



RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

STATE OF FLORIDA

Office of the Governor

THE CAPITOL
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0001

www.flgov.com
850-488-7146
850-487-0801 fax

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Executive Office of the Governor
Tallahassee, Florida
September 28, 2012

Jerry L. McDaniel, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1701 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

JoAnne Leznoff, Staff Director
House Appropriations Committee
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Terry Rhodes, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Executive Office of the Governor is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for the Fiscal Year 2013-14 through Fiscal Year 2017-18. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is www.flgov.com. This submission has been approved by Governor Rick Scott.

Per Chapter 2011-142, Laws of Florida, the Division of Emergency Management (Division) was transferred by type two transfer to the Executive Office of the Governor effective October 1, 2011. Section 11 of this law tasked the Division with the responsibility for all "...professional, technical, and administrative functions necessary to carry out its responsibilities under part I Chapter 252..." The Division has a unique mission, as well as distinct goals, objectives and performance metrics. To that end we have instructed the Division to develop a performance based budget plan as documented by a Long Range Program Plan specifically for the Division of Emergency Management. The Division's LRPP is attached herein, and has been approved by Bryan Koon, Executive Director. The Division of Emergency Management budget data has been included in the Executive Office of Governor for all agency level exhibits and schedules as prescribed in the budget instructions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kelley P. Sasso".

Kelley P. Sasso
Director of Finance and Accounting

Executive Office of the Governor



LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Fiscal Years

2013 - 2014 through 2017 - 2018

MISSION STATEMENT:

Listen, Lead, Communicate

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN*

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

GOAL: To improve the health, safety, welfare, and economic well-being of Florida's citizens.

OBJECTIVES:

- To help formulate the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.
- To provide management information services to the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget, and the Legislature. Assist in development of the agencies' Legislative budget requests, Governor's Budget Recommendations, and Legislative Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

GOAL: Improve the health, safety, welfare and economic well-being of Florida's citizens

GENERAL OFFICE [Program]

Executive Direction/Support Services [Service]

Objective: To help formulate and implement the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.

Outcome: Percentage of Governor's goals achieved

Baseline 2010-2011	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Executive Planning and Budgeting [Service]

Objective: To help formulate and implement the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.

Outcome: Percentage of Governor's goals achieved

Baseline 2010-2011	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

LAS/PBS [Service]

Objective: To provide management information services to the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget, and the Legislature. Assist in development of the agencies' legislative budget requests, Governor's Budget Recommendations and Legislative Appropriations.

Outcome: LAS/PBS system costs : number of users

Baseline 1999-2000	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
\$5,316,331: 1,365	\$4,783,294: 3,705	\$4,783,294: 3,705	\$4,783,294: 3,705	\$4,783,294: 3,705	\$4,783,294: 3,705

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN*

LINKAGE TO THE GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

The Executive Office of the Governor's goals, objectives, and performance measures are all associated with the Scott/Carroll administration priorities as listed below:

- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Regulatory Reform
- Focus on Job Growth and Retention
- World Class Universities
- Reduce Property Taxes
- Phase Out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

The following outlines each of the Executive Office of the Governor's goals and the associated priorities:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

GOAL: To improve the health, safety, welfare, and economic well-being of Florida's citizens

PRIORITIES:

- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Regulatory Reform
- Focus on Job Growth and Retention
- World Class Universities
- Reduce Property Taxes
- Phase Out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN*

*TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT
REQUEST YEARS 2013-2014 through 2017-2018*

The Governor is the state's chief elected official. His duties and responsibilities are enumerated in the Florida Constitution and in the Florida Statutes. Supreme executive power is invested in the Governor, as are the duties of commander-in-chief of all military forces of the state not active in the service of the United States. The Governor is also chief administrative officer responsible for the planning and budgeting for the state. The Executive Office of the Governor assists the Governor in fulfilling his constitutional and statutory duties and responsibilities through planning, policy development and budgeting; directing and overseeing state agencies; facilitating citizen involvement in government; and communicating with citizens at all levels.

With unemployment at over 10 percent for more than a year-and-a-half, Governor Rick Scott was elected in 2010 to turn Florida's economy around and get Floridians back to work. Known as the "Jobs Governor," Governor Scott is putting his 7-7-7 Plan to create 700,000 jobs in seven years to work. Since his inauguration, Florida's unemployment rate has dropped faster than any other state – down 2.3 percentage points, as of August 2012. While this achievement is notable, the Scott/Carroll Administration will continue working to make Florida the No. 1 state to start, grow or move a business until every Floridian who wants a job is able to get one.

To reach that goal, Governor Scott is working to make state government as efficient and effective as possible by cutting the size, scope and cost of bureaucratic red-tape and passing the savings along to businesses and families in the form of tax cuts. To strengthen Florida's pro-business climate, Governor Scott has built a leadership team focused on growing private-sector jobs by eliminating job-killing regulation and holding state government accountable to reach measurable goals.

In addition, the Scott/Carroll administration is working to make sure Florida has the best-educated workforce by working with the Legislature to increase funding for K-12 students and classrooms by \$1 billion during a time that Florida faced significant education funding challenges: Florida had gained 30,000 more students who would require almost \$200 million more state dollars, as well as a \$400-million reduction in ad valorem taxes due to declining property values and one-time state education funding. Despite these challenges, Governor Scott worked with the Legislature to provide:

- A \$405 million increase in per-student funding or roughly \$150 per student.
- An extra \$47 million for enhanced reading programs.
- \$663 million to fill funding gaps due to the influx of 31,000 expected new students next year and lower property taxes.
- Funding that will enable districts to reward the best teachers.

With more than 800,000 Floridians still out of work, Governor Scott understands that Florida cannot afford excessive government spending. The Scott/Carroll Administration understands that entrepreneurs and business owners are constantly seeking to improve the return on their investment, and in today's competitive global economy, state government must remain focused on increasing Florida's competitiveness.

To that end, during his first year in office, Governor Scott signed Florida's first "Jobs Budget." Governor Scott worked with the Florida Legislature to close a \$3.6-billion General Revenue budget gap and create a \$1.3 billion General Revenue reserve. Looking at the overall Florida budget, state spending was reduced by more than \$2 billion, including Governor Scott's veto of \$615 million from the state budget. In fact, Florida was the only state in the nation to balance the budget while also cutting taxes and avoiding new debt.

During his second year in office, Governor Scott signed a budget that made ends meet in spite of a budget gap in excess of \$1 billion, on top of the \$3.6-billion gap during the previous budget year. To reach this goal, Governor Scott vetoed \$142.7 million from the budget, adding to Florida's reserves.

Economic indicators show Florida is headed in the right direction. Florida is averaging almost 7,000 new private-sector jobs per month, and Governor Scott's business focus is gaining worldwide recognition. In 2012, CEOs from across the nation ranked Florida as the No. 2 state for business in Chief Executive Magazine's ranking of states, up from No. 6 when Governor Scott was elected and No. 3 during the previous year. While the improved ranking indicates progress, Governor Scott is committed to making Florida the No. 1 state for job creation and business development by unseating Texas from this long-held top spot.

Additionally, international recognition of Governor Scott's business focus came from the London-based business publication, fDi Magazine. Named the state with the best strategy for attracting international investment, the Scott/Carroll Administration understands the importance of foreign investment to Florida's economy. According to the latest available data, more than 2,500 FDI establishments in the Sunshine State account for 236,000 Florida jobs.

As an important part of Governor Scott's strategy to strengthen Florida's business climate, he regularly meets with business leaders throughout Florida and listens to their ideas for how state government can make Florida more competitive. In addition, he routinely calls CEOs of companies that currently do not do business in Florida to encourage them to consider Florida as the best location for expanding their operations.

Governor Scott is also making sure Florida becomes the ideal location for international business and trade. Florida is uniquely positioned to lead the nation in the volume and value of trade entering its ports. In preparation of the completed expansion of the Panama Canal in 2014, Governor Scott has called for expanding Florida's investment in modernizing its seaport system. As a result, funding for port projects has grown approximately 278 percent under Governor Scott's leadership, up from \$148.8 million in 2011, to \$562.7 million in 2013.

In addition, improvements to Florida's 15 seaports are positioning the Sunshine State to reap benefits from the expanded Panama Canal and be the gateway to the growing economies of Latin America and beyond. In 2011, Governor Scott put forward an important funding plan to widen and deepen Port Miami to allow Florida to capitalize on the larger Post Panamax ships that will bring cargo to and from the United States. This important project is projected to add 30,000 Florida jobs in the coming years while allowing Florida to outcompete other states for Post Panamax shipping.

Governor Scott's 7-7-7 Plan is achieving the following results:

Lowering Taxes. During his first year in office, Florida's first "Jobs Budget," signed by Governor Scott in 2011, closed a \$3.6-billion General Revenue budget gap and created a \$1.3 billion General Revenue reserve. Reduced state spending allowed a \$210-million savings in property tax cuts.

Governor Scott is also focused on doing away with Florida's corporate income tax. In his first year, it was eliminated for nearly 15,000 businesses, or roughly half the Florida businesses that paid it, saving business owners approximately \$30 million in each year they qualify for the exemption. In his second year, it was eliminated for another quarter of the remaining businesses required to pay it, saving those businesses also approximately \$30 million in each year they qualify for the exemption.

Holding government accountable. The Scott/Carroll Administration is returning state government to its core mission by consolidating agencies with similar missions into the Department of Economic Opportunity, giving businesses seeking to expand in Florida a single-point of contact for resources and information. In addition, red tape that slows economic growth is being eliminated through a review process that ensures state agencies develop regulations in the least burdensome way possible. Roughly 1,100 regulations have been targeted for repeal. State agencies are also checking the legal status of all new state employees.

Reducing Wasteful Spending. In his first year, Governor Scott worked with the Florida Legislature to reduce state spending by more than \$2 billion. Governor Scott directed the Department of Management Services to sell two taxpayer-funded state airplanes. This action netted the State of Florida more than \$560,000 in savings during the first fiscal year and eliminated the annual operating and leasing costs of \$2.4 million per year. These savings were achieved in a variety of ways, including reining in Medicaid costs to save \$1.6 billion, consolidating capacity in Florida's prisons and juvenile justice facilities to save \$251 million, and reducing housing programs and the Transportation Work Program by \$202 million.

In his second year, Governor Scott worked with the Florida Legislature to reduce state spending by another \$1.6 billion. These savings were achieved in a variety of ways, including reducing Medicaid costs to save \$576.8 million, consolidating Florida's prisons and juvenile justice facilities to save \$150.2 million. Also, the Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten program was streamlined and consolidated into one single agency.

In addition to leading the fight to require drug testing of TANF recipients, Governor Scott also worked with the Florida Legislature to modernize Florida's pension system through common-sense public pension reform requiring public employees to contribute three percent of their salaries toward their retirement, just like most private-sector

employees do. Prior to this reform, Florida was one of only three states that did not require public employees to contribute to their pensions. A 2011 study by two economists, Robert Novy-Marx and Joshua D. Rauh, revealed that every Florida household would have to pay an average of \$813 more in taxes, every year for the next 30 years, just to meet the obligations for state and local government retirees.

Making Sure Every Child Gets a Good Education. The Scott/Carroll Administration understands that a world-class education system is the foundation to ensure every child has the opportunity to compete in the 21st century economy.

In addition to helping secure an additional \$1 billion for K-12 education during his second year in office, Governor Scott worked to pass important education legislation during his first year. Principals are empowered to hire, reward and retain the best teachers by measuring educator performance and creating a merit-pay system and eliminating teacher tenure. By expanding charter schools and virtual schools, parents and students are likewise empowered to choose the education best suited to their needs.

For the past decade, Florida has been recognized as a national leader in education reform. As a result, Florida's education system has received national attention:

- Florida earned the highest overall grade in the nation for teacher quality from the National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Hispanic students in Florida led the nation in graduation rates in the 2012 Diplomas Count Report.
- Ten of *Newsweek* magazine's top 100 public high schools are in Florida, with two placing in the top ten.
- Four of Florida's high schools rank in the top 10 of *U.S. News & World Report's* top magnet schools.
- Florida's reading and accountability policies are models for other states.

These accomplishments show reform efforts have improved student learning and achievement; however, the Scott/Carroll Administration understands that Florida's work to better prepare students for college and careers is not complete.

Governor Scott is continuing to listen to teachers, parents and students, and has begun conversations about how to focus Florida's education system on helping students succeed in the college classroom and in the workforce, reflected in these six principles:

- 1. Link everything we do to preparation for college and careers.**
- 2. Maintain strong accountability measures that are fair clear and consistent.**
- 3. Make assessments purposeful, diagnostic and applicable.**
- 4. Reward teachers who make student achievement possible.**
- 5. Empower parents to improve student outcomes.**
- 6. Provide choices and competition to parents and students.**

**Performance Measures and Standards:
LRPP Exhibit II**

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards				
Department: Executive Office of the Governor Department No.: 31				
Program: General Office	Code: 311			
Service/Budget Entity: LAS/PBS	Code:31100500			
Approved Performance Measures	Approved FY 2011-12 Standard (Numbers)	FY 2011-12 Actual (Numbers)	Requested FY 2012-13 Standard (Numbers)	Requested FY 2013-14 Standard (Numbers)
LAS/PBS system costs: number of users	4,789,294 : 3705	4,563,004 : 3770	4,789,294 : 3705	4,789,294 : 3705

Assessment of Performance for Approved Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor
Program: General Office
Service/Budget Entity: System Design and Development Services
Measure: LAS/PBS Systems costs: number of users

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
4,789,294 : 3,705	4,563,004 : 3,770	(226,290) : 65	(4.72%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Performance Measure Validity and Reliability:

LRPP Exhibit IV

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND
RELIABILITY**

Department: Executive Office of the Governor

Program: General Office

Service/Budget Entity: System Design and Development Services

Measure: LAS/PBS Systems costs: number of users

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

Two main data sources were used for this exercise:

1. Total number of systems users. Total number of users was determined by the number of users for each of the major systems provided by Systems Design and Development.
2. Operating budget.

Methodology

The methodology used to collect the data is as follows:

1. Total number of users of each of the major systems provided by Systems Design and Development. For purposes of this exercise, a major system was defined as any proprietary application written and supported by Systems Design & Development that supports more than 50 users. The LAS/PBS Local Area Network (LAN) was also included as a major system in this listing as it provides the infrastructure necessary for these systems to operate. The below table shows a breakout of the aforementioned applications.

Procedure

The formula used to establish the indicator is as follows:
(\$ Actual Expenditures) / (Total Number of Users)

Validity & Reliability: Validity and reliability of the number of systems users was determined by comparing the number of users identified for each of the major systems provided by Systems Design & Development with the security profiles and tables for each of these systems. Since each separate application has associated security and user profiles, a highly accurate number of users can be determined. The totals for each of these systems were added to create the final output quantity.

Validity and reliability for the dollar amount was verified by comparing the Operating Budget amount against the figure used in this exercise.

<p>Supporting Table for Methodology – Systems and Corresponding Number of Users</p>
--

System Name	Number of Users	Comments
Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS)/LAS/PBS Web	450	
LAS/PBS Local Area Network (LAN)	260	
Appropriations Amendment Tracking System (AMTRK)	120	
Governor’s Budget Information System (e-Budget)	680	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was determined as follows (480 – Legislative; 200-Executive Office of the Governor).
Community Budget Issue Request System (CBIRS)	480	
Legislative Bill Analysis (LBA)	120	This number is comprised of OPB and Governor’s Executive Office staff.
Budget Amendment Processing Systems (ABAPS)	450	
Committee Meeting Minutes	100	
Special Interest Tracking System (SITS)	100	
Grants Management System (GMS)	80	
Agency Bill Analysis Request	120	
Comparison Issue Tracking System (CITS)	150	
Transparency Florida	680	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was determined as follows (480 – Legislative; 200-Executive Office of the Governor).
Total	3,770	

Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit V

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN*

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures			
Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	LAS/PBS system costs: number of users		System Design and development services (ACT 0320)

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

Agency Level Unit Cost Summary:

LRPP Exhibit VI

(This schedule includes data for the Division of Emergency Management.)

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Activity: A unit of work that has identifiable starting and ending points, consumes resources, and produces outputs. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and September 30 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act that represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings.

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

CIO - Chief Information Officer

CIP - Capital Improvements Program Plan

D-3A: A Legislative Budget Request (LBR) exhibit that presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units that are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

EOG - Executive Office of the Governor

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

FCO - Fixed Capital Outlay

FFMIS - Florida Financial Management Information System

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs, and renovations to real property that materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use. Includes furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

FLAIR - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

F.S. - Florida Statutes

GAA - General Appropriations Act

GR - General Revenue Fund

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word “measure.”

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

IOE - Itemization of Expenditure

IT - Information Technology

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAN - Local Area Network

LAS/PBS - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

LBC - Legislative Budget Commission

LBR - Legislative Budget Request

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created, pursuant to Section 19, Article III of the State Constitution and implemented pursuant to s. 11.90, Florida Statutes to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is

composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to section 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

L.O.F. - Laws of Florida

LRPP - Long Range Program Plan

Long Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the Legislative Budget Request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

MAN - Metropolitan Area Network (Information Technology)

NASBO - National Association of State Budget Officers

Narrative: Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue that is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

OPB - Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

Outsourcing: Means the process of contracting with a vendor(s) to provide a service or an activity and there is a transfer of management responsibility for the delivery of resources and the performance of those resources. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services that support the agency mission.

PBPB/PB2 - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. ***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.***

Performance Ledger: The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure.

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.
- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.
- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients that reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Primary Service Outcome Measure: The service outcome measure which is approved as the performance measure that best reflects and measures the intended outcome of a service. Generally, there is only one primary service outcome measure for each agency service.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Program: A set of services and activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals and objectives based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act by a title that begins with the word "Program." In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. "Service" is a "budget entity" for purposes of the Long Range Program Plan.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency's mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data is complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

TCS - Trends and Conditions Statement

TF - Trust Fund

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.



STATE OF FLORIDA

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

RICK SCOTT
Governor

BRYAN W. KOON
Director

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Florida Division of Emergency Management
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

September 28, 2012

Jerry L. McDaniel, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1701 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

JoAnne Leznoff, Staff Director
House Appropriations Committee
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Terry Rhodes, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Executive Office of the Governor, Division of Emergency Management is submitted in the format prescribed in the instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of the division's mission, goals, objectives and measures for Fiscal Year 2013-14 through Fiscal Year 2017-18. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is <http://www.floridadisaster.org/index.asp>. I have approved this submission.

Sincerely,

Bryan W. Koon, Director
Florida Division of Emergency Management

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN



**Fiscal Years 2013-2014
Through 2017-2018**

September 2012

Rick Scott
Governor

Bryan W. Koon
Director



Agency Mission:

“Working together to ensure that Florida is prepared to respond to emergencies, recover from them, and mitigate against their impacts.”

Agency Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Goal 1: Implement Director’s Priorities

Objective 1A:

Maintain current level of capabilities for County Emergency Management Agencies

Outcome: Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Objective 1B:

Explore and implement use of effective notification programs and identify potential gaps

Outcome: Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Outcome: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for State Emergency Operations Center activation

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Goal 2: Maintain National Accreditation

Objective 2A:

Update the compliance criteria in the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, including the Capability Assessment, to meet national standards

Outcome: Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year

Baseline Year FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18

Approved Standard					
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Outcome: Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Goal 3: Provide monitoring and oversight of nuclear facilities

Objective 3A:

Ensure licensure of existing facilities is maintained

Outcome: Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Goal 4: Create a career path for emergency management professionals in Florida

Objective 4A:

Identify, maintain, schedule, and offer training sufficient to meet the needs of the DEM mission by use of internal and external sources as appropriate

Outcome: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Percentage of state agencies/stakeholders identified in the State CEMP participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

Goal 5: Increase preparedness level of all Floridians

Objective 5A:

Develop an outreach coordination plan with the goal of reaching as many Floridians with the disaster preparedness message as possible

Outcome: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
64%	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%

Outcome: Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Goal 6: Provide safe and accessible sheltering

Objective 6A:

Ensure ability to shelter all Floridians

Outcome: Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Goal 7: Stabilize impacted jurisdictions

Objective 7A:

Maintain 24/7 readiness for an all hazards response statewide

Outcome: Average number of hours to activate the SLRC in order to deploy resources

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
12 hours	12 hours	12 hours	12 hours	12 hours	12 hours

**Outcome: Percentage of counties that annually update Form C-
Statewide Mutual Aid Agreement Contact Information**

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Objective 7B:

Maintain ability to notify SERT personnel and key Government officials within 30 minutes of a reported incident

Outcome: Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes

Objective 7C:

Maintain the ability to deploy a state Incident Management Team within 2 hours of activation/direction by the SERT chief

Outcome: Percentage of counties trained in EMAC

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Objective 7D:

Maintain redundant communications with the 67 County Warning Points and Nuclear Power Plants

Outcome: Percent of communication systems and are operational and mission capable

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Goal 8: Expedite Recovery Disaster Closeouts

Objective 8A:

Post 2005 disaster will be closed within 5 years of date of declaration

Outcome: Percentage of Public Assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Outcome: Percentage of Public Assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Goal 9: Maximize mitigation program funding

Objective 9A:

Maintain the State’s FEMA Approved Enhanced Mitigation Plan

Outcome: Percentage of listed local mitigation strategy projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%

Objective 9B:

Ensure the timely disbursement of funds and close out of disasters and funding cycles

Outcome: Percentage of annual residential construction mitigation projects completed

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Objective 9C:

Encourage all county and/or regional mitigation strategies and maintain 100% participation in all municipalities

Outcome: Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Goal 10: Expedite Mitigation disaster closeouts

Objective 10A:

Post 2005 disasters closed within 5 years

Outcome: Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%

Goal 11: Incorporate the private sector in all phases of emergency management

Objective 11A:

Provide educational, training and outreach opportunities to businesses on disaster related issues

Outcome: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Goal 12: Enhanced domestic preparedness

Objective 12A:

Ensure the timely obligation, disbursement and closeout of subgrants

Outcome: Percentage of domestic preparedness project lines closed out within 5 years

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Goal 13: Provide monitoring and oversight of hazardous chemical facilities

Objective 13A:

Continue facility outreach activities to increase reporting compliance

Outcome: Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Outcome: Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Outcome: Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA

Baseline Year FY 2012-13 Approved Standard	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Division of Emergency Management Linkage to Governor's Priorities

The Division of Emergency Management affirms its role in preparing for, responding to, recovering from and mitigating against disasters in the furtherance of Governor's Scott's priorities –

- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Regulatory Reform
- Focus on Job Growth and Retention
- World Class Education
- Reduce Taxes
- Phase Out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

The Division of Emergency Management (DEM) has two standing orders which are to take care of the needs of survivors and to take care of the needs of responders. To that end, the intent of authorized statutes under the purview of DEM address the needs and concerns of our citizens, state employees, first responders, county/municipal governments, non-profits and businesses operating in the State of Florida. DEM's mitigation efforts not only lessen the disaster costs and impacts to citizen and government but also citizens maintain employment through mitigation construction projects. The more projects awarded to the State of Florida results in less unemployment. Additionally, for every dollar spent on mitigation, it yields \$4.00 in future benefits such as reduced property insurance costs.

Trends and Conditions Statement

Introduction

The Division of Emergency Management is responsible for administering numerous programs related to emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. Chapter 252, Florida Statutes, and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 44, Parts 300, 355, 370, and 372 address all aspects of emergency management for manmade and natural disasters in Florida.

Emergency Management in Florida

Many unique factors contribute in making Florida vulnerable to the effects of natural and manmade disasters. Florida is the fourth most populated state in the nation with 18,801,311 residents¹ and is the top travel destination in the world. Florida has 1,197 miles of coastline and 2,276 miles of tidal shoreline. Additionally, 80% of the state's total population resides in the 35 coastal counties and approximately two-thirds of this population resides in a Category 5 hurricane storm surge zone. For a Category 5 hurricane scenario that simultaneously impacted the entire state of Florida, the public hurricane evacuation shelter space demand could be up to 835,019² spaces statewide. Currently, there are approximately 939,395 total shelter spaces statewide that meet the American Red Cross shelter guidelines, including both general population and special needs shelter spaces. However, though a statewide cumulative surplus appears to exist, there are three regions of the state with deficits of general population public hurricane evacuation shelter space: Northeast Florida, Withlacoochee and Southwest Florida. There are also seven regions with deficits of special needs population public hurricane evacuation shelter space: Apalachee, North Central Florida, Northeast Florida, Central Florida, Tampa Bay, Southwest Florida and Treasure Coast.

In addition, Florida is one of the largest users and producers of hazardous materials. There are over 11,053 facilities in Florida that meet the federally established thresholds for hazardous materials. Over 3,817 of these facilities house extremely hazardous substances.

Given the vast number of hazards to which Floridians are susceptible, a disaster may occur with little or no warning and may escalate more rapidly than the ability of any single local response organization or jurisdiction is able to manage. This was the case during the 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons when Florida was impacted by eight hurricanes, which is unprecedented for any state. During the 2004 season, three major hurricanes affected Florida between August 13 and September 26. Only Hurricane Frances weakened to Category 2 strength before landfall, as the state felt the force of four hurricanes in only six weeks. Four hurricanes and three tropical storms affected Florida during the 2005 season, with two of these cyclones rated as major hurricanes at landfall (Dennis in July and Wilma in October). During the 2004 and 2005 seasons, almost 15 million Floridians were in areas deemed vulnerable

¹ US Census Bureau, 2010 Population (April 1) estimates base

² 2012 Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan

and were either under mandatory or voluntary evacuation orders at some time with over 400,000 people seeking refuge in either special needs or general population shelters. The storms of 2004 and 2005 generated 63.5 million cubic yards of debris and over 2.6 million insurance claims were submitted. Additionally, during Hurricane Katrina, Florida spearheaded a massive Emergency Management Assistance Compact response to Mississippi that involved over 7,000 Florida responders at an estimated cost of approximately \$80 million.

Florida's ability to respond to the most traumatic hurricane seasons in the state's history is a direct result of the complex network of responders who provide safety and comfort to the survivors. Emergency Management is more than a single profession. It is made up of numerous disciplines that allow a phenomenal pool of talent to provide essential services to those in need. The Division continues to evaluate the impacts of the 2004-2005 hurricane seasons by seeking input internally and externally from our partners who make up the State Emergency Response Team (SERT) and from local governments. Performance data and trends will provide direction in reevaluating our core mission and will ensure that Florida's communities are prepared to respond to and mitigate future disasters.

While the Division serves as the central point and management structure to the SERT, management continually seeks feedback from staff and external partners to access our strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The Division follows the planning principals of the National Incident Management System that allows for a continuous analysis of the SERT's performance during an emergency event. Through Incident Action Plans and After-Action critiques, the Division can adequately evaluate whether the core mission was achieved. The Division will carefully review all systems and implement modifications and resource allocation as needed.

Natural Hazards' Vulnerability

FY 2008-09

With many residents living along or near our coasts, Florida communities faced the forces of nature as Tropical Storm Fay and Hurricanes Gustav and Ike impacted Florida in 2008, as well as the April and May Severe Weather events in 2009. These disasters set the Division of Emergency Management and the State Emergency Response Team into action. During these events and Florida's response to the Midwest Ice Storms of 2009, the State Emergency Operations Center was activated 99 days between the dates of July 2008 through June 2009. Also during this time, the following incidents occurred which caused the activation of a portion or all of the SERT team although the State Emergency Operations Center remained at a level 3 (monitoring). These incidents included the Orlando/Volusia Wildfire Complex, Martin County Wildfire Complex, Flagler County Train Derailment, Swine Flu, Operation Drywall, Wildland Fires, Inauguration 2009, January 2009 Cold Weather, CSX Derailment/Santa Rosa County, and the 2008-2009 Homeland Security Events.

FY 2009-10

In response to the devastating earthquake that hit Haiti January 12, 2010, the State Emergency Response Team assisted the federal government with repatriation of US citizens, foreign and Haitian nationals with passports or visas and severely injured Haitians. Haitian adoptees were also evacuated and reunited with their prospective parents. These operations centered on supporting 26,671 U.S. citizens, Haitian and other foreign nationals being transported back to the U.S., primarily on military aircraft. A portion of these flights involved 751 adoptees from Haiti who were allowed to enter the U.S. to be united with their prospective parents. The Department of Children and Families (DCF) oversaw the repatriation related efforts, and the Department of Health and the Agency for Health Care Administration oversaw medical evacuations in conjunction with DCF. Two Miami Urban Search and Rescue teams deployed to Haiti under federal order to search collapsed structures for survivors, provide medical and disaster triage and assist injured individuals to the country's health facilities. State and county agencies, various fire and rescue agencies, the Florida National Guard, the Agency for Workforce Innovation and Volunteer Florida provided airplane tickets, food, cash advances and hotel accommodations. Volunteer Florida oversaw assistance from 41 community and faith-based organizations, including the American Red Cross, Florida's Salvation Army Division, Florida Interfaith Networking in Disaster (FIND), Compassion Alliance, the Eagles Wing Foundation, Florida Association of Food Banks, Catholic Charities of Central Florida, the Archdiocese of Miami, Lutheran Services of Florida and the Church World Service. One of the efforts the group of charitable services provided was Operation Teddy Bear, which delivered 3,500 teddy bears to repatriated children in Orlando and South Florida. Royal Caribbean Cruises donated space on their ships to move 5 million pounds of humanitarian supplies from Florida to Port Labadee, Haiti. The SEOC's activation for Haiti lasted 29 days. Rescue and aid efforts were hampered during this time by major damage to communication systems and electrical networks, air, land and sea transport facilities, and hospitals. Lead federal agency issues, air traffic congestion and problems with flight prioritization further complicated early relief efforts. However, the state response team's performance met the needs of those being repatriated, as well as those who needed major medical attention.

The greatest trial Florida has faced in 2010 is the Deepwater Horizon oil spill; this calamity also affected Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas – and indirectly the rest of the world. The oil spill was an unforeseen and horrific disaster that has changed numerous aspects of life for residents, visitors and workers of the Gulf Coast. In order to respond to such an unimaginable force, proactive actions were continuously being implemented. Nine days after the Deepwater Horizon drilling platform explosion, a state of emergency was declared in the State of Florida, which marked the beginning of a long journey to recovery for the Sunshine State. In response to this order, the Florida State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) activated to Level 2 and began implementing response plans, organizing operational teams, and actively guarding the Gulf shorelines. The SEOC moved to Level 1 June 4 as the oil began closing in on Florida. Initially, the State Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activated on April 30 in response to this event. The final day of activation, August 27, marked day 120 of activation, which is the second longest

activation in EOC history, behind the 137 day activation for the 1998 wildfire season.

The lessons learned through all these events have helped to redefine how Florida and the nation respond to disasters.

Program Areas

The Division is responsible for programs and services that help communities prepare for, respond to, and recover from natural and man-made disasters. The Division of Emergency Management serves as the Governor's central coordinating body before, during, and after disasters. The Division works closely with all agencies (public and private) to ensure disaster resources are coordinated and delivered to the affected communities. Immediately following a disaster, the Division works closely with local governments to ensure appropriate aid is provided in an expeditious manner. In times of non-disaster, the Division works with local governments to enhance their ability to respond to future events thus alleviates the impacts to the community.

The Division provides the following programs and services: Citizen Corps, Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), Disaster Recovery (Public Assistance, Individual Assistance, Disaster Housing, Community Response and Local Disaster Recovery Centers), Emergency Field Services, Emergency Training and Exercise Program, Emergency Operations, Hurricane Shelter Retrofit Program, Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Program, Florida Accidental Release Prevention and Risk Management Planning Program, Severe Repetitive Loss Program, Flood Mitigation Assistance Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program, Florida Hazardous Materials Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act Program, Florida Prepares, Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, State/Local Mitigation Planning, Residential Construction Mitigation Program, Repetitive Flood Claims Program, State Floodplain Management, National Hazards Planning, Technical Hazards Planning, Petroleum Allocation and Conservation, Energy Emergency Contingency Planning, State Domestic Security Grant Program, and National Incident Management Systems Compliance.

Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan

The Florida Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) establishes a framework through which the State of Florida prepares for, responds to, recovers from, and mitigates the impacts of a wide variety of disasters that could adversely affect the health, safety and/or general welfare of the residents of and visitors to the state. The CEMP provides guidance to State and local officials on procedures, organization, and responsibilities. It also provides an integrated and coordinated response among local, State, Federal and private nonprofit entities.

The CEMP describes the basic strategies, assumptions, and mechanisms through which the State will mobilize resources and conduct activities to guide and support local emergency management efforts through four activities: preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. The Division revised its plan to comply with the National Incident Management System and to parallel federal activities set forth in

the National Response Framework. The CEMP is a standardized document that sets forth the State's role in organizing and carrying out evacuations, sheltering operations, post-disaster response and recovery activities, deployment of resources, and emergency warning and communications coordination. The Division conducts an annual statewide exercise to assess the State and local governments' ability to respond to emergencies. Smaller exercises are also held regularly to give State agencies and volunteer organizations the opportunity to train new personnel and to provide information in order to better coordinate response and recovery activities.

The CEMP addresses the following activities:

- **Preparedness** -- A full range of deliberate, critical tasks and activities necessary to build, sustain, and enhance readiness and minimize impacts through pre-deployment of resources, establishing field operations, evacuation and sheltering, implementing structural and non-structural mitigation measures, using technology to predict potential impacts, and implementing continuity of operations plans.
- **Response** -- Activities that address the immediate and short-term actions to preserve life, property, the environment, and the social, economic, and political structure of the community. Examples of response activities include emergency shelter; housing; food; water; search and rescue; emergency medical and mortuary services; public health and safety; decontamination from hazardous materials exposure; removal of threats to the environment; emergency restoration of critical services (electric power, water, sewer, telephone); transportation; coordination of private donations; and securing crime scenes, investigating, and collecting evidence.
- **Recovery** -- Actions and implementation of programs needed to help individuals and communities return to normal. These activities typically continue long after the incident has occurred and usually involve the repair of damaged public facilities (e.g., roads, bridges, schools, municipal buildings, hospitals, and qualified nonprofits). Debris cleanup, temporary housing, low-interest loans to individuals and businesses, crisis counseling, disaster unemployment, and long-term recovery planning are other examples of recovery actions.
- **Mitigation** -- Identifying potential threats and designing a long-term plan to prevent damages to individuals and property. Public education and outreach activities, structural retrofitting, code enforcement, flood insurance, and property buy-outs are examples of mitigation activities.

Management Priorities

The Division of Emergency Management selected two major priorities based upon its responsibilities for implementing the provisions of Ch. 252, F.S. The Division's primary priority is ensuring that the needs of disaster survivors are met. The second priority is to ensure emergency responders' needs are met by forming partnerships among entities at all levels. By operating and coordinating a number of programs related to emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation, the Division

is able to meet these priorities. The Division's recovery efforts related to the hurricanes of 2004 and 2005 will continue through 2014. Other shorter-term priorities include continuing with the development of partnerships with private industry, building response and recovery capabilities at all levels, training emergency managers, and implementing standards for performance. In order to meet these responsibilities, the Division has developed a mission statement, "Working together to ensure that Florida is prepared to respond to emergencies, recover from them, and mitigate against their impacts." The Division will continue to explore methods of incorporating other programs to strengthen its mission.

Short-Term Priority 1: Partnerships in Emergency Management

Partnerships in emergency management ensure that citizens' needs are met in the most expedient manner following a devastating event. The Division will continue to seek out those agencies and organizations that can provide value in meeting the Division's mission. Building capabilities at all levels will be accomplished by encouraging staff to provide premium customer service to Florida citizens, local governments, and State agencies. All entities should have a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) that will provide the framework for providing mission critical activities outside of the daily routine. Citizens expect services to continue in an emergency, and the State is responsible for ensuring that it is prepared to sustain critical operations. Frequent training and exercises provide emergency managers the opportunity to test plans and procedures for any event. The Division will expand its training effort by providing more in-class instruction and make certain courses available via the Internet.

Short-Term Priority 2: Emergency Management Accreditation Program

In December 2008, the Division was assessed on the revised Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) standards adopted in 2007. In March 2009, Florida was the first state along with Arizona to receive full re-accreditation from the EMAP Commission. The EMAP process was the result of more than a dozen national organizations creating a standard emergency management program. Currently, the National Emergency Management Association administers the program in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Division was required to comply with all 63 established standards encompassing 15 different program areas. Because the accreditation assessment is intended to be an improvement tool to assist emergency programs in identifying areas of focus for planning, management has aligned its five-year Long-Range Program Plan with the 15 EMAP program areas which are defined in Appendix B. In 2014, the accreditation expires for DEM. Therefore, we will begin the re-accreditation program in 2013.

Program Area Responsibilities

The Division of Emergency Management is responsible for developing and maintaining the state's ability to effectively respond to a wide variety of threats. The Division continually works with State and local governments to develop guides,

procedures, and plans to manage the consequences of emergencies or disasters. Florida is susceptible to natural disasters such as tropical storms, hurricanes, tornadoes, wildfires, flooding and drought. In addition, hazardous material releases, transportation catastrophes, pandemics, and both nuclear and domestic security incidents are man-made emergencies that pose a risk to the state.

The State Emergency Response Team (SERT) is the lawfully designated organization designed to respond to both man-made and natural disasters. The Governor or his designee activates the SERT, and it provides support and coordination to the affected jurisdictions. At the direction of the Governor, the Division provides overall coordination of the SERT which is comprised of state agencies, volunteer organizations, and private sector representatives. Constant communication between the SERT and the actual site of the emergency allows for the most expedited emergency response and recovery to communities, its citizens, and local officials. Subsequent visits are necessary to maintain the continuity of emergency preparedness and recovery.

Training for state and local emergency management personnel and citizens is an essential activity of the Division that furthers preparedness activities. Planning to enhance preparedness is an activity that includes maintaining Florida's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, which establishes the framework to effectively respond to any critical event. Also, associated supporting operational procedures are created and maintained for incidents such as regional evacuation, wildfire incidents, radiological incidents at commercial nuclear power plants, and terrorist incidents. The Division maintains the State Emergency Operations Center, which is a unique facility that provides a central command location for state emergency response and recovery efforts before, during, and after emergencies and disasters.

The Division assists with the logistics of disaster response and recovery operations with all branches of state government to ensure missions and resources are managed efficiently. The 24-hour State Watch Office (SWO) is housed within the State Emergency Operations Center and serves as the State's central emergency reporting, situational awareness and notification center every day of the year. The Division is also responsible for coordinating the elimination of the state's hurricane shelter space deficit by surveying and retrofitting facilities to add to local inventories and incorporating enhanced wind design and construction standards into new public building construction projects. The Division is responsible for reviewing site plans to enhance first-response efforts at facilities storing hazardous materials and for assisting facilities with reporting requirements and compliance verification. Staff also conducts on-site audits of county Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans and provides technical assistance for plan development.

The Division also administers programs designed to enhance State and local emergency management capabilities. These include the Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Trust Fund county base grants; and other Federal, State, or private awards of funding. These funds are allocated in order to enhance state and local emergency management capabilities. The Division also works to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to human life and property from disasters.

Assistance for recovery from disasters is provided through Federal infrastructure assistance, human services assistance and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. These programs help to rebuild lives and communities which have been affected by a major disaster and to reduce the impact of future disasters through mitigation.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

The Division of Emergency Management conducted a SWOT analysis in September 2008. A new SWOT analysis will be completed in 2013. The Division is a unique government entity because its roles and responsibilities often exceed “typical” office hours as emergency events demand an extensive amount of personnel working in an intensive and concentrated timeframe. The Division offers a high level of service in preparing for and responding to emergencies in the state. Therefore, the Division conducts multiple activities, both daily and during times of emergencies. The Division recognizes that increased training is critical, but it often results in creating a more marketable employee, thus causing a high turnover of staff. Expending resources to train staff is an investment that must be protected to ensure the State meets its mission of being prepared to respond to emergencies, recover from them, and mitigate against their impacts.

Strengths: The Division’s primary strength is its ability to coordinate multi-functional emergency tasks among a variety of government and private agencies. There is a strong mutual aid strategy in place and personnel are capable of a rapid response, and emergency deployment. The Division is often recognized among the emergency management profession as the premier emergency management agency in the nation. In 2003, the Division was the first state emergency management agency in the nation to receive national accreditation by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program. In March 2009, Florida received full re-accreditation from the EMAP Commission. The accreditation process involved an in-depth review of the entire program that was conducted by trained assessors. Also, the Division maintains one of the nation’s more reliable emergency alert and notification systems which ensures the public will receive timely messages and instructions.

Weaknesses: While the Division provides numerous emergency management related training opportunities to the current staff and the external stakeholders (i.e., first responders, emergency managers, and volunteers), the Department must realize that this investment should be adequately maintained to ensure employees do not leave the agency for better paid positions. The Department needs to be more consistent in cross-training employees in both daily work and in emergency response situations.

Opportunities: Since the 2004 hurricane season, the Division’s customers realize even more the importance of having a single point of command and control in any emergency. Additional federal funding for domestic security and for all hazards will ensure affected communities will recover from an event and realize a stronger economy.

Threats: The Division’s biggest challenge remains the “unknown” event. Even with

innovative technology that can predict certain events, such as severe weather, unpredicted events, such as the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, will present a larger challenge to the agency in the future. As the population continues to grow, especially in vulnerable areas, Florida will become more susceptible to catastrophic losses.

Emergency Management Outcomes

Mitigation

Outcome 1: Percentage of open Local Mitigation Strategy projects that are currently under construction

Justification of the Final Projection

As evidenced during the past decade and in the decades prior, Florida has been threatened by hurricanes, flooding, and tornadoes. The risk of these potential impacts to the state can be mitigated to a large degree by projects designed to strengthen homes, businesses and infrastructure.

Submittal and subsequent approval of Florida's Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan by FEMA provides for an increased percentage of total federal assistance the state receives for disaster mitigation activities at 20 percent, compared to 15 percent for states without an approved enhanced plan. The plan provides a framework for linking mitigation planning and measures with public and private sectors and demonstrates that Florida is capable of managing its mitigation planning and programs with minimal assistance from FEMA to ensure an integrated, comprehensive approach to disaster loss reduction in Florida.

Outcome 2: Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects

Justification of the Final Projection

Florida's long-term commitment to hazard mitigation through the development and adoption of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan makes Florida a safer place to live, work and vacation. Since the Groundhog Day tornadoes in 2007, Florida has received an additional \$4,758,680 in federal disaster funding due to its enhanced status.

Outcome 3: Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System

Justification of the Final Projection

The Division has provided technical assistance and resources to every county to develop their Local Mitigation Strategy. This activity allows community stakeholders to conduct an in-depth analysis of past and potential disaster losses and develop methods and priorities to reduce or eliminate future losses due to disaster. The Division also provides technical assistance to counties in identifying repetitive loss structures that can be mitigated with retrofitting; administers federal mitigation grant programs such as the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program and the Hazard

Mitigation Grant Program; provides technical assistance to local governments in planning and completing mitigation projects; and assesses federal and state compliance of projects in communities.

Outcome 4: Percentage of annual residential construction mitigation projects completed

Justification of the Final Projection

The state's Residential Construction Mitigation Program, also managed by the Division's Bureau of Mitigation, provides grant funds to reduce the state's vulnerability to wind-related damages. This program is essential in reducing repetitive losses to structures and providing valuable information to the homeowner. The program is statutorily funded by an annual allocation from the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Trust Fund.

Preparedness

Outcome 1: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Outcome 2: Percentage of state agencies/stakeholders identified in the State CEMP participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise

Justification of the Final Projections

Chapter 252.35(2) (a) (8), Florida Statutes, requires the Division to implement training programs to improve the ability of state and local emergency management personnel to prepare and implement emergency management plans and programs. The Bureau of Preparedness, Training and Exercise Section coordinates delivery of a continuous training program for agencies and individuals that will be called upon to perform key roles in state and local post-disaster response and recovery efforts and for local government personnel on federal and state post-disaster response and recovery strategies and procedures.

Outcome 3: Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted

Justification of the Final Projection

The Division assesses each county's emergency management agency plans, procedures, training, exercise performance, and actual performance in an emergency event. The Division established the capability assessment procedure in 2000 to help ensure counties are capable of responding appropriately to any emergency or disaster that occurs within their locality. The criteria used to perform a program review are comprehensive. Staff provides technical assistance to those programs needing further guidance or instruction. The criteria are reviewed to ensure the program is prepared to respond to future threats.

Outcome 4: Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable

Justification of Final Projection

Per Section 252.35 (2)(w), the division must report biennially the status of the emergency management capabilities of the state and its political subdivisions.

Additionally, an annual capability assessment is also required to maintain federal emergency management/disaster funding. Just as the state's capability assessment tool, the criteria used to perform the state's capabilities are comprehensive. The results will show deficiencies relating to planning, organization, equipment, training and exercises.

Outcome 5: Reported chemical releases or spills exceed reporting threshold quantity investigated

Outcome 6: Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R

Outcome 7: Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA

Justification of Final Projection

The Technological Hazards Section within the Bureau of Preparedness implements the requirements of the federal Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act. This implementation provides for hazardous materials emergency planning and allows public access to information regarding potential chemical hazards that exist in communities. The Division verifies compliance through reporting of facilities known to store hazardous materials, monitors accidental releases of chemicals and incidents involving hazardous materials, collects fines from facilities not in compliance, performs on-site facility audits, and provides technical assistance to local governments in preparing for and managing chemical emergencies.

Outcome 8: Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise

Justification of Final Projection

The Division has the overall responsibility for coordination of the response to a nuclear power plant emergency by federal, state and local agencies. In order for these facilities to maintain their licenses through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, annual evaluated exercises are conducted to not only determine their emergency capabilities but also to monitor compliance with federal regulations.

Response

Outcome 1: Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable.

Outcome 2: Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance

Outcome 3: Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant

Outcome 4: Percentage of confirmations within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation

Outcome 5: Percentage of counties trained in EMAC (Emergency Management Assistance Compact)

Outcome 6: Average number of hours to activate the SLRC (State Logistics Response Center) in order to deploy resources

Outcome 7: Percentage of counties that annually update their Form C-Statewide Mutual Aid Agreement Contact Information

Justification of the Final Projections

The Division maintains the State Emergency Operations Center, which is a unique facility that provides a central command location for state emergency response and recovery efforts before, during, and after emergencies and disasters. The Bureau of Response is home to the Operations Section which monitors day to day incidents, activities, and events within the State of Florida that could require a State response, as well as the operational readiness of the State Emergency Operations Center; and the Logistics Section which is responsible for contract negotiations, vendor management, and resource acquisition, deployment, tracking and management.

Warning of impending emergencies or disasters enables communities to prepare for the effects of disasters and, therefore, reduce the consequences of those effects. Preparation includes undertaking protective actions such as seeking safe shelter or evacuating unsafe areas in order to reduce event-related fatalities and injuries. In order to provide Florida residents and visitors with adequate warnings of impending emergencies/disasters, the Division maintains statewide technological communication capability through satellite and alternative, redundant systems and maintains continuous 24-hour staffing of the State Watch Office.

Outcome 8: Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed

Justification of Final Projections

Per Section 252.35, (2)(a)2, the division is responsible to ensure there is adequate public shelter space in each region of the state to safely house survivors in the event of a disaster evacuation. An annual Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan is submitted which identifies the general location and square footage of both general population and special needs shelters by Regional Planning Council Regions. The plan also includes information on the availability of shelters that accept pets. The plan outlines shelter needs for the next 5 years, the types of facilities that should be constructed, and a recommendation of an appropriate and available source of funding for the additional costs to comply with ARC 4496 guidelines. The Infrastructure Section provides technical assistance to county governments with locating, identifying, and retrofitting hurricane shelters.

Recovery

Outcome 1: Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within seven years of disaster declaration date

Outcome 2: Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration

Justification of the Final Projection

Recovery is the time period after a disaster that continues until all systems return to normal or as close to normal as possible. The Division administers federal public infrastructure and individual human assistance programs for emergency events and provides technical assistance to local governments concerning these programs.

Activities associated with public infrastructure assistance include assessing damage to public buildings, assisting local governments to plan recovery projects, and conducting on-going inspections of projects. Activities associated with individual human services assistance include coordinating with federal, local and volunteer agencies to provide survivors (individuals, families and businesses) with temporary housing, food and shelter, crisis counseling, rebuilding and replacement loans, and unemployment assistance.

Through specialized software, the Division is able to manage infrastructure projects relevant to rebuilding an affected community. The software expedites contract execution and vendor payments. While the Division is unable to control external factors responsible for completing a project (e.g., local purchasing and permitting requirements, etc.), staff will strive to close out at least 95% of projects within seven years of the disaster declaration date. In the event Florida experiences a large natural or man-made disaster, the Division will need to augment its existing staff to handle the increased workload.

Division Director's Office

Outcome 1: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Outcome 2: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan

Outcome 3: Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan

Justification of the Final Projection

The Florida Division of Emergency Management's External Affairs Section exists to facilitate the use of division-wide resources to support existing partnerships, as well as to educate and engage new partners in contributing to the overall mission of the Division and the State Emergency Response Team. The Division works to build effective relationships and partnerships with internal and external partners to advance the mutual needs of the emergency management community and to enhance our ability to serve the residents of Florida. It is vital that Florida's residents and visitors remain aware of, and are prepared for natural hazards, such as hurricanes, and man-made hazards, such as threats to domestic security by adopting a culture of preparedness. Floridians are urged to take personal responsibility and develop a disaster preparedness plan based on their own needs through continuous education and community outreach. This outreach seeks to increase knowledge of preparing and protecting families, homes and businesses from the hazards of natural disasters or man-made events and to *GET A PLAN!* for appropriate actions when called to do so by their local authorities.

Outcome 4: Percentage of domestic preparedness project lines closed out within 5

years

Justification of Final Projection

The division receives funding from the Department of Homeland Security to implement Presidential Policy Directive 8 which instructs the federal government to take action to strengthen our nation's security and resilience against a variety of hazards including terrorism, pandemics, and catastrophic natural disasters by supporting the development and sustainment of core capabilities to fulfill the National Preparedness Goal. The division provides grant oversight of these funds which are distributed to other state agencies, local governments and private non-profit entities through the division to address identified planning, organization, equipment, training and exercise needs to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.

Justification of Revised or Proposed New Programs and/or Services

The Division of Emergency Management will continue to manage the initiatives detailed in Chapter 2006-71, Laws of Florida, specifically relating to County Emergency Operations Center construction or renovation, public shelter retrofits, as well as, resource & logistical staging, warehousing and management.

List of Potential Policy Changes Affecting the Agency Budget Request or Governor' Recommended Budget

The division will be requesting an exemption from Section 282.201 (4)(g) to consolidate data processing activities to the Southwood Shared Resource Center. This exemption is being requested due to issues that have been encountered with the ability of the SSRC to respond quickly to emergency activations and the ability to maintain email connectivity.

Fiscal Restrictions to Federal Grants

The Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Plan was approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in 2010. The Division will continue to be eligible for up to 20% additional post-disaster mitigation funding. This is an increase from 15% previously awarded.

List of Changes Which Would Require Legislative Action, Including Elimination of Programs, Services and/or Activities

Exemption from Section 282.201 (4)(g) to consolidate data processing activities to the Southwood Shared Resource Center.

List of All Task Forces and Studies in Progress

- *Hurricane Loss Methodology Commission* -- This commission was formed after Hurricane Andrew to provide sophisticated and reliable actuarial methods for residential property insurance holders. The Division Director is a Commission member.
- *Domestic Security Oversight Council* -- The Board oversees the seven Regional Domestic Security task forces that determine prevention, planning and training strategies, and equipment purchases for domestic security. The Division Director serves on this committee along with the Commissioner of the Department of Law Enforcement, the Secretary of the Department of Health, the State Fire Marshal, and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services.
- *State Emergency Response Commission for Hazardous Materials* -- The Commission was established by Governor's Executive Order and implements the Federal provisions of the Community Right-to-Know Hazardous Materials Planning and Prevention Program. The 23-member Commission is now chaired by the Division Director since the Department of Community Affairs has been eliminated.
- *Citizens Corps Task Force* -- This task force was established by Governor's Executive Order. It is co-chaired by the Director of the Division of Emergency Management and Volunteer Florida. More than 40 state, nonprofit, and federal agencies meet regularly to further role of Florida's Citizen Corps programs, which is a system of local volunteers who assist communities during times of disaster.
- *Local Emergency Planning Committees* -- The committees provide hazardous materials training opportunities and conduct planning and exercise activities in each of the 11 planning districts. Through a contract with the Division, each committee is administratively staffed by the Florida Regional Planning Councils.
- *State Hazard Mitigation Plan Advisory Team (SHMPAT)* -- This multi-agency group is responsible for developing a state mitigation plan to reduce the effects of future disasters.
- *State Working Group on Domestic Preparedness* -- The State Working Group on Domestic Preparedness plays a vital role in the State of Florida's Domestic Security Program. It consists of an Executive Board and six committees. The Executive Board of the State Working Group on Domestic

Preparedness (SWG) is composed of voting and non-voting representatives. The representatives are appointed from five principal state agencies charged with domestic security responsibilities. This group will function as an executive committee and will be known as the Unified Coordinating Group. The State Working group is comprised of six committees. Each committee has designated co-chairs that will serve on the Executive Board as voting members. DEM serves as a co-chair and voting member on each of the committees. Each committee uses a unified approach to all of the Domestic preparedness issues to help Florida prepare, protect, mitigate and recover from any terrorist attack on this state.

- *Regional Hurricane Evacuation Studies* - The Division is continually working with various Federal, State, Regional Planning Councils and local entities to maintain and update the regional hurricane evacuation plans across the state.

Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget Summary

Emergency Management

The Division of Emergency Management is statutorily identified in Section 252.311, Florida Statutes, to promote the state's emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation capabilities through enhanced coordination, long-term planning, and providing effective, coordinated, and timely support to communities and the public. The Division of Emergency Management is given the responsibility under Section 252.35, Florida Statutes, of maintaining a comprehensive statewide program of emergency management. This entails preparing the state comprehensive emergency management plan to include an evacuation component, sheltering component, post-disaster response and recovery component, coordinated and expeditious deployment of state resources in case of a major disaster, communication and warning systems, exercise guidelines and schedules, and additional components that address the preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation aspects of the division. As defined in Chapter 252, Part II, Florida Statutes, the Division of Emergency Management has the responsibility of implementing the federal Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act and Risk Management Planning Act. These programs ensure procedures are in place to prevent, prepare for and respond to incidents involving hazardous materials.

Overview of Division of Emergency Management for Fiscal Year 2012-13

TOTAL DIVISION BUDGET:

Total Positions Funded	:	153
General Appropriations for Divisions Programs	27%	\$59,452,797
Federal and State Funds Provided as a result of Declared Disasters	73%	\$162,607,904
Total Appropriations	100.00%	\$222,060,701

BUDGET CHARACTERISTICS:

Federal Trust Funds	85%	\$188,112,801
State Trust Funds	15%	\$ 33,947,900
Total	100.00%	\$222,060,701

Note: This Budget Summary is reflective of that which was appropriated through Chapter 2012-118, Laws of Florida, and does not include subsequent budget amendment actions.



EXHIBIT II

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Executive Office of the Governor Department No.: 310000

Program: Emergency Management	Code: 1208000000
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management	Code: 31700100

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first. New primary service outcome for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14 highlighted in yellow

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2011-12 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2011-12 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2013-14 Standard (Numbers)
Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 2 upon notification to key stakeholders	30 minutes	30 minutes	**	**
Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders	60 minutes	60 minutes	**	**
Deficiency outcome percentage in complying with federal guidelines for nuclear power plant exercises	0%	0%	**	**
Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes	2%	2.23%	**	**
Compliance percentage of each hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements	90%	97.53%	**	**
Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan reviewed and revised by February 1st of each even year	100%	85%	**	**
Percentage of completed training courses and exercises	95%	100%	95%	95%
Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise	90%	100%	90%	90%
Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces	25,000	19,626	**	**
Percent of interoperable communication systems that are operational/mission capable	90%	97.8%	**	**

Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance	5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes
Average number of minutes to distribute reported incidents by the State Watch Office	11 minutes	12.57 minutes	**	**
Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan	3 years	3 years	**	**
Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects under \$50,000 completed within 4 years of project approval date	95%	98%	**	**
Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of project approval date	95%	100%	**	**
Percentage of local mitigation strategy plans that are updated or in the review update process every 5 years	100%	100%	**	**
Percentage of approved non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award	80%	92%	**	**
Percentage of non-disaster mitigation applications submitted to FEMA for repetitive loss structures	20%	57%	**	**
Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Program contracts closed within 30 days of expiration	100%	100%	**	**
Percentage of completed interviews and visits identified in the FEMA annual agreement	95%	100%	**	**
Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date	95%	98%	95%	95%
Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date	95%	85%	95%	95%
Percentage of counties with population less than 75,000 with a part-time emergency management coordinator	100%	100%	**	**
Percentage of counties with population more than 75,000 with a full-time emergency management director	100%	100%	**	**
Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award	100%	100%	100%	100%
Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org	35,000		10,000	10,000
Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at www.KidsGetAPlan.com	50,000	8,842	**	**
Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan	64%	59%	64%	64%

Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org	10,000	72	2,500	2,500
PROPOSED NEW MEASURES FOR FY 12/13 & FY 13/14				
Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable	*	*	0%	0%
Number of capabilities assessed	*	*	24	24
Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated	*	*	100%	100%
Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R	*	*	10%	10%
Number of facilities inspected/audited	*	*	27	27
Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA	*	*	10%	10%
Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting	*	*	485	485
Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise	*	*	0%	0%
Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise	*	*	10	10
Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year	*	*	50%	50%
Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed	*	*	14	14
Number of students attending training	*	*	2,520	2,520
Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed	*	*	10%	10%
Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes	*	*	200	200
Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable	*	*	95%	95%
Percentage of listed Local Mitigation Strategy Projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed	*	*	25%	25%
Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held	*	*	4	4

Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects	*	*	75%	75%
Number of non-disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for	*	*	5	5
Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System	*	*	50%	50%
Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program	*	*	50	50
Percentage of annual Residential Construction Mitigation projects completed	*	*	100%	100%
Number of Residential Construction Mitigation project applications submitted	*	*	22	22
Number of project worksheets closed	*	*	400	400
Number of issues closed annually	*	*	53	53
Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan	*	*	50%	50%
Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population	*	*	10,000	10,000
Percentage of business that have a business disaster plan	*	*	50%	50%
Percentage of counties trained in Emergency Mutual Aid Compact	*	*	10%	10%
Number of trained EMAC teams	*	*	2	2
Average number of hours to activate the SLRC in order to deploy resources	*	*	12 hours	12 hours
Number of survivors supported for 24 hours	*	*	1M	1M
Percentage of counties that annually update Form C	*	*	80%	80%
Number of mutual aid agreements in place	*	*	67	67

Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted	*	*	100%	100%
Number of county capability assessments conducted	*	*	10	10
Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant	*	*	80%	80%
Number of incidents tracked			8,000	8,000
Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation	*j	*	75%	75%
Number of SEOC activation roles notified	*	*	25	25

*New measure for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14

**Measure being deleted for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14



EXHIBIT III

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR APPROVED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan reviewed and revised by February 1st of each even year

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100%	85%	-15%	15%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|---|--|

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems
<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|--|--|

Explanation:

Not all elements of the CEMP required revision.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|---|---|

Recommendations:

Measure being revised for FY 2012-2013 and FY 2013-2014

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
25,000	19,626	5,374	21.5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

The reduction of the quantity of hurricane shelter spaces identified is primarily due to the downturn in the economy. School districts are constructing fewer new school facilities, thus reducing the quantity of EMPA shelter spaces. School districts are also less interested in accepting hurricane shelter retrofit grant funds due to budgetary constraints and reductions in the number of staff available to manage projects.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Recommend deleting the measure as the state's overall number of shelter spaces does not reflect a deficit situation.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Average number of minutes to distribute reported incidents by State Watch Office

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
11 Minutes	12.57 Minutes	1.57 Minutes	12.54%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

During evening and overnight shifts, only one staff member is on duty; when multiple incidents arrive during these periods, the operator prioritizes which incident to handle first, thereby causing outliers in some situations.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Prior to March 2012, the incident tracking system did not automatically document automatic e-mail notifications (operators had to manually copy/paste. With this functionality enabled in March 2012, the average for the remainder of the fiscal year dropped to **11.14 Minutes**, indicating some human error.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Will implement quality improvement program to monitor trends/delays with specific incident types and/or staff members.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95%	85%	-10%	10.5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|--|--|

Explanation:

Our limited number of staff balance working on multiple projects and disaster events daily. Currently there are 27 disaster events being worked in the Public Assistance Grant Program. While the closure of the 2004/2005 events is a current priority, other events must be actively worked as well. The division has also implemented a repayment plan program in September 2011 to recuperate funding due to overpayments which impacts project closeouts. Additionally, the division is tracking a large number of dormant, longstanding appeals with FEMA.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
|--|---|

Explanation:

Natural disasters continue to occur and affect the state of Florida. In the wake of a major disaster event, program staff are often sent to the field to assist communities and begin the process of managing Public Assistance and Individual Assistance Program grants for these new disasters in an effort to return affected areas to pre-disaster conditions. Work focused on new disaster events often mean that work on older disaster events must slow down significantly. Another external consideration is that FEMA has over the last few years given a lower priority to Florida projects which involve approvals, obligations, and de-obligations, in addition to the appeals discussed

above.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Due to the heavy workload continuing as a result of the historic and unusual 2004/2005 hurricane seasons, efforts are being maintained to close these events in order to place more emphasis on remaining events.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
35,000	785	(under) 34,215	97.76%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The previous year an organized outreach campaign was not conducted and a change in leadership within External Affairs reduced the activities within this area.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Multiple resources exist for individuals to create a family disaster supply kit making it difficult to measure the number of families with a kit.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

A strategic outreach campaign has been planned for this FY increasing the number of families given information on building a plan. Due to the number of resources available to create a family plan, it is recommended to reduce the standard for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at www.KidsGetAPlan.com

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50,000	8,842	(under) 41,158	82.32%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The previous year an organized outreach campaign was not conducted and a change in leadership within External Affairs reduced the activities in this area.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Multiple resources exist for individuals to create a family disaster supply kit making it difficult to measure the number of families with a kit.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

A strategic outreach campaign has been planned for this FY increasing the number of families given information on building a plan. Of note, this number does not represent the total number of families that have a disaster supply kit rather the number of supply kits created through the online game. Due to the number of resources available to create a family plan, it is recommended to delete this measure for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
64%	59%	-5%	7.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: People that have lived in Florida less than 5 years are less prepared than others. Those moving to Florida within the last 5 years would not have experienced a hurricane. Florida has not been directly impacted by a hurricane since 2006. There has been an increase in the percentage of people with a plan this year over previous years

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations: Through an expanded public outreach campaign, and utilizing social media, FDEM continues to promote the importance of having a family plan for emergencies. Each year a statistical survey is conducted pre-hurricane season to capture preparedness levels and areas of focus for the outreach campaign. Recommend the same standard be kept for FY 13/14

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/-Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10,000	72	(under) 9,928	99.28%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

A reduction in outreach campaign activities. Change in leadership in the private sector coordination position.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

The lack of a major disaster in recent years has lead to a diminished urgency amongst the target community to complete tasks such as this. Businesses have multiple resources for producing a business disaster plan do they may not be using the DEM website.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

DEM has hired a Private Sector Coordinator with the express purpose of engaging and serving as a liaison with the Business Community on issues such as this. Recommend reducing the measurement for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14.



EXHIBIT IV

PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure is from the State Preparedness Report Capability Assessment that is required to complete each fiscal year. The assessment is sent from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to the division. The division then conducts an assessment on each core capability based on standardized elements outlined in the assessment package. The measure will be calculated by dividing the number of required capabilities assessed at not capable by the total number of required capabilities.

Validity:

The validity of the measure is the core capabilities are standardized and provide a statistical assessment of the state's capability level. The appropriateness of this measure is a decision making tool for management to determine where gaps exist that resources need to be focused on.

Reliability:

The assessment is mandated for any state receiving preparedness assistance from the Department of Homeland Security. While the number of core capabilities may change from year to year, the measure can still be reproduced from year to year.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of capabilities assessed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure is from the State Preparedness Report Capability Assessment that is required to complete each fiscal year. The assessment is sent from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to the division. The division then conducts a self-assessment on each core capability based on standardized elements outlined in the assessment package. The measure will be calculated by adding up the total number of capabilities being addressed in the assessment.

Validity:

The validity of the measure is that the assessment will include other capabilities in addition to the core capabilities which provide an all-hazards assessment approach. The appropriateness of this measure is a decision making tool for management to determine additional programmatic responsibilities that are not currently being addressed in order for the state to be able to prevent, protect against, mitigate the effects of, respond to, and recover from all threats and hazards

Reliability:

The assessment is mandated for any state receiving preparedness assistance from the Department of Homeland Security. While the number of capabilities may change from year to year, the measure can still be reproduced from year to year.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to Clean Air Act section 112R

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Chemical releases are reported directly to the State Watch Office or through the National Response Center. Release information is entered into the SWO Incident Database and uploaded to Florida Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS). Release amount compared to threshold reporting requirements (EPA) and investigated if within 10% of TQ. Calculations will be made based upon the number of qualifying releases reported through the SWO against the number of investigations conducted.

Validity:

Chemical release information is entered into a secure limited access database when received by either National Response Center or State Watch Office. Release amount threshold quantities are established by US Department of Environmental Protection in accordance with Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) section 304

Reliability:

Chemical release information, whether received directly by the State Watch Office or relayed by the National Response Center, is required to be entered into the Incident database as Standard Operating Procedure for SWO watch standers. Reported spills are confirmed through local emergency responders and standard container size, length of release, amount of chemical contained and any other associated data is used to determine amount actually released through the use of EPA CAMEO Software.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to Clean Air Act section 112R

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

All Clean Air Act section 112r program level I, II and III chemical facilities are contained in the Florida Hazardous Materials Information Database and may be checked against the registration requirements of the US Environmental Protection Agency Chemical Data Exchange (CDX) database for accuracy. As a delegated state, Florida is required to inspect or audit a percentage of 112r facilities in the state, to include at least 5% of High Risk Facilities each year. Calculation will be based upon the number of inspections / audits conducted divided by the total number eligible facilities in the State.

Validity:

The number of chemical facilities required to register under section 112r can be easily determined through either the Florida Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS) or the US Environmental Protection Agency Chemical Database Exchange (CDX). Inspections / audits are scheduled in advance, unless a chemical release involves serious personal or property damage, approved by the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) and are documented in HMIS.

Reliability:

All information related to these inspections is maintained in two separate, secure databases and may be checked at any time. Additionally, a paper trail exists containing all pertinent inspection / audit information related to each facility.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to Clean Air Act section 112R

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

All Clean Air Act section 112r program level I, II and III chemical facilities are contained in the Florida Hazardous Materials Information Database and may be checked against the registration requirements of the US Environmental Protection Agency Chemical Data Exchange (CDX) database for accuracy. As a delegated state, Florida is required to inspect or audit a percentage of 112r facilities in the state, to include at least 5% of High Risk Facilities each year. Calculation will be based upon the number of inspections / audits conducted.

Validity:

The number of chemical facilities required to register under section 112r can be easily determined through either the Florida Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS) or the US Environmental Protection Agency Chemical Database Exchange (CDX). Inspections / audits are scheduled in advance, unless a chemical release involves serious personal or property damage, approved by the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) and are documented in HMIS.

Reliability:

All information related to these inspections is maintained in two separate, secure databases and may be checked at any time. Additionally, a paper trail exists containing all pertinent inspection / audit information related to each facility.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of facilities out of compliance with the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The total number of chemical facilities meeting the reporting requirements of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) are obtained from the Florida Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS). Calculation will be made from total number of outreach facilities (those facilities failing to report or identified through other research) against total number of reporting facilities.

Validity:

Staff conducts extensive research to determine facilities who had reported in prior years but had not in the current year, had reported to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection under section 313 (EPCRA) but had not reported to the Division, and through checking other chemical facilities databases to determine if companies with locations in Florida had reported to other states and had not in Florida. Initial contact is made through e-mails with follow-up telephone calls. Failure to respond results in a potential Notice of Violation (NOV) sent to subject company. Continued lack of response or non-compliance is referred to the Division General Counsel for prosecution.

Reliability:

The total chemical facility population is obtained through HMIS. The number of facilities subject to outreach and the final results are tracked, therefore, each time the measure is calculated, the same result will ensue.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: The total number of facilities is compiled and tracked from the Division's Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS) database. The measure will be calculated by adding up the total number of facilities that the division outreached to.

Validity:

Staff conducts research from varying sources to determine the outreach pool. Initial contact is made with each facility through e-mail with requirement attachments. Follow-up telephone calls are made with non-responding facilities, with a final contact made through Potential Notice of Violation letters. Results are then tracked.

Reliability: The total facility count is obtained through the Florida Hazardous Materials Information System (HMIS). The number of outreach efforts and their results are tracked, therefore, each time the measures are calculated, the same result will occur.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Deficiency outcome percentage in complying with federal guidelines for nuclear power plant exercises

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Every calendar year the division is required to participate in a minimum of one or more Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluated nuclear power plant exercises. The percentage of compliance is based on the number of deficiencies or areas requiring corrective action against the number of capabilities tested during those exercises

Validity:

Preparedness for response to radiological incidents can only be measured through graded exercises. These exercises are conducted once or twice per year and are evaluated by FEMA, a source external to the division. A written evaluation of the exercise results is provided upon completion in the form of an After Action Report (AAR).

Reliability:

Each evaluated exercise is graded by sources external to the division against the approved Extent of Play (EOP) for the exercise. FEMA Table II is the standard evaluation tool for radiological exercises related to nuclear power plants (NPP) and is the tool utilized in Florida for NPP exercises. Therefore the measure can be reproduced

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of capabilities assessed during a nuclear power plant exercise

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Every calendar year the division is required to participate in a minimum of one or more Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluated nuclear power plant exercises. The measure will be calculated by adding up the total number of capabilities tested during those exercises

Validity:

Preparedness for response to radiological incidents can only be measured through graded exercises. These exercises are conducted once or twice per year and are evaluated by FEMA, a source external to the division. A written evaluation of the exercise results is provided upon completion in the form of an After Action Report (AAR).

Reliability:

Each evaluated exercise is graded by sources external to the division against the approved Extent of Play (EOP) for the exercise. FEMA Table II is the standard evaluation tool for radiological exercises related to nuclear power plants (NPP) and is the tool utilized in Florida for NPP exercises. Therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan reviewed and revised each year

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Chapter 252.35(2)(a)(8), Florida Statutes, requires the Division to submit the complete State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (henceforth referred to as the Plan) to the Governor, Senate President, and House Speaker on February 1 of every even-numbered year. During the 24 month period between submittals, the Basic Plan is reviewed in-house and revised to incorporate lessons learned and any new innovations in emergency management. The Emergency Support Function plans and Hazard-Specific plans are distributed to the respective state agencies having responsibility for updating/revising these smaller plans. There are currently 27 plans that make up the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP), 1 Basic Plan, 18 Emergency Support Function plans and 8 Incident-Specific plans. In order to determine the percentage of review and revision, the following formula has to be used:

For example, if 18 of the 27 plans that make up the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan have been revised, the percentage completion would be:

Validity:

There is only one state CEMP; however, it is comprised of multiple elements. The methodology is valid in that it takes into account the revision of each element of the plan.

Reliability:

By taking into account the CEMP as a whole and not considering its elements, the performance measure would likely always be 100 percent because, theoretically, any change to any portion of

the plan, major or minor, would constitute a revision. By considering each element of the CEMP and whether or not it was revised, the data can be entered in the methodology formula and yield a more reliable ascertainment of the percentage of the CEMP that was revised. This formula yields the most accurate results, and the only modifications that would be required would be if an element was either added to or removed from the CEMP, thereby increasing or decreasing the number of plans which comprise the CEMP.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan elements reviewed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Chapter 252.35(2)(a)(8), Florida Statutes, requires the Division to submit the complete State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (henceforth referred to as the Plan) to the Governor, Senate President, and House Speaker on February 1 of every even-numbered year. During the 24 month period between submittals, the Basic Plan is reviewed in-house and revised to incorporate lessons learned and any new innovations in emergency management. The Emergency Support Function plans and Hazard-Specific plans are distributed to the respective state agencies having responsibility for updating/revising these smaller plans. There are currently 27 plans that make up the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP), 1 Basic Plan, 18 Emergency Support Function plans and 8 Incident-Specific plans. The target goal of 14 plans expected to be reviewed each year constitutes approximately half of the CEMP.

Validity:

There is only one state CEMP; however, it is comprised of multiple elements. The methodology is valid in that it takes into account the review of each element of the plan.

Reliability:

Considering each element of the CEMP and whether or not it was reviewed yields a reliable ascertainment of the number of reviewed CEMP elements.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of students attending training

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure will be the Florida Division of Emergency Management's SERT Training Resource and Activity Center (TRAC). This is a database that contains all the statewide training being performed related to emergency management. On an annual basis a report will be generated to reflect the number of students that participated in training during the fiscal year.

Validity:

SERT TRAC was designed and created to house and maintain a comprehensive statewide training database that allows for training registration, transcript compilation and tracking as well as student and instructor record keeping. It ensures that we maintain training standards for both students and instructors and maintain accurate training records. In order for the state to continue receiving federal funding from the Department of Homeland Security, training is a required element to maintain the funding.

Reliability:

Users are required to create a profile that allows them to manage their training records and also allows us to track training activity at all levels of government, non-government and private sector organizations. The system generates reports that allow us to assess percentages of training scheduled and completions, frequency of training, types of training, and employment type of individuals taking training statewide. The database has required fields that each training participant must complete therefore the measure can be reproduced from year to year.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Section 252.385(2), Florida Statutes directs the Division to administer a program to survey existing public and certain private buildings to identify those that are appropriately designed and located to serve as shelters. The Division performs the surveys and distributes the resulting reports to local emergency management agencies for consideration in public hurricane shelter designation process, and assist in development of a public hurricane shelter space deficit elimination program. The Division also uses the survey data for preparation of two (2) statutorily-required documents: the annual Shelter Retrofit Report; and the biennial Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan.

The survey methodology is a qualitative procedure that was developed based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's *National Multi-Hazard Survey Instructions* (FEMA TR-84, 1987); American Red Cross' publication *Standards for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter Selection* (ARC 4496, 2002); S. 423.25, Florida Building Code *Public Shelter Design Criteria*; and other applicable publications and "best practices." The surveys include construction document reviews, flood hazard map reviews, interviews with building and design professionals of record, and on-site observation of construction details and building surroundings.

Given the scope of a statewide survey, the Division has established a 10-year cycle to complete statewide baseline surveys. The Division estimates that for the current baseline survey approximately 2,000 buildings will need to be surveyed. This includes previously surveyed buildings (to confirm condition and usability) and new buildings constructed after the previous survey. Thus, to accomplish a baseline survey within 10-years, an average of 200 surveys will need to be accomplished annually.

The standard of measure is calculated by summing the number of hurricane shelter survey reports distributed by the Division (survey staff or consultants) to local emergency management during a specified time frame. The hurricane shelter survey reports are grouped into county-based studies for performance measurement. Then taking the number of hurricane shelter survey reports and dividing by the current baseline number of buildings to be surveyed.

Validity:

The Division maintains an inventory of both surveyed and locally designated public hurricane evacuation shelters. The inventory lists those buildings that are recognized by the Division as appearing to meet the intent of ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria. The inventory is grouped into county spreadsheets. The list of recognized buildings is updated annually by local emergency management agencies, and the submitted results quality checked by Division staff. The quality check is performed by comparison of the submitted local spreadsheets to the previous survey product(s) distributed by the Division, review of hurricane shelter survey reports prepared by Division staff or consultants, and comparison to the Dept. of Education's Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) data.

Prior to beginning a survey in a county, Division survey staff coordinate with local emergency management and building owners to validate the list of buildings to be surveyed, as well as identify new facilities. The Division then surveys the mutually agreed upon list buildings. This ensures that the Division is providing the local emergency managers with the most comprehensive list of surveyed buildings to meet their needs. The Division then conducts the surveys, performs quality control of preliminary draft reports, and provides local emergency management and building owners an opportunity to review and comment on the draft reports, then distribute completed reports. The individual building reports are then counted for performance measurement.

Reliability:

The methodology for identifying buildings to be surveyed, survey procedures/data collection, report preparation, quality control reviews and distribution are performed in a routine/consistent manner. The Division uses applicable statute or code requirements to identify the types of buildings to be surveyed (e.g., buildings owned or leased by public schools, community colleges, universities, state, county, municipal government and private through agreement). The public hurricane shelter space capacity is calculated based on the statute and code (FISH room types subject public shelter design criteria). The ARC 4496 survey criterion is provided in a prescriptive summary table for survey, report preparation and quality control consistency. Local emergency management and building owners have an opportunity review and comment on the reports. The Division also annually maintains and updates the statewide public hurricane shelter space inventory in coordination with local emergency management. These procedures provide the basis for identifying buildings to be surveyed, and monitoring progress toward completing a statewide baseline on a 10-year basis.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Section 252.385(2), Florida Statutes directs the Division to administer a program to survey existing public and certain private buildings to identify those that are appropriately designed and located to serve as shelters. The Division performs the surveys and distributes the resulting reports to local emergency management agencies for consideration in public hurricane shelter designation process, and assist in development of a public hurricane shelter space deficit elimination program. The Division also uses the survey data for preparation of two (2) statutorily-required documents: the annual Shelter Retrofit Report; and the biennial Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan.

The survey methodology is a qualitative procedure that was developed based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's *National Multi-Hazard Survey Instructions* (FEMA TR-84, 1987); American Red Cross' publication *Standards for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter Selection* (ARC 4496, 2002); S. 423.25, Florida Building Code *Public Shelter Design Criteria*; and other applicable publications and "best practices." The surveys include construction document reviews, flood hazard map reviews, interviews with building and design professionals of record, and on-site observation of construction details and building surroundings.

Given the scope of a statewide survey, the Division has established a 10-year cycle to complete statewide baseline surveys. The Division estimates that for the current baseline survey approximately 2,000 buildings will need to be surveyed. This includes previously surveyed buildings (to confirm condition and usability) and new buildings constructed after the previous survey. Thus, to accomplish a baseline survey within 10-years, an average of 200 surveys will need to be accomplished annually.

The standard of measure is calculated by summing the number of hurricane shelter survey reports distributed by the Division (survey staff or consultants) to local emergency management during a specified time frame. The hurricane shelter survey reports are grouped into county-based studies for performance measurement.

Validity:

The Division maintains an inventory of both surveyed and locally designated public hurricane evacuation shelters. The inventory lists those buildings that are recognized by the Division as appearing to meet the intent of ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria. The inventory is grouped into county spreadsheets. The list of recognized buildings is updated annually by local emergency management agencies, and the submitted results quality checked by Division staff. The quality check is performed by comparison of the submitted local spreadsheets to the previous survey product(s) distributed by the Division, review of hurricane shelter survey reports prepared by Division staff or consultants, and comparison to the Dept. of Education's Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) data.

Prior to beginning a survey in a county, Division survey staff coordinate with local emergency management and building owners to validate the list of buildings to be surveyed, as well as identify new facilities. The Division then surveys the mutually agreed upon list buildings. This ensures that the Division is providing the local emergency managers with the most comprehensive list of surveyed buildings to meet their needs. The Division then conducts the surveys, performs quality control of preliminary draft reports, and provides local emergency management and building owners an opportunity to review and comment on the draft reports, then distribute completed reports. The individual building reports are then counted for performance measurement.

Reliability:

The methodology for identifying buildings to be surveyed, survey procedures/data collection, report preparation, quality control reviews and distribution are performed in a routine/consistent manner. The Division uses applicable statute or code requirements to identify the types of buildings to be surveyed (e.g., buildings owned or leased by public schools, community colleges, universities, state, county, municipal government and private through agreement). The public hurricane shelter space capacity is calculated based on the statute and code (FISH room types subject public shelter design criteria). The ARC 4496 survey criteria is provided in a prescriptive summary table for survey, report preparation and quality control consistency. Local emergency management and building owners have an opportunity review and comment on the reports. The Division also annually maintains and updates the statewide public hurricane shelter space inventory in coordination with local emergency management. These procedures provide the basis for identifying buildings to be surveyed , and monitoring progress toward completing a statewide baseline on a 10-year basis.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management Interoperable Systems

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/

Measure: Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure is the Logistics tracking sheet.

The standard for this measure is calculated by computing the time the equipment is operational, as logged on the tracking sheet, for only those communication systems Emergency Management Manages and Controls for the operational period.

Validity:

All Division of Emergency Management Interoperable Communications, data and emergency alert and notification communications systems are 95.8% mission capable and operational with secondary and tertiary systems.

All systems are tested weekly, monthly or during operational deployments. Some systems such as MSAT have been placed on “Standby” to save recurring costs and are activated during disaster operations. Other systems such as VSAT are on a reduced monthly recurring cost plans and then bandwidth increased when activated for events thus saving funds.

Reliability:

Total system reliability runs 95% on any given day. Any occurrences of site system failure or outage are addressed within 6-hours and repaired within 24-48 hours unless the issue is beyond the control of the Division or one of our contractors.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of listed Local Mitigation Strategy Projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data for this measurement originates from the annual LMS reports submitted to the Division each January.

The methodology is that this data is collected from Local Mitigation Strategy working groups that provide annual updates to the state regarding their projects to reduce/eliminate the risks associated with natural and man-made hazards. A report will be generated that will detail project list activity, including the percentage of projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed.

Validity:

The validity of the methodology is that this information is required to be submitted annually to the division per Rule 27P-22.

The measure provides an evaluation tool to monitor the implementation of local mitigation strategies to reduce future losses.

Reliability:

Information regarding local mitigation strategy projects is reliable and can be reproduced. Specific information on each project listed is available and annual updates are required by state rule.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data for this measure originates from the division's planning unit reports. The methodology is this data is collected from published meeting announcements listed on the division's website at floridadisaster.org and from planning unit reports. The measure will be calculated by totaling up the number of meetings held.

Validity:

The validity of the methodology is that these meetings are required to be held as part of the plan requirements outlined in the State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The measure provides an avenue for decision making regarding the implementation of and updates to the State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Reliability:

The reliability of this measure is that in order to maintain the Enhanced State Mitigation Hazard Plan designation, meetings must be held as outlined in the plan. The designation that this measure is a factor of provides increased federal disaster funding and reduced match costs to the state which enables future risk of damages to be avoided.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The division has set a threshold of a cumulative percentage of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects it will be able to close out over all of the currently open disasters. The threshold will be set internally based on various factors affecting closeout. The “cumulative projects closed” number contains both the number of project previously closed in past fiscal years as well as those to be closed this fiscal year.

The data will be generated from the division’s mitigation database system known as mit.org. The database system maintains the approved final inspection completion dates for all mitigation projects.

The measure will be calculated by dividing the total number of projects closed by the total number of Hazard Mitigation grant projects obligated for current open federally declared disasters.

Validity:

The information contained in the mit.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the division. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting and tracking project specific information. Through database reports, any information gaps are quickly resolved to maintain validity of the data.

Reliability:

Mitigation.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the division. The database has reporting capabilities, which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured. The data is a representation of the Mit.org database throughout the year as well as on the day of the report. The constant updating of the database, verification against the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s quarterly analysis of these programs, other federal reports provided to the state and consistent information required for each record makes this data reliable.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of non-disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: Electronic grants application system and request for proposal process.

Methodology: The Flood Mitigation Assistance, Repetitive Flood Claims, Severe Repetitive Loss and Pre-Disaster Mitigation grants are entered into the electronic grants application system by the state. The Federal Emergency Management Agency subsequently accepts the state applications. The state's Residential Construction Mitigation Program funding is awarded through an annual request for proposal process.

Validity:

Both the Federal Emergency Management Agency's acceptance of the grant programs listed above and the Residential Construction Mitigation Program award notification validates the data. The appropriateness of the measure is as a decision making tool for management to determine workload needs as well as how the division is accomplishing the task to reduce future disaster losses and damages by mitigating the impacts.

Reliability:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency's acceptance of state application as well as Residential Construction Mitigation Program award notifications that are kept in the division's official grant files. This information is available and consistent so the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Florida Communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data for this measure originates from the list of communities participating in the rating system located at <http://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program/community-rating-system>

The methodology is this data is collected from the list of the number of communities participating by state and dividing this number by the total number of incorporated Florida communities shown on http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_municipalities_in_Florida

Validity:

The validity of the methodology is that this rating system is based on standardized floodplain activities that credit points are assigned to which communities earn for completing. The number of credit points earned by a community determines their class rating which provides premium reductions for flood insurance

The measure provides an evaluation tool of how outreach and technical assistance is resulting in reduced costs to consumers and reduction of future disaster losses.

Reliability:

The reliability of this measure is that the rating is established based on standardized activities. Therefore the measure can be reproduced based on this information. Specific information on each communities rating is available which shows the impact of outreach activities being performed.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Under the Community Assistance Program each 12-month period is accounted for in a Scope of Work; this Scope lists the exact number of Visits and Interviews that must be completed within the 12-month period. At the end of the 12-month period, at least 22 of these activities must be completed.

Data source: State Community Assistance Program –State Support Services Element quarterly reports/ State Floodplain Management Office records.

Validity:

The validity of this measure is determined through analysis of Community Assistance Program – State Support Services Element quarterly reports and State Floodplain Management Office records which accurately reflect activity for the program. The appropriateness of this measure is a decision making tool for management to determine workload needs and the division’s ability to maintain the division’s Enhanced Mitigation Plan designation.

Reliability:

Scope of work for the Community Assistance Program –State Support Services Element grant, and quarterly reports are sent to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for work conducted through the fiscal year. The data for this measure is a consistent requirement each year to maintain the grant funding as well as an element for the division to maintain its Enhanced Mitigation Plan designation. Therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Projects completed.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure will be obtained from the division's mitigation database known as mit.org. The data will be collected from reports queried through the database to show the number of projects approved in this program for funding during the fiscal year.

The measure will be calculated by dividing the number of projects completed by June 30th each fiscal year by the total number of projects approved for this funding during the given fiscal year.

Validity:

The information contained in mitigation.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the Bureau. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting and tracking project specific information such as the close out of the project. The appropriateness of this measure will provide the documented results on how the distribution from Florida's Hurricane Catastrophe Fund is being used so the fund's tax exempt status is being maintained. Additionally this measure is a decision making tool for management to ascertain any legislative changes that may be needed in regards to the program.

Reliability:

Mit.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the division. The database has reporting capabilities, which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured. Therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of Residential Construction Mitigation projects applications submitted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure will be from Request for Proposals submitted in response to the annual Notice of Funding Announcement. The number of proposals submitted will be listed on a tabulation sheet and then evaluated and ranked for funding.

Validity:

The data is valid as statutory requirements regarding the submission of valid proposals are followed. All documentation regarding the request for proposal process must be retained in the division's records for a period of 5 fiscal years. This measure is appropriate as it provides a decision making tool for management to determine workload needs as well as the program's in obtaining qualified projects.

Reliability:

The reliability of this measure is that the statutory requirements regarding Request for Proposals is a constant and prior year records are available as required by the state's record retention policy. Therefore, the measure can be reproduced in the same manner each fiscal year.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of project worksheets closed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The www.floridapa.org database is the data source which automatically populates from FEMA's NEMIS and EMMIE systems. Project completions are trackable through www.floridapa.org as they occur. At the close of each Fiscal Year, the State Public Assistance Officer (SPA0) or designee will compose a report that compiles the Project worksheets completed for each disaster during the fiscal year and add the figures together to obtain a final total. The designated Bureau planner/analyst will be responsible for monitoring this report

Validity:

In the FloridaPA.org system, a status report is generated to provide a listing of all projects. By generating this "Project List" report, we can determine which projects are open or complete. The report is sorted by disaster event. The report is then analyzed to obtain a final number of all completed projects by disaster. The appropriateness of this measure is a decision making tool for management to determine/adjust workload needs and also provides information regarding the rate of closure for an event.

Reliability:

The methodology used to obtain the results of this performance measure is scientific and can easily be repeated to obtain the same results now and in the future. The FloridaPA.org system is one of the Public Assistance program's main data sources and is reliable because it is automatically populated by FEMA's EMMIE and NEMIS systems. The "Project List" report is obtained through FloridaPA.org and allows for easy export to Microsoft Excel where the data can be efficiently analyzed. Furthermore, templates will be utilized to ensure the same analyses are conducted on every evaluation of performance.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of issues closed annually

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Master spreadsheets are maintained by grant managers detailing open domestic preparedness projects within a specific grant award.

Calculation methodology would be the number of project issues within a specific grant award which are closed within the fiscal year.

Validity:

A cross reference of encumbrance reports at the end of each fiscal year to ensure all project issues have been fully expended. This measure is appropriate as it is a decision making tool for management to determine workload needs.

Reliability:

Utilization of FLAIR as well as SF425, a federal quarterly reporting requirement quantifies this measure as the Division will not report erroneous data to the federal government. Furthermore, DHS performs financial audits and onsite monitoring that certify the figures reported are accurate.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Floridians considered vulnerable population that have a disaster plan

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

A pre hurricane season survey is conducted each year by the division to measure the preparedness of the vulnerable population prior to the start of hurricane season. The survey is a representation of the overall population and provides a snapshot into the overall preparedness of citizens. The survey will be tailored to include a section related to preparedness levels for those individuals that are considered part of the vulnerable population. The survey is an opportunity to measure the percentage of Floridians with an emergency plan in this demographic.

Validity:

This is valid measurement toll because it tracks the overall preparedness for the vulnerable population from year to year. The survey questions will be written to capture the information and can be used from year to year in order to compare the effectiveness of the division's efforts.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for an overall snapshot of Florida's vulnerable population that has an emergency plan. The results can be compared from year to year by using the same survey questions and demographics.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

A pre hurricane season survey is conducted each year by the division to measure the preparedness of the vulnerable population prior to the start of hurricane season. The survey is a representation of the overall population and provides a snapshot into the overall preparedness of citizens. The survey will be tailored to include a section related to preparedness levels for those individuals that are considered part of the vulnerable population. The survey is an opportunity to measure the number of Floridians with an emergency plan in this demographic.

Validity:

This is valid measurement tool because it tracks the overall preparedness for the vulnerable population from year to year. The survey questions will be written to capture the information and can be used from year to year in order to compare the effectiveness of the division's efforts.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for an overall snapshot of Florida's vulnerable population that has an emergency plan. The results can be compared from year to year by using the same survey questions and demographics.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

A pre hurricane season survey is conducted each year by the division to measure the preparedness of Florida businesses prior to the start of hurricane season. The survey is a representation of the overall population and provides a snapshot into the overall preparedness of citizens. The survey will be tailored to include a section related to businesses to measure the percentage of Florida businesses with and emergency plan

Validity:

This is valid measurement toll because it tracks the overall preparedness for businesses from year to year. The survey questions will be written to capture the information and can be used from year to year in order to compare the effectiveness of the division's efforts.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for an overall snapshot of Florida businesses that have an emergency plan. The results can be compared from year to year by using the same survey questions and demographics.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of counties that trained in EMAC

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

The data for this measure originates from the number of county personnel that have participated in an Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) mission and individuals that have participated in EMAC training provided by the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA).

Methodology

This information is being collected by the EMAC Branch Director manually to calculate the measure.

Procedure

Data is requested from NEMA on the number of participants attending EMAC training which is then compiled to determine the number of trained EMAC teams. This number is then further stratified by county which is then divided by the total number of counties in the state to obtain the percentage.

Validity:

Methodology

The information originates from REQ As which go through several internal edits including the Team Captain and Authorized Representative.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriated measure as it reflects the division's capabilities to educate counties on EMAC procedures as well as to effectively deploy training EMAC teams to assist other states impacted by disasters.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses mutual aid branch files that once they have been signed by an Authorized Representative are not changed. Therefore, we can reproduce any measure that originates from these files

Reliability of the Measure

Information regarding the percentage of county trained EMAC personnel is reliable and can be reproduced. Specific information on each individual who has participated is available.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of trained EMAC teams

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

The data for this measure originates from the number of training personnel who have participated in Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) training provided by the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA).

Methodology

This information is being collected by the EMAC Branch Director manually to calculate the measure.

Procedure

Data is requested from NEMA on the number of participants attending EMAC training which is then compiled to determine the number of trained EMAC teams.

Validity:

Methodology

The information originates from training records managed by the EMAC Branch Director and NEMA.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriated measure as it reflects the division's capability to effectively deploy trained EMAC teams to assist other states impacted by disasters.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses NEMA training files. Any measure can be reproduced that originates from these files.

Reliability of the Measure

Information regarding the number of EMAC teams is reliable and can be reproduced. Specific information on each individual who has participated is available.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Average number of hours to activate the State Logistics Response Center in order to deploy resources.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source will be after action reports for exercises conducted for SLRC operations. The measure will be calculated by determining the number of hours from the time of the notification to activate to the time the first truck leaves the dock.

Validity:

The division conducts one major exercise each year, to test this standard. The records and After Action Reports are maintained by the Training and Exercise Section of the Division. This standard while not a formal part of the CEMP is a standard that the Director and SERT Chief has set for this operation

Reliability:

Due to the fact that this has been exercised several times and we have actually accomplished this, this is 100% reliable. During these exercises and the actual events, we did not preposition personnel or resources; we activated all resources after the decision was made by the SERT Chief to do so, and was able to meet the 12 hour time frame. Therefore, the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of survivors supported for 24 hours.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure is from the Vendor's management inventory system and the State's Resource Management System for water maintained in the warehouse. The method is based on a visual inventory that is conducted annually as well as spot inventory checks during hurricane season. The measure is calculated based on 1 gallon of water per day per person.

Validity:

The number of gallons of water in the warehouse is closely monitored and we ensure that the water is rotated on a yearly basis to ensure that we maintain the amount needed to support the 1M survivors for 24 hours. The required standard for this measure was instituted by prior administrations and has been continued by subsequent administrations. The appropriateness of this measure is the state's capability to respond to the needs of survivors impacted by a disaster and provide a decision making tool for the State Emergency Response Team Chief to plan for these needs

Reliability:

The reliability of this measure is due to the continually monitoring and rotating of the inventory to maintain adequate supply. The inventory is accomplished by the same methods each time therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of counties that annually update Form C

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

The data for this measure originates from the number of updated Form C's on file in the Mutual Aid Branch. These forms provide updates to contact information for the county regarding mutual aid.

Methodology

This information is collected manually by the Mutual Aid Branch Director.

Procedure

Data is collected from the individual counties who return their Form C's upon request. The number is then divided by the total number of counties to obtain the percentage.

Validity:

Methodology

The information originates from the Form C's which are managed by the Mutual Aid Branch Director.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriated measure as it reflects the division's capabilities to effectively coordinate mutual aid needs between counties.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses mutual aid branch files which are reviewed by both the county and the Mutual Aid Branch Director. Therefore, we can reproduce any measure that originates from these files

Reliability of the Measure

Information regarding the percentage of counties that annually update the Form C is reliable and can be reproduced. Specific information on each county who has updated their information is available.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of counties that annually update Form C

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

The data for this measure originates from the number of signed mutual aid agreements on file in the Mutual Aid Branch.

Methodology

This information is collected manually by the Mutual Aid Branch Director.

Procedure

Data is collected from counting the number of signed mutual aid agreements on file.

Validity:

Methodology

The information originates from the signed copies of mutual aid agreements which are managed by the Mutual Aid Branch Director.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriated measure as it reflects the division's capabilities to effectively coordinate mutual aid needs between counties.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses mutual aid branch files which are signed by the county commission and the Director of the Florida Division of Emergency Management. Therefore, we can reproduce any measure that originates from these files

Reliability of the Measure

Information regarding the number of mutual aid agreements in place is reliable and can be reproduced. Specific information on each county's mutual aid agreement is available.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure will come from the County CEMP Review and Adoption Schedule Master List. The method will be based reviews performed by division staff with the county to review their plan. The measure will be calculated by dividing the number of plans adopted by the total number of plans scheduled to be adopted each year

Validity:

The measure is valid since each county is statutorily required to be reviewed by the division for consistency with the state comprehensive emergency management plan. This measure will provide a decision making tool for management as to the capabilities of our local partners and identify areas to focus resources on.

Reliability:

The master list of county CEMP reviews is scheduled out for 5 years. The percentage of plans adopted can be obtained from departmental records retained for 5 years. Therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of county capability assessments conducted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source for this measure will come from the County CEMP Review and Adoption Schedule Master List. The method will be based reviews performed by division staff with the county to review their plan. The measure will be calculated by adding up all the assessments conducted based on the master list.

Validity:

The measure is valid since each county is statutorily required to be reviewed by the division for consistency with the state comprehensive emergency management plan. This measure will provide a decision making tool for management as to the capabilities of our local partners and identify areas to focus resources on as well as a planning tool for workload needs.

Reliability:

The master list of county CEMP reviews is scheduled out for 5 years. The number of capabilities conducted can be pulled from travel vouchers which are in the official departmental records retained for 5 years. Therefore the measure can be reproduced.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate, and relevant.

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources:

Survey data from quality improvement survey appended to every outgoing State Watch Office notification.

Methodology:

The survey data is completed electronically (using a web-based survey tool) by recipients of Watch Office notifications. Questions on the survey include likert-scale Responses from 1- 5 asking the user to rate the timeliness, accuracy, and relevance of the notification in relation to their primary job responsibilities.

Validity:

Methodology

Answers to the Likert-scale questions are restricted to whole numbers, and are required responses of the survey.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriate measure of the Watch Office notifications, an indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain a system of communications and warning to ensure that the state's population and emergency management agencies are warned of developing emergency situations and can communicate emergency response decisions.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses survey data that, once created, is not changed.

Reliability of Measure

The link to the survey is only accessible via outgoing notifications, which are specific to individual Division staff, Emergency Coordinating Officers, and other response partners.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of Incidents Tracked by State Watch Office

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources:

Primary incident database, State Watch Office Incident Tracker.

Methodology:

Each incident the Watch Office receives is logged in to the primary incident database, and automatically assigned both a unique database ID and operational incident number that corresponds to the calendar year.

Validity:

Methodology

Every record is unique, and automatically assigned these two data points every time end-users create a new record.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriate measure of the Watch Office notifications, an indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain a system of communications and warning to ensure that the state's population and emergency management agencies are warned of developing emergency situations and can communicate emergency response decisions.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses unique data that, once created, is not changed.

Reliability of Measure

Only authorized users are able to create a new incident, and all incidents automatically have these metrics attached to them.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources:

Emergency notification system broadcast reports.

Methodology:

Broadcast reports from the Division's emergency notification system automatically calculate the percentage of unique contacts that confirmed receipt of the notification within the initial broadcast window.

Validity:

Methodology

Every notification is automatically assigned a unique broadcast ID number by the notification system vendor.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriate measure of the outgoing notifications to the State Emergency Response Team an indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain and activate the State Emergency Operations Center per the Division's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses unique data that, once created, is not changed.

Reliability of Measure

Only authorized users are able to send a notification, and all notifications automatically have these metrics attached to them, and individual user responses are tracked as unique values that contribute to the cumulative percentage.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of SEOC Activation Roles notified

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources:

Emergency notification system broadcast reports.

Methodology:

Broadcasts from the Division's emergency notification system can be targeted to a variety of internal and external positions identified by Division staff.

Validity:

Methodology

Every notification is automatically assigned a unique broadcast ID number by the notification system vendor.

Appropriateness

This is an appropriate indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain and activate the State Emergency Operations Center per the Division's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. It demonstrates that staff are maintaining sufficient and identifiable response roles in the notification system so that any SEOC activation can be appropriately scaled to the a specific incident or incidents.

Reliability:

Methodology

This measure uses unique groups that can be modified as needed based on changing mission requirements, lessons learned, or future technological improvements of the vendor's software.

Reliability of Measure

Only authorized administrators are able to modify filters and roles that dynamically match individual contacts to notification groups, including activation roles.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Floridians with and emergency plan

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

A pre hurricane season survey is conducted each year by the division to measure the preparedness of citizens prior to the start of hurricane season. The survey is a representation of the overall population and provides a snapshot into the overall preparedness of citizens. The survey will be tailored to measure the percentage of Floridians with an emergency plan, including items for a disaster supply kit to sustain their families for up to 72 hours following a disaster.

Validity:

This is valid measurement toll because it tracks the overall preparedness for citizens from year to year. The survey questions will be written to capture the information and can be used from year to year in order to compare the effectiveness of the division's efforts.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for an overall snapshot of Floridians that have an emergency plan. The results can be compared from year to year by using the same survey questions and demographics.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2012



EXHIBIT V

IDENTIFICATION OF ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Proposed Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 & FY 2013-14 (Words)		Proposed Associated Activities Title
1	Percentage of confirmations received within the initial broadcast window for SEOC activation		State Emergency Operations Center Activation
2	Number of SEOC activation roles notified		State Emergency Operations Center Activation
3	Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
4	Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
5	Number of facilities inspected/audited		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
6	Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA		Florida Community Right to Know Act
7	Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting		Florida Community Right to Know Act
8	Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness
9	Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plan exercise		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness
10	Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan
11	Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan
12	Percentage of completed training courses and exercises		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program
13	Number of students attending training		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program
14	Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program

15	Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
16	Number of Public Hurricane Shelters evaluated		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
17	Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable		Emergency Communications and Warnings
18	Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance		Emergency Communications and Warnings
19	Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant		Emergency Communications and Warnings
20	Number of incidents tracked		Emergency Communications and Warnings
21	Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
22	Percentage of open Local Mitigation Strategy Projects that are currently under construction		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
23	Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects		Financial Assistance for Long Term Prevention Measures
24	Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for		Financial Assistance for Long Term Prevention Measures
25	Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System		Mitigation Technical Assistance
26	Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews conducted		Mitigation Technical Assistance
27	Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation projects completed		Residential Construction Mitigation Program
28	Number of Residential Construction Mitigation project applications submitted		Residential Construction Mitigation Program
29	Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date		Financial Assistance for Recovery
30	Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date		Financial Assistance for Recovery

31	Number of project worksheets closed		Financial Assistance for Recovery
32	Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award		Maintaining Domestic Preparedness Capabilities
33	Number of issues closed annually		Maintaining Domestic Preparedness Capabilities
34	Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org		Individual & Family Public Awareness
35	Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan		Individual & Family Public Awareness
36	Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan		Private Sector Business Awareness
37	Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org		Private Sector Business Awareness
38	Percentage of counties trained in Emergency Mutual Aid Compact		Maintaining Emergency Management Assistance Compact
39	Number of trained EMAC teams		Maintaining Emergency Management Assistance Compact
40	Average number of hours to activate the SLRC in order to deploy resources		State Logistics Response Center
41	Number of survivors supported for 24 hours		State Logistics Response Center
42	Percentage of counties that annually update Form C		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements
43	Number of mutual aid agreements in place		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements
44	Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
45	Number of county capability assessments conducted		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
46	Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment

47	Number of capabilities assessed		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment
48	Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan		Disability Outreach Program
49	Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population		Disability Outreach Program



EXHIBIT VI

AGENCY LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY (DEM ONLY)



APPENDICES

Appendix A

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Affected Population -- population identified in the regional hurricane evacuation studies as being vulnerable to a hurricane storm surge.

Community Right-to-Know Requests -- Federal law requires access to information for facilities meeting federal thresholds for chemical storage concerning location, amounts, etc.

Division of Emergency Management (DEM) -- The Division of Emergency Management is responsible for ensuring that State and Local governments develop sound plans to manage consequences of events or disasters. The Division coordinates state agency support to local governments in emergency situations and supports the Governor as the state's Chief Emergency Management Official.

Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) -- This is a voluntary accreditation process for state and local emergency management programs. Florida's was program was the first in the nation to comply with all 54 standards.

Flood Mitigation Assistance Program -- Federal program whose funds originate from the National Flood Insurance Program premium collections

Long-Range Program Plan -- a plan developed on an annual basis by each State agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

Mitigation -- any measure related to actions that reduce or eliminate long-term risk to human life and property from natural and technological hazards

National Flood Insurance Program -- This is a pre-disaster flood mitigation and insurance protection program designed to reduce the cost of disasters. This voluntary program makes federally backed flood insurance available to residents and businesses that agree to adopt sound flood mitigation measures that guide area floodplain development.

Participating -- applying for grants or seeking technical assistance

Shelter deficit -- the number of hurricane shelters by region that are needed to

shelter vulnerable populations minus the number of available public shelters

Signatories -- those communities (i.e. cities and counties) that has, or will be, signing the Statewide Mutual Aid Compact

State Warning Point -- a 24-hour facility located in the State Emergency Operations Center as the one point of reporting for all hazardous incidents occurring anywhere in the state

Technical Assistance -- letters, telephone calls, referrals, time extensions, on-site visits, coordination, facilitation, mediation

Training -- formal and informal classes presented by State or Federal trainers

Appendix B

Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) Standards

Program Management. To facilitate effective emergency management, the State uses a functional approach that groups the types of assistance to be provided into 18 Emergency Support Functions. Each Emergency Support Function is headed by a lead agency or organization, which has been selected based on its authority, resources, and capabilities in that functional area. Each agency appoints an Emergency Coordination Officer to manage that function in the State Emergency Operations Center. The Emergency Coordination Officers and members of the Division of Emergency Management form the State Emergency Response Team (SERT). The SERT serves as the primary operational mechanism through which state assistance to local governments is managed. State assistance will be provided to impacted counties under the authority of the State Coordinating Officer, on behalf of the Governor, as head of the SERT.

Laws and Authorities. The Division's authorities are vested within Chapter 252, Florida Statutes, commonly referred to as the State of Florida's "Emergency Management Act".

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment. The Division has identified hazards; the likelihood of their occurrence; and the vulnerability of people, property and the environment.

Hazard Mitigation. The Division has a strategy to eliminate hazards or mitigate the effects of hazards that cannot be eliminated.

Resource Management. The Division has identified personnel, equipment, training, facilities, funding, expert knowledge, materials, and associated logistics that will be used to achieve operational objectives. The Division has aggressively reduced the state's shelter deficit and will continue to do so until 2009. The Division has worked closely with Monroe County to improve the U.S. 1 evacuation route without widening it.

Planning. The Division has a strategic plan, emergency operations plan, mitigation plan, and recovery plan. The Division continues to emphasize the importance of supporting local governments in determining mitigation priorities.

Direction, Control, and Coordination. Command relationships exist within and between emergency management programs and external organizations. The Division would like to create a new Emergency Support Function: Long-Term Recovery and Economic Development. Also, by integrating the long-term recovery process among all of the Department's programs, a more beneficial use of dollars would be realized. This support function would provide long-term expertise in ensuring local economies return to normal within 5 to 10 years of a major disaster. The State Emergency Response Commission for hazardous materials formally adopted the National Incident Management System as the incident command

structure.

Communications and Warning. The Division has redundant emergency communications and they are regularly tested. “StormReady” is another example of a program that provides communities with the communication and safety skills needed to save lives and property before and during the event. Initiated by the National Weather Service, this program helps community leaders and emergency managers strengthen local safety programs. More than 16 million Floridians (over 90% of the state’s population) live in the 51 designated StormReady counties. Additionally, as more communities bring the 211 telephone referral service online, the Division could use this resource to reach more people with current information.

Operations and Procedures. The Division maintains standard operating procedures, checklists, maps, information cards, and instructions for daily and emergency use.

Logistics and Facilities. The Division will locate, acquire, distribute and account for services, resources, materials and facilities procured or donated to support the program. The Division is working with the Florida National Guard to determine the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of relocating the State Emergency Operation Center in Tallahassee to Camp Blanding in the event the current center becomes inoperable. This alternate site could provide a stationary training ground for emergency personnel.

Training. Training of emergency management personnel and key public officials is a priority of the Division. Staff will continue its focus in providing training to emergency managers, its associates, and to the public. An average of 65 professional emergency management training courses will be offered throughout the year and staff will conduct citizens training through the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT). This program is a locally based framework that emphasizes readiness and rescuer safety. Over 170,000 people have received CERT training in Florida since 1995.

Exercises, Evaluations, and Corrective Actions. Division program plans and capabilities are evaluated through periodic reviews, testing, performance evaluations, and exercises.

Crisis Communication, Public Education, and Information. The Division develops procedures to disseminate and respond to requests for pre-disaster, disaster, and post-disaster information to the public and to the media. A primary means of meeting the Division’s mission is through the Florida Prepares Program. This initiative facilitates partnerships among local governments, private sector businesses, and volunteer organizations in communities in order to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against emergencies and disasters. The Division has a key role in implementing the Governor’s priorities of improving education, strengthening Florida families and promoting economic diversity in order to reduce the impacts of disaster on families, businesses and communities.

Finance and Administration. Financial and administrative procedures are in place and are intended to support the Division before, during, and after an emergency. Florida has adopted a detailed Resource and Financial Management policy that provides guidance to all state agency budget officers during emergency operations.

Appendix C

Hazard Analysis

Biological -- Biological hazards are associated with any insect, animal or pathogen that could pose an economic or health threat. Biological hazards are a pervasive threat to the agricultural community in Florida with the Mediterranean fruit fly and citrus canker as two examples. In addition, a remote possibility exists that the general population could be adversely affected by naturally occurring pathogens (i.e. influenza, emerging infectious diseases, etc.) or by way of terrorist action. Also, heavy rain events may cause problems with arboviruses transmitted to humans and livestock by infected mosquitoes. The primary hazards associated with this category are pest infestation, disease outbreaks, and contamination of a food and/or water supply.

Environmental -- Environmental hazards are those that are a result of natural forces. For example, a prolonged drought will cause the water table to recede thus contributing to an increased incidence of sinkholes. In addition, an area in drought also suffering from the effects of a severe freeze is at greater risk for wildfires because of dead vegetation. The primary hazards associated with this category include drought, freshwater flooding, storm surge flooding, wildfires, sinkholes, ice storms, and freezes.

Mass Migration -- Florida's geographic location makes it vulnerable to a mass influx of aliens that becomes a problem when they enter Florida illegally. Although local jurisdictions may coordinate with State and federal agencies in response to a mass migration event, enforcement of immigration laws remains the responsibility of the federal government. The main problem posed by illegal immigration is the inability of the system to assimilate the aliens without affecting already strained local economies and infrastructures (health, medical, jails, social services, etc.). The U.S. Department of Homeland Security may delegate authority to State and local law enforcement officers to support a Federal response.

Severe Weather -- Phenomena associated with weather-induced events are categorized as severe weather. Each severe weather hazard has its own natural characteristics, areas, and seasons in which it may occur, duration, and associated risks. The primary hazards included under this category are lightning, hail, damaging winds, freezes, tornadoes and winter storms.

Technological -- A technological hazard is one that is a direct result of the failure of a manmade system or the exposure of the population to a hazardous material. The problem arises when that failure affects a large segment of the population and /or interferes with critical government, law enforcement, public works, and medical functions. To a greater degree, there is a problem when a failure in technology results in a direct health and safety risk to the population. The primary hazards associated with this category include hazardous materials spill, release of a

radioactive isotope into the environment, mass communication failure, major power disruption, and critical infrastructure disruption/failure.

Terrorism -- Terrorism constitutes a violent or dangerous act done to intimidate or coerce any segment of the general population (i.e., government or civilian population) for political or social objectives. The potential for terrorism remains high in the Florida. This threat exists because of the high number of facilities within the state that are associated with tourism, the military, and State and Federal government activities. Terrorist attacks may also take the form of other hazards when the particular action induces such things as dam failure, or the release of hazardous or biological materials.

Tropical Cyclones -- Florida is the most vulnerable state in the nation to tropical cyclones (hurricanes and tropical storms). While other storms, especially winter storms, may equal or exceed the wind speeds associated with tropical cyclones, they are different due to such factors as direction, life span, and size. Other hazards associated with tropical cyclones include tornadoes, storm surge, high velocity winds, and fresh water flooding.