

Table of Contents

Section Update, Review, and Analysis A.2
Assessment and Revision of 2010 Mitigation Goals & Objectives A.10
Assessment and Revision of 2007 Policies..... A.13

Section Update, Review, and Analysis

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|--|------------------------|--|---|
| PREREQUISITE | | | |
| <i>Adoption by the State</i> | | | |
| 2.4 | 1.1 | A. Has the state formally adopted the new or updated plan? | The State of Florida shall include a letter of approval from the Director of DEM. |
| 2.3 | 1.2 | B. Does the plan provide assurances that the state will continue to comply with all applicable federal statutes and regulations during the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c), and will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in state or federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d)? | The SHMPAT reviewed the assurances included in the 2010 plan and concluded it should remain the same but moved the piece to fit the revised organization. |
| PLANNING PROCESS | | | |
| <i>Documentation of the Planning Process</i> | | | |
| 2.1 | 2.1 | A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of how the new or updated plan was prepared? | The 2010 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2013 update process. |
| 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | B. Does the new or updated plan indicate who was involved in the current planning process? | The 2010 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2013 update process. |
| 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | C. Does the new or updated plan indicate how other agencies participated in the current planning process? | The 2010 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2013 update process. |
| 2.1 Appendix A All Plan Sections | 2.1 Appendix A | D. Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan? | This table was used again to discuss how each section was reviewed, analyzed, and revised if necessary. This table highlights if information/elements were incorporated into a different section. |
| Appendix A | Appendix A | E. Does the updated plan indicate for each section whether or not it was revised as part of the update process? | Yes, it is included in this table. |
| <i>Coordination Among Agencies</i> | | | |
| 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | A. Does the new or updated plan describe how federal and state agencies were involved in the current planning process? | The process and extent of agency participation in the 2013 planning process is detailed in Section 2 and Appendix B |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | 2.1, 2.2 Appendix B | B. Does the new or updated plan describe how interested groups (e.g., businesses, non-profit organizations, and other interested parties) were involved in the current planning process? | The process and extent of stakeholder participation in the 2013 planning process is detailed in Section 2 and Appendix B |
| 2.2 | 2.2 | C. Does the updated plan discuss how coordination among federal and state agencies changed since approval of the previous plan? | After careful review the SHMPAT determined and explained that federal/state coordination has been constant over the years. |
| <i>Program Integration</i> | | | |
| 4.5 | 2.3 | A. Does the new or updated plan describe how the state mitigation planning process is integrated with other ongoing state planning efforts? | The SHMPAT reviewed plan integration in the 2010 plan and determined the process was similar during the 3-year planning period; plan integration was moved from the planning process to Section 4: Goals and Capabilities. |
| 4.5, 5.1 | 2.3 | B. Does the new or updated plan describe how the state mitigation planning process is integrated with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives? | The SHMPAT reviewed federal/state planning integration in the 2010 plan and determined the process was similar; integration efforts are now located in different parts of the plan for better organization. Integration with federal funding programs is discussed in Section 5 and planning efforts are in Section 4. |
| RISK ASSESSMENT | | | |
| <i>Identifying Hazards</i> | | | |
| 3.1 | 3.1 | A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the type of all natural hazards that can affect the state? | The data in Section 3 was updated utilizing the most current 2012 data. The Risk Assessment Sub-group reviewed and approved the list of included hazards. |
| <i>Profiling Hazard Events</i> | | | |
| 3.3 | 3.2 | A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazards addressed in the new or updated plan? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 3.3 | 3.2 | B. Does the new or updated plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan? | This section covers the previous occurrences of each hazard. The risk assessment lists major occurrences going back 10 years and any significant ones past that time frame. |

| 2013 Section | 2010 Section | Crosswalk Element | Update Review and Analysis |
|---|---------------------|---|--|
| 3.3 Appendix D | 3.2 | C. Does the new or updated plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. Data from the previous summary table was moved into separate pages in Appendix D for easier reading. |
| <i>Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction</i> | | | |
| 3.3 Appendix C | 3.2 | A. Does the new or updated plan describe the state's vulnerability based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the state risk assessment? | The SHMPAT elected to combine sections so that all hazard specific information is in one place. The majority of large tables were pulled and placed in Appendix C to enhance readability. This section was updated with the most current data available. |
| 3.3 Appendix C | 3.2 | B. Does the new or updated plan describe the state's vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event(s)? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 3.2, 3.3 | 3.2 | C. Does the updated plan explain the process used to analyze the information from the local risk assessments, as necessary? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 3.2, 3.3 | 3.2 | D. Does the updated plan reflect changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| <i>Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities</i> | | | |
| 3.3 Appendix C | 3.3 | A. Does the new or updated plan describe the types of state owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas? | Many of the tables containing this analysis were moved to Appendix C. This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| <i>Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction</i> | | | |
| 3.2, 3.3 Appendix C | 3.4 | A. Does the new or updated plan present an overview and analysis of the potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 3.2, 3.3 Appendix C | 3.4 | B. Are the potential losses based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the state risk assessment? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available |
| 3.2, 3.3 Appendix C | 3.4 | C. Does the updated plan reflect the effects of changes in development on loss estimates? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|--|---------------------|---|--|
| <i>Estimating Potential Losses State Facilities</i> | | | |
| 3.2, 3.3 Appendix C | 3.6 | A. Does the new or updated plan present an estimate of the potential dollar losses to state owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the identified hazard areas? | Many of the tables containing this analysis were moved to Appendix C. This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| MITIGATION STRATEGY | | | |
| <i>Hazard Mitigation Goals</i> | | | |
| 4.1 | 4.1 | A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of state mitigation goals that guide the selection of mitigation activities? | Goals and objectives are described in section 4.1 |
| 4.1 Appendix A | 4.1 Appendix A | B. Does the updated plan demonstrate that the goals were assessed and either remain valid or have been revised? | A complete explanation of the revisions with the goals and objectives can be found in Appendix A and a basic description is provided in Section 4.1. |
| <i>State Capability Assessment</i> | | | |
| 4.2, 5.1 Appendix A Appendix G | 4.2 | A. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the state's pre-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 4.2, 5.1 Appendix A Appendix G | 4.2 | B. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the state's post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 4.2, 5.1 Appendix A Appendix G | 4.2 | C. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the state's policies related to development in hazard prone areas ? | Policies have been updated for clarity and to reflect existing conditions. A list of changes can be found in Appendix A. This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 5.1, 5.2 | 4.5 | D. Does the new or updated plan include a discussion of state funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects? | The enhanced and standard elements have been combined. As such, funding capabilities have been moved to Section 5.1. Each funding source has been evaluated. Management of these funds is also discussed in Section 5.2. |
| 4.2, 5.2 | 4.2, 4.4, 4.5 | E. Does the updated plan address any hazard management capabilities of the state that have changed since approval of the previous plan? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|---|---------------------|---|--|
| <i>Local Capability Assessment</i> | | | |
| 4.3, 4.5 | 4.3 | A. Does the new or updated plan present a general description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 4.3.1 | 4.3 | B. Does the new or updated plan provide a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| <i>Mitigation Actions</i> | | | |
| Appendix N | Appendix D | A. Does the new or updated plan identify cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions and activities the state is considering? | To further inter-agency as well as public-private cooperation, mitigation actions have been expanded to include the activities of non-profits and individual agencies. This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| Appendix N | Appendix D | B. Does the new or updated plan evaluate these actions and activities? | Every mitigation activity is evaluated as it relates to our goals and the hazards it is intended to address. |
| 5.1, 5.2 Appendix N | Appendix D | C. Does the new or updated plan prioritize these actions and activities? | Local mitigation activities are prioritized at the local level. Each agency prioritizes its own projects and is explained in Sections 5.1-5.2. This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| Appendix N | Appendix D | D. Does the new or updated plan explain how each activity contributes to the overall state mitigation strategy? | Every mitigation activity is analyzed to determine how it contributed to the strategy by getting paired with a SHMP goal. |
| 5.1 Appendix N | Appendix D | E. Does the mitigation strategy in the new or updated section reflect actions and projects identified in local plans? | Funding prioritization identifies the procedures for how the state handles local actions and projects. This process was reviewed and it was determined that no changes were necessary. |
| <i>Funding Sources</i> | | | |
| 5.1 | 4.5 | B. Does the new or updated plan identify current sources of federal, state, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| 5.1 | 4.5 | C. Does the new or updated plan identify potential sources of federal, state, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|--|---------------------|--|---|
| 5.1 Appendix N | 4.5 Appendix D | D. Does the updated plan identify the sources of mitigation funding used to implement activities in the mitigation strategy since approval of the previous plan? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |
| COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING | | | |
| <i>Local Funding and Technical Assistance</i> | | | |
| 4.3, 4.5 | 5.1, 4.4, 4.5 | A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the state process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans? | The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed the funding and technical assistance presented in the 2010 plan. Elements that were no longer relevant were removed and current items were added or updated. |
| 4.3, 4.5 | 5.1, 4.2, 4.5 | B. Does the updated plan describe the funding and technical assistance the state has provided in the past three years to assist local jurisdictions in completing approvable mitigation plans? | The SHMPAT included recent methods of assistance that the state has provided to local jurisdictions, including workshops, conference calls, and interns. |
| <i>Local Plan Integration</i> | | | |
| 4.4 | 5.2 | A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the state established to review local plans? | The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed the process and timeframe the state uses to review local plans and found that it was sufficient. No changes were made but the location did change. |
| 3.1, 4.3 | 5.2 | B. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the state established to coordinate and link local plans to the state mitigation plan? | The process used for the 2013 update has been explained. |
| <i>Prioritizing Local Assistance</i> | | | |
| 5.0, 5.1 | 5.3 | A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the criteria for prioritizing those communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available mitigation funding programs? | The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed the criteria for prioritization of local jurisdictions and communities and found that the process and criteria are still current. |
| 5.1, 5.2 | 5.3 | B. For the new or updated plan, do the prioritization criteria include, for non-planning grants, the consideration of the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of proposed projects and their associated cost? | This section was updated with the most current 2012 data available. |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| 5.1 | 5.3 | C. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the highest risk? | SHMPAT reviewed this section and determined it was sufficient. |
| 5.1 | 5.3 | D. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties? | SHMPAT reviewed this section and determined it was sufficient. |
| 5.1 | 5.3 | E. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures? | SHMPAT reviewed this section and determined it was sufficient. |
| PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS | | | |
| <i>Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan</i> | | | |
| 7.0 | 6.1 | A. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for monitoring , includes schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and/or meetings) | This section was revised based on recommendations from the DEM Mitigation Planning Unit and was approved by the SHMPAT. |
| 7.2 | 6.1 | B. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for evaluating the plan, includes the criteria used to evaluate the plan) | Florida DEM continues to be the lead agency for the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan. |
| 7.2 | 6.1 | C. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan? | This section was revised based on recommendations from the DEM Mitigation Planning Unit and was approved by the SHMPAT. |
| 7.0 | 6.1 | D. Does the updated plan include an analysis of whether the previously approved plan's method and schedule worked, and what elements or processes, if any, were changed? | The revisions are discussed throughout Section 7. |
| <i>Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities</i> | | | |
| 5.2 | 4.4 | A. Does the new or updated plan describe how mitigation measures and project closeouts will be monitored? | The SHMPAT reviewed the process as outlined in the 2010 Enhanced Plan and determined that only minor adjustments were necessary. |

| <i>2013 Section</i> | <i>2010 Section</i> | <i>Crosswalk Element</i> | <i>Update Review and Analysis</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| 7.1 | 4.1 | B. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the mitigation strategy? | SITE remains the process for monitoring progress on goals. |
| 7.1,7.3 | 4.4 | C. Does the updated plan describe any modifications, if any, to the system identified in the previously approved plan to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigation activities? | The revisions are discussed throughout Section 7. |
| 7.1 | 6.1, 4.4 | D. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on implementing activities and projects of the mitigation strategy? | The SHMPAT reviewed the process as outlined in the 2010 plan and determined the process to be acceptable. |
| 4.0, 5.0 Appendix A Appendix N | 4.4 Appendix A | E. Does the updated plan discuss if mitigation actions were implemented as planned? | The 2010 plan was updated to account for the implementation of projects since the last plan approval. |

Assessment and Revision of 2010 Mitigation Goals & Objectives

The goals from the 2010 State Hazard Mitigation Plan (SHMP) were reviewed and revised by the strategy sub-group. The group decided that the seven mitigation goals listed in the 2010 plan could be simplified and combined into four Goals. Specifically, the group felt that many of the goals from the 2010 plan could be accomplished as objectives under other goals. Goal 4 from the 2010 plan (Reduce Florida's hazard vulnerability through the application of scientific research and development) became objective 3.5 and goal 6 (Reduce vulnerability of state-owned facilities and infrastructure to natural hazards) became objective 4.5. Goal 7 (Foster interagency relationships for hazard mitigation across the state) was eliminated because it was determined that the objectives under goal 7 could be accomplished under other goals. Therefore, the strategy sub-group decided upon a total of 4 broad goals which captured the essence of the goals from the 2010 plan.

The objectives from the 2010 SHMP were also reviewed and revised by the strategy sub-group. Most of the objectives remain the same as in the 2010 plan and a few were placed under different goals after the goals were restructured. Some objectives were also reworded in order to make them easier to understand. Other objectives were deleted because they had been accomplished, such as the former objective 4.3: "Monitor climate change and sea level rise research; create a compendium of existing studies and data." For the work completed in regards to sea level rise, please see [Appendix K: Sea Level Rise Compendium](#). Other objectives were deleted because the group deemed that they were more appropriate as specific tasks that would fall under an objective. A few new objectives were also added, specifically in regard to incorporating climate change into mitigation efforts. The changes were ultimately reviewed and approved by the State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team (SHMPAT).

The following list represents the newly revised goals and objectives for the 2013 plan and beyond. Further clarification of changes made from the 2010 plan can be found below each goal and list of objectives.

- **Goal 1: Implement an effective comprehensive statewide hazard mitigation plan.**
 - Objective 1.1: Provide training opportunities and encourage staff to pursue professional development.
 - Objective 1.2: Pursue methodologies that will enhance mitigation successes.
 - Objective 1.3: Integrate mitigation practices throughout all state plans, programs, and policies.

Changes from 2010 plan: The goal and objectives remain the same as in the 2010 plan, with the exception of some minor wording changes.

- **Goal 2: Support local and regional mitigation strategies.**
 - Objective 2.1: Maintain up-to-date risk assessment information in coordination with local communities.

- Objective 2.2: Assist in integrating hazard mitigation concepts into other local and regional planning efforts such as comprehensive plans, local mitigation strategies, and comprehensive emergency management plans.
- Objective 2.3: Ensure that all communities are aware of available mitigation funding sources and cycles.
- Objective 2.4: Assist in the integration of climate change and sea level rise research into state, local and regional planning efforts.
- Objective 2.5: Conduct all possible actions to mitigate severe repetitive loss properties.

Changes from 2010 plan: The 2010 goal was shortened from “support the implementation of effective local and regional hazard mitigation practices” to “support local and regional mitigation strategies,” which was formerly “objective 2.2: Enhance local and regional mitigation strategies.” Objective 2.3 was added to incorporate integrating sea level rise research into local plans. From objective 2.5, the explanations on specific outreach tasks were removed because they are covered in greater detail in **Section 6: Severe Repetitive Loss Outreach Strategy** and are considered projects, not objectives.

- **Goal 3: Increase public and private sector awareness and support for hazard mitigation in Florida.**
 - Objective 3.1: Work with other state and regional entities to incorporate mitigation concepts and information into their outreach efforts.
 - Objective 3.2: Educate Florida's private sector about mitigation concepts and opportunities.
 - Objective 3.3: Develop and integrate hazard mitigation curriculum into higher education.
 - Objective 3.4: Educate state risk management entities on mitigation incentives.
 - Objective 3.5: Support hazard mitigation research and development.

Changes from 2010 plan: Goal 4 was deleted (Reduce Florida’s hazard vulnerability through the application of scientific research and development) because SHMPAT felt the objectives under goal 4 could be captured under the new goal 3. Old objective 4.1 (Continue to support Florida’s public and private research institutes in their efforts to assess, understand, develop, apply, and educate about successful mitigation practices, policies and programs) became new objective 3.4: Educate state risk management entities on mitigation incentives. Objective 3.1 from the 2010 plan (Use all available resources to increase awareness of mitigation) was deleted because it was determined that it was too broad. Objectives 3.2-3.4 from the 2010 plan were simplified and became objectives 3.1-3.3.

- **Goal 4: Support mitigation initiatives and policies that protect the state’s cultural, economic, and natural resources.**
 - Objective 4.1: Support land acquisition programs that reduce or eliminate potential future losses due to natural hazards and that are compatible with the protection of natural or cultural resources.
 - Objective 4.2: Support restoration and conservation of natural resources wherever possible.

- Objective 4.3 Seek mitigation opportunities that reduce economic losses and promote responsible economic growth.
- Objective 4.4: Retrofit existing state-owned facilities.
- Objective 4.5: Participate in climate change and sea level rise research that will further the state and local government's ability to plan for and mitigate the impacts of future vulnerability.
- Objective 4.6: Coordinate effective partnerships between state agencies for floodplain management.

Changes from 2010 plan: The 2010 goal 5, "Protect the state's cultural, economic and natural resources," became goal 4. Objectives 4.1-4.3 remain the same as the 2010 objectives 5.1-5.3. The 2010 goal 6, "Reduce vulnerability of state-owned facilities and infrastructure to hazards" became objective 4.4. Objective 4.5 was added as an attempt to begin to focus more on sea level rise. The 2010 objective 7.2 became objective 4.6.

During the update process, a fifth goal was briefly added which read, "Support mitigation initiatives and policies that reduce the impacts of hazards on Florida's population." This goal was approved by the SHMPAT, but was ultimately removed because it was determined that any objectives could be accomplished under other goals. The changes were then discussed at length by the SHMPAT and were ultimately approved.

Assessment and Revision of 2010 Policies

For the 2013 SHMP update, the SHMPAT reviewed the list of policies that had been updated in 2010. The review process followed the same process identified in 2010 and involved the following steps:

1. Conduct an inventory of new and updated legislation 2010 – 2013.
2. Review the 2010 list of policies to determine whether any changes were necessary based on the findings.
3. Review the 2010 list of policies and identify opportunities to streamline policies into singular objectives.
4. Review the 2010 list of policies and identify opportunities to eliminate redundancies or enhance the scopes of policies.

The review team determined that all new and updated legislation still fell within the scope of the policies updated in 2010 and that no changes were necessary based on steps three and four identified above. As a result, all policies from the 2010 plan have been integrated into the comprehensive list of policies used in **Section 4.2 Agency Capability Assessment**. Below you will find the list. It additionally provides reference to legislation and rules the policies were drawn from. These references have been updated to include any new or updated legislation since 2010.

Encourage land acquisition strategies to avoid future development in coastal areas, wetlands, floodplains and timberlands

Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Section 163.3168, FS; Section 163.3178, F.S.; Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 380 Part II, FS; Ch. 2011-139, Laws of Florida (LOF);

Manage natural resources to reduce impacts of natural and manmade disasters

Ch. 161, FS; Section 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 590, FS; Rule 62B-33, FAC; Ch. 2011-206, LOF

Seek to maintain natural vegetation in flood zones and high hazard areas for flood storage, water quality, and erosion control

373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 2012-187, LOF

Enhance local government capacity to mitigate hazards

Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 163, FS; Section 163.3168, FS; Section 215.555, FS; Section 215.5586, FS; Section 215.5588, FS; Section 215.559, FS; Section 252.35, FS; Section 252.38, FS; Section 252.44, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC; Rule 27P-6, FAC; Rule 61G20, FAC; Ch. 2012-65, LOF; Ch. 2012-126, LOF; Ch. 2011-196, LOF; Ch. 2011-110, LOF; Ch. 2010-176, LOF; Ch. 2010-139, LOF

Encourage post-disaster redevelopment

Ch. 163, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Section 136.3168, FS; Section 163.3178; Ch. 252 FS; Section 215.5586, FS; Section 215.5588, FS; Section 215.559, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC

Prevent unwise expenditures that hinder mitigation efforts

Rule 61G20, FAC; Ch. 161, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC; Ch. 2011-196, LOF

Pursue mitigation as an ongoing, evolving, research dependent activity

Rule 61G20, FAC; Section 252.44, FS; Section 14.0216, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Section 215.555, FS; Section 215.5586, FS; Section 215.5588, FS; Section 215.559, FS; Ch. 252, FS; Section 373.036, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 590, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC

Pursue interagency cooperation as an important means to mitigate hazards

Section 14.0216, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 252, FS; Section 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Rule 61G20, FAC; Rule 27P-22, FAC

Encourage/require special siting, setback, and design criteria for construction related activities within high hazard areas

Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 163, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Rule 61G20, FAC; Rule 62B-33, FAC

Use design and site criteria as a general means to mitigate hazards

Rule 61G20, FAC; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Section 163.3202, FS

Support and fund beach erosion control activities

Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 373, FS; Section 163.3178, FS; Rule 62B-33, FAC; Ch. 2012-65, LOF; Ch. 2011-110, LOF

Ensure that local comp plans contain hazard mitigation components such as directing development away from high hazard areas, designating appropriate land uses in vulnerable areas, and post-disaster redevelopment planning

Ch. 163, FS; Ch. 380, FS

Promote vertical consistency within all levels of government

Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 252, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC; Rule 27P-6, FAC; Rule 61G20, FAC; Ch. 2010-205, LOF

Guide growth as an important means to mitigate hazards

Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 163, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Ch. 2011-139, LOF; Ch. 2010-176, LOF

Promote funding sources and implementation strategies for mitigation

Section 215.555, FS; Section 215.5586, FS; Section 215.5588, FS; Section 215.559, FS; Section 252.38, FS; Section 252.44, FS; Section 553.844, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Rule 27P-22, FAC; Rule 61G20, FAC; Ch. 2012-65, LOF; Ch. 2012-187, LOF; Ch. 2012-174, LOF; Ch. 2012-126, LOF; Ch. 2011-142, LOF; Ch. 2011-196, LOF; Ch. 2011-110, LOF; Ch. 2010-176, LOF; Ch. 2010-139, LOF;

Promote regional or basin-wide stormwater management and flood protection infrastructure to mitigate coastal and inland flooding.

373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Section 373.4131, FS; Ch. 2010-205, LOF

Operate and maintain water control structures to reduce potential impacts from storm events.

373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Section 373.4591, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 2012-187, LOF

Give coastal areas, including barrier islands, beaches and related lands, priority in local, regional and state land acquisition programs.

Ch. 380, FS

Manage water on a state and regional basis for the conservation, replenishment, recapture, enhancement, development, and proper utilization of surface and ground water to protect against hazards and ensure its presence for future generations.

373.016, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 2012-187, LOF; Ch. 2012-174, LOF