

SECTION 3E – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

Priority Risk Index

The hazard profiles presented in this section were developed using best available data and result in what may be considered principally a qualitative assessment as recommended by FEMA in its guidance document entitled *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook*. It relies heavily on historical and anecdotal data, stakeholder input, and professional and experienced judgment regarding observed and/or anticipated hazard impacts; and carefully considers the findings in other relevant plans, studies and technical reports.

In order to draw some meaningful planning conclusions on hazard risk for Atlantic County as a whole and each participating jurisdiction, the hazard profiling and risk assessment processes were used to generate hazard classifications according to a “Priority Risk Index” (PRI) - a tool used to measure the degree of risk for identified hazards in a particular planning area. The purpose of the PRI, described further below, is to categorize and prioritize all potential hazards as high, moderate or low risk. The PRI is used to assist in the determination of those hazards that pose the most significant threat to Atlantic County based on a variety of factors. The PRI is a qualitative assessment methodology meant to be utilized as an objective planning tool for classifying and prioritizing hazard risks based on standardized criteria. Combined with the asset inventory and quantitative vulnerability assessment provided in the previous sections, the summary hazard classifications generated through the use of the PRI allows for the prioritization of those high hazard risks for mitigation planning purposes, and more specifically, the identification of hazard mitigation opportunities for Atlantic County jurisdictions to consider as part of their proposed mitigation strategies. Each jurisdiction focused on the identification of mitigation actions that will reduce or eliminate their own unique hazard risks.

The application of the PRI results in numerical values that allow identified hazards to be ranked against one another (the higher the PRI value, the greater the hazard risk). PRI values are obtained by assigning varying degrees of risk to five categories for each hazard (probability, impact, spatial extent, warning time and duration). Each degree of risk has been assigned a value (1 to 4) and an agreed upon weighting factor¹, as summarized in **Table 3e.1**. To calculate the PRI value for a given hazard, the assigned risk value for each category is multiplied by the weighting factor. The sum of all five categories equals the final PRI value, as demonstrated in the example equation below². According to the weighting scheme applied for Atlantic County, the highest possible PRI value is 4.0.

$$\text{PRI VALUE} = [(\text{PROBABILITY} \times .30) + (\text{IMPACT} \times .30) + (\text{SPATIAL EXTENT} \times .20) + (\text{WARNING TIME} \times .10) + (\text{DURATION} \times .10)]$$

¹ The Atlantic County Planning Committee, based upon any unique concerns or factors for the planning area, may adjust the PRI weighting scheme during future plan updates.

² “Hazard Mitigation: Integrating Best Practices into Planning” (available online at www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/19261), prepared by the American Planning Association (APA) and supported through a contract with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), discusses the calculation of Priority Risk Indices in Chapter 6 in its case study on the Mecklenburg County Hazard Mitigation Plan (www.charmeckem.net/sites/charmeckem.net/files/HMP/Sections/06_Vulnerability_Assessment.pdf). The Atlantic County HMP Update uses the same PRI calculation and weighting factors.

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

| Table 3e.1 | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Priority Risk Index for Atlantic County | | | | |
| PRI Category | Degree of Risk | | | Assigned Weighting Factor |
| | Level | Criteria | Index Value | |
| Probability | Unlikely | Less than 1% annual probability | 1 | 30% |
| | Possible | Between 1 and 10% annual probability | 2 | |
| | Likely | Between 10 and 100% annual probability | 3 | |
| | Highly Likely | 100% annual probability | 4 | |
| Impact | Minor | Very few injuries, if any. Only minor property damage and minimal disruption on quality of life. Temporary shutdown of critical facilities. | 1 | 30% |
| | Limited | Minor injuries only. More than 10% of property in affected area damaged or destroyed. Complete shutdown of critical facilities for more than one day. | 2 | |
| | Critical | Multiple deaths/injuries possible. More than 25% of property in affected area damaged or destroyed. Complete shutdown of critical facilities for more than one week. | 3 | |
| | Catastrophic | High number of deaths/injuries possible. More than 50% of property in affected area damaged or destroyed. Complete shutdown of critical facilities for 30 days or more. | 4 | |
| Spatial Extent | Negligible | Less than 1% of area affected | 1 | 20% |
| | Small | Between 1 and 10% of area affected | 2 | |
| | Moderate | Between 10 and 50% of area affected | 3 | |
| | Large | Between 50 and 100% of area affected | 4 | |
| Warning Time | More than 24 hours | Self-explanatory | 1 | 10% |
| | 12 to 24 hours | Self-explanatory | 2 | |
| | 6 to 12 hours | Self-explanatory | 3 | |
| | Less than 6 hours | Self-explanatory | 4 | |
| Duration | Less than 6 hours | Self-explanatory | 1 | 10% |
| | Less than 24 hours | Self-explanatory | 2 | |
| | Less than one week | Self-explanatory | 3 | |
| | More than one week | Self-explanatory | 4 | |

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

As part of the 2016 Plan Update, the application of the PRI was done for every participating jurisdiction. The process was reviewed and results were updated as part of the 2021 Plan Update process, including a reorganization of hazard presentation to align with the overall new presentation of the updated hazard identification step documented of Section 2, and the hazard profiles of Section 3a.

PRI Results

The application of the PRI was done separately for each jurisdiction in Atlantic County, and for the County as a whole. Assigned risk levels were based on the detailed hazard profiles developed for this section, as well as input from the Planning Committee and results of the vulnerability assessment. The results were then used in calculating PRI values and making final determinations for the risk assessment.

Table 3e.2 summarizes the degree of risk assigned to each category for all identified hazards based on the application of the PRI for Atlantic County, as a whole.

Table 3e.3 presents an overview of the PRI Results for each jurisdiction.

Detailed tables for each jurisdiction (similar to Table 3e.2) are included in **Appendix 3e**.

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

**Table 3e.2
Summary of PRI Results for Atlantic County**

| Hazard | Category/Degree of Risk | | | | | | | | | | | Hazard Ranking |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Probability | PROBABILITY INDEX VALUE | Impact | IMPACT INDEX VALUE | Spatial Extent | SPATIAL INDEX VALUE | Warning Time | WARNING INDEX VALUE | Duration | DURATION INDEX VALUE | PRI Score | |
| Atmospheric Hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Extreme Temperatures | Highly Likely | 4 | Minor | 1 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.7 | M |
| Extreme Wind | Highly Likely | 4 | Limited | 2 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than 24 hours | 2 | 2.9 | M |
| Hail | Highly Likely | 4 | Minor | 1 | Negligible | 1 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 1 | 2.2 | L |
| Hurricane & Tropical Storm | Possible | 2 | Catastrophic | 4 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 3.0 | H |
| Lightning | Highly Likely | 4 | Minor | 1 | Negligible | 1 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 1 | 2.2 | L |
| Nor'easter | Likely | 3 | Minor | 1 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.4 | M |
| Tornado | Possible | 2 | Catastrophic | 4 | Negligible | 1 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 1 | 2.5 | M |
| Winter Storm | Highly Likely | 4 | Minor | 1 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.7 | M |
| Hydrologic Hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coastal Erosion | Highly Likely | 4 | Critical | 3 | Small | 2 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.9 | M |
| Sea Level Rise | Highly Likely | 4 | Critical | 3 | Small | 2 | More than 24 hours | 1 | More than one week | 4 | 3.0 | H |
| Dam Failure | Unlikely | 1 | Catastrophic | 4 | Negligible | 1 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 1 | 2.2 | L |
| Levee Failure | N/A | No recorded levees in Atlantic County | | | | | | | | | | N/A |
| Drought | Possible | 2 | Minor | 1 | Large | 4 | More than 24 hours | 1 | More than one week | 4 | 2.2 | L |
| Flood | Highly Likely | 4 | Critical | 3 | Moderate | 3 | 6 to 12 hours | 3 | Less than one week | 3 | 3.3 | H |
| Tsunami | Unlikely | 1 | Limited | 2 | Small | 2 | 6 to 12 hours | 3 | Less than 24 hours | 2 | 1.8 | L |
| Storm Surge | Likely | 3 | Catastrophic | 4 | Moderate | 3 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 3.1 | H |
| Wave Action | Highly Likely | 4 | Critical | 3 | Small | 2 | More than 24 hours | 1 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.9 | M |
| Geologic Hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Earthquake | Unlikely | 1 | Minor | 1 | Large | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than 6 hours | 1 | 1.9 | L |
| Other Natural Hazards | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wildfire | Possible | 2 | Critical | 3 | Small | 2 | Less than 6 hours | 4 | Less than one week | 3 | 2.6 | M |

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

Table 3e.3
PRI Results for Each Jurisdiction³

| Jurisdiction | Atmospheric | | | | | | | | Hydrologic | | | | | | | Geologic | Other | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | Extreme Temperatures | Extreme Wind | Hail | Hurricane and Tropical Storm | Lightning | Nor' easter | Tornado | Winter Storm | Coastal Erosion | Sea Level Rise | Dam Failure ⁴ | Drought | Flood | Tsunami | Storm Surge | Wave Action | Earthquake | Wildfire |
| ATLANTIC COUNTY | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 |
| Absecon, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Atlantic City, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Brigantine, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Buena, Borough of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | N/A | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Buena Vista, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 2.2 | 2.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| Corbin City, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Egg Harbor City, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | 3.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.8 | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Egg Harbor, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Estell Manor, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Folsom, Borough of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | N/A | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Galloway, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Hamilton, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 2.8 | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Hammonton, Town of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | N/A | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 1.2 | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Linwood, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Longport, Borough of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Margate City, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Mullica, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | 3.0 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 2.8 | N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Northfield, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | N/A | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Pleasantville, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.0 |

³ N/A = The hazard was not identified as a significant hazard of concern for the jurisdiction because the footprint of the hazard area is entirely outside of the jurisdictional boundary, as detailed in the hazard profiles of Section 3A.

⁴ Levee Failure: Atlantic County has no significant levees recorded, therefore PRI was not done for levee failure

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

**Table 3e.3
PRI Results for Each Jurisdiction³**

| Jurisdiction | Atmospheric | | | | | | | | Hydrologic | | | | | | | Geologic | Other | |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | Extreme Temperatures | Extreme Wind | Hail | Hurricane and Tropical Storm | Lightning | Nor' easter | Tornado | Winter Storm | Coastal Erosion | Sea Level Rise | Dam Failure ⁴ | Drought | Flood | Tsunami | Storm Surge | Wave Action | Earthquake | Wildfire |
| Port Republic, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Somers Point, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | N/A | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Ventnor City, City of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | #N/A | 2.2 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Weymouth, Township of | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | N/A | N/A | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 2.8 | #N/A | 1.9 | 2.8 |

Final Determinations

The conclusions drawn from the application of the PRI process for Atlantic County resulted in the classification of risk for each identified hazard according to three categories: High Risk, Moderate Risk and Low Risk. Hazards with a PRI of 3.0 or more were deemed “high risk”; hazards with a PRI between 2.4 and 2.9 were deemed “moderate risk”; and hazards with a PRI of 2.3 or less were deemed “low risk”. For purposes of these classifications, risk is expressed in relative terms according to the estimated impact that a hazard will have on human life and property throughout all of Atlantic County. It should be noted that although some hazards are classified below as posing low risk, their occurrence of varying or unprecedented magnitudes is still possible in some cases and their assigned classification will continue to be evaluated during future plan updates. **Table 3e.4** presents conclusions on hazard risk for the County as a whole, based on the PRI scores for each hazard in the County. **Table 3e.5** presents an overview of the resultant hazard risk rankings for each jurisdiction. Detailed tables for each jurisdiction are included in **Appendix 3e.1**.

| Table 3e.4 Hazard Risk Rankings for Atlantic County | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| HIGH RISK PRI ≥ 3.0 | Hurricane and Tropical Storm Flooding Storm Surge Sea Level Rise |
| MODERATE RISK 2.4 ≤ PRI ≤ 2.9 | Extreme Temperatures Extreme Wind Nor'easter Tornado Winter Storm Coastal Erosion Wave Action Wildfire |
| LOW RISK PRI ≤ 2.3 | Hail Lightning Dam Failure Drought Tsunami Earthquake |

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

**Table 3e.5
Hazard Risk Rankings for Each Jurisdiction**

| Jurisdiction | Atmospheric | | | | | | | | Hydrologic | | | | | | | | Geologic | Other |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | Extreme Temperatures | Extreme Wind | Hail | Hurricane and Tropical Storm | Lightning | Nor' easter | Tornado | Winter Storm | Coastal Erosion | Sea Level Rise | Dam Failure | Drought | Flood | Tsunami | Storm Surge | Wave Action | Earthquake | Wildfire |
| ATLANTIC COUNTY | M | M | L | H | L | M | M | M | M | H | L | L | H | L | H | M | L | M |
| Absecon, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | L | H | L | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Atlantic City, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | H | L | L |
| Brigantine, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Buena, Borough of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | N/A | L | L | H | N/A | N/A | N/A | L | M |
| Buena Vista, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | N/A | N/A | L | M | N/A | N/A | N/A | L | M |
| Corbin City, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | L | L | M |
| Egg Harbor City, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | H | L | L | H | L | M | N/A | L | M |
| Egg Harbor, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | M | L | H | L | M | M | L | M |
| Estell Manor, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | L | L | H | L | M | L | L | M |
| Folsom, Borough of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | N/A | L | L | H | N/A | N/A | N/A | L | M |
| Galloway, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | L | L | H | L | M | M | L | M |
| Hamilton, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | H | M | L | H | L | M | N/A | L | M |
| Hammonton, Town of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | N/A | L | L | M | L | L | N/A | L | M |
| Linwood, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | L | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Longport, Borough of | M | M | L | H | L | H | L | M | H | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Margate City, City of | M | M | L | H | L | H | L | M | H | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Mullica, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | H | L | L | H | L | M | N/A | L | M |
| Northfield, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | M | N/A | L | L |
| Pleasantville, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | M | L | L | L |
| Port Republic, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | L | L | H | L | H | L | L | M |

SECTION 3e: RISK ASSESSMENT – CONCLUSIONS ON HAZARD RISK

**Table 3e.5
Hazard Risk Rankings for Each Jurisdiction**

| Jurisdiction | Atmospheric | | | | | | | | Hydrologic | | | | | | | Geologic | Other | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | Extreme Temperatures | Extreme Wind | Hail | Hurricane and Tropical Storm | Lightning | Nor' easter | Tornado | Winter Storm | Coastal Erosion | Sea Level Rise | Dam Failure | Drought | Flood | Tsunami | Storm Surge | Wave Action | Earthquake | Wildfire |
| Somers Point, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | M | L | L |
| Ventnor City, City of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | M | H | N/A | L | H | L | H | L | L | L |
| Weymouth, Township of | M | M | L | H | L | M | L | M | N/A | N/A | M | L | M | L | M | N/A | L | M |

Key Risk Findings

Key Risk Findings are problem statements arising from the risk assessment by each participating jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction was encouraged to consider different types of mitigation actions for addressing their highest hazards and Key Risk Findings.

Key Risk Findings for Atlantic County (as determined by the Atlantic County JAT) are presented in **Table 3e.6**. Key Risk Findings reported by each individual jurisdiction are included in **Appendix 3e**.

| Table 3e.6 Key Risk Findings for Atlantic County |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The current configuration of the intersection and roadway allows for flooding on regular tidal events and during larger storms prevents evacuation of the Ventnor Heights and Chelsea Heights neighborhoods. |
| Pump station is critical in removal of flood water in the communities of Ventnor and Margate. Storm water system is antiquated and has produced multiple failures of the system resulting in flooded streets and residential/commercial properties in Ventnor and Margate and surrounding areas. |
| By ensuring that local plans incorporate natural disaster techniques the risks to people and property could be reduced from hazards such as hurricanes, tropical storms, flooding, storm surge, nor'easters, coastal erosion, etc. Hazard mitigation techniques in local comprehensive plans can provide improved life safety and protection of property in communities. |
| Prevent risks from increasing if local planning and zoning decisions are made without consideration of natural hazard and mitigation techniques. |
| Keeping new and updated development in line with the Hazard Mitigation Plan Strategies. |
| The general public's understanding of natural hazards and preparedness and mitigation possibilities could be improved. The planning area's overall level of disaster resistance would increase if a greater number of households had a thorough understanding of their risks and things they can do to reduce these risks. |
| Local codes & ordinances can be updated to address natural disaster mitigation techniques or, if already included, they can be re-evaluated to improve upon or expand the mitigation approach. |
| The community's overall level of disaster resistance would increase if hazard mitigation principles were more closely aligned with day-to-day operations and activities. |