

Monroe County Local Mitigation Strategy

Meeting 2: Local Mitigation Strategy Working Group

Time & Date: Wednesday September 2, 2020 2:00 PM

Location: Zoom Video Conference Call

Introductions and Agenda

Approximately 20 people were in attendance at the Local Mitigation Strategy Working Group (LMSWG) Meeting #2 which took place at 2:00pm on Wednesday September 2, 2020.

Jeff Manning, from Monroe County Emergency Management thanked everyone for attending the meeting and participating in the LMS update. He reiterated the importance of this process and reminded the group that the HMGP money coming into the County post-Irma is a direct result of having an LMS plan in place.

Abby Moore and Frankie Zito (Wood) presented the briefing slides per the meeting agenda shown below.

1. Updates: Where we are in the planning process
2. Project Schedule Update
3. Review Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Findings
 - a. Hazard Identification
 - b. Asset Inventory
 - c. Hazard Profiles: Risk and Vulnerability
4. Review & Update Mitigation Goals and Objectives
5. Reminders & Next Steps:
 - a. Finalize Goals & Objectives
 - b. Update info for Carried Forward Actions
 - c. Review HIRA Findings
6. Questions

Planning Process

Abby updated the LMSWG on where the consultants are in the Planning Process. Wood is currently working through Steps 4 and 5: Assessing the Hazard and Assessing the problem, the results of this assessment were presented at this meeting and the full assessment draft will be shared with the LMSWG in the coming days for review. The remainder of the meeting would focus on Step 6: Setting Goals.

Abby noted that only 7 community members had responded to the community survey so far. She asked that the LMSWG think about this survey as an important tool that gives the community and opportunity to represent to planners and committee members a better understanding of community thoughts on risk and mitigation needs. As such, Abby asked that the committee members and communities continue to publicize the survey to garner more response. Options for advertisement might include social media, community websites, NextDoor and short newspaper advertisements. Chuck will make plans to increase public awareness of the survey. The survey can be found at <http://www.monroecountyfl-lms.com/survey.html>.

Abby also reminded the committee members to post the full website (www.monroecountyfl-lms.com), which contains everything the public needs to know about the plan, including draft documents, on their communities' websites.

Project Schedule

Given the delays caused by COVID-19, the plan is as on schedule as possible. The Wood consultants presented the schedule, aiming to have the next meeting to discuss mitigation action strategies and prioritization methods by October, given feedback from Jeff about the final deadline. Wood will facilitate two more LMSWG meetings and one more public meeting throughout the remainder of the planning process.

Review Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Findings

Frankie reviewed the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) methodology and process, and a summary of each hazard in the plan – including the overall risk level assigned to each hazard. Hazards were identified for initial review based on the list of hazards included in the 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan and the 2015 Monroe County Local Mitigation Strategy. Major disaster declarations, NCEI storm events data, and LMSWG input were also reviewed to determine which hazards would be fully profiled in the plan. The full list of hazards profiled is as follows:

- ▶ Flood
- ▶ Tropical Cyclones
- ▶ Severe Storms
- ▶ Tornadoes and Water Spouts
- ▶ Wildfire
- ▶ Coastal Erosion
- ▶ Drought
- ▶ Sea Level Rise and Climate Change
- ▶ Extreme Heat
- ▶ Radiological Incident
- ▶ Cyber Attack

The summary info that was presented on each hazard can be found in the PDF of the presentation posted on the plan website. The following comments were made during the discussion:

- ▶ There was a question regarding which category of the asset inventory contains utility structures. Wood will provide clarification in the HIRA asset inventory.
- ▶ Wood has included a table comparing floodplain acreage on the current effective FIRM to the recently released preliminary FIRM. Scott Fraser of Key West noted that there are major changes on the preliminary FIRM, including significant increases to the BFE and an additional 2,000 buildings in Key West being added to the SFHA. The addition of this was purely comparative – all flood analysis and loss estimates were based on the effective FIRM. It will be noted in the plan that these numbers are not officially accepted and are likely to shift with comment from the communities.
- ▶ Scott Fraser also asked about the inclusion of environmental hazards – for example, the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill threatened Monroe County, causing a \$2 million impact even though the direct impacts never actually arrived on the shores of the County. Because FEMA only reviews natural hazards, the LMSWG decided this hazard does not need to be included in the plan update.
- ▶ Charles Pattison asked about the discussion of the underground plume as it relates to Turkey Point and its impact on the aquifer. David Hackworth also asked about SLR impacts on the aquifer and inquired whether grant funding would support building a new wellfield (which FKAA is already planning to do). Wood will add discussion of these points into the Radiological Incident and Sea Level Rise sections of the plan.

Review and Update Mitigation Goals

Abby reviewed the seven goals from the 2015 Monroe County Local Mitigation Strategy; the existing long-standing goals had no associated objectives. Abby recommended the LMSWG try to shorten their list of goals to a more manageable set of three to four broad-based goals.

Each goal will have nested objectives which can allow for more specificity. Abby discussed Wood’s recommended revisions to each of the goals as well as objectives within each of the goals. The original goals are as follows:

#1	Preservation of sustainability of life, health, safety, and welfare.
#2	Preservation of infrastructure, including power, water, sewer, and communications.

#3	Maintenance and protection of roads and bridges, including traffic signals and street signs.
#4	Protection of critical facilities, including public schools and public buildings.
#5	Preservation of property and assets.
#6	Preservation of economy during and after disaster, including business viability.
#7	Preservation and protection of the environment, including natural and historic resources.

Wood’s recommended revisions maintained the overarching topical areas from the original goals, but combined some and nested the more specific topics as objectives under larger, overarching goals. Wood presented the following updates to the goals and objectives to the committee:

Goal 1: Preserve the sustainability of life, health, safety, and welfare.

- **Objective 1.1:** Provide education and outreach to teach residents and visitors how to protect themselves and their property.
- **Objective 1.2:** Improve preparedness, response, and recovery capabilities to minimize hazard impacts.
- **Objective 1.3:** Pursue property protection and structure projects to reduce vulnerability of existing development.

Goal 2: Protect and preserve property and assets, including the built environment and natural resources.

- **Objective 2.1:** Protect and preserve community infrastructure systems, including critical facilities, utilities, water, communications, and transportation.
- **Objective 2.2:** Use planning and regulatory tools to protect future development and prevent hazard risk from worsening.
- **Objective 2.3:** Preserve natural areas that provide hazard risk reduction and other beneficial functions

Goal 3: Build local capacity to become continuously less vulnerable to hazards.

- **Objective 3.1:** Reduce losses from business interruption and support long term business viability.
- **Objective 3.2:** Ensure continuity of critical local government operations.
- **Objective 3.3:** Strengthen regional connections and foster inter-jurisdictional coordination for risk reduction.

Abby asked the LMSWG for other idea for the County’s fourth mitigation goal, but none were presented. Abby asked that if there is any input it be send to the Wood consultants. Otherwise, Wood will draft the goals and objectives and share with the County for feedback in the near future.

Existing Mitigation Projects

The LMSWG representatives from each jurisdiction must assign an action status to each existing action from the prior plan: Delete if the project is no longer a priority, there is no available funding, or it has been carried forward for one or two plan updates; Completed if the project has been completed; and Carried forward if the project is in progress or has not yet been started but is still a priority for the community. Communities must include a brief, but detailed, comment for each action – especially those that are being carried forward.

Next Steps

Continue Outreach: The County and Jurisdictions should continue to share the plan website and promote the community survey. Options include: Social Media, Local Newspapers/Radio, Nextdoor, and Community Websites. Please send Abby links and/or screenshots of your outreach to document in the plan; this is especially important for CRS credits.

Abby will send out the draft goals and objectives to the LMSWG for review. LMSWG members will then have time to submit comments to Abby at abigail.moore@woodplc.com.

LMSWG members should also continue working on their mitigation action reporting. All jurisdictions should submit action statuses for all actions to Abby at abigail.moore@woodplc.com by Friday, September 4th.

Communities that have yet to do so are asked to complete and return their data collection guides ASAP.

The next meeting will be scheduled soon for the Wood to go over and finalize the Goals and Objectives, discuss mitigation action ideas, and prepare/update the County's mitigation strategies. Jeff Manning asked if we would go over the prioritization procedure for mitigation strategies – as the current procedure was not successful, especially post Irma. Wood will plan to revisit this procedure at the next meeting. Wood usually uses a modified STAPLEE Criteria. To ensure as much input and feedback as possible to come to an agreed upon procedure, Wood will help the County advertise this meeting and will provide an agenda in advance.

Meeting Adjourned