

**Leon County Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan (PDRP) Focus Group Meeting
Tallahassee Renaissance Center - Tallahassee, Florida
January 17, 2012 – 9:30-11:30 am**

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Cherie Bryant
Glen Dodson
Jeff Evans
Ryan Guffey
Denise Imbler
Dorothy Inman-Johnson
Timeka Knowles
Alex Mahon
Greg Mauldin
Cindy Mead
Gary Oberschlake
Joyce Olavez
Kevin Peters
Susan Poplin
Robbie Powers
Harry Reed
Richard Smith
Larry Wayne Strickland
Cynthia Valencia
Janice Watson
Scott Weisman

Representing

Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
City of Tallahassee Building Department
Tallahassee National Weather Service
Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
Apalachee Regional Planning Council (ARPC)
Capital Area Community Action Agency
Leon County Housing
Leon County Health Department
Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department (TLCGIS)
City of Tallahassee Parks & Recreation
City of Tallahassee Electric Department
City of Tallahassee ECD Housing
Leon County Emergency Management
Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department (TLCPD)
City of Tallahassee Emergency Management
Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency
Leon County Emergency Management
Tallahassee Builders Association
Capital Area Community Action Agency
Apalachee Regional Planning Council (ARPC)
Tallahassee-Leon County GIS Department (TLCGIS)

I. Welcome

Denise Imbler welcomed everyone to the fifth 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.

II. Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment – Data Review

Denise Imbler handed out copies of the Draft Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment and gave the group a brief overview of Part I (Hazard Risk Overview) and Part II (GIS Methodology). Ms. Imbler explained that the data sets had been prepared using a slow moving Category 1 storm with heavy rain, another Category 1 storm with a similar path and winds to Hurricane Kate and also a Category 3 storm. She noted that flood data and wildfire analysis had also been included.

Scott Weisman reviewed the work completed to date on Part III (GIS Vulnerability and Risk Assessment). Mr. Weisman reported that the 2000 census data sets in the model could not be updated at this time and as a result the 2006 building valuations might be slightly inflated from actual Leon County property values in 2012. Mr. Weisman referenced the Category 3 storm scenario, and explained that the model predicted 14,000 of the 97,000 buildings in Leon County would sustain some type of hit with 325 being completely destroyed, which resulted in a total property damage loss of approximately \$1.25 billion. He explained that 75% of the total loss was residential with 1300 – 1400 homes damaged enough to displace those families for a long period of time. Denise Imbler added that 10% of site built home residents would go to a shelter and 60% would elect to stay with family and friends.

Ms. Imbler referenced Table 1.7 on page 17 and explained much higher damage would be associated with slow moving hurricanes that included massive amounts of slow driving rain. Ms. Imbler also pointed out that there was no way to estimate damage from tornados that might spin off of a hurricane, and likewise the data provided only accounted for damage incurred from sustained winds. Jeff Evans noted that the storm tracks used in the model were based on actual past storm scenarios.

Richard Smith questioned whether or not the proposed losses lined up with expected losses in the coastal counties like Wakulla and Franklin. It was determined through general discussion that the losses would not line up with the losses in the coastal counties because the building make up in the adjoining coastal counties was much different from Leon County and also because the coastal counties would have to deal with direct winds and storm surge issues that would not be a concern for Leon County in the scenario provided.

Various changes in the Leon County Building Code over time were discussed. Ms. Imbler agreed to provide data and a map to document buildings that were built before Hurricane Andrew in 1992 and also a category break depicting buildings built before 1973 when the standard building code was adopted. Mr. Smith pointed out that Leon County was not as vulnerable to roofs being blown off from hurricane force winds as it was to trees falling on roofs.

The Group reviewed the wildfire risk data and map and by general consensus determined that the risk of wildfire was not a critical issue for Leon County. Greg Mauldin noted that there were additional layers that also looked at access routes that might be blocked for responders trying to put out the fire in addition to infrastructure roadways or power plants that might also be impacted.

Denise Imbler asked if critical facilities could be mapped by the model. Scott Weisman noted that the model referred to them as essential facilities and stated that all of the facilities could be identified infrastructure spots and added to the map. It was the consensus of the group to have a map of these facilities included in the report. Mr. Weisman and Ms. Imbler agreed to work together on the project to come up with a map that made sense.

Greg Mauldin raised another question in reference to the wildfire section, stating that the education loss figures seemed unusually high. It was discussed that maybe the loss to the FSU area also included Innovation Park. Susan Poplin questioned if the numbers were for all of Leon County or just for the red zone. Denise Imbler agreed to add clarification language to the paragraph on page 21 which explained the fire loss numbers.

Ms. Imbler reviewed the 100-year flood plain map on page 22, explaining that the entire county does not have AE Flood elevation data and the HAZUS model only uses AE data to calculate loss. Mr. Mauldin noted that most of the AE data available was inside the City of Tallahassee. It was suggested that the legend on map 1.7 be made smaller in order for the map to depict the western border of Leon County.

Mr. Mauldin added that Leon County was in a reasonably good position in reference to potential flood losses, simply because the building codes do not allow building in the floodplain. Jeff Evans explained the actual meaning of each of the flood zone categories to the group. Ms. Imbler suggested that language might be added to explain that the map represented the worst case scenario did not account for the policy which allows for structures to be built 1-2 feet above the flood base. Richard Smith also pointed out that it may not address the scenarios when a residence did not flood, but the property access, well, and septic tank did flood. Mr. Mauldin stated that they have reasonably current septic tank data and could possibly identify potential losses of septic tanks through 2006. Mr. Smith noted that maybe language could also be added to note that seldom would all septic tanks in the county flood at the same time and each scenario would have to be addressed as the event merited the attention.

Denise Imbler reviewed the Leon County Parcels in the FEMA 100 Year Flood Plain list included in Table 1.14. Greg Mauldin explained that all property appraiser data referred to in the report was taken from the 2011 Tax Roll.

The Group discussed Population and Demographic Vulnerability Tables included in Section IV. Ms. Imbler explained that the majority of data was very similar to the widely accepted data from the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR).

Denise Imbler stated that before the next focus group meeting she would be contacting the individual agencies and to set up meetings to gather input for the gap analysis to be included in the capacity assessment section of the PDRP. She explained that the gap analysis would also be included in the action plan and would include all areas affected with a realistic cost attached to the improvements. The Group gave Ms. Imbler several suggestions for gathering gap analysis input which included: attending the Leon County Healthcare Coalition meeting on January 26th; scheduling a combined meeting with utilities, water and wastewater in order for all to benefit from mutual responses; scheduling a meeting with the Leon County Health Department in reference to septic tanks; and possibly including parks/recreation and building code staff in the meeting with growth management staff. Ms. Imbler thanked the Group for the suggestions and in advance for their input at the individual agency meetings.

IV. Action Plan – Format Review

Ms. Imbler passed out a PDRP – Draft Action Plan which gave sample data and represented the format to be used in the Final Action Plan. She noted that it would be one of the last items put together, because it would be the result of data formulated throughout the entire PDRP development process. Ms. Imbler asked for input from the group on the format and key action items and recommendation items as presented. Scott Weisman noted that the HAZUS model also took into account the cost of debris removal. Ms. Imbler stated that she would bring this up in the infrastructure agency meeting. Mr. Weisman noted that the main issue to address would be whether or not the City of Tallahassee would be reimbursed for the money spent on debris removal.

V. Housing Strategy Work Group Update

Ms. Imbler reported that the Housing Strategy was near completion and commented that there had been great participation from all parties concerned. She noted that the final meeting was scheduled for February 1st.

VI. Public Workshop – February 21, 2012

Ms. Imbler announced that the public workshop scheduled to give the general public opportunity to offer input on the plan would be held on February 21, 2012 from 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm at the Renaissance Building. She noted that the public workshop was announced at the last council on neighborhood affairs. Dorothy Inman-Johnson stated that the PDRP information presented at the workshop would need to be clear and in laypeople language in order for it to be understood by the most vulnerable population.

VII. Question and Answer

Ms. Imbler handed out copies of the final draft of the Finance Strategy and briefly reviewed the document. She explained that the document now incorporated comments suggested at previous Focus Group meetings.

Ms. Imbler stated that with the majority of the data established, the next task was to determine the best procedure for activating the plan after a disaster. She suggested that the plan should determine an order of meetings and coordination during the PDRP period. Richard Smith stated that it was the vision of Leon County Emergency Management that coordination would begin 72 hours after impact, and after initial meetings were held, transition into the long term recovery mode where the lawmakers would use the information in the PDRP for making decisions on how to proceed. Harry Reed emphasized how important it was that the PDRP direct redevelopment away from known problem areas.

Greg Mauldin asked if Ms. Imbler could schedule a short meeting with the TLCGIS Department to identify any remaining data items that needed to be addressed.

VIII. Next Meeting

Ms. Imbler announced that the next Focus Group meeting would be held on February 21st from 9:30 am – 11:00 am at the Renaissance Center.