

Minutes

Pinellas County
Local Mitigation Strategy Work Group Meeting
Thursday, July 16, 2015 1:30 P.M.
Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Office
4000 Gateway Centre Blvd, Pinellas Park

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairperson Renea Vincent welcomed attendees and attendees introduced themselves.

2. Review/Approval of Minutes, April 16, 2015:

Dayton Saltsman of the City of South Pasadena made the motion to accept the minutes from the last meeting, April 16, 2015. (?) **inaudible** seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Presentation: Pinellas County CRS/LMS results (510 and 610 Activities)

Rahim Harji, Pinellas County; Lisa Foster, Jones Edmunds ; Sally Bishop, Pinellas County

Mr. Harji stated that the purpose of the presentation was to share the County's Community Rating System (CRS) with the various municipalities. He explained that most of the content of the presentation was coming from Sections 510 and 610 of the County's Local Mitigation Strategy outreach information that Emergency Management staff does countywide, so that the municipalities could qualify for some of the required points of the system. He also explained that the municipalities would need to modify some of the information so that it is specific to their municipality. Mr. Harji then introduced Ms. Lisa Foster, with Jones Edmunds.

Ms. Foster stated that the Jones Edmunds consulting firm assisted the County with their CRS over the past year and that the County had its verification visit in November 2014. She then gave a basic overview of the CRS.

The CRS has four **(4) components** (core series): **a)** (300) Public Information Activities; **b)** (400) Mapping & Regulations; **c)** (500) Flood Damage Reduction Activities and **d)** (600) Warning & Response Activities. The focus of the presentation was on the 500 and 600 series.

The 300 Series deals with activities such as elevation certificates, in which 90% of them have to be correct before being able to move forward in the CRS program. The activities also deal with outreach projects, flood insurance promotions and the dissemination of flood protection information. The 400 Series deals with activities such as stormwater management, open space preservation, flood data maintenance, floodplain mapping and the assurance that regulations are in place that are going to protect the residents from flooding.

The 500 Series focuses on floodplain management planning. Pinellas County uses the Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) as their floodplain management plan for their CRS Plan. The 600 Series focuses on Warning and Response. The Pinellas County Emergency Management Department is expecting to earn the maximum points that have yet to be earned in the state of Florida.

There are three **(3) different elements** in the **510 Floodplain Management Planning Activity (Max credit 622 points)**:

- **FMP: Floodplain Management Planning** (382 points for a communitywide floodplain management plan that follows a 10-step planning process: {**Step 1.** Organize; **Step 2.** Involve the public; **Step 3.** Coordinate; **Step 4.** Assess the hazard; **Step 5.** Assess the problem; **Step 6.** Set goals; **Step 7.** Review possible activities; **Step 8.** Draft an action plan; **Step 9.** Adopt the plan; and **Step 10.** Implement, evaluate, revise.}
 - LMS
- **RLAA: Retlitive Loss Area Analysis** (140 points for a detailed mitigation plan for a repetitive loss area.
 - RL Mitigation Plan

- **NFP: Natural Floodplain Functions** (100 points for adopting plans that protect one or more natural functions within the community's floodplain)
 - Comp Plan, Preserve Plans

Ms. Foster explained the prerequisites for the program. She stated that if a community is a repetitive loss community, the following prerequisites must be completed before being able to participate in the CRS program: **a)** a repetitive loss list needs to be generated; **b)** a map; **c)** list of causes; **d)** list of addresses; and **e)** a building count for areas with at least one, but fewer than 10, repetitive loss properties that have not been mitigated or with 10 or more repetitive loss properties that have not been mitigated. Either a Repetitive Loss Area Analysis or a Floodplain Management Plan must be done for those communities with 10 or more repetitive loss areas.

Ms. Foster introduced the Crosswalk Tool which includes a checklist and the 10 Step planning process, for those communities that are utilizing their own LMS. She then explained how to complete the Crosswalk Tool and went into more detail regarding the specifics of the steps.

She pointed out that regarding Step 3, Coordinating with Other Agencies, other agencies and organizations must be contacted to determine if they have studies, plans, or information pertinent to the floodplain management plan; to determine if their programs or initiatives may affect the community's program; and to see if they could support the community's efforts. It is important to ensure that the agencies and organizations that are contacted are not part of the LMS Committee working group which is comprised of 50% government and 50% stakeholders/public.

Some examples of "other agencies and organizations" include neighboring communities; local, regional, state, and federal agencies; and businesses, colleges, and other private and nonprofit organizations affected by the hazards or involved in hazard mitigation or floodplain management.

Regarding Step 2, Involving the Public, a public meeting separate from the committee meeting must be held within the first two months of the planning process to obtain public input. Another one must also be held at the end of the planning process, at least two weeks before submittal.

Some of the municipalities are very small and may encounter difficulty getting the required points needed so it is important for these communities to work closely with the ISO person from the County, as County points may be awarded to munis. The ISO can recognize any overlap and potential for duplicate efforts.

Step 8, Draft an Action Plan, is where the munis can specify activities appropriate to the community's resources, hazards, and vulnerable properties. The maximum points for this step is 60, the County anticipates 55 points. 50% of the available 60 points are needed to meet Class 4 prerequisites.

Ms. Foster stated that meeting the 50% stakeholder is the most difficult requirement to meet and suggested that each community bring a stakeholder to the next LMS Meeting. Chairperson, Renea Vincent asserted that the LMS Committee is a very broad working group and asked if there was any benefit to maybe shrinking the size of the group so that it would be easier to get the 50% as there are multiple individuals from multiple jurisdictions attending. Ms. Foster replied that as long as the working group is comprised of the required representatives from the various departments for the various jurisdictions (i.e. Planning, EMS, Engineering, etc.) and the match, that that would be acceptable. Ms. Foster added that it was important to be mindful that if points are desired for Step 3, that anyone who is included as a stakeholder cannot be consulted for information. Mr. Harji added that it was also important not to exclude anyone and suggested that a list be formed to see the specific existing representation and then go from there in deciding who is missing and/or needed. Chairperson Vincent asked if all of the positions had to be represented under each municipality. Ms. Foster replied that it is dependent upon the municipality's size and its department composition.

If a community has a floodplain ordinance that is more restrictive than the LMS it is okay; however, it would be in the community's best interest to review the model ordinance of the State and the County.

After seeing that there were no additional questions or comments relating to the 500 series, Ms. Foster moved on to the 600 Series which focuses on Warning and Response. This Series has three **(3) components: a) Flood Warning and Response; b) Levees; and c) Dams.**

There are **6** different **elements** in the **610 Flood Warning and Response Activity (Max credit 395 points):**

- FTR: Flood threat recognition system
- EWD: Emergency warning dissemination
- FRO: Flood response operations
- CFP: Critical facilities planning
- SRC: Storm Ready community
- TRC: Tsunami Ready community

The Flood Warning and Response Activity consists of a Documentation Report (developed by Sally Bishop), a Checklist and several Attachments.

Ms Foster stated that Mr. Harji would make the County's report, checklist, attachments and scoring available to the communities for review as a lot of what the County does is countywide. She suggested that the communities utilize a similar format but each community has to go through the report compare and tweak when necessary to make it community specific. Mr. Harji will send the information to the LMS group/communities and will also post it on the website downloadable in WORD format for easy editing.

Communities that do not have an individualized plan for any specific emergency operation and therefore rely on the County's plan must indicate that and state that the County is aware. The communities were urged to contact their ISO for assistance.

At the conclusion of the PowerPoint presentation, Chairperson Vincent reiterated that the County's report, checklist, attachments etc. will be made available via multiple channels to the LMS group, CRS etc.

Ms. Sally Bishop asked if the Program for Public Information Committee (PPI) was made aware of what was occurring so that the County could take advantage and get some points via that venue. Chairperson responded that the LMS group met once early on in the process to talk about the PPI Committee. Ms. Bishop also stated that the cities could take advantage of the fact that the County is already storm ready; however, if the cities were not storm ready but wanted to be, that they needed to contact Daniel Noah, the County's National Weather Service contact, to start the process. She will ensure that his contact information is made available to anyone who is interested.

Ms. Bishop and Mr. Harji explained that if the cities do not want to be a part of the County's PPI, the cities can take the information that the County has developed and reproduce it at the city level and swap out logos, get the points and have all of the same materials without having to reinvent the wheel. Additionally, if a community doesn't want to create a PPI website, they can simply direct them to the County's website, which would still qualify the community for those points.

Mr. Harji also shared that the communities could utilize the Pinellas County Map Service Center which pulls in data for the entire nation; however, the capability exists for parcel level searches for flood zones, storm surge, contour elevations and other layer information that gets more points. The source of the data must be noted.

Chairperson Vincent added that Pinellas County's Enterprise Egis staff recently added new set of public facing map applications. She will see if a link can be added to the LMS website so that it is easily accessible to the workgroup.

4. LMS Update/Status – Those municipalities that still need to adopt the LMS

Chairperson Vincent stated that there are still a few municipalities that still need to adopt the LMS. She stated that she sent out an email to those specific municipalities and thanked those who got them in. There are 7 remaining municipalities that still have not gotten their adopted LMS Resolutions in to her or Michael Wallach that she will follow up with independently.

5. Appendix 9 and 10, Annual Updates

Chairperson Vincent stated that the group needs to start thinking about Appendix 9 and 10 annual updates which is the list of unfunded projects and the list of accomplishments. There were a few municipalities who identified some things that needed to be corrected after the LMS had been adopted. The information is currently contained on a huge EXCEL spreadsheet. Mrs. Vincent stated that she is open to suggestions for the best way to make corrections. She is hoping to make it available for the October meeting for discussion and get it ready for finalization in December. Noah Taylor, with the City of St. Petersburg stated that there may be some unfunded projects on Appendix 9 that may have been completed that need to be moved to 10. There was a slight modification to the format of the spreadsheet for the last LMS review, as additional information had been requested. For new projects for 9, there will need to be a committee to score them and go through the ranking to get them officially on the list. Noah Taylor and Bob Bray assisted on the committee last time; additional volunteers are welcome.

If a municipality has data errors in the plan, those errors can be corrected during the annual update. Mrs. Vincent said that she will investigate to see what can be done if there are errors elsewhere in the LMS document that need to be corrected. There may be a way to do minor edits to the document without having everyone have to re-adopt the LMS completely. Ms. Vincent stated that she would reach out to Hillsborough for some guidance as they have gone through the correction process before. It would be in the muni's best interest to adopt the plan with the errors and then go through the correction process. As it is a countywide process, it has already been approved for adoption so it is important for everyone to get it adopted. If a municipality does not have an adopted LMS Resolution, they will not be able to apply for any of the hazard mitigation funding opportunities that may be available in the future.

6. Other Business

-Future meeting agenda item will include Appendix 9 and 10 Annual Update

7. The meeting was **adjourned** at 3:40 p.m.