



Minutes

Pinellas County
Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Work Group
Quarterly Meeting
July 22, 2010, 10:00 a.m.
Pinellas County Emergency Operating Center
400 S. Ft. Harrison Ave
Clearwater, FL 33756

Welcome and Introductions – Ed McKenzie, Vice Chair

Status of FEMA Approvals:

The original letter from FEMA approved the LMS plan for the following municipalities: Clearwater, Kenneth City, North Redington Beach, Redington Shores, and Pinellas County.

A supplemental letter from FEMA, dated 5/21, added: Indian Rocks Beach, Oldsmar, Redington Beach, and Treasure Island

Another supplemental letter from FEMA, dated 7/14, added: Belleair Beach, Indian Shores, Pinellas Park, St. Petersburg, South Pasadena, and Tarpon Springs

The following municipalities have had their city council adopt LMS and a supplemental letter from FEMA is pending: Belleair Bluffs, Dunedin.

On the back of the meeting agenda was a list of the FEMA programs available for a municipality that has adopted the approved LMS Plan. I expanded the list to include the types of projects eligible and a web site where more information is available. The list is attached at the bottom of these minutes.

A general discussion followed concerning (1) the overall scope of LMS goals and objectives, (2) projects that do not support any objectives and, (3) projects that have not been scored using the evaluation matrix.

1 LMS Goals and Objectives

Betti Johnson from TBRPC explained that historically the goals and objectives in the LMS addressed all mitigation activities in the county, including those activities conducted as part of comprehensive planning and growth management. Thus, land use (e.g., population restrictions in high hazard areas), land development regulations (e.g. building codes) and floodplain management were addressed in the goals and objectives as part of a more comprehensive LMS approach. This demonstrates that mitigation is not just about specific project funding. That it requires a comprehensive commitment to a safer community.

Ed looked at the LMS in a more strategic manner. He saw it as a vehicle for members to identify key projects within their community which would contribute to the resiliency and enhance public safety. In order to compete for the funding, a project had to be on the list and the member had to be active. The projects on the list should address the LMS objectives and be ranked according to the established LMS procedure. On the flip side, objectives that had no reasonable possibility of generating a project were inappropriate. He saw the objectives as the strategies of the LMS and the projects as the tactics to achieve them. We called this a strategic LMS approach.

The committee looked at the "Appendix 4 Combined Commentary" that Ed prepared and posted at the website. After much discussion, we decided to recommend to the whole LMS workgroup that we maintain the broader comprehensive approach.

The current list of goals and objectives, with some rewording, will be posted at the sharepoint site for review by the workgroup before our next meeting.

2 Projects that do not support any LMS objectives.

While the comprehensive list of LMS goals and objectives covers large areas of mitigation activities, we still have almost 25% of our project initiatives that do not contribute to the accomplishment or activity on any objective. We did also recognize that the description of many initiatives is very brief and is likely not structured to focus on which objective it is related to. The committee discussed our alternatives which we saw as:

(a) If a project does not support or contribute to a stated LMS objective, it should come off the list.;

(b) If a project does not support or contribute to a stated LMS objective, it should be allowed to remain on the list;

(c) If a project does not support or contribute to a stated LMS objective, an objective should be developed to cover it.

We decided on a combination recommendation to the whole LMS workgroup that we give each municipality with an unrelated project the opportunity to do one of two things:

(a) provide additional information about the project that would show it does support an existing objective, or

(b) draft an objective that would cover their initiative (and likely others that are similar). These proposed objectives would then be presented to the whole LMS workgroup for adoption.

3 Projects that have not been scored using the evaluation matrix.

Over 20% of the project initiatives on our list have no scores. That means the organizations that submitted them didn't submit an evaluation matrix, for whatever reason. The committee discussed our alternatives which we saw as:

(a) If a project does not have a score, it remains on the list, at the bottom;

(b) If a project does not have a score, the organization must not be sufficiently interested in getting funding for it to fill out an evaluation matrix and it comes off the list.

We decided to recommend to the whole LMS workgroup that we give each organization with an unscored project the opportunity to submit one and receive a score. Projects that remain unscored at the end of the calendar year will not appear on the annual update we send to FEMA next January.

Next LMS meeting: Oct 21, 2010, the 89th anniversary of the last hurricane to hit Pinellas County. We'll meet at Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council,

The subcommittee adjourned at 11:30.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

1. Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)

Ref: <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hmgp/index.shtm>

- A. Acquisition of real property for willing sellers and demolition or relocation of buildings to convert the property to open space use.
- B. Retrofitting structures and facilities to minimize damages from high winds, earthquake, flood, wildfire, or other natural hazards.
- C. Elevation of flood prone structures.
- D. Development and initial implementation of vegetative management programs.
- E. Minor flood control projects that do not duplicate the flood prevention activities of other Federal agencies.
- F. Localized flood control projects, such as certain ring levees and floodwall systems that are designed specifically to protect critical facilities.
- G. Post-disaster building code related activities that support building code officials during the reconstruction process.

2. Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program (PDMGP)

Ref: <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pdm/index.shtm>

- A. Provides for hazard mitigation planning and the implementation of mitigation projects prior to a disaster event. Funding these plans and projects reduces overall risks to the population and structures, while also reducing reliance on funding from actual disaster declarations. Grants are awarded competitively without reference to state allocations or quotas.

3. Severe Repetitive Loss Program (SLR)

Ref: <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/srl/index.shtm>

- A. Provides funding to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of flood damage to severe repetitive loss (SRL) structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). An SRL property is defined as a residential property that is covered under an NFIP flood insurance policy and:
 - 1) That has at least four NFIP claim payments (including building and contents) over \$5,000 each, or
 - 2) For which at least two separate claims payments (building payments only) have been made with the cumulative amount of the building portion of such claims exceeding the market value of the building.

4. Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA)

Ref: <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/fma/index.shtm>

- A. Planning Grants to prepare Flood Mitigation Plans.
- B. Project Grants to implement measures to reduce flood losses such as elevation, acquisition, or relocation of NFIP-insured structures.
- C. Management Cost Grants for the State to help administer the FMA program and activities.