STATE OF FLORIDA

Office of the Governor

THE CAPITOL
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0001

www.flgov.com
850-488-7146
850-487-0801 fax

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Executive Office of the Governor
Tallahassee, Florida
September 30, 2013

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

Mike Hansen, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Executive Office of the Governor is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for the Fiscal Year 2014-15 through Fiscal Year 2018-19. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is www.flgov.com. This submission has been approved by Governor Rick Scott.

Pursuant to Section 14.2016, Florida Statutes, the Division of Emergency Management (Division) within the Executive Office of the Governor shall be responsible for all professional, technical, and administrative support functions to carry out its responsibilities under part I of Chapter 252. The Division has a unique mission, as well as distinct goals, objectives, and performance metrics. To that end we have instructed the Division to develop a performance based budget plan as documented by a Long Range Program Plan specifically for the Division of Emergency Management. The Division's LRPP is attached herein, and has been approved by Bryan Koon, Executive Director. The Division of Emergency Management budget data has been included in the Executive Office of Governor for all agency level exhibits and schedules as prescribed in the budget instructions.

Sincerely,

Kelley P. Sasso
Director of Finance and Accounting

Executive Office of the Governor

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Fiscal Years
2014 - 2015 through 2018 - 2019

MISSION STATEMENT:

Listen, Lead, Communicate

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

GOALS:

- Improve the health, safety, welfare, and education of Florida's citizens.

- Lower the cost of living for Florida families and put Florida families back to work.

OBJECTIVES:

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

- Provide management information services to the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget, and the Legislature. Assist in development of the agencies' Legislative budget requests, Governor's Budget Recommendations, and Legislative Appropriations.

SERVICE OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE PROJECTION TABLES

GOALS: **Improve the health, safety, welfare and education of Florida's citizens**

Lower the cost of living for Florida families and put Florida Families back to work

GENERAL OFFICE [Program]

Executive Direction/Support Services [Service]

Objective: **Help formulate and implement the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.**

Outcome: Percentage of Governor's goals achieved

Baseline 2010-2011	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Executive Planning and Budgeting [Service]

Objective: **Help formulate and implement the Governor's goals and policies through legislation, the budget process, and supervision of executive agencies.**

Outcome: Percentage of Governor's goals achieved

Baseline 2010-2011	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

LAS/PBS [Service]

Objective: **Provide management information services to the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget, and the Legislature. Assist in development of the agencies' legislative budget requests, Governor's Budget Recommendations and Legislative Appropriations.**

Outcome: LAS/PBS system costs : number of users

Baseline 1999-2000	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
$5,316,331: 1,365	$4,789,294: 3705	$4,789,294: 3705	$4,789,294: 3705	$4,789,294: 3705	$4,789,294: 3705

LINKAGE TO THE GOVERNOR'S PRIORITIES

The Executive Office of the Governor's goals, objectives, and performance measures are all associated with the Scott administration priorities as listed below:

1. **Improving Education**
   - World Class Education

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

3. **Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida**
   - Accountability Budgeting
   - Reduce Government Spending
   - Reduce Taxes
   - Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

The following outlines each of the Executive Office of the Governor's goals and the associated priorities:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

GOAL: To improve the health, safety, welfare, and education of Florida's citizens

PRIORITIES:

Improving Education
- World Class Education

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

Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida
- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Reduce Taxes
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

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

PRIORITIES:

Improving Education
- World Class Education

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

Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida
- Accountability Budgeting
- Reduce Government Spending
- Reduce Taxes
- Phase out Florida's Corporate Income Tax

Trends and Conditions Statement
FY 2014-15 through FY 2018-19

The Governor is the state's chief elected official. His duties and responsibilities are enumerated in the Florida Constitution and in the Florida Statutes. Supreme executive power is invested in the Governor, as are the duties of commander-in-chief of all military forces of the state not active in the service of the United States. The Governor is also chief administrative officer responsible for the planning and budgeting for the state. The Executive Office of the Governor assists the Governor in fulfilling his constitutional and statutory duties and responsibilities through planning, policy development, and budgeting; directing and overseeing state agencies; facilitating citizen involvement in government; and communicating with citizens at all levels.

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

In 2010, Governor Scott campaigned on an agenda to create 700,000 jobs in seven years. During his first year in office, he made the hard decisions to right-size government, reduce spending, and pay down the state's debt. These conservative, pro-growth policies are creating a business climate where Florida's private sector is able to create jobs. To reach that goal, the Scott Administration is focused on three things: making sure every Floridian who wants a job is able to get one, ensuring Florida's children have access to a quality education that will prepare them for success in college or a career, and keeping the cost of living low for Florida families.

During his first year in office, Governor Scott made the decisions needed to get Florida's economy back on track. During his first year in office, Governor Scott worked with the Florida Legislature to close a $3.6-billion General Revenue budget gap and create a $1.5 billion General Revenue reserve. Looking at the overall Florida budget, state spending was reduced by more than $2 billion, including Governor Scott's veto of $615 million from the state budget. In fact, Florida was the *only* state in the nation to balance the budget while also cutting taxes and avoiding new debt.

Florida's conservative, pro-growth solutions are working, resulting in an incredible economic turnaround for the Sunshine State: From December 2010 to August 2013, Florida's unemployment rate dropped 4.1 percentage points – while the national unemployment rate has dropped 2.0 percentage points, demonstrating Florida's improving economic climate continues to outpace the national recovery. In just two-and-a-half years, Florida is more than half-way to Governor Scott's goal of creating 700,000 jobs in seven years. According to a 2013 Moody Investors report, Florida's 2013 employment growth is expected to surpass the national rate through 2017.

In 2013, Florida's economy is turning around. Florida saw the first budget surplus in six years, providing the opportunity for historic investments in education as Governor Scott signed *Florida's Families First* budget in 2013. Florida's General Revenue forecast for 2014-2015 will be the highest ever.

Governor Scott has paid down $3.5 billion in state debt while streamlining services and targeting reforms to help businesses compete. These strategies have caught the attention of national business leaders, and Florida's turnaround story is traveling the globe. Florida's pro-business climate has been ranked No. 1 for Renewed Consideration Post-Recession by the business-development experts of *Area Development* magazine. In addition, CEOs throughout the nation recognized Florida as the No. 2 state to do business – behind only Texas – in *Chief Executive* magazine's ranking of the top states for business. Although the Sunshine State has risen from its No. 6 ranking in 2010, Governor Scott is committed to making Florida the No. 1 state for job creation and business development.

The success of Governor Scott's common sense, pro-growth formula is evident in the following results:

Lower Taxes. To keep costs low for Florida families and businesses, the Scott Administration has cut taxes five times in three years. In 2011, reduced state spending allowed a $210-million savings in property tax cuts for Florida homeowners and businesses. Florida's businesses are paying less corporate income tax after the tax exemption for job creators was increased, first from $5,000 to $25,000 in 2011, and then to $50,000 in 2012. By 2013, more than 70 percent of Florida businesses no longer pay the corporate income tax. After Governor Scott's call to do so, the sales tax on manufacturing equipment was eliminated to help jump-start manufacturing investment in the Sunshine State. Reducing the tax burden on Florida families and businesses led to Florida's first budget surplus in 2013, allowing record investments in education, transportation, and Florida's environment.

Streamlined Government. The Scott Administration has returned state government to its core mission by consolidating agencies with similar missions into the Department of Economic Opportunity. In addition, roughly 2,600 costly and outdated regulations have been repealed in order to eliminate red tape that slows economic growth. To reduce fraud and help families, Governor Scott reformed Florida's unemployment assistance program to require people receiving unemployment benefits to show they are actively seeking a job every week. State agencies are also checking the legal status of all new state employees.

Historic Investments in Transportation. Florida's infrastructure is ranked the best in the nation by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation. Fully-funding the Department of Transportation's Work Program creates job opportunities and strengthens Florida's economy, while also reducing traffic and enhancing the quality of life for both residents and visitors. Maintaining and improving Florida's roads and bridges, as well as enhancing trade and logistics infrastructure such as Florida's seaports and railroads, will position Florida businesses to reap the benefits from the expansion of the Panama Canal in 2015 and position Florida to be the gateway to Latin America and beyond. The Scott Administration is focused on introducing Florida's

business and community leaders to prospective international clients and markets that can lead to global business and export opportunities, as well as attracting job-creating foreign direct investment into the Sunshine State. Together, these strategies are leading to more jobs for Florida families.

Historic Investments in Florida's Environment. Florida's springs and estuaries are important to animal and plant life, while also supporting Florida's booming tourism industry and water quality for Florida families. State investments, along with funds from local partners, provided nearly $37 million for projects to improve the water quality and water quantity in springs. To help restore water quality throughout South Florida, the Scott Administration is investing $130 million to restore estuaries in South Florida: $90 million will help replace a 2.6 mile segment of Tamiami Trail with a bridge that will allow water to flow into the Everglades, and $40 million will help complete the C-44 Storm Water Treatment Area project in half the time in order to clean water diverted from Lake Okeechobee and storm water runoff year-round, keeping more high nutrient water from entering the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie estuaries.

A Good Education for Every Child. The Scott Administration is making historic investments to build a world-class education system so that Florida's children are able to pursue the college and career of their dreams. Florida's economic growth has allowed record investments in education, and the Scott Administration has increased K-12 education funding by more than $2 billion in two years, including the $480 million Governor Scott championed for teacher salary increases.

Florida has experienced incredible gains in performance, including being ranked sixth nationally for overall quality of education by *Education Week's* 2013 *Quality Counts* report. Florida fourth-graders rank second internationally for reading scores, and Florida teachers earned the highest overall grade in the nation for teacher quality, according to the National Council on Teacher Quality.

To help ensure our students' success in college, Governor Scott is working to make one of Florida's state universities one of the nation's top 10 public universities. As progress toward that goal, the 2013 *U.S. News and World Report* rankings named the University of Florida 14th among the nation's public universities, a jump of three spots from the previous year's rankings. In addition, North Florida Community College was named the No. 2 community college in the nation by *Washington Monthly.*

To help lower college costs for Florida families, the Scott Administration has made a major change in how higher education in Florida is funded by changing it from a system that relied on students and families to cover rising costs, to one that awards funding based on how universities serve students as they earn degrees and secure well-paying jobs in our state. Higher tuition or fees mean a heavier debt burden on students and their families following graduation.

In addition, Governor Scott worked to pass legislation that empowers principals to hire, reward, and retain the best teachers by measuring educator performance and creating a merit-pay system and eliminating teacher tenure. By expanding charter schools and virtual schools, parents and students are likewise empowered to choose the education best suited to their needs.

Performance Measures and Standards:
LRPP Exhibit II

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards				
Department: Executive Office of the Governor Department No.: 31				
Program: General Office	Code: 311			
Service/Budget Entity: LAS/PBS	Code:31100500			
Approved Performance Measures	Approved FY 2012-13 Standard (Numbers)	FY 2012-13 Actual (Numbers)	Requested FY 2013-14 Standard (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)
LAS/PBS system costs: number of users	4,789,294 : 3705	4,712,281 : 3765	4,789,294 : 3705	4,789,294 : 3705

Assessment of Performance for Approved Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor
Program: General Office
Service/Budget Entity: System Design and Development Services
Measure: LAS/PBS Systems costs: number of users

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
4,789,294 : 3,705	4,712,281 : 3,765	(151,115) : 60	(1.61%)

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Performance Measure Validity and Reliability:

LRPP Exhibit IV

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Department: Executive Office of the Governor
Program: General Office
Service/Budget Entity: System Design and Development Services
Measure: LAS/PBS Systems costs: number of users

Action:

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

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Sources

Two main data sources were used for this exercise:

1. Total number of systems users. Total number of users was determined by the number of users for each of the major systems provided by Systems Design and Development.

2. Operating budget.

Methodology

The methodology used to collect the data is as follows:

1. Total number of users of each of the major systems provided by Systems Design and Development. For purposes of this exercise, a major system was defined as any proprietary application written and supported by Systems Design & Development that supports more than 50 users. The LAS/PBS Local Area Network (LAN) was also included as a major system in this listing as it provides the infrastructure necessary for these systems to operate. The below table shows a breakout of the aforementioned applications.

Procedure

The formula used to establish the indicator is as follows:
($ Actual Expenditures) / (Total Number of Users)

Validity & Reliability: Validity and reliability of the number of systems users was determined by comparing the number of users identified for each of the major systems provided by Systems Design & Development with the security profiles and tables for each of these systems. Since each separate application has associated security and user profiles, a highly accurate number of users can be determined. The totals for each of these systems were added to create the final output quantity.

Validity and reliability for the dollar amount was verified by comparing the Operating Budget amount against the figure used in this exercise.

Supporting Table for Methodology – Systems and Corresponding Number of Users

System Name	Number of Users	Comments
Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS)/LAS/PBS Web	450	House, Senate, OPB and Agencies
LAS/PBS Local Area Network (LAN)	200	
Appropriations Amendment Tracking System (AMTRK)	75	House and Senate Appropriations
Governor's Budget Information System (e-Budget)	680	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was determined as follows (480 – Legislative; 200-Executive Office of the Governor).
Special District Review	250	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was estimated to be 200.
Legislative Bill Analysis (LBA)	100	This number is comprised of OPB and Governor's Executive Office staff.
Budget Amendment Processing Systems (ABAPS)	450	House, Senate, OPB and Agencies
Committee Meeting Minutes	80	OPB
Special Interest Tracking System (SITS)	80	OPB
Florida Fiscal Portal	250	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was estimated to be 200.
Agency Bill Analysis Request	240	80 users from House and Senate Appropriations, 160 Legislative members
Comparison Issue Tracking System (CITS)	80	OPB
Transparency Florida	680	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users

		was determined as follows (480 – Legislative; 200-Executive Office of the Governor).
Florida Sunshine	150	This system will provide access to an unlimited number of world wide web users. For this exercise, the total number of users was estimated to be 150.
Community Based Issue Request System (CBIRS)	0	This application has not been used by the Legislature in several years but stilled maintained by SDD in the event that the Legislature decides to reopen the process.
Grants Management System (GMS)	0	This application has not been used by the Legislature in several years but stilled maintained by SDD in the event that the Legislature decides to reopen the process.
Total	**3,765**	

Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures:

LRPP Exhibit V

	LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures		
Measure Number	**Approved Performance Measures for FY 2013-14 (Words)**		**Associated Activities Title**
1	LAS/PBS system costs: number of users		System Design and development services (ACT 0320)

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2010

Agency Level Unit Cost Summary:

LRPP Exhibit VI

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

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE	FISCAL YEAR 2012-13		
SECTION I: BUDGET	**OPERATING**		**FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY**
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		247,031,136	8,000,000
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		246,027,797	0
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		493,058,933	8,000,000

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES	Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)				0
Mitigation Technical Assistance * Number of community assistance visits and contact interviews conducted	47	27,067.51	1,272,173	
Maintaining Capabilities Of Local Emergency Management Programs * Number of county capabilities assessments conducted	17	2,953,800.35	50,214,606	5,000,000
Emergency Management Training And Exercises Program * Number of students attending training	10,016	203.41	2,037,313	
Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan * Number of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan elements reviewed	22	67,051.68	1,475,137	
Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements * Number of mutual aid agreements maintained	67	7,859.87	526,611	
Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program * Public Hurricane Shelters Evaluated	151	7,446.45	1,124,414	3,000,000
Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment * Number of capabilities assessed	119	344,957.94	41,049,995	
Financial Assistance For Recovery * Number of project worksheets closed	1,478	69,178.87	102,246,368	
Financial Assistance For Long Term Prevention Measures * Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for	1	117,870,908.00	117,870,908	
State Emergency Operations Center Activation * Number of State Emergency Operations roles notified	103	23,444.37	2,414,770	
Emergency Community And Warnings * Number of incidents tracked by the State Watch Office	8,021	252.28	2,023,538	
State Logistics Response Center * Number of survivors supported for 24 hours	1,000,000	3.03	3,026,961	
Florida Community Right To Know Act * Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting	638	5,390.86	3,439,370	
Accidental Release Prevention And Risk Management Planning * Number of facilities inspected/audited	27	47,478.41	1,281,917	
Individual And Family Public Awareness * Annual number of family disaster plans created	35,000	43.04	1,506,570	
Private Sector Business Preparedness * Annual number of business disaster plans created.	10,000	48.11	481,145	
Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness * Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise	10	104,522.40	1,045,224	
Disability Outreach Program * Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population	10,000	47.29	472,865	
Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation * Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meeting held	4	1,039,558.50	4,158,232	
TOTAL			337,668,117	8,000,000

SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET			
PASS THROUGHS			
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES			
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS			
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS			
OTHER		8,625,116	
REVERSIONS		146,765,755	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4) **		493,058,988	8,000,000

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

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

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

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

(4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.   ** $55 difference due to rounding/budget adjustments

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Activity: A unit of work that has identifiable starting and ending points, consumes resources, and produces outputs. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and September 30 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act that represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings.

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

CIO - Chief Information Officer

CIP - Capital Improvements Program Plan

D-3A: A Legislative Budget Request (LBR) exhibit that presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units that are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

EOG - Executive Office of the Governor

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

FCO - Fixed Capital Outlay

FFMIS - Florida Financial Management Information System

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs, and renovations to real property that materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use. Includes furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

FLAIR - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

F.S. - Florida Statutes

GAA - General Appropriations Act

GR - General Revenue Fund

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word "measure."

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

IOE - Itemization of Expenditure

IT - Information Technology

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

LAN - Local Area Network

LAS/PBS - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

LBC - Legislative Budget Commission

LBR - Legislative Budget Request

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created, pursuant to Section 19, Article III of the State Constitution and implemented pursuant to s. 11.90, Florida Statutes to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is

composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to section 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

L.O.F. - Laws of Florida

LRPP - Long Range Program Plan

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

MAN - Metropolitan Area Network (Information Technology)

NASBO - National Association of State Budget Officers

Narrative: Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue that is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

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

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

Outsourcing: Means the process of contracting with a vendor(s) to provide a service or an activity and there is a transfer of management responsibility for the delivery of resources and the performance of those resources. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services that support the agency mission.

PBPB/PB2 - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. ***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.***

Performance Ledger: The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure.

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.

- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.

- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients that reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Primary Service Outcome Measure: The service outcome measure which is approved as the performance measure that best reflects and measures the intended outcome of a service. Generally, there is only one primary service outcome measure for each agency service.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Program: A set of services and activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals and objectives based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act by a title that begins with the word "Program." In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. "Service" is a "budget entity" for purposes of the Long Range Program Plan.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency's mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data is complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

TCS - Trends and Conditions Statement

TF - Trust Fund

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

STATE OF FLORIDA
DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

RICK SCOTT
Governor

BRYAN W. KOON
Director

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

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

September 23, 2013

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

Mike Hansen, Staff Director
Senate Budget Committee
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the
Executive Office of the Governor, Division of Emergency Management is submitted in the
format prescribed in the instructions. The information provided electronically and contained
herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures
for Fiscal Year 2014-15 through Fiscal Year 2018-19. The internet website address that
provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is
http://www.floridadisaster.org/index.asp. I have approved this submission.

Sincerely,

Bryan W. Koon, Director
Florida Division of Emergency Management

FLORIDA RECOVERY OFFICE • DIVISION HEADQUARTERS • STATE LOGISTICS RESPONSE CENTER
5900 Lake Ellenor Drive
Orlando, FL 32809

2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
Tel: 850-413-9969 • Fax: 850-488-1016
www.FloridaDisaster.org

2702 Directors Row
Orlando, FL 32809-5631

DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Fiscal Years 2014-2015
Through 2018-2019

September 2013

Rick Scott   *Bryan W. Koon*
Governor   *Director*

Mission

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

Vision

Failure is not an option

Motto

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

Goals

DEM has identified five major goals to further enhance emergency management capabilities throughout the state:

Goal 1: Be prepared to support whole community emergency management activities
Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters
Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs
Goal 4: Optimizing the use of resources and funding
Goal 5: Promote Florida as a safe place to live, work and play

Objective 1.1: Maintain ongoing risk and vulnerability assessment

Objective 1.2: Develop a capabilities assessment

Objective 1.3: Maintain plans for each phase of emergency management

Objective 2.1: Reduce the social impact

Objective 2.2: Reduce the financial impact

Objective 2.3: Reduce the duration of impacts

Objective 3.1: Implement programs as incentives

Objective 3.2: Develop and implement orientation programs for staff and community

Objective 3.3: Develop a system for staff communication and coordination

Objective 4.1: Realign responsibilities

Objective 4.2: Streamline administrative processes

Objective 4.3: Share information

Objective 5.1: Identify DEM brand

Objective 5.2: Develop a communication plan

Objective 5.3: Promote Florida private sector

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

Objective 1.1: Maintain ongoing risk and vulnerability assessment

Outcome: **Number of county capability assessments conducted**

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
10	10	10	10	10	10

Objective 1.2: Develop a capabilities assessment

Outcome: Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable.

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Objective 1.3: Maintain plans for each phase of emergency management

Outcome: Percentage of completed training courses and exercises

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters

Objective 2.1: Reduce the social impact

Outcome: Percentage change of county benchmark indices after a disaster

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%

Objective 2.2: Reduce the financial impact

Outcome: Percentage reduction in disaster operation cost and financial aid needed (Standard not defined as division is working on method to calculate)

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Objective 2.3: Reduce the duration impacts

Outcome: Percentage reduced for communities to fully recover from a disaster (time)

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs

Objective 3.1: Implement programs as incentives

Outcome: Percentage of counties that have received EMAP accreditation

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
10%	25%	45%	65%	85%	100%

Objective 3.2: Develop and implement orientation program

Outcome: Number of students attending training

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520

Objective 3.3: Develop a system for staff communication and coordination

Outcome: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Goal 4: Optimize the use of resources and funding

Objective 4.1: Realign responsibilities

Outcome: Percentage of county emergency management plans adopted

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Objective 4.2: Streamline administrative processes

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

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

Objective 4.3: Share information

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

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

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

Objective 5.1: Identify Florida Division of Emergency Management brand

Outcome: Number of outreach events attended

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
25	25	25	25	25	25

Objective 5.2: Develop a communication plan

Outcome: Total annual number of family, business and vulnerable population disaster plans created

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000

Objective 5.3: Promote Florida to the private sector

Outcome: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan

Baseline Year FY 2013-14 Approved Standard	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%

Division of Emergency Management Linkage to Governor's Priorities

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

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

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

Introduction

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

The Division of Emergency Management has reviewed and re-formulated strategic goals and objectives for the Long Range Program Plan for Fiscal Years 2014-15 through 2018-19 to meet the tremendous challenges and opportunities ahead of us. Our challenges include increasing frequent and expensive natural and man-made disasters across the country, a continually growing and changing population in the state of Florida, a constrained budget environment, a high percentage of divisional staff that has not experienced a land-falling hurricane during their tenure, and a shifting set of operating and fiscal parameters at the federal level. From and opportunity perspective, the division has the opportunity to ensure that our programs are positioned to deal with all of the challenges and meet the needs of Floridians while simultaneously improving how we conduct business internally. The division will be able to align the strategic goals and objectives with the annual business plan that will then define each employee's goals and objectives. The final result will be that each division employee will fully understand how their individual effort contributes to the success of the division and the State Emergency Response Team (SERT) as a whole.

Statutory Authority

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

Emergency Management in Florida

Many unique factors contribute in making Florida vulnerable to the effects of natural and manmade disasters. Florida is the fourth most populated state in the nation with 19,317,568 residents[1] and is the top travel destination in the world. Florida has 1,197 miles of coastline and 2,276 miles of tidal shoreline. Additionally, 80% of the state's total population resides in the 35 coastal counties and approximately two-thirds of this population resides in a Category 5 hurricane storm surge zone. For a Category 5 hurricane scenario that simultaneously impacted the entire state of Florida, the public hurricane evacuation shelter space demand could be up to 835,019[2] spaces statewide. Currently, there are approximately 939,395 total shelter spaces statewide that meet the American Red Cross shelter guidelines, including both general population and special needs shelter spaces. However, though a statewide cumulative surplus appears to exist, there are three regions of the state with deficits of general population public hurricane evacuation shelter space: Northeast Florida, Withlacoochee and Southwest Florida. There are also seven regions with deficits of special needs population public hurricane evacuation shelter space: Apalachee, North Central Florida, Northeast Florida, Central Florida, Tampa Bay, Southwest Florida and Treasure Coast.

---

[1] US Census Bureau, 2012 Population estimates
[2] 2012 Statewide Emergency Shelter Plan

In addition, Florida is one of the largest users and producers of hazardous materials. There are over 11,053 facilities in Florida that meet the federally established thresholds for hazardous materials. Over 3,817 of these facilities house extremely hazardous substances.

Given the vast number of hazards to which Floridians are susceptible, a disaster may occur with little or no warning and may escalate more rapidly than the ability of any single local response organization or jurisdiction is able to manage. Florida's ability to respond to the most traumatic hurricane seasons in the state's history is a direct result of the complex network of responders who provide safety and comfort to the survivors. Emergency Management is more than a single profession. It is made up of numerous disciplines that allow a phenomenal pool of talent to provide essential services to those in need. Performance data and trends will provide direction in reevaluating our core mission and will ensure that Florida's communities are prepared to respond to and mitigate 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.

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.

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.

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.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

The Division of Emergency Management conducted a SWOT analysis in August 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 the synergy created by coordinating multi-functional emergency tasks among a variety of government and private agencies. Other strengths are:
- Reputation (both national and international)
- Relationships with stakeholders
- Responsiveness and timeliness to incidents
- History of Performance and past experience
- Accreditation through the Emergency Management Program (first state to receive accreditation and also be re-accreditated)
- Leadership on national emergency management issues
- Effective training program
- Positioning within the Executive Office of the Governor
- State Emergency Operations Center facility
- Mutual aid strategy built with 67 counties capable of rapid response and emergency deployment

Weaknesses: The Division's primary weakness is the division's size which leads to gaps in coverage, shallow bench strength due to actual disaster experience, limited personnel to handle Florida's large geographic and populated areas, and the inability to handle prolonged emergency activations. Other weaknesses identified were:
- Employee turnover related to state's salary constraints
- Limited information technology and administrative support
- Lack of importance (gravitas) due to being a relatively young entity
- Dependency upon external entities to provide support
- Being reactive instead of proactive
- Prone to focus on response and recovery
- With limited number of disasters occurring, there is less motivation to have excellent preparedness and mitigation programs
- Political Awareness as compared to other agencies (who we are and what we do)

Opportunities: The division's is continually finding new and innovative opportunities to enhance emergency management.   Those opportunities are:
- Using education as a recruiting tool
- Using social media to engage stakeholders with citizen awareness
- Improved forecasting
- Better intelligence gathering
- Emerging technologies
- Communication with Florida's tribal nations
- Florida as a testing site for changes in federal programs
- Private sector partnerships
- Non-Partisan political leadership dealing with emergency management
- Emergency Management staffing levels as compared to other states

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

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

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

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

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

Goal 2: Reduce the impacts of disasters

Disasters impact Floridians and guests physically, emotionally and financially. Although we can never reduce any of these impacts to zero, we can continue to drive them downwards. In order to do so, we need to continually understand what those impacts are in the current demographic and financial climate and apply our limited resources where they provide the greatest return and meet the greatest need. We need to take full advantage of the partners we have in the state of Florida in meeting these needs. We also need to ensure that our programs and processes operate with the minimum of administrative overhead required, so that the majority of our efforts benefit survivors and their communities.

In order to meet this goal, DEM will identify and analyze community indices for all 67 counties using nationally recognized benchmarks to develop community focused response/recovery

strategies to ensure no more than 5% change in the identified indices. DEM will develop baseline data of Gross Domestic Product for each county and the state using economic data studies to develop business recovery plans and mitigation strategies to reduce cost of disaster operations and minimize the amount of aid needed to recover from an event. A multi-faceted notification process and method to educate local stakeholders on funding opportunities and community best practices focusing on NDRF Long Term Recovery strategies will be developed to reduce the overall recovery duration.

Goal 3: Enhance emergency management workforce and programs

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

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

Goal 4: Optimize the use of resources and funding

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

To meet this goal, DEM will realign responsibilities based on identified competencies, trends, threats and shortfalls that affect customers, both internal and external that exists or perceived to exist. Plans will be created using this data which are meant to reduce costs by minimizing redundancies and addressing unmet gaps in the comprehensive emergency management process. DEM will review and improve business processes to reduce the administrative impact to realize time and/or productivity savings. Enact processes and procedures to provide for the timely, common and effective flow of accurate information for government and individual decision-makers to make the best possible decision.

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

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

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

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

The division is not requesting any policy changes that will affect the agency budget request or governor's recommended budget.

Fiscal Restrictions to Federal Grants

The Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Plan was approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in 2010. The Division will continue to be eligible for up to 20% additional post-disaster mitigation funding. This is an increase from 15% previously awarded.

List of Changes Which Would Require Legislative Action, Including Elimination of Programs, Services and/or Activities

No changes.

List of All Task Forces and Studies in Progress

- *Hurricane Loss Methodology Commission* -- This commission was formed after Hurricane Andrew to provide sophisticated and reliable actuarial methods for residential property insurance holders. The Division Director is a Commission member.

- *Domestic Security Oversight Council* -- The Board oversees the seven Regional Domestic Security task forces that determine prevention, planning and training strategies, and equipment purchases for domestic security. The Division Director serves on this committee along with the Commissioner of the Department of Law Enforcement, the Secretary of the Department of Health, the State Fire Marshal, and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

- *State Emergency Response Commission for Hazardous Materials* -- The Commission was established by Governor's Executive Order and implements the Federal provisions of the Community Right-to-Know Hazardous Materials Planning and Prevention Program. The 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.

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 2013-14

TOTAL DIVISION BUDGET:

Total Positions Funded :		153
General Appropriations for Divisions Programs	28%	$94,991,876
Federal and State Funds Provided as a result of Declared Disasters	72%	$247,126,614
Total Appropriations	**100.00%**	**$342,118,490**

BUDGET CHARACTERISTICS:

Federal Trust Funds	79%	$269,475,606
State Trust Funds	21%	$ 72,642,884
Total	**100.00%**	**$342,118,490**

Note: This Budget Summary is reflective of that which was appropriated through Chapter 2013-40, Laws of Florida, and does not include subsequent budget amendment actions.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS LRPP EXHIBIT II

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcome highlighted in ==yellow==

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)
==Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable==	==0%*==	==0%==	==0%==	==0%==
Percentage of completed training courses and exercises	95%	160%	95%	95%
Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise	90%	100%	90%	90%
Number of capabilities assessed	24*	119	24	24
Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated	100%*	100%	100%	100%
Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R	10%	10%	10%	10%
Number of facilities inspected/audited	27	27	27	27
Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA	10%	4.53%	10%	10%
Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting	485	638	485	350
Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise	0%	0%	0%	0%
Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise	10	10	10	10

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year	50%	81%	50%	50%
Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed	14	22	14	14
Number of students attending training	2,520	10,016	2,520	6,300
Percentage of domestic preparedness grants closed out within 5 years of grant award	100%	100%	100%	90%
Number of issues closed annually	53	120	50	50
Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of county capability assessments conducted	10	17	10	10
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%	76.9%	95%	95%
Number of project worksheets closed	400	1,478*	400	400
Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance	5 minutes	**	*	*
Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed	10%	7.55%	10%	10%
Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes	200	151	200	200
Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable	95%	98%	95%	95%
Average number of hours to activate the SLRC in order to deploy resources	12 hours	12 hours	12 hours	12 hours

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)
Number of survivors supported for 24 hours	1M	1M	1M	1M
Percentage of counties that annually update Form C	80%	26%	80%	80%
Number of mutual aid agreements in place	67	67	67	67
Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant	80%	83.91%	80%	80%
Number of incidents tracked	8,000	8,021	8,000	8,000
Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation	75%	73.54%	75%	75%
Number of SEOC activation roles notified	25	103	*	*
Number of SEOC activation notifications sent	**	**	20	20
Percentage of listed Local Mitigation Strategy Projects for which applications have been submitted or have been completed	25%	25%	25%	25%
Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held	4	4	2	2
Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects	75%	81%	75%	75%
Number of non-disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for	5	1	3	3
Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System	50%	47%	50%	50%
Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program	50	47	50	50

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2012-13 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2012-13 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2013-14 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2014-15 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Funding Used	100%	80%	100%	100%
Number of Residential Construction Mitigation project applications submitted	22	30	22	22
Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org	10,000	***	*	*
Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan	64%	***	64%	64%
Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org	2,500	***	2,500	2,500
Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan	50%	*	50%	50%
Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population	10,000	*	*	*
Percentage of business that have a business disaster plan	50%	***	50%	50%
Percentage of counties trained in Emergency Mutual Aid Compact	10%	65%	10%	20%
Number of trained EMAC teams	2	10	2	3
Number of public education outreach events attended annually	**	**	25	25
Number of individuals added to the 67 county registries for persons with special needs	**	**	8,000	8,000

*Deleting Measure for FY 13/14 and FY 14/15
**New Measure for FY 13/14 & FY 14/15
***Data Unavailable

ASSESSMENTS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS LRPP EXHIBIT III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: **Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management**
Program: **Emergency Management**
Service/Budget Entity: **Emergency Management/31700100**
Measure: **Number of buildings surveyed for hurricane evacuation shelter planning purposes**

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
200	151	-49	24.5

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☒ Staff Capacity
☒ Competing Priorities   ☒ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)

Explanation: The Division was only able to complete 151 surveys of the standard 200 for FY 12/13 due extended periods of staff vacancies beginning in January, 2013. When positions were filled, newly hired staff required training and on the job experience to become productive surveyors. The staff position assigned to perform quality control reviews and distribute reports was also vacant during a portion of the FY, which reduced distribution of reports. There were also competing priorities that reduced survey and report distribution productivity, such as need to emphasize hurricane shelter retrofit grants, and completion of tasks needed for assigned and statutory reports.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☒ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: Productivity of the Division's survey staff is dependent on readily available construction documents (e.g., construction drawings and specifications) and appropriate local facility staff/owners representatives. During FY 12/13, access to these local resources were challenging in some jurisdictions.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☒ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Continue to promote appropriate training and mentored field experience of staff.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed

Action:

☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10	7.55	-2.45	24.5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Personnel Factors   ☒ Staff Capacity
☒ Competing Priorities   ☒ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)

Explanation: The Division was only able to complete surveys for 7.55 percent of the estimated 2,000 existing or potential public hurricane shelters for FY 12/13 due extended periods of staff vacancies beginning in January, 2013. When positions were filled, newly hired staff required training and on the job experience to become productive surveyors. The staff position assigned to perform quality control reviews and distribute reports was also vacant during a portion of the FY, which reduced distribution of reports. There were also competing priorities that reduced survey and report distribution productivity, such as need to emphasize hurricane shelter retrofit grants, and completion of tasks needed for assigned and statutory reports.

External Factors (check all that apply):

☒ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: Productivity of the Division's survey staff is dependent on readily available construction documents (e.g., construction drawings and specifications) and appropriate local facility staff/owners representatives. During FY 12/13, access to these local resources were challenging in some jurisdictions.

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

☒ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Continue to promote appropriate training and mentored field experience of staff.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of counties that annually update Form C

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
80%	26%	-54%	67.5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐. This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: Counties are slow to provide this information even after requests for it by FDEM.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: DEM will continue to reach out to all 67 counties for compliance on this issue. It will also be brought up during County Conference Calls and annual CIEM Meetings.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
75%	73.54%	-1.46%	1.9%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☒ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☒ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation: Personnel not following through on confirmation of messages when technical issue noted below was experienced.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☒ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: Known issue in vendor system that does not allow sufficient time for human user to enter touchtone command and be recognized as human for call flow to confirm receipt.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☒ Training   ☒ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: Migrated to new release of vendor software. Implemented training presentation and conducting focused follow-up training with staff that repeatedly fail to confirm test messages. Adjusting data source to measure DEM staff confirmations only.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Number of SEOC activation roles identified

Action:

☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☒ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
25	103	+78	312%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)

Explanation: This is the first year using this measure, concurrent with this year's assessment; the unit identified a more effective measure (below).

External Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: Number of positions identified will fluctuate as response structure is scaled to different events and/or as lessons learned are incorporated.

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

☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Deleting measure and developing new measure for the number SEOC activations or Exercise notifications sent to SERT response partners.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☒ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5 minutes	Not available	-5	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☒ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation: Re-broadcasting hazardous weather data after alert issuance competes with the documentation of other incidents that must be recorded by the State Watch Office per Chapters 62-150, F.A.C & 62-770.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The National Weather Service is the official source of hazardous weather warnings; technology has improved and county warning points now receive these warnings directly and reliably by other means faster than the Division can re-send them.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: Eliminating the current time measure will enable unit to focus on situational awareness of other natural and technological hazards and reduce duplication of effort.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95%	76.9%	-18.1%	19.1%%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☒ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation: As new disasters occur, two effects are noted in regard to meeting the LRPP threshold of 95%. First, Recovery staff is called away from closeout work on earlier events, to write project worksheets for the new disaster event. Second, the new project worksheets for the new event add to the overall total of project worksheets to be closed, which makes the LRPP threshold of 95% harder to attain.
External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐. This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: As we are now beyond the 7 year mark for the 2004-05 events, no new large project worksheet closures/completions for those events will apply towards changing the LRPP % completion. However, due to FEMA funding requirements, these 7+ year old events must continue to be the priority for Recovery to close/complete, in order to not increase the Division's drain on General Revenue resources.
Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☒ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: Recovery continues to address underperformance in this area through deployment of additional contractor resources. These contractor resources will be prioritized towards the 2004-05 events due to the need to close these projects out due to event funding

needs (discussed above), but will also be instructed to work on post 2005 events as well, so as to improve the LRPP % in this category.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Annual number of family disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☒ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10,000	Unable to Report	-10,000	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The Division's website used for building disaster preparedness plans experienced technical issues and all data was lost. A new website is in development.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The Division's website used for building disaster preparedness plans experienced technical issues and all data was lost. A new website is in development.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: The Get a Plan Website is in re-development. The division is recommending a new measure that more accurately measures output for this activity.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50%	Unable to Report	-50%	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: The new all-hazard survey will be issued in spring 2014 and will capture this data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
64%	Unable to Report	-64%	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)

Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

External Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

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

☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: The new all-hazard survey will be issued in spring 2014 and will capture this data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50%	Unable to Report	-50%	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: The new all-hazard survey will be issued in spring 2014 and will capture this data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

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

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The Division's website used for building disaster preparedness plans experienced technical issues and all data was lost. A new website is in development.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The Division's website used for building disaster preparedness plans experienced technical issues and all data was lost. A new website is in development.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: The Get a Plan Business Website is in re-development.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: 31700100
Measure: Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10,000	Unable to Report	-10,000	100%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: The Division is changing the survey used to capture data on preparedness to an all-hazard survey. The 2013 survey was not issued. The new survey format will be unveiled in spring 2014.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: The new all-hazard survey will be issued in spring 2014. The division is recommending a new measure that more accurately measures output for this activity.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews completed under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Assistance Program

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☒ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50	47	-3	6%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☒ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation: The division was only required to complete a combined total of 47 CAVs and CACs that were funded per the cooperative agreement with FEMA for FY 12/13.

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of Non-Disaster mitigation grant programs annually applied for

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☒ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5	1	-4	80%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):
☒ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation:
FEMA did not have an application cycle for four of the programs: Severe Repetitive Loss, Flood Mitigation Assistance, Repetitive Flood Claims and Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant programs during Fiscal Year 12/13.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:
The standard will be revised as FEMA has changed the number of programs available beginning with the FY 13/14 cycle.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of Residential Construction Mitigation Project funding used

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100%	80%	-20%	20%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Personnel Factors ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect ☒ Other (Identify)

Explanation: After recipients were awarded, some of the submitted structures did not meet BCA standards for mitigation. If the recipient did not have other eligible structures to replace these, no all award dollars were used. $3,401,889 was awarded, $2,716,811.02 was spent.

External Factors (check all that apply):

☐ Resources Unavailable ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change ☒ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

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

☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☒ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: The division will continue to work with applicants and seek other avenues to fully utilize the funds that meet the statutory requirements.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☒ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
50%	47%	-3%	6%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable   ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change   ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☒ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: Participation in the NFIP CRS is completely voluntary. Florida has a participation rate of 47% compared to the national average of 11%. The state works with the federal contractors to assist in any way possible, but the State has no real ability to increase rate of participation in this federal program.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations: Management expects that the participation in the federal CRS program will increase over time as impacts of the Biggert-Waters NFIP Reform Act take place.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY & RELIABILITY

LRPP EXHIBIT IV

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Percentage of confirmations received within initial broadcast window for SEOC activation

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:
Data Sources:
Emergency notification system broadcast reports for notifications sent to Division staff only.
Methodology:
Broadcast reports from the Division's emergency notification system automatically calculate the percentage of unique contacts that confirmed receipt of the notification within the initial broadcast window.

Validity:
Methodology
Every notification is automatically assigned a unique broadcast ID number by the notification system vendor.
Appropriateness
This is an appropriate measure of the outgoing notifications to the State Emergency Response Team an indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain and activate the State Emergency Operations Center per the Division's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. Revising measure to reflect notifications to Division staff only.

Reliability:
Methodology
This measure uses unique data that, once created, is not changed.
Reliability of Measure
Only authorized users are able to send a notification, and all notifications automatically have these metrics attached to them, and individual user responses are tracked as unique values that contribute to the cumulative percentage.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of SEOC activation notifications sent

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 Sources:
Emergency notification system broadcast reports for notifications sent to SERT response partners.
Methodology:
Broadcast reports from the Division's emergency notification system automatically calculate the percentage of unique contacts that confirmed receipt of the notification within the initial broadcast window.

Validity:
Methodology
Every notification is automatically assigned a unique broadcast ID number by the notification system vendor.
Appropriateness
This is an appropriate measure of the outgoing notifications to the State Emergency Response Team an indicator of the Division's responsibility to maintain and activate the State Emergency Operations Center per the Division's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

Reliability:
Methodology
This measure uses unique data that, once created, is not changed.
Reliability of Measure
Only authorized users are able to send a notification, and all notifications automatically have these metrics attached to them, and individual user responses are tracked as unique values that contribute to the total number

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of public education outreach events attended annually

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

Validity:
The Division continues to expand partnerships with non-profits, universities, and other organizations to identify outreach events to provide materials to the public. With a comprehensive public education campaign there is an increase in the number of citizens that receive the information to prepare their families and businesses, reducing the need for state assistance with response and recovery following a disaster.

Reliability:
The Division maintains a list of outreach events conducted on an annual basis and can report the increase in events on a yearly basis.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Executive Office of the Governor/Division of Emergency Management
Program: Emergency Management
Service/Budget Entity: Emergency Management/31700100
Measure: Number of individuals added to the 67 county registries for persons with special needs

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:
F.S. 252.355 requires each county to maintain a registry for persons with special needs located within the jurisdiction of the local agency.

Validity:
This is a valid measure to identify the number of individuals with a special need in each county so that emergency management services can be provided in the event of a disaster.

Reliability:
This is a reliable measurement tool as it allows for an overall snapshot of Florida's vulnerable population that has an emergency plan. The results can be compared from year to year by gathering data from each county on their registry numbers.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2013

ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES

LRPP EXHIBIT V

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

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Percentage of confirmations received within the initial broadcast window for SEOC activation		State Emergency Operations Center Activation
2	Number of SEOC activations sent		State Emergency Operations Center Activation
3	Reported chemical releases or spills exceeding reporting threshold quantity investigated		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
4	Percentage of inspections/audits conducted on all facilities subject to 112R		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
5	Number of facilities inspected/audited		Accidental Release Prevention & Risk Management Planning
6	Percentage of facilities out of compliance with EPCRA		Florida Community Right to Know Act
7	Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting		Florida Community Right to Know Act
8	Percentage of deficiencies found during evaluated exercise		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness
9	Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant exercise		Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness
10	Percentage of Comprehensive Emergency Plans reviewed and revised each year		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan
11	Number of Comprehensive Emergency Plan elements reviewed		Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan
12	Percentage of completed training courses and exercises		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
13	Number of students attending training		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program
14	Percent of state agencies identified in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan participating in the Statewide Hurricane Exercise		Emergency Management Training & Exercise Program
15	Percentage of shelter facilities surveyed		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
16	Number of Public Hurricane Shelters evaluated		Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program
17	Percent of communication systems that are operational and mission capable		Emergency Communications and Warnings
18	Average number of minutes to disseminate hazardous weather data after alert issuance		Emergency Communications and Warnings
19	Percentage of notifications that are timely, accurate and relevant		Emergency Communications and Warnings
20	Number of incidents tracked		Emergency Communications and Warnings
21	Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meetings held		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
22	Percentage of open Local Mitigation Strategy Projects that are currently under construction		Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation
23	Cumulative percentage closeout of all current Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects		Financial Assistance for Long Term Prevention Measures
24	Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for		Financial Assistance for Long Term Prevention Measures
25	Percentage of Florida communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Community Rating System		Mitigation Technical Assistance
26	Number of Community Assistance Visits and Community Assistance Contact interviews conducted		Mitigation Technical Assistance

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
27	Percentage of public assistance small project worksheets completed within 4 years of disaster declaration date		Financial Assistance for Recovery
28	Percentage of public assistance large project worksheets completed within 7 years of disaster declaration date		Financial Assistance for Recovery
29	Number of project worksheets closed		Financial Assistance for Recovery
30	Number of public education outreach events attended annually		Individual & Family Public Awareness
31	Percentage of residents that have a family disaster plan		Individual & Family Public Awareness
32	Percentage of businesses that have a business disaster plan		Private Sector Business Awareness
33	Annual number of business disaster plans created at www.FloridaDisaster.org		Private Sector Business Awareness
34	Percentage of counties trained in Emergency Mutual Aid Compact		Maintaining Emergency Management Assistance Compact
35	Number of trained EMAC teams		Maintaining Emergency Management Assistance Compact
36	Average number of hours to activate the SLRC in order to deploy resources		State Logistics Response Center
37	Number of survivors supported for 24 hours		State Logistics Response Center
38	Percentage of counties that annually update Form C		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements
39	Number of mutual aid agreements in place		Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements

Measure Number	Performance Measures (Words)		Associated Activities Title
40	Percentage of county comprehensive emergency management plans adopted		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
41	Number of county capability assessments conducted		Maintaining Capabilities of Local Emergency Management Programs
42	Percentage of required capabilities assessed at not capable		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment
43	Number of capabilities assessed		Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment
44	Percentage of vulnerable population that have an emergency disaster plan		Disability Outreach Program
45	Number of individuals added to the 67 county registries for persons with special needs		Disability Outreach Program

AGENCY LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

LRPP EXHIBIT VI

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE		FISCAL YEAR 2012-13		
SECTION I: BUDGET		**OPERATING**		**FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY**
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		218,415,197		8,000,000
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		248,354,699		0
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		466,769,896		8,000,000

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES	Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)		(3) FCO
Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)					
Mitigation Technical Assistance * **Number of community assistance visits and contact interviews conducted**	47	12,586.21	591,552		
Maintaining Capabilities Of Local Emergency Management Programs * **Number of county capabilities assessments**	17	2,856,952.82	48,568,198		5,000,000
Emergency Management Training And Exercises Program * **Number of students attending training**	10,016	132.38	1,325,890		
Maintaining State Comprehensive Emergency Plan * **Number of Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan elements**	22	43,747.09	962,436		
Maintaining Statewide Mutual Aid Agreements * **Number of mutual aid agreements maintained**	67	4,122.72	276,222		
Emergency Management Public Sheltering Program * **Public Hurricane Shelters Evaluated**	151	3,452.28	521,294		3,000,000
Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment * **Number of capabilities assessed**	119	327,958.07	39,027,010		
Financial Assistance For Recovery * **Number of project worksheets closed**	1,478	68,104.59	100,658,583		
Financial Assistance For Long Term Prevention Measures * **Number of non-disaster grant programs annually applied for**	1	116,963,744.00	116,963,744		
State Emergency Operations Center Activation * **Number of State Emergency Operations roles notified**	103	11,955.17	1,231,383		
Emergency Community And Warnings * **Number of incidents tracked by the State Watch Office**	8,021	133.36	1,069,675		
State Logistics Response Center * **Number of survivors supported for 24 hours**	1,000,000	2.68	2,677,211		
Florida Community Right To Know Act * **Number of facilities outreached for non-reporting**	638	3,833.48	2,445,762		
Accidental Release Prevention And Risk Management Planning * **Number of facilities inspected/audited**	27	21,755.00	587,385		
Individual And Family Public Awareness * **Annual number of family disaster plans created**	35,000	34.56	1,209,481		
Private Sector Business Preparedness * **Annual number of business disaster plans created.**	10,000	28.44	284,411		
Maintaining Radiological Emergency Preparedness * **Number of capabilities evaluated during a nuclear power plant**	10	50,569.50	505,695		
Disability Outreach Program * **Annual number of emergency disaster plans created for vulnerable population**	10,000	27.61	276,131		
Maintaining Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan Designation * **Number of State Hazard Mitigation Advisory Team meeting**	4	820,964.75	3,283,859		
TOTAL			322,465,922		8,000,000

SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER					
REVERSIONS			144,304,025		
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)			466,769,947		8,000,000

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

National Flood Insurance Program -- This is a pre-disaster flood mitigation and insurance protection program designed to reduce the cost of disasters. This voluntary program makes federally backed flood insurance available to residents and businesses that agree to adopt sound flood mitigation measures that guide area floodplain development.

Participating -- applying for grants or seeking technical assistance

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

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

State 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 to10 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.