



STATE OF FLORIDA

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

RICK SCOTT
Governor

BRYAN W. KOON
Director

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

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

October 24, 2011

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

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

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

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes and Chapter 2011-142, Laws of Florida, the Division of Emergency Management submits our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) in the format prescribed in the instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of the division's mission, goals, objectives and measures for Fiscal Year 2012-13 through Fiscal Year 2016-17. I have approved this submission.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bryan W. Koon".

Bryan W. Koon, Director
Florida Division of Emergency Management

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN



**Fiscal Years 2012-2013
Through 2016-2017**

September 2011

Rick Scott
Governor

Bryan W. Koon
Director

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Agency Mission ----- | 3 |
| Agency Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes ----- | 4 |
| Linkage to Governor’s Priorities ----- | 6 |
| Trends and Conditions Statement ----- | 7 |
| Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Budget Summary ----- | 21 |
| Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards ----- | 22 |
| Exhibit III - Assessment of Performance for Approved Performance Measures ----- | 26 |
| Exhibit IV - Performance Measure Validity and Reliability ----- | 60 |
| Exhibit V – Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures ----- | 94 |
| Exhibit VI – Agency-Level Unit Cost Summary (DEM only) ----- | 97 |
| Appendices: | |
| Appendix A: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms----- | 100 |
| Appendix B: Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) Standards ----- | 102 |
| Appendix C: Hazard Analysis ----- | 104 |



Agency Mission:

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

Agency Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Goal 1: Communities prepared to respond to and resist disaster

Objective 1A:

Improve Florida’s ability to prepare for all hazards

Outcome: Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 3 years | 3 years | 3 years | 3 years | 3 years | 3 years |

Outcome: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |

Outcome: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% |

Objective 1B:

Improve Florida’s ability to respond to and recover from all hazards

Outcome: Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 60 minutes | 60 minutes | 60 minutes | 60 minutes | 60 minutes | 60 minutes |

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

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 5 minutes | 11 minutes |

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

| Baseline Year FY 2010-11 Approved Standard | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |

Division of Emergency Management Linkage to Governor's Priorities

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

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

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

Trends and Conditions Statement

Introduction

The Division of Emergency Management is responsible for administering numerous programs related to emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. Chapter 252, Florida Statutes, and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 44, Parts 300, 355, 370, and 372 address all aspects of emergency management for manmade and natural disasters in Florida. Pursuant to Chapter 2011-142, Laws of Florida, on July 1, 2011, the Division was transferred to the Executive Office of the Governor (EOG) through a type two transfer and shall be a separate budget entity. This move keeps the same reporting structure in place that the Division operates under during an Executive Order and activation status in times of emergency. DEM no longer contracts professional, technological and administrative support services through the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) but is solely responsible for these functions.

Emergency Management in Florida

Many unique factors contribute in making Florida vulnerable to the effects of natural and manmade disasters. Florida is the fourth most populated state in the nation with 18,537,969 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. In a worst case scenario event, a Category 5 hurricane would cause a demand for up to 1,499,223 shelter spaces statewide. Currently, there are approximately 1,165,851 total shelter spaces statewide that meet the American Red Cross shelter guidelines, including both general population and special needs shelter spaces. Therefore, a Category 5 hurricane could cause a deficit of roughly 333,372 shelter spaces.

In addition, Florida is one of the largest users and producers of hazardous materials. There are over 12,000 facilities in Florida that meet the federally established thresholds for hazardous materials. Over 3,700 of these facilities house extremely hazardous substances.

Given the vast number of hazards to which Floridians are susceptible, a disaster may occur with little or no warning and may escalate more rapidly than the ability of any single local response organization or jurisdiction is able to manage. This was the case during the 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons when Florida was impacted by eight hurricanes, which is unprecedented for any state. During the 2004 season, three major hurricanes affected Florida between August 13 and September 26. Only Hurricane Frances weakened to Category 2 strength before landfall, as the state felt the force of four hurricanes in only six weeks. Four hurricanes and three tropical storms affected Florida during the 2005 season, with two of these cyclones rated as major hurricanes at landfall (Dennis in July and Wilma in October). During the 2004 and 2005 seasons, almost 15 million Floridians were in areas deemed vulnerable and were either under mandatory or voluntary evacuation orders at some time with over 400,000 people seeking refuge in either special needs or general population

shelters. The storms of 2004 and 2005 generated 63.5 million cubic yards of debris and over 2.6 million insurance claims were submitted. Additionally, during Hurricane Katrina, Florida spearheaded a massive Emergency Management Assistance Compact response to Mississippi that involved over 7,000 Florida responders at an estimated cost of approximately \$80 million.

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

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

Natural Hazards' Vulnerability

FY 2008-09

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

FY 2009-10

In response to the devastating earthquake that hit Haiti January 12, 2010, the State Emergency Response Team assisted the federal government with repatriation of US citizens, foreign and Haitian nationals with passports or visas and severely injured

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

The greatest trial Florida has faced so far in 2010 is the Deepwater Horizon oil spill; this calamity also affected Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas – and indirectly the rest of the world. The oil spill was an unforeseen and horrific disaster that has changed numerous aspects of life for residents, visitors and workers of the Gulf Coast. In order to respond to such an unimaginable force, proactive actions were continuously being implemented. Nine days after the Deepwater Horizon drilling platform explosion, a state of emergency was declared in the State of Florida, which marked the beginning of a long journey to recovery for the Sunshine State. In response to this order, the Florida State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) activated to Level 2 and began implementing response plans, organizing operational teams, and actively guarding the Gulf shorelines. The SEOC moved to Level 1 June 4 as the oil began closing in on Florida. Initially, the State Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activated on April 30 in response to this event. The final day of activation, August 27, marked day 120 of activation, which is the second longest activation in EOC history, behind the 137 day activation for the 1998 wildfire season.

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

Agency Goals

The Division's primary goal is preparing communities to respond to and resist disaster. In addition, the Division has realigned the organizational structure to operate similarly to the functional areas used during activations.

Program Areas

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

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

Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan

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

The CEMP describes the basic strategies, assumptions, and mechanisms through which the State will mobilize resources and conduct activities to guide and support local emergency management efforts through four activities: preparedness,

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

The CEMP addresses the following activities:

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

Management Priorities

The Division of Emergency Management selected two major priorities based upon its responsibilities for implementing the provisions of Ch. 252, F.S., as well as the goal of preparing communities to respond to and resist disaster. The Division's primary priority is ensuring that the needs of disaster survivors are met. The second priority

is to ensure emergency responders' needs are met by forming partnerships among entities at all levels. By operating and coordinating a number of programs related to emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation, the Division is able to achieve its two primary goals. The Division's recovery efforts related to the hurricanes of 2004 and 2005 will continue over the next two years. Other shorter-term priorities include continuing with the development of partnerships with private industry, building response and recovery capabilities at all levels, training emergency managers, and implementing standards for performance. In order to meet these responsibilities, the Division has developed a mission statement, "Working together to ensure that Florida is prepared to respond to emergencies, recover from them, and mitigate against their impacts." The Division will continue to explore methods of incorporating other programs to strengthen its mission.

Short-Term Priority 1: Partnerships in Emergency Management

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

Short-Term Priority 2: Emergency Management Accreditation Program

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

Program Area Responsibilities

The Division of Emergency Management is responsible for developing and maintaining the state's ability to effectively respond to a wide variety of threats. The Division continually works with State and local governments to develop guides, procedures, and plans to manage the consequences of emergencies or disasters. Florida is susceptible to natural disasters such as tropical storms, hurricanes, tornadoes, wildfires, flooding and drought. In addition, hazardous material releases, transportation catastrophes, pandemics, and both nuclear and domestic security incidents are man-made emergencies that pose a risk to the state.

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

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

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

The Division also administers programs designed to enhance State and local emergency management capabilities. These include the Emergency Management Preparedness and Assistance Trust Fund county base grants; and other Federal, State, or private awards of funding. These funds are allocated in order to enhance state and local emergency management capabilities. The Division also works to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to human life and property from disasters. Assistance for recovery from disasters is provided through Federal infrastructure assistance, human services assistance and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. These programs help to rebuild lives and communities which have been affected by a major disaster and to reduce the impact of future disasters through mitigation.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

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

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

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

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

Threats: The Division's biggest challenge remains the "unknown" event. Even with innovative technology that can predict certain events, such as severe weather, unpredicted events, such as the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, will present a larger challenge to the agency in the future. As the population continues to grow, especially in vulnerable areas, Florida will become more susceptible to catastrophic losses.

Emergency Management Outcomes

The Division of Emergency Management has identified six outcomes for the services it provides.

Mitigation

Outcome 1: Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan

Justification of the Final Projection

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

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

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

Additionally, the Division has provided technical assistance and resources to every county to develop their Local Mitigation Strategy. This activity allows community stakeholders to conduct an in-depth analysis of past and potential disaster losses and develop methods and priorities to reduce or eliminate future losses due to

disaster. The Division also provides technical assistance to counties in identifying repetitive loss structures that can be mitigated with retrofitting; administers federal mitigation grant programs such as the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; provides technical assistance to local governments in planning and completing mitigation projects; and assesses federal and state compliance of projects in communities.

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

Preparedness

Outcome 1: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Justification of the Final Projection

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

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

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

Response

Outcome 1: Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders.

Outcome 2: Average number of minutes to distribute reported incidents by the State Watch Office

Justification of the Final Projection

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

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

Recovery

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

Justification of the Final Projection

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

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

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

Office of Policy and Financial Management

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

Justification of the Final Projection

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

Justification of Revised or Proposed New Programs and/or Services

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

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

Fiscal Restrictions to Federal Grants

The Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Plan was again 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

There are no changes that would require such action.

List of All Task Forces and Studies in Progress

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

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

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

Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget Summary

Emergency Management

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

Overview of Division of Emergency Management for Fiscal Year 2011-12

TOTAL DIVISION BUDGET:

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Total Positions Funded | : | 136 |
| General Appropriations for Divisions Programs | 23.8% | \$66,309,646 |
| Federal and State Funds Provided as a result of Declared Disasters | 76.2% | \$212,516,353 |
| Total Appropriations | 100.00% | \$278,825,999 |

BUDGET CHARACTERISTICS:

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Federal Trust Funds | 86.1% | \$240,168,607 |
| State Trust Funds | 13.9% | \$ 38,657,392 |
| Total | 100.00% | \$278,825,999 |

Note: This Budget Summary is reflective of that which was appropriated through Chapter 2011-69, Laws of Florida, and does not include subsequent budget amendment actions.



EXHIBIT II

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Department of Community Affairs/Executive Office of the Governor Department No.: 520000/310000 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Program: Emergency Management | Code: 1208000000 |
| Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management | Code: 52601000/31700100 |

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

| Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words) | Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2010-11 (Numbers) | Prior Year Actual FY 2010- 11 (Numbers) | Approved Standards for FY 2011-12 (Numbers) | Requested FY 2012-13 Standard (Numbers) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 2 upon notification to key stakeholders | 30 minutes | N/A | 30 minutes | 30 minutes |
| Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders | 60 minutes | N/A | 60 minutes | 60 minutes |
| Deficiency outcome percentage in complying with federal guidelines for nuclear power plant exercises | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes | 2% | 3.68% | 2% | 2% |
| Compliance percentage of each hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements | 90% | 97.35% | 90% | 90% |
| Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan reviewed and revised by February 1st of each even year | 100% | N/A | 100% | 100% |
| Percentage of completed training courses and exercises | 95% | 98% | 95% | 95% |
| Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise | 90% | 100% | 90% | 90% |
| Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces | 25,000 | 38,867 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Percent of interoperable communication systems that are operational/mission capable | 90% | 97.80% | 90% | 90% |
| Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance | 5 minutes | 4.04 minutes | 5 minutes | 5 minutes |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Average number of minutes to distribute reported incidents by the State Watch Office | 5 minutes | 11.3 minutes | 11 minutes | 11 minutes |
| Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan | 3 years | 3 years | 3 years | 3 years |
| Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects under \$50,000 completed within 4 years of project approval date | 95% | 94% | 95% | 95% |
| Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of project approval date | 95% | 100% | 95% | 95% |
| Percentage of local mitigation strategy plans that are updated or in the review update process every 5 years | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Percentage of approved non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award | 80% | 92% | 80% | 80% |
| Percentage of non-disaster mitigation applications submitted to FEMA for repetitive loss structures | 20% | 70% | 20% | 20% |
| Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Program contracts closed within 30 days of expiration | 100% | 14% | 100% | 100% |
| Percentage of completed interviews and visits identified in the FEMA annual agreement | 95% | 100% | 95% | 95% |
| Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date | 95% | 99% | 95% | 95% |
| Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date | 95% | 85% | 95% | 95% |
| Percentage of counties with population less than 75,000 with a part-time emergency management coordinator | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Percentage of counties with population more than 75,000 with a full-time emergency management director | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org | 35,000 | 55,085 | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at www.KidsGetAPlan.com | 50,000 | 13,387 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan | 64% | 32.5% | 64% | 64% |
| Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org | 10,000 | 9,596 | 10,000 | 10,000 |

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



EXHIBIT III

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR APPROVED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 0% | 0% | 0 | 0% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2% | 3.68% | +1.68% | +175% |

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:

Exceeded established measure as the result of extensive staff research and outreach to facilities thought to be required to report.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

This measure is being reviewed for adjustment by program staff. At this time the same measure is being recommended for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Compliance percentage of each hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 90% | 97.35% | +7.35% | 108% |

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:

Exceeded measure as the result of increased quality checks of facility data and the use of technology (HMIS).

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

This measure is being reviewed for adjustment by program staff. At this time the same measure is being recommended for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 95% | 98% | 3% | 3% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: Based on Training and Exercise Plan agency was required to maintain a comprehensive training and Exercise plan – we exceeded measures due to external/internal training staff availability and no impacts from activations that caused cancellation of training or exercise events.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 25,000 | 38,867 | +13,867 | +55 % |

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:

N/A

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The annual standard is only a rough estimate based on past local hurricane shelter space production performance. The actual annual results can be highly variable and dependent on federal, state and local funding/grant availability, and facility-owner preferences, design, permitting/ regulatory and construction timeline, and contractor and product availability.

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percent of interoperable communication systems that are operational/mission capable

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 90% | 97.8% | +7.8% | 0.6% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

ESATCOM Network (analog) was replaced statewide in June 2011 with EMnet (digital) statewide. EMnet is the state's EAS system and now afforded both voice and data streams with selective areas of the state. All systems are tested weekly, monthly or during operational deployments. Some systems such as MSAT have been placed on "Standby" to save recurring costs and are activated during disaster operations. Other systems such as VSAT are on a reduced monthly recurring cost plans and then bandwidth increased when activated for events thus saving funds.

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

Recommendations:

The state has upgraded several systems such as EMnet, EDICS/EDWARDS and FIN all of which has resulted in greater efficiencies and reliability. Additional training was afforded to all counties and State Watch Office personnel. One additional communications technician was added to address issues and service.

NOTE: The statewide ESATCOM analog system was totally replaced by the new EMnet digital system in June 2011. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Average number of minutes to distribute hazardous weather data after alert issuance

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 5 minutes | 4.04 minutes | -0.96 minutes | -18% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Cross training of state watch office staff to send out weather notifications after business hours

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

On some occasions, data and graphics from the National Weather Service, specifically the Storm Prediction Center in Oklahoma, does not appear on their webpage for several minutes after watch issuance. This may cause a longer warning time from the meteorology unit or result in an incomplete warning email.

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

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

Recommendations:

The State Meteorological Support Unit has instituted 2 additional redundant weather notification systems to receive warnings, both of which were at no cost to the State of Florida. In addition, a

Standard Operating Procedure for Severe Weather Warning Dissemination has been compiled and given to all meteorologists to ensure consistent formatting of messages and expectations. Also, regular cross-training of State Watch Office staff to access and send out weather notifications after business hours to mirror the format of the meteorology staff has been instituted. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" 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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 5 minutes | 11.3 | 6.3 | 48.7 |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The approved standard of 5 minutes does not account for the phone call, our limited staff, multiple calls taken at the same time by one operations officer, new employees, and a new web based system.

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

Recommendations:

Currently in the process of hiring 3 operations officers and adding a “training officer” as an additional duty to one of our staff members. Technology is part of our problem and our solution. Due to the new system it has caused us additional time to adjust, train, and to define our processes. We are meeting all of these needs moving ahead with additional staff, training, and time on our new system to cut down on the length of time spent taking a call and sending a notification. Recommend changing the standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 3 years | 3 years | 0 | 0 |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of project approval date

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 95% | 100% | 5% | 5% |

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

Explanation:

Staff provided technical assistance including grant management, environmental and engineering guidance, and field inspections.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Staff will continue to closely monitor quarterly reports for early identification of issues and task field inspections as needed. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of local mitigation strategy plans that are updated or in the review update process every 5 years

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 100% | 100% | 0 | 0 |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of approved non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 80% | 92% | 12 | 15% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Non-disaster and technical staff continues to provide excellent technical assistance and desk monitoring to ensure projects remain on schedule.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Bi-weekly staff meetings help to identify and resolve project issues early on, which in many cases, prevents the need for time extensions. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of non-disaster mitigation applications submitted to FEMA for repetitive loss structures

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 20% | 70% | 50 | 250% |

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:

Due to the large number of repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties in the State, program staff has focused its outreach efforts toward these properties.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Program contracts closed within 30 days of expiration

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% | 14% | (86) | 86% |

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:

Recipients have thirty (30) days after the contract expiration date to provide the closeout information to the Division. Once closeout package is received, Division staff review the information for compliance and approve the final payment for the project. Also, due to financial deadlines associated with the end of fiscal year, there is a timeframe in July in which payments are not processed.

If information required for reimbursement is lacking, the recipient is given additional time to respond. The overall closeout period can take up to 90 days, thus a revision of this measure is needed.

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 some cases, recipients do not respond to information requests in a timely manner or within the required timeframe. These delays hinder project closeout

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

- Training
 Personnel

- Technology
 Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Recommend to modify the measure to align with the close out process. 100% Percentage of RCMP projects closed within 90 days of expiration.

Also, the RCMP timeframe has been improved to allow contracts/subgrantee agreements to be awarded and executed earlier, allowing more time for project completion. This, in turn, should eliminate a vast number of subgrantees working up until the contract expiration date.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of completed interviews and visits identified in the FEMA annual agreement

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 95% | 100% | 5 | 5% |

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

Explanation:

Staff worked diligently and efficiently resulting in increased performance.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 95% | 99% | +4% | +4.6% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

None at this time.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

None at this time.

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

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 |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 95% | 85% | -10% | -11% |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Our limited number of staff balance working on multiple projects and disaster events daily. Currently there are 16 disaster events being worked in the Public Assistance Grant Program. While the closure of the 2004-2005 events is a current priority, other events must be actively worked as well. Staff also spent part of their time completing small project closures and other grant management activities.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input checked="" 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:

Natural disasters continue to occur and affect the state of Florida. In the wake of a major disaster event, our staff is often sent in the field to assist communities and begin the process of managing Public Assistance Grants for these new disasters in an effort to return affected areas to pre-disaster conditions. Work focused on new disaster events often means that work on older disaster events must slow down significantly. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

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

Training

Personnel

Technology

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of counties with population less than 75,000 with a part-time emergency management coordinator

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 100% | 100% | 0 | 0 |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

No difference calculated

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

No difference calculated

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of counties with population more than 75,000 with a full-time emergency management director

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 100% | 100% | 0 | 0 |

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:

No difference calculated

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:

No difference calculated

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 100% | 100% | 0 | 0 |

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

N/A

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

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

Recommendations:

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13..

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 35,000 | 55,085 | (over) 20,085 | 163% |

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: A higher than expected level of response from the Public through the Division's outreach and education efforts.

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: The Division prefers this number to be as high as possible, we will continue outreach activities to continually encourage more families to create a plan. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000
Measure: Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at
 www.KidsGetAPlan.com

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 50,000 | 13,387 | (under) 36,613 | 73% |

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: Consecutive years without a major disaster in the state may be a contributing factor, as the disaster preparedness message resonates most strongly in the run-up to or aftermath of a significant incident.

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

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

Recommendations: Through expanded outreach with school age Floridians and better utilization of social media we continue to promote and emphasize the importance of having a family disaster supply kits. Of note, this number does not represent the total number of families that have a disaster supply kit rather the number of supply kits created through the online game. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 64% | 32.5% | (under) 31.5% | 51% |

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

The increase in the census data for the population combined with multiple consecutive years with no direct hurricane impacts on the state of Florida have combined to diminish the overall percentage of residents that have disaster plans according to this measure.

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

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

Recommendations: Through expanded outreach and better utilizing social media we continue to promote and emphasize the importance of having a family disaster plan. Of note, the 50,000 residents who have developed a plan through our online tool equates to less than 1% of the total population in the state of Florida. However, in the statistically valid survey results the mean average across the state is 65% of residents claim to have a disaster plan. Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Community Affairs-Division of Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action:

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

| Approved Standard | Actual Performance Results | Difference (Over/Under) | Percentage Difference |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 10,000 | 9,596 | (Under) 404 | 4% |

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: Gap in outreach activities due to the change in Administration

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation: The lack of a major disaster in recent years has lead to a diminished urgency amongst the target community to complete tasks such as this.

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

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

Recommendations: DEM has hired a Private Sector Coordinator with the express purpose of engaging and serving as a liaison with the Business Community on issues such as this.

Recommend keeping the same standard for FY 12/13.



EXHIBIT IV

PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 2 upon notification to key stakeholders

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:

Average number of minutes it takes to activate the SEOC would be calculated by the time the Activation mass notification went out minus the time the Emergency Coordinating Officers or assigned representative signed into EM Constellation and posted an information message that they were on duty.

No measure can be provided for FY 10/11 as the SEOC was not activated to a Level 2.

Validity:

The data collected from the SWO mass notification system and EM Constellation is system generated reports that are run to provide the calculations.

Since the SEOC was not activated to a Level 2 during the FY 10/11, the methodology validity cannot be tested.

Reliability:

The Mass phones calls are logged and time stamped as are the information messages which both can be archived and retrieved without being manipulated. The only possible variable could be human error relating to the Emergency Coordinating Officers logging into and posting their roster message on EM Constellation. Since the SEOC was not activated to a Level 2 during FY 10/11, the methodology reliability cannot be tested.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders

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:

Average number of minutes it takes to activate the SEOC would be calculated by the time the Activation mass notification went out minus the time the Emergency Coordinating Officers or assigned representative signed into EM Constellation and posted an information message that they were on duty.

No measure can be provided for FY 10/11 as the SEOC was not activated to a Level 1.

Validity:

The data collected from the SWO mass notification system and EM Constellation is system generated reports that are run to provide the calculations.

Since the SEOC was not activated to a Level 1 during the FY 10/11, the methodology validity cannot be tested.

Reliability:

The Mass phones calls are logged and time stamped as are the information messages which both can be archived and retrieved without being manipulated. The only possible variable will be human error relating to the Emergency Coordinating Officers logging into and posting their roster message on EM Constellation. Since the SEOC was not activated to a Level 1 during FY 10/11, the methodology reliability cannot be tested.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Every calendar year the Division is responsible for participation in a minimum of one, if not two, evaluated nuclear power plant exercises. The percentage of deficiencies is based on number of exercises participated in successfully with no negative findings from the federal evaluators

Validity:

Preparedness for response to radiological incidents can only be measured through graded exercises. These exercises are conducted once or twice per year and are evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), a source external to the Division. A written evaluation of the exercise results is provided upon completion.

Reliability:

Each evaluated exercise is graded by sources external to the Division. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Table II is the standard evaluation tool for Radiological exercises related to Nuclear Power Plants (NPP), and is the tool utilized in Florida for NPP exercises.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes

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:

Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes will be calculated as follows:

$$481 - 40 / (12000) \times 100\% = 3.68\%$$

Data Source: The total number of facilities is compiled and tracked from the Division's Hazardous Materials Information System database

Validity:

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

Reliability:

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Compliance percentage of each hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements

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 compliance percentage of hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements (section 252.85, Florida Statutes, and Rule 9G-14.005) will be calculated as follows:

$$(12,000 - 318)/(12,000) \times 100\% = 97.35\%$$

Please note: NOV = Notice of Violation

Data Source: The total number of facilities will be compiled and tracked from the Division's Hazardous Materials Information System database

Validity:

This measure identifies those facilities not in compliance with current rule or regulation through critical review of current reporting period input, or lack thereof, in the Florida HMIS (Florida Hazardous Materials Information System), for registered facilities. For facilities not yet registered, the compliance outreach measure is used.

Reliability:

The methodology utilized for this measure is 100% reliable and will yield the same results each time. Numbers used for this measure are taken directly from HMIS, a database of all facilities and chemicals required to report under EPCRA (Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act). NOV's are tracked in a spreadsheet containing Facility, date NOV issued, results of contact and comments.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

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

The Natural Hazards Unit has a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan Coordinator who spearheads the maintenance of this plan for the Division. This position is responsible for coordinating the distribution of the elements of the Plan to internal and external stakeholders and is the central collection point for the revised elements of the Plan. In addition, this position is responsible for incorporating the revised smaller plans into the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan and submitting to the Division's senior leadership for review.

Validity:

There is only one state CEMP; however, it is comprised of multiple elements. The methodology

is valid in that it takes into account the revision of each element of the plan.

Reliability:

By taking into account the CEMP as a whole and not considering its elements, the performance measure would likely always be 100 percent because, theoretically, any change to any portion of the plan, major or minor, would constitute a revision. By considering each element of the CEMP and whether or not it was revised, the data can be entered in the methodology formula and yield a more reliable ascertainment of the percentage of the CEMP that was revised. This formula yields the most accurate results, and the only modifications that would be required would be if an element was either added to or removed from the CEMP, thereby increasing or decreasing the number of plans which comprise the CEMP.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

The Training and Exercise Evaluation Plan will be utilized to ensure we accomplish the projected training scheduled statewide. Registration forms will be utilized to calculate the number of trainings conducted. Exercises will be calculated based on the information contained in the National Exercise Scheduler.

Validity:

Based on the Training and Exercise Plan projections, 111 mobile deliveries, 164 FEMA G courses, 58 FEMA L courses and 81 Florida Specific courses and four (4) major exercises were conducted. This yielded the following calculation:

414 trainings conducted/ 431 trainings listed in Training and Exercise Evaluation Plan = 96%
4 exercises conducted/4 exercises listed in the Training and Exercise Evaluation Plan = 100%
(96% +100%)/2=98%

Reliability:

Data would be consistent and would yield same results on repeated trails due to it being generated from the registration forms on the Training and Events Calendar and exercise upload to the National Exercise Scheduler. Training and Exercise plan was used as the guiding factor because in order to receive federal funds the State must complete this document on an annual basis.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Chapter 252.35(2)(a)(8), Florida Statutes, requires annual exercises be conducted to determine the ability of state and local governments to respond to emergencies and disasters. Utilizing the Training and Exercise Plan will establish guidelines and schedules for annual and periodic exercises that evaluate the ability of the state and its political subdivisions to respond to emergencies, minor, major, and catastrophic disasters and support local emergency management agencies.

The Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan will be utilized to measure against the agencies listed in this document versus those that actually participate in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise per sign in sheets.

Validity:

27 agencies participated/27 listed in the CEMP = 100% participation.

State agencies participate to maintain their readiness level and also as a tool to train new personnel and a refresher for existing staff.

Reliability:

Sign-in sheets are used to collect the data which have been consistently used during past statewide hurricane exercises that provide the same data which was used to calculate the above result.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces

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 standard for the measure is calculated by subtracting the total existing hurricane shelter capacity of the current year Shelter Retrofit Report minus the previous year Shelter Retrofit Report shelter capacity.

2011 Shelter Retrofit Report Hurricane Shelter Capacity, spaces = 1,165,851

2010 Shelter Retrofit Report Hurricane Shelter Capacity, spaces = 1,126,984

Increase of the number of hurricane shelter spaces 2011, spaces = 38,867

Validity:

The shelter space numbers are updated annually by local emergency management agencies and the submitted results quality checked by Division staff. The quality check is performed by comparison of the submitted local spreadsheets to the initial product distributed by the Division, review of hurricane shelter survey reports prepared by Division staff or consultants, and comparison to the Dept. of Education's Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) data. The annual Shelter Retrofit Reports contain the most up-to-date annual hurricane shelter capacity numbers available to the Division, thus the most consistent data sources and method of calculating annual shelter space capacity increases.

Reliability:

Each year the Division supplies county emergency management with the baseline spreadsheets of recognized hurricane shelter buildings and their respective capacities to local emergency managers. This ensures that each year's shelter capacity starting point is consistent with the previous year's results. The annual shelter space updates from the counties can vary from year-to-year dependent on changes in local shelter preferences and the knowledge, skills and abilities of the most recent local mass care surveyors. To maintain consistency from year-to-year the Division's hurricane shelter capacity numbers for each building are tracked separately from local planned usage numbers. The Division's hurricane shelter space capacities for individual buildings are only revised when a compelling reason is given, such as reported change is

structural condition or hurricane hazard exposure, closure/decommissioning of the building, and remodeling or change in building or room use that is inconsistent with shelter management and operation needs.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percent of interoperable communication systems that are operational/mission capable

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The standard for this measure is calculated by computing the time the equipment is listed as operational on the Logistics tracking sheet over the operational period.

Validity:

All Division of Emergency Management Interoperable Communications, data and emergency alert and notification communications systems are 97.8% mission capable and operational.

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

Reliability:

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

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 standard for this measure is calculated by computing the time between the time stamp of the notification message vs. the time stamp on dissemination message. Random sample of messages will be computed each quarter.

July 2010-September 2010 average dissemination time was 4.89 minutes; October 2010-December 2010 average dissemination time was 4.47 minutes; January 2011-March 2011 average dissemination time was 3.53 minutes; April 2011-June 2011 average dissemination time was 3.28 minutes.

$(4.89 \text{ minutes} + 4.47 \text{ minutes} + 3.53 \text{ minutes} + 3.28 \text{ minutes}) / 4 \text{ quarters} = 4.04 \text{ minutes average}$

Validity:

Due to staff limitations, the State Meteorological Support Unit only disseminates hazardous weather information during working hours. If a meteorologist is not in the office, the State Warning Point will issue the message to appropriate personnel and local agencies. A contact database is shared between the Meteorology Unit and the State Watch Office to ensure all appropriate parties are notified, regardless of the source, whether the meteorology unit or State Warning Point.

Reliability:

The State Meteorological Support Unit has several redundant methods of receiving hazardous weather watches, warnings and advisories from the National Weather Service and other appropriate NOAA entities.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The standard for this measure will be calculated by computing the time stamp of the incident notification message with the time stamp of the incident distribution message. Random sample of messages will be computed each quarter.

Validity:

Taking into account that 223 randomly selected calls over the past year have given us an average of an 11.31 minute turn around that by the original standard should be 5 minutes is not a valid standard because it does not compensate for the actual phone call and therefore is not an accurate account of how long it takes to send out the information. At this time there is no process in place to capture the time the operator gets off the phone with the caller and the time the notification is sent. Therefore the time allotted to send out a notification should also include a reasonable call of 6 minutes giving us a new grand total of 11 minutes to get out our notifications.

Reliability:

The reliability of the method of calculating calls is not an accurate picture because it does not consider the duration of the call. For example if a call comes in and it takes 6 minutes to collect all the needed information to make our report then an additional 2-4 minutes to refine and edit the report and send out the notification then we have clearly not met the 5 minute target. So the need to adjust the method to include the time of the call is necessary to make a realistic and achievable goal.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Per FEMA requirements, the State Hazard Mitigation Plan (SHMP) must be updated every 3 years. Therefore, the methodology utilized for this performance standard is a record of whether or not the State implemented the update within the required timeframe and that the SHMP was approved by FEMA.

Data source: Bureau of Mitigation Planning Unit staff records and correspondence.

Validity:

The State Hazard Mitigation Plan approval correspondence from FEMA indicates that the plan has been reviewed and approved by FEMA and indicates the date this approval took place.

Reliability:

The update and approval process for the SHMP is outlined in Federal regulation and guidance which must be followed to achieve approved status. Therefore, the approval letter is a reliable measuring tool for meeting the performance measure as stated above.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects under \$50,000 completed within 4 years of project approval 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 Bureau of Mitigation will conduct assessment of projects awarded during FY 06/07 and provide percentage of mitigation projects under \$50,000 completed within 4 years of grant award. This assessed the amount of projects that should have been completed this fiscal year and reports a percentage demonstrating performance.

This information will be generated by the Bureau of Mitigation Program's database system (Mit.org). The database system maintains the approved final inspection completion dates for all mitigation projects.

50 Total Projects

47 Completed within 4 years

3 Over Time Limit

$(47/50) \times 100 = 94\%$

Validity:

The information contained in mitigation.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the Bureau. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting to FEMA and tracking project specific information.

Reliability:

Mitigation.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the Bureau. The database has reporting capabilities which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of project approval 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 Bureau of Mitigation will conduct assessment of projects awarded during FY 03/04 and provide percentage of mitigation projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of grant award. This assessed the amount of projects that should have been completed this fiscal year and reports a percentage demonstrating performance.

This information will be generated by the Bureau of Mitigation Program's database system (Mit.org). The database system maintains the approved final inspection completion dates for all mitigation projects.

9 Total Projects

9 Completed within 7 years

0 Over time limit

100%

Validity:

The information contained in mitigation.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the Bureau. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting to FEMA and tracking project specific information.

Reliability:

Mitigation.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the Bureau. The database has reporting capabilities which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of local mitigation strategy plans that are updated or in the review update process every 5 years

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 FEMA requirements, Local Mitigation Strategies must be updated every 5 years. Therefore, the methodology utilized for this performance standard is a record of whether or not the Local Mitigation Strategies entered into their update and review process within the 5-year timeframe. The Bureau of Mitigation maintains tracking documents of all Strategies (67) and their point of entry into the update process. Using these tracking documents a percentage is calculated to assess the performance measure above.

Data source: Bureau of Mitigation Planning Unit staff records.

Validity:

The tracking document is a valid as it is an accurate record of plans submitted to the state for approval as well as the date those plans was approved by FEMA.

Reliability:

Mitigation planning staff keeps a tracking report of each county's progress throughout the update period. Additionally, FEMA supplies a spreadsheet on the status of each LMS plan from approval through local adoption which ensures reliability of the tracking document.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of approved non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award

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 Bureau of Mitigation will conduct an assessment of the projects completed during FY 10/11 and provide a percentage of non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award.

This information will be generated by the Bureau of Mitigation Program's database system (Mit.org). The database system maintains the approved final inspection completion dates for all mitigation projects.

50 Projects Completed

54 Project Total

$(50/54) \times 100 = 92\%$

Validity:

The information contained in mitigation.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the Bureau. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting to FEMA and tracking project specific information.

Reliability:

Mitigation.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the Bureau. The database has reporting capabilities which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of non-disaster mitigation applications submitted to FEMA for repetitive loss structures

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: E-Grants (electronic grants application system)

E-Grants have a repetitive loss property indicator that must be completed during the development of each application. Project managers review each application, ensuring the indicator is checked yes for properties that have two or more claims documented in the damage history.

Methodology: Once each non-disaster application is reviewed and submitted to FEMA, the property section of the application will be reviewed to determine whether the property is a repetitive loss structure (i.e. repetitive loss indicator equals “yes”). The total number of applications with repetitive loss structures will be compared to the overall number of applications submitted to FEMA for review.

26 Applications contained Repetitive Loss Structures

37 Total Applications

$(26/37) \times 100 = 70\%$

Validity:

As mentioned in the methodology section above, the repetitive loss indicator was reviewed and compared to the overall number of applications submitted to determine the percentage reported.

Reliability:

Repetitive loss data is entered into the E-Grants system by applicants and is reviewed by program staff prior and submitted to FEMA. This ensures accurate data in the E-Grants system.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Program contracts closed within 30 days of expiration

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 Bureau of Mitigation will conduct an assessment of the projects completed during FY 11/12 and provide a percentage of RCMP projects closed within 30 days of expiration. This information will be generated by the Bureau of Mitigation Program's database system (Mit.org). The database system maintains the completion and closed dates of all mitigation projects.

3 Projects closed within 30 days

21 Total projects

$(3/21) \times 100 = 14\%$

Recommend to modify the measure to align with the closeout process.

100% Percentage of RCMP projects closed within 90 days of expiration

Validity:

The information contained in mitigation.org is valid as it is entered by project managers and is reviewed by other units within the Bureau. Mitigation.org is used for processing payments, quarterly reporting to FEMA and tracking project specific information.

Reliability:

Mitigation.org has various fields that capture project specific information for all projects. These fields are consistent and are required for all projects managed by the Bureau. The database has reporting capabilities which identify gaps and missing information to ensure that necessary data is captured.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of completed interviews and visits identified in the FEMA annual agreement

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Under the Community Assistance Program (CAP), each 12-month period is accounted for in a Scope of Work; this Scope lists the exact number of Visits and Interviews that must be completed within the 12-month period. At the end of the 12-month period, at least 95% of these activities must be completed.

Data source: State CAP-SSSE quarterly reports/ State Floodplain Management Office records.

- 30 of 30 Community Assistance Visits were conducted by 6-30-2011.
- 48 of 48 Community Assistance Contact interviews were conducted by 6-30-11.

Validity:

Scope of work outlined for the federal fiscal year of 2010 was completed (100%) by March 31, 2011. Work on the subsequent federal fiscal year scope began on April 1, 2011. Therefore, 100% of the scope was completed before June 30, 2011. This was determined through analysis of CAP-SSSE quarterly reports and State Floodplain Management Office records which accurately reflect activity for the program. With regard to actual numbers:

Reliability:

Scope of work for the CAP-SSSE grant, federal fiscal year of 2010; Quarterly reports sent to FEMA through 3-31-2011.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of 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 www.floridapa.org database is the data source which automatically populates from FEMA's NEMIS and EMMIE systems.

1. A Small Project worksheet will be defined as "completed" once obligated funds for that project worksheet have been completely reimbursed from the applicant's SMARTLINK account. This is consistent with the FEMA-State Administrative Plan that minimizes reporting requirements for small projects.
2. Small Project completions are trackable through www.floridapa.org as they occur.
3. At the close of each Fiscal Year, the State Public Assistance Officer (SPA0) or designee, will compose a report that compiles the Small Project worksheets completed for each disaster as a percent (%) of the total number of Small Project worksheets that had been obligated for that disaster.
4. The designated Bureau planner/analyst will be responsible for monitoring this report and notifying Bureau management in regards to the following interim monitoring thresholds:
 - a. At 2 years post-disaster, 45% of the Small Project worksheets should be completed.
 - b. At 3 years post-disaster, 70% of the Small Project worksheets should be completed.
 - c. At 4 years post-disaster, 95% of the Small Project worksheets should be completed.

Validity:

In the FloridaPA.org system, a status report is generated to provide a listing of all projects. By generating this "Project List" report, we can determine which projects are open or complete and which projects are small versus large. The report is filtered to list only small projects, and then sorted by disaster event. The report is then analyzed to obtain a percentage of all completed small projects by disaster.

Upon obtaining the percentage of small projects completed, that number is compared to the interim monitoring thresholds, listed above, which correspond to the number of years past the

disaster declaration date. Per each disaster event, completed small projects are assigned a percentage in comparison with the LRPP threshold.

A final analysis is performed in order to find the weighted mean of the overall percent of projects complete relative to the LRPP “Approved Standard”. A weighted mean is similar to an arithmetic mean, where instead of each of the data points contributing equally to the final average, some data points contribute more than others. This methodology is used in order to account for the wide range of total small projects in each disaster. Some disasters have nearly 8,000 total small projects, and others have less than 10 total. When using an arithmetic average, this varying number of projects per disaster is overlooked. However, by assigning a weight to each disaster based on their total number of large projects, those disasters with very few projects no longer skew the overall performance results of percent completed of the LRPP “Approved Standard”.

Reliability:

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

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of 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 www.floridapa.org database is the data source which automatically populates from FEMA's NEMIS and EMMIE systems.

1. A Large Project worksheet will be defined as "completed" once it has been closed-out by FEMA and the State of Florida in accordance with the FEMA-State Administrative Plan.
2. Large Project completions are trackable through www.floridapa.org as they occur.
3. At the close of each FY, the State Public Assistance Officer (SPA0) or designee, will compose a report that compiles the Large Project worksheet closeouts for each disaster as a percent (%) of the total number of large project worksheets that had been obligated for that disaster.
4. The designated Bureau planner/analyst will be responsible for monitoring this report and notifying Bureau management in regards to the following interim monitoring thresholds:
 - a. At 3 years post-disaster, 25% of the Large Project worksheets should be completed.
 - b. At 4 years post-disaster, 35% of the Large Project worksheets should be completed.
 - c. At 5 years post-disaster, 50% of the Large Project worksheets should be completed.
 - d. At 6 years post-disaster, 70% of the Large Project worksheets should be completed.
 - e. At 7 years post-disaster, 95% of the Large Project worksheets should be completed.

Validity:

In the FloridaPA.org system, a status report is generated to provide a listing of all projects. By generating this "Project List" report, we can determine which projects are open or complete and which projects are large versus small. The report is filtered to list only large projects, and then sorted by disaster event. The report is then analyzed to obtain a percentage of all completed large projects by disaster.

Upon obtaining the percentage of large projects completed, that number is compared to the interim monitoring thresholds, listed above, which correspond to the number of years past the

disaster declaration date. All disasters that are less than 3 years past those established dates are removed from all evaluation, as they are not assigned an interim monitoring standard. Per each disaster event, completed large projects are assigned a percentage in comparison with the LRPP threshold.

A final analysis is performed in order to find the weighted mean of the overall percent of projects complete relative to the LRPP “Approved Standard”. A weighted mean is similar to an arithmetic mean, where instead of each of the data points contributing equally to the final average, some data points contribute more than others. This methodology is used in order to account for the wide range of total large projects in each disaster. Some disasters have nearly 2,000 total large projects, and others have less than 10 total. When using an arithmetic average, this varying number of projects per disaster is overlooked. However, by assigning a weight to each disaster based on their total number of large projects, those disasters with very few projects no longer skew the overall performance results of percent completed of the LRPP “Approved Standard”.

Reliability:

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

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of counties with population less than 75,000 with a part-time emergency management coordinator

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source/methodology utilized for determining whether counties are required to have a part-time coordinator or a full-time director is the population from the census data provided by the University of Florida.

The requirement is verified by the position descriptions, staffing detail and the quarterly reimbursement requests which are submitted as deliverables to each county's base grant agreement.

31 counties have a population of less than 75,000

31 part-time emergency management coordinators / 31 counties = 100%

Validity:

Based on using the official census data to determine population, the Division verifies this measure through the Staffing Detail Report submitted (on an annual basis) as a condition of the EMPA Base Grant agreement for the 31 counties with a population less than 75,000. This methodology was used to meet the statutory requirement of Ch. 252, F.S.

Reliability:

Due to being a statutory requirement and a condition of the EMPA Base Grant agreement, the counties commit to at least staffing Emergency Management with a part-time coordinator.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of counties with population more than 75,000 with a full-time emergency management director

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

The data source/methodology utilized for determining whether counties are required to have a part-time coordinator or a full-time director is the population from the census data provided by the University of Florida.

The requirement is verified by the position descriptions, staffing detail and the quarterly reimbursement requests which are submitted as deliverables to each county's base grant agreement.

36 counties have a population of more than 75,000
36 full-time emergency management directors / 36 counties = 100%

Validity:

Based on using the official census data to determine population, the Division verifies this measure through the Staffing Detail Report submitted (on an annual basis) as a condition of the EMPA Base Grant agreement for the 36 counties with a population more than 75,000. This methodology was used to meet the statutory requirement of Ch. 252, F.S.

Reliability:

Due to being a statutory requirement and a condition of the EMPA Base Grant agreement, the counties commit to staffing Emergency Management with a full-time director.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

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

Calculation methodology would be the number of projects within a specific grant award which are closed within a five year period divided by the number of overall projects.

Validity:

A cross reference of encumbrance reports at the end of the 5 year period to ensure all grants have been fully expended or de-obligated in comparison with federal report SF425.

Reliability:

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: A database that is maintained as a part of the Get A Plan! module at www.FloridaDisaster.org. This database logs and maintains the date a family disaster plan is created at www.FloridaDisaster.org on a daily basis.

Methodology: Query database for total number of family disaster plans created between 7/1 and 6/30 of each state fiscal year. Review and subtract any duplicate entries to ensure accurate reporting numbers in the LRPP.

Validity:

This is a valid measurement tool as it tracks the actual number of visitors to the site which is a dedicated webpage for the sole purpose of creating a disaster supply kit online.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for a 1:1 ratio for tracking and is based on an actual count.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at www.KidsGetAPlan.com

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: A web database matrix is maintained as a part of the Kids Get A Plan website by Google. This web database matrix tracks the visits to the supply kit page at www.KidsGetAPlan.com which would indicate the number of people who played the game thereby creating a disaster supply kit. The web database matrix can sort based on dates and give a number of uses of the disaster supply kit game for that time period.

Methodology: Query database for total number of family disaster supply kits created between 7/1 and 6/30 of each state fiscal year.

Validity:

This is a valid measurement tool as it tracks the actual number of visitors to the site which is a dedicated webpage for the sole purpose of creating a disaster supply kit online.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for a 1:1 ratio for tracking and is based on an actual count.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: 1) A database that is maintained as a part of the Get A Plan! module at www.FloridaDisaster.org. This database logs and maintains the date a family disaster plan is created at www.FloridaDisaster.org on a daily basis. 2) Annual survey commissioned by the Florida Division of Emergency Management which involves a statistically valid sample of Floridians who indicate whether they have a family disaster plan or not.

Methodology: 1) Query database for total number of family disaster plans created since the inception of the database in 2005. Remove duplicate entries. Divide the total number of people with family disaster plans by the current US Census Population figure for the State of Florida. This would give a percentage of residents with a family disaster plan. (Weight 50%) 2) Take the percentage of residents in the annual survey that indicate they have a family disaster plan. (Weight 50%) Add the percentages from 1 & 2 together and divide by 2 to come up with the average percentage based on these two measurement tools.

Validity:

This is a valid sample as it gives equal weight to both the actual count as well as the statistically valid sample results.

Reliability:

By using a statistically valid sample this information should be viewed as a reliable indicator.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2011

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Community Affairs - Emergency Management

Program: Emergency Management

Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/52601000

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

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Source: A database that is maintained as a part of the Get A Plan! module at www.FloridaDisaster.org. This database logs and maintains the date a business disaster plan is created at www.FloridaDisaster.org on a daily basis.

Methodology: Query database for total number of business disaster plans created between 7/1 and 6/30 of each state fiscal year. Review and subtract any duplicate entries to ensure accurate reporting numbers in the LRPP.

Validity:

This is a valid measurement tool as it tracks the actual number of visitors to the site which is a dedicated webpage for the sole purpose of creating a disaster supply kit online.

Reliability:

This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for a 1:1 ratio for tracking and is based on an actual count.



EXHIBIT V

IDENTIFICATION OF ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

| Measure Number | Approved Performance Measures for FY 2010-11 (Words) | Associated Activities Title |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 2 upon notification to key stakeholders | <p><i>Effective July 1, 2011, Chapter 2011-142, Laws of Florida, the Division of Emergency Management was transferred to the Executive Office of the Governor.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of the new organization, the Division intends to work with the Executive Office of the Governor and the Legislature to identify and reach consensus on changes in performance measures and appropriate activities and to ensure outputs are aligned with activities, pursuant to section 216.1826, Florida Statutes.</i></p> <p><i>Prior output measures and activities were used to complete the Agency Unit Cost Summary spreadsheet.</i></p> |
| 2 | Average number of minutes to activate the State Emergency Operations Center to a Level 1 upon notification to key stakeholders | |
| 3 | Deficiency outcome percentage in complying with federal guidelines for nuclear power plant exercises | |
| 4 | Percent increase of the number of reporting facilities compliant with Section 252, Part II, Florida Statutes | |
| 5 | Compliance percentage of each hazardous materials facilities with rule requirements | |
| 6 | Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan reviewed and revised by February 1st of each even year | |
| 7 | Percentage of completed training courses and exercises | |
| 8 | Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise | |
| 9 | Annual increase of the number of shelter spaces | |
| 10 | Percent of interoperable communication systems that are operational/mission capable | |
| 11 | Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance | |
| 12 | Average number of minutes to distribute reported incidents by the State Watch Office | |
| 13 | Average number of years to update/submit the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan | |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| 15 | Percentage of Hazard Mitigation Projects over \$50,000 completed within 7 years of project approval date | | |
| 16 | Percentage of local mitigation strategy plans that are updated or in the review update process every 5 years | | |
| 17 | Percentage of approved non-disaster mitigation projects completed within 4 years of grant award | | |
| 18 | Percentage of non-disaster mitigation applications submitted to FEMA for repetitive loss structures | | |
| 19 | Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Program contracts closed within 30 days of expiration | | |
| 20 | Percentage of completed interviews and visits identified in the FEMA annual agreement | | |
| 21 | Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date | | |
| 22 | Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date | | |
| 23 | Percentage of counties with population less than 75,000 with a part-time emergency management coordinator | | |
| 24 | Percentage of counties with population more than 75,000 with a full-time emergency management director | | |
| 25 | Percentage of domestic preparedness grant project lines closed out within 5 years of grant award | | |
| 26 | Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org | | |
| 27 | Annual number of family disaster supply kits created at www.KidsGetAPlan.com | | |
| 28 | Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan | | |
| 29 | Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org | | |



EXHIBIT VI

AGENCY LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY (DEM ONLY)



APPENDICES

Appendix A

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

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

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

Department of Community Affairs (DCA) -- The Department is a state agency that is statutorily responsible for land planning, land acquisition, and administration of multiple grants for local governments. The Department of Community Affairs serves Florida's communities by focusing primarily on four program areas: Florida Communities Trust, Housing and Community Development, and Community Planning.

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

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

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

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

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

National Flood Insurance Program -- This is a pre-disaster flood mitigation and insurance protection program designed to reduce the cost of disasters. This

voluntary program makes federally backed flood insurance available to residents and businesses that agree to adopt sound flood mitigation measures that guide area floodplain development.

Participating -- applying for grants or seeking technical assistance

Shelter deficit -- the number of hurricane shelters by region that are needed to shelter vulnerable populations minus the number of available public shelters

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

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

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

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

Appendix B

Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

structure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix C

Hazard Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

associated with this category include hazardous materials spill, release of a radioactive isotope into the environment, mass communication failure, major power disruption, and critical infrastructure disruption/failure.

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

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