Local Mitigation Strategy Task Force Regular Meeting
Santa Rosa County Public Services Conference Room
July 25, 2019 – 1:30 PM

Minutes

Present:

Dan Schebler (SRC Administration)
Mark Murray (SRC Administration)
Comm. Dave Piech (SRC BOCC)
Stephen Furman (SRC Public Works)
Eric Seib (Town of Jay)
Thomas Lambert (City of Gulf Breeze)
Karen Thornhill (SRC Development)
Sandi Woodberry (Rebuild NWFL)
Tanya Gallagher (SRC GIS)
Kim Bouler (SRC Emergency Management)
Vlady Fierro (SRC Emergency Management Intern)
Sheila Fitzgerald (SRC Grants)
Jared Lowe (SRC Grants)

1. **Call to Order and Introductions.** The meeting was called to order by Dan Schebler at 1:33 PM, and introductions were made around the table.

2. **Approval of Minutes from the April 25, 2019 Regular Meeting.** Minutes were approved.

3. **Reorganization of Chairman and Vice Chairman Positions.** Mr. Schebler asked the Steering Committee to consider a “rotating” chair and vice chair scenario and asked for volunteers to take the committee’s chair position. Eric Seib volunteered as chair, and Mark Murray volunteered as vice chair. Mr. Seib and Mr. Murray were approved as chair and vice chair, respectively, with no opposition.

4. **Emergency Management Accreditation** Kim Bouler gave a presentation (slides attached) detailing Santa Rosa County Emergency Management’s ongoing efforts to become accredited through the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP). Ms. Bouler explained the EMAP includes a Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) process which correlates with the work of the Local Mitigation Strategy Task Force and LMS Plan. Santa Rosa County Emergency Management was accredited through a similar process in 2015. While the EMAP is similar to the existing accreditation, this is not considered a “renewal” as the criteria for the 2020 accreditation requires a more in-depth review of emergency management planning and hazard mitigation documentation. Upon successful completion of the accreditation process, SRC will become the only county bordering the Gulf of Mexico with EMAP accreditation. SRC will also be included with the less than one percent of counties nationwide that have achieved EMAP accreditation. While EMAP accreditation and planning considers both natural and manmade
hazards, the naturally occurring hazards outlined in the LMS Plan will be vital to completing the HIRA and achieving EMAP accreditation. Sheila Fitzgerald explained the LMS Plan, to be updated and finalized by December 2021, would not be completed before the EMAP accreditation process. Ms. Bouler said this does not hinder the accreditation process and promised to provide updates as Emergency Management requires input from the LMS Task Force.

5. **Rebuild NWFL Wind Mitigation Updates** Sandi Woodberry provided an updated on Rebuild NWFL’s residential wind mitigation efforts. As of the meeting, Ms. Woodberry explained, Rebuild NWFL had retrofitted 3,202 Santa Rosa County homes. Of those, 1,630 were in southern SRC and 1,572 were in northern SRC. Since beginning their work, Rebuild NWFL has received $22.8 million of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds to retrofit homes in Santa Rosa County. Rebuild NWFL has also applied for Hurricane Loss Mitigation Program (HLMP) funds on behalf of Santa Rosa County since HMGP funds have either been exhausted or expired. Rebuild has retrofitted over 14,000 homes in the region and has been asked by the State of Florida to administer their program statewide. Ms. Woodberry stated Rebuild NWFL is still taking Escambia County and Santa Rosa County applicants for their waiting list. HLMP funds should be available for program use by late August.

6. **Old Business – Seismic Activity Information for Possible Addition to LMS Plan.** Jared Lowe presented the 2011 – 2016 Local Mitigation Strategy Plan section on seismic activity to further the group’s discussion regarding whether the next LMS Plan update would include earthquakes as a hazard. Sheila Fitzgerald clarified the current LMS Plan does not include seismic activity as a hazard since the LMS Task Force agreed not to provide mitigation activities for earthquakes. Ms. Fitzgerald said the conversation regarding seismic activity came up following recent, small earthquakes in the Atmore, AL and Jay, FL area over the last several months. Mr. Schebler asked that the Task Force consider including the language similar to the 2011 – 2016 plan in the upcoming update. This will allow provide assurance the LMSTF is aware of the threat but will also clarify that earthquake mitigation activities will not be conducted since the threat of earthquake damage is so low. Stephen Furman elaborated that the only real mitigation efforts for earthquakes in SRC would be regular bridge inspections and thorough mapping of water and gas lines.

7. **Other Business and Public Comments.** Karen Thornhill provided a Flood Mitigation Task Force update. The FMTF will meet on August 22, 2019 at 1:30 PM to begin planning for the community rating system update. Ms. Thornhill will be sending out paperwork for the LMSTF to review.

Tanya Gallagher gave an update on a recently confirmed $60,000 grant for flood resiliency. The grant will require a civic engagement workshop and a GIS vulnerability assessment for Santa Rosa County to consider socioeconomic and environmental factors related to flooding. Ms. Gallagher said the GIS department would be working to create a cost mitigation assessment tool.

Ms. Fitzgerald asked the steering committee to consider another SRC resident to fill Lou Greene’s spot on the committee, as Mr. Greene is relocating out of the county. Staff will send
the steering committee information regarding the desired qualifications of another resident member of the LMS steering committee.

8. **Next Meeting and Adjournment.** The next meeting will be October 24, 2019 at 1:30 PM. Mr. Schebler adjourned the meeting at 2:07 PM.
Emergency Management Accreditation Program
EMAP
Discussion Points

• What is accreditation?
• Why is accreditation important?
• Who is accredited?
• How does Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment fit into Accreditation?
What is the Emergency Management Accreditation Program?

• The voluntary standards, assessment, and accreditation process for disaster preparedness programs throughout the country.

• Provides the opportunity to be recognized for compliance with industry standards.
Why Become Accredited?

• Credibility
• Accountability
• Sustainability
• Improved Coordination
• Resilience
• Cost Savings
Who is Accredited?

- Federal (U.S.) Programs
- State Programs
- Local Programs
- Institutes of Higher Education
- International Programs
- Tribal Nation Programs
- Private Sector Programs
Functional Areas

- Regulatory
- Risk Assessment, Consequence Analysis, Mitigation
- Operations
- Resources & Support
- Capability Assessment & Improvement
- Notifications/Alerts & Outreach
Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment
What Hazards Do We Face?

Natural Hazards

Human-Caused Hazards
Hazard Mitigation
Questions?
VULNERABILITY CHART: WILDFIRE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Infrastructure is vulnerable to fires, as transportation routes may be blocked during the response to wildfires, critical facilities along the urban rural interface may be more vulnerable to the direct effect of fire, or to associated hazards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Economic Vulnerability</td>
<td>Each employment sector is potentially vulnerable to fire. Such precautions as fire escape plans, smoke detectors/alarms, sprinkler systems, continuity of operations planning, insurance, and contingency planning for the protection of critical records, helps to reduce the vulnerability associated with a potential fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Hazards</td>
<td>Associated hazards include: explosions, hazardous materials incidents, vehicle accidents, mass exodus, evacuations, illness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2F Other Hazards

4.2F1 Earthquake

Although the U.S. Geological Survey National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project (1996) indicates there is a 1.5%g peak acceleration rate for earthquake hazard (this is considered very minimal risk), there have been a series of small seismic events within 75 miles of northern Santa Rosa County that deserve analysis in this plan in order to justify it as a “non-impact” or “virtually no impact” risk. The table below shows a record of seismic activity in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Co/State</th>
<th>Epicenter</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Depth in km</th>
<th>Magnitude (Richter)</th>
<th>Felt at or located at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/13/1929</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/1974</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Huxford</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>87.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/1984</td>
<td>Clarke, AL</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>87.65</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Jackson &amp; Walker Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/1997</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Atmore</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>5 3.1</td>
<td>Brewton &amp; Flomaton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/1997</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>shallow 4.9</td>
<td>Within 10 miles of Jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/1997</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>10 3.7</td>
<td>Within 10 miles of Jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/1997</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>10 3.0</td>
<td>Within 10 miles of Jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/1998</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>87.61</td>
<td>4 2.8</td>
<td>21 km north of Atmore, felt south of Little Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2000</td>
<td>Monroe, AL</td>
<td>Monroeville</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>87.31</td>
<td>7 2.5</td>
<td>Monroeville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2000</td>
<td>Clarke, AL</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>87.84</td>
<td>5 2.4</td>
<td>10 km west of Fulton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2003</td>
<td>Escambia, AL</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>87.52</td>
<td>5 3.3</td>
<td>10 km NNW of Atmore, within 10 miles of Jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The October 24, 1997 earthquake at Little Rock, Alabama (located 31.114° N. and 87.389° W. or about ten miles northwest of Jay, FL in Escambia County, AL) (see Figure 4-8) registered 4.9 on the Richter scale and provided Mercalli Intensity Scale ranges of III, IV, V and VI (See Figure 4-9). These ranges cause the effects as listed on Table 4-10 below.

The Little Rock 4.9M earthquake was widely reported by area media and felt by hundreds if not thousands of people. 911 centers were deluged with surprised residents in both Escambia (FL) and Santa Rosa Counties with reports of experiencing shaking, hearing a loud rumble or small explosion, or noticing pictures or household items shaking or rattling on shelves and counters. Because the earthquake happened in the early morning hours, the number of telephone calls to 911 centers would indicate it woke hundreds of people from their sleep. There was some property and vegetation damage reported near the epicenter in Alabama, including a crane and trees that slid into a sand pit and an incident where goods shook onto the floor in a convenience store near Barnett Crossroads at Exit 67 on I-65.

![Figure 4-8 - Intensity map of the October 24, 1997 earthquake at Little Rock, Alabama. Note that Mercalli Intensity Scale ranges went from III to VI in Santa Rosa County. Source: Geological Survey of Alabama, 1999.](image)

The cause of the number of small tremors in the vicinity of Santa Rosa County is not fully understood by seismologists and geologists. It is known that a series of faults known as the “Pickens-Gilbertown-Flomaton Fault System” exist from near Meridian, Mississippi to the Luann Salt Formation approximately 18,000 feet below the surface in the vicinity of Jay. Along this fault line are a number of petroleum producing areas, including the Little Escambia Creek oilfield in north Santa Rosa County near Jay. (Source: Cooey, Julian C., P.G., Geologist, Santa Rosa County Public Works.) Most of the tremors in the area are originating at a depth, or focus, of 3 miles (5 km). Some individuals have pointed to the possibility that oil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richter Scale Reference</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>Recorded on local seismographs, but generally not felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Often felt, no damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Felt widely, slight damage near epicenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Damage to poorly constructed buildings and other structures within 10’s km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“Major” earthquake, causes serious damage up to ~100km (recent Taiwan, Turkey, Kobe, Japan, and California earthquakes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Great” earthquake, great destruction, loss of life over several 100km (1906 San Francisco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rare great earthquake, major damage over a large region over 1000km (Chile 1960, Alaska 1964)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-8: Richter Scale Reference. Source: Canada Geological Survey 2003
extraction processes in the area may be causing the increasing number of earthquakes, but this has not been proven or acknowledged by the oil industry.

Seismologists do collectively agree the 1.5%g peak acceleration rates for earthquake hazard is at a minimal risk level. This means there is roughly a 1.5% chance in fifty years of the ground experiencing a horizontal shaking.

Since there is no history of damaging earthquakes in the county, the peak acceleration rate is determined to be low by the U.S. Geological Survey, and recent events near Santa Rosa County provide a reference that building damage will not occur from the area’s seismic activity, no further analysis or risk assessment will be conducted for this plan (See Figure 8). Mitigation activities will not be considered in this plan at this time. However, continued or more frequent seismic activity, or an increase in intensity in the area may warrant possible examination of mitigation activities that may need to occur, especially near Jay and in northern Santa Rosa County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercalli Intensity Scale Rating</th>
<th>Effects Noticed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Not felt. Marginal and long period effects of large earthquakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Felt by persons at rest, on upper floors, or favorably placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Felt indoors. Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing of light trucks. Duration estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing of heavy trucks; or sensation of a jolt like a heavy ball striking the walls. Standing automobiles rock. Windows, dishes, doors rattle. Glasses clink. Crockery clashes. In the upper range of IV, wooden walls and frame creak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Felt outdoors; direction estimated. Sleepers waken. Liquids disturbed, some spilled. Small unstable objects displaced or upset. Doors swing, close, open. Shutters, pictures move. Pendulum clocks stop, start, change rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Felt by all. Many frightened and run outdoors. Persons walk unsteadily. Windows, dishes, glassware break. Knick-knacks, books, etc off shelves. Pictures off walls. Furniture moved or overturned. Weak plaster and masonry cracked. Church and school bells ring. Trees, bushes shaken (visibly or heard to rustle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-9: Partial listing of the Mercalli Earthquake Intensity Scale Rating System, Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, California 2003

Figure 4-9: Earthquake frequency in Santa Rosa County is considered to be less than 2%g, or very minima. Source: U.S. Geological Survey national Seismic Hazard Mapping Project.