



APPENDIX E – MITIGATION ACTION PRIORITIZATION TOOL (MAP-T)



For the 2024 SHMP Update, the STAPLEE approach used in 2014 and 2019 was modified to remove redundancies, highlight the State’s priorities, and align with HMA grant program guidance. Some criteria were not changed, but additions to their definitions have expanded the scope of the individual criterion. This modification resulted in the establishment of the Mitigation Action Prioritization Tool (MAP-T). The following list describes the substantial changes to the STAPLEE methodology that have been adopted into the MAP-T:

- The “technical” criterion was eliminated as only technically feasible actions are included in the mitigation strategy. Actions lacking technical feasibility will be identified and removed from the mitigation strategy prior to prioritization.
- A fiscal criterion was added to gauge if the action is likely to have available funding.
- The social criterion has been modified to consider the benefits and potential negative impacts to socially vulnerable populations and underserved communities.
- A hazards of concern criterion was added to note if the action addresses a high-ranked hazard(s).
- A timeline criterion was added to identify if the action can be completed within the plan effectiveness period (five years).
- A community lifelines criterion was added to note if the action benefits a community lifeline.
- An optional recovery criterion was established that can be added following a disaster event to identify if the action aligns with the current disaster recovery funding sources (Hazard Mitigation Grant Program [HMGP], etc.) and disaster recovery needs. The scoring of the recovery criterion can also be updated when existing funding sources have modified eligibility requirements/areas of focus, when new funding sources are established, and when emerging disaster recovery needs based on communities impacted are identified. This will allow the prioritization of actions to be aligned with available funding and disaster recovery needs.

Agencies were asked to use these criteria to assist them in evaluating and prioritizing mitigation actions identified in the 2024 SHMP Update. Specifically, for each mitigation action, agencies were asked to assign a numeric rank (-1, 0, or 1) for each of the 15 evaluation criteria, defined as follows:

- 1 = Highly effective or feasible
- 0 = Neutral
- -1 = Ineffective or not feasible

The numerical results of this exercise were then used to help prioritize the action or strategy as Low, Medium, or High based on the following totals for numeric ranks:

- 0 – 6 = Low
- 7 – 11 = Medium
- 11 – 14 = High

Actions that resulted in a low prioritization were re-evaluated to determine if alternative approaches to the problem could perform better in the STAPLEE prioritization evaluation. While the 2024 modified STAPLEE provided a consistent, systematic methodology to support the evaluation and prioritization of mitigation actions, agencies may have additional considerations that could influence their overall prioritization of mitigation actions.



2024 SHMP Mitigation Action Prioritization Tool (MAP-T)

Criteria	Description	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Life Safety	How effective will the action be at protecting lives and preventing injuries? Will the proposed action adversely affect one segment of the population?		
Property Protection	How significant will the action be at eliminating or reducing damage to structures and infrastructure? Developing in the floodplain or high-risk areas?		
Cost-Effectiveness	Are the costs to implement the action commensurate with the benefits achieved?		
Political	Is there overall public support for the action? Is there the political will to support it? Is the action at odds with development pressures?		
Legal	Does the entity have the authority to implement the action?		
Fiscal	Can the action be funded under existing program budgets (i.e., is this initiative currently budgeted for)? Or would it require a new budget authorization or funding from another source such as grants?		
Environmental	What are the potential environmental impacts of the action? Will it comply with environmental regulations? Are there co-benefits of this action?		
Social Vulnerability	Does the action benefit socially vulnerable populations and underserved communities? Additional considerations can include the SVI index and other appropriate measures of social vulnerability. Note: Use of this criteria should include which, if any, social vulnerability indices are used. The social vulnerability indices used should be consistent with any indices used in the risk assessment.		
Administrative	Does the entity have the personnel and administrative capabilities to implement the action and maintain it or will outside help be necessary? Does the scale and scope of the project align with the entity's capabilities?		
Hazards of Concern	Does the action address one or more of the entity's high-ranked hazards?		
Climate Change	Does the action incorporate climate change projections for the State? Is the action designed to withstand/address long-term conditions? Is the action consistent with the State's climate resilience goals?		
Timeline	Can the action be completed in less than 5 years (within the planning horizon of the SHMP)?		
Community Lifelines	Does this project benefit community lifelines?		
Other State and Local Objectives	Does the action advance other entity objectives, such as capital improvements, economic development, environmental quality, or open-space preservation? Does it support the policies of other plans and programs?		
Total			
Priority (High/Med/Low)			

It is important to note that certain initiatives from the 2011, 2014, and 2019 HMPs are being carried forward in the 2024 SHMP Update. As discussed, these initiatives were previously prioritized using the STAPLEE approach established in 2011 and 2014. With the new STAPLEE approach established for the 2024 SHMP Update, these carryover actions have been re-prioritized using the updated STAPLEE methodology.



An optional recovery criteria can also be added to the MAP-T following disaster events to aid in prioritization of recovery related mitigation actions.

2024 MAP-T Optional Recovery Criteria

Criteria	Description	Numeric Rank (-1, 0, 1)	Provide brief rationale for numeric rank when appropriate
Recovery	How does this action align with current disaster recovery funding sources (HMGP, etc.) and disaster recovery needs?		

HHPD Action Prioritization

NJDEP and NJOEM prioritize funding for actions that address potential dam failures using a risk-based eligibility matrix. Dams that are ranked as high hazard dams that have received poor/unsatisfactory safety inspections are considered HHPD eligible dams. Mitigation actions for poor/unsatisfactory dams are also prioritized using the 2024 MAP-T. Prioritization for mitigation of HHPD eligible dams is also re-evaluated based on annual updates to the HHPD program’s annual requirements and eligible activities as outlined in the annual notice of funding opportunity (NOFO).