

## 6.0 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

Plan implementation is a vitally important aspect of the overall program. Without an implementation program, the Plan either “gathers dust on the shelf” or lags along implementing projects incrementally based more on agencies’ or individuals’ interest than on a prioritized need basis. Discussed below are issues related to the organizational arrangement and administrative responsibility, the role of the Steering Committee, plan monitoring, plan funding, and plan update process.

### 6.2 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

The creation of a disaster-resistant community is achieved once the concept becomes part of the mindset and fabric of the private and public sectors of a community. Effective implementation requires the strong support of the locally elected body. In addition, it requires an advocate. Someone or group who believes the issue to be essential to the long-term sustainability of the community. This individual or group of individuals continually is reassessing the vulnerabilities of the community, and identifying potential strategies and partners to address the vulnerabilities and means to affecting change whether it be a bricks and mortar project or implementing a new programmatic initiative or modification to existing codes or plans.

This section describes the comprehensive organizational arrangement required to effectively implement the countywide LMS program. It also describes the administrative framework that defines the roles and responsibilities of those at the staff level who carry out activities on a daily basis that lead to the implementation of the LMS.

#### 6.2.1 Organizational Structure

The LMS organizational structure consists of several levels (see **Figure 6.1**, LMS Organization Structure). Heading the effort is the LMS Steering Committee. This group must have broad representation to be effective. It should embrace all stakeholder groups in the County from both the public and private sectors. Therefore when the St. Lucie County Steering Committee was originally established in 1998, representatives were selected so that all affected groups would have representation in the planning process and in the ongoing implementation of the LMS. The Steering Committee interacts directly with the County Commission and the general public. The St. Lucie CDD staff has provided direct support to the Steering Committee. In addition, the CDD has been the liaison to the Florida Division of Emergency Management within the FDCA, and the FEMA Department of Homeland Security.

#### 6.2.2 Administrative - Lead Responsibility

As described in **Section 6.2.1**, the lead individual having primary responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the LMS program has been a staff planner from the CDD Planning Division. As depicted in **Figure 6.1**, to be effective in implementing the LMS, the the LMS Coordinator will need the full support of their department’s director and County Administrator; thus, it is important that the LMS Coordinator have an opportunity to interact

INSERT FIGURE 6.1

with their Department Director and the County Administrator on a frequent basis, reporting on the progress of the implementation program, obstacles or problems that have delayed the implementation program, and ideas or alternative options to overcome the obstacles and/or problems being encountered.

Responsibilities of the staff planner will be

- To be the hazard mitigation advocate at staff level;
- To keep current with all changes in LMS/DMA2K programs;
- To interact frequently with the Florida Division of Emergency Management County Liaison;
- To work closely with the LMS Chairperson; To organize meetings of the Working Group;
- To coordinate with and contact all members of the Working Group on a regular basis;
- To maintain avenues of communication with the general public;
- To set up and maintain files documenting progress of LMS program;
- To update the PPL as needed; and
- To coordinate 5-year LMS update.

### **6.2.3 Administrative - Support Responsibility**

Successfully implementing the LMS is not the sole responsibility of one department – it is the responsibility of all participating organizations. Participating organizations from both the public and private sectors can fulfill administrative responsibility in a number of ways including

- Promote and educate others about the significance of local hazard mitigation;
- Interact and coordinate frequently with LMS Coordinator;
- Manage mitigation projects or activities;
- Provide support, helping other organizations implement their mitigation projects or activities;
- Disseminate hazard mitigation-related information to constituents;
- Document the progress of one's organization's hazard mitigation activities; and
- Make available to LMS Coordinator new data and information relevant to the LMS process.

An example of providing support to other organizations could involve assisting in an all-hazard public awareness/education program. While it may be the responsibility of a specific department to see that the project is implemented, other organizations such as the County Fire Rescue, American Red Cross, St. Lucie County School District, and even homeowner associations could serve in a support role designing such a program. Supporting organizations can assist in making sure that its members or member organizations publicize and disseminate the program information generated as a result of the development of the public awareness/education program.

Who should assume lead responsibility was discussed by the LMS Steering Committee at its 25 March 2004 meeting. It was felt that either the County CDD and/or County Division of Emergency Management would be appropriate entities to house the LMS Coordinator; however, both agencies lack the staff resources to devote to the LMS program

at this time. The LMS Steering Committee members concluded that they needed to establish a strategy that would enable them to continue the program until the time the County can assign an individual to manage the project. Therefore, it was suggested that a contractor be hired to assume the responsibilities as the LMS Coordinator temporarily.

### **6.3 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

The implementation strategy is based on information gathered from the Steering Committee as well as key community stakeholders and citizens. The hazards and community issues identified as well as the community's institutional analysis are used to determine the best means to implement mitigation strategies in St. Lucie County. The implementation strategy includes the goals and objectives identified by the Steering Committee as well as a list of prioritized mitigation activities.

#### **6.3.1 Goals and Objectives**

In formulating the goals and objectives, appropriate plans, policy statements, laws, codes, and ordinances from each participating local government have been reviewed. With multiple local governmental entities involved in defining a community-wide vision, this becomes a complex process. To help clarify the process, a facilitated discussion with the Steering Committee was conducted, and a comprehensive list of the areas where disasters affect the community was developed. The list included the following:

- Loss of life;
- Loss of property;
- Community sustainability;
- Health/medical needs;
- Temporary sheltering;
- Food and water;
- Communication;
- Housing;
- Historical structures;
- Adverse impacts to natural resources (e.g., beaches, water quality);
- Economic disruption;
- Fiscal impact;
- Recurring damage;
- Damage to repair to public infrastructure (e.g., roads, water systems, sewer systems, stormwater systems, electrical power);
- Debris removal;
- Redevelopment/reconstruction;
- Development practices;
- Environmental damage;
- Intergovernmental coordination; and
- Mental health counseling.

Along with these general hazard impacts, specific issues related to preparing for, mitigating against, responding to, and recovering from disasters were identified by the Steering Committee. The issues identified are summarized as follows.

The following issues were identified during the second and third meetings of the LMS in St. Lucie County on 12 December 2003 and 8 January 2004. The first sets of issues are considered to be All-Hazard. The second sets of issues are broken out by hazards.

*All-Hazards Issues.*

*Lack of Street Signs.* Creates problems for first responders who may be unfamiliar with the area.

*Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) Transponders.* AVL transponders in emergency vehicles can help locate sites faster.

*Medical Facilities Access to Emergency Communication System.* Can the hospital be connected to the emergency communication system for monitoring purposes to prepare for mass victim situations.

*Expanded Communication System.* Can the current system be expanded to accommodate important community organizations?

*Communication System Test.* The current communication system has yet to be tested during a large-scale event.

*Special Needs (SN) Shelters.* More special needs shelters are needed in the County. More equipment is needed at the current SN shelters. The current shelters need more staff available. The public needs to be better aware of the purpose of the SN shelter. There have been several incidents of leaving elderly individuals without food or proper medication.

*Generators.* New buildings should be built to accept generators.

*Population Growth.* Growth within the County has created an awareness issue among new residents. Many have not experienced the type of hazards in Florida and have limited knowledge of how to prepare for them. Education programs are needed to address this issue.

*Risk Communication.* Need to educate the public without creating fear or anxiety, which can overwhelm emergency responders.

*Transportation.* The growth in the County will have impacts on transportation systems and evacuation times.

*Community Emergency Response Team (CERT).* The County has had trouble getting the program off the ground.

*Influence of the Media.* The mass media has a tendency to sensationalize events. Need to partner with them to communicate effectively the impacts of the event and how to prepare and respond to it.

*Hazardous Materials Compliance.* There is not enough enforcement of hazardous materials identification requirements in the County.

*Catholic Charities.* This organization is trying to start a program similar to CERT that might be effective in preparing citizens for events.

*Food at Shelters.* Possibility of providing meals ready to eat at shelters for quick evacuation scenarios.

*Emergency Purchases.* Create arrangements pre-disaster to allow organization to acquire resources. Have purchase orders on file.

*Flooding.* Many areas of flooding are being addressed. A majority are in the study phases now.

*Evacuation Routes.* Are evacuation routes in areas subject to flooding?

*GIS.* There is a need to tie County, municipal, and other organizational GIS data together.

*Non-English Speaking Residents.* Many residents in the County do not speak English. There is a need to provide information (public service announcements [PSAs]) in languages other than English.

*Landscaping.* FEMA will not reimburse landscaping following a disaster.

*Training.* Continued training for emergency responders and services providers is important.

*Shelter Deficit/Overcrowding.* With the growth the County has experienced, a major event could result in overcrowding at shelters.

*Trauma Center.* The County currently does not have a trauma center. Growth in the County could create a need for such a facility locally.

*Automated External Defibrillator (AED).* There is a need for AED in public areas.

*Intergovernmental Coordination.* Remove political barriers to planned bureaucratic response, increase teamwork in minor events, and de-politicize countywide responses.

*New Construction.* Securing construction sites from oncoming events.

*Natural Gas Lines.* Are there emergency plans in place for these lines? In some areas, above ground valves could cause secondary impacts.

*Health Department Awareness.* Residents need to be made aware of the programs and activities offered by the County Health Department.

### ***Hazard-Specific Issues***

*Flooding.*

- More planning is needed to identify flooding hazards;

- Need to identify areas where FIRM map revisions or amendments are needed because of either mitigation or development;
- Limited mobility – need 4x4 vehicles to facilitate sampling and assessments; and
- Gas stations inundated with floodwaters.

*Hurricane.*

- Evacuation planning;
- Evacuation mapping;
- Evacuation education;
- Need more special needs shelters;
- Tree failure causes utility line breakage and power outages;
- Lessons learned from Hurricane Charley need to be passed on to the local jurisdictions;
- Road clearance is a major issue following a hurricane;
- Need more trained special needs shelter staff; and
- Need more trained environmental staff for post-event assessments.

*Thunderstorm and Lightning.*

- Public awareness

*Wildland Fire.*

- Need to reduce human caused fires;
- Limited health resources – need respirators, masks, and oxygen in special needs shelters;
- City of Port St. Lucie has a pattern of scattered growth, increasing the potential for wildland fire;
- Fuel build-up;
- Roof type and construction; and
- PGA and the Reserve are potentially at risk.

*Tornado.*

- Public awareness.

*Extreme Temperature.*

- Need for more special needs shelters; and
- Need for more special needs shelter staff.

*Soil Erosion.*

- Encourage multi-objective, multi-disciplinary approaches to hazard mitigation.

*Agricultural Pest and Disease.*

- Public awareness;

- More training in anthrax, brucellosis, and Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (Mad Cow); and
- Agriculture is a major component of the County economy; a loss in crops could severely impact the local economy.

*Drought.*

- Public awareness; and
- Contamination of wells from increased drawdown.

*Epidemic.*

- Team with Center for Disease Control;
- Public awareness;
- Limited health resources;
- Need for inter-municipal cooperation;
- Need additional beds to meet potential capacity; and
- Better training for health care staff.

*Radiological Accident.*

- Evacuation planning; and
- Emergency response training.

*Power Failure.*

- Public awareness;
- Shelter education; and
- Shelter mapping.

*Hazardous Materials Accident.*

- Evacuation planning;
- Public awareness;
- Need for personal protective equipment;
- Training;
- Railroad carries hazardous materials through multiple jurisdictions;
- Potential impacts in the river where the line crosses Taylor Creek;
- Small business owners need method of legally disposing of small quantity waste;
- Limited awareness of what materials are being transported in and through the County; and
- School's ability to respond to an event, lack of proper resources.

*Transportation Accident.*

- Public awareness;
- Level of preparedness at the Port Authority;
- Coordination between Airport and Port Authority, local authorities, State authorities, and Coast Guard;

- Significant accidents on I-95 or the Turnpike can create major traffic flow problems;
- New Walmart Distribution Center will create increased truck traffic;
- Lack of mapping technology and resources to map hazardous materials storage; and
- Compatibility of parcels with hazardous materials and neighboring parcels.

*Communication Failure.*

- Public awareness.

*Unexploded Military Ordnance.*

- Public awareness.

*Terrorism.*

- Training for local emergency responders; and
- Establish emergency communication system.

*Immigration Crisis.*

- Develop a communication plan;
- Increased need for medical care – need expanded facilities;
- Increased need to monitor living conditions – need environmental staff;
- Increased need for active disease surveillance – need epidemiology staff;
- Increased need for physicals – need clinical staff;
- Increased probability of disease – need mass isolation area;
- Increased sanitary surveillance of watercraft – need more environmental response staff; and
- Increased communication with Coast Guard and law enforcement.

*Societal Alienation.*

- Develop a communication plan; and
- Public awareness.

*Substance Abuse.*

- Public awareness.

*Economic Collapse.*

- Regulations;
- Increased need for public medical care – need expanded facilities;
- Increased need for public medical care – need for additional clinic parking;
- Increased need for shelter care – need public health staff;
- Increased need to monitor living conditions – need environmental staff; and
- Increased need for active disease surveillance – need epidemiology staff.

These concerns, along with information generated from the inventory of local planning documents and ordinances, resulted in the following goals and objectives for all-hazard mitigation planning in St. Lucie County.

The St. Lucie County LMS Steering Committee identified the following goals and objectives. The goals and objectives were selected because of their ability to address community issues that were identified earlier in the mitigation planning process. Goals as defined by FEMA are general guidelines that explain what you want to achieve. They are usually broad policy statements and are long-term in nature. Objectives as defined by FEMA are strategies or implementation steps to attain the identified goals. Unlike goals, objectives are specific and measurable. The goals and objectives define the broad direction of the mitigation strategy and provide the focus for developing and adopting mitigation projects and activities.

Goal 1. Reduce the loss of life and property and potential reoccurrence in areas vulnerable to the effects of natural, societal, and technological hazards.

- Objective 1.1 Reduce flooding and/or wind damage.
- Objective 1.2 Eliminate or retrofit repetitive loss properties.
- Objective 1.3 Retrofit and/or construct new critical facilities.
- Objective 1.4 Protect and restore areas susceptible to erosion.
- Objective 1.5 Improve local roadways to ensure safe, efficient, evacuation.
- Objective 1.6 Reduce the potential threat of fires, wildland and structural.
- Objective 1.7 Increase public awareness of hazards and their impacts.
- Objective 1.8 Evaluate codes, policies, ordinances, and regulations dealing with natural hazards.
- Objective 1.9 Reduce exposure to potential environmental hazards.

Goal 2. Minimize public and private exposure and economic disruption resulting from natural or technological disasters.

- Objective 2.1 Prepare a post-disaster redevelopment plan.
- Objective 2.2 Create disaster-resistant businesses.
- Objective 2.3 Ensure the economic viability of the local business community following a disaster event.

Goal 3. Achieve safe and fiscally sound, sustainable communities.

- Objective 3.1 Ensure that local planning and development matters address hazard mitigation.
- Objective 3.2 Enhance environmental quality and/or function of natural resource.
- Objective 3.3 Prepare informational materials explaining the positive relationship between sustainable communities and disaster-resistant communities.
- Objective 3.4 Create and maintain current an all-hazards database.
- Objective 3.5 Enhance GIS capabilities for use in hazard analysis.

Goal 4. Ensure orderly, effective short-term post-disaster recovery and redevelopment by establishing a program that provides adequate provision of shelters, community health services, food and water, debris removal, and promotes rapid economic recovery following a disaster.

Objective 4.1 Ensure continuity of government.

Objective 4.2 Develop a post-disaster redevelopment plan to ensure orderly recovery and redevelopment from a disaster event.

Objective 4.3 Expand existing shelter inventory and manpower to operate such facilities during disaster events.

Objective 4.4 Test and modify as needed the city and County comprehensive emergency management plans through the use of mock drills.

Goal 5. Optimize the effective use of all available resources.

Objective 5.1 Establish public/private partnerships.

Objective 5.2 Establish procedures that strengthen intergovernmental coordination and cooperation.

#### **6.4 INTEGRATION INTO LOCAL PLANS**

Hazards are pervasive throughout our local communities. While it is understood that the issue of hazard mitigation is a central focus of the unified LMS, there are other planning mechanisms where this important issue should be addressed. Issues of land use, infrastructure, and environment have been addressed in local comprehensive plans; however, few plans properly address the impact disasters may have on existing and future development. Disasters have enormous physical and social impacts on the community. Other types of planning mechanisms where hazards should be addressed include County and city CEMPs, Continuity of Operations Plans, (COOPs), flood mitigation plans, State Housing Initiative Partnership Program (SHIP), and Local Development Regulations. Disaster planning is relevant to historic resources, waterfront development, community redevelopment, and low income neighborhoods where substandard housing is typically found has resulted due to use of poor construction methods and materials, and/or lack of adequate maintenance by the homeowner.

From a regulatory standpoint, the local government comprehensive plans administered under the provisions of Section 163.3161, F.S. are the cornerstone of growth management in Florida. Being supported by force of law, local comprehensive plans are extremely important vehicles to implement hazard mitigation. Local governments under Section 163.3161, F.S. are required to update their capital improvement lists annually. The projects included on the LMS PPL also should be incorporated into the local comprehensive plan capital improvement elements. This should be accomplished annually in keeping with the annual update of the jurisdiction's CIE list of projects.

As described in **Section 6.7, Continuing Public Involvement**, the LMS Steering Committee will meet quarterly. It is anticipated that one of the quarterly meetings will focus on integrating hazard mitigation into comprehensive plans. At that meeting, ideas will be shared about how successes were achieved and obstacles overcome.

#### **6.4.1 The Integration Process**

The following process will be followed to ensure widespread integration of hazard mitigation into local planning mechanisms in St. Lucie County.

- 1) A letter from the LMS chair, along with a letter of support from the chair of the elected body will be transmitted to local planning directors inviting each to attend an LMS Steering Committee meeting to discuss ways in which hazard mitigation can be best integrated into planning matters.
- 2) Meeting of the LMS Steering Committee is held. This phase could be said to be the institutionalization of hazard mitigation into the local planning and development.
- 3) Each director will be asked to work with their planning staff to develop a strategy to integrate hazard mitigation into their planning programs and to evaluate whether their regulations address hazard mitigation, and if found to be lacking, identify several possible alternatives.
- 4) At the next meeting of the LMS, each director will report their situation to the LMS Steering Committee.
- 5) Identified changes will be made through the plan amendment process. Refer to Section 163.3187, F.S. and Chapter 9J-11, F.A.C. Local governments can seek plan amendments twice each year. This is the preferred approach because the formal, legally-mandated Evaluation and Appraisal Report process in which local comprehensive plans undergo extensive review and scrutiny and modification will not be triggered until 2008 for St. Lucie County and 2010 for the municipalities.

A similar process as described in points 1-4 above will be taken by the LMS Steering Committee to study the feasibility and implementation mechanics relative to other planning processes active in the County such as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, important in addressing transportation matters, and SHIP, which is active with low-income housing issues. Historical resources also will be evaluated since there are a number of historical structures in risk areas in the County.

#### **6.5 PLAN MONITORING**

Once the LMS is adopted by participating local governments, monitoring the progress of plan implementation is extremely important. It is through the monitoring process that the Steering Committee can determine whether or not implementation is occurring as originally envisioned. Determining whether or not the implementation timeframes are being met is critical. The monitoring process may be more important in identifying why actions/initiatives are not occurring. The identification of obstacles to implementation also is important. Funding cutbacks, unsuccessful competitive grant applications, and staff changes (e.g., key individual resigns or reassigned to new job, unexpected design problems, unexpected complexity in securing permits, lose commitment of partner agencies/organizations) can have significant impacts on implementing the LMS. Certain events or circumstances can alter the traditional means of operation, as was the case following September 11<sup>th</sup>. Changes such as this make plan monitoring important in keeping the LMS current.

### 6.5.1 Process

- Step 1 Each quarter, the designated contact for all mitigation projects or initiatives identified on the PPL will report progress to the LMS Coordinator. For the first and third quarter, the point of contact will complete an Individual Project Progress Report (**Form #1**) and submit it to the LMS Coordinator. For the second and fourth quarters, an informal progress check-in will take place between the project point of contact and the LMS Coordinator. The point of contact also will be responsible for submitting any supporting documentation such as newspaper articles or other relevant media. Step 2 Based on the submitted progress report forms and progress check-ins, the LMS Coordinator will complete quarterly progress reports for the overall LMS program and present it to the elected boards of the County and municipalities.
- Step 3 At the end of each year, the LMS Coordinator will prepare an Annual LMS Report based on (**Form #2**). The Annual Report will be presented to the elected boards of the County and municipalities. It is important that the Annual Report, not just be placed on the consent agenda of each local government, but a formal presentation be made where, not only is the status reported, but the elected officials have an opportunity to ask questions about the program.
- Step 4 Besides reporting to local governments, the LMS Coordinator and/or Chair of the LMS Steering Committee will be available to make similar presentations to private sector organizations, non-profit organizations (e.g., Council on Aging, chambers of commerce) and community organizations (e.g., Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions).

## 6.6 UPDATING THE PLAN

There are two updating processes connected to the LMS. One describes how the PPL is updated annually. A detailed description of the PPL updating procedure is provided below. The second updating process, involves the 5-year update of the entire LMS.

### 6.6.1 Project Prioritization List

At the heart of the LMS is the PPL (see **Table 6.1**). The PPL is a rank order of priority projects that if implemented will result in a more disaster-resistant community. Because projects are completed, new needs surface, new funding opportunities arise, and dramatic events occur that affect priorities, it is important that the PPL be a dynamic document. For this reason, the window to submit projects to the PPL will always be open. All applicants desiring to have their project on the PPL must submit their proposed project utilizing **Form #3**. The following sections identify the multi-step prioritization methodology. Potential LMS mitigation projects and activities were evaluated based on the following four criteria:

- 1) Which goal(s) the project addresses;
- 2) Which hazard(s) the project addresses;

FORM #1

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY  
UNIFIED LOCAL MITIGATION STRATEGY**

**INDIVIDUAL PROJECT  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_ PPL Ranking: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project/Initiative Description:

Status of Progress:

Problems/Obstacles & Proposed Corrective Action:

6-14

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Report Preparer: \_\_\_\_\_ Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone #: \_\_\_\_\_

Send to:  
LMS Project Coordinator  
St. Lucie County Community Development Department  
2300 Virginia Avenue  
**Fort Pierce, Florida 34982-5652**

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_



**FORM #2 (Continued).**

**NEW PROJECTS (1/1/05 – 12/31/05)**

<b>PPL Ranking</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Purpose of Project</b>	<b>Funding Source(s)</b>	<b>Anticipated Problems/ Solutions</b>	<b>Start/End Dates</b>

Table 6.1. St. Lucie County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Prioritization List.

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	1	Virginia Avenue Basin (Mayflower Canal & U.S. Highway 1 crossing) – Upgrade/replace culvert crossing of the Mayflower Canal and U.S. Highway 1 drainage	750,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Taxing District</li> <li>• Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)</li> <li>• Disaster Recovery Initiative (DRI)</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• Flood Mitigation Assistance Program (FMA)</li> <li>• Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)</li> <li>• Local General Revenues</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.1	2	Phase 2, St. Lucie Gardens Stormwater Improvement – Permits and land acquisition	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	3	Phase 1, St. Lucie Gardens Stormwater Improvement – Design of stormwater system	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	4	Lakewood Park – Pipe Retrofit – Replacing various pipes within roadways that are currently deficient	175,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	5	Avenue Q/12 <sup>th</sup> Street Basin – Replace and upgrade 12 <sup>th</sup> Street outfall and other main conveyance systems	300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.3 & 4.3	6	Special Needs Shelter Retrofit – Roof repairs for Civic Center, which is designated as a special needs shelter for St. Lucie County	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3 & 4.3	7	Structural Improvements to School Shelters – Installing shutters on designated windows, pre-wiring for generators and construction of enclosures to protect generators from high winds and debris	180,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #6</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	8	N-6 (Header Canal – Pump Station No. 2) – Install automatic operation controls on Pump Station No. 2 at the south end of Header Canal	12,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• FMA</li> <li>• Flood Control Projects</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	9	N-5 (Header Canal – Pump Station No. 1) – Install automatic operation controls on Pump Station No. 1 at the north end of Header Canal	12,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	
1.1	10	(Moore’s Creek Canal Basin) – Replacement/upgrading of storm system and expansion of the canal to provide additional flooding protection by increasing conveyance capacity	6,900,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.1	11	Phase 1, St. Lucie Plaza Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	12	Phase 1, Harmony Heights Plaza Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	13	Phase 2, St. Lucie Plaza Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	14	Phase 2, Sunland Gardens Plaza Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	15	N-4 (Fitting Structure Gates) – Install automatic controls on the “Fitting Structures” gates	95,000.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	
1.1	16	Phase 1, Sunland Gardens Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	17	Emergency Operation Center Renovation – Continued structural and contents upgrade to the City’s Emergency Operation Center	80,000.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Flood Control Projects</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.7 & 1.10	18	Emergency Communication Vehicle – Purchase and equip an emergency communication vehicle in order to provide continual broadcast on television during an emergency event	300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Revenue Sources</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Grant</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	19	Sunrise Mitigation Site – Provides stormwater storage and treatment for a thousand-plus acre drainage basin. Provides environmental benefit to the estuary of the North St. Lucie River and flood control to the drainage basin	3,800,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge 21, Floodplain</li> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• Conservation Technical Assistance</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	20	Phase 3, St. Lucie Gardens Stormwater Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	3,900,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	21	Phase 2, Harmony Heights Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	22	N-3 (Gordy Road Structure Gates) – Install automatic controls on the “Gordy Road Structure” gates	130,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	23	Phase 2, South 7 <sup>th</sup> Street Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	25,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	24	Phase 1, Carlton Road Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	50,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	25	Phase 1, Paradise Park Drainage Improvements – Design stormwater project	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	26	Phase 2, Carlton Road Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisitions for stormwater project	25,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	27	Phase 1, Silver Lake Park Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	75,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	28	Phase 1, Wilbure Subdivision Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	75,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	29	Phase 2, Paradise Park Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	250,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	30	Phase 2, Silver Lake Park Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	31	Phase 3, South 7 <sup>th</sup> Street Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	175,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	32	Phase 1, Bluefield Road Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	33	Phase 2, Bluefield Road Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	25,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	34	White City/Citrus Avenue Drainage Study – Drainage improvements for a severely flood prone subdivision of fifty homesites, on septic tank and well system	1,500,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	35	Phase 1, South 7 <sup>th</sup> Street Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	36	Phase 2, Wilbure Subdivision Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	37	Phase 2, Trowbridge Road Drainage Improvements – Permits and land acquisition for stormwater project	200,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	38	Phase 3, Harmony Heights Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	2,650,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	39	Westmoreland Blvd./Gatlin Culvert – Drainage improvements to a section of Westmoreland Blvd. that is subject to flooding during heavy rains	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	
1.1	40	Phase 1, Trowbridge Road Drainage Improvements – Design of stormwater project	50,000	• Potential funding sources same as Project #1		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	41	Indian River Estates Drainage Improvements – Drainage improvements for a severely flood prone subdivision of 1,800 single family homesites, on septic tanks and wells	4,800,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	42	Phase 3, Wilbure Subdivision Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	875,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	43	Ten Mile Creek (Regional Attenuation Facility) – joint project between St. Lucie County, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and South Florida Water Management District to construct a regional storage reservoir for stormwater within a flood prone river flood plain area affecting approximately 50 homesites	30,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge 21, Floodplain</li> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• Florida Communities Trust</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	44	Phase 3, Paradise Park Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	2,650,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	45	Phase 3, Silver Lake Park Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	875,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	46	Phase 3, St. Lucie Plaza Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	2,650,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	47	Phase 3, Sunland Gardens Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	2,650,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	48	N-2 (North Emergency Relief Canal [NERC]) – Install a 72-inch diameter culvert and control gate between the NERC and C-25 of the South Florida Water Management District to allow gravity discharge from the NERC to C-25	40,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	
1.1	49	N-1 (Canal No. 86) – Install an 84-inch diameter culvert and control gate between the south end of the North St. Lucie River Water Control District Canal No. 86 to C-24 for gravity discharge	50,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	
1.1	50	Gatlin Blvd. Box Culvert – Installation of a box culvert at the E-8 Canal in an area subject to constant flooding	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	51	Renovation to EOC Building – Remodeling and increasing the capacity of the St. Lucie County Emergency Operations Center	7,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Operations Center Grant – FEMA</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1 & 1.5	52	Elevation of Walton Road – Elevate Walton Road between the Fire Station and shopping center to alleviate flood during heavy rains	200,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.1 & 1.3	53	Zullo Street Pump Storage Facility – Installation of a pump station in an area that is subject to flood during heavy rains causing, access problems	1,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.5	54	Roundabout Feasibility Study – south Indian River Drive/Midway Rd. – Fund study to determine necessity for a roundabout to serve as traffic control and bank stabilization and evacuation route	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Local General Revenues</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• FEMA Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.5	55	South 25 <sup>th</sup> Street – Phase II (Edwards to Midway) – Road widening from Edwards to Midway, a north/south evacuation corridor	1,764,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	56	F-2 (Canal No. 21 culvert replacement) – Replace the existing 36-inch diameter gated culvert connection between Canal No. 21 and C-25 of the South Florida Water Management District with a 72-inch diameter weir-control gate	40,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce Farms Water Control District	
1.1	57	Phase 3, Trowbridge Road Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	750,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	58	Relief Culvert in Section 39 – Installation of a gated culvert between two drainage ponds	250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.5	59	Roundabout Feasibility Study – south Indian River Drive/Savanna Road – Study on necessity for roundabout for traffic control and bank stabilization	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Local General Revenues</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• FEMA Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.5	60	Roundabout Feasibility Study – south Indian River Drive/Walton Road – Study on necessity for roundabout for traffic control and bank stabilization	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as Project #59</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	61	Phase 3, Bluefield Road Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	425,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	62	Phase 3, Carlton Road Drainage Improvements – Construction of stormwater project	425,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	63	Airosa Culverts at Eyerly – Replacement of culverts at Airosos & Eyerly to a larger sized culvert due to severe flood after heavy rains	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1	64	F-1 (Water Control Structure No. 1) – Installation of electric-powered openers for the radial gates on Water Control Structure No. 1	45,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce Farms Water Control District	
1.1	65	Turnpike Diversion Ditch – Creation of a diversion ditch along the west side of the Florida Turnpike, creating an outfall from the E-5 Canal to the C-24 Canal	750,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.3 & 4.3	66	School Shelter Retrofit – Retrofitting current school hurricane shelters with generators, hardening facilities, increasing capacity	25,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #6</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	67	Comprehensive Drainage Plan – Identify the sub-basin, determine necessary improvements, and long-term maintenance of stormwater within the Village	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• Flood Plain Management Services</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Planning Assistance to States (Section 22)</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	68	Traffic Operations Hurricane Shutters – Installation of hurricane shutters at the Traffic Operations building	15,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	69	Road & Bridge Office Hurricane Shutters – Installation of hurricane shutters for the main office at Road & Bridges	15,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #68</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.6	70	Acquisition of two Heavy Rescue Vehicles – Acquire and equip two heavy rescue vehicles	380,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County Fire District	
1.3	71	N-7 (Radial Gates) – Replace the radial gates on the “Fitting Structure” with stainless steel gates	110,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #8</li> </ul>		North St. Lucie Water Control District	
1.3 & 4.3	72	Special Needs Shelter – Design and construct an additional Special Needs Shelter for the citizens of St. Lucie County	2,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #68</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	73	Lein Ditch Pipe Replacement – Replace the pipes within the Lein Ditch	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.5	74	West Virginia Corridor – Design and construct an additional roadway corridor for evacuation and relief of Prima Vista Blvd. traffic congestion	50,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency Relief Program</li> <li>• Economic Development Public Works Impact Program – Economic Development Administration (EDA)</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• General Fund Revenue</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.1	75	Easy Street – Replacement of all cross pipes at Buchanan Dr., Pinetree Dr., Palmetto Dr., Silver Oak Dr., Seagrape Dr., Myrtle Dr., Birch Dr., Hickory Dr., Raintree Trail, Tangelo Dr., Spruce Dr., Cassia Dr., Bamboo Dr., Balsam Dr., Papaya Dr., and Yucca Dr.	150,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1 & 1.5	76	Rouse Road - Installation of paving and drainage improvements to Rouse Road	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	77	South 35 <sup>th</sup> Street & Cortez Blvd. – Replacement of failing pipes	120,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.5	78	Road Restoration and Improvement - Initiation of a study to evaluate the condition of roads within the Village and then prioritize road restoration projects to ensure the most deteriorated facilities are brought into conformance	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency Relief Program</li> <li>• Economic Development Public Works Impact Program – EDA</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• General Fund Revenue</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.1	79	Merritt Ditch (U.S. Highway 1 @ Burger King) – Retrofitting failing cross pipes	350,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	80	Mobile Command Center – Acquire and equip a mobile command center that can be moved to safety and ensure response team availability	300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.3	81	Verada Ditch & Lucero Drive Crossing – Replacement of twin 60-inch pipes	210,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	82	Merritt Ditch & Sunrise Blvd. Crossing – Replacement of 60-inch pipe	75,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	83	Merritt Ditch & Elm Street Crossing – Replacement of 60-inch pipe	75,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	84	Airosa Ditch Crossing & Lucero Drive – Replacement of twin 48-inch pipes	175,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	85	Mariposa Ditch – Redesign and reroute of failing ditch	750,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
4.1	86	Large Scale Disaster Drill Exercises – Acquire funds to conduct large scale exercises	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• State Disaster Preparedness Grants</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	87	Lakewood Park (Remove Control Structures) – Remove control structures so water can drain into the Fort Pierce Farms canal system as well as increase the drainage rate into the canal system from 1 inch per hour to 3 inches per hour	150,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	88	Orange Avenue & Pulitzer Road (Culvert Replacement) – Replacement of failing cross pipes	125,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
3.2	89	Natural Heritage Reserve – Establish the Natural Heritage Reserve utilizing grant funds to purchase approximately 76.55 acres of land	1,895,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge 21, Floodplain</li> <li>• Florida Communities Trust Program</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.10	90	AM Radios for Communication – Acquire AM radio transmitters for information dispersal	300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	91	South Indian River Drive (Drainage Improvements) – Replace existing pipes with new pipes and catch basins	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.6 & 1.9	92	Municipal Water Service – Provide municipal water services to the residents of St. Lucie Village	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.3	93	Acquisition of Emergency Generators and Pumps – Acquire funding to purchase emergency generators and pumps (6 to 12 inches)	240,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.6	94	Infrared Technology – Purchase infrared technology for fire district	300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• Firefighters Assistance Grant</li> </ul>			

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.9	95	Municipal Sewer Service - Install a municipal sewer service into the Village	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Hazard Mitigation Grant Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.1	96	National Register Properties Damage Assessment – Assess the exposure to damage by any type of disaster for properties located within the Village’s Historic District	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Historic Preservation Fund Grants-in-Aid</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
3.1	97	Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan – Complete a study to determine the appropriate process to handle emergency management in the Village	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• State Disaster Preparedness Grants</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.3	98	Mobile Command Post – Acquire and equip a mobile command center that can be immobilized to any area within the County	80,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	99	5-year survey – Survey and replace the equipment on the 5-year replacement list	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.3	100	Right of Way Culvert Replacement Project – Replace drainage right-of-way culverts with corrugated metal pipes on failing cross roads	2,800,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.6	101	Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan – Research and prepare a wildland fire mitigation plan	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• Fire Grant Program – FEMA</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.6	102	Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan – City of Port St. Lucie – Preparation of a Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan as part of the Comprehensive Emergency Operations Plan	100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• Fire Grant Program - FEMA</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
4.1	103	Transfer of Public Records – Transfer of public records from paper to an optical disc	40,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Fort Pierce	
1.10	104	Acquire Radio Communication Equipment – Acquire (two hand-held and one base unit) radio communication equipment	2,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Grant</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
3.1	105	Comprehensive Plan – Review and prepare revisions to the Village’s Comprehensive Plan	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Plain Management Services</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Planning Assistance to States (Section 22)</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• State Disaster Preparedness Grants</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	106	Pet/Small Animal Shelter – Design and construct a pet/small animal shelter	1,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• Wallace Global Fund</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
4.1	107	Microfilming – Microfilming municipal records and one-of-a-kind drawings	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard Mitigation Grant Program</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.4	108	Rivergate (Erosion Control Devices) – Develop and install erosion control barriers along the entire shore of Rivergate Waterway	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• Conservation Plant Material Centers</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.3	109	Recreation Building Upgrades – Retrofit current buildings in parks to current codes (garages, doors)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.6	110	Prescribed Burns	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
4.1	111	Vital Records Protection	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.6	112	Lightning Devices in Parks	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
4.1	113	ID Badges for all City Employees – Incorporate a side for “Priority One Clearing” for immediate access to any type of disaster area	4,075	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> <li>• State Disaster Preparedness Grants</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
3.1	114	Community Rating System Designation – Apply and establish the Village as a participant of the Community Rating System for insurance reductions	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Trust Fund</li> <li>• Local General Revenue</li> </ul>		St. Lucie Village	
1.1	115	Employee Hurricane Shutters – Coordinate loans for the acquisition of hurricane shutters for city employees’ personal homes	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• Hurricane Program</li> <li>• Property Improvement Loan Insurance for Improving All Existing Structures and Building of New Nonresidential Structures (Title I)</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		Port St. Lucie	
1.1	116	Stormwater Master Plan – design and implement a city-wide stormwater master plan to address flooding concerns and plan for future projects	185,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Fort Pierce	
1.6	117	Horizontal Wells – Provide horizontal wells throughout the County in order to provide access to water during emergencies	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Florida Water Management District</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
3.2	118	North Fork – St. Lucie River Acquisition and Restoration – Acquire properties along the North Fork of the St. Lucie River and its tributaries to restore the natural flood plain in St. Lucie County	13,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• Florida Communities Trust</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.2	119	Repetitive Loss Inventory Buyout – Acquire properties located on the repetitive loss inventory to eliminate future flooding of structure	2,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Grant</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	120	Citrus Avenue Basin Retrofit – Construct a stormwater treatment facility for an 80-acre drainage basin	1,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Fort Pierce	
1.1 & 3.2	121	Indrio Blueway Buffer Acquisition – St. Lucie County – Acquisition of a 105-acre site located adjacent to the Indian River Lagoon and Wilcox Road and provide for access and restoration of the site to decrease future flooding hazards	1,800,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDBG</li> <li>• DRI</li> <li>• Emergency Rehabilitation of Flood Control Works</li> <li>• Florida Communities Trust</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• National Flood Mitigation Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant</li> <li>• Public Assistance</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.1 & 3.2	122	10 Mile Creek Acquisition and Restoration – Acquire properties along 10 Mile Creek to restore the natural flood plain in St. Lucie County	4,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #120</li> </ul>		St. Lucie County	
1.1	123	Watershed “B” – Construct improvements to the E-8 Canal System and E-8 drainage basin to reduce flooding hazard	940,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
1.3	124	Public Works Facility – Construct a new Public Works Facility adjacent to the Florida Turnpike	3,500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance Trust Fund</li> <li>• Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Grant</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
1.1	125	Watershed “A” – West E-5 Improvements	500,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
1.1	126	Watershed “A” – West E-84 Improvements – Improvements to the E-5 and E-84 drainage canals and E-84 drainage basin to reduce flooding hazard	1,210,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
1.1	127	Watershed “A” – East – Installation of culverts, sluice gates, and retaining wall to connect the A-1 lake to A-7 lake in the Watershed “A” – East Drainage Basin	600,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
1.1	128	St. Lucie North – Construct improvements to the C-104, C-105, C-106, C-107, and C-108 drainage canals to reduce flooding hazards	250,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding sources same as Project #1</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	

Table 6.1. (Continued).

Supports Objective	Project Identification Number	Project Description	Project Cost (\$)	Potential Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Date of Completion	Implementation Responsibility	Action
1.3	129	Cameo Boulevard/Turtle Run Park Debris Storage Area – Develop/Identify an area for emergency management debris removal and storage, including construction of infrastructure to reach site	40,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Emergency Management</li> <li>• General Local Revenue</li> <li>• Preparedness Assistance Trust Fund</li> </ul>		City of Port St. Lucie	
2.3	unranked	Collect data for infrastructure and critical facilities	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDM</li> <li>• EMPA</li> </ul>	2010	St. Lucie County	
2.3	unranked	Collect data to improve future loss estimation efforts	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDM</li> <li>• EMPA</li> </ul>	2006	St. Lucie County	
1.7	unranked	Purchase and equip an outreach van	To be added later	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDM</li> <li>• EMPA</li> <li>• HMGP</li> </ul>	2006	St. Lucie County Health Department	
1.9	unranked	Work with solid waste to create small business hazardous materials disposal amnesty day	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Emergency Planning Committee Funding</li> </ul>	2006	St. Lucie County	
1.1	unranked	Identify trees that may fail during high winds	To be added later	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDM</li> <li>• EMPA</li> <li>• HMGP</li> </ul>	2010	City of Fort Pierce	
1.1	unranked	Identify areas that may require Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) revisions or amendments due to mitigation or development	To be added later	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDM</li> <li>• EMPA</li> <li>• HMGP</li> <li>• FMA</li> </ul>	2010	St. Lucie County	

<sup>1</sup> Availability of funding depends upon funding cycles, and prerequisites such as a disaster event.

CDBG = Community Development Block Grant.

DRI = Disaster Recovery Initiative.

EMPA = Emergency Management Preparedness Assistance.

FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency.

FMA = Flood Mitigation Assistance.

HMGP = Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

N/A = not available.

PDM = Pre-Disaster Mitigation.

## St. Lucie County Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Mitigation Measure (Project or Initiative) Proposal Form

Municipality(s) or Agency(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fax #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Estimated Cost of Project or Initiative \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the proposed mitigation measure as well as the population that will benefit:

---



---



---



---

What is the community's loss exposure **before** this mitigation effort? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What will be the community's loss exposure **after** this mitigation effort? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What is the estimated cost per benefited individual?  
 (project cost/# of benefited individuals) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What is the project's benefit cost ratio? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Which LMS goal(s) does the mitigation project address? Mark with an **X**.

Goal	X
To reduce the loss of life and property and potential reoccurrence in areas vulnerable to the effects of natural, technological, and societal hazards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
To minimize public and private exposure and economic disruption in the event of natural, technological, and societal hazards	<input type="checkbox"/>
To achieve safe and fiscally sound, sustainable communities through thoughtful long-range planning of the natural and man-made environment	<input type="checkbox"/>
To ensure orderly, effective short-term recovery and redevelopment by establishing a program that provides adequate provision of shelters, community health services, food and water, debris removal, and promotes rapid economic recovery following a disaster	<input type="checkbox"/>
To optimize the effective use of all available resources by establishing public/private partnerships, and promote intergovernmental coordination and cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please return completed forms to: Cyndi Snay, LMS Coordinator  
 2300 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 34982-5652  
 Phone: (772) 462-2822, Fax: (772) 462-1581  
 Snayc@stlucieco.gov

## St. Lucie County Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Mitigation Measure (Project or Initiative) Proposal Form

Which LMS hazard(s) does the mitigation project address? Mark with an **X**.

HAZARD	<b>X</b>	HAZARD	<b>X</b>	HAZARD	<b>X</b>
Agricultural Pest & Disease		Civil Disturbance		Communication Failure	
Drought		Economic Collapse		Epidemic	
Erosion		Extreme Temperature		Flooding	
Hazardous Materials Accident		Hurricane		Immigration Crisis	
Lightning		Power Failure		Radiological Accident	
Seismic		Substance Abuse		Terrorism	
Thunderstorm		Tornado		Transportation System Accident	
Unexploded Military Ordnance		Wellfield Contamination		Wildland Fire	

Contained within:

The Jurisdiction's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan?      yes      no  
 Specific Location \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jurisdiction's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan?      yes      no  
 Specific Location \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other local planning document (which one?) \_\_\_\_\_)yes      no  
 Other local budgeting document (which one?) \_\_\_\_\_)yes      no

Does this project address issues related to public health, safety, and welfare?      yes      no

Nature of critical facility benefited by this mitigation measure?

Primary                  Secondary                  Not Applicable

What is the life expectancy of the proposed mitigation measure? \_\_\_\_\_ years

Is there demonstrated public support for this measure? (attach documentation)

Has a public meeting or hearing been held (attach documentation)

Amount of match (funds or in-kind services) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Source of Match)

Date funding will be available? \_\_\_\_\_

**Sponsor(s)** \_\_\_\_\_  
 NAME ALL SPONSORS OF THIS PROJECT, WHETHER OR NOT THEY WILL CONTRIBUTE FUNDS

If funding were immediately available, how long would it take until the community began receiving benefits from this mitigative measure? \_\_\_\_\_ years.

**Respond as completely as possible; attach additional pages as required.**

Please return completed forms to: Cyndi Snay, LMS Coordinator  
 2300 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 34982-5652  
 Phone: (772) 462-2822, Fax: (772) 462-1581  
 Snayc@stlucieco.gov

- 3) Whether or not the project is supported in a plan or policy of the jurisdiction (i.e., Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, etc.);
- 4) Does the project address an immediate threat to public health, safety, and welfare; and
- 5) Is the project's benefit cost ratio greater than 1?

In order to evaluate the projects, the Steering Committee had to first establish the priority goals and hazards using the following methodology. The process listed below will be followed during each update of the LMS.

Each Steering Committee member ranks the goals and hazards below using the ranking methodology described below.

**6.6.1.1 Prioritization Process**

Please prioritize the following LMS goals using the following methodology. Rank St. Lucie County LMS goals, by placing a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 next to the goals according to the following priority ranking. Place a 1 next to the goal with the highest priority in the County. Place a 2 next to the goal with the second highest priority in the County. Place a 3 next to the goal with the third highest priority, etc.

Goal	Rank
Reduce the loss of life and property and potential reoccurrence in areas vulnerable to the effects of natural, technological, and societal hazards	
Plan ahead to facilitate orderly and timely recovery of a community following a disaster event	
Achieve safe and fiscally sound, sustainable communities	
Ensure orderly, effective short-term post-disaster recovery and redevelopment by establishing a program that provides adequate provision of shelters, community health services, food and water, debris removal, and promotes rapid economic recovery following a disaster	
Optimize the effective use of all available resources	

Please prioritize the following hazards using the following methodology. Rank the top five hazards facing St. Lucie County by placing a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 next to the hazard according to the following priority ranking. Place a 1 next to the hazard with the highest priority in the County. Place a 2 next to the hazard with the second highest priority in the County. Place a 3 next to the hazard with the third highest priority. Place a 4 next to the hazard with the fourth highest priority. Place a 5 next to the hazard with the fifth highest priority. Leave all other hazards blank.

Hazards	Rank
Agricultural Pest & Disease	
Civil Disturbance	
Communication Failure	
Drought	

Hazards	Rank
Economic Collapse	
Epidemic	
Erosion	
Extreme Temperature	
Flooding	
Hazardous Materials Accident	
Hurricane/Tropical Storm	
Immigration Crisis	
Military Ordnance	
Power Failure	
Radiological Hazards	
Seismic (Sinkholes, Earthquakes, Dam/Levee Failure)	
Societal Alienation	
Substance Abuse	
Terrorism/Sabotage	
Thunderstorm/Lightning	
Tornado	
Transportation System Accident	
Wellfield Contamination	
Wildland Fire	

**6.6.1.2 Prioritization Scoring**

The rankings above will be translated into scores so that priority can be determined. Once the Steering Committee has ranked the goals and hazards, staff will convert the rankings into numerical scores as follows:

Goals

- Rank #1 – 5 points
- Rank #2 – 4 points
- Rank #3 – 3 points
- Rank #4 – 2 points
- Rank #5 – 1 point

The goal with the most points will be the highest priority goal, the goal with the second highest points will be the second highest priority goal, and the goal with the lowest points will be the third priority goal.

Hazards

- Rank #1 – 50 points
- Rank #2 – 40 points
- Rank #3 – 30 points
- Rank #4 – 20 points
- Rank #5 – 10 points

The rankings given to each hazard will be converted into the points listed above. The total points for each hazard will be added. The hazard with the highest score, will be

the highest priority hazard and so on. Those hazards that do not receive any rankings will be grouped together as “non-immediate” priority hazards.

### **6.6.1.3 Project Evaluation**

The process above results in a prioritized list of goals and hazards; from here, the projects or mitigation activities can be evaluated and ranked based on the following criteria:

- 1) Which goal(s) the project addresses;
- 2) Which hazard(s) the project addresses;
- 3) Whether or not the project is supported in a plan or policy of the jurisdiction (i.e., Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, etc.);
- 4) Does the project address an immediate threat to public health, safety, and welfare; and
- 5) Is the project's benefit cost ratio greater than 1?

Any organization interested in submitting a project for the PPL must complete a project submission form. The form will include questions regarding the above criteria. Proposers will be asked to identify which goal(s) the project addresses, which hazard(s) the project addresses, cite supporting evidence from other plans, and document how the project addresses the issues of public health, safety, and welfare. CDD staff will apply the criteria listed above to projects that are up for consideration for the LMS PPL. Each project will be scored according to the following point system. Projects will be listed on the PPL ranked according to their total evaluation score. The project with the most points will be ranked first.

The Steering Committee prioritized the plan goals as follows:

- 1) To reduce the loss of life and property and potential reoccurrence in areas vulnerable to the effects of natural, technological, and societal hazards.
- 2) To ensure orderly, effective short-term recovery and redevelopment by establishing a program that provides adequate provision of shelters, community health services, food and water, debris removal, and promotes rapid economic recovery following a disaster.
- 3) To minimize public and private exposure to and economic disruption in the event of natural, technological, and societal hazards.
- 4) To achieve safe and fiscally sound, sustainable communities through thoughtful long-range planning of the natural and man-made environment.
- 5) To optimize the effectiveness use of all available resource by establishing public/private partnerships, and promote intergovernmental coordination and cooperation.

The Steering Committee prioritized the hazards as follows:

- 1) Hurricane/Tropical Storm
- 2) Radiological Hazard
- 3) Flooding
- 4) Tornado
- 4) Wellfield Contamination
- 5) Hazardous Materials Accident

- 5) Power Failure
- 6) Wildland Fire
- 7) Communication Failure
- 7) Epidemic
- 7) Transportation System Accident
- 8) Drought
- 8) Erosion
- 8) Terrorism/Sabotage
  - Agricultural Pest & Disease;
  - Civil Disturbance;
  - Economic Collapse;
  - Extreme Temperatures;
  - Immigration Crisis;
  - Military Ordnance;
  - Seismic (Sinkholes, Earthquakes, Dam/Levee Failure);
  - Societal Alienation;
  - Substance Abuse; and
  - Thunderstorm/Lightning.

Bulleted hazards indicate that no priority score was given, therefore, the hazard is a “non-immediate priority” hazard.

*Project Scoring.*

Project addresses:

- Multiple goals = 10 points
- Highest priority goal = 5 points
- 2<sup>nd</sup> highest priority goal = 4 points
- 3<sup>rd</sup> highest priority goal = 3 points
- 4<sup>th</sup> highest priority goal = 2 points
- 5<sup>th</sup> highest priority goal = 1 point

Project addresses:

- Multi-hazard project = 10 points
- 1<sup>st</sup> Highest priority hazard = 5 points
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Highest priority hazard = 4 points
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Highest priority hazard = 3 points
- 4<sup>th</sup> Highest priority hazard = 2 points
- 5<sup>th</sup> Highest priority hazard = 1 point
- Addresses a “non immediate” hazard priority = 0 points

Project is:

- Supported in multiple plans or policies = 10 points
- Supported in a plan or policy = 5 points
- Not supported in any plan or policy = 0 points

Addresses Issues of Public Health, Safety, and Welfare (PHSW)

- Project addresses PHSW = 5 points
- Project does not address PHSW = 0 points

Project's benefit cost ratio is greater than 1:	
Project ratio is greater than 2	= 10 points
Project ratio is greater than 1 but less than 2	= 5 points
Project ratio is less than 1	= project is no longer considered for listing on the PPL

The maximum score for a project is 45 points, which would be received by a project that addresses multiple goals and hazards, is supported by multiple plans and policies, addresses issues related to PHSW, and has a benefit cost ratio greater than 2.

The scores for the five criteria will be added together. The total scores for each of the five criteria will be the bases of the ranked list of projects. The projects with the highest scores will be ranked highest on the PPL.

After the total scores have been determined, a revised PPL will be developed by listing the projects in ranked order according to score.

#### **6.6.1.4 Tie Break Methodology**

This project prioritization methodology will most likely result in tie scores for projects that address the same hazards. For instance, most stormwater management projects will address the same goals and hazards, resulting in tie ranking scores. Because of this, it is important to develop a tie-break methodology.

For projects with identical ranking scores that address different hazards, the project that addresses the highest priority hazard shall be ranked higher. For instance, if a tornado project and a hazardous materials accident project received identical ranking scores, the tornado project would be ranked higher because it's overall hazard priority is higher than hazardous materials accidents.

For projects with identical ranking scores that address the same hazards, the benefit cost ratio will be used to break the tie.

#### **6.6.2 Comprehensive Update**

The LMS planning process is dynamic and results in the development of a set of prioritized projects and initiatives with the aim of mitigating hazard impacts. To ensure this Local Hazard Mitigation Strategy remains consistent with current community issues and characteristics, it is important that it be periodically reviewed and updated.

In developing this updating process, three key sources were consulted to shape the process and procedures developed herein: Section 163.3191, F.S.; the evaluation and appraisal process of local government comprehensive plans; the American Red Cross, Ten-Step Informative Model; and the Federal Emergency Management Agency's DMA2K local mitigation planning requirements. A key objective in the development of the process was to keep it from being excessively bureaucratic and cumbersome.

The LMS update process will occur on a 5-year cycle as is recommended by FEMA's DMA2K. The Steering Committee indicated that there needed to be some abbreviated reassessment of the strategy following a Disaster Declaration.

The LMS update procedures will be initiated and carried out by the LMS Coordinator. Both the regular 5-year strategy update processes, as well as the abbreviated review process applicable following a Disaster Declaration, are depicted in **Figure 6.2**.

#### **6.6.2.1 Regular LMS Update Procedures**

The regular updating process will occur every 5 years. The administrative steps, as described below, constitute the procedures that will be followed.

- Step 1 The LMS Coordinator will activate the update process in January of the fourth year of the update cycle by notifying each member of the Steering Committee of an initial organizational meeting. At that time, the CDD requests information updates on those serving on the Steering Committee (name of person, address, telephone and fax number, and e-mail address, if available).
- Step 2 The LMS Coordinator prepares meeting agenda in coordination with the Chairman of the Steering Committee to be distributed in advance of the meeting to members of the Steering Committee.
- Step 3 Steering Committee meeting held. A brief review of the updating process is discussed. A discussion of whether the evaluation criteria are still appropriate or whether modifications or additions are needed due to changing conditions over the period since the last update process occurred. The data needs will be reviewed, data sources identified, and responsibility for collecting information assigned to members.
- Step 4 A draft report prepared. Evaluation criteria to be addressed include the following:
  - A. Changes in the community and government processes, which are hazard-related and have occurred since the last Strategy review;
    - 1. Community change
      - a. Growth and development in vulnerable areas;
      - b. Impact of actions resulting from growth that adversely affect natural resources in vulnerable areas, such as seawalling, beach erosion, heightening deposition in inlets;
      - c. Demographic changes;
      - d. New hazards identified;
      - e. Changes in community economic structure; and
      - f. Special needs population changes.
    - 2. Government process changes
      - a. New or changing laws, policies, and regulations;
      - b. Changes in funding sources or requirements;
      - c. Change in priorities for implementation;
      - d. Changes in government structure; and
      - e. Shifts in responsibility and mitigation committee resources.

INSERT FIGURE 6.2

- B. Progress in implementing LMS initiatives and projects - the Strategy initiatives and projects as compared with actual results at the date of the report;
- C. Effectiveness of the implemented initiatives and projects;
- D. Evaluation of unanticipated problems and opportunities that have occurred between the date of adoption and date of report;
- E. Evaluation of hazard-related public policies, initiatives, and projects;
- F. Assess the effectiveness of public and private sector coordination and cooperation.

- Step 5 The LMS Coordinator determines best method to solicit public input. The LMS Coordinator is responsible for public noticing/advertising requirements. All Steering Committee members are informed and requested to attend public meeting.
- Step 6 A public meeting is held. The LMS Coordinator or a representative of the Steering Committee presents findings, conclusions, and recommendations of Strategy effort. Public comments are recorded.
- Step 7 The LMS Coordinator distills and synthesizes public comments in memorandum.
- Step 8 The LMS Coordinator coordinates and organizes second meeting of Steering Committee. The draft Strategy update report is distributed to each participant 7 days prior to the meeting. The Steering Committee meeting is held. Consensus is reached on changes to the draft. If agreement can not be reached by certain local governments on certain issue(s) and/or project prioritization(s), the conflict resolution process (**Section 6.8**) may be triggered for those specific items parties cannot agree upon. A vote is taken securing approval of the draft Strategy Update Report, contingent upon integrating Steering Committee comments into draft report.
- Step 9 The LMS Coordinator incorporates modifications/additions resulting from Steering Committee meeting.
- Step 10 The LMS Coordinator finalizes the Strategy Update Report. Copies are distributed to Steering Committee members.
- Step 11 Each jurisdictional representative presents the updated Strategy to their respective governing body, and other interested parties. If there are new or modified recommendations that their local government could implement to further the countywide Strategy, member seeks direction from governing body to implement appropriate strategies.

- Step 12 The final updated LMS is formally adopted by all of the participating jurisdictions.
- Step 13 The final updated LMS is forwarded on to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer at the Florida Division of Emergency Management and then to FEMA Region IV for review.

#### **6.6.2.2 Declared Emergency Assessment**

- Step 1 Within 6 months following a Disaster Declaration, the LMS Coordinator will initiate a post disaster review and assessment. The LMS Coordinator will activate the assessment by appointing a Strategy Update Subcommittee. Each member of the Strategy Update Subcommittee will be notified that the assessment process is being commenced.
- Step 2 The LMS Coordinator, through the Strategy Update Subcommittee will draft a Technical Report. The purpose of the report is to document the facts of the event and assess whether the Strategy effectively addressed the hazard. The Report should contain, at a minimum, the following:
- A. Identification of whether the hazard creating the declared emergency has been addressed in the Strategy;
  - B. Documentation of the event: the magnitude of the event, areal extent of damages, specific damages sustained (public infrastructure [e.g., potable water and wastewater treatment plants and collection systems] and private infrastructure [e.g., utilities, power]);
  - C. Discussion of impacts to the private sector, such as obstacles to recovery, utilization of local vendors, deficits in types of products needed, accessibility of vendor suppliers, demand for space for temporary relocation, local business contingency plans, etc.;
  - D. Analysis of effectiveness of coordination among institutional entities (e.g., local governments, Council on Aging, St. Lucie County Health Department, medical facilities, Florida Power & Light Company, Southern Bell, American Red Cross, Salvation Army, South Florida and St. Johns River Water Management Districts, FDCA, Florida Department of Transportation), and make recommendations, as necessary;
  - E. Evaluation of the accuracy of the hazard vulnerability and risk assessment in Strategy relative to actual event;
  - F. Identification of Strategy initiatives/projects that had been implemented to mitigate impacts of the type of flooding hazard creating the emergency event, and evaluate effectiveness.

- G. Discussion of unanticipated impacts and identification of potential mitigation measures; and
  - H. Synthesis of information and prepare conclusions. Recommendation of whether the Strategy needs to be amended.
- Step 3 The LMS Coordinator schedules a meeting of Steering Committee and distributes copies of the draft Technical Report prior to the meeting.
- Step 4 A meeting of the Steering Committee is held. Members discuss the Report findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and determine whether the Strategy needs to be modified.
- Step 5 If the conclusion is that no modification is needed for the Strategy, the Report is approved and transmitted to local governments.
- Step 6 If it is determined that the Strategy is to be amended, the Steering Committee prepares Draft Amended Strategy. The Amended Strategy should do the following:
- A. Utilize information from the Technical Report;
  - B. Provide justification of the need to amend the Strategy;
  - C. Contain a review and analysis of existing Strategy Initiatives/Projects in light of new Initiatives/Projects recommended in Technical Report; and
  - D. Include a re-prioritization of Initiatives/Projects.
- Step 7 A draft Amended Strategy is provided to each member of the Steering Committee 1 week in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- Step 8 A meeting of Steering Committee held. Draft Amended Strategy is discussed. Modifications suggested.
- Step 9 The LMS Coordinator, in consultation with Steering Committee, establishes appropriate method(s) to solicit public input. The LMS Coordinator is responsible for public noticing/advertising requirements. Steering Committee members informed and requested to attend public meeting.
- Step 10 Public meeting held. The LMS Coordinator or a representative of the Steering Committee presents findings, conclusions, and recommendations of Draft Amended Strategy.
- Step 11 The LMS Coordinator distills and synthesizes public comments, and circulates them among the Steering Committee for comment. If comments are extensive and/or controversial, a meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled and organized by the LMS Coordinator. If no meeting of Steering Committee is warranted, skip to Step 13.

- Step 12 A meeting of the Steering Committee is held. Public comments are discussed. Consensus reached as to how comments are to be reflected in the Amended Strategy. If agreement can not be reached by certain local governments on certain issue(s) and/or project prioritization(s), the conflict resolution process (**Section 6.8**) may be triggered for those specific items parties cannot agree upon. A vote is taken securing approval of the draft Strategy Update Report, contingent upon integrating Steering Committee comments into draft report.
- Step 13 The LMS Coordinator modifies the draft report based on the outcome of the results of Steering Committee meetings (STEPS 8 & 12), or makes modifications resulting from public comments generated during Step 10.
- Step 14 The LMS Coordinator finalizes the Amended Strategy. Copies of Amended Strategy are distributed to the Steering Committee for review.
- Step 15 Each jurisdictional representative presents the Amended Strategy to their local governing body, and other interested parties. If there are new or modified recommendations that their local government could implement to further the countywide Strategy, the member seeks direction from governing body to implement appropriate strategies.
- Step 16 The final updated LMS is formally adopted by all participating jurisdictions
- Step 17 The final updated LMS is forwarded to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer at the Florida Division of Emergency Management and FEMA Region IV for review.

## **6.7 CONTINUING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The St. Lucie County LMS Steering Committee recognizes the importance of public involvement in the LMS planning process. The Committee is committed to providing opportunities for the public to become and remain engaged in the LMS process in the future. The Committee will ensure continued public involvement through the following methods:

- 1) Advertising quarterly meetings of the LMS Steering Committee in local newspapers and websites to invite the public to attend;
- 2) Posting updated LMS information and data on County and municipal websites when available;
- 3) Engaging in public hazard awareness programs to make residents more aware of the hazards that St. Lucie County faces; and
- 4) Providing copies of the final LMS at local library branches for the public to view.

The LMS Coordinator shall have the responsibility of ensuring that these activities are being implemented.

## **6.8 CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

### **6.8.1 Background**

With multiple local governments involved in the development of the St. Lucie County LMS, differences of opinions may arise over the course of the program with regard to goals, objectives, policies, and projects. Governments often have different interests, priorities, and needs as well as distinct constituents. In cases where an impasse occurs, there needs to be a procedure that can be activated to resolve such conflicts. This section describes the procedure that will be used to resolve conflicts arising among the participating entities in the development of the St. Lucie County LMS. The conflict resolution process is depicted in **Figure 6.3**. The specific steps are described in detail below.

Prior to developing the process, other dispute resolution processes were investigated. They included the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Dispute Resolution Process, the Palm Beach County Multi-jurisdictional Issues Coordination Forum, the South Florida Growth Management Conflict Resolution Consortium, the Volusia County Coastal Management Element Conflict Resolution Program, and the Monroe County procedures for resolving disputes during the planning, design, construction, and operation of wastewater collection/treatment and effluent disposal facilities.

The two types of conflicts that may arise are issues and disputes. Issues are technical problems that are susceptible to informal solution by emergency management or planning office staff. Disputes are problems that escalate to levels requiring formal resolution by neutral third parties. In either case, resolution or settlement will not be binding, but a mutual, agreed to understanding among the disputing parties.

Developing an LMS is a cooperative, collaborative process, and local governments should be able to reach consensus on most issues and problems that arise during the development period. When occasions arise where local governments cannot reach agreement on a particular issue or project, they will be able to petition a hearing of the issues before the Steering Committee.

The LMS Coordinator would provide staff support.

### **6.8.2 Conflict Resolution Procedure**

The following provides a detailed, step-by-step procedure that would be followed should a dispute arise during the study.

Objective: To institute a fair, effective, and efficient process to resolve conflicts among local governments during the development of the single, Countywide LMS.

During the development of the LMS, local governments may reach an impasse on a particular issue or position. The local government has an opportunity to elect to exercise the following LMS Conflict Resolution Procedure.

Step 1 The local government would submit a letter of dispute (LOD) to the LMS Coordinator explaining in as much detail as possible, their

INSERT FIGURE 6.3

concern and position along with documentation to support their position. Also, they would outline potential alternative solutions.

- Step 2 The LMS Coordinator would review the LOD, making sure that it clearly outlined the position of the local government(s) and provided sufficient information supporting their position so the dispute at question could be easily understood by the members of the Steering Committee. If necessary, the LMS Coordinator would contact the disputing party and ask for additional information/data necessary to clarify the position.
- Step 3 The LMS Coordinator will schedule a meeting of the LMS Steering Committee. In an effort to continue to try to resolve the impasse expeditiously, the LMS Coordinator will make every attempt to schedule the meeting within two calendar weeks from the date once the LMS Coordinator determines that there are sufficient data available to proceed to the Steering Committee. Each member will be sent a copy of the LOD and any supportive materials provided by the disputing party. The disputing party will be notified of the meeting date and time.
- Step 4 A meeting of the Steering Committee will be held. The representative of the disputing party will present their positions to the Steering Committee. Based on the ensuing discussion, hopefully resolution will be achieved. At the end of the meeting, if no mutually acceptable compromise is achieved, the position of the Steering Committee will be final. Whatever the outcome of the meeting, a memorandum of understanding will be prepared by the LMS Coordinator. To be official, the memorandum must have the concurrence of the Steering Committee Chair, and a representative of the disputing party.

## **6.9 FUNDING**

Whether projects are implemented in many instances is dependent on whether or not funding is available or whether a grant application was awarded. Potential funding sources are listed in **Appendix C**. However, because funding programs are so fluid (funding some years, cutback other years, or completely eliminated) the County and its municipalities maintain contact with their Florida Department of Community Affairs liaison and the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, who are familiar with available grants. Also, Region IV, Federal Emergency Management Agency – Pre-disaster Mitigation Senior Coordinator and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Coordinator for Florida are excellent resources.