

Appendix A: Reviewed, Evaluated, and Changed Materials

Table of Contents

Section Update, Review, and Analysis	A.2
Assessment and Revision of 2007 Mitigation Goals	A.10
Assessment and Revision of 2007 Mitigation Objectives	A.11
Assessment and Revision of 2007 Policies.....	A.24

DRAFT

Section Update, Review, and Analysis

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
PREREQUISITE			
<i>Adoption by the State</i>			
1.1	1.0	A. Has the State formally adopted the new or updated plan?	The State of Florida upon receipt of Federal Emergency Management Agency's "approved pending adoption" status, will seek formal adoption of the State of Florida Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan by the Governor.
1.2	1.0	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 2007 plan and decided to streamline the assurance language for the 2010 update.
PLANNING PROCESS			
<i>Documentation of the Planning Process</i>			
2.1	2.0	A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of how the new or updated plan was prepared?	The 2007 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2010 update process.
2.1 – 2.2 Appendix B	2.0	B. Does the new or updated plan indicate who was involved in the current planning process?	The 2007 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2010 update process.
2.1 – 2.2 Appendix B	2.0	C. Does the new or updated plan indicate how other agencies participated in the current planning process?	The 2007 plan was reviewed and revised to reflect the 2010 update process.
2.1 Appendix A	2.0	D. Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan?	This table was created to discuss how each section was reviewed, analyzed, and revised if necessary. In addition, this table highlights if information/elements were incorporated into a different section.
		E. Does the updated plan indicate for each section	Yes it is included in this table

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
		whether or not it was revised as part of the update process?	
<i>Coordination Among Agencies</i>			
2.1 – 2.2 Appendix B	2.1 - 2.2	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 2010 planning process is detailed in Section 2 and Appendix B
2.1 – 2.2 Appendix B	2.1 – 2.2	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 2010 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>			
2.3	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 planning integration in the 2007 Plan and determined the process was similar during the 3-year planning period; minor changes were made
2.3	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 state/federal planning integration in the 2007 Plan and determined the process was similar during the 3-year planning period; this integration was described in greater detail for the 2010 update
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 2009 data. All data was approved by the State Hazard Advisory Team for usage in updating this section of the Statewide Hazard Mitigation Plan.
<i>Profiling Hazard Events</i>			

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
3.2	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 2009 data available.
“	“	B. Does the new or updated plan provide information on previous occur of each hazard addressed in the plan?	This section covers the previous occurrences of each hazard. The State Hazard Advisory Team list major occurrences going back 10 years and any significant ones past that time frame.
“	“	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 2009 data available.
<i>Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction</i>			
Incorporated into Section 3.2	3.3	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 State Hazard Advisory Team elected to combine this section with Section 3.2 for more consistency and user ability. Each hazard is listed with the information required in Section 3.2 followed by the information required in Section 3.3. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
Incorporated into Section 3.2	3.3	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 2009 data available.
Incorporated into Section 3.2	3.3	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 2009 data available.
Incorporated into Section 3.2	3.3	D. Does the updated plan reflect changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas?	This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
<i>Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities</i>			
Moved to Section 3.3	3.4	A. Does the new or updated plan describe the types of State owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	The Department of Financial Services Database was utilized fully for this update. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
<i>Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction</i>			
Moved to Section 3.4	3.5	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 2009 data available.
Moved to Section 3.4	3.5	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 2009 data available.
Moved to Section 3.4	3.5	C. Does the updated plan reflect the effects of changes in development on loss estimates?	This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
<i>Estimating Potential Losses State Facilities</i>			
Moved to Section 3.6	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?	The Department of Financial Services Database was utilized fully for this update. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
MITIGATION STRATEGY			
<i>Hazard Mitigation Goals</i>			
4.1 Hazard Mitigation Goals	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	B. Does the updated plan demonstrate that the goals were assessed and either remain valid or have been revised?	A 7 th goal was added with explanation in Section 4.1. Review and Update of the Objectives is available in Appendix A.
<i>State Capability Assessment</i>			
4.2 State Capability Assessment	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 has been altered to include an evaluation of goals, hazards, and policies addressed for each agency summary, activity, program, and piece of legislation. They can also be found in Sections 4.4 and 4.5. Policies are made apparent through the actions of the State and so they are included as part of the evaluation of State activities. Policies have been updated for clarity and to reflect existing conditions. A list of changes
"	"	B. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State's post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	
"	"	C. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State's policies related to	

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
		development in hazard prone areas?	can be found in Appendix A. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
4.5 Funding Sources	4.2	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 are discussed in Section 4.5. Each funding source is evaluated. Management of these sources is discussed in Section 4.4 as well.
4.2, 4.4 Project Implementation, 4.5	4.2	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 2009 data available.
<i>Local Capability Assessment</i>			
4.3 Local Capability Assessment	4.5.	A. Does the new or updated plan present a general description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	This section has been streamlined and redundancies have been cleaned. More on this is available in Section 5.0 of the Enhanced Plan.
4.3	4.5	B. Does the new or updated plan provide a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	
<i>Mitigation Actions</i>			
Appendix D	4.6	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 2009 data available.
Appendix D	4.6	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.
Appendix D	4.6	C. Does the new or updated plan prioritize these actions and activities?	Local mitigation activities are prioritized at the local level and expressed. Each agency prioritizes its own projects. This is explained in detail in Section 4.4 Project implementation. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
Appendix D	4.6	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 addressing hazards and goals

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
Appendix D	4.6	E. Does the mitigation strategy in the new or updated section reflect actions and projects identified in local plans?	This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
<i>Funding Sources</i>			
4.5 Funding Sources	4.7	B. Does the new or updated plan identify current sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	The Department of Financial Services Database was utilized fully for this update. This section was updated with the most current 2009 data available.
4.5	4.7	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 2009 data available.
4.5/Appendix D	4.7	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 2009 data available.
COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING			
<i>Local Funding and Technical Assistance</i>			
5.1 Local Mitigation Planning Support, 4.4,4.5	5.1	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 2007 plan. Elements that were no longer relevant were removed and current items were added or updated.
5.1, 4.2, 4.5	5.1	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>			
5.2 Local Plan Integration	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.
5.2	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	The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed current local plans, updating and including current and relevant data.

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
		plans to the State Mitigation Plan?	
<i>Prioritizing Local Assistance</i>			
5.3 Prioritizing Local Assistance	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.
5.3	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?	After careful consideration this information was expanded to give a more robust description.
5.3	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
5.3	5.3	D. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties?	The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed the 2007 criteria for consideration of repetitive loss properties and found that it was sufficient and relevant.
5.3	5.3	E. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures?	The SHMPAT reviewed and analyzed the 2007 criteria for consideration of communities with the most intense development pressures and found that it was sufficient and relevant.
PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS			
<i>Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan</i>			
6.1 Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan	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)	As part of the 2010 update, the 2007 process was analyzed and revised to better reflect the resource capabilities of the State and more specifically the Division of Emergency Management’s Mitigation Planning Unit. The changes reflect the needs of the State and lessons learned during the previous 3-year planning period.
“	“	B. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan?	Florida DEM continues to be the lead agency for the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan.

<i>2010 Section</i>	<i>2007 Section</i>	<i>Crosswalk Element</i>	<i>Update Review and Analysis</i>
		(e.g., identifies the party responsible for evaluating the plan, includes the criteria used to evaluate the plan)	
“	“	C. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan?	HMPAT reviewed the process as outlined in the 2007 plan and adjusted the method and schedule to better reflect the Division current resources.
“	“	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?	After careful analysis the SHMPAT streamlined the Plan Maintenance method and schedule. The changes reflect the needs of the State and lessons learned during the previous 3-year planning period.

Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities

4.4	7.0	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 2007 Enhanced Plan Appendix and determined to be similar and needing only minor adjustments
4.1	4.1	B. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy?	The review process for the goals and objectives is outlined in Section 6 and Appendix B. Results from the SHMPAT analysis can be found in Appendix A
4.4	4.0	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 SHMPAT reviewed the process as outlined in the 2007 plan and after minor adjustments and needed status determined the process to be acceptable
6.1, 4.4	7.0	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 2007 plan and after minor adjustments and needed status determined the process to be acceptable
Appendix and 4.4	7.0	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

Appendix A: Reviewed, Evaluated, and Changed Materials

Assessment and Revision of 2007 Mitigation Goals

The SHMPAT reviewed the mitigation goals of the 2007 plan and decided as a group that the 6 goals found in the 2007 plan continue to be reasonable goals for the state. Minor grammatical changes were made, but the essence of each goal remains in the 2010 plan. A new goal was added by group consensus, and discussed in several meetings both of the entire SHMPAT group and in sub-committee meetings. This seventh goal has been added to the 2010 updated plan:

Goal 7: Foster interagency relationships for hazard mitigation across the state.

The State feels that placing this goal in the state plan will promote an increased sense of urgency to strengthen relationships for more comprehensive mitigation actions on state lands and within state agency assets. Additionally, the state encourages agencies to become more involved with the Local Mitigation Strategy working groups whenever mitigation opportunities arise in those counties. Florida has re-established the National Flood Insurance Program state office, which further seeks to understand state assets within special flood hazard areas. This mitigation goal supports that effort also.

Assessment and Revision of 2007 Mitigation Objectives

Many of the objectives presented in the 2007 have been retained or modified in the 2010 update. The following objectives have been removed or modified, and the explanation follows each item below.

Goal 1 Objectives

Objective 1.1

“Review existing state agency programs, plans and policies to determine their effectiveness and efficiency in reducing risk and vulnerabilities to natural and manmade hazards, on annual basis.”

The SHMPAT decided that "on an annual basis" was not feasible. During the 2010 plan update process, the SHMPAT agencies individually reviewed their own programs, plans and policies for continuing effectiveness, and revised the list appropriately. These items were subsequently submitted as revised for the 2010 plan update. Agencies will monitor changes to their respective programs, plans and policies, and will update these within the respective agency. During the third year of the current plan, agencies will submit their updated information for the 3-year state plan review process.

Objective 1.2

“Incorporate state policies into the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and coordinate with Local Mitigation Strategy programs.”

This objective has been met and continues through concerted effort by state mitigation planners. Throughout the 2010 plan update process as well as through the update processes of other state plans (i.e. the CEMP and the Division’s 5-year strategy), state mitigation planners work with other teams to incorporate mitigation goals, objectives, and tasks. The state has expanded its mitigation planning unit since the last plan, and planners work closely with Local Mitigation Strategy working groups to assure a comprehensive mitigation strategy across the state.

Objective 1.3

“As a means of enhancing intra and inter-governmental coordination, establish and support an on-going liaison among federal, state, regional and local governments, volunteer organizations, as well as the private sector and general public through the State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team.”

This objective has been met, and continues to play out through the mitigation planning unit, the Division's Regional Coordinators, and the ESF lead agency teams. The SHMPAT elevated this continuing task to a new goal in the 2010 plan update (goal #7) in order to emphasize its importance as a state-level effort.

Objective 1.4

“Integrate the pre- and post disaster mitigation functions with the response and recovery functions of the state’s existing Emergency Support Functions (ESFs).”

This objective has been met extremely well through various elements of pre and post-disaster work. Mitigation education (including NFIP materials) is included in the work of the Division's Bureau of Preparation, and mitigation planners meet with planners and mitigation specialists from other agencies such as the Department of Community Planning, Division of Forestry, Department of Transportation and the Department of Environmental protection in a continuing effort to introduce mitigation concepts into their planning efforts.

Mitigation planners from the Division also work with post-disaster planning efforts such as post-disaster recovery planning teams, the state’s Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan team, local National Flood Insurance Program managers, emergency managers throughout the state and local governments to present mitigation opportunities and offer technical assistance throughout the year for post and pre-disaster grant cycle mitigation projects.

Objective 1.5

“Design a process for prioritizing state and local projects for mitigation-related funding programs.”

This objective was met with Florida's implementation of the 9G-22 Rule. Although primarily a tool for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, the concept of this tool prevails in all mitigation project prioritization by focusing mitigation priorities at the local level. Even projects submitted by state agencies must be included and prioritized on the Local Mitigation Strategy measures list. For more information about prioritizing local measures, please see Section **5.0 Coordination of Local mitigation Planning** of this Plan.

Objective 1.6

“Establish a mediation process to resolve conflicts between state agency existing plans, programs and mitigation-related policies and integrate them into the State Hazard Mitigation Plan.”

This objective has been met over the 3 years and reinforced in this plan update through the State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team. All state agencies are invited to participate in the planning process, and differences are ironed out in these meetings. In the 2010 update process, there were no conflicts of this nature. The state will continue to improve interagency relationships and identify mitigation efforts under goal 7 of the updated plan.

Objective 1.7

“Review and recommend at least annual updates of the state risk and vulnerability assessments.”

This objective has been met and is ongoing. While the state does not create an “annual update” per se, risk and vulnerability data is captured and assessed after each disaster event. The database of state-owned structures is stored with the Florida Department of Financial Services and is being continually updated. During the past 3 years, dedicated efforts have been made to capture the GPS coordinates of all state facilities. Work has begun to confirm all structures in

the special flood hazard areas across the state. This work will continue in conjunction with the newly-established state office of the NFIP. This objective was revised in the 2010 plan to be objective 2.1.

Objective 1.8

“Coordinate funding resources and opportunities among state agencies to assist both state and local sub-grantees to meet the non-federal match requirements for federal mitigation-related funding sources.”

This objective has become part of our day-to-day operations. Both planning and grants unit staff work with local applicants to discover funding resources and to leverage federal funds with any other available funding. Mitigation planners learn about the funding resources of other bureaus and agencies in order to understand how these relate to mitigation opportunities. Mitigation grant specialists also make presentations to communities throughout the year about mitigation grant opportunities. The objective remains in the updated plan as objective 2.4.

Objective 1.9

“Support the development and use of disaster loss reduction related building codes and standards designed to reduce vulnerability and risk to all hazards.”

This objective has been met with the inclusion of the International Building Code flood-resistant standards into the Florida Building Code update. Some ongoing work remains to be done on this before the updated code is finalized, but Florida looks forward to this change as one that will help to strengthen development throughout the state. A study that supports wind mitigation efforts has been recently completed also (see Section [4.2.2 State Initiatives](#)), and other such investigations are being funded through the State's Residential Construction Mitigation Program 2010 grant projects. Please see the [Appendix D](#) for examples of these efforts. This objective resides in the updated plan under Objective 1.3, 3.2, 4.1 and 7.1.

Objective 1.10

“Annually review and update the existing Mitigation Resource Identification Strategy Database.”

This objective was not met due to an interdepartmental re-structuring. This objective has been deleted from the 2010 plan, as the updating and dissemination of information about mitigation funding opportunities has since been woven into daily work by both the grants program staff and the mitigation planning unit, and has been retained as objective 2.4 in the updated plan.

Goal 2 Objectives

Objective 2.1

“Develop guidelines for enhancing local community risk and vulnerability assessments.”

This objective was changed from developing "guidelines" to developing tools and techniques that would assist Local Mitigation Strategy groups to utilize and understand their hazard risk and vulnerability data. This work continues to be supported by objectives 2.1 and 2.2 in the updated plan.

Objective 2.3

“Identify effective local regulatory approaches to hazard mitigation.”

This objective has been met by identifying local regulatory "best practices" over the past three years and sharing them with other communities. The objective will continue to be pursued under the updated plan-- please see the revised 2010 plan objectives under objective 2.2.

DCA's Division of Community Planning and partners have been heavily involved in this with the development of local government best practice manuals such as

- *Wildfire Mitigation in Florida: Land Use Planning Strategies and Best Development Practices*
- *Protecting Florida Communities: Land Use Planning Strategies and Best Development Practices for Minimizing Vulnerability to Flooding and Coastal Storms*
- *Disaster Planning for Florida's Historic Resources*
- *Guiding the way to Waterfronts Revitalization: Best Management Practices.*

The Division also produced a series of profiles for each county that reviewed both their local hazard mitigation plan and their local comprehensive plan and recommended strategies for integration of the hazard mitigation plan into the local comp plan.

In 2010 they will publish a new best practices guide titled, *Post-Disaster Redevelopment Planning: A Guide for Florida's Communities*.

More on the Agency efforts towards achieving this objective can be found in Section **4.2.1 Agency Capabilities**.

Severe Repetitive Loss Addendum Goals

Also under goal 2, the objectives related to the Severe Repetitive Loss Program (targeted structures) have been retained but placed under objective 2.5. Other objectives under goal 2 have been retained or modified only slightly by the SHMPAT and sub-committees.

Goal 3 Objectives

Although much progress has been realized with regard to public and private education about mitigation opportunities, the "objectives" listed in the 2007 plan were not all implemented, primarily due to lack of resources. In fact, many of these objectives are really mitigation

measures, and should have been listed on the measures list of the 2007 plan. Some of these have been re-issued in the updated plan under broader goal 3 objectives, while others have indeed been placed on the state's 2010 mitigation measures list. The following are items that have been removed or substantially modified into broader objectives:

Objective 3.1

“Create an Education and Outreach Committee of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team to organize and develop a comprehensive statewide mitigation education and outreach strategy.”

This has not been implemented as described above, however the state’s mitigation unit has certainly conducted an outreach program for the purpose of assisting and guiding communities through the Local Mitigation Strategy update process, and for educating communities about mitigation opportunities and funding resources. Please see Section **4.2 State Capabilities** for a description of these outreach activities.

Because the Education & Outreach Committee was never created, the following objectives were not met as stated, although several were met through other processes, as described below.

Objective 3.2

“Conduct a summit for education stakeholders to present and promote statewide mitigation education program.”

This objective was met in 2007 when the state held a Mitigation Summit. The state is planning another such an event in 2010, and hopes to make this an annual event. Also, training that focuses on mitigation efforts is conducted each year during the Governor’s Hurricane Conference. 2010 objective 3.1 supports the continuation of this work.

Objective 3.3

“Conduct a feasibility study of web-based learning site for Hazard Mitigation.”

Although the Education & Outreach Committee did not materialize to conduct this study, the Federal Alliance of Safe Homes (FLASH at www.flash.org), the Florida Home Builder’s Association (FHBA <http://www.fhba.com>), Florida Interfaith Networking in Disaster (FIND <http://www.findflorida.org>) and others have websites that help property owners to understand and apply wind mitigation techniques to their property. The State Floodplain Management Office (NFIP) also leads property owners to www.floodsmart.gov, the NFIP website that presents flood mitigation information for citizens. This 2007 mitigation action (objective) has been met through the directed use of these tools, and will continue under 2010 objective 3.1.

Objective 3.4

“Develop a business continuity awareness program designed to educate the business community on the benefits of mitigation in reducing their vulnerabilities and risks to natural and manmade hazards.”

Many non-profit organizations fulfill this objective by educating businesses of the benefits and how-to’s of mitigation. The American Red Cross, for instance, has partnered with FEMA, Habitat for Humanity, members of the insurance industry, the Association of State Flood

Plain Managers, the Institute for Business and Home Safety, and many others to this end. FHBA's Disaster Contractors Network offers online training through the Center for Disaster Risk Policy at Florida State University. Their efforts and many others can be found throughout Section **4.2 State Capabilities**. In addition, please see Section **7.0 Florida's Severe Repetitive Loss Outreach** Strategy for information concerning efforts to educate and work with members of the business community who own repetitive loss properties.

Objective 3.5

“Develop, and promote outreach strategies designed to educate residents and visitors of Florida’s endemic hazards, their associated risks and vulnerabilities, and the applicable mitigation actions.”

Although the SHMPAT committee described above was not formed, the State's efforts towards this objective are being met and are ongoing. Many non-profits additionally engage in this activity, to include the extensive efforts of FLASH and the Red Cross. Please see Section **4.2 State Capabilities** for a description of these activities.

Objective 3.6

“Identify and incorporate available hazard mitigation education and outreach programs/products into public school education programs.”

The Division of Emergency Management (DEM) has established an online program (kidsgetaplan.com) that educates children, parents, and teachers about disaster planning and mitigation. The site contains activities, games, stories, books, guides, and other information for teachers to take and incorporate into the classroom. The site is split to enable kids of various age groups to access the site on their own to entertain and educate themselves.

The American Red Cross, with the help of the Allstate Insurance Company Foundation, has developed an innovative school-based curriculum called *Masters of Disaster*. This curriculum is for children kindergarten through 8th grade. *Masters of Disaster* uses interactive lessons to bring disaster preparedness and mitigation into classrooms by aligning with academic, standards-based learning school districts seek. For more on this effort, please see **Section 4.2.1 Agency Capabilities**.

FLASH additionally has a web-based program that may be used by public-schools called the FLASH Kid Zone Children's Program. The FLASH Kids Zone program is a portal on the flash.org website designed for preteens to promote the message of mitigation. The sections of the portal include the Weather Station, the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and the Safety House. There are games, quizzes and downloadable fact sheets that focus on creating a family disaster plan, building a disaster supply kit, doing a home inventory of belongings and having a home inspection.

Objective 3.7

“Establish an ongoing education and outreach effort to educate elected officials on the importance of hazard mitigation to include annual report to the legislature and other appropriate officials.”

This objective is another that has been addressed in a variety of forms since 2007. There are numerous best practice guides state agencies produce (discussed above). One important guide is the Community Visioning Guide produced by the Division of Community Planning. The guide will assist local governments in Florida to incorporate hazard mitigation practices, strategies, and principles into the local government comprehensive plan through the visioning process.

Several conferences attended by local officials have training sessions and workshops directed towards keeping officials informed. The FFMA, Governor’s Hurricane Conference, FAPA, FAC Conference, and the recent Mitigation Summit are just a few.

FLASH holds a Risk Mitigation Leadership Forum Series. The Forum events provided an organized setting for the exchange of ideas from elected officials, corporate banking and insurance sectors, academic and research sectors, and new non-traditional allies in the cause of disaster mitigation. Additionally, both Florida League of Cities and Florida Association of Counties engage in education and outreach for elected officials. For more on all of these efforts please see Section [4.2 State Capabilities](#).

Objective 3.8

“Develop a public awareness campaign on the benefits of pre- and post-disaster mitigation through the dissemination of mitigation success stories.”

The Division of Emergency Management posts best practice mitigation efforts on their website (www.floridadisaster.org) The Department of Community Affairs has published several documents (described in DCA’s Summary in Section [4.2 State Capabilities](#)) for the purposes of disseminating mitigation success stories which are listed above. The Division of Forestry also conducts a public awareness campaign that addresses several facets of wildfire prevention and mitigation. The Florida Firewise Communities Program, the development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans, and other outreach efforts promote public awareness through the use of success stories.

Additionally, The State Mitigation Officer designates staff to support mitigation outreach at established Disaster Recovery Centers and Reconstruction Information Centers. The State Mitigation Officer designates staff to assist communities in completing their mitigation Preliminary Damage Assessment, reviewing and updating local mitigation strategies, and identifying mitigation success stories and potential mitigation grant fund projects. This objective is continued in the 2010 plan as objective 3.1.

Objective 3.9

“Develop a strategy for working with the print, electronic and broadcast media on the dissemination of mitigation education and outreach material.”

This objective has been met in a variety of ways and is ongoing. There is not a comprehensive strategy in place. Nevertheless, each program has a process and strategy for outreach. This is done through print, website, electronic, broadcast media, and more.

Section **7.0 Severe Repetitive Loss Outreach Strategy** provides an outline of the method for reaching out to severe repetitive loss property owners. HMGP administrators reach out through applicant workshops and Notices of Funding Availability. Information on these processes is outlined in portion Section **4.2 State Capabilities**, as well as Section **4.4 Project Implementation**.

The NFIP coordinator reaches out through the FFMA with bi-annual newsletters and supplies the association with tech topics for its website. NFIP also provides FFMA updated email lists for all Florida flood plain managers.

More on these efforts can be found throughout Section **4.2 State Capabilities**, most specifically in portion **III. Outreach and Partnerships**.

Goal 4 Objectives

Objective 4.1

“Establish partnerships with Florida’s public and private research universities to enhance and support their efforts to secure funding, contracts, and opportunities; to develop or enhance research infrastructure; and to assess Florida’s vulnerability to natural and anthropogenic hazards in order to develop the means to reduce the potential for damage from their impacts on society.”

This objective has been met and is on-going. The RCMP program statutorily receives \$7 million of the total \$10 million annual appropriation for the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund. \$3.5 million is designated for wind mitigation of residential structures. \$2.8 million is designated for the Mobile Home Tie-Down Program administered by Tallahassee Community College. The remaining \$700,000 is designated for hurricane research conducted by Florida International University. IHRC has four laboratories dedicated to mitigation research. For more, please see Section **4.2.1 Agency Capabilities**.

The 2010 plan carries forward this objective, re-worded as follows:

Objective 4.1

Continue to support Florida’s public and private research institutes in their efforts to assess, understand, apply and educate about successful mitigation practices, policies and programs

Part 4.1.1

“Establish a Research Committee consisting of SHMPAT members to establish state research needs; adopt research strategies; and formulate a review process for resource allocation.”

This did not happen due to lack of time and staff resources. This objective has been deleted from the 2010 plan, as it is not feasible. Because the remaining objectives under 4.1 were to be the work of this “Research Committee,” none of the following objectives (which are actually mitigation measures) were accomplished.

Part 4.1.2

“Partner with Florida Hurricane Alliance, a consortium of Florida public universities engaged in scientific research with the objective of developing or implementing mitigation strategies.”

This part of the objective is a mitigation activity and has been addressed. It is discussed at length in FIU’s Summary in Section **4.2 State Capabilities**. Please also see the above response to Objective 4.1.

Part 4.1.3

“Support the formation of the Science and Technology Center sponsored by the Florida National Science Foundation dedicated to the study of hurricane sciences and related education and outreach.”

Objective 4.2

“Establish partnerships with Florida’s public and private research universities and public or private science research or resource centers for the purpose of creating a comprehensive archive and a clearinghouse for scientific information, basic and applied knowledge, case studies, engineering studies and design criteria, as well as social and behavioral studies related to hazards, vulnerability and mitigation.”

This objective was not met due to lack of resources to implement. Therefore, none of the following objectives under 4.2 were met.

Part 4.2.1: Obtain archive space and dissemination services from Florida’s public universities.

Part 4.2.2: Establish a catalog of Florida’s hazards and mitigation research studies.

Part 4.2.3: Establish a web-based electronic library.

Part 4.2.4: Establish access and/or interchange privileges with pertinent resource centers throughout the country and internationally.

Objective 4.3

“Establish a comprehensive state research agenda that will integrate the work of individual research institutions in Florida for the purpose of achieving financial efficiency, promoting collaborative efforts reducing overlapping research, reducing duplication of efforts. Also, develop a review process for resource allocation.”

Again, because this was to be implemented by the unformed Research Committee, this objective was not met. There are no plans to implement these activities in the 2010 plan.

Objective 4.4

“Collaborate with FEMA’s Emergency Management Institute and Florida’s public and private universities in the development of a higher education curricula primarily designed

to educate professionals in emergency management, as well as to integrate hazard mitigation curricula into existing career programs.”

Place holder for response.

Part 4.4.1

“Create a memorandum of collaboration with FEMA and Florida public and private universities for designing higher education curriculum for emergency management professionals, including the hazard mitigation and related fields.”

This is a duplication of Objective 4.4 and has been removed. The below are also duplications of other objectives.

- Part 4.4.2: Participate in education program course development.
 - Task 4.4.3: Participate in focus groups toward the creation of textbooks and other pertinent education material.

Objective 4.5

“Foster the continued development and improvement of existing research centers and laboratories within Florida’s public research universities by supporting their efforts to secure funding and research contract opportunities, in order to enhance instate capabilities for conducting hazard mitigation-related research.”

See response to Objective 4.1.

Objective 5.1

“Support mitigation initiatives that are compatible with the protection of the state’s cultural, economic and natural resources.”

There have been considerable efforts towards achieving this objective and they are ongoing. Every water management district, DEP, DCA, DOF, and others regularly engage in mitigation activities compatible with the protection of the state’s cultural, economic, and natural resources. In addition, various pieces of legislation have recently passed in support of such endeavors as the State realizes protection and restoration of the natural environment (through the restoration of wetlands, eroding beaches, and indigenous flora, for example) is a mitigation activity in itself. Furthermore, an IHRC laboratory is entirely dedicated to the socio-cultural impacts and responses to disasters and mitigation. Pertinent new legislation can be viewed in [Section 4.2.3 Legislation and Rules](#). State, university, and non-governmental agency activities can be viewed in [Section 4.2.1 Agency Capabilities](#).

Part 5.1.1

“Promote land acquisition programs that support mitigation opportunities compatible with the protection of natural and cultural resources”

This objective has been met. Most recently, legislation was passed to further this objective. House Bill 7157- Session Law 2009-157 provides additional financial incentives to manage private lands for conservation and specifies criteria for those properties, including whether the property will yield significant public benefit. Because this act promotes the retention of the natural value of land in perpetuity, including those with value for water quality and

recharge, it helps to remove certain risks associated with the population of natural lands including wetlands, coastal properties, and other water management areas.

Objective 5.2

“Encourage the development of drainage improvement systems based on their compatibility with the natural environmental system functions”

This objective has been met and is ongoing. Most recently, Senate Bill No. 280- Session Law 2009-243 which creates s. 373.0363 was passed. The Southern Water Use Caution Area Recovery Strategy principally seeks to restore natural water bodies and their capacity to store surface waters. In addition to working toward providing water for future needs, this Act contains initiatives for flood protection and to slow saltwater intrusion. Additionally, water management districts and the State promote regional or basin-wide stormwater management and flood protection infrastructure to mitigate coastal and inland flooding. Chapter 373 of Florida Statutes contains several sections in support of the above and water management districts act in compliance.

The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) is another excellent example of the State’s pursuit of this objective. The CERP provides a framework and guide to restore, protect, and preserve the water resources of central and southern Florida, including the Everglades. It covers 16 counties over an 18,000-square-mile area and has been described as the world’s largest ecosystem restoration effort.

The Plan was approved in the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. It includes more than 60 elements, was estimated to take at least 30 years to complete and originally estimated to cost \$7.8 billion in October 1999 dollars (or at 1999 price levels). Because the region’s environment and economy are integrally linked, the Plan provides important economic benefits. Thus, the Plan will result in a sustainable south Florida by restoring the ecosystem, ensuring clean and reliable water supplies, and providing flood protection.

CERP is a multi-purpose project and is basically about getting the water right. This includes getting water in the right place, right time, right quantity and right quality to restore the Everglades while providing for other water management needs of the region. CERP, where possible, will provide improved flood damage reduction and in no case will flood protection be diminished by the project(s).

Please see Section **4.2.1 Agency Capabilities** and Section **4.2.3 Legislation and Rules** for more on how we have met this objective to encourage drainage systems compatible with the natural environment.

Objective 5.3

Use the state-clearing house for environmental compliance and protection of natural resources.

This objective continues to be met. The Florida State Clearinghouse (SCH) reviewed 1105 projects for consistency with the Florida Coastal Management Program between 8/01/07 and 12/31/09. The SCH serves as the state’s single point-of-contact for the review of federal assistance applications and federal projects under Presidential Executive Order 12372, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state intergovernmental review process is conducted by nine state agencies and the five water

management districts, to ensure that the proposed projects are consistent with the 24 Florida Statutes that make up the Florida Coastal Management Program and requirements within each agency's jurisdiction.

Objective 6.1

“Establish hazard mitigation priorities for retrofitting existing state critical facilities and infrastructure based upon risk and vulnerability assessment.”

Florida has a comprehensive, multi-year plan to mitigate risks to buildings necessary for post-disaster response and recovery operations. By January 31 of each year, the Division of Emergency Management is required to provide a report to the Governor and Legislature that identifies the State's capacity to shelter residents at risk from the effects of a major hurricane. The report guides local shelter planning and the construction of new educational facilities for use as hurricane shelters. The surveys lead to selection of safer hurricane shelters, decommissioning (or phasing-out) of vulnerable buildings, and provide valuable direction in selecting effective retrofit projects.

The Infrastructure Section of DEM's Bureau of Response provides technical assistance to county governments with locating, identifying, and retrofitting hurricane shelters. Grants administered by DEM's Bureau of Recovery and Mitigation to respond to infrastructure needs are prioritized at a local level.

Objective 6.2

“Ensure that state facilities and infrastructure are located, designed and constructed to complement/support local priorities as defined in the Local Mitigation Strategies.”

State agencies must use local ordinances and comprehensive plans when constructing state facilities and infrastructure. Local governments are encouraged to integrate LMS strategies into their comprehensive plans. This is the most efficient way to ensure facilities and infrastructure are located, designed and constructed to complement/support local priorities as defined in the Local Mitigation Strategies.

New addition for 2010 update:

Goal 7: Foster interagency relationships for hazard mitigation across the state.

Objective 7.1

“Work to better integrate mitigation policies, programs and practices between state agencies, public and private organizations for a comprehensive statewide approach to mitigation”

Overall work of the Mitigation Bureau; this work will be carried out according to the Division's 5-year strategic plan, which includes this work in various elements.

Objective 7.2

“Coordinate effective partnerships between state agencies for exemplary floodplain management of state-owned lands and facilities”

The State Floodplain Management Office (NFIP) will work toward this continuing objective, and will report on activities that meet this objective over the next 3 years.

DRAFT

Assessment and Revision of 2007 Policies

SHMPAT determined it necessary to approach the policies discussed in Section **4.2 State Capability Assessment** differently for the 2010 State Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. An approach was needed that was both efficient and comprehensive. Policies detailed in the 2007 Update were thus updated for 2010 in the following broad terms:

- **Streamlined:** Policies were trimmed or divided to contain one specific objective as opposed to many
- **Generalized:** Many policies from the 2007 Plan Update spoke to very specific tasks. As such, many redundancies were present. Where appropriate, policies were combined and their scope broadened.
- **Appended:** Additional policies were added to reflect emerging legislation or activities that have taken priority since the 2007 Update.

In any case, all policies from the 2007 Plan have been integrated into the comprehensive list of policies used in Section 4.2 State Capability Assessment. Below you will find the list. It additionally provides reference to legislation and rules the policies were drawn from.

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

Session Law 2009-157; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS

Manage natural resources to reduce impacts of natural and manmade disasters

Session Law 2009-157; Session Law 2009-243; Ch. 161, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 590, FS; Rule 62B-33, FAC

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

Session Law 2009-157; Session Law 2009-243; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS

Enhance local government capacity to mitigate hazards

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Session Law 2009-178; Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 163, FS; 215.555, FS; 215.5586, FS; 215.5588, FS; 215.559, FS; 252.35, FS; 252.38, FS; 252.44, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC; Rule 9J-5, FAC; Rule 9G-6, FAC

Encourage post-disaster redevelopment

Chapters 163, 187, FS; Rule 9J-5, FAC; Session Law 2009-210; 215.5586, FS; 215.5588, FS; 215.559, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC

Prevent unwise expenditures that hinder mitigation efforts

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Session Law 2009-210; Ch. 161, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC

Pursue mitigation as an ongoing, evolving, research dependent activity

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Statute 252.44; Session Law 2009-243; 20.18, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; 215.555, FS; 215.5586, FS; 215.5588, FS; 215.559, FS; Ch. 252, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Ch. 590, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC

Pursue interagency cooperation as an important means to mitigate hazards

Rule 9B-74, FAC; 20.18, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 252, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC

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

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Ch. 161, FS; Rule 62B-33, FAC

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

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS

Support and fund beach erosion control activities

Session Law 2008-242; Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 62B-33, FAC

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; Rule 9J-5, FAC

Promote vertical consistency within all levels of government

Rule 9B-74, FAC; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 252, FS; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC; Rule 9J-5, FAC; Rule 9G-6, FAC

Guide growth as an important means to mitigate hazards

Session Law 2009-157; Session Law 2009-178; Ch. 161, FS; Ch. 163, FS; Ch. 186, FS; Ch. 187, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 9J-5, FAC

Promote funding sources and implementation strategies for mitigation

215.555, FS; 215.5586, FS; 215.5588, FS; 215.559, FS; 252.38, FS; 252.44, FS; Ch. 380, FS; Rule 9G-22, FAC

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

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

373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS

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; Session Law 2009-243; 373.036, FS; Ch. 373 Part IV, FS; Ch. 380, FS

DRAFT