



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 30, 2014

Cynthia Kelly, 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

Cindy Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Committee on Appropriations
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 2015-16 through Fiscal Year 2019-20. 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.

Pursuant to Section 14.2016, Florida Statutes, the Division of Emergency Management (Division) within the Executive Office of the Governor shall be responsible for all professional, technical, and administrative support functions to carry out its responsibilities under part I of 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

2015 - 2016 through 2019 - 2020

MISSION STATEMENT:

Listen, Lead, Communicate

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN*

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

GOALS:

- Improve the health, safety, welfare, and education of Florida's citizens.
- Lower the cost of living for Florida families and put Florida families back to work.

OBJECTIVES:

- Help formulate the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.
- 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

**GOALS: Improve the health, safety, welfare and education of Florida's citizens.
 Lower the cost of living for Florida families and put Florida Families back to work.**

GENERAL OFFICE [Program]

Executive Direction/Support Services [Service]

Objective: 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	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Executive Planning and Budgeting [Service]

Objective: 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	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

LAS/PBS [Service]

Objective: 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	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
\$5,316,331: 1,365	\$4,789,294: 3705	\$4,789,294: 3705	\$4,789,294: 3705	\$4,789,294: 3705	\$4,789,294: 3705

*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 administration priorities as listed below:

- 1. Improving Education**
 - World Class Education

- 2. Economic Development and Job Creation**
 - Focus on Job Growth and Retention
 - Reduce Taxes
 - Regulatory Reform
 - Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

- 3. Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida**
 - Accountability Budgeting
 - Reduce Government Spending
 - Reduce 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 education of Florida's citizens

PRIORITIES:

Improving Education

- World Class Education

Economic Development and Job Creation

- Focus on Job Growth and Retention
- Reduce Taxes
- Regulatory Reform
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida

- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Reduce Taxes
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

GOAL: To lower the cost of living for Florida families and put Florida families back to work

PRIORITIES:

Improving Education

- World Class Education

Economic Development and Job Creation

- Focus on Job Growth and Retention
- Reduce Taxes
- Regulatory Reform
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida

- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Reduce Taxes
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

FY 2015-16 – FY 2019-20
Trends and Conditions Statements

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.

Governor Rick Scott was elected in 2010 to turn Florida's economy around and get Floridians back to work. At that time, Florida's economy was in a free fall, losing jobs and causing many families to lose their dreams. In the four years before 2011, Florida lost more than 832,000 jobs, and unemployment more than tripled – from 3.5 percent to 11.1 percent. In addition, state debt increased by \$5.2 billion, and Florida's housing market collapsed.

In 2010, Governor Scott campaigned on an agenda to create 700,000 jobs in seven years. As of August 2014, Florida's private-sector businesses added 643,100 jobs for Florida families since December 2010, and Florida's annual job growth rate exceeded the nation's rate since April 2012. The economic turnaround was made possible by strategies to invest more in our children's education, cut taxes, and pay down the state's debt. These strategies make Governor Scott's priorities possible: make sure every Floridian who wants a job is able to get one, ensure Florida's children have access to a quality education that will prepare them for success in college or a career, and keep the cost of living low for Florida families.

To get Florida's economy back on track, Governor Scott worked with the Florida Legislature during his first year in office to close a \$3.6-billion General Revenue budget gap and create a \$1.5 billion General Revenue reserve. State spending was reduced by more than \$2 billion, including Governor Scott's veto of \$615 million from the state budget.

In contrast to Governor Scott's first year in office, Florida's current long-term budget outlook indicates ample resources to further cut taxes and make strategic investments. Projected General Revenue funds for 2015-16 exceed the current 2014-15 recurring budget by \$2.8 billion. For the fourth consecutive year, the outlook shows sufficient funds to meet all critical and other high priority needs identified for the upcoming three years.

Florida's financial outlook indicates that the Scott Administration's conservative, pro-growth solutions are working, resulting in an incredible economic turnaround for the Sunshine State: From December 2010 to August 2014, Florida's unemployment rate dropped 4.8 percentage

points, and in nearly four years, Florida is already approaching Governor Scott's goal of 700,000 private-sector jobs. In 2013, Florida saw the first budget surplus in six years, providing the opportunity for historic investments in education in 2013. In fiscal year 2014-15, Florida's General Revenue collection are expected to increased by 3.8 percent over the previous year, mostly due to increased sales tax collection, further indicating Florida's positive economic growth.

Governor Scott's common sense, pro-growth formula to right-size government, reduce spending, and pay down the state's debt has been achieved through the following strategies:

Streamlined Government. Governor Scott has cut government waste and created efficiencies across state government. By holding state agencies responsible for reviewing all state contracts, a total savings from contract renegotiations of \$24.1 million has been realized during the past three fiscal years. In 2014-15 alone, \$605.6 million in budget savings were realized due to cost efficiencies. In addition, more than 3,000 costly and outdated regulations have been repealed in order to eliminate red tape that slows economic growth.

Lower Taxes. To keep costs low for Florida families and businesses, the Scott Administration has cut taxes more than 40 times. In 2011, reduced state spending allowed a \$210-million savings in property tax cuts for Florida homeowners and businesses. Florida's businesses are paying less corporate income tax after the tax exemption was increased from \$5,000 to \$25,000 in 2011, and then to \$50,000 in 2012, eliminating these taxes for more than 75 percent of Florida's businesses. After Governor Scott's call to do so, the sales tax on manufacturing equipment was eliminated effective April 30, 2014, to help jump-start manufacturing investment in the Sunshine State.

With Florida on a path towards an opportunity economy that creates prosperity for future generations, \$500 million in tax and fee reductions went back to Florida families in 2014 through rolling back motor vehicle fees to 2009 levels, sales tax holidays for hurricane and back-to-school supplies and energy-efficient appliances, and sales tax exemptions for child car seats, college meal plans, and other items important to Florida families. Florida's long-range financial outlook shows sufficient funds to meet all critical and high-priority needs while also returning to Florida families at least \$1 billion in additional tax cuts over the next two years.

Reduced Debt. Governor Scott has paid down \$4 billion in state debt while streamlining services and targeting reforms to help businesses compete. The Scott Administration continues to push for responsible debt reduction to help the state's bond rating, allowing new debt exclusively for the expansion and support of Florida's transportation infrastructure system, focusing on projects that provide taxpayers a return on their investment and continue to position Florida as a leader in global trade and commerce. As evidence these policies are working, Fitch revised its outlook from "negative" to "stable."

These strategies have given Florida businesses a competitive advantage and caught the attention of national business leaders:

- *Area Development* magazine awarded Florida the Silver Shovel award for significant job creation and economic impact two years in a row.
- According to *Chief Executive* magazine's ranking of the top states for business, Florida was named No. 1 in quality of living environment, taking the top spot away from Texas.
- Since 2013, Florida has been ranked by *Chief Executive* as the No. 2 state to do business and continues to gain ground on top-ranked Texas, up from a No. 6 ranking in 2010.

Reducing the tax burden on Florida families and businesses has allowed record investments in Florida's transportation infrastructure, environment, education system, and opportunities to strengthen Florida families.

Historic Investments in Transportation. High quality, safe transportation systems are vital to the growth of Florida's economy, and the Sunshine State's economic turnaround made possible in 2014 a historic investment of \$10.1 billion for transportation projects, the largest transportation funding ever in Florida history. Fully-funding the Department of Transportation's Work Program creates job opportunities and strengthens Florida's economy, while also reducing traffic and enhancing the quality of life for both residents and visitors. Maintaining and improving Florida's roads and bridges, as well as enhancing trade and logistics infrastructure such as Florida's seaports and railroads, will position Florida businesses to reap the benefits from the expansion of the Panama Canal in 2015 and position Florida to be the gateway to Latin America and beyond.

The Scott Administration is focused on introducing Florida's business and community leaders to prospective international clients and markets that can lead to global business and export opportunities, as well as attracting job-creating foreign direct investment into the Sunshine State. Together, these strategies are leading to more jobs for Florida families as evidenced by the fact that Florida is running a trade surplus of \$12.5 billion – with \$85.5 billion in exports and \$73 billion in imports in 2013.

Historic Investments in Florida's Environment. Governor Scott is committed to protecting, preserving, and improving Florida's natural resources. The Scott Administration has invested unprecedented funding to protect Florida's springs and continue South Florida ecosystem restoration projects, including a more than \$250-million investment toward Everglades restoration and \$50 million for wastewater treatment upgrades in the Florida Keys. In addition, Florida's economic turnaround provided the opportunity to make the following additional investments:

- \$30 million for spring water quality restoration and water conservation measures.
- \$80 million in the Florida Forever program.
- \$19.1 million toward repairs and renovations to state park facilities.
- \$15.9 million for 11 new projects that will help advance Florida's Coast to Coast Connector, providing a safe and continuous multi-use trail from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic Ocean.

Looking forward, future investments in Florida's environment will maintain the state's commitment to the Everglades through funding for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (with a focus on storage for our South Florida estuaries), the Governor's Water Quality Plan, and the Central Everglades Planning Project. In addition, proposed investments in land acquisition will increase to \$150 million a year, funding for parks will increase with a focus on cooperative fundraising with "friends of parks" organizations, springs funding will increase to \$50 million a year, and \$50 million a year in alternative water supply funding, with a focus on conservation, will be proposed. Also of note, funding for the completion of the Stan Mayfield Grant Program is expected to be completed by 2018-19. Lastly, funding for Florida's revolving loan programs and other water quality investments will continue to be an important commitment by the state.

Historic Investments in a Good Education for Every Child. The Scott Administration is making historic investments to build a world-class education system so that Florida's children are able to pursue the college and career of their dreams. Florida job growth is making it possible for record investments in education. Fiscal year 2014-15 saw the highest total spending in K-12 education, including the \$480 million Governor Scott championed to give every teacher a pay raise on a recurring basis. With Florida's economy on the right track, we can increase Florida's per-pupil spending to the highest level in our state's history. By increasing per-pupil spending to historic levels in 2015, school districts will have more resources to provide students the opportunities they need to succeed in the classroom and in Florida's opportunity economy.

Florida has experienced incredible gains in performance, including being ranked sixth nationally for overall quality of education by *Education Week's Quality Counts* report. Florida fourth-graders rank second internationally for reading scores, and Florida's teacher policy earned the highest overall grade in the nation, according to the National Council on Teacher Quality.

To help ensure our students' success in higher education, Governor Scott is committed to making Florida's higher education system more affordable, more accessible, and connected to a student's ability to get a great job. In addition, he is committed to preeminence and working towards ensuring one of Florida's state universities becomes one of the nation's top 10 public universities.

Higher tuition and fees mean a heavier debt burden on students and their families following graduation. To allow all Florida families to have access to an affordable higher education, Governor Scott has held the line on tuition. Governor Scott championed legislation that eliminated automatic tuition increases at Florida's state universities and makes it possible for the Florida Prepaid College Board to better predict tuition and fee costs, providing either a refund or a payment reduction to Florida families participating in one of the Florida Prepaid College Plans.

Strengthening Florida Families. Due to Florida's economic turnaround, the Sunshine State is becoming known as a great place for families and businesses to succeed. Over the long term, Florida's economic performance is expected to be strong due to solid economic

fundamentals and robust population growth. If current population growth rates continue, Florida is projected to officially surpass New York as the third most populous state in the nation by 2020.

Along with state and local law enforcement, Governor Scott is committed to continuing efforts to ensure Florida families and visitors are safe, which is evident by Florida's crime rate now at a 43-year low. This low crime rate can be attributed to law enforcement's utilization of state-of-the-art technologies and crime fighting tools that aid in their continued fight against crime, maintaining Florida's sentencing laws that hold individuals accountable, rehabilitation efforts to treat addictions and underlying factors of criminal behavior, and efforts to teach literacy and job skills.

Florida is seeing results not only through record low crime rates, but also through a more than four percent drop in recidivism over the past three years. Similarly, juvenile arrests and commitments to residential stay are declining as a result of effective community-based prevention programs and evidence-based treatment and rehabilitation programs for at-risk youth.

Other increased investments to support Florida families made possible by Florida's growing economy include:

- \$80 million investment in cancer research to give hope to families affected by cancer by better equipping cancer centers with the tools they need to expand cancer research and care for patients and their loved ones.
- \$50.9 million to support initiatives that focus on the protection of Florida's children, including an additional 270 child protective investigators to lower caseloads.
- \$56 million since 2013, to serve approximately 2,800 individuals with critical needs who have been on the Agency for Persons with Disabilities waiting list and offer enrollment in the Home and Community-Based Services Medicaid waiver.
- \$500,000 for supported employment services and internship services to help 400 individuals with disabilities on the waiting list participate in and contribute to Florida's continuing job growth.
- Increased funding of \$14.8 million for the Fiscal Year 2014-15 to address the Long Term Care Waiver waitlist that will provide home and community-based services for approximately 950 more individuals most at-risk of nursing home placement who are eligible for Medicaid.
- \$4 million additional funding in the Fiscal Year 2014-15 for Alzheimer's Disease Initiative waitlist and \$3 million for Alzheimer's research.
- \$3 million increased funding for the Statewide Public Guardianship Program.
- \$28.7 million increased funding in the Fiscal Year 2014-15 for Maintenance Adoptions Subsidies.
- \$11 million for a new state Veterans Nursing Home.
- \$5 million increased funding for the Community Care for the Elderly waitlist that provides home and community-based services for 750 more individuals most-at-risk of nursing home placement who are not eligible for Medicaid.

**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 2013-14 Standard (Numbers)	FY 2013-14 Actual (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
LAS/PBS system costs: number of users	4,789,294 : 3705	4,689,864 : 4254	4,789,294 : 3705	4,789,294 : 3705

Assessment of Performance for Approved Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit III

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	579	House, Senate, OPB and Agencies. Ran OSDR on 8/21 for active user accounts.
LAS/PBS Local Area Network (LAN)	200	Manual count on 8/21 of user accounts on the LAS/PBS LAN.
Appropriations Amendment Tracking System (AMTRK)	75	Manual count of House and Senate Appropriations users on 8/21
Governor’s Budget Information System (e-Budget)	242	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise this year, the average number of users per day was used instead of the estimated total number of users.
Special District Review	22	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise this year, the average number of users per day was used instead of the estimated total number of users.
Legislative Bill Analysis (LBA)	100	Manual count of OPB and EOG users. (80 OPB, 20 EOG)
Budget Amendment Processing Systems (ABAPS)	477	Queried Oracle database on 8/21 for active user accounts.
Committee Meeting Minutes	80	Manual count of OPB users as of 8/21
Special Interest Tracking System (SITS)	80	Manual count of OPB users as of 8/21
Florida Fiscal Portal	304	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise this year, the average number of users per day was used instead of the estimated total number of users.
Agency Bill Analysis Request	240	75 users from House and Senate Appropriations, estimated 165 Legislative/Agency users.
Comparison Issue Tracking System (CITS)	80	Manual count of OPB users as of 8/21
Transparency Florida	1,754	This system will provide access to an

		unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise this year, the average number of users per day was used instead of the estimated total number of users.
Florida Sunshine	21	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise this year, the average number of users per day was used instead of the estimated total number of users.
Community Based Issue Request System (CBIRS)	0	This application has not been used by the Legislature in several years but stilled maintained by SDD in the event that the Legislature decides to reopen the process.
Grants Management System (GMS)	0	This application has not been used by the Legislature in several years but stilled maintained by SDD in the event that the Legislature decides to reopen the process.
Total	4,254	

Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit V

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures			
Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (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 2014

Agency Level Unit Cost Summary:

LRPP Exhibit VI

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

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE		FISCAL YEAR 2013-14			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING		FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY	
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT			339,118,490	3,800,000	
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)			101,787,428	-800,000	
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY			440,905,918	3,000,000	
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
<i>Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)</i>					0
Mitigation Technical Assistance * Number of community assistance visits and contact interviews conducted		46	29,629.37	1,362,951	
Maintaining Capabilities Of Local Emergency Management Programs * Number of county capabilities assessments conducted		16	2,757,648.06	44,122,369	
Emergency Management Training And Exercises Program * Number of students attending training		5,948	408.06	2,427,136	
Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan * Number of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan elements reviewed		27	63,198.93	1,706,371	
Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements * Number of mutual aid agreements maintained		67	8,262.64	553,597	
Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program * Public Hurricane Shelters Evaluated		208	5,791.07	1,204,543	3,000,000
Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment * Number of capabilities assessed		156	207,135.67	32,313,164	
Financial Assistance For Recovery * Number of project worksheets closed		328	357,547.73	117,275,656	
Financial Assistance For Long Term Prevention Measures * Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for		3	38,871,206.00	116,613,618	
State Emergency Operations Center Activation * Number of State Emergency Operations roles notified		22	120,808.59	2,657,789	
Emergency Community And Warnings * Number of incidents tracked by the State Watch Office		8,876	254.11	2,255,473	
State Logistics Response Center * Number of survivors supported for 24 hours		1,000,000	3.02	3,017,888	
Florida Community Right To Know Act * Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting		438	8,254.07	3,615,281	
Accidental Release Prevention And Risk Management Planning * Number of facilities inspected/audited		31	44,398.03	1,376,339	
Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness * Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise		31	35,577.03	1,102,888	
Disability Outreach Program * Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population		37,575	14.46	543,253	
Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation * Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meeting held		2	1,629,976.00	3,259,953	
TOTAL				335,408,269	3,000,000
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER				10,759,670	
REVERSIONS				94,737,984	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)				440,905,923	3,000,000

SCHEDULE XI/EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

(1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.

(2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.

(3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.

(4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

2014 LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN (LRPP)
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.

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.

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

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.

GAA - General Appropriations Act

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.”

Input: See Performance Measure.

IOE - Itemization of Expenditure

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

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.

LBR - Legislative Budget Request

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.

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.

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.

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

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

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 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.

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.

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 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

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

Division of Emergency Management

Tallahassee, Florida

September 16, 2014

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1701 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300


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

Cindy Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Committee on Appropriations
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Division of Emergency Management 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 2015-16 through Fiscal Year 2019-20. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is <http://www.floridadisaster.org/index.asp>. This submission has been approved by Bryan W. Koon, Director of the Division of Emergency Management.

Sincerely,

for 
Bryan W. Koon
Director

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN



**Fiscal Years 2015-2016
Through 2019-2020**

September 2014

Rick Scott
Governor

Bryan W. Koon
Director

Mission

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

Vision

Failure is not an option

Motto

1. Take care of the needs of survivors
2. Take care of the needs of responders
3. When in doubt, re-read number one

Goals

Division of Emergency Management (DEM) has identified five major goals to further enhance emergency management capabilities throughout the state:

Goal 1: Identify and analyze threats, risks, and capabilities of the whole community, and be prepared to support its emergency management activities

Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters

Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs

Goal 4: Optimize the use of resources and funding

Goal 5: Promote Florida as a safe place to live, work and play

- Objective 1.1:** Assess threats, risks, hazards, and their impacts.
- Objective 1.2:** Assess capabilities and resources of the whole community.
- Objective 1.3:** Identify shortfalls and develop solutions.
- Objective 1.4:** Develop and/or update plans and procedures for all phases of emergency management.
- Objective 1.5:** Implement and exercise plans and procedures.
- Objective 2.1:** Identify costs and impacts of disasters.
- Objective 2.2:** Research and identify opportunities to minimize costs and impacts of disasters.
- Objective 2.3:** Prioritize, implement, and facilitate those opportunities.
- Objective 2.4:** Reduce the durations of disasters when and where possible.
- Objective 3.1:** Implement programs as incentives for jurisdictions and emergency management partners to seek EMAP Accreditation. Reduce the barrier and streamline the process for accreditation.
- Objective 3.2:** Continue to develop and promote the orientation program and ongoing education process for staff development.
- Objective 3.3:** Continue to develop and promote an education program for SERT.
- Objective 3.4:** Develop a system for staff coordination and communication. Focus on facilitating cooperation and communication amongst programs with overlapping impacts.
- Objective 3.5:** Develop a system for inter-communication and coordination of the whole community.
- Objective 3.6:** Analyze and refine the Division's talent management process.
- Objective 4.1:** Analyze and streamline processes to reduce administrative impact. Establish performance standards for each program and continue to analyze the needs of the customers, clients, and community.
- Objective 4.2:** Conduct a whole community analysis and realign programmatic responsibilities where applicable.
- Objective 4.3:** Create an environment of transparency for whole community awareness.
- Objective 4.4:** Support whole community return to normalcy after a disaster.

Objective 5.1: Develop a public education campaign to provide citizens with information to build a family plan to prepare for all types of hazards.

Objective 5.2: Work with stakeholders to provide information to tourists on the processes and programs in place to protect them in the event of a disaster.

Objective 5.3: Develop a public education campaign to provide business owners with information on how to prepare for all types of hazards.

Objective 5.4: Work with stakeholders to provide information to business owners exploring the idea to relocate a business to Florida to ensure the decision makers understand that Florida is prepared to respond to all disasters, should they arise.

Goal 1: Identify and analyze threats, risks, and capabilities of the whole community, and be prepared to support its emergency management activities

Outcome: Percentage of scheduled county comprehensive emergency management plan reviews that are completed.

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
75%	75%	80%	80%	85%	90%

Outcome: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises.

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
75%	75%	80%	85%	90%	95%

Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters

Outcome: Percentage of public assistance open large projects for disaster older than 7 years that are completed

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
75%	75%	80%	85%	87.5%	90%

Outcome: Percentage closeout of mitigation grant program projects with period of performance dates within the current fiscal year

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
75%	75%	76%	77%	78%	79%

Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs

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

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
75%	75%	76%	78%	80%	82%

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

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
80%	80%	82%	84%	86%	88%

Goal 4: Optimize the use of resources and funding
 (Division still determining the outcome measure for this goal)

Outcome:

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Goal 5: Promote Florida as a safe place to live, work and play

Outcome: Percentage of scheduled public education outreach events attended

Baseline Year FY 2014-15 Approved Standard	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
80%	80%	82%	84%	85%	87%

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 –

- Improving Education
- Economic Development and Job Creation
- Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida

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.

Introduction

As the emergency management community looks forward, we see that the world we live in today will not be the same tomorrow. Changing demographics, technological innovation and dependency, universal access to information, globalization, government budgets, critical infrastructure, and evolving terrorist threats will have significant impacts and provide challenges for emergency management.

The Division of Emergency Management (DEM) has reviewed and re-formulated strategic goals and objectives for the Long Range Program Plan for Fiscal Years 2015-16 through 2019-20 to meet the tremendous challenges and opportunities ahead of us. Our challenges include increasingly frequent and expensive natural and man-made disasters across the country, a continually growing and changing population in the state of Florida, a constrained budget environment, a high percentage of divisional staff that has not experienced a land-falling hurricane during their tenure, and a shifting set of operating and fiscal parameters at the federal level. However, now DEM has the opportunity to ensure that our programs are positioned to deal with all of the aforementioned challenges and to meet the needs of Floridians while simultaneously improving how we conduct business internally. DEM will be able to align the strategic goals and objectives with the annual business plan, which will then define each employee's goals and objectives. The final result will be that each division employee will fully understand how their individual effort contributes to the success of the division and the State Emergency Response Team (SERT) as a whole.

Statutory Authority

The Division of Emergency Management has been statutorily recognized through Chapter 252, Florida Statutes to ensure the State is adequately prepared for, resilient to, and recover from natural, technological, man-made emergencies and disasters. DEM achieves these responsibilities through coordination efforts with other state agencies, local governments, non-profit organizations, private sector, and federal agencies.

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 19,317,568 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 886,541² spaces statewide. Currently, there are approximately 960,924² total shelter spaces statewide that meet the American Red Cross shelter guidelines, including both general population and special needs shelter spaces. However, though the statewide cumulative number of shelter space appears to be adequate, 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.

¹ US Census Bureau, 2012 Population estimates

² 2014 Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan

In addition, Florida is one of the largest users and producers of hazardous materials. There are over 10,747 facilities in Florida that meet the federally established thresholds for hazardous materials. Over 3,587 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. 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. 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 against future disasters.

While DEM serves as the central point and management structure to the State Emergency Response Team (SERT), management continually seeks feedback from staff and external partners to assess 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, DEM can adequately evaluate whether the core mission was achieved. DEM will carefully review all systems and implement modifications and resource allocation as needed.

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

DEM 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 Survey and Retrofit Program, Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Program, Florida Accidental Release Prevention and Risk Management Planning 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.

DEM is responsible for developing and maintaining the State's ability to effectively respond to a wide variety of threats. DEM 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, their 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 DEM that furthers preparedness activities. Planning to enhance preparedness is an activity that includes maintaining Florida's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP), 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. DEM maintains the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC), 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.

DEM assists with the logistics of disaster response and recovery operations unified across all branches of state government, voluntary agencies, contract and federal partners to ensure missions and resources are managed efficiently. DEM manages the State Logistics Response Center in Orlando, Florida, established in February 2007, which is a 200,000 square foot, 12 acre secure climate controlled warehouse and Logistics Operations and Movement Control Center. The facility serves to pre-stage critical disaster response and recovery caches and resources as part of the total State Logistics Management System of on-hand resources and stand-by contingency contracts with multiple vendors under both State Term and Agency contracts.

The 24-hour State Watch Office (SWO) is housed within the SEOC and serves as the State's central emergency reporting, situational awareness and notification center every day of the year. DEM 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. DEM 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.

DEM also administers programs and allocates funds 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. DEM also works to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to human life and property from disasters. Assistance to minimize such risk is provided through federal infrastructure assistance, human services assistance, Flood Mitigation Assistance, Pre-Disaster Mitigation 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.

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 areas: preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. The CEMP is compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and incorporates the principles set forth in the Incident Command System (ICS). The CEMP employs the strategic vision of Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8), to strengthen resiliency by involving partners at all levels of government as well as with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector. 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. DEM 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 logistics and resource management, 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.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

The Division of Emergency Management conducted a SWOT analysis in August 2013. DEM 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. DEM offers a high level of service in preparing for and responding to emergencies in the state. Therefore, DEM conducts multiple activities, both daily and during times of emergencies. DEM 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: DEM's primary strength is the synergy created by coordinating multi-functional emergency tasks among a variety of government and private agencies. Other strengths are:

- Reputation (both national and international)
- Relationships with stakeholders
- Responsiveness and timeliness to incidents
- History of Performance and past experience
- Accreditation through the Emergency Management Program (first state to receive accreditation and also be re-accredited twice)
- Leadership on national emergency management issues
- Effective training program
- Positioning within the Executive Office of the Governor
- State Emergency Operations Center facility
- Mutual aid strategy built with 67 counties capable of rapid response and emergency deployment

Weaknesses: DEM's primary weakness is the division's size which leads to gaps in coverage, shallow bench strength due to actual disaster experience, limited personnel to handle Florida's large geographic and populated areas, and the inability to handle prolonged emergency activations. Other weaknesses identified were:

- FTE employee turnover related to state's salary constraints
- OPS employee turnover related to lack of mobility to FTE positions
- Limited information technology and administrative support
- Lack of importance (gravitas) due to being a relatively young entity
- Dependency upon external entities to provide support
- Being reactive instead of proactive
- Prone to focus on response and recovery
- With limited number of disasters occurring, there is less motivation to have excellent preparedness and mitigation programs
-

Opportunities: DEM is continually finding new and innovative opportunities to enhance emergency management. Those opportunities are:

- Using education as a recruiting tool
- Using social media to engage stakeholders with citizen awareness
- Improved forecasting

- Better intelligence gathering
- Emerging technologies
- Communication with Florida's tribal nations
- Florida as a testing site for changes in federal programs
- Private sector partnerships
- Non-Partisan political leadership dealing with emergency management
- Emergency Management staffing levels as compared to other states

Threats: As with any emergency management program, the biggest challenge remains the “unknown” event. It is literally impossible to be prepared for any eventuality when it comes to emergency management. Threats that have been identified by DEM include:

- Over-reliance on federal funding from past disasters to prepare for future disasters
- Lack of state and federal funding to cover reductions for domestic security and urban area security initiatives
- Small agency budgetary constraints
- Lack of importance (gravitas) from external partners
- Professional certification still in development stages
- Federal Emergency Management Agency philosophy changes
- Performance of peers
- Competition for disaster funding with other states
- Shifting of cost burden to those who have the risk of being impacted
- Less funds to put towards other programs
- Complex local governments
- Emergency Management and Domestic Security are driven by events, no long term sustainment
- Potential decline in revenues (secondary homes) due to increased insurance costs
- Potential target for terrorism

Goal 1: Be prepared to support whole community emergency management activities

This goal is at the core of what we do as emergency management professionals. It serves as a reminder to us that our function is to identify needs, coordinate the appropriate responses, and ensure that our plans work. Those needs and capabilities change constantly, so we must remain vigilant to ensure that our efforts are properly aligned with the need and that we minimize overlaps and eliminate gaps. Although seemingly broad, this goal is the hardest to meet and our efforts in this area need to be taken up anew every single day.

In order to meet this goal DEM will maintain a statewide risk and vulnerability assessment to all hazards by adopting assessment standards, collecting and analyzing data, determining gaps/irregularities and completing required research. DEM will estimate emergency management capabilities of the whole Florida community by establishing a whole community stakeholder list, applying capability assessment tools to all stakeholder units and reporting on the findings. DEM will implement and or exercise as appropriate all required plans and procedures.

Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters

Disasters impact Floridians and guests physically, emotionally and financially. Although we can never reduce any of these impacts to zero, we can continue to drive them downwards. In order to do so, we need to continually understand what those impacts are in the current demographic

and financial climate, and apply our limited resources where they provide the greatest return and meet the greatest need. We need to take full advantage of the partners we have in the state of Florida in meeting these needs. We also need to ensure that our programs and processes operate with the minimum of administrative overhead required, so that the majority of our efforts benefit survivors and their communities.

In order to meet this goal, DEM will identify and analyze community indices for all 67 counties using nationally recognized benchmarks to develop community focused response/recovery strategies to ensure no more than 5% change in the identified indices. DEM will develop baseline data of Gross Domestic Product for each county and the state using economic data studies to develop business recovery plans and mitigation strategies to reduce cost of disaster operations and minimize the amount of aid needed to recover from an event.

One of the key impacts of disasters that can be reduced is the time that it takes to complete the recovery period. While the goal is never to rush recovery in ways that will lead to incomplete service provision to impacted survivors, local governments and businesses, open-ended recovery periods lend themselves to federal “repurposing” initiatives which systematically tend to take funds away from deserving states. To this end, the division will continue to concentrate on two initiatives designed to speed the durations of recovery events. First, the division will concentrate on the closure of long-open projects and events, attempting to work in a (general) “first in, first out” hierarchy. Second, the division will continue to develop notification and education strategies for funding opportunities) both traditional and innovative) and community best practices focusing on National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF) principles.

Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs

In order to accomplish goals one and two, the state and DEM need to have a highly qualified, highly-educated and highly-trained work force that communicates well and functions as a team. This goal and objectives will ensure that we continue to keep that in mind as we design and improve our organizational structure to deal with whatever the current situation dictates.

In order to meet this goal, DEM will strengthen credibility and develop skill sets of the whole community to increase the professionalism of emergency management through accreditation, training and planning. DEM will use orientation, basic and executive education and training to enhance the emergency management workforce to retain staff and increase professional levels, and facilitate cooperation and communication on division programs with overlapping impacts through quick reference guides and calendars.

Goal 4: Optimize the use of resources and funding

Governmental Emergency Management is largely defined by our processes and programs. Continually expanding requirements given static or even reduced resources is the scenario we will most likely face over the next several years, and the one that we will use to define our plans. By continually ensuring that we are focused on the right issues and applying our scarce human and financial resources appropriately, we will maximize the return on the taxpayer dollars with which we are entrusted. We will need to continue to look for opportunities to maximize the participation of our stakeholder partners, including the survivors themselves, and to remember our primary focus of returning the community back to normalcy.

To meet this goal, DEM will realign responsibilities based on identified competencies, trends, threats and shortfalls that affect customers, both internal and external that exists or is perceived to exist. Plans will be created using this data which are meant to reduce costs by minimizing

redundancies and addressing unmet gaps in the comprehensive emergency management process. DEM will review and improve business processes to reduce the administrative impact to realize time and/or productivity savings, and enact processes and procedures to provide for the timely, common and effective flow of accurate information for government and individual decision-makers to make the best possible decision.

Goal 5: Promote Florida as a safe place to live, work and play

Finally we must continue to differentiate Florida's emergency management structure from the rest of the world. By leaning forward and clearly communicating the people and structures we have in place to deal with events, we can ensure that Florida retains its well-deserved reputation.

In order to meet this goal, a multi-faceted marketing campaign geared towards educating Floridians, visitors and the business community will be developed to include creating a DEM brand. A comprehensive strategic communication plan including public education goals for each bureau will be implemented through outreach events, strategic communication messaging and traditional press outreach. Partnering with the Department of Economic Opportunity, DEM will gather data on businesses deciding to relocate to Florida to determine if disaster preparedness was a factor in their decision to relocate.

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

DEM will shift responsibility for Hazards Analysis contract oversight from DEM to the 11 Regional Planning Councils. This shift in oversight brings the program more in line with the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA). EPCRA places responsibility for Hazard Analysis on the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) for use in preparing the Emergency Response Plan for Hazardous Materials. DEM provides funds to the Regional Planning Councils to assist with staffing the LEPC position. Shifting the contract oversight will allow DEM to conduct facility and county training programs to ensure proficiency implementing EPCRA in Florida. The shift will also free DEM staff to perform desk audits and site visits to ensure appropriate use of the Federal Hazardous Emergency Planning and State Hazardous Materials funding.

Although the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) is currently sufficient for the State Emergency Response Team (SERT) during activations, the expanded Private Sector integration into all aspects of protective actions, response and recovery, coupled with increased staffing throughout the ESF's has created a need for more space in the future. In addition to SERT staffing increases from within the other state agencies, there is a growing staff population by way of interstate EMAC support, Department of Defense and other Federal partners contributing to this ever expanding space requirement in the SEOC.

Another future planning consideration in the area of response concerns the expansion of the All Hazards Incident Management Team (AHIMT) effort throughout the State. As a result, there is an increasing need to train, credential and maintain documentation on this expanding population of first responders across the state. This future growth in the multi-regional AHIMT teams will require additional staffing in the Operations Section of the Division of Emergency Management Response Bureau to manage this critical statewide program.

The Biggert Waters 2012 Legislation and Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014

gave more visibility to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) than ever before. States around the nation began looking for ways to alleviate the increasing cost of flood insurance as premiums continue to rise to reflect actual risk to homeowners. One solution many have taken a closer look at is the Community Rating System (CRS). CRS is a voluntary component of the NFIP that allows communities to achieve flood insurance premium discounts for their citizens by taking credit for enforcing higher regulations in their community that reduces the risk of flood damage. Florida currently has 47% of the communities (representing 91% of the NFIP policy holders) taking advantage of at least a 5% discount to their premiums. Many jurisdictions across the state have gone much further, achieving up to a 25% discount for policy-holders in their community. Combined, NFIP policy holders in Florida save \$191 million each year because of the CRS effort across the state. It is possible to achieve a 45% premium discount within the CRS program.

While our efforts so far have been a great achievement, there are still communities in Florida not participating in CRS. In order to help move Florida toward that objective, the Division has made assisting communities in the CRS effort a top priority. In mid-2013, the Division created and hired a coordinator whose sole responsibility will be to increase CRS participation throughout the state. The CRS coordinator is focused on two primary areas: enrolling every eligible jurisdiction in the CRS program, and maximizing every community's standing in the program. These two focuses will be accomplished by maximizing the baseline points for which every community can take credit from state-wide activities, and by working with individual communities to help enforce a more comprehensive floodplain management program at the local level. This effort is still in its formative stages, but as additional staff and resources are applied, we will see continued progress as communities recognize the tremendous opportunity the program provides for their residents.

The program received support from the Florida Legislature during the 2014 session, with additional funding being allocated to fund two additional positions and to do outreach and education regarding the program. As the program matures and legislators and other elected officials are briefed about the program, it is probable that this additional focus on CRS will affect DEM's budget request in the future.

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

No changes.

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 28-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 the 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 updating and monitoring the State mitigation plan to reduce the impacts 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* - DEM 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.

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 2014-15

TOTAL DIVISION BUDGET:

Total Positions Funded	:	157
General Appropriations for Divisions Programs	31%	\$71,791,279
Federal and State Funds Provided as a result of Declared Disasters	69%	\$158,840,546
Total Appropriations	100.00%	\$230,631,825

BUDGET CHARACTERISTICS:

Federal Trust Funds	79%	\$183,024,595
State Trust Funds	20%	\$ 45,657,230
General Revenue	1%	\$ 1,950,000
Total	100.00%	\$230,631,825

Note: This Budget Summary is reflective of that which was appropriated through Chapter 2014-051, Laws of Florida, and does not include subsequent budget amendment actions.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AND STANDARDS
LRPP EXHIBIT II**

Executive Office of the Governor Department No.: 310000	
Program: Emergency Management	Code: 1208000000
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management	Code: 31700100

NOTE: Approved primary service outcome highlighted in yellow

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable	0%	0%	*	*
Number of capabilities assessed	24	156	*	*
Percentage of scheduled county comprehensive emergency management plan reviews that are completed	N/A	N/A	75%**	75%**
Number of county comprehensive emergency management plans reviewed	N/A	N/A	10**	10**
Percentage of domestic preparedness grants closed out within 5 years of grant award	100%	100%	*	*
Number of issues closed annually	50	50	*	*
Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year	50%	56%	*	*
Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed	14	27	*	*
Percentage of completed training courses and exercises	95%	100%	75%	75%
Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise	90%	100%	90%	90%
Number of participants attending training	2,520	5,948	6,300	6,500

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted	100%	56%	*	*
Number of county capability assessments	10	16	*	*
Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding the reporting threshold quantity investigated	100%	100%	*	*
Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to the Clean Air Act-Section 112R	10%	12%	10%	10%
Number of facilities inspected/audited	27	31	27	27
Percentage of facilities out of compliance with the Emergency Planning Communities Right to Know Act (EPCRA)	10%	4%	*	*
Percentage of facilities in compliance with the Emergency Planning Communities Right to Know Act (EPCRA)	N/A	N/A	90%	90%
Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting	485	438	350	500
Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise	0%	0%	*	*
Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise	10	31	*	*
Percentage of time that division communications systems are operational and capable	95%	96%	*	*
Percentage of State Watch Office Notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant	80%	86%	80%	80%
Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for State Emergency Operations Center Activation	75%	68%	75%	75%
Number of incidents tracked	8,000	8,876	8,000	8,000
Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed	10%	10%	10%	10%

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes	200	208	200	200
Number of State Emergency Operations Center activation notifications sent	20	22	*	*
Percentage of counties training in Emergency Management Assistance Compact	10%	28%	*	*
Number of trained Emergency Management Assistance Compact teams	2	2	*	*
Average number of hours to activate the State Logistics Response Center in order to deploy resources	12 hours	12 hours	*	*
Average number of hours to deploy resources during State Emergency Operations Center activation	N/A	N/A	12**	12**
Number of survivors supported for 24 hours	1M	1M	*	*
Number of events supported by State Logistics Response Center resources	N/A	N/A	1**	1**
Percentage of counties that annually update Form C	80%	85%	*	*
Number of mutual aid agreements in place	67	67	*	*
Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years	95%	98.3%	*	*
Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration	95%	76.6%	*	*
Number of project worksheets closed	400	328	*	*
Percentage of public assistance open large projects older than 7 years from Disaster Declaration Date	N/A	N/A	75%**	75%**
Number of public assistance large projects closed	N/A	N/A	147**	147**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of listed Local Mitigation Strategy Projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed	25%	1%	*	*
Percentage of Local Mitigation Strategy Plans that are approved	N/A	N/A	100%**	100%**
Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held	2	2	*	*
Number of local mitigation strategy plans reviewed	N/A	N/A	67**	67**
Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects	75%	79%	*	*
Percentage closeout of mitigation grant program projects with period of performance dates within the current fiscal year	N/A	N/A	75%**	75%**
Number of non-disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for	3	3	*	*
Number of mitigation grant program project closeouts completed	N/A	N/A	65**	65**
Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System	50%	46%	*	*
Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact Interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program	50	46	*	*
Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Funding used	100%	87%	*	*
Number of Residential Construction Mitigation project applications submitted	22	16	*	*
Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan	64%	***	*	*
Percentage of scheduled public education outreach events attended	N/A	N/A	80%**	80%**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2014-15 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2015-16 Standard (Numbers)
Number of public education outreach events attended annually	25	26	25	25
Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan	50%	***	*	*
Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org	2,500	***	*	*
Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan	50%	***	*	*
Number of individuals added to the 67 county registries for persons with special needs	8,000	37,575	*	*

*Deleting Measure for FY 14/15 and FY 15/16

**New Measure for FY 14/15 & FY 15/16

***Data Unavailable

Footnote: Budget Amendment (O0052) is currently pending approval for all changes made to activities and performance measures

**ASSESSMENTS OF
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
LRPP EXHIBIT III**

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted

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
100%	56%	(44%)	44%

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:

Adoption of county comprehensive emergency management plans is the responsibility of the governing body of the respective county, not the Division. The Division's responsibility is to review county plans and determine compliance with established criteria, which was done.

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:

This measure is being deleted for FY 2014-15 and forward as the division has no control over the adoption process for the respective counties.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for State Emergency Operations Center Activation

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
75%	68%	(7%)	10%

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:

Measure is dependent on external response partners' communication devices delivering the message to them and taking action to confirm receipt of the message.

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

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

Recommendations:

Additional training on interacting with the notification system is being provided to both internal staff and external response partners.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of the disaster declaration date

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" 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
95%	76.6%	(18.4%)	19.4%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input 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:

As new disasters occur, two effects are noted in regard to meeting the LRPP threshold of 95%. First, Recovery staff are called away from closeout work on earlier events to write project worksheets for the new disaster event. Second, new project worksheets for events reaching their 7 year thresholds add to the overall total of project worksheets to be closed, which makes the LRPP threshold of 95% harder to attain.

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:

As we are now beyond the 7 year mark for the 2004-05 events, no new large project worksheet closures/completions during this past year will apply towards changing the LRPP % calculation. However, due to FEMA funding requirements, these 7+ year old events must continue to be the priority for recovery to close/complete, in order to not increase the Division's drain on general Revenue resources.

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Recovery continues to address underperformance in this area through deployment of additional contractor resources. These contractor resources will be prioritized towards the 2004-05 events due to the need to close these projects out due to event funding needs (discussed above), but will also be instructed to work on post 2005 events as well, so as to improve the LRPP % in this category. This measure is being revised to capture the percentage of large project worksheets still open each year for all events that have passed the 7 year timeframe.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of Project Worksheets Closed

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" 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
400	328	(72)	18.0%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input 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:

Two effects are noted that have had a negative effect in regard to the Division's ability to meet the LRPP threshold of 400. First, as new disasters occur, Recovery staff are called away from closeout work on earlier events to write project worksheets for the new disaster event. Second, the large majority of open project worksheets remaining from the 2004-05 seasons have issues that still remain to be worked out with sub grantees before they can be closed (i.e. – lack of documentation, appeals, etc...). These issues increase the time necessary to close an individual project worksheet.

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:

In previous years Recovery has typically satisfied this threshold through a project closure/completion strategy that included a large number of small projects. However, due to FEMA funding requirements, the emphasis over the past year has been on the closure of large projects (many of which have issues – see above) which must continue to be the priority for Recovery to close/complete, in order to not increase the Division's drain on general Revenue resources.

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Recovery continues to address underperformance in this area through deployment of additional contractor resources. These contractor resources will be prioritized towards open 2004-05 large projects due to the need to close these out due to event funding needs (discussed above). This measure is being revised to capture the number of large projects as there is no formal closeout process for small projects.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-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:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
25%	1%	(24%)	96%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input checked="" 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 calculation of this measure is extremely time-consuming as the data, on which this measure relies, is constantly changing. Due to this fact, it is difficult to provide a true and accurate measure.

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:

Counties update their project list continually which may or may not be eligible under division grant programs. Many of these projects are completed by other funding sources which the division has no control over.

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:

Since this measure is extremely time consuming to calculate, a new measure has been developed for FY 2014-15 and forward that captures percentage of local mitigation strategy plans approved.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <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
50%	46%	(4%)	8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" 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: The performance shortfall is attributed to the absence of dedicated staff focused on Community Rating System participation.

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

Recommendations: The performance remedy is through enhanced focus on CRS participation. This is accomplished by the addition of a lead CRS Coordinator, and two CRS Field Technicians to lend support and provide technical assistance to new and existing communities. Due to deletion of the activity for this measure, the measure is also being deleted for FY 2014-15 and forward.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-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:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50	46	(4)	8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Turnover impacted the unit's ability to complete all tasks as identified. In addition, there was a misconception about the unit's measurable objective.

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

Recommendations: Clarify measurable objectives, and increase staff by one OPS position. Due to deletion of the activity for this measure, the measure is also being deleted for FY 2014-15 and forward.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Funding Used

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
100%	87.38%	(12.62%)	12.62%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: While the bureau can fully allocate funding at 100% for sub-grantee awards, it cannot control the total usage of the award due to project variables and sub-grantee capacity.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations: Measure being deleted for FY 2014-15 and forward since these funds are being captured in another measure that will capture the activity for all mitigation funds.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: EOG-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100

Measure: Number of Residential Construction Mitigation project applications submitted

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 type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
22	16	(6)	27.2%

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 checked="" 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: Grants under the Residential Construction Mitigation Program are provided on a cost reimbursement basis which local governments and non-profit organizations have limited resources dedicated to conducting mitigation programs.

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: Measure being deleted for FY 2014-15 and forward since these funds are being captured in another measure that will capture the activity for all mitigation funds.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

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

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: 31700100

Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan.

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
64%	Unable to Report	(64%)	100%

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 Division is changing the survey from a hurricane preparedness survey to an all-hazard survey. Due to this change, no survey was conducted in 2013.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

This measure is being deleted as the activity is being consolidated with two other activities and a new outcome measure is being established for the consolidated activity.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

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

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: 31700100

Measure: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan.

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
50%	Unable to Report	(50%)	100%

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 Division is changing the survey from a hurricane preparedness survey to an all-hazard survey. Due to this change, no survey was conducted in 2013.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

This measure is being deleted as the activity is being consolidated with two other activities and a new outcome measure is being established for the consolidated activity.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

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

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: 31700100

Measure: Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org

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 type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,500	Unable to Report	(2,500)	100%

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 Division's website used for building disaster preparedness plans experienced technical issues that resulted in all the data being lost in 2012. A new website was developed that was not operational until August 2014 so there is no data available to calculate the measure for FY 2013-14.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

This measure is being deleted as the activity is being consolidated with two other activities and a new outcome measure is being established for the consolidated activity.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

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

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: 31700100

Measure: Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan.

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
50%	Unable to Report	(50%)	100%

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 Division is changing the survey from a hurricane preparedness survey to an all-hazard survey. Due to this change, no survey was conducted in 2013.

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:

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:

This measure is being deleted as the activity is being consolidated with two other activities and a new outcome measure is being established for the consolidated activity.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURE
VALIDITY & RELIABILITY
LRPP EXHIBIT IV**

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of scheduled county comprehensive emergency management plan reviews that are 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:

Per 27P-6, Florida Administrative Code, the Division is responsible for reviewing county comprehensive emergency management plans (CEMPs) at a minimum of every four years. On average, there are approximately 10 county CEMP reviews scheduled per calendar year. The number scheduled, however, could be higher or lower due to factors on either the state or county level. A county CEMP review consists of two parts – the review of the plan document and the capabilities assessment. Both must be completed and found compliant with established standards in order for a review to be completed.

The data related to reviews scheduled and completed is stored on the Division's SharePoint site. The formula to determine the percentage of completed reviews is:

Percentage of completed CEMP reviews = (Number of reviews completed ÷ Number of reviews scheduled) X 100

Validity:

The data from the SharePoint site, the schedule CEMP reviews and the number of completed CEMP reviews, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to the completion of CEMP reviews.

Reliability:

The data from the SharePoint site contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage of scheduled CEMP reviews completed: 1) a list of scheduled CEMP reviews and 2) letters sent to counties documenting completion of each CEMP review. The information recorded on the SharePoint site is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Number of county comprehensive emergency plans 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:

Per 27P-6, Florida Administrative Code, the Division is responsible for reviewing county comprehensive emergency management plans (CEMPs) at a minimum of every four years. On average, there are approximately 10 county CEMP reviews scheduled per calendar year. The number scheduled, however, could be higher or lower due to factors on either state or county level. A county CEMP review consists of two parts – the review of the plan document and the capabilities assessment. Both must be completed and found compliant with established standards in order for a review to be completed.

The data related to reviews scheduled and completed is stored on the Division's SharePoint site. The calculation for the measure is a count of the county CEMP reviews completed.

Validity:

The data from the SharePoint site, the number of completed CEMPs reviewed, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to the completion of CEMP reviews.

Reliability:

The data from the SharePoint site contains all elements necessary to calculate the number of CEMPs reviewed: letters sent to counties documenting completion of each CEMP review. The information recorded on the SharePoint site is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of training courses and exercises 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 Division is required by the Department of Homeland Security's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) to maintain a Multi-year Training and Exercise Plan (MYTEP). The MYTEP provides a calendar of training courses and exercises to be held by the Division and local stakeholders throughout multiple years. The Division includes only training courses and exercises scheduled during the current fiscal year in the calculation of this measure.

The data related to training courses and exercises scheduled is maintained in the Division's MYTEP document. The data related to training courses completed is stored on the Division's SERT TRAC database, which allows course instructors throughout the state to electronically document course completion. The data related to exercises completed is stored in an Excel spreadsheet maintained by Division staff. The formula to determine the percentage of training courses and exercises completed is:

Percentage of training courses and exercises completed = (Number of training courses and exercises completed / Number of training courses and exercises scheduled) X 100.

Validity:

The data from the MYTEP document, SERT TRAC, and exercise spreadsheet (the schedule of training courses and exercises, the number of training courses completed, and the number of exercises completed) is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to the completion of training courses and exercises.

Reliability:

The data from the MYTEP document, SERT TRAC, and exercise spreadsheet contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage of training courses and exercises completed: 1) a list of scheduled training courses and exercises; 2) a list of training

courses completed; and 3) a list of exercises completed. The information recorded in the MYTEP document, SERT TRAC, and exercise spreadsheet is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of facilities in compliance with the Emergency Planning and Communities Right to Know Act (EPCRA) related to hazardous materials 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:

The EPCRA contains reporting requirements related to the storage, use, and release of hazardous chemicals. The Division maintains a list of Florida EPCRA reporting facilities and performs outreach activities to ensure facilities report by March 1 of each year to comply with the EPCRA. Reporting documentation is submitted and maintained in E-Plan, the University of Texas at Dallas national chemical facility database.

The formula to determine the percentage of facilities in compliance with the EPCRA hazardous materials reporting requirements is:

Percentage of facilities in compliance = (Number of Florida facilities that reported by March 1 / Total Number of Florida EPCRA reporting facilities) X 100

Validity:

The list of Florida EPCRA reporting facilities and the data from the E-Plan database, the list of facilities that reported by March 1, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to outreach activities for facilities not in compliance with the EPCRA reporting requirements.

Reliability:

The list of Florida EPCRA reporting facilities and the data from the E-Plan database contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage of facilities in compliance with EPCRA: 1) the number of Florida EPCRA reporting facilities and 2) the number of facilities that reported by March 1. The information recorded on the Division's list of facilities and the E-Plan site is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Average number of hours to deploy resources during State Emergency Operations Center 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:

During an activation of the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC), resource requests are placed in EM Constellation, the Division's web-based platform for information management. EM Constellation records the time that requests are placed and when resources are deployed, allowing the Division to determine the number of hours it took to deploy resources for any request. The Division uses EM Constellation data to calculate the number of hours it took to deploy the first request for resources made during each activation. Since the Division does not control when resources are deployed from other sources, only requests for resources stored in the State Logistics Response Center (SLRC) warehouse are considered for this measure.

The formula to determine the average number of hours to deploy resources during all SEOC activations that required SLRC resources that occurred during the year is:

Average number of hours to deploy resources = (Number of hours to deploy resources during activation 1+ Number of hours to deploy resources during activation 2+...Number of hours to deploy resources during activation X) / Number of activations

Validity:

The data from EM Constellation, the number of activations and the number of hours to deploy the resources for the first SRLC resource request for each activation, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to the readiness and availability of SLRC resources.

Reliability:

The data from EM Constellation contains all elements necessary to calculate the average number of hours to deploy resources: 1) a list of all SEOC activations and 2) the times requests were placed and deployed. The information recorded in EM Constellation is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Number of events supported by State Logistics Response Center 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 Division stores resources to assist Florida citizens in recovering from emergency events in the State Logistics Response Center Resources (SLRC) warehouse. During events, requests for SLRC resources are placed in EM Constellation, the Division's web-based platform for information management.

The Division uses EM Constellation data to calculate the number of events during which SLRC resources were deployed. The formula to determine the number of events supported by SLRC resources is:

Number of events = Number of events during which SLRC resources were deployed

Validity:

The data from EM Constellation, the number of events and the requests for SLRC resources, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to the readiness and availability of SLRC resources.

Reliability:

The data from EM Constellation contains all elements necessary to calculate the number of events supported by SLRC resources: 1) a list of all SEOC activations and 2) lists of requests for SLRC resources. The information recorded in EM Constellation is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of Public Assistance Open Large Projects Older than 7 years from Disaster Declaration Date

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 manages FEMA Public Assistance Grant Program projects for all local eligible jurisdictions and agencies within the State of Florida. A project is categorized as large if the estimated costs of the project meet or exceed a cost threshold determined annually by FEMA. Since the Division does not control when FEMA closes a project, the Division considers a project open until all documentation has been sent to FEMA for closeout. The Division aims to timely close all large projects for each disaster that is older than 7 years to comply with FEMA guidance.

The data related to Public Assistance projects is stored on the Division's www.FloridaPA.org database. The formula to determine the percentage of open large projects older than 7 years is:

Percentage of open large projects that are older than 7 years = (Number of open large projects for open disasters older than 7 years ÷ Total Number of large projects for open disasters older than 7 years) X 100

Validity:

The data from the www.FloridaPA.org database, the number of open large projects and the total number of large projects, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to achieving 100% closeout of large projects for events that have reached their 7 year mark.

Reliability:

The data from the www.FloridaPA.org database contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage of open large projects older than 7 years: 1) a list of open large project worksheets (forms used to document the scope of work and cost estimate for a project) for disasters older than 7 years and, 2) a list of all large project worksheets for disasters older than 7 years. The information recorded on the www.FloridaPA.org

database is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Number of Public Assistance Large Projects 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 Division manages FEMA Public Assistance Grant Program projects for all local eligible jurisdictions and agencies within the State of Florida. A project is categorized as large if the estimated costs of the project meet or exceed a cost threshold determined annually by FEMA. Since the Division does not control when FEMA closes a project, the Division considers a project closed once all documentation has been sent to FEMA for closeout.

The data related to Public Assistance projects is stored on the Division's www.FloridaPA.org database. The calculation for the measure is a count of Public Assistance large projects closed.

Validity:

The data from the www.FloridaPA.org database, the number large projects closed, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to closeout of Public Assistance large projects.

Reliability:

The data from the www.FloridaPA.org database contains all elements necessary to calculate the number of large projects closed: a list of large project worksheets that were closed during the fiscal year. Project worksheets are the forms used to document the scope of work and cost estimate for a project. The information recorded on the www.FloridaPA.org database is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of Local Mitigation Strategy Plans that are approved

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:

Each of the 67 Florida counties is required by 27P-22.004, Florida Administrative Code, to maintain an approved Local Mitigation Strategy Plan in order to qualify for participation in the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. Local Mitigation Strategy Plans are developed to reduce or eliminate the risks associated with natural and man-made hazards. Plans are approved by the Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM) through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) delegated authority under the Program Administration by States (PAS). The plans remain in approved status for five years from the approval date. The Division conducts an annual review of plan updates to ensure each county's plan remains in approved status.

The data for this measure is maintained by FEMA. FEMA also performs the calculation for the measure and provides the results to the Division in a status report. The formula to determine the percentage of plans that are in an approved status is:

Percentage of plans that are approved = (Number of plans in approved status ÷ Number of Florida county plans) X 100

Validity:

The information provided by FEMA, the percentage of plans that are in approved status, provides the results for the measure and supports the decision making process as related to performing outreach activities and providing counties with Federal grant funding.

Reliability:

The information provided in the FEMA status report contains all elements necessary to report on the percentage of plans that are approved: the percentage of plans that are in approved status. The results provided in the FEMA status report are accurate and well-defined.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Number of Local Mitigation Strategy Plans 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:

The Division conducts an annual review of each of the 67 Florida counties' Local Mitigation Strategy Plan annual updates. Local Mitigation Strategy Plans are developed to reduce or eliminate the risks associated with natural hazards. The Division's review ensures each county updates all components required by 27P-22.004 and 27P-22.005, Florida Administrative Code, and is in compliance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

The data related to plans reviewed is stored on the Division's SharePoint site. The calculation for the measure is a count of the Local Mitigation Strategy Plans reviewed during the fiscal year.

Validity:

The data from the SharePoint site, the number of plans reviewed, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to completion of Local Mitigation Strategy Plan update reviews.

Reliability:

The data from the SharePoint site contains all elements necessary to calculate the number of plans reviewed: notifications sent to counties documenting completion of each Local Mitigation Strategy Plan review. The information recorded on the SharePoint site is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage closeout of mitigation grant program projects with period of performance dates within the current fiscal 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:

The Division (grantee) manages projects under several federal and state mitigation grant programs for local eligible jurisdictions and agencies within the State of Florida. Since the Division does not control when projects are formally closed by the grantor of each program, the Division considers a project closeout complete once all closeout documentation has been submitted to the grantor. The Division aims to complete each closeout by the project's period of performance (POP) date to comply with grant guidance.

The data related to mitigation grant program projects is stored on the Division's www.floridamitigation.fleoc.org (Mit.org) database. The formula to determine the percentage closeout of Mitigation grant program projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year is:

Percentage closeout of projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year = (Number of closeouts of projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year ÷ Total number of projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year) X 100

Validity:

The data from the Mit.org database, the number of closeouts of projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year and the total number of projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to oversight of mitigation grant programs.

Reliability:

The data from the Mit.org database contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage closeout mitigation grant program projects with POP dates within the current fiscal year: 1) project closeout packages and 2) a list of Mitigation grant program projects. The information recorded on the Mit.org database is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Number of mitigation grant program project closeouts 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 Division (grantee) manages projects under several federal and state mitigation grant programs for local eligible jurisdictions and agencies within the State of Florida. Since the Division does not control when projects are formally closed by the grantor of each program, the Division considers a project closeout complete once all closeout documentation has been submitted to the grantor.

The data related to mitigation grant program projects is stored on the Division's www.floridamitigation.fleoc.org (Mit.org) database. The calculation for the measure is a count of the mitigation grant program project closeouts completed during the fiscal year.

Validity:

The data from the Mit.org database, the number of project closeouts completed, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to oversight of mitigation grant programs.

Reliability:

The data from the Mit.org database contains all elements necessary to calculate the number of mitigation grant program project closeouts completed: a list of project closeouts that were completed during the fiscal year. The information recorded on the Mit.org database is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: EOG / Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management / 31700100

Measure: Percentage of scheduled public education outreach events attended

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 252.35, Florida Statutes, requires the Division to institute a statewide public awareness campaign on emergency preparedness issues, including, but not limited to, the personal responsibility of individual citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours following a natural or man-made disaster. The Division's public education campaign includes outreach events throughout the state to provide materials to the public on preparedness issues.

At the beginning of each fiscal year, External Affairs creates a list of outreach events scheduled for the upcoming year. After each event attended, External Affairs creates a photo sheet, containing photos of Division staff at the event, to document attendance. The formula to determine the percentage of scheduled events attended is:

Percentage of scheduled outreach events attended = (Number of outreach events attended ÷ Number of outreach events scheduled) X 100

Validity:

The information provided by the list of scheduled events and the photo sheets, the events scheduled and proof of attendance at each event, is relevant to the calculation of the measure and supports the decision making process as related to performing public education outreach activities for disaster preparedness.

Reliability:

The data from the list of scheduled events and the photo sheets contains all elements necessary to calculate the percentage of scheduled outreach events attended: 1) the number of outreach events scheduled and 2) the number of scheduled outreach events attended. The information recorded in list of scheduled events and photo sheets is accurate and well-defined to yield consistent results.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2014

**ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES
CONTRIBUTING TO
PERFORMANCE MEASURES
LRPP EXHIBIT V**

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

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment *
2	Number of capabilities assessed		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment *
3	Percentage of scheduled county comprehensive emergency management plan reviews that are completed **		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
4	Number of county comprehensive emergency management plans reviewed**		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
5	Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted*		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
6	Number of county capability assessments*		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
7	Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise		Emergency Management Training and Exercises Program
8	Percentage of completed training courses and exercises		Emergency Management Training and Exercises Program
9	Number of participants attending training		Emergency Management Training and Exercises Program
10	Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise*		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness*
11	Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise*		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness*
12	Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
13	Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year*		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan*
14	Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed*		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan*
15	Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated*		Accidental Release, Prevention and Risk Management Planning
16	Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to the Clean Air Act – Section 112R		Accidental Release, Prevention and Risk Management Planning
17	Number of facilities inspected/audited		Accidental Release, Prevention and Risk Management Planning
18	Percentage of facilities out of compliance with the Emergency Planning Communities Right to Know Act (EPCRA)*		Florida Community Right to Know Act
19	Percentage of facilities in compliance with the Emergency Planning Communities Right to Know Act (EPCRA) related to hazardous materials reporting**		Florida Community Right to Know Act
20	Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting		Florida Community Right to Know Act
21	Percentage of time that division communication systems are operational and capable*		Emergency Communications and Warnings and State Emergency Operation Center Readiness**
22	Percentage of State Watch Office Notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant		Emergency Communications and Warnings and State Emergency Operation Center Readiness**
23	Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for State Emergency Operations Center Activation		Emergency Communications and Warnings and State Emergency Operation Center Readiness**
24	Number of incidents tracked		Emergency Communications and Warnings and State Emergency Operation Center Readiness**
25	Number of State Emergency Operations Center activation notifications sent*		Emergency Communications and Warnings and State Emergency Operation Center Readiness**

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
26	Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
27	Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
28	Average number of hours to activate the State Logistics Response Center in order to deploy resources*		State Logistics Response Center
29	Average number of hours to deploy resources during a State Emergency Operations Center Activation		State Logistics Response Center
30	Number of survivors supported for 24 hours*		State Logistics Response Center
31	Number of events supported by State Logistics Response Center Resources**		State Logistics Response Center
32	Percentage of counties that annually update Form C*		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements*
33	Number of mutual aid agreements in place*		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements*
34	Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date*		Financial Assistance for Recovery
35	Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date*		Financial Assistance for Recovery
36	Percentage of public assistance open large projects for disasters older than 7 years, that are completed**		Financial Assistance for Recovery
37	Number of project worksheets closed*		Financial Assistance for Recovery
38	Number of public assistance large projects closed**		Financial Assistance for Recovery
39	Percentage of listed local Mitigation Strategy Projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed*		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
40	Percentage of Local Mitigation Strategy Plans that are approved**		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
41	Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team Meetings*		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
42	Number of approved local mitigation strategy plans maintained		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
43	Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Projects*		Financial Assistance for Long Term Mitigation Measures
44	Percentage closeout of mitigation grant program projects with period of performance dates within the current fiscal year**		Financial Assistance for Long Term Mitigation Measures
45	Number of non-disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for*		Financial Assistance for Long Term Mitigation Measures
46	Number of mitigation grant program project closeouts completed**		Financial Assistance for Long Term Mitigation Measures
47	Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System*		Mitigation Technical Assistance*
48	Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact Interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program*		Mitigation Technical Assistance*
49	Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan*		Individual and Family Public Awareness*
50	Number of public education outreach events attended annually		Individual and Family Public Awareness*/Public Awareness**
51	Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan*		Private Sector Business Awareness*
52	Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org *		Private Sector Business Awareness*

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
53	Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan*		Disability Outreach Program*
54	Number of individuals added to the 67 county registries for persons with special needs*		Disability Outreach Program*
55	Percentage of public education outreach event attended**		Public Awareness**

*Measure and/or activity being deleted for FY 14/15 and FY 15/16

**New measure and/or revised activity for FY 14/15 and FY 15/16

Footnote: Budget Amendment (O0052) is currently pending approval for all changes made to activities and performance measures

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE		FISCAL YEAR 2013-14			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING	FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY		
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		312,183,504	3,800,000		
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		100,649,151	-800,000		
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		412,832,655	3,000,000		
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
<i>Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)</i>					
Mitigation Technical Assistance * Number of community assistance visits and contact interviews conducted	46	13,872.00	638,112		
Maintaining Capabilities Of Local Emergency Management Programs * Number of county capabilities assessments	16	2,648,062.50	42,369,000		
Emergency Management Training And Exercises Program * Number of students attending training	5,948	280.68	1,669,494		
Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan * Number of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan elements	27	42,976.33	1,160,361		
Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements * Number of mutual aid agreements maintained	67	4,282.70	286,941		
Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program * Public Hurricane Shelters Evaluated	208	2,703.08	562,241		3,000,000
Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment * Number of capabilities assessed	156	193,325.34	30,158,753		
Financial Assistance For Recovery * Number of project worksheets closed	328	352,392.43	115,584,718		
Financial Assistance For Long Term Prevention Measures * Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for	3	38,549,173.00	115,647,519		
State Emergency Operations Center Activation * Number of State Emergency Operations roles notified	22	63,523.73	1,397,522		
Emergency Community And Warnings * Number of incidents tracked by the State Watch Office	8,876	139.66	1,239,640		
State Logistics Response Center * Number of survivors supported for 24 hours	1,000,000	2.65	2,645,416		
Florida Community Right To Know Act * Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting	438	5,838.18	2,557,122		
Accidental Release Prevention And Risk Management Planning * Number of facilities inspected/audited	31	20,538.26	636,686		
Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness * Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant	31	17,042.19	528,308		
Disability Outreach Program * Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population	37,575	8.88	333,738		
Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation * Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meeting	2	1,164,386.00	2,328,772		
TOTAL			319,744,343		3,000,000
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER (5)			1,947,385		
REVERSIONS			91,140,933		
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)			412,832,661		3,000,000
SCHEDULE XI/EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY					

(1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.

(2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.

(3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.

(4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

(5) Output measures for two activities could not be calculated due to technological issues.

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 Watch Office -- 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.