

# Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Energy Allocation Initiative and Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program

## Overview and Process Summary July 2014

### Overview

Superstorm Sandy highlighted the region's energy vulnerabilities with widespread and prolonged energy failures that triggered significant negative impacts across a number of infrastructure sectors. As a result, jurisdictions and critical facilities identified energy resilience as a top priority for funding in requests submitted to FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (known as "Letters of Intent" or "LOIs"); more than \$469 million in energy-related requests were submitted to the program.

In an effort to begin to address these needs, the State announced a \$25 million program in October 2013 known as the "Energy Allocation Initiative", which was supported through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. The goal of this program was to promote energy resilience statewide for critical facilities and infrastructure.

The program was developed by subject matter experts from across State government who were charged with evaluating energy needs of critical facilities throughout the State, and identifying creative and cost-effective alternative energy solutions. This team evaluated energy projects and determined funding allocations using objective scoring criteria.

Prior to submitting any project to FEMA for approval, the State undertook a thorough quality assurance / quality control process to ensure validation of the data. Through this process final allocations were determined.

The request for funds far exceeded the initial \$25 million in federal dollars available under the "Energy Allocation Initiative." Therefore, to further enhance energy resilience at key infrastructure statewide, an additional \$13 million in Hazard Mitigation Grant Program dollars has been dedicated to a new "Lifeline / Life Safety Program Energy Resilience Program." This new program is intended to address energy resilience needs at critical life safety (e.g., police departments, hospitals, water and wastewater facilities, and shelters) and lifeline (e.g., communications equipment, transportation facilities) facilities throughout the State. Additionally, \$1.3 million has been set aside for a "Reserve for Critical Energy Projects" to ensure that the goal of regional energy resilience is met by addressing any gaps in critical infrastructure.

This document provides an overview of the process used to determine funding levels for the Energy Allocation Initiative and the Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program. All jurisdictions receiving an award under either program must meet FEMA requirements, including a benefit-cost analysis.

## Energy Allocation Initiative

To examine energy resilience, a cross-agency working group consisting of employees from the New Jersey Office of Emergency Management, Office of Homeland Security & Preparedness, Board of Public Utilities, and Department of Environmental Protection collaborated with the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory to study the State's energy vulnerabilities, and identify opportunities to leverage commercially available technologies to address back-up power generation needs at critical facilities. In designing the \$25 million Energy Allocation Initiative, the working group developed objective scoring criteria to evaluate projects submitted to the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for funding. Scoring criteria included the following, and is explained in detail in Attachment 1:

1. Participation in the National Flood Insurance Program
2. Listing in the Office of Homeland Security and Protection (OSHP) State Asset Database, which identifies critical State infrastructure and key resources
3. Population for each jurisdiction, as identified in 2010 US Census
4. Population density for each jurisdiction, as identified in 2010 US Census
5. For water and wastewater system projects - millions of gallons per day (MGD) of flow
6. For water and wastewater system projects population served
7. Public facility criticality "tier," prioritizing facilities that must remain operational during and immediately following a disaster, including facilities that perform life-saving or provide life-sustaining functions
8. FEMA Public Assistance Disbursement history, over a fifteen-year period
9. Participation in the Board of Public Utilities' Local Energy Audit program

The cross-agency working group scored projects submitted to the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program by applying the objective criteria identified above. Funding levels were to be determined as follows:

- Only individual projects scoring a minimum of 80 points would be eligible to receive an allocation.
- Funding would be awarded in five point increments, based on a dollar value of \$1,776 per point, with a maximum award at 140 points
- The amount allocated to each jurisdiction would be determined by the scoring methodology and capped by the proposed project cost in a jurisdiction's LOI. Based on the total number of points available and the assignment of points, proposed projects that scored 80 points would receive an allocation of the cost of the project up to a maximum allocation of \$142,080; projects scoring 85 points would receive an allocation of the cost of the project up to \$150,960; projects scoring 140 points would receive an allocation of \$248,640.
- Where multiple projects within a jurisdiction scored 80 or more points, the jurisdiction's total allocation would be based on the combined total of all eligible projects.

## Quality Assurance / Quality Control Process

The cross-agency working group performed an extensive quality assurance / quality control process prior to any Energy Allocation applications being submitted for funding to FEMA. The working group re-examined all identified energy projects collected by the NJ Office of Emergency Management through the LOI process, and conducted data verification of all objective criteria.

The quality assurance / quality control process included a systematic evaluation of all data used in the scoring process, a review to ensure that all proposed projects were captured, and additional verification through manual and electronic processes. As part of this process:

- The working group devised a system designed to give reasonable assurance that every individual energy-related project included in a LOI was reviewed and scored.
  - Each individual project was listed and scored individually. To do this, LOIs that included multiple projects within a single LOI document were separated so that each individual project from that LOI would be reviewed as a stand-alone project.
  - Each individual project was assigned a unique Project ID using the county and project number (e.g., MON-1, referencing Monmouth County Project #1) and was recorded on a standardized form.
  - To ensure that all requests for funding were considered and incorporated into the database, paper files containing all of the LOIs were reviewed. Projects not previously identified were listed, reviewed, and scored.
  - Where a LOI was not clear or additional information was required, the jurisdiction was contacted to obtain the needed information.
- All projects received a final score using the original objective criteria. All data fields were verified to ensure accuracy.
- Any clarifications needed to complete the review were documented to ensure transparency and consistency. (Noted clarifications are contained in Attachment 2).
- Data was transferred to an Oracle database. Data transfer included multiple levels of quality control to ensure data accuracy. (Quality control steps are detailed in Attachment 3).
- Due to the oversubscription of projects in the program, non-profit and for-profit organizations were excluded from consideration. (A list of those applicants is contained in Attachment 4).

## Results of Quality Assurance / Quality Control Process

Through the QA/QC process the cross-agency working group identified more than 500 projects that were not previously reviewed, the vast majority of which were entered into the electronic grant management system as bundled projects. For example, a jurisdiction may have submitted multiple energy projects within one LOI; however, the grant management system chronicled the submission as one energy project. The working group also identified inaccuracies in a number of the 19,000 data fields. As part of the quality assurance / quality control process, this data was also reviewed and corrected.

In order to account for an increase in the total number of projects scored and total energy-related requests to the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, and to ensure that the limited available funding (\$25 million) was distributed fairly across jurisdictions, the working group established funding caps based on population size:

- Jurisdictions with populations of less than 25,000 residents now have Energy Allocations capped at \$100,000. Jurisdictions with populations greater than 25,000 residents now have Energy Allocations capped at \$250,000.

- Population caps were set based on an analysis of jurisdictions that applied for energy projects to the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. Approximately 75% of applicant jurisdictions have less than 25,000 residents, while 25% of applicant jurisdictions have more than 25,000 residents.

Jurisdictions are eligible to receive the lower of the requested allocation for the highest scored project or the capped amount.

The results of the \$25 million allocation are found in Attachment 5.

## **Launch of “Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program” and “Reserve for Critical Energy Projects” to Meet State’s Energy Resilience Needs**

Due to the overwhelming demand for this program and the availability of additional funding, the State is targeting an additional \$13 million in Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds to support the new “Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program” to fund additional local energy projects at critical facilities. This program is targeted exclusively at facilities that serve critical life safety (e.g., police departments, hospitals, water and wastewater facilities, and shelters) or life sustaining (e.g., communications equipment, transportation facilities) functions that scored between 50 and 75 points in the Energy Allocation Initiative process. Under the Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program, 197 jurisdictions are eligible to receive grants of up to \$75,000 (or the amount requested for the highest scored project, whichever is lesser) to support resilient energy technologies.

Consistent with the Energy Allocation Initiative, the new proposed Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program is not necessarily contemplated to fund complete projects – but to serve as seed money, allowing communities to pursue more meaningful energy projects, including distributed generation and microgrid projects, which may be eligible for additional funding through the New Jersey Energy Resilience Bank.<sup>1</sup> Alternatively, communities can use program funding toward the purchase of more traditional back-up generation technology. Projects funded both through the Energy Allocation Initiative and the new Lifeline / Life Safety Energy Resilience Program need to meet FEMA requirements, including a benefit-cost analysis.

The results of the \$13 million allocation are found in Attachment 6.

The State is also setting aside approximately \$1.3 million to ensure the goal of regional energy resilience for critical infrastructure is met by addressing any gaps.

---

<sup>1</sup>For more information on the New Jersey Energy Resilience Bank, please see the [State’s Action Plan Amendment No. 7](#), which addresses the State’s intended use for the second allocation of Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery funds.

## Attachment 1: Project Scoring Criteria

Criteria used for scoring are as follows:

1. **Municipality participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) (Points: 0=no, 20=yes).** This criterion was viewed as an indication of risk for the affected municipality. Once all applicants were scored, it was determined that all applicants received 20 points for this criterion. Only a few jurisdictions do not participate in NFIP and none of those jurisdictions submitted an energy LOI.
2. **The facility is identified as a State level Asset in the Office of Homeland Security & Preparedness State Asset Database (Points – 0=no or 20=yes).** The State Asset Database is a database of buildings or facilities that meet pre-established State or national asset criteria or meet other statewide emergency planning or homeland security objectives.
3. **Population density data for the applicant.** Population density data was drawn from publicly available US Census data (2010 U.S. Census). Scoring increments were assigned by using incremental ratios from the Census data. For example, point increments were scored for population density based on a range from zero to 57,020.<sup>2</sup>The median of the 0 – 57,020 data range was determined to be 28,510. From there, two tiers were calculated using the same median methodology for both the zero – 28,510 and 28,511 – 57,020 ranges. This median approach had the functional effect of prioritizing county or "regional" projects (instead of projects in individual communities), in line with the recommendations of the President's Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force.
4. **Population data for the applicant.** Population data was drawn from publicly available US Census data (2010 U.S. Census). Scoring increments were determined using the same procedures used for population density data. Points based on population density data were awarded in the following manner: 0 – 14,255 (0 points), 14,256 – 28,510 (5 points), 28,511 – 42,765 (10 points), and 42,766 – 57,020 (20 points).
5. **Millions of gallons per day (MGD) of flow (criteria unique to water and wastewater system projects).** Where the LOI was submitted for a project at a drinking water or wastewater treatment facility, this factor was used in place of the population density factor identified in item three above as population of the municipality where the facility is located generally significantly under represents the population affected by the facility. Scoring increments were determined using the same procedures used for population and population density above. Resulting scoring increments for wastewater facilities were as follows: 0.238-3.86 (0 points), 3.87-7.4 (5 points), 7.5-168.74 (10 points), and 168.75-330 (20 points). For drinking water facilities, scoring increments were as follows: 0-0.7495 (0 points), 0.7496–1.582 (5 points), 1.583–43.5094 (10 points), 43.5095–88.607 (20 points).
6. **Population Served (criteria unique to water and wastewater system projects).** As with item five above, where the LOI was submitted for a project at a drinking water or wastewater treatment facility, this factor was used in place of the population factor identified in item four above.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the 2010 Census, the most densely populated municipality in New Jersey (and likely the country) is Guttenberg at 57,020.4 persons per square mile; four Hudson County cities are in the top five nationally.

Scoring increments were as follows: 783-11,428 (0 points), 11,429-22,074 (5 points), 22,075-1,376,037 (10 points), 1,376,038-2,370,000 (20 points).

7. **Public facility criticality “tier” reflecting prioritization of those facilities that must remain operational during and immediately following a disaster, including facilities that perform life-saving or provide life-sustaining functions**
  - Tier 1 – Life Safety (20 points):** Correctional facilities, emergency medical services, emergency operations centers, fire stations, hospitals, municipal utilities, police departments, public safety answering points, public works departments, radio towers, shelters and water and wastewater facilities.
  - Tier 2 – Lifeline Sector (10 points):** Health departments, highway departments, public housing, stormwater pump stations, and traffic signals.
  - Tier 3 – All others (0 points):** Airports, animal shelters, community centers, group homes, municipal buildings, municipal garages, public transportation, schools and universities not otherwise identified as sheltering facilities.
  
8. **FEMA Public Assistance (PA) disbursements.** 15-year history of the applicant or jurisdiction entity/jurisdiction, as identified in FEMA and OEM datasets \$0-\$50,000 (0 points), \$50,000-\$500,000 (10 points), \$500,000-\$2,000,000 (20 points), \$2,000,001+ (40 points). These criteria captured data through August 21, 2013 for project worksheets in all categories and indicated risk to that jurisdiction.
  
9. **Participation in BPU’s Local Energy Audit program** (0 or 20 points) which indicated efficiency and forethought in energy resiliency.

## Attachment 2: Supporting Principles Employed by the Working Group to Inform Project Review During Quality Assurance / Quality Control Process

**NOTE:** Principles included below reflect those adopted in assessing energy projects by the cross-agency working group. Other Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs may incorporate differing or additional programmatic criteria.

### Facility Type/Tier

- In circumstances where a county applied for funding to support a municipal sheltering project, the *municipal* population, PA, NFIP and BPU data were used for scoring, in consideration of the direct population served;
- In circumstances where a county applied for funding to support a county shelterserving people throughout the county, the *county* population, PA, NFIP and BPU data were used for scoring;
- For a “City Hall, Borough Hall or Municipal Building” project that incorporates a police department, fire department and/or EOC within its structure, a Tier 1 classification was assigned;
- An “Emergency shelter” designation was only applied to facilities that are not used for housing as an ordinary course -
  - Relief/warming centers were not considered emergency shelters and were scored based on the facility/service provided,
  - Municipalities requesting generators for shelters held within private or non-profit facilities were scored as shelters,
  - Projects including homeless shelters and women’s shelters were categorized as “Public Housing,” and not as emergency shelters;
- Mobile generator requests for unspecified purposes (e.g., applicants seeking mobile generators to allow for flexibility of response) were scored as a Tier 3.

### Estimated Cost

- For applications containing multiple projects without itemized dollar amounts, the Estimated Cost for each project was determined by dividing the total amount requested by the total number of projects and that resultant value was applied to each project.
- Full cost share was used, not 75% cost share.
- Contingency costs were included when provided.

### FEMA PA/NFIP

- For applications identifying multiple projects, municipal FEMA PA and NFIP data points were used.

### Population

- For projects identified as serving multiple municipalities (e.g., dispatch service), the population of the facility location was used.

- In circumstances where a county applied for funding, county-level data was used, unless it could be determined that the project was intended to support a specific municipality.

#### **DEP**

- For projects involving sewage pump stations, the municipal population for the location was used for scoring(flow data is not used in such instances);
- For projects involving a generator to be used at both a water/wastewater utility and a pump station/well, the DEP Population served and MGD data was used;
- Projects requesting pumps were eligible only if that project included a request for a power source, such as a generator, and only the power source portion of the project was scored;
- Drinking water facilities were assigned an MGD based on 5 year maximum flow:0-0.7495 (0 points), 0.7496-1.582 (5 points), 1.583-43.5094 (10 points), 43.5095-88.602 (20 points).
- Wastewater facilities were assigned an MGD based on the permitted flow: 0.238–3.86 (0 points), 3.87–7.4 (5 points), 7.5–168.74 (10 points), and 168.75–330 (20 points).

#### **BPU**

- If a governmental entity within a municipality (e.g., school board or MUA) performed a Local Government Energy Audit (LGEA), then that municipality also received 20 points;
- County governments, county colleges or county vocational schools that performed a LGEA audit received 20 points.



## Attachment 3: HMGP Energy LOIs Quality Control Process

1. To provide reasonable assurance that all energy projects were reviewed and that data was accurately captured, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Office of Information Resources Management (OIRM) verified the accuracy of the translation from hard copy to electronic format of energy projects using three major steps as follows:

During data entry, the following manual checks were utilized:

- All data was entered with extreme caution employing data entry/data quality best practices;
- After entering each row, staff conducted a visual “double check” for quality and keying errors against the master list;
- If clarification on contents of the Master List was needed, OIRM used the following procedures:
  - Google to obtain clarification on text such as street spelling for project title, sewer plant names, etc., when the legibility was difficult.
  - OIRM keying tools for assistance (example used for correct county spellings. (Municipalities & County report)
  - OIRM entered data exactly as provided in the Master List even if spelling errors were included (e.g. misspelled township left as-is, but will be corrected upon data normalization when imported into final database). Any noted discrepancies, or questions were added to the comments field for further evaluation by the working group.
- Visually checked all rows / counts are in accordance with info from Master List.

During data entry, the following automated checks were utilized:

- Incorporated two separate automated numeric checksums in the data entry spreadsheet to verify and validate entered scoring data and to check against manually calculated total score entered on the Master List as follows:
  - Next to last column uses Excel SUM function to auto sum the total score from the individual scores entered into the cells for each row;
  - Last column uses Excel SUM function to calculate the difference between the calculated sum of the data entered scores and the total score hand written on the Master List. Any value in this column other than ‘0’ indicates that there is an error either:
    - In the data entry of the individual scores for that row. Data entry staff review entered data against Master List to verify accurate entry of the individual scores; or
    - In the manually calculated total score listed in the Master List. If the manually calculated total score is in error, this error is listed in the comments field for verification by the program area

Subsequent to data entry, the following check was utilized:

- Once data entry was completed, Data entry staff switched data sets and visually verified raw data against keyed data for data they did not key.

2. The cross agency working group consisting of subject matter experts from OHSP, OEM, BPU and DEP subsequently met to verify entries; review any additional questions noted by step one above; and cross-check the original spreadsheet with the information in the database.
3. Members of the cross agency working group, along with at least one other member from each agency that was not involved in any previous scoring, met to audit scoring of the LOIs as follows:
  - A random sample of 5% of the projects was selected from the total population. County sample population was weighted proportional to the respective county population.
  - The team conducted a blind scoring of the LOI (i.e. original score of the LOI was unknown to the team) and results of the scoring were recorded.
  - Members of the cross agency team not involved in the previous scoring reviewed each project within the sample and compared its score to the original score.
4. All verified data was translated into an Oracle database to enhance reporting functions, data storage and integrity. After transfer, the transferred data set were compared against the original excel data set by the cross agency team to ensure accuracy.

## **Attachment 4: List of Non-profits and For Profits Not Scored in Verification Process**

1. Atlanticare Regional Med Center – Atlantic
2. Baccarach Rehab Institute – Atlantic
3. Beth MedrashGovoha of America – Ocean
4. Catholic Charities of Newark – Hudson
5. Community Faith for House – Hudson
6. Georgian Court University – Ocean
7. Haven Supportive Living – Atlantic
8. JFK Medical Center – Middlesex
9. John Brooks Recovery Center – Atlantic
10. Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in Lyndhurst – Bergen
11. Monoc Hospital Service Corporation - Monmouth
12. Newark AIDS Broadway House – Essex
13. Palisades Medical Center – Hudson
14. Plainfield Health Center/Neighborhood Health Center - Union
15. Preakness Healthcare – Passaic
16. Reeves Reed Arboretum – Union
17. Robert Wood Johnson Hospital – Mercer
18. Robert Wood Johnson Hospital – Middlesex
19. Rockaway Assembly of God, 113 E Main St Rockaway NJ – Morris
20. Roxbury Water Company – Morris
21. Seton Hall University – Essex
22. South Shore Village Housing – Hudson
23. Spectrum for Living Group Homes Inc. (11 group homes) – Bergen
24. St. Josephs Wayne Hospital – Passaic
25. St. Lukes Warren Hospital – Warren
26. Stevens Institute – Hudson
27. Stonecrest Community Church – Somerset
28. The ARC of Union County – Union
29. Trinitas Regional Medical Center – Union
30. Wayne PAL – Passaic

## Attachment 5: Energy Allocation Grant Program Awardees

Applicant Name	Recommended Allocation
ASBURY PARK	\$100,000
BERGEN COMM COLLEGE	\$250,000
BERGEN COUNTY	\$250,000
BERGEN COUNTY TECH	\$62,000
BERGEN COUNTY UTILITIES AUTH	\$250,000
BERKELEY	\$215,400
BERKELEY HEIGHTS	\$100,000
BERKELEY TOWNSHIP SEWAGE AUTH	\$100,000
BLOOMFIELD	\$120,000
BORO OF BELMAR	\$100,000
BORO OF CARTARET	\$100,000
BORO OF CLOSTER	\$90,000
BORO OF CRESKILL	\$100,000
BORO OF FAIRLAWN	\$250,000
BORO OF HAWTHORNE	\$100,000
BORO OF MANASQUAN	\$25,000
BORO OF OCEANPORT	\$100,000
BORO OF RIVER EDGE	\$50,000
BOROUGH OF AVALON	\$100,000
BOROUGH OF SEASIDE HEIGHTS	\$100,000
BRANCBURG TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
BRICK MUA	\$250,000
BRICK TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
BURLINGTON COUNTY	\$250,000
CAPE MAY CITY	\$100,000
CHATHAM TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
CITY OF ATLANTIC CITY	\$250,000
CITY OF BRIGANTINE	\$100,000
CITY OF CLIFTON	\$250,000
CITY OF LONG BRANCH HOUSING AUTH	\$250,000
CITY OF MARGATE	\$100,000
CITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK	\$250,000
CITY OF PASSAIC	\$250,000
CITY OF PLEASANTVILLE	\$100,000
CITY OF RAHWAY	\$250,000
CITY OF RAHWAY (HOUSING AUTH)	\$20,000
CITY OF VINELAND	\$25,000
COUNTY OF HUDSON	\$250,000

COUNTY OF HUNTERDON	\$250,000
CRANFORD	\$100,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	\$250,000
DENVILLE TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
EAST WINDSOR	\$96,875
E BRUNSWICK	\$250,000
ELIZABETH	\$250,000
ESSEX COUNTY	\$250,000
FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP	\$115,000
FREEHOLD TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
GALLOWAY TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
GLENRIDGE	\$45,500
HANOVER SEWER AUTHORITY	\$100,000
HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP	\$120,000
HILLSDALE	\$60,000
HOBOKEN	\$250,000
HOWELL	\$188,000
HUDSON COUNTY ROADS & PUBLIC PROP	\$250,000
IRVINGTON	\$250,000
JACKSON MUA	\$70,845
JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
JERSEY CITY	\$250,000
JERSEY CITY MUA	\$250,000
KEARNY	\$250,000
KEARNY MUA	\$250,000
LACEY MUA	\$250,000
LACEY TOWNSHIP BOE	\$250,000
LANDIS SEWER AUTHORITY	\$60,000
LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
LITTLE EGG HARBOR MUA	\$100,000
LIVINGSTON	\$222,000
LODI	\$100,000
MANTOLOKING BORO	\$100,000
MARLBORO	\$250,000
MENDHAM TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
MERCER COUNTY	\$250,000
MIDDLESEX COUNTY	\$250,000
MIDDLESEX VOC/TECH SCHOOLS	\$250,000
MIDDLETOWN SEWAGE AUTH	\$250,000
MIDDLE TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
MILLBURN	\$100,000
MILLSTONE TOWNSHIP	\$57,500

MONMOUTH COUNTY	\$250,000
MONROE TOWNSHIP	\$250,000
MONTVALE	\$100,000
MORRIS COUNTY	\$250,000
N BERGEN	\$250,000
N BRUNSWICK	\$250,000
NEPTUNE TWNSHP	\$85,000
NEWARK	\$250,000
NEW PROVIDENCE	\$100,000
NORTH HUDSON MUA	\$250,000
OCEAN CITY BOE	\$57,122
OCEAN COUNTY	\$250,000
OCEAN COUNTY UTILITIES AUTH	\$250,000
OCEAN TWNSHP	\$121,397
OLD BRIDGE	\$250,000
OLD BRIDGE BOE	\$250,000
OLD BRIDGE MUA	\$250,000
ORANGE	\$200,000
PARSIPPANY/TROY HILLS	\$250,000
PASSAIC COUNTY	\$135,000
PEQUANNOCK	\$100,000
PEQUANNOCK LINCOLN PARK FAIRFIELD SEWAGE AUTH	\$250,000
PERTH AMBOY	\$250,000
PERTH AMBOY HOUSING AUTHORITY	\$250,000
PLAINFIELD	\$250,000
RAHWAY VALLEY SEWAGE AUTH	\$225,000
READINGTON TWNSHP	\$100,000
RED BANK	\$100,000
ROCHELLE PARK	\$34,000
ROCKAWAY TWNSHP	\$100,000
RUMSON BORO	\$100,000
S BRUNSWICK TWNSHP	\$43,500
SCOTCH PLAINS	\$100,000
SECAUCUS	\$100,000
SECAUCUS MUA	\$100,000
SE MORRIS COUNTY MUA	\$250,000
SOMERSET COUNTY PARK COMM	\$16,667
SOUTH RIVER	\$100,000
S PLAINFIELD	\$100,000
SPRINGFIELD	\$100,000
STONYBROOK REG SEWER AUTH	\$250,000
SUMMIT	\$100,000
SUSSEX COUNTY	\$210,000

TENAFLY	\$100,000
UNION CITY	\$250,000
UNION COUNTY	\$250,000
UPPER TOWNSHIP	\$100,000
VERONA	\$100,000
WALL TWNSHP	\$250,000
WARREN COUNTY	\$250,000
WARREN TWNSHP	\$73,349
WATCHUNG	\$100,000
WAYNE TWNSHP SCHOOLS	\$250,000
WESTWOOD BORO	\$100,000
WILLINGBORO MUA	\$250,000
WOODBIDGE	\$250,000
WOODBIDGE (COLONIA) AVENEL	\$23,625
WOODCLIFF LAKE	\$100,000
W ORANGE	\$250,000

## Attachment 6: Lifeline Life Safety Program Awardees

Applicant Name	Recommended Allocation
ALEXANDRIA TWNSHP	\$15,000
ALLOWAY TOWNSHIP	\$53,000
ANDOVER TWNSHP	\$75,000
ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS	\$46,500
BAYONNE	\$75,000
BAYONNE HOUSING AUTH	\$75,000
BAYONNE MUA	\$75,000
BELLEVILLE	\$75,000
BERNARDSVILLE	\$75,000
BLAIRSTOWN	\$75,000
BOONTON	\$60,000
BORO OF ALLENTOWN	\$75,000
BORO OF BLOOMINGDALE	\$75,000
BORO OF CAPE MAY PT	\$75,000
BORO OF CARLSTADT	\$75,000
BORO OF DUMONT	\$75,000
BORO OF EDGEWATER	\$75,000
BORO OF EMERSON	\$75,000
BORO OF FAIR HAVEN	\$20,200
BORO OF FAIRVIEW	\$75,000
BORO OF HALEDON	\$75,000
BORO OF HIGHBRIDGE	\$75,000
BORO OF HIGHLANDS HOUSING AUTH	\$75,000
BORO OF KEANSBURG	\$75,000
BORO OF LAKE COMO	\$75,000
BORO OF LINCOLN PARK	\$50,000
BORO OF MATAWAN	\$75,000
BORO OF MENDHAM	\$65,900
BORO OF METUCHEN	\$65,960
BORO OF MOUNTAINSIDE	\$75,000
BORO OF PALMYRA	\$75,000
BORO OF RIDGEFIELD	\$75,000
BORO OF RINGWOOD	\$75,000
BORO OF ROCKY HILL	\$75,000
BORO OF SURF CITY	\$75,000
BORO OF WANAQUE	\$69,999
BORO OF WANAQUE BOE	\$75,000



BORO OF WASHINGTON	\$75,000
BORO OF W CAPE MAY	\$75,000
BORO OF W WILDWOOD	\$75,000
BORO PEAPACK/GLADSTONE	\$75,000
BOROUGH OF KEYPORT	\$75,000
BOROUGH OF TUCKERTON	\$75,000
BURLINGTON TWNSHP	\$75,000
CALDWELL	\$75,000
CEDAR GROVE	\$75,000
CHESTER TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
CITY OF ABSECON	\$75,000
CITY OF EGG HARBOR	\$75,000
CITY OF ENGLEWOOD	\$75,000
CITY OF LAMBERTVILLE	\$47,404
CITY OF LINWOOD	\$75,000
CITY OF NORTHFIELD	\$70,000
CLARK TWNSHP	\$75,000
CLIFFSIDE PARK	\$75,000
DELAWARE TWNSHP	\$75,000
DOVER TWNSHIP	\$75,000
EAGLEWOOD TWNSHP	\$75,000
EGG HARBOR TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
EGG HARBOR TWNSHIP MUA	\$75,000
E HANOVER TWNSHP	\$75,000
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS	\$75,000
ENGLISHTOWN BORO	\$75,000
E ORANGE	\$75,000
E RUTHERFORD	\$75,000
ESSEX FELLS	\$75,000
ESTELL MANOR CITY	\$36,000
FAIRFIELD	\$75,000
FAIRFIELD TWNSHIP	\$75,000
FAIRLAWN BOE	\$18,000
FANWOOD	\$75,000
FAR HILLS	\$45,140
FLEMINGTON BORO	\$75,000
FORT LEE	\$75,000
FRANKFORD TWNSHP	\$10,000
FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
FREEHOLD BORO	\$75,000
FRENCHTOWN BORO	\$50,000
GARFIELD	\$75,000
GREENBROOK TWNSHP	\$28,000

GREENE TWNSHP	\$75,000
GREENWICH TWNSHP	\$35,000
GUTTENBURG	\$75,000
HACKENSACK	\$75,000
HACKETTSTOWN	\$75,000
HACKETTSTOWN BOE	\$75,000
HAMPTON TWNSHP/NEWTON	\$75,000
HANOVER TOWNSHP	\$75,000
HARDYSTON TWNSHP	\$75,000
HARRINGTON PARK	\$75,000
HARVEY CEDARS	\$75,000
HASBROUCK HEIGHTS	\$45,000
HAWORTH	\$75,000
HAZLET TWNSHP	\$75,000
HIGHLAND PARK	\$75,000
HILLSIDE TWNSHP	\$75,000
HOLLAND TWNSHP	\$75,000
HOPATCONG BORO	\$75,000
HOPE TOWNSHIP	\$29,167
KEANSBURG BORO HOUSING AUTH	\$75,000
KENILWORTH BORO	\$69,000
LAKEHURST BORO	\$75,000
LAMBERTVILLE MUA	\$75,000
LAMBERTVILLE/NEW HOPE	\$75,000
LAWRENCE TWNSHIP	\$60,000
LEBANON TWNSHP	\$75,000
LEONIA	\$60,000
LIBERTY TWNSHP/HACKETTSTOWN	\$75,000
LINDEN	\$75,000
LINDEN HOUSING AUTHORITY	\$75,000
LITTLE FALLS TWNSHP	\$75,000
LITTLE FERRY	\$75,000
LONG VALLEY	\$15,000
LOWER TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
LYNDHURST	\$68,470
MAHWAH	\$75,000
MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
MANSFIELD TWNSHP	\$70,450
MANVILLE	\$75,000
MAPLEWOOD	\$75,000
MAYWOOD	\$75,000
MIDLAND PARK	\$40,000
MIDLAND PARK BOE	\$60,000

MONTCLAIR	\$75,000
MONTGOMERY TWNSHP	\$75,000
MOONACHIE	\$75,000
MORRIS PLAINS	\$75,000
MORRISTOWN	\$75,000
MORRIS TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
MOUNT OLIVE	\$75,000
MT ARLINGTON BORO	\$75,000
MULLICA TWSP	\$75,000
N ARLINGTON	\$75,000
NEPTUNE CITY	\$75,000
NORTH CALDWELL	\$75,000
NORTHERN VALLEY HS-DEMAREST	\$75,000
NORTHVALE	\$60,000
NORWOOD	\$75,000
N PLAINFIELD	\$75,000
NUTLEY	\$75,000
OAKLAND	\$75,000
OLD TAPPAN	\$75,000
PARAMUS	\$75,000
PENNINGTON BORO	\$75,000
PHILLIPSBURG	\$75,000
PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP	\$75,000
POINT PLEASANT BOE	\$75,000
POMPTON LAKES	\$75,000
PRINCETON	\$75,000
PT PLEASANT BOROUGH	\$75,000
RAMSEY	\$75,000
RIDGEWOOD	\$75,000
RIVERDALE BORO	\$75,000
ROCKAWAY BOROUGH	\$75,000
ROSELAND	\$15,500
ROSELLE	\$75,000
ROSELLE PARK	\$75,000
ROXBURY TOWNSHIP	\$50,000
SADDLE BROOK	\$75,000
SADDLE RIVER	\$75,000
SANDYSTON	\$26,000
SAYREVILLE	\$75,000
SEA GIRT	\$45,000
SEA ISLE CITY	\$75,000
SEASIDE PARK	\$75,000
SOMERDALE	\$75,000

<b>SOUTH AMBOY</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>SOUTH ORANGE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>STAFFORD TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>STONE HARBOR</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TOTOWA</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TOWN OF BELVIDERE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TOWN OF CLINTON</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TRENTON</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TWNSHP OF BYRAM</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>
<b>TWNSHP OF DENNIS</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>TWNSHP OF KINGWOOD</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>UNION TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>UPPER SADDLE RIVER</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>UPPER SADDLE RIVER BOE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>VILLAGE OF RIDGEFIELD PARK</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WALLINGTON</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WANTAGE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WASHINGTON TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>W CALDWELL</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WEEHAWKEN</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WEST AMWELL</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>
<b>WESTFIELD</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WHITE TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>
<b>WILDWOOD CREST</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WINSLOW TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WOODBINE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WOODRIDGE</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>W WINDSOR TWNSHP</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>
<b>WYCKOFF</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>