

CHAPTER EIGHT: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Contents

CHAPTER EIGHT: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION1

 Introduction and Purpose3

 Administration and Logistics3

 Mitigation Goals to Reduce Identified Hazards10

 Goals and Mitigation Initiatives for Marion County11

 Goals Analysis for Flood Mitigation and Related Programming14

 Mobile and Manufactured Homes17

Actions that promote control of hazards18

Actions that protect public facilities and infrastructure18

Actions that promote emergency preparedness and response19

 Other Program and Policy Enhancements22

 Post-Disaster or Long-Term Community Redevelopment22

 Concept Papers for Consideration by the Marion Working Group for LMS Development23

 Concept Paper #1 Wildfire Risk Management Ordinance23

 Concept Paper #2 Notification of Special Populations23

 Concept Paper #3 Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan24

 Concept Paper #4 Increase Flood Awareness25

 Concept Paper #5 Mobile and Manufactured Housing26

 Concept Paper #6 Evacuation Routes27

 Concept Paper #7 Business Emergency Preparedness28

 Initiative/Project Scoring and Prioritization Procedures29

 Funding Sources34

 Cost-Benefit Analysis40

 Incorporate the Requirements of the Mitigation Plan into Other Planning Mechanisms41

 Individual Action Items for Each Jurisdiction Requesting FEMA Approval of or Credit for the Plan41

 Future Meeting Dates43

 Updating and Revising the LMS46

 Adoption and Implementation of the LMS48

Introduction and Purpose

This section of the LMS describes the recommended plan adopted by the Steering Committee for the ensuing period of maintenance and implementation of the Strategy. These Strategy items cover two major categories:

1. An administrative plan and an organizational structure through which the bylaws and operational procedures of the Working Group are prioritized, and
2. An adopted set of program goals and priorities for guiding efforts of the Working Group for the ensuing planning cycle within which additional mitigation initiatives can be proposed, characterized and prioritized.

The Working Group intends this section be updated at the conclusion of each planning cycle to guide the continuing efforts of the Working Group.

Administration and Logistics

This portion describes the program for administering the current edition of the Marion County LMS.

Adoption of the Strategy

The contractually designated LMS representative from each municipality is responsible for ensuring their portion of the Strategy remains updated and is presented to their respective local governing bodies for re-adoption, re-endorsement, or other appropriate action. This has been reiterated on numerous occasions, as documented in the Meeting Summaries.

Maintenance of the Strategy

This section describes the plan of Marion Working Group for the continuance of updating, maintenance and implementation of the Strategy.

Coordination of Strategy Implementation and Maintenance

The Working Group focused on what agency should maintain overall responsibility for the LMS. It was noted that the custodian would be responsible for scheduling meetings of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees, recording the proceedings of the meetings, distributing the meeting minutes, coordinating the update of the GIS database, collecting proposed mitigation initiatives, and any other administrative matters that may arise in the maintenance of the Strategy. For the foreseeable future, the Marion County Growth Services Department will maintain responsibility for the following duties:

- Coordination of meetings;
- Maintenance of mailing lists;
- Maintenance of the bylaws and procedures;
- Maintenance and updating of data;
- Receipt of notification of financial opportunities;
- Use of the procedure and database to assist in the selection of prioritized initiatives

- for funding;
- Support to processing of initiatives;
- Implementation, as appropriate, of this section of the Strategy;
- Publication of updated Strategy documents.

Organizational Structure

After review by the Steering Committee, it was decided to maintain the current organization structure and meeting schedules: the Subcommittees will meet as needed; and, the Steering Committee and Working Group will meet at least quarterly. The Working Group will continue to report to the Steering Committee and will also include the following:

1. Risk Assessment Subcommittee
2. Mitigation Planning Subcommittee
3. Public Affairs Subcommittee
4. Financial Issues Subcommittee

The Steering Committee Chair may reactivate the above subcommittees upon need of the Working Committee.

Continuing items for Working Group determinations include:

1. Assignment of a Subcommittee member to be responsible for review and update of Guiding Principles database.
2. Assignment of an individual or organization responsible for update and maintenance of GIS database.
3. Increase LMS participation from the public and private sectors.
4. Where appropriate, involve Financial Issues Subcommittee in securing mitigation initiative funding.

And other items as may be requested.

Schedule for Strategy monitoring, evaluating, and updating

The Marion County Growth Services Department shall be responsible for monitoring of the Strategy. Monitoring activities include coordinating annual updates by agencies and jurisdictions responsible for individual mitigation actions located on the project list. Coordination may include site visits and meetings with staff and/or the Steering Committee as needed. Monitoring shall occur throughout the year on an as needed basis.

The following are tasks and monitoring activities that should be accomplished prior to or in the early part of the LMS update and revision process. These tasks represent examples of recommended actions and should be reviewed for their applicability by the Emergency Management Director (prior to the update process) or the Working Group (as a part of the update process.)

- On-going information systems – HAZUS-MH GIS databases that have been created for the LMS should be reviewed and updated with each formal revision of the Strategy.

- Monitoring implementation process - Projects that have been implemented need to be taken off the List of Mitigation Initiatives. Members of the Working Group should also attend workshops and stay abreast of current grant funding opportunities.
- Obstacles/problems in implementation - Some listed projects may be considered as poor candidates for grant funding and may need to be revised to be fundable. Criteria has been developed to achieve regular maintenance of the mitigation action list. Projects older than 5 years will be removed from the list unless a new application is submitted.
- Ability to update baseline data - The HAZUS-MH GIS update to the LMS could be made the responsibility of one or several County Departments with GIS capability.
- Monitoring of hazards - The development of local information regarding the effects of hazards (such as the flooded roads database) should be an ongoing process. The Emergency Management Department should monitor the effects of hazards and actions taken and keep a record of such.
- Updatable, objective achievement measures – Various indicators for the evaluation of the performance of the LMS have been related to individual hazard types have been developed however, indicators for several hazards could benefit from more standardized evaluation criteria.
- Citizen participation in the LMS process - It is recommended that future updates of the LMS receive media exposure through press releases to encourage public participation.
- It is recommended that social media platforms be utilized to enhance outreach activities in order to solicit input from as diverse of a citizen contingent as possible.

Updating and Revising the LMS

The LMS will be reviewed annually, or as circumstances dictate, by the LMS Working Group. The appropriate membership of the committee to include County, agency, municipal and private business representatives will review the Strategy; amending their responsibilities under the Strategy; updating the Hazard Identification / Vulnerability Assessment and Mitigation Initiatives by modifying procedures, maintaining current data and/or adding new projects and deleting completed projects.

Proposed amendments to the LMS that are approved by the Working Group shall be submitted to the Marion County Emergency Management Director for presentation to the Marion County Board of County Commissioners for public comment and final adoption.

The Marion County Growth Services Department and the Steering Committee members shall be responsible for evaluating the Strategy. Evaluation of the Strategy will occur on an annual basis or after a hazard occurrence. Updates necessary for the Strategy's maintenance shall also occur on an annual basis in conjunction with the evaluation process described above. Planning Staff shall also monitor and update the Strategy related to changes in State and Federal hazard mitigation requirements on an annual basis.

Additionally, during the ensuing 5 year planning cycle, the Working Group will continue to develop initiatives for characterization, prioritization and implementation. This includes consideration of:

Private Sector Participation

By increasing business and industry involvement in mitigation planning and programming, the economic and social well-being of the community becomes stronger and more lasting.

Actions to increase involvement of the private sector include:

- Enhancing existing partnerships with chambers of commerce, economic development commissions, and builders' associations;
- Inviting major employers and industries to attend Working Group meetings;
- Inviting local businesses and business leaders to attend Public Forums and other activities scheduled by the Public Affairs Subcommittee.

Vulnerable Neighborhood Needs

Many initiatives proposed for the initial edition of the Strategy focused on reducing the vulnerabilities of local government facilities and systems. This acknowledges the urgency to make existing government infrastructures more resistant to the structural and/or operational impacts of future disasters.

The LMS continues to be expanded and enhanced to address the vulnerability of neighborhoods and population sectors that are at heightened risk from human or economic impacts of disasters. Following are highlights of anticipated actions to be taken during continuing planning cycles:

- Focus on neighborhoods at risk to these hazards:
 - Flood
 - Wildfire
 - Hazardous Materials
 - High Winds Mobile/Manufactured Homes Older Non-Compliant Buildings
- Review the various Guiding Principles documents for inconsistencies and discrepancies in interest areas noted above.

The Risk Assessment Subcommittee will utilize the GIS database provided by project staff, as well as local experience in the area to identify potential all-hazard risks to neighborhoods. This Subcommittee will report to the Working Group as events require.

Mitigating Flood Losses

The Working Group intends this edition of the Strategy also constitute an update to the Marion County's Flood Mitigation Assistance Plan, in accord with FEMA requirements. This specific Plan is consistent with the overall objectives and concepts used in the Working Group's planning and programming for mitigating vulnerability to all types of hazards as expressed in this Strategy. Additionally, the County and its jurisdictions adopted the 2008 FEMA FIRM maps in August 2008 along with a new Flood Plain Ordinance. The County has participated in the NFIP Community Rating System since 1993 and is a Class "7"; the City of Ocala has achieved a Class "3" rating in the CRS program.

<i>Communities Participating in the NFIP</i>	<i>Community Number</i>	<i>Participating in the CRS Program</i>	<i>CRS Rating</i>
City of Belleview	120383	No	N/A
City of Dunnellon	120574	No	N/A
Marion County	120160	Yes	7
Town of McIntosh	120575	No	N/A
City of Ocala	130330	Yes	3
City of Reddick is not in a flood prone area - not in the NFIP			

Multi-Jurisdictional Actions Related to Continued Compliance with NFIP

- Adopted revised FIRM effective March 2019 in accordance with FEMA Map Modernization Program
- Adopted Floodplain Ordinance effective July 15, 2008 to comply with changes and updates to federal and state regulations.
- Permits in floodplain reviewed to assure new or substantially improved buildings reasonably safe from flooding.
- Verify and record lowest floor elevation of all new or substantially improved buildings.
- Require all new development in floodplain to obtain all necessary federal, state or local permits.
- Prohibit or reduce development in floodway, establishing no-rise no impact in floodway when development or construction is allowed.
- Require 1' freeboard above Base Flood Elevation for new and substantially improved buildings in the Special Flood Hazard Area. Require 1 to 1 compensatory storage.
- New and substantially improved structures, including manufactured homes to be designed or modified and adequately anchored to prevent flotation, collapse or lateral movement of the structure resulting from hydrodynamic and hydrostatic loads, including effects of buoyancy.
- New construction or substantial improvements shall be constructed by methods and practices that minimize flood damage.
- The City of Ocala adopted by reference the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) and the standards set forth in Section 60.3(c) of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations (44 CFR 59, etc.) in support of Map 3: FEMA Designated Flood Prone Areas (effective date August 2017)

The Marion County Office of Emergency Management has identified over thirty flood-prone areas throughout

the County. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee, as part of the “area wide” risk assessment process, will continue to evaluate these areas. In various sections of the Strategy, as well as in the paragraphs below, the human and economic vulnerability to floods includes repetitive flood loss properties.

Mitigating Repetitive Flood Loss

FEMA has identified five repetitive loss structures in the County. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee will assist in identifying mitigation initiatives to relieve these situations.

Mitigating Future Flood Losses

Besides the five identified repetitive flood loss properties, there are a significant number of properties within recognized floodplains or flood-prone areas. The Working Group is very interested in reducing flood losses to these areas so they do not remain subject to repetitive flood loss.

Studying Flood-prone Areas

Marion County Public Works has identified over ninety flood-prone areas, with most areas flooding during heavy rains. The Risk Assessment Subcommittee plans to prioritize those areas that endanger the greatest number of properties, disrupt vital community services, or threaten concentrations of businesses and industries. The Subcommittee will then determine if proposed mitigation initiatives would help these properties, and, if not, to propose new mitigation initiatives to solve the repetitive flooding. The Working Group will review the findings of the Subcommittee and take action as appropriate.

Continuing Review of Guiding Principles Documents

The mitigation Planning Subcommittee, in conjunction with the Risk Assessment Subcommittee, will continue to evaluate flood-prone areas and their relationship to special flood hazard areas (SFHA), particularly as they pertain to current zoning and future land use. Project staff has provided the Subcommittees GIS maps that depict future land use parcels that are currently zoned for development and are located within SFHA. The Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will coordinate with various municipality planning departments to determine what, if any, action needs to be taken in terms of reviewing current and future land use planning.

Coordination with Local Mitigation Strategy

The Working Group plans to mitigate future flood losses through close integration with plans, programs and initiatives for all natural, technological and societal hazards confronting Marion County communities. The Working Group will, in taking the actions described above, attempt to utilize opportunities to reduce future flood losses and to reduce vulnerabilities to other hazards that threaten structures or neighborhoods in question.

Preparation of a Comprehensive Redevelopment Plan

The Working Group recognizes that the County and each of its communities are vulnerable to a major disaster that could cause significant levels of damage and disruption. Such an event would necessitate numerous decisions by each affected jurisdiction regarding restoration of community services and reconstruction of damaged properties and infrastructure. Without careful planning by all key entities within the County,

decisions made in the post- disaster environment may not improve the capabilities of impacted areas to withstand future disasters with less damage. Therefore, an important priority program of the next planning cycle is to begin preparation of the comprehensive, coordinated post-disaster redevelopment plan. The Marion County Office of Emergency Management has discussed proposing an initiative to draft a County-wide Comprehensive Redevelopment Plan.

The County Comprehensive Plan is periodically reviewed in the form of Evaluation and Appraisal Reports (EAR). Elements of the Plan are reviewed for consistency with the existing community growth. Updating the capital improvements element of the Plan allows the County and municipalities to include specific actions that will be completed through inclusion in the budget. The LMS prioritized project list provides reviewers of the capital improvements element an excellent source of ideas.

Projects that deal primarily with the safety of existing buildings and infrastructure can be included in updates of the Land Development Code and other guidelines for building and zoning policy. Areas that the LMS recognized as specifically vulnerable to flooding, wind damage or wildfire should be examined before updating building and zoning codes.

Incorporation of the Strategy into Current and Future Planning Documents

Data and information in the LMS were incorporated into numerous planning documents, processes, programs, ordinances, and development code criteria.

LMS Data:

Data generated from the LMS was used extensively to develop policies and background materials for the Conservation Element of the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. Sinkhole locations and areas vulnerable to wildland fires were included in the Conservation Element Map Series attached to the 2010 update of the Comprehensive Plan and updated accordingly in 2015 and 2020.

Site planning and development criteria:

The County and its municipalities have taken a number of steps to incorporate elements of the LMS into local development criteria and site plan review that emphasize the importance of flood, wildfire, and sinkhole mitigation as well as the strategies used to reduce the vulnerability.

The County and the City of Ocala have adopted a landscape and irrigation ordinance that requires removal of exotic vegetation and proper management in high fire risk areas as a condition of development approval. Exotic vegetation including cogon grass and other species that increase fire risk now must be removed prior to obtaining site plan approval. Removing fire fuels prior to development can reduce the risk of wildfire damages.

The County and the City of Ocala have adopted regulations relating to Springs Protection which include requiring a geotechnical report with each major site plan or subdivision plat across the entire County. Developers must provide buffers near karst sensitive areas and require geological testing prior to development. Additionally, site engineers now must incorporate Low Impact Development principles in designing stormwater controls in order to improve the quality of water being reabsorbed into the Floridan Aquifer. These enhanced stormwater controls can better mitigate non-point source pollution and leaching of some hazardous materials into the drinking water supply.

Further, the County now requires each site to provide for fire flow within urban interface zones either through the use of centralized services or by providing underground storage tanks.

Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP)

Data, hazard analysis methodology, and vulnerable structures and populations were incorporated into the CEMP from the LMS. Data and methodology from the LMS was used in developing the Emergency Support Functions (ESF) contained within the Marion/Ocala CEMP.

Evaluating Progress and Establishing Additional Priorities

The Working Group intends the actions described here will, in most cases, identify and propose specific initiatives for incorporation into future editions of the Strategy. Then, at the close of the next planning cycle, the Working Group will evaluate the progress made towards achieving the program priorities described here, as well as the initiatives proposed as an outcome of this planning effort. As a result, a revised plan of action, and a modified or new set of program priorities, will be established to guide the Working Group focus and to adjust the updated Strategy contents.

The Working Group established project prioritization protocols in the 1999 document. The same protocols remain, allowing the Steering Committee to evaluate and prioritize projects. Many projects are ranked in 1- to 20-numbered style. This process involves a Notice of Intent, followed by a Characterization Sheet. The Working Group then ranks each project based upon the characterization submitted by its project initiator.

Mitigation Goals to Reduce Identified Hazards

The idea of developing mitigation goals reflects back to the 1999 Plan with emphasis on “guiding principles.” These guiding principles are related to each hazard identified by the County as critical. Some items in the hazards list were not specific to this area; therefore, goals and mitigation strategies were not created for them.

The 1999 Plan was used merely as a reach tool to understand the DMA 2000 requirements. The Working Group did not establish a new set of goals related to DMA 2000 because most of the 1999 guiding principles still apply. Changes were made as needed.

In order to identify where improvements are needed, an important part of the planning effort by the Working Group is to review and analyze the existing plans, programs of County and municipal government, collectively referred to as the community’s “guiding principles” for mitigation programming. The objective of this analysis is to determine whether there are inconsistencies or discrepancies with local governments, and to determine if the goals and mitigation initiatives are considered adequate to address risks posed by the impacts of future disasters. If the findings of this analysis indicated there is an area of concern, then one or more mitigation initiatives may be defined for incorporation into the Strategy. If there is a suitable sponsor identified for an initiative under consideration, then that agency or organization would include the initiative in its portion of the County Strategy.

It is important to emphasize that the Marion County Working Group considers the review and analysis of the goals and mitigation initiatives as an ongoing part of the planning process, just like the other aspects of the process. The Working Group's review was initiated early in the process and continues through each

edition of the Marion County LMS.

Although the level of vulnerability to any particular community varies throughout the County, the review of the "guiding principles" has been based on an assumed equal level of risk throughout the County for every identified hazard. The analysis process consisted of the review of key documents from each local jurisdiction.

Goals and Mitigation Initiatives for Marion County

Goal #1 – Protect human health, safety and welfare

Objectives

- 1.1 Limit public expenditures in areas identified as subject to repetitive damage from disasters.
- 1.2 Ensure the protection of critical facilities such as prohibitions on constructing critical facilities in high-hazard areas.
- 1.3 Reduce or eliminate development in hazard prone areas such as floodplains.
- 1.4 Implement additional development restrictions in high-hazard areas.
- 1.5 Consider the use of land acquisition programs for properties subject to development that are located in high-hazard areas.

Goal #2 – To increase business, residential and community awareness of hazard mitigation

Objectives

- 2.1 Effective dissemination of mitigation information
- 2.2 Implement a strategy to educate interest in obtaining disaster mitigation and preparedness training
- 2.3 Develop a single clearinghouse to disseminate accurate and consistent information relating to disaster mitigation.
- 2.4 Identify segments of the community most at risk and develop strategies that will help increase community awareness.
- 2.5 Maintain a profile of available funding sources for mitigation projects and make it available through the Marion County website.
- 2.6 Create and maintain a listing of successfully mitigated projects to showcase best practices countywide.

Goal #3 – To ensure adequate training opportunities to support hazard mitigation

Objectives

- 3.1 Develop ongoing education and exercise curricula for public and private officials in the areas of hazard mitigation and emergency management.
- 3.2 Support local training opportunities in hazard mitigation construction techniques for building officials, engineers and other public officials.
- 3.3 Support existing hazard mitigation training efforts.
- 3.4 Maintain a profile of existing available resources for mitigation training techniques projects.

Goal #4 – To facilitate preparedness measures to mitigate structural hazards

Objectives

- 4.1 Encourage local municipalities and eligible not-for-profit entities to review site and building plans for hazard mitigation issues and to include storm hardening in the building plans of all municipal structures.
- 4.2 Encourage retrofitting of existing residential and business structures using disaster mitigation construction techniques.
- 4.3 Encourage the development of hazard mitigation related building codes and inspection procedures.
- 4.4 Encourage local governments to implement prioritized hazard mitigation projects.
- 4.5 Maintain a profile of existing available funding sources for structural mitigation projects and make it available through the Marion County website, press releases (as applicable), and any Marion County newsletters available to the general public.

Goal #5 – To facilitate planning initiatives that ensure effective hazard mitigation programs and policies

- 5.1 In high-hazard rural areas, all regulatory agencies should discourage expenditures of public funds for infrastructure improvements that attract new residential development.
- 5.2 Develop strategies to reduce risk to healthcare patients and special needs populations within vulnerable areas, including land development code revisions to discourage the construction of new year-round residential facilities for treatment of special needs populations in coastal high hazard areas.
- 5.3 Encourage 100% municipal participation in the Community rating System (CRS).
- 5.4 Encourage all municipalities to develop and maintain an all-hazard Comprehensive Emergency

Management Plan (CEMP) that is consistent with other county plans and procedures.

- 5.5 In areas identified by the vulnerability analysis as being a threat due to the presence of hazardous materials, local governments should encourage compatible land uses and improve public safety.

Goal #6 – Develop and enhance regional mitigation efforts

Objectives

- 6.1 Coordinate with other government agencies to develop regional mitigation efforts

Goal #7 – Promote mitigation partnerships

Objective

- 7.1 Develop effective partnerships with public and private sector organizations and significant agencies and businesses for future hazard mitigation efforts.
- 7.2 Coordinate with the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Resiliency Collaborative Group’s resiliency initiatives

Goal #8 - Reduce flood damage in the County

Objectives: Minimize damage due to flooding from stormwater

- 8.1 Adapt stormwater related flood control measures in the guiding principles including LDC and Comprehensive Plans
- 8.2 Approval of construction will not take place for any facility within a designated flood hazard area unless mitigation measures are identified and installed. These regulations will be found in the adopted flood control regulations.

Floods and Flood Related Hazards

Reducing flooding is one of the goals followed by mitigation initiatives that the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee selected for emphasis. The following discussion explains the goals that are now in place, based on the current analysis, and discusses the findings in light of enhancements to plans, policies, and programs that are being or could be considered as mitigation initiatives for incorporation into the Marion County LMS.

Goals Analysis for Flood Mitigation and Related Programming

Flood Control

All the municipalities (even those in relatively non-flood-prone areas) and the County for the unincorporated areas have adopted some type of stormwater-related flood control measures in their guiding principles. For example, the County requires that adequate stormwater drainage will be provided to afford reasonable protection from flooding and to prevent degradation of quality of the receiving water. The County has adopted numerous regulations concerning stormwater runoff and flood control. It will not approve construction of any facility within a designated flood hazard area unless mitigation measures as identified in the applicable regulations have been installed by the developer to overcome an identified flood hazard.

Enhancements regarding flood control programming

The analysis, as illustrated indicated that there is a wide variability in how many of the key "guiding principles" documents stipulate controls and requirements for flood control measures. To the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee, this indicated a need to further assess, in detail, the current County and municipal flood control regulations. Consequently, the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee has recommended the hiring of a consultant to conduct a County-wide study of the various jurisdictions' compliance with FEMA requirements. Of course, if indicated, changes in the local plans and ordinances would be made resulting in program enhancements to control future flood damages.

Stormwater Runoff Level of Service

Due to the vulnerability of central Florida to flood hazards, the preliminary planning efforts have been geared towards this known hazard. This portion of the report is generated from the database material that deals with issues that are associated with stormwater management and conservation, flood control, and pollution control.

The County's Level of Service standard for new and existing development is listed in the following table:

Table VIII.1 Level of Service Standards			
	Residential	Commercial	Industrial
City of Belleview (in the City)	69gpcd	462gud	960gud
City of Belleview (outside the City)	74gpcd	979gud	960gup
City of Dunnellon	125gpcd	125gpcd	125gpcd
City of Ocala	176gpcd	176gpcd	176gpcd
Marion County residential	150gpcd		
Marion County nonresidential	2750g/acre/day	150gpcd	150gpcd

All the municipalities and the County require some type of retention/detention systems to handle stormwater runoff from construction sites. They are required to be designed and located so as to be "compatible with those natural terrain or landscape barriers that protect the site from flooding". The County has adopted a broad goal to "maintain the direction and rate of historical (pre-development) surface water flows" for all proposed developments.

Enhancements regarding stormwater control programming

From the Working Group's perspective, the analysis to date indicates that the issues with enhanced stormwater control do not lie in the "guiding principles" for this hazard, but rather in the existing infrastructure to effectively handle excess stormwater when it occurs. Therefore, the planning participants have viewed the enhancements needed in stormwater control to be most effectively addressed through structural mitigation initiatives to improve existing drainage projects or develop new projects. This would require additional funding for implementation of all the projects that are indicated as needed. Several such projects have been discussed with County stormwater management engineers, and it is anticipated that several structural initiatives concerning stormwater management will be proposed prior to finalizing the initial Strategy.

Stormwater Runoff and Pollution Control

A search of the mitigation factor "stormwater management" and the mitigation sub-factor of "pollution control" generated ten reports.

Highlights of the reports include the observation that all municipalities and the County have addressed stormwater management and pollution control. The County has adopted many ambitious regulations concerning stormwater and pollution control including a major ordinance adopted in 2009 specifically focused on protecting the natural springs of Marion County through a combination of stormwater controls, landscaping and irrigation standards, and land use regulations.

The County has established a well head protection area (WHPA) of 200' primary and 1,000'secondary from the well head to protect citizens from the effects of polluted stormwater runoff.

Additional control measures that have been enacted to control and reduce exposure to polluted water also include mandatory hook-ups to water and sewer service within calculated distances to Marion County services depending upon the intensity of the residential and commercial uses as well as the mandatory installation of nitrogen reducing septic systems within the Primary Springs Protection area if Marion County sewer services are not available.

Objective - Minimize damage due to pollution from stormwater

- 8.3 Design retention/detention systems to handle stormwater runoff from construction sites, not simply for final construction
- 8.4 Create development codes that provide structural mitigation measures to improve existing drainage projects and secondly develop new projects.

Water Use and Conservation

Of the focus areas selected by the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee, water use and conservation would also be considered to be related to wildfire control and the availability of water during drought for wildfire suppression. Thirteen reports have been developed which show some of the "guiding principles" that are currently in place to lessen the impact of stormwater runoff as it relates to conservation and nature, and potable water considerations.

The City of Ocala has included regulations regarding landscaping and particularly water conservation through the use of irrigation systems. While the unregulated use of irrigation systems can create a significant draw on the local water supply system, it can save considerable amounts of water compared to the use of hoses and lawn sprinklers.

Marion County has a regulation that states that the County shall implement water conservation programs and requirements that are consistent with the water conservation policies of the SJRWMD and the SWFWMD. Additionally, the County has adopted new landscape and irrigation regulations promoting the use of water efficient irrigation and use of native and drought tolerant plants on a countywide scale.

Enhancements regarding water conservation programming

Based on the "guiding principles" assessment, there were no clear indications that modifications or enhancements to plans and programs for water conservation were needed at this time for incorporation into the initial edition of the Strategy.

Goal #9 - Reduce water use and conservation to control the availability of water during drought for wildfire suppression

Objective - Minimize damage due to over use of water

- 9.1 Adopt conservation regulations regarding types of landscaping allowed as well as type of irrigation systems allowed.
- 9.2 Approval of construction will not take place of any facility within a designated flood hazard area unless mitigation measures are identified and installed. These regulations will be found in the municipal flood control regulations.

Enhancements regarding hazardous materials control programming

The hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process undertaken by the Working Group, has indicated that there are numerous "critical facilities" that exist within the predicted impact zone of facilities using or storing hazardous materials. The results of the "guiding principles" analysis indicates that it may be very helpful to further develop mitigation programming in this area for such activities as:

- 1) Awareness and educational programs for the special populations at risk;
- 2) Enhanced accident warning systems for special facilities and population;
- 3) Protective action planning to evacuate or shelter-in-place the populations of special facilities that do not currently have such plans;
- 4) Revisiting the existing emergency plans of health care facilities at risk to incorporate shelter-in-place implementation procedures.

To date, the planning participants have not had the opportunity to pursue such potential mitigation initiatives, but can consider these and other options for initiatives for incorporation into the Strategy.

Goal #10 - Reduce danger of critical facilities to potential hazardous waste releases

Objective: Enhance critical facilities of potential danger.

- 10.1 Create an education program that critical facilities could provide to their employees including directions to constructed-in-place shelters.
- 10.2 Have each municipality provide an early detection and warning system to the critical facilities in the event of a release.

Mobile and Manufactured Homes

The fact that mobile and manufactured homes is an area of focus for the "guiding principles" analysis reflects these structures have relatively greater vulnerability to high winds and flooding impacts. In addition, a high percentage of Marion County residents use this type of structure as their primary residence. Therefore, the hazard identification and risk assessment information presented, indicates the large number of such structures at risk within Marion County, as well as their high level of vulnerability to damage from hurricane force winds.

Enhancements to programming for protection of mobile and manufactured housing

A search of the mitigation sub-factor "mobile homes" in the database produced only one report. The City of Ocala requires all new mobile home parks and subdivisions to be located on arterial or collector streets to facilitate movement of the mobile home units into and out of the development. This is an indication that the existing "guiding principles" in Marion County may not be effectively addressing the risks to mobile and manufactured housing. This issue was more fully addressed with the promulgation of the State Building Code in 2007. Nevertheless, some of the potential mitigation initiatives that were previously considered by the Working Group for incorporation into the initial edition of the Marion County LMS regarding this program area were:

Goal #11 - Reduce risk of mobile home residents to natural disasters

Objective: Enhance the quality of the homes and specify locations for construction.

- 11.1 Develop new or enhanced codes regarding the characteristics of mobile home communities to provide enhanced capability in evacuation and/or sheltering from high winds.
- 11.2 Replace and/or retrofit mobile structures used in community buildings, schools, and local agency operations.
- 11.3 Propose other such programmatic improvements that would result in increased protection for residents of mobile and manufactured homes.

11.4 Improve enforcement of existing requirements for tie downs.

Objective: Provide education to residents of mobile homes

11.5 Establish a program for retrofitting of community centers as storm shelters.

11.6 Distribute weather radios to mobile home community managers and/or residents of mobile homes for advanced warning of severe weather.

11.7 Establish a program for financially assisting economically disadvantaged mobile home residents in their purchase or placement of tie downs.

11.8 Provide public education programs in wind and flood mitigation to existing mobile home residents.

The action items that are needed to ensure operability during a storm are primarily the same for all jurisdictions. To better understand which communities should focus on which action items, a spreadsheet was created. In this spreadsheet the values of High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L) have been assigned to each municipality's need to focus their primary mitigation strategies on a particular action item. A definition of the values and their relationship to the action item is described below.

Actions that promote control of hazards

Storm water controls – Stormwater management plans through grants and fees.

- H – Extreme documented flooding in jurisdiction
- M – Some flooding in specific areas
- L – Little to no flooding

Structures to lessen hazard impacts – Hurricane shutters are one of the most cost-effective mitigation measures. All critical public facilities should be “hurricane hardened.” New facilities should be built to current structural standards for withstanding hurricane winds.

- H – Many critical facilities without hurricane hardening
- M – Few critical facilities without hurricane hardening
- L – All critical facilities have hurricane hardening

Actions that protect public facilities and infrastructure

Adjust infrastructure location, design – Avoid building new public infrastructure that will encourage growth in high hazard areas. Design new public infrastructure to withstand disasters.

- H – High development rate
- M – Some new development – very few public buildings
- L – New development – primarily private

Retrofit community facilities – Shutters, hurricane clips, roof retrofits, door braces

- H – Many facilities without hurricane hardening
- M – Few facilities without hurricane hardening
- L – All facilities with hurricane hardening

Hazard-proof new community facilities – Assure proper elevation, backup generators, safe guard computers and communications systems.

- H – All public facilities should comply due to potential hazards
- M – Some potential for future hazards
- L – Very little potential for hazards

Site community facilities to maintain services – Site community facilities near trunk lines for utilities and ensure that access roads don't flood.

- H – Very little development outside city limits
- M – Expanded city limits
- L – Continual development

Actions that promote emergency preparedness and response

Preparedness plan/program – increase communications system and warning procedures for all disasters. Increase weather-monitoring capabilities.

- H – Level of potential hazards
- M – Level of potential hazards
- L – Level of potential hazards

Emergency response plans – Continue ongoing efforts for planning, preparedness and training. Focus on issues identified in needs assessments.

- H – No specific response plan
- M – A limited response plan
- L – Response plan

Evacuation plan/program – Begin with population/ housing analysis possibly following the census. Perform transportation analysis using updated traffic counts and roadway Capacities.

- H – Based on Population
- M – Based on Population
- L – Based on Population

Sheltering plans – Perform structural analysis of shelters and incorporate population analysis.

- H – No hurricane shelters
- M – Small number of shelters
- L – Adequate shelter

Table VIII.2 Primary Mitigation Activities by Action Item						
	Bellevue	Dunnellon	McIntosh	Ocala	Reddick	Marion Unincorporated
Actions that promote control of hazards	M	M	L	H	L	H
Storm water controls – Stormwater management plans through grants and fees.	L	H	L	L	L	M
Structures to lessen hazard impacts – Hurricane shutters are one of the most cost-effective mitigation measures. All critical public facilities should be “hurricane hardened.” New facilities should be built to current structural standards for withstanding hurricane winds.	H	H	H	H	H	H
Actions that protect public facilities and infrastructure	M	M	L	H	L	H
Adjust infrastructure location, design – Avoid building new public infrastructure that will encourage growth in high hazard areas. Design new public infrastructure to withstand disasters.	M	L	L	H	L	H
Retrofit community facilities – Shutters, hurricane clips, roof retrofits, door	H	H	H	H	H	H
Hazard-proof new community facilities – Assure proper elevation, backup generators, safe guard computers and communications	M	H	L	M	L	M

MARION COUNTY
LOCAL MITIGATION STRATEGY
2020 ANNUAL PLAN UPDATE

Site community facilities to maintain services – Site community facilities near trunk lines for utilities and ensure that access roads don't flood.	M	M	M	M	M	M
Actions that promote emergency preparedness and response	M	M	L	H	M	H
Preparedness plan/program – increase communications system and warning procedures for all disasters. Increase weather monitoring capabilities.	M	H	L	M	L	M
Emergency response plans – Continue ongoing efforts for planning, preparedness and training. Focus on issues identified in needs assessments.	L	L	L	L	L	L
Evacuation plan/program – Begin with population/housing analysis possibly following the census. Perform transportation analysis using updated traffic counts and roadway capacities.	M	H	L	H	L	M
Sheltering plans – Perform structural analysis of shelters and incorporate population analysis.	M	M	M	M	M	M

Other Program and Policy Enhancements

In conducting the "guiding principles" analysis, the Working Group recognized that there would be a need for enhancements to plans, policies and programs that would not be directly related to a single type of hazard or disaster event. The progress in addressing this area of program enhancement is summarized below.

Post-Disaster or Long-Term Community Redevelopment

A review of the existing "guiding principles" indicated that another area in need of enhancements for plans, programs and policies is in the area of controlling post-disaster redevelopment. A search of the database on this topic indicates the Marion County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan addresses recovery in a generic sense; for example, it discusses damage assessment, public assistance, and reconstruction. However, the reconstruction discussion describes the technical assistance that is available to obtain funds for redevelopment, without mentioning stricter building codes/standards that may or may not be in effect.

Enhancements to post-disaster redevelopment programming

The existing "guiding principles" do not appear to provide an adequate basis to effectively manage the post-disaster redevelopment process in the aftermath of a major disaster striking the area. Therefore, one of the enhancements to the existing plans and programs will be to propose to develop a comprehensive, multi-organizational planning process to develop a coordinated plan for management of post-disaster redevelopment operations.

Concept Papers for Consideration by the Marion Working Group for LMS Development

Concept Paper #1 Wildfire Risk Management Ordinance

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Develop a Wildfire Risk Management Ordinance

Origin of the Initiative: The analysis of the guiding principles governing mitigation programming has indicated that there is no comprehensive guidance for the control of wildfire risk in the unincorporated areas of Marion County or in its municipalities. In comparison with the wildfire risk documented by the hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process conducted for Marion County, as well as past experience with wildfires, has demonstrated a need for improved capabilities in wildfire risk management.

Summary of the Initiative: The communities at risk from future wildfires, as defined by the hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process, would propose to consider for adoption, at a later appropriate time, a comprehensive addition to the land development code to control the wildfire risk of new developments. This proposed code change could encompass the following basic options:

- Mandatory vs. voluntary - Developed vs. undeveloped lands
- Small vs. large property tracts - Vegetation control only
- Control over tract development pattern - Control over landscaping
- Provisions for emergency declarations - Specific locations addressed
- Changes to any local restrictions on prescribed burning of properties

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: The County (Fire-Rescue, Planning and Zoning, Growth Management, etc.) for unincorporated areas at risk; Municipal governments for the towns and cities at risk.

Benefits of the Initiative: For those jurisdictions where adopted, and depending on the terms of the proposed code change, the result during future wildfire events could be a reduction in property damage, a lessening of the threat to public health and safety to residents in the urban interface, and minimization of emergency response and disaster recovery costs.

Cost Impact of the Initiative: The cost to develop and promulgate the proposed ordinance would be very small to local governments. However, depending on the terms of the proposed code change, there could be a cost to land developers and owners for compliance.

Likely Funding Source: It would not be necessary to establish a funding source for a code change such as this.

Concept Paper #2 Notification of Special Populations

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Improve Notification of Special Populations at Risk and Their Preparedness for Emergency and Disasters

Origin of the Initiative: The hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process has demonstrated that there are several facilities holding special populations, as well as special needs individuals resident among the general population, that are vulnerable to a variety of natural and technological disasters. Several of these types of disasters have the potential for rapid onset or escalation. Currently Marion County does not have the means to rapidly notify these individuals at risk, and they are typically not prepared to promptly take effective protective actions.

Summary of the Initiative: Marion County and its municipalities need a mechanism to quickly notify these facilities and individuals of a threatening emergency and to have assurance that effective protective actions will be taken. At this time, there is uncertainty as to the optimum way to make these notifications, and guidance for emergency response planning for different types of facilities is limited. Therefore, a study of the optimum notification mechanism for special facilities will be conducted and, as a part of the study, one or more types of effective emergency planning guidance will be defined to address the needs of the facilities and prepared for distribution.

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: The County's emergency management agency may be the most appropriate sponsor, with the cooperation of other County and municipal agencies who deal with the needs of special populations and special needs individuals. State agencies responsible for health care facilities could also be involved.

Benefits of the Initiative: The Initiative would create an increased capability to protect the health and safety of special populations and special needs facilities once the notification system was in place and the planning guidance distributed and used.

Cost Impact of the Initiative: The costs of the Initiative would be for time and services of personnel in the study of the notification systems needed and development of the guidance documents. An estimated cost of \$75,000, for both activities, in order to enlist the services of a private consultant specializing this type of service would be a close approximation. Additional, follow-up costs would be necessary for the purchase and installation of the notification system and the distribution and utilization of emergency planning guide documents.

Likely Funding Sources: Likely funding sources could be a competitive grant from the Florida Division of Emergency Management or from federal grants for programs to support the elderly, economically disadvantaged, or the handicapped.

Concept Paper #3 Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Prepare a Comprehensive Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan

Origin of the Initiative: Review of the existing guiding principles for Marion County and its municipalities indicates that there is no comprehensive plan for guiding and managing the redevelopment of the impacted community in the aftermath of a major disaster.

Summary of the Initiative: Request resources to prepare a County-wide, comprehensive redevelopment plan for management of local government operations in the redevelopment of the impacted communities. The planning would involve County and municipal agencies, and perhaps key elements of the private sector. The plan would address redevelopment issues such as issuance of building permits, construction inspection, contractor qualification, support to impacted businesses and industries, demands on local agencies and personnel, etc.

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: The County would be the most likely sponsor of this initiative, perhaps utilizing an approach establishing a lead County agency, such as land planning, growth management, permitting and inspection, with other designated support County agencies, such as emergency management, utilities, etc.

Benefits of the Initiative: The availability of a comprehensive, County-wide redevelopment plan would have many benefits in the aftermath of a major disaster. The policies and requirements governing reconstruction of damaged properties, utilities, and the infrastructure would be established. Plans would also be in place to mobilize the additional resources needed at the County and municipal level to expedite the effective and efficient process of helping the community return to normalcy. This plan would enable local governments to speed the reconstruction and redevelopment effort without unwarranted compromise to ensuring the future "disaster-resistance" of the rebuilt communities, minimizing the overall economic and human costs of the event.

Costs Impact of the Initiative: The costs of the Initiative would be for the time and materials needed by County and municipal personnel to meet for decision-making, gather information, prepare documentation, and seek promulgation of the plan by local governing bodies. If desired, a budget for contracting with a consultant to assist in the planning process could be incorporated into the initiative. Overall an estimated cost of \$50,000 to \$75,000 could be anticipated.

Likely Funding Sources: A variety of funding sources could be considered for implementation, including local government budgeting, hazard mitigation grant program funding, or funding under the State's Emergency Management and Preparedness Trust Fund (Competitive grant program).

Concept Paper #4 Increase Flood Awareness

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Increase Awareness of Flood Hazards and the Need for Flood Insurance

Origin of the Initiative: A survey of the both the general public and local businesses has indicated that there is a lack of awareness of the flood hazard in areas of Marion County and its municipalities among a significant portion of the respondents. In addition, the surveys have also indicated that significant portion of the property and business owners located in the floodplain do not have flood insurance.

Summary of the Initiative: The proposed initiative would consist of developing and implementing County-wide educational program for both the public and businesses located in the special flood hazard areas. This program could consist, as desired, of the following elements:

Identification of the properties at risk - Development of educational materials
Identifying agents selling flood insurance - Promoting the flood insurance purchase
Encouraging flood proofing - Advanced disclosure to property buyers

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: This Initiative could be sponsored on a County-wide basis by a single agency from the County, with the cooperation of each participating municipality having properties at risk from flood. Insurance agents or associations of agents may wish to cooperate in promoting the purchase of flood insurance. Chambers of Commerce and business associations maybe interested in promoting the program to business owners. Mortgage lending institutions and/or Realtors could also be interested, positively or negatively, in the question of advanced disclosure of risk.

Benefits of tile Initiative: The proposed program would be expected to increase the percentage of property and business owners who purchase and maintain flood insurance, thereby lowering the economic impacts of future flood disasters.

Costs Impact of the Initiative: The costs for the Initiative would be for the identification of properties at risk, development of educational materials, and their distribution. Additional costs may be necessary to publicize the program to the community at large to achieve a higher percentage of participation. There would be a cost impact of the program to those property owners purchasing flood insurance for the first time.

Likely Funding Sources: A proposed mitigation initiative such as this would probably be eligible for state funding under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program, the competitive County or municipal grant program of the Florida Division of Emergency Management, or similar mitigation-related funding program.

Concept Paper #5 Mobile and Manufactured Housing

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Improve Hazard Mitigation Programming for Mobile and Manufactured Housing Residents

Origin of the Initiative: The hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process for Marion County has indicated that there are several mobile and manufactured home communities that are vulnerable to the impacts of high winds, flooding, and wildfires. The guiding principles analysis has also indicated that the County and its municipalities do not currently have specific programs or requirements that address these risks.

Summary of the Initiative: The County and those municipalities having mobile and/or manufactured home communities of significant size would develop programs appropriate to their own needs in areas such as:

- Inventorizing of existing homes by age/type - Survey of condition of homes
- Promulgation of codes for new communities - Funding for home retrofitting
- Community-specific vulnerability assessment - Community education programs
- Warning and notification systems - Storm shelter development
- Community-based emergency planning - Risk disclosure to residents

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: Development of this program may be the most effective if done on a consistent, County-wide basis. Local governments would have the statutory authority to implement such functions as code promulgation and code enforcement inspections, and the appropriate agency within the County or its municipalities would be the sponsor if these components are included. Community associations and/or management may be suitable for sponsoring educational components. County and/or municipal emergency services agencies may be good sponsors for vulnerability assessment and emergency planning program components.

Benefits of the Initiative: The higher vulnerability of the residents of mobile and manufactured homes to

disaster-related safety risks would be decreased. Depending on the specific components of the proposed program, property damage from future disasters could also be minimized.

Costs Impact of the Initiative: The costs and/or cost impact of the Initiative would vary with the scope of the programs proposed and their components. Generally, there could be personnel costs for program development, design and construction costs for retrofitting programs, and cost-impacts to property owners for meeting the requirements of any codes to be promulgated. Risk disclosure could be claimed to have a cost impact as well.

Likely Funding Sources: Probably funding sources would vary with the program components included. State hazard mitigation grant programs may be suitable for construction and retrofitting. Funds for defined populations, such as low income, may also be available. Community associations and management may be appropriate sources for funding education programs.

Concept Paper #6 Evacuation Routes

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative of Hazards Threatening Evacuation Routes

Origin of the Initiative: The hazard identification and vulnerability assessment process has indicated that designated evacuation routes within Marion County and several municipalities are threatened with flooding, debris blockage and other types of hazards. In order to protect the capability to evacuate, it is necessary to eliminate or minimize these types of hazards.

Summary of the Initiative: All evacuation routes important to the effective evacuation of specific neighborhoods, or to supporting regional hurricane evacuation that are vulnerable to localized flooding would be defined and mitigation initiatives proposed for implementation (e.g., roadway elevation, storm drainage improvement, etc.)

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: The sponsors selected for this initiative would depend on the responsibility for the roadways of concern. Potential sponsors could include State, County or municipal highway departments, perhaps in conjunction with the County or municipal agency responsible for public works or storm water management.

Benefits of the Initiative: Upon completion of the construction, the greater assurance that evacuation routes will remain available to traffic when needed could reduce evacuation times and help protect the lives of evacuating populations. In most cases, evacuation routes are also the principal roadways serving the community.

Costs Impact of the Initiative: Costs for the initiative would depend on the number of roadways requiring attention, and the scope of the corrective project selected for each point of vulnerability. Costs would likely be significant in view of the construction-related nature of each project.

Likely Funding Sources: Funding sources could include those typically used for capital improvement projects of this type, such as highway and public works funds. In addition, due to the mitigation-related purposes of these projects, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Flood Mitigation Assistance Program may be available.

Concept Paper #7 Business Emergency Preparedness

A Proposed Mitigation Initiative to Develop and Implement a Comprehensive Business Emergency Preparedness Program

Origin of the Initiative: A survey of businesses and industries, conducted by the Marion County Working Group indicated that there is a significant portion of the County's private sector that is not fully prepared to respond to and recover from future disasters.

Summary of the Initiative: A comprehensive package of awareness, education and guidance materials would be prepared and made available to the private sector. This package, as desired, could consist of one or more of the following:

Awareness information on risk areas - A "model" emergency response plan
A "model" business recovery plan - Information on flood insurance availability
Data on business interruption insurance - Workshops on emergency preparedness
Creating a business assistance center - Creating a business ESF for the County
Establishing a mitigation loan fund - Creating a preparedness award program

A "refresher" package of similar material, or a program of implementation monitoring, could be included in the initiative to maintain the program in future years.

Possible Sponsors for the Initiative: Sponsors from the private sector would probably be the most effective, and could include chambers of commerce, economic development agencies, business roundtables, etc. Insurance companies or associations may also be interested. Public sector sponsors could include County emergency management agencies or business promotion and support offices.

Benefits of the Initiative: Initial implementation and continuing maintenance of the program would result in a business community less vulnerable to extended loss of operation or complete closure as the result of future disasters. This would avoid loss of jobs, purchase of goods and services, and tax revenue generation after future disasters. Depending on the size and characteristics of the businesses participating, the savings could be very substantial.

Costs Impact of the Initiative: Costs would be for the development of the informational and guidance materials, and the resources needed for the implementation method utilized. If a revolving business mitigation loan fund was included in the program, an initial principal amount would be required. If development of a business ESF or a business disaster assistance center was included, the costs for the personnel resources needed for the planning should be considered.

Likely Funding Sources: Funding sources could depend on the scope and characteristics of the program selected as the initiative. Private sector organizations may be interested in funding the educational components of the program, while insurance and banking interests may have an interest in insurance and loan programs.

Initiative/Project Scoring and Prioritization Procedures

This procedure is for the development and maintenance of the Marion County Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Mitigation Initiative/Project Listing to prioritize those projects listed in the LMS document. The goal is to provide objective and consistent standards for the LMS Steering Committee for the evaluation, scoring, and prioritization of projects to allow for an effective comparison of projects when potential funding sources become available.

Overview

The scoring/prioritization process is necessary to identify and establish a prioritized list projects for the LMS document. Scoring using the information provided by the Mitigation Initiative/Project Application submitted for each project. Scoring projects intends to incorporate three basic considerations:

1. Consider all foreseeable significant decision factors involved in the merit and feasibility of implementing the proposed project,
2. Provide a uniform method to numerically quantify projects for scoring and ranking and support potential computerization of the scoring/prioritization,
3. Provide a uniform method to evaluate projects regardless of their origin, restrictions, and purposes by assessing each project individually to determine the resulting score and prioritization including for the particular funding situations.

Decision Factors

In all cases, the LMS Steering Committee will score the projects based only on the “worst case” analysis, using the information provided on the Mitigation Initiative/Project Application. The analyses conducted for the “most likely” situation will be useful during the application process for funding or other approval/permitting steps. The higher the numerical score of the project, the higher the overall priority of the project by the LMS Steering Committee.

The scoring procedure in the 2020 LMS Five-Year Plan is identical to the system that was utilized under the 2015 LMS Five-Year Plan. As new projects are reviewed and ranked annually, maintaining the same system allows for consistency within the ranking process.

The decision factor categories considered for scoring are:

1. The population benefited
2. The percentage of the jurisdiction benefited
3. Health and safety considerations
4. The cost of implementing the project
5. The cost impact of the initiative
6. The benefit to cost / cost impact ratio
7. The probability of community acceptance
8. The probability of funding

- 9. The feasibility of implementation
- 10. Consistency with other plans and programs

The rankings assigned to each factor are explained below.

Scoring for Prioritization Decision Factors

Total Population Benefited

This decision factor account for the total number of people that would be directly or indirectly benefited by implementation of the proposal, reflecting the likely importance to the County as a whole of the initiative.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	76 to 100% of the total County population (BEBR)
3	51 to 75% of the total County population (BEBR)
2	26 to 50% of the total County population (BEBR)
1	6 to 25% of the total County population (BEBR)
0	Less than 5% of total County population (BEBR)

Percentage of Jurisdictions Population Benefited

This decision factor allows for consideration of the percentage of the population within a defined jurisdiction that would directly or indirectly benefit from implementation of the initiative, reflecting the likely importance t the specific jurisdiction of the initiative.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	76 to 100% of the jurisdiction's population
3	51 to 75% of the jurisdiction's population
2	26 to 50% of the jurisdiction's population
1	6 to 25% of the jurisdiction's population
0	Less than 5% of the jurisdiction's population

Health and Safety Considerations

This decision factor is the second step in adding weight to the importance of the human health and safety benefits that are to be derived from implementation of the initiative. (The first step was the multiplier applied to the estimated benefit to cost ratio of the proposed initiative during the preparation of the form “characterization of proposed mitigation Initiatives.)

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	76 to 100% of the total County population (BEBR)
3	51 to 75% of the total County population (BEBR)
2	26 to 50% of the total County population (BEBR)
1	6 to 25% of the total County population (BEBR)
0	Less than 5% of total County population (BEBR)

The Cost of the Initiative

This decision factor considers the cost of implementing the initiative.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
--------------	---------------------------------------

4	No quantifiable cost to implement the initiative
3	The cost is estimated to be less than \$250,000
2	The cost is estimated to be between \$250,000 and \$1,000,000
1	The cost is estimated to be between \$1,000,000 and
0	The cost is estimated to be over \$5,000,000

The Cost Impact of the Initiative

The decision factor considers the cost impact of implementing the initiative. The values are the total over the anticipated life of the initiative.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	No quantifiable cost to implement the initiative
3	The cost is estimated to be less than \$250,000
2	The cost is estimated to be between \$250,000 and \$1,000,000
1	The cost is estimated to be between \$1,000,000 and
0	The cost is estimated to be over \$5,000,000

The Benefit to Cost/Cost Impact Ratio

This decision factor considers the benefit to cost ratio, adjusted for health, safety, and valuable resource protection, of implementing the initiative.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	The adjusted benefit to cost ratio is 5.0 or more
3	The adjusted benefit to cost ratio is 4.0 to 4.9
2	The adjusted benefit to cost ratio is 3.0 to 3.9
1	The adjusted benefit to cost ratio is 2.0 to 2.9
0	The adjusted benefit to cost ratio is 1.0 to 1.9

The Probability of Community Acceptance

This decision factor considers the likelihood that the community will accept implementation of the initiative as it is currently planned by the proposing organization.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	This initiative is likely to be endorsed by the entire community
3	The initiative would benefit only those directly affected and would not adversely affect or be noticed by the remainder of the community
2	The initiative would be somewhat controversial with and/or opposed by special interest groups or a small percentage of the general population
1	The initiative would be strongly opposed by special interest groups or a significant percentage of the general population
0	The initiative would be strongly opposed by nearly all of the general population and special interest groups

The Probability of Receiving Funding for Implementation

This decision factor considers the likelihood that the appropriate officials or agencies would fund the project adequately for its implementation as proposed. The scoring approach for this decision factor relies on the concept that the potential for difficulty in funding means that the initiative should be ranked higher than for one for which funding can be easily secured. This reflects the assumption that one of the

fundamental purposes of the Marion County Local Mitigation Strategy is to facility securing funding for meritorious initiatives which otherwise may not be funded in a timely manner.

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	No potential funding sources for this initiative can be readily identified
3	The only potential funding source is post-disaster mitigation funds
2	Funding could only be accomplish through matching local dollars with funds from other sources; or would require a mixture of funding sources
1	Funding can probably be obtained through locally controlled long term budgeting (more than 2 years) or grants for this type of initiative are known to be available and the chance of successful application is moderate
0	Funding is available through locally controlled short term budgeting (less than 2 years) or a grant for this type of initiative is known to be available and the chance of successful application is high

The Feasibility of Implementation

This decision factor considers issues that are influential to the feasibility of implementation of the initiative from an administrative or managerial perspective. The following list of considerations is to be evaluated for the proposed initiative.

- The time evolved for planning and/or completion
- The requirement to involve numerous agencies and/or jurisdictions
- The type, number and time needed to secure permits and approvals
- The initiative would require a referendum vote by the general public
- The initiative would require a public hearing and/or commission/council approval

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	The initiative would be relatively easy to put in place within a year.
3	The initiative is not anticipated to be difficult to put in place because none of the considerations listed is applicable or would only have minimum influence on the implementation process.
2	The initiative is somewhat difficult to put in place because one of the considerations listed is applicable and implies significant influence on the implementation process
1	The initiative is difficult to put in place because two of the considerations listed are applicable and imply significant influence on the implementation process.
0	The initiative is very difficult to put in place because three or more of the considerations listed are applicable and imply significant influence on the implementation process.

Consistency with other Plans and Programs

This decision factor is used to consider the level of consistency that the mitigation initiative has with other current plans and programs that have been previously approved, accepted or utilized by the community to be affected or benefited by the initiative. The premise here is that proposed mitigation initiatives should be ranked higher if they are consistent with these other plans and programs, rather than if they are inconsistent or in conflict with the goals and objectives of generally accepted guiding principles.

The following types of plans, policies and programs to be considered under this decision factor are the following:

The goals and objectives of the Marion County Local Mitigation Strategy

The jurisdiction’s comprehensive growth management plan

The jurisdiction comprehensive emergency management plan and/ or the Marion County Comprehensive Emergency Operations Plan

Any applicable land development code, zoning ordinance, or land use plan

Any applicable environmental resource preservation or protection plan, policy or ordinance

Any other applicable local, state or federal law of regulation

Score	Description of Decision Factor
4	The initiative is incorporated into at least three of the documents listed, or judged to be highly consistent with all
3	The initiative is incorporated into at least two of the documents listed, or judged to be highly consistent with all documents
2	The initiative is incorporated into at least one of the documents listed, or judged to be highly consistent with all documents
1	The initiative is not known to be incorporated into any of the documents listed, and there is uncertainty whether it is inconsistent with or in conflict with any of the documents listed
0	There is some anticipation that the initiative may have inconsistencies and conflicts with any of the documents listed, but additional analysis is necessary to determine if such conflicts are irresolvable

Funding Sources

These sources described below are administered through the State of Florida and consider hazard mitigation as a main priority in their funding criteria. It is recommended that further information on any of these grants funding sources be investigated by accessing the respective agency website.

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program

The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) operates under the authority of Public Law 100707, the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. There are two (2) hazard mitigation programs authorized under the Stafford Act. The site specific mitigation under Section 406 of the Stafford Act is part of each Damage Survey Report that is written if authorized by the federal/state/local officials and is in accordance with any applicable rules and regulations. This type of mitigation receives 75 percent federal money and requires a state/local match of 25 percent. However, the State of Florida will currently provide half of the 25% match for grant applications that are awarded HMGP funds.

The HMGP under Section 404 provides 75/25 matching funds to eligible applicants to implement immediate and long-term hazard mitigation measures. A total of up to 15 percent of the combined public assistance and individual assistance programs are available to fund hazards mitigation projects.

These measures will be consistent with the state's Hazard Mitigation Administrative Plan and the Hazard Mitigation Plan developed in response to the planning requirements of the Stafford Act. The HMGP is used to fund projects to protect either public or private property.

Examples are:

Structural hazard control or protection, such as debris basins or stormwater facilities. Retrofitting of critical facilities, such as flood proofing or installation of hurricane shutters. Property acquisition, relocation, and elevation to protect structures from future damage. Development of state and local mitigation standards, and comprehensive mitigation plans or programs with implementation as an essential component.

Public Assistance Funding

Section 406 of the Stafford Act authorizes funding to local governments for cost-effective repairs, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of a public facility damaged or destroyed by a major disaster. This funding is site specific and must be tied to specific damaged facilities.

The Federal Coordinating Officer may authorize hazard mitigation measures that are necessary for compliance with codes and standards if the measures are in the public interest and the following conditions are met:

1. The mitigation measures will substantially reduce or eliminate the risk of recurring damage to the facility.
2. The measures reflect sound engineering and construction practices.
3. The measures are cost-effective.
4. Applicable environmental and floodplain management requirements have been met.

It is important that the State Hazard Mitigation Officer work with the Hazard Mitigation Engineer when inspecting the damage to make site specific recommendations for incorporating hazard mitigation measures into necessary repairs and to include them in the Damage Survey Reports.

Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Trust Fund

The Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Trust Fund (EMPA) consists of two competitive grant programs: The Emergency Management Competitive Grant Program and the Municipal Competitive Grant Program. Both programs are designed to implement projects that will further State and local emergency management objectives. The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) to open grant cycles for the EMPA grant programs are published in the Florida Administrative Weekly. Examples of eligible activities include:

- Storm Shelter and critical facility retrofitting and equipping. Informational studies relating to evacuation scenarios, hurricane insurance risk assessment, transportation methodologies.
- Operational readiness and response equipment (such as radios, potable water delivery system, search and rescue equipment, warning/alert devices).
- Public disaster education projects, including individual training, radio and television public service announcements, brochures/ publications.
- LMS development activities.

Building Resilient Infrastructure & Communities (BRIC)

Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) support states, local communities, tribes and territories as they undertake hazard mitigation projects, reducing the risks they face from disasters and natural hazards. BRIC is a new FEMA pre-disaster hazard mitigation program that replaces the existing Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program.

The BRIC program guiding principles are supporting communities through capability- and capacity-building; encouraging and enabling innovation; promoting partnerships; enabling large projects; maintaining flexibility; and providing consistency.

- Conducting a capability gap analysis (or partner network analysis) to determine where partnerships could be helpful or where funding matching opportunities can be leveraged
- Providing or attending training on evaluating, pursuing, or sustaining partnerships
- Supporting partner identification or partnership development activities (e.g., hosting a partner fair, pursuing initiatives with higher education institutions, engaging with economic development organizations)
- Involving private-sector and Community-Lifelines operators, such as health and medical, energy, and transportation service providers, in the mitigation planning processes
- Developing a partner database or online portal to submit and share partnership case studies
- Pursuing opportunities for knowledge transfer between partners (e.g., mentoring or shadowing programs)
- Attending state, local, tribal, territorial, regional, or national conferences to support knowledge sharing and partnership development

- Hosting a forum to share best practices and lessons learned or conducting mitigation-related tabletop exercises to build relationships
- Sustaining existing partnership initiatives or capitalizing on existing networks
- Implementing other innovative partnership approaches identified by the Applicant or sub-applicant to meet stated needs

Flood Mitigation Assistance Program (FMAP)

The Florida Division of Emergency Management in coordination with the Federal Emergency management Agency administers the FMAP which is a pre-disaster grant program. Planning is the foundation of flood mitigation. Therefore, the State of Florida and FEMA encourages local governments to identify ways to reduce their risk of flood damage by preparing Flood Mitigation Plans.

Planning grants may be provided to local governments to develop or update the flood portion of Local Mitigation Strategies. Project grants are available to owners of repetitively flooded structures to reduce flood losses. Examples of projects include:

- Elevation of structures insured by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).
- Acquisition of NFIP insured structures and real property.
- Relocation or demolition of NFIP insured structures.
- Dry flood proofing of NFIP insured structures.
- Minor localized drainage projects.
- Beach re-nourishment activities.

Florida Communities Trust

The Florida Communities Trust Program (FCT) provides approximately \$66 million annually to local governments. Small local governments with a population of less than 10,000 are eligible for a 100% grant award. The amount of any award or combination of awards to an applicant cannot exceed ten percent of the advertised amount of available funding. Application cycles are announced in the Florida Administrative Weekly at least 75 days prior to each application deadline.

The FCT program offers incentives to assist local governments in protecting resources identified in the comprehensive plan. FCT helps to implement conservation, recreation, open space, and coastal management elements. FCT provides financial and technical assistance to acquire lands that conserve natural resources, correct undesirable development patterns, restore degraded natural areas, enhance resource values, restore deteriorated urban water fronts, reserve lands for later purchase, use innovative land acquisition methods, and provide public access to surface waters.

Florida Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

In addition to the long established CDBG entitlement programs the state allocates funding for a Neighborhood Revitalization program and an Economic Development program. Typical activities that are eligible for the Revitalization program are:

- Construction of water and sewer lines;
- Construction of streets and neighborhood facilities;

- Sewer and water system hookups;
- Upgrades to systems in low to moderate income neighborhood housing.

Typical activities eligible for funding under the Economic Development program are:

- Assistance to local businesses in retaining or creating jobs.
- Public infrastructure necessary for business to locate at a desired site.

The CDBG program will also allocate funding to affected areas following Presidentially declared disasters. Current priorities are: acquisition of repetitive loss properties, elevation of structures, and drainage projects. As always, CDBG grant funding focuses on low to moderate income households.

Florida DEO Disaster Recovery Initiative

The Department of Economic Opportunity operates a disaster recovery initiative funded by CDBG funds. Disaster Recovery projects rehabilitate damaged housing and infrastructure and strengthen housing and public structures. Residential recovery funds have been used to repair storm-damaged houses, provided funding for buy-outs, and relocation for flood plain residents. Infrastructure funds provide funds for storm water, sewer, drainage, and street improvements. CDBG Disaster Recovery funds are made available to states and local governments designated by the President of the United States as disaster areas. Communities must have significant unmet recovery needs and the capacity to carry out a disaster recovery program.

Disaster Recovery funds are most appropriate for long-term recovery needs. Grantees may use funds for recovery efforts that involve: housing, economic development, infrastructure and prevention of further damage to affected areas. Activities must meet at least one of three program national objectives:

- Benefit persons of low and moderate income
- Aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight
- Meet other urgent community development needs

Other Emergency Related Funding Sources

These funding sources are not specifically targeted by the LMS however are included to give a more complete overview of disaster related funding sources.

Small Business Administration (SBA)

Once implemented, the SBA program can offer low interest rates to individuals and businesses for refinancing, repair, rehabilitation or replacement of damaged property (real and personnel). Loans may be available to

businesses which have suffered an economic impact as the result of the disaster. An SBA declaration can be made independently or in concert with a Presidential disaster Declaration. There must be a minimum of 25 homes or businesses with 40 percent or more uninsured losses and/or five businesses with substantial with economic or physical losses.

Temporary Housing

In the event of a Presidentially declared disaster, the FEMA managed Temporary Housing Program may be authorized in order to meet the housing needs of victims. The program has several components including:

1. Mortgage and Rental Assistance Program Individual and Family Grant Program

Applicable for individuals or families who have received written notice of eviction or foreclosure due to financial hardship caused by the disaster.

2. Rental Assistance

Provided to homeowners or renters, whose dwelling is determined unlivable as a direct result of the disaster.

3. Minimal Repair Program

This program provides money for owner occupied, primary residences which have sustained minor damage, and are unlivable as a direct result of the disaster.

4. Mobile Homes or Other Readily Fabricated Dwellings

When all other avenues are exhausted, FEMA may initiate the mobile home program. Such homes are moved to, or near, the disaster site and set up.

The Individual and Family Grant Program provides grants up to \$10,000 to help families meet serious needs and necessary expenses that are not covered by other governmental assistance programs, insurance, or other conventional forms of assistance. Financial aid can be provided under the following categories:

- Medical expenses
- Transportation costs
- Home repairs
- Replacement of essential property
- Protective measures
- Funeral expenses

75 percent of the costs are funded by FEMA and 25 percent funded by the state and/or local government.

Disaster Unemployment Assistance

Individuals unemployed as a result of a major disaster, and not covered by regular state or private unemployment insurance programs, will be eligible for unemployment benefits. The weekly compensation received will not exceed the maximum amount of payment under Florida's Unemployment Compensation Program, and may be provided until an individual is re-employed or up to 26 weeks after the major disaster is declared, whichever is the shorter period.

Farmers Home Administration (FmHA)

Low interest disaster loans are made available to farmers, ranchers and agricultural operators for physical or production losses. Loans of up to 50 percent of the loss are made available to farmers, ranchers and agricultural operators for physical or production losses. Loans of up to 50 percent of the loss or \$500,000 (whichever is less) may be made to either the tenant or owner of the agricultural business.

Income Tax Service

The Internal Revenue Service helps victims identify ways in which the disaster affects their federal income tax. Casualty loss credits, early tax refunds and information on lost documentation are some services available to disaster victims.

Food Coupons

Emergency food coupons may be made available to disaster victims. This program is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture at the federal level and DHRS at the state level. Length and eligibility for receiving food coupons will be determined by the President.

Community Outreach

FEMA and state officials will conduct "outreach" activities in an effort to inform disaster victims concerning what programs are available, where the DACS are located and hours of operations. This outreach will be accomplished by utilizing all media resources and by assembling and deploying outreach teams to remote areas to inform residents of assistance efforts.

Disaster Related Stress Management

Professional services are provided to help relieve disaster related stress and prevent the development of

added physical and mental health problems.

Florida Department of Insurance

Assistance and information about resolving insurance claims are provided.

National Fire Programs

Project Grants; Use of Property, Facilities, and Equipment; Provision of Specialized Services Direct Financial Assistance. These programs are administered by a variety of forestry and land management agencies at State and Federal agencies.

Federal Funding Sources

Attached as Appendix “I” is a description of many different federal funding sources related to disaster relief. This information is intended to serve as a starting point for County and Municipal Officials, Nonprofit organizations and businesses to use in identifying sources of assistance.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

One of the important aspects to the LMS is the end product, which is a listing of projects a jurisdiction wishes to get funded. The projects get funded through a variety of grants and opportunities. To receive many of the mitigation grants a requirement includes being on the LMS list but also establishing a “benefit” and “cost” analysis of the project that the jurisdiction wishes to complete.

The benefit-cost analysis can be completed with software provided by FEMA. The program considers what future damages and losses are possible and the benefits are the reduction in expected damages. The cost is the amount needed to implement an action that will support a greater benefit. Normally it is not too hard to figure out the cost – especially if a new structure is being designed. The benefits are harder because the severity of a storm and the probability may be opposite. For example a hurricane’s probability is low – but the severity is high. Some benefits to include in the analysis are damage to buildings, damage to business operations, and displacement of inhabitants, rental loss, and nonprofit function loss. Also make sure that the benefits are calculated for the life of the project and not just directly after completion.

There is a lot of confusion about the benefits of mitigation. Obviously there are higher benefits for mitigation to a building that is in the 10-year floodplain versus one that is in the 500-year floodplain. Yet a low-occupancy building, receiving funding in a 10-year floodplain is also not as beneficial. So the majority of the projects gain the most benefit points by suggesting mitigation for critical facilities including hospitals, fire stations, assisted living facilities and schools. Also keep in mind that “cost effective” is a big key to having a project funded. Each

project then is scored against itself - there can be no comparison because each project has a myriad of possibilities. Make each project count by establishing a convincing cost-benefit analysis.

Incorporate the Requirements of the Mitigation Plan into Other Planning Mechanisms

Marion County's growth and development is guided by its comprehensive plan, land development code and zoning regulations. Due to the nature of the comprehensive plan the LMS plan will be updated and implemented on a more frequent basis than the local comprehensive plan. The projects listed in the LMS are projects that the communities need in a timely manner. Many projects will be completed on a time scale not related to the comprehensive plan's updates. When the time arrives for an update to the comprehensive plan the LMS plan will be observed for trends in capital improvement initiatives. The projects nominated that have not been completed can be included in a general fashion in order to guide the capital improvements element of the comprehensive plan.

Also, the comprehensive plan reviews issues such as impact fee and future land use. Reviewing the LMS plan will provide the planners of Marion County with a tool that takes the public, private, government and specifically emergency management and looks at what their emergency management concerns are.

When making Changes in the Land Development Code (LDC) staff should refer and review the LMS. At times, changes in the development codes could alleviate persistent problems, creating less vulnerability to future structures. Another plan that should look to the LMS to learn about problem areas and needed projects includes water resource studies to evaluate the current condition of the water supply and look at key flooding issues. The underlying goal of the LMS in regards to local jurisdictions will be to educate and inform the departments on the types of projects Marion County is considering to implement through mitigation funding.

Another plan that should look to the LMS to learn about problem areas and needed projects includes The Water Resource Studies to evaluate the current condition of the water supply and look at key flooding issues. The underlying goal of the LMS in regards to local jurisdictions will be to educate and inform the departments on the types of projects considered for implementation through mitigation funding.

Individual Action Items for Each Jurisdiction Requesting FEMA Approval of or Credit for the Plan

For FEMA program funding these mitigation measures must be cost effective, environmentally sound and technically feasible. The local jurisdiction and the state must prioritize the measures based on these criteria. The Marion County Working Group covers several jurisdictions. The action items identified were based upon a county-wide approach to needed mitigation. Therefore each municipality is responsible for the implementation of the actions they see are needed for their community. All of the actions below will not be

implemented by each of the municipalities in Marion County.

- Stormwater controls – Stormwater management plans through grants and fees.
- Structures to lessen hazard impacts – Hurricane shutters are one of the most cost-effective mitigation measures. All critical public facilities should be “hurricane hardened.” New facilities should be built to current structural standards for withstanding hurricane winds.
- Adjust infrastructure location, design – Avoid building new public infrastructure that will encourage growth in high hazard areas. Design new public infrastructure to withstand disasters.
- Retrofit community facilities – Shutters, hurricane clips, roof retrofits, door braces.
- Hazard-proof new community facilities – Assure proper elevation, backup generators, safeguard computers and communications systems.
- Site community facilities to maintain services – Site community facilities near trunk lines for utilities and ensure that access road don’t flood.
- Preparedness plan/program – Increase communications system and warning procedures for all disasters. Increase weather monitoring capabilities.
- Emergency response plans – Continue ongoing efforts for planning, preparedness and training. Focus on issues identified in needs assessments.
- Evacuation plan/program – Begin with population/ housing analysis, possibly following the 2010 census. Perform transportation analysis using updated traffic counts and roadway capacities.
- Sheltering plans – Perform structural analysis of shelters and incorporate population analysis.
- Programs and actions that promote financial assistance for local governments
- Finance mitigation with grants – Attend grant writing workshops. Form strategies to “bundle” several funding sources together.
- Seek financial aid for local government planning – Incorporate hazard mitigation studies with comprehensive planning activities (i.e. population analysis, transportation studies, development trends etc.)
- Develop planning and project revenue sources – For example: Earmark a portion of impact fee assessments for mitigation activities.
- Seek financial aid to local governments for retrofitting structures – Attend grant writing workshops to stay current on new initiative at the federal and state levels.
- Seek financial aid to local governments for acquisition – identify repetitive loss areas that better fit the criteria for acquisition
- Programs and actions that control new development
- Building standards – Participate in and stay current regarding the development of a unified Florida Building Code through the Building Code Study Commission.
- Control type/arrangement of land – Integrate land use planning activities with hazard mitigation.
- Design standards for new development – Address vulnerability of mobile homes and mobile home parks.
- Legal protection for natural mitigation features – Ensure protection of vegetation to reduce wind vulnerability and prevent erosion. Protect the storage capacity of floodplains.

- Setbacks or buffer zones – Review existing policies to assure effectiveness. Review applicability of buffers to mitigate fire vulnerability.
- Tax abatement for using mitigation.
- Density transfer provision – Promote transfer of development rights and density clustering in PUDs to protect the mitigation function of wetlands, and floodplains.

Future Meeting Dates

The meeting dates will be established at the end of each 5-year update cycle. In the upcoming years the Steering Committee will be called together by the Chairman. If for some reason the Working Group establishes a new chair the responsibility will be transferred accordingly. The steps below indicate the protocol for these quarterly meetings.

- January – Notification of Meeting to evaluate document.
- February – Meeting
- March – Notice to discuss possible new projects and receive NOI forms
- April – Meeting
- June – Solicit municipalities for new project applications
- July - Meeting
- October/November – Score new project application / Rank all projects
- December – meeting

The meetings are to take place quarterly. This is to allow jurisdictions to initially look for changes in their projects and community profiles. The second meeting is for the review of the past projects and the review of the protocol for project nomination. The third meeting is for the nomination of new projects. The fourth meeting is to rank the projects for updates, because it is important for projects to be included in the LMS document in order to receive funding.

The jurisdictions to include in the invitation, but not limited to include – County departments, FDOT, Natural Resources, Forestry, Economic Development, Chamber of Commerce, Emergency Management, and an Academic Representative.

At the meetings a copy of the LMS on CD should be available upon request. To get a better feel for the changes that have occurred, a yearly survey could be conducted at each of the first yearly meetings, asking for changes in each of the areas and projects previously added to the document. Keeping up with yearly changes is very important in the struggle to get projects funded and creating a safer County to live in.

On no less than a biannual basis, the following steps will be taken by the Working Group to accomplish this procedure:

1. The Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will conduct the following tasks:

- Consult with the Financial Issues Subcommittee to determine the current status of funding and implementation of the priority mitigation initiatives as defined in the current edition of the LMS, as well as to determine if any new federal, state, local or private sources for funding of mitigation initiatives have become available to the Working Group, local government or key elements of the private sector;
- Review the records of the meetings of the Steering Committee and Working Group from the preceding two year period to identify any Initiatives for new mitigation initiative;
- Review the statutes of federal, state and local legislation related to hazard mitigation programming promulgated during the preceding two-year period and identify any regulations, requirements or guidelines pertinent to the Working Groups mission or the contents and format of the LMS;
- Request the Public Affairs Subcommittee to assess the implementation of the LMS to date, and the types of modifications and/or enhancements that would likely be acceptable to the community at large;
- Prepare a written description of the status of each of the priority mitigation initiatives, new legislation and/or new funding sources for mitigation initiatives, as well as comments on the public acceptability of likely changes to the Strategy. Transmit the report to the chair of the Steering Committee and each of the Working Group's then existing subcommittees.

2. Concurrently with Step 1, the Risk Assessment Subcommittee will accomplish the following tasks:

- Review all post-event assessments of disasters and emergencies occurring in the intervening two-year period to identify the effectiveness of any mitigation initiatives involved, as well as to identify any new vulnerabilities or risks indicated by the events;
- Research any new information regarding hazards threatening the County, the vulnerabilities to those hazards, and the risks associated with the vulnerabilities;
- Review the predicted effectiveness of any mitigation initiatives being initiated at the time of the assessment, but not yet completed;
- Prepare a written report regarding the results of the assessment, emphasizing the judged effectiveness of the mitigation initiatives in place and defining any new risks to the community becoming apparent during the preceding two-year period;
- Provide the written report to the chair of the Working Group's Steering Committee and the lead agency representative to each of the subcommittees.

3. Using the results of Steps 1 and 2, the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will identify those portions of the current edition of the LMS that necessitate expansion, enhancement or updating. The lead agency representative will then identify to the chair of the Steering Committee the scope, schedule and resources required to develop a revision of the LMS.

4. Upon instruction from the chair of the Steering Committee, and with the cooperation of the Working Group's staff, the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will prepare a draft of the updated Strategy and circulate

copies to all members of the Steering Committee.

5. The Steering Committee members will individually review the draft of the updated Strategy and provide comments to the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee for consideration. Following a reasonable time period for review, the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will revise the draft as needed, and submit it to the Steering Committee for review and release as a draft.
6. Pursuant to the procedure given above, the Steering Committee will take formal action to release the draft of the updated LMS for public review. Upon an affirmative vote, the draft will be released publicly for a request for comments, or, if not affirmed, the draft will be returned to the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee for further revision.
7. The Public Affairs Subcommittee will review the Strategy for further revisions and legal notices regarding the availability of the draft for review by the public. The subcommittee would take additional steps to encourage all member of the Working Group to review the draft in detail prior to the meeting in order to comment more effectively on the document.
8. The Steering Committee and Working Group's staff will prepare a public presentation summarizing the findings and conclusions reached by the Working Group in the preceding steps, as well as highlighting the proposed changes in the Strategy.
9. At the meeting of the Working Group, the presentation prepared in Step 8 would be given to the members, and comments will be received and recorder for further consideration. The record of the meeting will remain open for 15 days after the conclusion of the Working Group meeting in order to receive further written comments.
10. As needed, following the close of the comment period, the Mitigation Planning Subcommittee will modify the draft of the Strategy and submit a final edition to the Steering Committee for formal adoption in accord with the procedures for such action given above.

Each year the plan should be evaluated. The main question that should be raised, is whether or not the plan still reflects the character of the jurisdictions? The second question, have there been any rules or regulations that have been adopted in the year that would alter the effectiveness of the LMS document? Finally the third question, are there any changes in the administrative process or participation?

Continue Public Participation in the Ongoing Mitigation Planning Process

A major goal to be achieved in establishing the working group is to provide an ongoing forum for cooperative efforts, information exchange and continuing consultation between the public and private sectors of Marion County. As such, the presence of representatives of all local government jurisdiction as well as key elements of the county's private sector on the steering committee and its subcommittees are expected to provide for

coordination of public and private sector mitigation initiatives.

With the availability of the internet, newspaper, public announcements and members of the steering committee that are involved in many different groups, there is a plethora of public interactions to promote the LMS. The public involvement that has the highest participation includes citizen groups such as the American Red Cross and a variety of church organizations. These persons are allowed to participate in all aspects of the working group meetings. Obviously the voting members of the steering committee are the decision makers for furthering the project lists and amendments to the LMS, based on the recommendations of the working group.

The availability of the plan for public comment will be located in the Chamber of Commerce as well as on-line at the Marion County website in PDF format before final adoption. The contact for public participation will be through the Marion County Growth Services Department as well as the director of Emergency Management for Marion County. The contact information will include both telephone as well as email address for both of the agencies. This will allow the public to reach an agency they feel most comfortable in discussing the LMS.

The adoption of the plan will include each of the municipalities and the county. At each of these meetings there is a request for public participation. Marion County and the participating municipalities are responsible for the advertisement of these meetings.

Importance and Advantages of Public Participation

Public participation in the LMS process begins with education about the importance of hazard mitigation. A diverse community of interests will benefit from hazard mitigation planning, particularly when a local government's mitigation strategy address needs identified by a group that is educated in emergency management issues. Public involvement helps to guarantee that the public is knowledgeable of and has worked to establish ownership of the strategy. The Marion County LMS Working Group meetings are noticed in all the area newspapers and are open to the public. The meetings have been attended by area media personnel giving publicity to the Strategy.

Involving the public in the planning process is most effective when diversely knowledgeable and motivated individuals are involved. The involvement of the public helps support an effective program that better fits their needs as they are able to provide more local knowledge of historical flooding. Involving the public in the process helps them to become invested in the outcome.

Updating and Revising the LMS

The LMS will be reviewed annually, or as circumstances dictate, by the LMS Working Group. The appropriate membership of the committee to include County, agency, municipal and private business representatives will review the Strategy; amending their responsibilities under the Strategy; updating the Hazard Identification / Vulnerability Assessment and Mitigation Initiatives by modifying procedures, maintaining current data and/or adding new projects and deleting completed projects.

Proposed amendments to the LMS that are approved by the Working Group shall be submitted to the Marion County Emergency Management Director for presentation to the Marion County Board of County Commissioners for public comment and final adoption.

Nominating and Ranking Projects and Initiatives

The first step toward developing the required single, prioritized list of mitigation initiatives is to establish and educate the Working Group. The initial core Working Group members were the County and municipal representatives as appointed by their respective jurisdictions. At their first formal meeting the Working Group initiated more participation from the private sector, by inviting the local Chambers of Commerce to participate in the LMS process.

Education of the group is and will remain an ongoing process. The Working Group found that the most useful information for the LMS process pertained to mitigation grants and the competitive grant process. Also of great interest were the maps generated for structural damage and storm surge. The most valuable information given by the working group were examples of the effects of previous flooding or storm events. These were used as a measure of vulnerability.

Before projects were submitted, a system for evaluating and ranking the projects had to be set into place. The adoption of criteria to rank mitigation projects featured lengthy discussion through the course of several Working Group meetings. Once a matrix for scoring projects was agreed upon by the working group, projects could be nominated for scoring in the prioritization process. A separate scoring process was also adopted to evaluate the vulnerability issues of each project. A vulnerability matrix was developed and adopted over several meetings with much discussion as a part of the Vulnerability Assessment. The Working Group directed staff to score the Vulnerability Index and combine it with the score from the Project Ranking Worksheet once complete.

It was agreed that each jurisdiction would first list and prioritize their own projects using their own criteria. However, it was recommended that the adopted LMS Working Group criteria be used. Second, each jurisdiction would nominate its top three projects for formal ranking. To nominate a project the "Project Nomination Worksheet" is used to provide information about the proposed project in regards to each of the ranking criteria.

The ranking process is begun by distributing the Project Nomination Sheet and the Project Ranking Worksheet for one project to each voting member. Each voting member fills in the appropriate score for each of the ranking criteria. This process takes place for each project that is nominated. After all the projects are ranked the total score from each voting member is then averaged to form a preliminary score. The score from the Vulnerability Index is then combined with the preliminary score to create a final score.

After the projects were scored and ranked the Working Group created priority groups for implementation.

Adoption and Implementation of the LMS

Implementation of the LMS will be done by each of the local governments in Marion County or by other entities that may identify funding for projects listed in this LMS or future editions of the LMS. As with all plans, studies and strategy documents the final goal is implementation. The timing of implementation a factor that is dependent on funding mechanisms therefore a timeline for implementation cannot be established. However, it is clear that those initiatives with life-safety implications or initiatives that will eliminate losses should be implemented first. The methods for implementation are important, but stand as a secondary goal. It is the intent of this strategy to keep all windows of funding opportunity open and open them further if possible.