

# **State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team**

## **July 2008 Brainstorming Results**

The following are the results from the July SHMPAT meeting. The purpose of these questions was to evoke discussion of ways to improve mitigation in the state of Florida. These are the top five (in order of prevalence) given responses for each question. There are a few instances where there are less than five due to the number of responses received. During the next SHMPAT meeting these will be discussed in greater detail so members can elaborate on their ideas. An effort was made to keep your answers as close as possible to your original responses so they would not be taken out of context. Please excuse us if we didn't quite capture something correctly, there will be an opportunity for you to clarify anything at the next meeting.

### **No Holds Barred Mitigation—Why Not?**

*1. What are the challenges to implementing hazard mitigation measures in your purview?*

- A. Lack of funding
- B. General lack of education and awareness of mitigation issues by government officials
- C. Lack of communication and coordination with universities and between agencies.
- D. Lack of staff at the local level
- E. Political buy-in

*2. What resources do we need in order to effectively mitigate for hazards? Which are readily available, and which are more difficult to obtain?*

The responses to this question were not clearly defined as readily available or more difficult to find but rather what is the current need for resources.

- A. Grant writing
- B. Political support
- C. Staffing
- D. Social buy-in, more champions at the local level
- E. Was a tie between the following:
  - i. Corporate and public-private partnerships
  - ii. Ideas and information
  - iii. Technical assistance from the State

3. *There's more than one way to accomplish a task. How can we be more creative in addressing hazard mitigation in order to overcome some of the above listed obstacles? What non-traditional ideas can we bring to the table?*

- A. Incentives to mitigate
  - i. Tax credits for measures such as green buildings
  - ii. Above code incentives
  - iii. Insurance
  - iv. Expand programs such as My Safe Florida Home
  
- B. Market mitigation through education and outreach
  - i. Improve CRS understanding
  - ii. Better educate realtors to assist with NFIP rate reduction efforts
  - iii. Public demonstrations
  - iv. News programs
  - v. Software visualization
  - vi. More creative outreach with LMS (LMS Committee Meeting BBQ's)
  
- C. Relationship building including public-private partnerships
  - i. Relationship building between agencies
    - i. Faith Based Organizations / Community Based Organizations
    - ii. Universities and COEIS
  
- D. Planning and monitoring methods
  - i. Identify how mitigation can address hazards as well as climate change, preserve open space, restore wetlands, etc.
  - ii. Stronger post-disaster mitigation (no building in flood plains, surge zones, etc.)
  - iii. More interdisciplinary approach to mitigation (ex. tying mitigation to resource management)
  - iv. Assign regional mitigation representative to conduct periodic monitoring of the LMS and design a standard mitigation review tool to publish a community report card.
  - v. Land acquisition
  - vi. Local or regional organizations dedicated to mitigation with accountability to do periodic, ongoing reviews and to include community feedback.

4. *Who are the potential partners that can make our projects happen?*

- A. This is a tie between State (including Universities) and Federal agencies
- B. Local government
- C. Non-profits, churches, neighborhood associations, etc.
- D. Construction companies, architects, engineers, realtors, landscapers, etc.
- E. Private sector

5. *Are there opportunities in our communities we've overlooked?*

- A. Marketing mitigation through:
  - i. Engaging the public, especially children, in support of mitigation (ie. Programs such as Recycling, seat belts, Just Say No, etc.)
  - ii. Training and workshops – residential and business
  - iii. Take advantage of social networks
  - iv. Education of county and local officials
  - v. Campaign for local champions
- B. Local Mitigation Strategy
  - i. Integrate LMS groups into community planning and infrastructure
  - ii. Collaboration of university research with LMS strategy
- C. Planning
  - i. Ordinances and codes
  - ii. No adverse impact approach
  - iii. Swap increased densities for increased mitigation at time of conceptual approval
  - iv. Identify areas where we can achieve multiple objectives
- D. Financial
  - i. Low interest mitigation loans
  - ii. Grants
- E. Neighbors, local governments, and private industry

6. *Is there something we can change to make hazard mitigation more palatable or attractive in our purview?*

- A. Marketing
  - i. Emphasis of safety
  - ii. Personalize through education initiatives
  - iii. Use “green” ideals to push a safer lifestyle
  - iv. Raise awareness of economic and social value of resources at risk
  - v. Make fire resistant landscaping fashionable
- B. Incentives
  - i. Homeowner and business
  - ii. Tax abatement
  - iii. Transferable development credits
  - iv. Insurance breaks / rebates
  - v. Offer lease discounts
  - vi. Carrots not sticks
- C. Loss avoidance studies and programs
- D. Link hazard mitigation to sustainability initiatives

## **Making Every Penny Count—Leveraging Across Boundaries**

*1. Have you used the FDEM mitigation funding sources? If not, why not?*

The number one reason FDEM mitigation funding is not pursued is because state agencies have to go through the Local Mitigation Strategy groups. Agencies either find this process too cumbersome or there is a lack of information regarding available assistance.

*2. Does your agency or organization have separate funding specifically allocated for mitigation projects? What are these funding programs called?*

Either the participants were not sure of the programs available within their purview or they did and did not list them. Below are the funding programs available:

- A. Fuels management
- B. My Safe Florida Home Program
- C. Coastal Zone Management (DEP) and possible funding through DCA for projects related to mitigation planning and or restoration and conservation.

*3. Have you conducted mitigation projects with funding that is not traditionally used for mitigation? What types of projects are completed this way?*

- A. Education
  - i. Information and education projects
  - ii. Education projects partnering with cell phone providers
  - iii. Conducted mitigation workshops for private sector in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce
- B. Planning
  - i. Wildfire mitigation
  - ii. LMS integration
  - iii. Post-disaster redevelopment planning
  - iv. Land acquisition
  - v. Restoration, conservation and public access
- C. Hardening of homes

*4. What types of non-mitigation funds exist that could possibly be combined with mitigation dollars (perhaps as non-federal match) to achieve mitigation measures through your agency or organization?*

- A. EMPA, CDBG, and private donations were identified as the number one possible funding source
- B. The following were identified equally
  - County or local government funds
  - Private organizations
  - EMPA grants

- Educational grants
- Safety grants
- Community Development Block Grant - CDBG
- Florida Housing Finance - FHF
- State Housing Initiatives Partnership - SHIP
- HOME
- My Safe Florida Home - MSFH

*5. What types of partnerships have been or could be created for the purpose of achieving mutual mitigation objectives?*

The responses to this question for the most part were not broken down by “have been” or “could be”. The following are the responses given:

- A. Local government
- B. Partner with My Safe Florida Home (MSFH), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP), Florida Housing Finance (FHF), HOME, etc
- C. The following were all listed equally:
  - Regional coordination of LMS chairs or coordinators for project comparison and consolidation of mutually beneficial projects
  - Partnering with neighborhood associations, Scouts, and city governments
  - Should partner with the Florida Governor’s “Climate Action Team” and the Technical Work Group (TWG) on adaptation organized by Florida Department of Environmental Protection (adaption = mitigation)
  - Partner with climate change/energy conservation groups
  - State agencies need the ability to apply for mitigation funds directly forgoing the cumbersome LMS process.

Participants were asked to rate how often key components of the Florida State Hazard Mitigation Plan should be updated. The table below reflects the participant's ratings.

<b>Plan Component</b>	<b>Post-Disaster</b>	<b>Annually</b>	<b>Every 3 Years</b>
<b>Planning process</b>			
- Documentation of	12.5%	50%	37.5%
- Coordination with other state agencies	30%	60%	10%
- Integration with other planning efforts	12.5%	75%	12.5%
<b>Risk Assessment</b>			
- Hazard Identification	45%	.09%	45%
- Hazard Event Profile	42%	25%	33%
- Assess vulnerability by Jurisdiction	33%	33%	33%
- Assess vulnerability of state facilities	42%	25%	33%
- Estimating potential losses by jurisdiction	36.3%	18.1%	45.5%
- Estimating potential losses of state facilities	36.3%	27.2%	36.3%
<b>Mitigation Strategy</b>			
- Goals and Objectives	10%	80%	10%
- State Capabilities	16.7%	58.3%	25%
- Local Capabilities	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%
- Mitigation measures	38.5%	38.5%	23%
- Funding sources	42%	33%	25%
<b>Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning</b>	22.2%	66.7%	11.1%
<b>Plan maintenance process</b> (includes § 201.4 (c)(6-7) – Adoption and Assurances)	12.5%	62.5%	25%