

**Leon County Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan (PDRP) Focus Group Meeting  
Tallahassee Renaissance Center - Tallahassee, Florida  
November 8, 2011 – 9:30 am**

**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

**Representing**

Leigh Davis	Leon County Public Works
Jeff Evans	Tallahassee National Weather Service
Carmen Green	Blackwater Engineering
Lee Hartsfield	Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department (TLCGIS)
Steve Hodges	Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
Cherie Horne	Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
Denise Imbler	Apalachee Regional Planning Council (ARPC)
Greg Mauldin	Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department (TLCGIS)
Keith McCarron	Apalachee Regional Planning Council (ARPC)
Joyce Olaves	Tallahassee Economic and Community Development
Kevin Peters	Leon County Emergency Management
Marc Phelps	City of Tallahassee Stormwater
Susan Poplin	Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
Harry Reid	Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency
Richard Smith	Leon County Emergency Management
Larry Wayne Strickland	Tallahassee Builders Association (TBA)
John Venable	FL Department of Financial Services (DFS)
Janice Watson	Apalachee Regional Planning Council (ARPC)
Scott Weisman	Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department (TLCGIS)

**Welcome**

Denise Imbler welcomed everyone to the fourth Leon County Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan (PDRP) Focus Group Meeting and before beginning the discussion, asked the attendees to introduce themselves and to identify the agency they represented. Susan Poplin commented that Ms. Imbler has been doing a good job completing the draft plan components based on the timeline and explained that once the HAZUS model was completed it would be the pivotal point in determining how to proceed with the action and implementation plans. Ms. Imbler emphasized the even though there would not be a focus group meeting scheduled in December, work would still be going on. She encouraged the group to continue reviewing the draft documents and to be thinking about ways they could eventually work into an implementation and action plan. Ms. Imbler also noted that the PDRP website was continually being updated with the meeting materials as well as the draft documents as they are updated.

**Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment Chapter Update**

Scott Weisman and Greg Mauldin of the Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department gave the Group an update of their progress on the development of the HAZUS hurricane model

methodology. Mr. Weisman started by reviewing the layers of the inventory types and discussing whether or not local data updates could be used. He noted that the latest property appraiser data could not be used because the property appraiser's office has augmented its data for tax purposes only, which was not in a format compatible with the HAZUS model. Mr. Weisman stated that the HAZUS model was currently using 2006 property values. Ms. Imbler pointed out that the PDRP was ultimately a guide and a big picture scope of how Leon County would respond post disaster, more than it was a specific economic report. Susan Poplin asked if the data presented was a conservative estimate of actual property values, and Ms. Imbler and Mr. Weisman both replied that it was. Ms. Poplin suggested that the fact that the values were conservative might need to be noted in the plan. Mr. Weisman stated that whenever the HAZUS model was updated by FEMA, it will be no trouble to re-run the determined storm scenario using the newest version, which would likewise include the most current property values available.

Richard Smith asked if the volunteer fire departments had been included in the emergency facilities category. Mr. Weisman answered that they had been included under fire stations. He explained that the volunteer fire department list was not completed, but it was the intent of the TLCGIS to include all volunteer fire departments before finalizing the layer. Mr. Weisman reviewed each inventory line item and updated the group on the process of the TLCGIS on each. After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the group that the Armory and the Army Reserve Center should be included in the military section. Ms. Imbler questioned whether or not local roads had been included. Mr. Weisman explained that the model only looked at highways that would have the potential of needing federal reimbursement. There were several questions in reference to water facilities. Mr. Imbler suggested that wells and lift stations might need to be included as they have the potential to produce adverse impacts if contaminated. It was also discussed if the report should include maps or lists. Susan Poplin stated that other PDRPs did not include maps. It was the general consensus of the group that a list format would be sufficient. The group clarified for Mr. Weisman that the water and wastewater facilities would be included in the model but not identified on the map. There was a short discussion on how to handle the natural gas pipeline. Ms. Imbler stated that she would check with other PDRP developers on how they had handled natural gas facilities in their respective communities. There was discussion on how to address the hydro-electric dam at Lake Talquin. Mr. Weisman stated that he planned to include it in both the electric power facilities as well as the dam layer. Questions were raised on how the model would treat cell towers. Mr. Weisman agreed to research the matter further, stating that he was unsure how difficult it would be to establish a replacement value for the tower itself as they were all different.

Mr. Weisman reviewed a quick assessment and explained that he had used Hurricane Frances to run a prototype. He reviewed the initial 15 page report with the group which had been produced from the basic data that comes with the model. He noted that until 2012 when all of the 2010 census data was made available, the HAZUS model would be using 2000 census information.

Ms. Imbler asked Mr. Weisman whether or not the data collected so far would be comprehensive enough to give a fairly accurate picture of the expected loss resulting from a storm scenario. The TCGIS staff confirmed that the data collected up to this point should produce a better than expected accurate picture of expected loss. Steve Hodges questioned how often community updates would be incorporated into the data sets used in the model. Ms. Imbler explained that it was suggested that the PDRP be updated annually with a major update completed every 5 years. She also noted that the other PDRP plans she reviewed previously had a set of guidelines for updating the plan included in the document.

There was a brief discussion about the essential facility inventory, specifically about how many actual licensed hospitals there were in the County. Mr. Smith questioned whether or not the ancillary locations had been included. Ms. Imbler offered to research and provide the actual number of beds, and it was the general consensus to use just the main facilities in the inventory. Ms. Imbler asked Mr. Weisman if the school layer had taken into account the schools that had been retrofitted as a shelter. Mr. Weisman noted that he would research the school inventory data to find the answer. He also agreed to determine whether or not FSU, FAMU, and TCC had been included in the school layer.

Ms. Imbler opened the discussion on establishing the storm parameters, explaining that the original plan was to run two separate storms. She proposed running a fast moving Category 3 storm with a lot of wind and a slow moving Category 2 storm with a lot of rain. Mr. Smith suggested that maybe the group should consider running a Category 1 storm, because the damage to be expected between a Category 1 and a Category 3 grows much more exponentially than most people expect. Several questions were raised about the flood modeling capabilities of HAZUS. The TCGIS staff responded that they had not looked at the flood model portion of the project yet. Ms. Imbler stated that wind damage needed to be addressed as well as water damage. She also pointed out that the PDRP was not prohibited from using other mapping capabilities outside of HAZUS to project what type of damage could be expected for a particular storm type and scenario. Mr. Smith suggested that the PDRP should always take the worst case scenario and plan to re-build from that point. Mr. Weisman noted that the model already assumes that a slow moving storm would ultimately produce more rain and flooding. The TCGIS staff reported that the next step in the process for them would be to review the flood portion of the model and to run a scenario coinciding with the hurricane portion of the model and to compare the results.

It was the general consensus of the group to run a strong fast Category 3 storm, a slow wet Category 2 storm, and a Category 1 storm. Ms. Poplin asked whether or not there was data available on the property loss and economic impacts of Hurricane Kate in 1985 and if available could it assist in developing the storm scenarios to be run. Mr. Smith stated that the only data on Kate was very general and had been compiled by the Tallahassee Democrat. Jeff Evans stated that the intended storm trek that the Tallahassee National Weather Service would be assimilating for the TCGIS Department would indeed be very similar to the path that Kate took. Mr. Evans emphasized that the effects of a Category 2 storm on Leon County would be much worse than it would be on South Florida. He agreed to assist the TCGIS staff on the

development of the storm parameters, noting that he would be able to submit historical data to support the development of the fictitious storms as well as document how the storms related to actual storm damage in the past.

#### Housing Strategy Work Group Update

Ms. Imbler reported that there would be a meeting later on in the week to further discuss how temporary housing situations progress into transitional housing and finally back to permanent housing, which would include both new facilities and the repaired original homes. She explained that the Housing Work Group would also be looking at what the role of Leon County would be as a host county for displaced coastal displaced residents as well as an impact county. Ms. Poplin pointed out that the actual housing structures were not the only thing to be considered, but also the fact that the displaced households [including those from surrounding areas] would also need a full range of social services. It was discussed that low income households would ultimately require more services following a disaster. Ms. Imbler stated that one of the goals of the PDRP would be to assure that the disaster recovery center would be a one stop shop for the displaced individuals to access all needed services. Ms. Poplin suggested that maybe there could be a general plan in the PDRP and then a separate complimenting detailed plan developed on how to address specific housing issues. Ms. Imbler emphasized that the stronger and more capable a community is to tap into the FEMA system, the less likely FEMA would be to come in and take over the entire process, a situation which severely limits the local input into the disaster recovery planning and implementation process.

Ms. Imbler pointed out that the disaster recovery center would only be around for a few months following the disaster while the community is working into the transition process. Mr. Hodges asked if the PDRP would explain the existing process because there is a transition period from immediate recovery to long-term recovery. Ms. Imbler responded that it would only be discussed generally in the PDRP because it was discussed in detail in the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP).

#### Introduction Review:

Ms. Imbler reviewed with the group a draft of the introduction section of the plan. Ms. Imbler reviewed the overview section explaining that the action plan was intended to be an operational plan for how to carry out the informational portions of the PDRP. She discussed briefly a scenario for how the task force would react to the disaster following the implementation of the immediate recovery covered by the CEMP. She reviewed the purpose section and explained that the section would try to capture the transition from immediate short term recovery to long term recovery and redevelopment. Mr. Smith suggested that a sentence might be added to the purpose section to clarify the distinction between long term recovery and post disaster redevelopment. Ms. Poplin suggested that the clarifying language might be that the PDRP would use mechanisms already in place such as the recovery ordinance and the local mitigation strategy.

Ms. Imbler explained that the PDRP would only kick in if there was a continued need following the situations already covered by the immediate recovery systems currently in place. She

noted that an additional purpose of the PDRP would be to keep all the entities working together as they address the long term needs. Ms. Poplin asked that it be noted in the introduction that it was allowable to activate a portion of the PDRP without activating the entire plan. There was discussion about the possibility of establishing a long term recovery to compliment the team approach being adopted by the City and the County in other endeavors. Mr. Smith stated that the role of emergency management would be very minimal once the PDRP recovery team effort was activated.

Ms. Imbler read for the committee the outline details in the Purpose, Goals and Objectives section of the Introduction.

Ms. Imbler read the Plan Integration narrative and it was discussed that some specifics might need to be included to address the intergovernmental coordination between the City and the County. Concerns were voiced that if the PDRP will function as a true community redevelopment tool there would have to be a coordinated process in place between the two local governments in order for it to function successfully. Keith McCarron stated that it might be a good idea to recognize in the PDRP that there are two separate local elected bodies making decisions. Mr. McCarron suggested that the PDRP could note that both local elected bodies had already adopted an identical recovery ordinance. After additional discussion it was the final consensus that it should be acknowledged up front that there are two separate local elected bodies which would be making decisions and they should be formally encouraged in the plan to work together to the largest extent possible in the post disaster recovery process. Mr. McCarron noted that another possible point to be included would be to recognize that great steps had already been made in that regard between the two local governments by combining the planning departments and the local mitigation strategy. Mr. Smith commented that the group should be sensitive to the fact that there are other separate documents in place as well as two active elected bodies which are concerned mainly with their separate jurisdictions, and at the same time use every possible opportunity to encourage intergovernmental coordination.

The group reviewed the Planning Process narrative in the Introduction section. Mr. McCarron stated that in a plan, objectives referred to what you wanted to accomplish and what you wanted to do. Mr. Hodges added that the objectives are usually the guidelines and the meat is more clearly defined in the policies. There was a discussion on how specific the objectives listed in the plan should be. Marc Phelps stated that a lack of funding might prohibit some objectives from being accomplished. Mr. McCarron noted that the plan could also be used as verification for priorities being funded during the redevelopment process, and the objective list could serve as a benchmark for giving some sense to the team and the local governments on when the plan had been completed. Ms. Poplin stated that Alachua was using the objective list more as an informational guide rather than a measurement for completion. She also noted that if the group decided that the plan should have measurable objectives, the group would also have to determine and give someone the responsibility of doing the actual measuring.

Mr. Hodges commented that at a certain point redevelopment should do more than just restore the community or develop it better than it was before, it should identify deficiencies in the

comprehensive plan as well as the local mitigation strategy. Ms. Poplin noted that the action plan of the PDRP would recommend changes to the local mitigation strategy and the comprehensive plan in order to strengthen weak areas and to maximize the implementation of the PDRP. Mr. Hodges suggested taking it back to the TLCPD staff to get feed back and gather suggestions for the goals and objectives. Ms. Poplin stated that the goals and objectives as presented were very much in line with other PDRPs. She emphasized that the main goal of the PDRP was to get people back to where they were as quickly as possible through a process that should also be able to add value.

It was suggested that the words “a sustainable” should be added before quality of life in section B-2. There was a brief discussion on what would happen to the County, if due to a large-scale disaster the State Capitol was permanently relocated to a different location in the State.

#### Capacity Assessment / Gap Analysis

In the interest of time, Ms. Imbler briefly stated that the bulk of the work on Capacity Assessment would be prepared during the two month period before the next focus group meeting.

#### Public Outreach and Coordination Input

Ms. Imbler reported that the plan for interaction with the public was to use several different outreach methods to encourage them to be part of the plan. She noted that this would probably happen in February during the final stages of writing the plan. Ms. Imbler explained that the second meaning of public outreach would be addressed in the plan and should outline how to get the information out to the public, once the PDRP had been activated.

Ms. Poplin stated that the original PDRP pilot project in Sarasota County prepared a Public Service Announcement to present to the public about why the PDRP was so important. All agreed that if a PSA of this type could be developed for Leon County and presented correctly, it would be a very compelling tool in getting the public to buy in to the process. Ms. Poplin stated that moving into the future it would be a good idea for the website to be maintained and updated periodically.

#### Next Meeting

Ms. Imbler thanked everyone for their participation and announced that the next Focus Group Meeting would be on January 17, 2012 at the same location and at the same time.