

**Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan
Focus Group Meeting
07/19/2011 from 1 - 2:30 p.m.
Renaissance Center, 2nd Floor Conference Room**

Attendees: Don Lanham, Rob McGarrah, Lee Hartsfield, Greg Mauldin, Richard Smith, Glenn Dodson, Alex Mahon, Gary Obershlake, Nowfal Ezzagaghi, Michael Parker, Steve Hodges, John Venable, Robby Powers, Larry Strickland, Harry Reed, Ryan Guffey, Lamar Kemp, Susan Poplin, Denise Imbler, and Chris Rietow

Convening and Introductions

Susan Poplin convened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. with a brief description of the focus group role in development of the PDRP and group introductions.

Overview

Denise Imbler provided a brief overview of the PDRP project and components, and specific goals for the meeting today including recommendations for vulnerability identification and analysis.

Hazards Identification and Study

Denise Imbler presented the anticipated major vulnerabilities of interest for the PDRP including flooding, hurricane/wind, and wildfires. Lee Hartsfield identified that they have 2010 certified data for wildfires. The group did not identify others to be examined as part of the effort. She also presented general data and analyses that would be gathered in completing the study.

Analysis of Vulnerabilities

Denise Imbler presented the concept of HAZUS analysis as opposed to previous MEMPHIS [mapping for emergency management, parallel hazard information systems], ELVIS [economic loss vulnerability index systems] and TAOS [the arbiter of storms]. FDEM is recommending HAZUS and other PDRPs have used this data tool for their plans. The HAZUS has updated information on property valuation, economic loss, and more of a regional approach. Greg Mauldin, Leon County GIS, commented that local data can be added to HAZUS. Disadvantages of HAZUS include labor intensive data input and length of time to complete. Lee Hartsfield, Leon County GIS, indicated the potential for data collection including potential time data and time limitations. A request was made to include both residential and commercial property information for non-conforming uses [based on use of 1994 building codes, Zone 2 standard]. The group discussed the HAZUS approach with input of local data as available and appropriate, and agreed it would be used for the PRDP. The LMS data could be used as a backup if necessary. Updates on development of the vulnerability analysis will be provided at the planned PDRP focus group meetings. January is the target timeframe for the completion of the final PDRP Vulnerability Analysis using HAZUS with assistance from the Leon County GIS team.

Infrastructure and Facilities

Denise Imbler presented examples of critical facilities. After discussion the group determined that the report would include critical public facilities in the Regional Evacuation Study and also examine the Local Mitigation Strategy. Some discussion of the prioritization of public facility improvements for mitigation purposes was had with the idea that some facilities could be hardened or significantly improved but that these items could be cost prohibitive (i.e., Rob McGarrah's example of 200 miles of overhead electric lines that could be placed underground but the cost would be \$2 billion). The group anticipates further

discussion on this and similar issues would occur with other components of the PRDP including the implementation plan and the financing chapters.

For the critical public facilities list, considerations include making sure that public facilities for homeland security purposes do not disclose information making facilities vulnerable. Also, the group determined that critical infrastructure, differentiated from public facilities, would be included in the report. Infrastructure should include roadways, communication facilities and gas transmission lines.

Historical Overlay : Michael Parker recommended consultation with the Trust for Historic Preservation to identify vulnerable historic structures. Steve Hodges also suggested the Planning Department had most recent historic structure data.

Denise also agreed to define Short-term and Long-term facility impacts with direction from state Division of Emergency Management Staff.

Other hazards to be considered for impacts on public facilities and infrastructure included sinkholes and earthquakes. A discussion of the impacts of existing and perhaps unpermitted dam/berm failure as a result of flooding [and/or earthquake] occurred. It was decided the impacts from earthquakes to the extent the model would accommodate, would be included. For sinkholes, data on locations or vulnerability through Leon County Aquifer Vulnerability Assessment could be included.

Anticipated Scenarios For Study

Denise Imbler recommended looking at two natural disaster scenarios from a modeling standpoint. The first would include a slow-moving tropical storm where much of the impact would be from rain and flooding. The second scenario would be fast moving category 4 hurricane where damage would be from wind and also flooding. The group had no comments on the potential scenarios.

Demographics

Denise presented two sources for population and demographic data including the US 2010 Census and the American Community Survey (ACS) updated from 2006-2010. Both the ACS data and the 2010 Census data use the new geography based on redistricting. Vulnerable population data would be provided for those over 65, under 5, disabled, single-head of household below poverty, linguistically challenged, and households without cars. The group agreed to use 2006-2010 ACS data which is set to be released in December because it provides more information than 2010 Census data.

Plan Integration

Denise presented a list of plans to be examined as part of the effort to integrate their components into the PDRP and vice versa. The initial plan analysis includes the Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, the Local Mitigation Strategy, the Regional Hurricane Evacuation Study and the Apalachee Strategic Regional Policy Plan. Recommendations were made to also include the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Corridor Plans, Blueprint, and local redevelopment plans. Participants were encouraged to send any other recommendations for review to Denise or Susan Poplin.

Next Meetings

After some discussion the meeting schedule for the PDRP Focus Group was set for the following dates to occur from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. at the 2nd floor conference room at the Renaissance Building:

August 16, 2011

October 4, 2011
January 17, 2012
February 21, 2012
March 29, 2012
May 7, 2012

The group agreed with the schedule for future meetings. Also, the website under development will be used to disseminate information about future meetings and draft components of the PDRP.

Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.