

This section discusses the manner in which the county LMS will continue to be implemented, maintained and updated over time. “Plan implementation” is considered as the implementation of the proposed mitigation initiatives now included in the plan. “Plan maintenance” is considered to be the process by which the Task Force will continue to update, improve and expand the mitigation planning process. It also includes the technical analyses needed for the process to propose more mitigation initiatives for incorporation into the plan. “Plan maintenance” further includes the group’s activities to monitor implementation of the plan, to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented mitigation initiatives, and to continually strive to engage the community in the planning process. The basic elements of the Task Force’s actions to implement and maintain the plan are also described in the Task Force’s operating procedures, given in Section 2: The Planning Process of the plan.

Plan Implementation Responsibility and Schedules

As noted above, implementation of the LMS is basically through implementation of the approved mitigation initiatives incorporated into this document. As these initiatives are implemented over the years, the facilities, systems and neighborhoods of the participating jurisdictions will become less vulnerable to the impacts of future disasters, and the communities of the county will become increasingly more disaster resistant.

Pursuant to the developed planning process, the individual agencies and organizations that originally proposed the mitigation initiatives incorporated into the LMS are responsible for their implementation when the resources or opportunity to do so become available. As a practical matter, in most cases, this means that the proposing agencies identify the most feasible funding source (e.g., a state or federal grant program, the agency’s budgetary process, etc...), make application to the funding source or otherwise allocate funds and upon receipt of funding, take the necessary steps to actually implement the project, whatever that may entail (e.g., design, permitting and construction, etc.). In other cases, this may mean that, should a unique opportunity for implementation of an initiative arise, e.g., upon receipt of unexpected funds, immediately after a disaster event, the agency can proceed with implementation of the initiative.

While the actual responsibility for implementation of a mitigation initiative remains the responsibility of the sponsoring agency, the Task Force as a multi-jurisdictional, cooperative organization has a substantial involvement in the implementation of the LMS and under the Task Force’s approach, can assist with the coordinating and scheduling of the implementation of approved mitigation initiatives.

As a part of the planning process, approved mitigation initiatives included in the LMS are re-evaluated annually by the Task Force as to their continuing value and the need



for their implementation. The purpose of this re-evaluation is to assure that a proposed mitigation initiative remains a valuable component of the LMS, and whether any unique or unanticipated conditions warrant extra efforts to implement the initiative.

The Task Force has chosen not to assign priorities for implementation. Mitigation initiatives will be implemented as funding becomes available. Funding will be pursued for each project by the sponsoring agency, organization or jurisdiction as a part of their normal operations or activity scheduling.

The implementation of a mitigation initiative may be moved forward due to unique circumstances. For example, assume that the proposed mitigation initiatives included in the LMS with the highest priority score are for flood-related vulnerabilities, because this reflects the most normal concern for the planning area. However, also assume that long-range weather forecasts are for drought conditions, not flooding. This circumstance may warrant attempting to implement any drought-related mitigation initiatives included in the LMS as soon as feasible. Therefore, in this case, drought-related initiatives would be given higher priority until drought conditions have passed.

Conversely, implementation for some mitigation initiatives may be deferred. This means that the initiative is still a valid proposal, but that under present circumstances, its implement should be deferred until a future date, allowing the participating agencies to focus on higher priority initiatives. Also, some projects may be terminated, which means that, upon re-evaluation, the Task Force believes the initiate to not longer be needed or beneficial, and that it should be removed from the LMS.

Plan Maintenance and Monitoring of Plan Implementation

Mitigation planning is a dynamic process that must be continually adjusted to account for changes in the community and to further refine the information, judgments and proposals documented in the LMS. The process used by the Task Force to maintain the LMS consists primarily of four functions.

- The first is to continue to expand and improve the LMS by accomplishing additional technical analyses, such as vulnerability assessments, evaluation of the policy framework of the participating jurisdictions, and post-event analysis of disasters, etc.
- The second is to continue to expand participation in the planning process by soliciting the involvement of additional agencies from the participating jurisdictions, by implementing public information programs, and by inviting expanded participation by the private sector.
- The third is to routinely monitor implementation of the initiatives in the LMS until each is completed and in-place, and to assess their actual effectiveness following the next relevant disaster event.
- The fourth is to issue an updated LMS for use by the participating jurisdictions, to inform the community, and when appropriate for submittal to State and Federal agencies for approval pursuant to the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. This portion of Section 7 describes these four activities by the Task Force to maintain the LMS.



The technical analyses conducted by the participating jurisdictions will be an ongoing effort to continually assess the hazards threatening the community, the vulnerabilities to those hazards, and the adequacy of the participating jurisdictions policy and program framework to control those vulnerabilities. When indicated, the technical analysis also includes formulating proposed mitigation initiatives to eliminate or minimize the identified vulnerabilities. In the next planning cycles, the Task Force will continue to assess the vulnerabilities of critical facilities, repetitive loss properties, and the jurisdictions to stated hazards. Vulnerability assessments are fundamental to identifying needed mitigation initiatives to propose for incorporation into the LMS, and as this process is continued, additional mitigation initiatives will be proposed for incorporation into the LMS.

Another technical analysis important to maintenance of the LMS is the expanded and refined evaluation of the policy and program framework of the participating jurisdictions and the adequacy of this framework to control the vulnerabilities of the community. To date, the current comprehensive land use plans, land development codes, general policies of the participating jurisdictions have been assessed in detail. As the plans are updated, the LMS will also be revised to reflect these changes. During the next planning cycle, the Task Force participants intend to expand the analysis of the policy and program framework. The emphasis of this LMS maintenance activity during the upcoming planning cycle will be to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation affiliated policies, the adequacy of their enforcement, and recommend modifications.

The second type of activity to continue to maintain the LMS will be to continue to expand participation in the Task Force and the mitigation planning process. The current participants in the planning and the level of their participation are addressed in Section 2: The Planning Process of the LMS. Gaining additional participation in the planning is also part of the public information and community outreach component of the Task Force's approach to LMS development. The specific public information activities that are directly related to expanding participation in the mitigation planning are listed under the "Continued Public Involvement" heading of this section. The Task Force has planned these activities to expand participation in the planning through active involvement of additional local agencies, community groups, and private sector interests as partners in the planning.

The third category of LMS maintenance activities that will be undertaken by the Task Force will be to monitor the implementation of mitigation initiatives by the participating jurisdictions and their agencies. The Task Force will document the efforts to fund the initiative, to conduct required studies, and to obtain any needed permits, as well as to estimate the time remaining to complete design, needed studies and purchasing or construction. When an initiative is completed, this fact is noted in the program as well. The current status of initiative implementation has been discussed in Section 6: Compilation of Mitigation Initiatives and the Task Force will again update this section for the next publication of the LMS.



As a part of monitoring the implementation of mitigation initiatives, following a disaster and as a part of the post-event analysis that the Task Force will conduct, the effectiveness of completed mitigation initiatives, or any pre-existing mitigation initiatives, in reducing the human and economic impacts of the event can be estimated. As time passes and disaster events occur, this will enable the Task Force to accumulate a database of “mitigation success stories” with regard to the value of the property losses avoided and the number of fatalities, injuries or illnesses prevented. Recent disaster events have been so evaluated and documented in Section 4: Hazards and Vulnerabilities, while a report of the mitigation initiatives is included in Section 6: Compilation of Mitigation Initiatives, is documentation of this planning effort and the success of the mitigation actions of the participants.

Monitoring of the effectiveness of LMS implementation and maintenance also involves assessing the effectiveness of the mitigation goals established for the planning process. As noted in Section 5: Mitigation Goals and Policies, the Task Force established general goals to guide the participants in the mitigation planning process. The Task Force’s attempts to achieve the associated mitigation goals for the community, is a key measure of the effectiveness of the continuing LMS maintenance and implementation. As these initiatives are implemented, and monitored for their effectiveness in future disasters, the Task Force will be able to determine the overall success of their mitigation planning effort. In future planning cycles, these goals will be reviewed and re-evaluated to ensure they are still relevant to the unique needs of the community and continue to address current and expected conditions.

The fourth category of LMS maintenance activities is to actually incorporate the results of all technical analyses, including the development of new mitigation initiatives, and to publish another, updated edition of the LMS.

Plan Updating, Review and Approval

The maintenance and revision process is in recognition of the likelihood of change and the need to refine the strategy over time. Furthermore, it is a requirement of the county’s Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) to address hazard mitigation and to review the CEMP on an annual basis.

The LMS should be revised at least annually to ensure that it remains current and reflects changing conditions within the community. In order to ensure that the local mitigation strategy remains updated, the county’s Emergency Management Department personnel have agreed to review and revise the strategy annually as part of the CEMP annual review. To assist in this process, the Task Force developed the following procedures.

Each Year Prior to June 30:

1. Update hazard maps and history, if needed.
2. Update list of mitigation programs and policies, if needed.



3. Revise list of mitigation initiatives, including the removal of completed or unnecessary projects, proposal of new initiatives, and prioritization of remaining projects.
4. Conduct preliminary cost-benefit analysis for projects that are technically feasible, potentially cost effective, and environmentally sound.
5. Obtain grant applications for mitigation funding programs.
6. Submit revised LMS for public review and adoption by governing bodies of the county and the cities of Apalachicola and Carrabelle.

After a Declared Emergency:

1. Obtain information regarding the availability of and requirements for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and any other special post-disaster funding.
2. Identify suitable projects for HMGP, CDBG and any other special post-disaster funding from the existing list of initiatives and add any new projects identified.
3. Incorporate recommendations of the State Mitigation Task Force into the LMS.
4. Prioritize projects and apply for funding for those projects that have the highest priority and the greatest likelihood of being funded.
5. Keep list of any new projects identified to add to annually revised list of mitigation initiatives.
6. Keep narrative and financial records of community and repetitive damage for updating hazard history.

To correspond with many mitigation and government grant cycles, the new planning period is to begin June 30. The schedule for the upcoming planning cycle is included in Table 7.1 at the end of this section. In addition to the start date for the planning cycle, this planning timeline also documents the intended deadlines for completion of key activities. The planned date for release of the next edition of the LMS is intended to be April 1, 2010. This edition represents a review and revision of the entire LMS. The Task Force has agreed to meet annually (at a minimum) in order to regularly update the LMS. As necessary, the county's Emergency Management Department staff will make minor revisions to the document and contact the Task Force for meetings.

At the conclusion of the planning cycle, a draft of the updated LMS will be prepared and distributed for public comment and input. The draft will be placed in a public archive, advertised for a specified review period, and discussed at a public hearing. A planning process following similar procedures to those detailed in Section 2: The Planning Process will be used to receive public commentary on the update LMS. Each update will then be provided to State and Federal agencies, if desired, for review, comment and / or approval. Formal LMS approval by the governing bodies of the participating jurisdictions will be provided upon issuance of an updated LMS.



Status of Plan Promulgation

Promulgation of the LMS is a very important step in assuring its implementation through the implementation and actual functioning of the mitigation incorporated into it. The LMS is formatted to place all of the jurisdiction-specific information into discussions throughout this document. Jurisdiction-specific information has been developed through the efforts of the personnel representing the corresponding individual jurisdiction or organization participating in the planning process.

It is the expectation of the Task Force that governing body or executive leadership of each participating jurisdiction or organization will review, consider, and act on the information provided in the LMS. If the governing body acts in a positive manner, this is basically an approval or endorsement of the proposed mitigation initiatives. This approval or endorsement, with or without modification by the governing body, represents both consent and commitment by the representatives of that organization or jurisdiction to seek the resources needed to implement the priority initiatives contained therein. In addition, resolutions signed by each jurisdiction have been included with this document as approval of the LMS and inter-agency agreement to implement its initiatives. Only through actual implementation of the proposed mitigation initiatives contained in the LMS can it actually help to make the county a disaster resistant community.

Implementation through Existing Plans and Programs

One of the methods to most effectively implement the LMS is to propose and implement initiatives that will further the goals and objectives in the LMS. In Section 6: Compilation of Mitigation Initiatives, are listed. Initiatives listed, when implemented will served to mitigate existing issues. Other current plans, when reviewed and updated will be compared to the initiatives and objectives of the LMS to ensure that all planning activities work toward the common goal.

During the revision process of the LMS the county's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) was also undergoing an extensive review and revision. An important portion of the CEMP review and revision process included:

- Identifying lead and support agencies / organizations responsible for the various aspects of mitigation.
- Determining the mitigation training needs of various lead and support agencies / organizations better coordinate and undertake mitigation initiatives.

As identified in Section 5 Table # 5.2 of the LMS the county has taken great care to incorporate the various concepts of disaster mitigation into the county's Comprehensive Plan and Floodplain Ordinance.



The LMS will continue to be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan in terms of policies governing land uses or infrastructure that may be at significant risk.

Continued Public Involvement

The Task Force will continue efforts to develop and implement a year-round program to engage the community in the mitigation planning process and to provide them with mitigation-related information and education. These efforts will be to continually invite public comments and recommendations regarding the mitigation goals for the community, the priorities for the planning and the unique needs of each community for mitigation-related public information. A copy of the LMS will be posted to the internet making access to this important document easily accessible to the residents of the county. Each of these activities continues to engage the community in the planning process through the presentation of a specific topic or program related to or relevant for hazard mitigation.

Past efforts to engage the community in the mitigation planning process are detailed in Section 2: The Planning Process of this document. These efforts will be continued in the future. Input received via the internet and Task Force members will be recorded and brought for consideration at the annual Task Force meeting. Any revisions that have the support of the Task Force will be submitted as an amendment to the LMS to the applicable jurisdiction's county or city commission for approval. Upon approval, the amendment will be integrated into the LMS at the earliest opportunity. Approved mitigation initiatives may be implemented as soon as they are approved.

The Next Planning Cycles

As given in this section, the Task Force has established a schedule and procedure for both LMS implementation and LMS maintenance that is expected to be very helpful in improving and expanding the mitigation planning process. Initially, the planning efforts by the jurisdictions will seek to build on the analyses and proposals included in this edition of the LMS, primarily by completing more vulnerability assessments, evaluations of plans and programs, and proposing additional mitigation initiatives. Eventually, after a number of planning cycles with ongoing new analyses, all important facilities and vulnerable neighborhoods within all of the participating jurisdictions will have been evaluated and the mitigation planning effort can enter more of a normal maintenance and implementation mode. During these continuing efforts, the Task Force will prioritize its efforts towards assessing all critical facilities and expanding information about known hazard areas.

The LMS is a dynamic document, reflecting a continuing and expanding planning process. The efforts of the Task Force will continue into the future, striving to make all of the jurisdictions in the county truly disaster resistant communities.

Modification to Other Policies, Plans and Programs



Finally, it is the intention of the Task Force to continue to improve the existing policy framework for the participating jurisdictions so that they will be able to more effectively manage the community’s vulnerabilities to future disasters. An analysis of the current policy framework is included in Section 5: Mitigation Goals and Policies of this document. Any shortfalls in the number of policies addressing identified higher risk hazards can be addressed by implementing non-structural initiatives intended to modify or enhance current plans, policies and programs. The Task Force’s approach enables organizations proposing initiatives to associate them, if applicable, with the plans or policies to be changed. These are reported on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. The proposed modifications to the listed policies and programs are additional documentation of the Task Force’s efforts to achieve its established goals.

The following procedures have been outlined by the Task Force to resolve conflicts arising from the modification of other policies or the development of the LMS:

1. The Task Force will follow the guidelines contained in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element of the county’s Comprehensive Plan before beginning any hazard mitigation initiative in the final LMS. This includes contacting and coordinating mitigation strategies with agencies within the county, adjacent local governments and any regional, State and / or Federal agencies that are likely to be affected by the initiative or having jurisdiction and / or permit authority over the initiative. In addition, the county, along with its cities and towns request to be informed of agency or neighboring government’s actions that may affect community health, safety and welfare.
2. If any agency or government body undertakes an initiative that is inconsistent with the LMS, the agency or government body should be notified by a representative of the local government and informed of the inconsistency. Conflicts or complaints against an agency outside of the county will be expressed in writing and delivered to the agency in question with a request to a timely and fair response.
3. Should a conflict arise during the coordination of mitigation strategies as discussed above that cannot be resolved through continued coordination and discussion, the Task Force may request to use the Apalachee Regional Planning Council’s dispute resolution process.

Any complaints should be addresses to the appropriate jurisdiction found in the following table.

Table # 7.1		Jurisdiction Point of Contact	
Jurisdiction	Point of Contact	Address	Phone
Franklin County	Clerk of the Circuit Court	33 Market Street Apalachicola Fl 32320	850/653-8861



City of Apalachicola	City Clerk	1 Avenue E Apalachicola FI 32320	850/653-9319
City of Carrabelle	City Clerk	106 Southeast Avenue B Carrabelle FI 32322	850/697-2727

All complaints should be filed within forty-five (45) days of the alleged incident. Upon receipt of the complaint, notice of the same will be provided to the agency, department, individual or company against whom the complaint has been filed, as applicable within 15 days. A copy of the complaint will be forwarded to the county's Emergency Management Department for consideration.

The government clerk or manager receiving the complaint will investigate and provide written answers to complaints and grievances within 45 days of their receipt. Should the conflict remain unresolved after the steps detailed above have been taken, the local government receiving the complaint or the Task Force may request to use the Apalachee Regional Planning Council's (ARCP) dispute resolution process. If the ARPC's assistance is requested, a letter requesting assistance and copies of all complaints and responses will be sent to:

- Executive Director
Apalachee Regional Planning Council
20776 Central Ave E # 1
Blountstown FI 32424
Phone # 850/674-4571



Table # 7.2

Meeting Schedule and Activities for Plan Maintenance

Time Period	Activity by Group	
Month	Franklin County Task Force	Support Staff
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure approval or adoption of last LMS issued by the participating jurisdictions. Continue to request participating jurisdictions to expand efforts to assess neighborhoods, facilities and systems and to submit proposed initiatives for incorporation into the LMS. Continue activities to promote community awareness of the LMS and its comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review participant list and continue to solicit additional involvement as indicated. Strive to obtain active involvement by each jurisdiction. Review Task Force membership list and make adjustments as indicated. Compile and review comments received on last LMS issued.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review goals via web site, phone and e-mail. Modify goals as needed for the new planning period. Review comments received on LMS issued. Review and act on any mitigation initiatives submitted for incorporation into the LMS. Review current hazard identification / risk estimation and determine need for update. Continue programs for community acceptance of LMS and for implementation of mitigation related education programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive and process any proposed mitigation initiatives. Prioritize technical analyses to be requested of the participating jurisdictions.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete additional technical analyses and propose mitigation initiatives. Continue to pursue community acceptance of LMS and implementation of mitigation related education programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue documentation on meeting from proceeding month. Update web sites and send articles to the county's Chamber of Commerce. Provide support to jurisdictions in training and conducting needed technical analyses.



4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review status of organizational and jurisdictional participation and progress in completion of the needed technical analyses. Make recommendations to support staff of the additional involvement to solicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support jurisdictions pursuing funding opportunities for implementation of mitigation initiatives.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive and act on proposed mitigation initiatives via web site, phone and e-mail. 	
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete forms provided by support staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue documentation on information from proceeding month. Formulate schedule for completion of technical analyses and final submittal of proposed mitigation initiatives.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet to review, discuss and approve release of draft LMS. Finalize plan for public information support to the release of the next edition of the LMS. Formulate recommendations on program and mitigation education in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule and facilitate Task Force meeting.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure approval or adoption of final LMS issued by participating jurisdictions governing bodies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue documentation on meeting from proceeding month. Prepare, print and release final LMS adjusted in accord with directions of the Task Force. Submit updated data to the state on request.

