing out projects with conceptual planning/engineering and conceptual BCAs. Also, MUST bring more stateholders together (not just the OEM community; county planning departments). Also, integration with municipal Master Plans and influencing land use is this next step. Let's use the Sandy HMGP planning money wisely to make a difference.
With FEMA assistance (funding) we have been able to remove 30+ homes from the SFHA. Funding is critical!
Hoboken's challenges are unique and need to be done comprehensively. The City of Hoboken has been dealing with a variety of entities in the discussion as to how to deal with the issues here. These include the FEMA, HUD, the USACE, the State of NJ, the Rebuild by Design group, Steven's Institute, the North Hudson Sewerage Authority and others. The City itself can do things to change building codes and inform the public. Work needs to be done by the Port Authority of NYNJ and NJ Transit which directly impacts the flow of surge water across their property into our City and which is critical to maintaining our local and regional transportation systems. The "big fix" is will smartly combine all of this information, engineering, public and political will in protecting our whole community. We will "sink or swim" together in doing this.
Most feel there is little we can do to increase our resiliency
Local government and not train or have any idea of hazard mitigation
County level documents seem too general, without enough thought to each municipality's needs. Might be better to do reports by municipality and then assemble them into a county plan.
One more time: There is a tremendous disconnect between what we are trying to achieve - mitigation - and who is doing it - untrained personnel.
All new homes are 100% compliant, most are built higher than required (per bldg. dept. involvement)
Lack of seminars or info in dealing with construction codes, enforcement or making changes to the mitigation plan for construction in flood hazard areas.
Public opposition to change is our biggest obstacle.
More needs to be done to bring all types of municipal offices to the tables to develop plans.
Turnover of politicians, and the associated learning curve and lack of institutional memory is a continuing problem. If officials do not know the causes, procedures, and plans because of constant turnover, they cannot be effective. Education should be provided at least every other year.
Greatest challenge will be the economic impact on stable, built-out neighborhoods in the Ironbound section of Newark that will be in nonconformance with more restrictive flood hazard regulations. Increased NFIP flood insurance premiums may be more destabilizing to these older neighborhoods than any past or future flood risk.
"DISCONNECT" Planning is great and necessary, but there are not enough financial and technical resources available to help communities become more resilient. Therefore, most local governments in New Jersey are woefully unprepared for major disaster events.
Communities need to better understand structural elevation. NJ will need to elevate around 400,000 buildings in next 50 years due to regulatory and climate changes.
I have written letters to my town committee and they have not been answered, passed on to Cumberland, no answer there either. They are awaiting SLOSH Model results before they will do anything, meanwhile the rest is history. They appear to be incompetent
The ABFEs created a lot of problems, the the newer plans lowered parameter
Lack of funding.
3 N/As



## NJ COUNTY COORDINATORS MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE – SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES

**Note:** Not all questions were answered by each respondent; therefore, the percentage presented has been calculated based on the number of respondents that answered the specific question and not the overall number of questionnaires submitted either online or via hard-copy.

**Total Responses: 9**

**Question 1: What County do you represent? (8 responses)**

- Middlesex
- Sussex
- Essex
- Morris
- Monmouth
- Somerset
- Camden
- Warren

Question 2: Are you familiar with FEMA’s hazard mitigation planning program (purpose, benefits, requirements for local governments)? (9 responses)

Yes	No
100%	0%

**Question 3: Are you familiar with your County’s Hazard Mitigation Plan? (8 responses)**

Yes	No
100%	0%

**Question 4: What do you feel are the top 3 natural hazards that pose a risk to your County, in order of greater to lesser risk? (9 responses)**

Flood

Severe Winter Storm

Wind

**Question 5: Can you identify specific programs or resources within your County that support natural hazard risk reduction? (8 responses)**

All respondents identified programs, resources, and actions that support hazard risk reduction including acquisition and floodplain identification.



**Question 6: Have you incorporated your mitigation plan into other plans, programs, or policies in your County and communities? (9 responses)**

Yes	No
77.8%	22.2%

**Question 7: Does your emergency operations plan/comprehensive emergency plan refer to your county hazard mitigation plan or incorporate hazard mitigation data or research? (9 responses)**

Yes	No
77.8%	22.2%

**Question 8: Is your County HMP readily available for public and municipal review, and if so, how is it made available (e.g. online)? (9 responses)**

Yes	No
100%	0%

**Question 9: Have you reviewed the county-level mitigation strategy identified in your County HMP? (9 responses)**

Yes	No
100%	0%

**Question 10: Can you identify county or municipal level mitigation projects identified in the County HMP that have been implemented? (8 responses)**

Most respondents indicated that they are able or are in process of identifying projects. Some respondents indicated that Hurricane Sandy has hampered response to project implementation for county or municipal initiatives. Respondents also identified that their plans will be updated and new/existing mitigation projects will be further explored and are currently being planned for accordingly.

**Question 11: Has the County or municipalities been awarded hazard mitigation grant funding to implement projects identified in the mitigation strategy? (8 responses)**

Yes	No
62.5%	37.5%