

Division of Emergency Management

Comprehensive Funding Proposal for County Emergency Operations Centers November 1, 2006

Purpose: Chapter 2006-71, Laws of Florida (House Bill 7121) directs the Division of Emergency Management (Division) to establish a statewide competitive grant application process for proposals to construct or improve county Emergency Operations Centers (EOC) and designated state alternate EOCs. Upon completion of the competitive grant application process, the Division is further directed to prioritize properly submitted projects and submit a comprehensive funding proposal to the Legislative Budget Commission (LBC) for approval. This report provides the Division's comprehensive funding proposal to construct or improve county EOCs to the LBC.

Background: By statute (s. 252.38(3)(a)3, Florida Statutes), all of Florida's counties are required to establish a primary (and one or more secondary) EOC to provide continuity of government and direction and control of emergency operations. However, neither the statute, nor any other law, rule, standard or code sets forth minimum survivability or workspace criteria for county EOCs. Therefore, the relative survivability, available workspace, features and prominence of the emergency management EOC-function over other day-to-day uses is quite variable.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidance states that "survivable" means having the ability to continue to function under any condition that would destroy or disable normal systems or structures. Further, it is essential that the actual physical facilities from which a crisis or emergency is to be managed, survive the event that precipitated their need. If they cannot, then the ability to direct, control, manage and coordinate a response is in jeopardy. To achieve survivability, FEMA and the Division recommend that EOCs have certain features or capabilities. These include, though not limited to:

1. Designed and equipped to manage the range of anticipated emergencies, both natural and technological;
2. Constructed with sufficient space to house staff and equipment for day-to-day and sustained continuous operations and capable of full staffing for the most extensive emergency anticipated;
3. Sited to avoid or minimize risk or threats to the EOC from natural and technological hazards;
4. Designed and built to survive the range of anticipated hazards and to function effectively; and,
5. Equipped with self-contained electric power, fuel and life support (e.g., shelter, food, water, sewer, air-conditioning, etc.) capabilities for sustained operations over an extended period.

Beginning in the 1950's and continuing through the late 1980's, FEMA provided limited cost-share funding for state and local EOCs. These funds could only be used for

construction of the building to meet their minimum design criteria, which included nuclear fallout protection. In 1984, FEMA published Civil Preparedness Guide (CPG) 1-20, *Emergency Operating Center Handbook*. FEMA CPG 1-20 provided national guidance for planning, designing, constructing and operating EOCs, and all federally funded EOCs were required to comply with its recommendations. Among the topics presented in FEMA CPG 1-20, a key criterion is staffing and workspace floor area size recommendations. The staff size estimate is based on community population served, though there is flexibility in that a specific EOC’s staff size can (and should) be determined based on the concept of operations.

Though published in 1984, many of FEMA CPG 1-20’s recommendations and design criteria are still applicable today with some adjustments. Research by the Division’s Critical Infrastructure/Facilities program staff indicate that the FEMA CPG 1-20’s staff size criteria, which is based on two shifts concurrently occupying the EOC, is still generally valid today. Most modern EOCs are occupied during a major disaster by about 60 to 85 percent of FEMA CPG 1-20’s staff size recommendations, which during shift changes, press briefings and other extenuating events provides an adequate basis for design. FEMA CPG 1-20’s floor area criterion is provided as a range from 50 to 85 square feet (sq.ft.) per staff person, with 85 sq.ft. being the basis for model EOC floorplans that permit effective direction, control and coordination between agencies. A summary of FEMA CPG 1-20’s staff size and floor area recommendations can be seen in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Federal Emergency Management Agency <i>Emergency Operating Center Handbook (CPG 1-20, 1984)</i> EOC Staff Size and Workspace Recommendations				
Community Population, persons	EOC Staff Size, persons	Recommended Gross Floor Area @ 85 sq.ft. per workspace, sq.ft.	Mid-range Gross Floor Area @ 67 sq.ft. per workspace, sq.ft.	Minimum Gross Floor Area @ 50 sq.ft. per workspace, sq.ft.
1,000	20	1,700	1,340	1,000
10,000	24	2,040	1,608	1,200
15,000	28	2,380	1,876	1,400
25,000	33	2,805	2,211	1,650
50,000	47	3,995	3,149	2,350
75,000	59	5,015	3,953	2,950
150,000	90	7,650	6,030	4,500
300,000	127	10,795	8,509	6,350
1,000,000*	150	12,750	10,050	7,500
10,000,000*	325	27,625	21,775	16,250

* - Extrapolated values based on research by the Division of Emergency Management

FEMA CPG 1-20 does not provide specific design criteria for natural hazards, but instead relies upon normal building codes and standards plus fallout shelter “hardening” (windowless structures with 16 inches of reinforced concrete in walls, roof, and door entryway baffling) to ensure resistance to high wind events. With the exception of

federally funded EOCs, very few others are constructed as massively. Therefore, the Division recognizes the American Red Cross' *Standards for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter Selection* (ARC 4496) as the minimum natural hazards safety criteria. ARC 4496 provides a "best practices" set of criteria for storm surge, rainfall flooding and high winds. As with FEMA CPG 1-20, ARC 4496 relies upon normal building codes and standards (plus window protection), but is more applicable to typical structures since there is no expectation of special hardening. ARC 4496 also provides a least-risk decision making process, which is useful since very few structures are specially designed to be "survivable." Also, older buildings constructed prior to the late 1980's are generally much more vulnerable to wind damage than more modern buildings.

Historically, county EOCs are selected from available government-owned or leased facilities. The types of facilities range from office buildings to jails. Even when county EOCs are constructed (either stand-alone or multi-agency), mostly local capital is involved, so there is negligible participation by the Division in the siting and design process. Also, there is an expectation among public officials that buildings constructed to normal codes and standards (sometimes regardless of year of construction) are designed to resist Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Categories 3 or 4. This is because building codes are based on 3-second gust measurements, and the National Hurricane Center uses a 1-minute sustained measurement. As can be seen in **Table 2**, most buildings are only designed for hurricane Categories 1 and 2. To achieve Category 3 or higher wind designs requires use of enhanced performance standards.

Table 2						
Equivalent Basic Wind Speeds						
Wind Speed Conversion						
3-second gust, fastest-mile and 1-minute sustained velocities (miles per hour)						
Wind Measurement Scale	Hurricane Category 1	Hurricane Category 2	Hurricane Category 3	Hurricane Category 4	Hurricane Category 5	Extreme Hurricane Category 5
3-second Gust (ASCE 7 and 2001 Florida Building Code)	90	117	135	160	190	234
Fastest Mile (Standard Building Code)	75	100	117	141	170	213
1-minute Sustained (National Hurricane Center)	74	96	111	131	156	192

Throughout the 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons, state and local officials and legislators observed that many of Florida's county EOCs did not have sufficient survivability or operational workspace. Two EOCs suffered significant damage, and many others were over-crowded and their capabilities stretched. To address this concern, Governor Bush proposed that as part of a hurricane preparedness, response and recovery

initiative, that state and federal funds be used to supplement local commitment to construct and improve county EOCs. The 2006 Legislature agreed and funds were appropriated under House Bill (HB) 7121. The stated intent of the appropriation was that county EOCs and designated state alternate EOCs meet minimum criteria for structural survivability and sufficiency of operational space. To achieve these objectives, FEMA CPG 1-20 workspace criteria and ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria were established as minimum performance expectations.

HB 7121 requires that the Division establish a statewide grant application process; provide criteria for an appropriation to fund construction or renovation of county EOCs and designated state alternate EOCs, and requires the Division to submit a comprehensive funding proposal to the LBC for approval. Based upon these requirements, the Division established the following schedule:

Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and application cycle: June 2 to August 15, 2006 (75 days)

Programmatic review of applications: August 16 to 28, 2006

Committee preparation of initial priorities and

funding recommendations: August 29 to September 1, 2006

Division review and preparation of comprehensive

funding proposal report: September 5 to October 31, 2006

Submission of comprehensive funding proposal to LBC: November 1, 2006

LBC review and approval: November to December 2006

Preparation and distribution of funding agreements to recipients: January 2007

EOC design and construction process: February 2007 through June 2009

Competitive Grant Application Process: Chapter 2006-71, Laws of Florida (HB 7121) directs the Division to establish a statewide competitive grant application process for proposals to construct or improve county EOCs and designated state alternate EOCs. The funding sources were both state General Revenue (GR) at \$20 million and federal Hazard Mitigation Grant (HMGP) at \$25 million. There were no designated state alternate EOC construction or improvement proposals submitted, so there will be no references to them in the remainder of this report. HB 7121 established a very challenging schedule for a building construction or remodeling type of initiative. The normal process involves needs-assessment, planning and cost development between the facility owners and architectural and engineering consultants. Given an expectation of a short lead time for an application cycle, the Division proactively informed counties that an EOC funding proposal was being considered by the 2006 Legislature. The Division also prepared and distributed guidance for county EOC staff size and workspace criteria, and EOC hurricane survivability design criteria; both of which are based on state and national guidelines and best practices. The Division also supplied EOC cost estimating guidance to assist those counties with limited resources.

To maximize the time available to Boards of County Commissions (the only agencies eligible for funds under HB 7121) to apply for EOC construction or improvement grants, the Division prepared a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)

advertisement for publication in the June 2, 2006 Florida Administrative Weekly. The NOFA was published immediately after the bill was signed into law and provided 75 days for preparation and submittal of an application by interested counties. The NOFA outlined the funding requirements, eligibility, limitations, priorities and application process. The text of the NOFA can be found in Appendix 1. An application form was prepared that was consistent with the Division's hurricane shelter and critical facility survey program, and requested additional information required to be considered by HB 7121. The Division also prepared a spreadsheet that summarized much of the non-financial information needed to prepare the application, then distributed an e-mail to all counties providing guidance on the application process, weblinks to HB 7121, the spreadsheet and text files of the NOFA and application. The e-mail was distributed on May 25, 2006 so all interested counties could be prepared for the published NOFA.

The Division provided programmatic assistance during the application cycle. This assistance was in the form of telephone contacts, e-mails and meetings. The Division also distributed Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) via e-mail to all counties, and provided updated guidance information spreadsheets on July 18, 2006. Division staff also reviewed draft applications for completeness when requested. These steps are standard practice for Division grant programs, and ensured that all potential applicants received sufficient information and assistance to submit a complete application that met the intent of HB 7121. The application cycle closed at 4:00 p.m. local time in Tallahassee on August 15, 2006 with 33 counties having submitted applications, and six counties proposing more than one solution. All applications were properly submitted and sufficiently complete to prioritize and make funding recommendations. There were no applications received after the closure of the grant application cycle. A summary of the applications can be seen in Appendix 2.

Prioritization Process: HB 7121 prescribes the criteria that the Division must consider for prioritizing and recommending of funding for county EOCs under this statewide competitive grant process. The criteria includes, but not limited to: 1) County Population; 2) Hurricane Evacuation Clearance Time for the Vulnerable Population of the County; 3) Structural Survivability of the Existing EOC; and 4) Guidance of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for workspace requirements for the EOC. These respective criteria are summarized in **Table 3**. To meet the intent of HB 7121, the Division convened an ad hoc committee of program staff (Critical Infrastructure/ Facilities and Hazard Mitigation) and a representative of the Florida Emergency Preparedness Association (FEPA) to review and make initial priority and funding recommendations. The committee's initial prioritization and funding recommendation methodologies were generally followed by the Division, with adjustments due to limited availability of funds, when finalizing its funding recommendations.

It should be noted that the Applicants requested more than \$74 million in base construction funds (state General Revenue) and about \$24 million in structural enhancement funds (federal Hazard Mitigation Grant Program). The base construction funding requests far exceeded the \$20 million appropriated under HB 7121. This

difference in requested funds versus appropriated funds is at least partly caused by many Applicants (more than 60 percent) requesting funds for structures significantly larger than recommended by FEMA CPG 1-20. In fact many of the proposals include construction of multi-function public safety facilities; that is, incorporation of Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP or 9-1-1 dispatch center), Intelligent Transportation System (ITS), etc., into the facilities. These functions are not eligible under HB 7121, and so must be extracted from the priority (and funding) recommendation process.

The Division made every effort to follow the process and priorities established in HB 7121. Since the majority of counties requested gross floor areas that were in excess of FEMA CPG 1-20 recommendations, the Division used interpolated (and for larger counties with populations greater than 300,000, extrapolated) staff sizes to estimate workspace needs using 85 sq.ft. gross floor area per staff. This workspace value was then compared to existing EOC workspace floor area values as estimated by Division assessments. Also, for those counties that do not have an existing EOC that meets ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria, and/or use a temporary facility that can not be made operational within one hour (as required per Rule 9G-6, Florida Administrative Code, Capability Assessment), the existing workspace value was taken as zero (0). Consistent with HB 7121, this placed priority on counties with no EOC that could meet ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria, and thus the greatest needs.

For those counties which have received state appropriations to construct EOCs over the past two years, the quantity of floor area that is estimated to be constructed with said funds is listed with a footnote ⁽¹⁾ in **Table 3**. Two counties (Bay and Citrus) have been appropriated sufficient funds to meet their respective FEMA CPG 1-20 floor area recommendations; therefore, they have been categorized with those counties that have existing floor area. Counties where there is still a need for additional floor space, after consideration of the other state funds, were assumed for the prioritization process to have zero existing floor area; however, the funding recommendations were adjusted accordingly. The Applicants were then sorted into those counties with zero existing floor area values, which were grouped together at the top of the list (spreadsheet), and those with existing floor area values other than zero, which were grouped together at the bottom of the list.

The projects were then sorted separately using county population size and then hurricane evacuation clearance time. A fine-tuning of this procedure can be seen in **Table 4**. The first step was to sort the counties with zero existing floor area with the largest population county at the top and descending in order to the smallest population. The county population data source chosen for the prioritization process was the *Florida Statistical Abstract 2005*, Table 1.41, 2010 Projection using medium population growth. Each county then received a numeric ranking value in ascending order based on its respective position on the list, Lee being number 1 and Liberty being number 24. The same procedure was then performed for those counties that had non-zero existing floor area, except that the largest population county's (Volusia) numeric ranking score began at 25 and downward to the smallest (Lafayette) with a numeric ranking score of 33.

The same procedure as population size ranking was followed for hurricane evacuation clearance time. It should be noted that not all inland counties have a clearance time published in Hurricane Evacuation Studies. Counties without a published clearance time were assigned a value of zero (0) hours. To begin the clearance time prioritization process, the zero existing floor area counties were re-sorted in descending order using clearance time (in hours), and then the non-zero existing floor area counties separately re-sorted in descending order. For counties with the same clearance time value, population size was used as a secondary factor with larger population counties prioritized ahead of smaller population counties. Each county on the re-sorted list was then given a numeric ranking value in ascending order beginning with the highest clearance time county with zero floor area (Collier at number 1) and downward to the smallest county with non-zero floor area (Union at number 33).

The final step of the prioritization process was to take the numeric ranking values for both county population size and clearance time and average them together. The averaged numeric ranking values were then re-sorted in ascending order with the lowest numeric value (2.0) at the top of the list and the highest numeric value (32.5) at the bottom of the list. This final re-sorted list was then given ascending numeric ranking values from number 1 (highest priority) to 33 (lowest priority). As with the clearance time criteria above, larger population counties were given precedence over smaller population counties when their respective averaged ranking values were equal. The final list can be seen in **Table 4** and is the Division's recommended priorities for EOC construction and improvements under HB 7121.

Table 3
HB 7121 Emergency Operations Center Funding Prioritization Criteria
November 1, 2006

County	County Population, 1,000 persons	Hurricane Evacuation Clearance Time, hrs	Survivability of Existing EOC, ARC 4496 "Yes" or "No"	FEMA CPG 1-20 Workspace Floor Area Guidance, sq.ft.	Existing EOC Workspace Floor Area that meets ARC 4496, sq.ft.	Needed EOC Workspace Floor Area that meets ARC 4496, sq.ft.
Alachua	259.7	18	Yes	9,860	3,500	6,360
Bay	171.8	19	No	8,075	14,792 ¹	0
Brevard	577.3	16	Yes	11,475	8,500	2,975
Citrus	144.8	19	Yes ²	7,480	11,096 ¹	0
Clay	192.7	11	No	8,330	0	8,330
Collier	380.9	36	No	11,050	0	11,050
DeSoto	39.3	18	No	3,485	0	3,485
Dixie	17.0	6	No	2,465	0	2,465
Gadsden	48.8	0	Yes	3,995	4,300	0
Gilchrist	18.6	10	No	2,465	754 ¹	1,711
Glades	11.7	8	No	2,125	0	2,125
Hendry	43.3	6	No	3,655	0	3,655
Holmes	19.9	10	No	2,550	0	2,550
Jackson	51.1	11	No	3,995	1,303 ¹	2,692
Jefferson	14.6	6	No	2,380	0	2,380
Lafayette	8.0	8	Yes	2,040	792	1,248
Lake	303.6	12	No	10,795	5,401 ¹	5,394
Lee	618.0	27	No	11,730	0	11,730
Liberty	7.8	0	No	2,040	0	2,040
Madison	20.4	8	No	2,550	0	2,550
Manatee	335.9	19	No	10,880	0	10,880
Marion	340.3	0	No	10,880	0	10,880
Monroe	82.4	36	No	5,270	0	5,270
Nassau	75.7	14	No	5,015	0	5,015
Okaloosa	206.2	22	No	8,670	4,328 ¹	4,342
Okeechobee	40.7	10	No	3,655	0	3,655
Putnam	76.8	18	Yes ³	5,015	20,618	0
Polk	587.6	13	No	11,560	0	11,560
St. Johns	183.7	17	No	8,330	0	8,330
Taylor	22.5	6	No	2,635	0	2,635
Union	15.9	0	Yes	2,380	1,720	660
Volusia	537.8	18	Yes	11,475	9,600	1,875
Washington	25.8	8.5	No	2,805	0	2,805

Notes:

¹ – Existing workspace shown is that which can be constructed using existing unexpended state funds.

² – Citrus County has an existing EOC that meets ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria, but existing workspace shown represents that which can be constructed using unexpended state funds.

³ – Putnam County EOC is currently required to meet ARC 4496, but county requests additional federal mitigation funds to complete project; no General Revenue base construction funds requested or required.

Table 4
HB 7121 Emergency Operations Center Priority Rankings
November 1, 2006

County Name	Final Priority No.	Priority Rankings		
		County Population, larger county size in descending order	Hurricane Evacuation Clearance Time*, longer time in descending order	Average of Population and Clearance Time Rankings*
Lee	1	1	3	2.0
Collier	2	3	1	2.0
Manatee	3	5	5	5.0
Polk	4	2	9	5.5
Okaloosa	5	7	4	5.5
Monroe	6	10	2	6.0
Lake	7	6	10	8.0
St. Johns	8	9	7	8.0
Clay	9	8	11	9.5
Nassau	10	11	8	9.5
DeSoto ¹	11	15	6	10.5
Jackson ¹	12	12	12	12.0
Marion	13	4	23	13.5
Okeechobee ¹	14	14	13	13.5
Hendry ¹	15	13	19	16.0
Washington ¹	16	16	16	16.0
Holmes ¹	17	19	14	16.5
Madison ¹	18	18	17	17.5
Gilchrist ¹	19	20	15	17.5
Taylor ¹	20	17	20	18.5
Glades ¹	21	23	18	20.5
Dixie ¹	22	21	21	21.0
Jefferson ¹	23	22	22	22.0
Liberty ¹	24	24	24	24.0
Volusia	25	26	27	26.5
Bay	26	28	25	26.5
Brevard	27	25	30	27.5
Alachua	28	27	28	27.5
Citrus	29	29	26	27.5
Putnam ¹	30	30	29	29.5
Gadsden ^{1,2}	31	31	32	31.5
Lafayette ¹	32	33	31	32.0
Union ¹	33	32	33	32.5

Notes:

¹ – County names highlighted in **Bold** are listed as fiscally constrained.

² – County’s proposal under this grant process was for ineligible equipment items.

* – Rankings are weighted toward larger county populations when other criteria are equal.

Funding Recommendation Process: With the priorities established, the Division then began the funding recommendation process. HB 7121 provides funding from two separate sources: \$20 million in state General Revenue (GR) and \$25 million in federal Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). Each source has limitations on what they can fund. The HMGP funds can only be used for code-plus (or above code) wind and flood resistance enhancements. Therefore, since HMGP can not fund basic construction costs, the GR funds by necessity were allocated for basic construction. Since basic construction costs normally account for greater than 60 percent of total EOC construction costs, the available GR funds are the limiting factor for constructed floor area production.

The Division is also required by HB 7121 to consider all state funds that have already been provided to local governments to construct EOCs which will decrease the project's fiscal need. There are six (6) counties among the Applicants that have already been provided state funding for EOCs: Bay, Citrus, Gilchrist, Jackson, Lake and Okaloosa for a total of \$9.31 million (all eligible for use in basic construction, except \$760,000 in HMGP funds provided to Bay County). By reducing the need for HB 7121 funds in counties that have already been provided with other state funds, the remaining HB 7121 GR funds can be maximized to assist those that have not received other state funds. This method results in an effective funding impact of almost \$29 million instead of \$20 million in state funds.

The highest funding priority for the Division is those counties that do not have an existing EOC that meets the minimum hurricane safety criteria published in ARC 4496. For those counties that do not have a survivable EOC and applied for funding under HB 7121, the \$20 million in capital outlay base construction funds is adequate to construct about 70 percent of the workspace floor area recommended by FEMA CPG 1-20. Of the 33 counties that applied for funding, nine (9) have EOCs that either meet ARC 4496, or are the recipients of other state funds that are adequate to construct EOCs of the recommended floor area. Bay and Citrus counties are in excess of 100 percent of the recommended floor area. Given this situation, the Division proposes that the \$20 million in GR funds be limited to distribution to those counties without a survivable EOC.

There was relatively little consistency among the submitted applications, though some features were common. The majority requested funding for facilities in excess of FEMA CPG 1-20 recommendations; on average greater than 50 percent. The majority of proposals were for construction of multi-agency public safety complexes and not stand-alone EOCs. The proposed GR funding requests ranged from nearly \$6 million to less than \$450,000, and costs per square foot ranged from as high as \$700 to as low as \$140. Local government participation ranged from as high as \$47 million (for a 100,000 sq.ft. public safety complex) to zero (0), making useful comparisons difficult. Also, there was uncertainty as to what features may have been included in the Applicant's proposed construction costs (e.g., limestone exterior finish, multi-story construction, audio-video "walls," etc.) It should also be noted that basic construction costs are affected by local basic wind design requirements, special foundations and economies-of-scale, so there are

expectations that costs will vary from project to project. Therefore, no single cost per square foot value is appropriate.

To ensure equitable distribution of the available GR funds, and that only basic building construction costs are included in the funding recommendation, the Division proposes to base funding recommendations on model costs developed by program staff. The model costs were derived from RSMMeans *Square Foot Costs 2004*, a nationally recognized construction cost estimating guide, using types of facilities constructed to similar standards/criteria as EOCs (courthouses, police stations, jails, etc.) RSMMeans model costs include only those costs necessary to construct the building, and not other “additive” costs, so the Division is more certain of what the proposed costs represent. The model costs were adjusted to compensate for high wind performance, which provided the Division with a means of estimating code-plus cost premiums. The model construction costs include allowances for generator, fuel tank and other minimum survivability features that the Division considers reasonably necessary to have a fully operational EOC. The model construction costs used by the Division can be seen in **Table 5**.

Table 5					
2006 Model* EOC Construction Costs					
Floor Area, sq.ft.	Single Story Low Cost; 90 to 110 mph, \$/sq.ft.	Single Story Medium-Low Cost; 115 to 135 mph, \$/sq.ft.	Single Story Medium Cost; 140 to 165 mph, \$/sq.ft.	Single Story Medium-High Cost; 170 to 195 mph, \$/sq.ft.	Single Story High Cost; 200 to 225 mph, \$/sq.ft.
2,500	\$265.12	\$305.25	\$345.37	\$385.49	\$425.62
5,000	\$233.73	\$270.11	\$306.49	\$342.87	\$379.25
6,000	\$222.69	\$257.60	\$292.51	\$327.42	\$362.33
7,000	\$213.29	\$246.81	\$280.34	\$313.86	\$347.38
8,000	\$204.48	\$236.60	\$268.72	\$300.83	\$332.95
9,000	\$194.79	\$225.47	\$256.16	\$286.85	\$317.54
10,000	\$185.14	\$214.40	\$243.65	\$272.91	\$302.17
15,000	\$161.19	\$186.70	\$212.21	\$237.72	\$263.23
20,000	\$151.27	\$175.20	\$199.13	\$223.06	\$246.99
25,000	\$146.95	\$170.26	\$193.57	\$216.88	\$240.19
30,000	\$143.24	\$165.92	\$188.61	\$211.30	\$233.99
35,000	\$140.20	\$162.44	\$184.68	\$206.92	\$229.16
40,000	\$137.25	\$159.04	\$180.83	\$202.62	\$224.41
45,000	\$135.79	\$157.34	\$178.88	\$200.43	\$221.97
50,000	\$133.72	\$155.00	\$176.28	\$197.55	\$218.83
* - Model costs are derived from and based on values for building types that are similar to EOCs and published in the RSMMeans <i>Square Foot Costs 2004</i> .					

Using the FEMA CPG 1-20 staff size and floor area recommendations (85 gross sq.ft. per staff), the prioritized list of those Applicants that do not have existing ARC 4496 recognized EOCs, and the model EOC construction costs, the Division documented a GR basic construction funding need of \$32,587,136. With only \$20 million available, a proportional allocation method is necessary. Given this situation, another factor that the Division proposes to include in the proportional allocation process is a county's status as a fiscally constrained county (reference ss. 218.67 and 288.0656, Florida Statutes). The fiscal impact of capital projects, such as construction of an EOC, is greater upon small rural counties than on larger, less economically distressed counties. The Division is concerned that if insufficient funds are allocated to fiscally constrained counties, they may be unable to identify sufficient other funds to construct a complete and fully operational EOC. Therefore, the Division proposes to allocate proportionally higher funding to fiscally constrained counties. The fiscally constrained counties that applied for EOC basic construction funds, and do not have an EOC recognized as meeting ARC 4496 are: DeSoto, Dixie, Gilchrist, Glades, Hendry, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Liberty, Madison, Okeechobee, Taylor and Washington.

Another factor to consider in the proportional allocation process is that FEMA CPG 1-20, section I.C., states that there should be a minimum of 50 sq.ft. per staff person, and then further states "A range of 50 to 85 square feet per person is recommended, but should be determined based on the EOC concept of operation and extenuating variables..." Appendix D demonstrates that FEMA CPG 1-20 recommends 85 sq.ft. gross floor area per staff person, and is the minimum necessary for effective direction, control and coordination between agencies. This is also the Division's minimum recommendation; more than 100 gross sq.ft. per staff person is preferred in modern EOCs.

Given the above factors, the Division proposes the following proportional allocation method for HB 7121 GR funds. Counties that are not designated as fiscally constrained receive a proportion adequate to construct about 50 sq.ft. per staff person, and the counties that are designated as fiscally constrained will receive a proportion of the remaining funds. Staff size and floor area requirements are based on FEMA CPG 1-20 and basic construction cost per square foot is based on model costs given in **Table 5**, with adjustments for special foundation requirements. This allocation method provides fiscally constrained counties with about 78 sq.ft. per staff person, which is greater than a 50 percent increase over the allocation proposed for non-fiscally constrained counties. Also, for those counties that have received other state funds to support their respective EOC construction projects, their proposed HB 7121 GR allocation has been decreased such that they will only receive sufficient funds to construct the same square footage per staff person as their contemporaries with the same fiscal constraint designation.

There was adequate federal HMGP funding appropriated under HB 7121 for the submitted EOC construction and improvement applications, so no special proportional allocation method was needed. There were only three (3) issues that needed to be resolved: 1) enhancement of the wind and flood design criteria above minimum ARC 4496; 2) funding enhancement of the whole public safety facility (when applicable) and

not just the EOC portion; and, 3) recommend an increase in the proposed HMGP funding when program staff estimate costs may be higher than proposed by the Applicant.

First, since the minimum ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria only requires that a building meet minimum modern wind design and construction codes and standards (plus window protection), and HMGP can only fund code-plus construction, very little federal funding would be needed to meet minimum ARC 4496. Given the expectation that EOCs be the most survivable facilities in Florida's counties, the Division considers minimum design codes and standards to be inadequate. Therefore, the Division proposes that county EOCs funded under HB 7121 be designed and constructed to enhanced wind and flood performance criteria. As such, the Division's proposed HMGP funding reflects the code-plus requirements.

Second, following the same facts given above, EOCs are often constructed as part of larger public safety facilities. These other public safety functions must also be survivable for a community to effectively respond and recover from a disaster. Given that there are adequate funds appropriated under HB 7121 to support structural enhancement of the larger public safety facilities, and not just the integral EOC workspace, the Division proposes to allocate the amount of funds requested by each Applicant.

Third, there were a few counties that applied for less HMGP funding than the Division's program staff estimated they may need to achieve enhanced wind and flood performance; the counties are: DeSoto, Gilchrist, Glades, Hendry, Liberty, Madison, St. Johns, Taylor and Union. Given the importance of these projects, and the need to ensure adequate funding during the design and construction process, the Division is proposing that the program staff's cost estimate be used in-lieu of the Applicant's request.

It should also be noted that the Division is proposing that HMGP funds be provided to counties that have existing EOCs that meet ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria, though not proposed to be provided with state GR funds under HB 7121. This is to provide the respective Applicants with an opportunity to further enhance their existing facilities, or structurally enhance an addition or new construction.

HB 7121 directs that the Division's funding proposal not only include state and federal funding, but also local participation/funding. Though no specific cost-share or match is required, funds appropriated under HB 7121 may not be used for land acquisition, furnishings, communication or other operational equipment, or recurring costs. Also, HB 7121 funding is limited to construction of the EOC to ARC 4496 hurricane survivability criteria and FEMA CPG 1-20 workspace criteria. Therefore, construction of communications towers, landscaping, parking lots and driveways, etc. appear to be ineligible. Therefore, these costs must be addressed locally.

Also, HB 7121 directs that upon completion of each county's project that they have a fully operational EOC. FEMA CPG 1-20 recommends that each EOC have about 85 sq.ft. per staff person to effectively direct, control and coordinate between agencies.

Given that the Division's proposed allocation is adequate to partially fund the recommended 85 sq.ft. per staff, local participation "value" will be needed. Such value may be in the form of local cash, construction measures that reduce costs, identification of additional grant funding sources, etc. The Division's estimate of the local participation value needed to complete basic construction to 85 sq.ft. per staff can be seen in **Table 6**.

HB 7121 directs that the Division provide a detailed identification of the projects and their corresponding local, state and federal funding proposals for each project. All of the projects that the Division proposes receive state GR funding are new construction projects, with most incorporated into larger public safety facilities. Also, all of the proposals from counties with existing EOCs that meet ARC 4496 are additions or new construction (i.e., replacement of existing EOC). Therefore, all of the proposals are for new "work" and not remodeling of existing facilities with little differentiation in terms of a scope-of-work. The Division's detailed funding proposal can be seen in **Table 7**. The local funds shown on Table 7 are those committed by the respective counties during the application process.

Table 6
HB 7121 Estimate of Local Government Participation
Needed to Construct EOCs to Meet FEMA CPG 1-20 Workspace Criteria
November 1, 2006

County	Priority No.	FEMA CPG 1-20 EOC Staff Size, persons	FEMA CPG 1-20 Recommended EOC Floor Area @ 85 Gross sq.ft. per Staff, sq.ft.	DEM Projected EOC Construction Cost based on 85 Gross sq.ft. per Staff, \$	DEM's Proposed HB 7121 GR Funding plus Other State Funds for Basic Construction Costs, \$	DEM Estimate of Local Participation Needed to Meet CPG 1-20 Recommended Work Space, \$
Lee	1	138	11,730	\$2,514,912	\$1,480,839	\$1,034,073
Collier	2	130	11,050	\$2,564,595	\$1,510,094	\$1,054,501
Manatee	3	128	10,880	\$2,332,672	\$1,373,532	\$959,140
Polk	4	136	11,560	\$2,140,218	\$1,260,211	\$880,007
Okaloosa	5	102	8,670	\$2,003,030	\$1,179,431	\$823,599
Monroe	6	62	5,270	\$1,748,481	\$1,029,547	\$718,934
Lake	7	127	10,795	\$1,998,586	\$1,176,815	\$821,772
St. Johns	8	98	8,330	\$1,970,878	\$1,160,499	\$810,379
Clay	9	98	8,330	\$1,837,098	\$1,081,727	\$755,372
Nassau	10	59	5,015	\$1,263,379	\$743,907	\$519,472
DeSoto ¹	11	41	3,485	\$935,897	\$859,582	\$76,315
Jackson ¹	12	47	3,995	\$1,072,857	\$985,374	\$87,483
Marion	13	128	10,880	\$2,014,323	\$1,186,081	\$828,242
Okeechobee ¹	14	43	3,655	\$981,550	\$901,512	\$80,038
Hendry ¹	15	43	3,655	\$981,550	\$901,512	\$80,038
Washington ¹	16	33	2,805	\$799,930	\$734,702	\$65,228
Holmes ¹	17	30	2,550	\$727,209	\$667,911	\$59,298
Madison ¹	18	30	2,550	\$676,056	\$620,929	\$55,127
Gilchrist ¹	19	29	2,465	\$653,521	\$600,231	\$53,290
Taylor ¹	20	31	2,635	\$751,449	\$690,174	\$61,275
Glades ¹	21	25	2,125	\$606,008	\$556,592	\$49,415
Dixie ¹	22	29	2,465	\$752,441	\$691,085	\$61,356
Jefferson ¹	23	28	2,380	\$678,728	\$623,383	\$55,345
Liberty ¹	24	24	2,040	\$581,767	\$534,329	\$47,439
Volusia	25	135	11,475 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Bay	26	95	8,075 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Brevard	27	135	11,475 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Alachua	28	116	9,860 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Citrus	29	88	7,480 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Putnam ¹	30	59	5,015 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Gadsden ^{1,2}	31	47	3,995 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Lafayette ¹	32	24	2,040 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A
Union ¹	33	28	2,380 ³	N/A	\$0	N/A

Notes:

¹ – County names highlighted in **Bold** are listed as fiscally constrained.

² – County's proposal under this grant process was for ineligible equipment items.

³ – Counties that currently have EOCs recognized as meeting or exceed ARC 4496 hurricane safety criteria; Bay and Citrus Counties have received State Appropriations sufficient to construct EOCs larger than CPG 1-20 recommends.

Table 7
Division of Emergency Management
Comprehensive Funding Proposal for County Emergency Operations Centers
November 1, 2006

County Name	Priority No.	Proposed Funding		
		Local	State	Federal
Lee	1	\$6,566,700	\$1,480,839	\$1,759,500
Collier	2	\$47,000,000	\$1,510,094	\$1,639,225
Manatee	3	\$5,297,760	\$1,373,532	\$1,383,440
Polk	4	\$2,334,825	\$1,260,211	\$868,620
Okaloosa	5	\$450,000	\$179,431	\$1,509,993
Monroe	6	\$802,500	\$1,029,547	\$3,240,000
Lake	7	\$10,260,000	\$176,815	\$1,500,000
St. Johns	8	\$727,954	\$1,160,499	\$1,332,653
Clay	9	\$3,000,000	\$1,081,727	\$728,875
Nassau	10	\$183,587	\$743,907	\$588,444
DeSoto ¹	11	\$400,000	\$859,582	\$333,271
Jackson ¹	12	\$0	\$635,374	\$254,550
Marion	13	\$1,250,000	\$1,186,081	\$845,801
Okeechobee ¹	14	\$1,019,854	\$901,512	\$1,152,009
Hendry ¹	15	\$750,000	\$901,512	\$551,798
Washington ¹	16	\$650,000	\$734,702	\$414,440
Holmes ¹	17	\$55,766	\$667,911	\$331,910
Madison ¹	18	\$150,000	\$620,929	\$204,638
Gilchrist ¹	19	\$999,956	\$400,231	\$296,712
Taylor ¹	20	\$126,032	\$690,174	\$244,800
Glades ¹	21	\$500,000	\$556,592	\$264,317
Dixie ¹	22	\$750,000	\$691,085	\$350,000
Jefferson ¹	23	\$200,000	\$623,383	\$249,900
Liberty ¹	24	\$100,000	\$534,329	\$513,840
Volusia	25	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$1,130,434
Bay	26	\$500,000	\$0	\$0
Brevard	27	\$479,750	\$0	\$109,814
Alachua	28	\$2,261,515	\$0	\$942,136
Citrus	29	\$113,710	\$0	\$1,836,315
Putnam ¹	30	\$1,125,000	\$0	\$200,000
Gadsden ^{1,2}	31	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lafayette ¹	32	\$160,000	\$0	\$222,566
Union ¹	33	\$1,125,000	\$0	\$0
	Total \$	\$94,339,909	\$20,000,000	\$25,000,000

Notes:

¹ – County names highlighted in **Bold** are listed as fiscally constrained.

² – County's proposal under this grant process was for ineligible equipment items.

Conclusion: The 2006 Legislature found that there was a compelling need for improvements to the Florida's emergency preparedness, response and recovery infrastructure. An essential component of Florida's emergency infrastructure is county EOCs, which are critical to continuity of government, direction and control of emergency operations, and communication between all levels of government and citizens. HB 7121 appropriates \$45 million in state and federal funds to construct or improve county EOCs. Such improvements are required to enhance both survivability and workspace capabilities. Also, the state and federal funds are intended to supplement local participation and resources, and not supplant county responsibilities. To these ends, HB 7121 directs the Division to establish a competitive grant application process, prioritize those applications that are properly submitted, prepare and recommend a funding proposal that documents need and local government participation, and submit funding proposal to the LBC for approval.

The Division received applications from 33 counties, with one of the applications (Gadsden) requesting ineligible improvements under HB 7121. Two counties (Bay and Citrus) had already been provided with sufficient funds to meet the established workspace criteria, so no additional state funds are recommended under HB 7121. Six other counties (Alachua, Brevard, Putnam, Lafayette, Union and Volusia) have EOCs that meet the minimum hurricane safety criteria, and so given that there are insufficient funds to meet the documented needs, the Division does not recommend providing state funds for these projects. Therefore, the Division proposes to provide state funds for 24 county EOC construction projects. For those counties recommended to receive state funds, the Division proposes to proportionally allocate additional funds to fiscally constrained counties. Fiscally constrained counties will receive sufficient additional funds to construct about 50 percent greater floor area than counties that are less financially distressed. The Division proposes to provide federal HMGP funds to all applicants, regardless of state funding recommendation. The applicants that receive HMGP funds may continue forward with locally funded construction projects, and the funds can be used to enhance hurricane survivability.

When combined with \$25 million in federal HMGP funds and local participation and resources, the \$20 million in state funds will construct about 94,000 square feet of survivable workspace. This is an unprecedented initiative that will significantly improve Florida's emergency response and recovery capabilities for decades to come.

Appendix A

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA):
Statewide Competitive Grants to
Construct or Improve County Emergency Operations Centers

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
STATEWIDE COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO CONSTRUCT OR IMPROVE COUNTY
EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTERS

The Department of Community Affairs gives notice of its intent to open a competitive grant application process to construct or improve county emergency operations centers and designated alternate state emergency operations centers.

In House Bill (HB) 7121, the 2006 Legislature found that county emergency operations centers (EOCs) and designated alternate state EOCs should meet minimum structural survivability and operational space criteria. The enacted legislation directs the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to establish a statewide competitive grant application process for proposals to construct or improve county EOCs, such that those centers will meet minimum criteria upon completion of the projects. Therefore, DCA is soliciting applications on a competitive basis to construct or improve county EOCs. The application may contain one or more independent proposals.

Eligible Applicants include Boards of County Commissioners. The total amount of funding available under this offering is \$20 million for the purpose of general construction and stand-by emergency electric power, and \$25 million for the purpose of improving structural survivability. DCA has been authorized to use up to five percent of the funds to administer awarded grants. The application cycle officially opens June 1, 2006, with an application deadline of August 15, 2006. Grant funds provided under this application process will be provided to award recipients contingent on availability and approved Legislative Budget Authority. EOCs that receive funding under this competitive grant process must be completed by June 30, 2009, unless the award is extended with the approval of DCA.

The structural survivability improvement funding portion of this grant application process is subject to eligibility requirements of the federal Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). HMGP funding is only applicable to costs associated with "above code" construction improvements that protect the EOC building, occupants and contents from natural hazards and their effects. Prior to award of HMGP funds, the Applicant is required to submit an HMGP application and be determined to meet all eligibility criteria, including demonstrated cost-effectiveness. However, completion of the HMGP-specific application is not necessary to meet the August 15, 2006 project proposal deadline. Only the application attached to this NOFA must be completed and received by the August 15, 2006 deadline. Projects offered funding under this NOFA will be required to submit an HMGP application prior to the award of funds. Failure to submit the required application, or failure to meet HMGP eligibility criteria, will result in denial of funds for that portion of the grant program. The Applicants are encouraged to provide as much information as available with the initial application. The HMGP application can be found at the following URL address:

http://www.floridadisaster.org/brm/hmgrp_proc_forms.htm

At a minimum, all EOCs that receive grant funds under this application process must meet the structural and siting criteria established in the American Red Cross' publication "Standards for Hurricane Evacuation Shelter Selection" (ARC 4496, January 2002). To enhance survivability, DCA recommends hurricane performance criteria that exceed ARC 4496. DCA will encourage construction or improvement proposals that specify that the EOC will meet or exceed design criteria established in the Department of Energy's (DOE) Standard "Natural Phenomena Hazards Design and Evaluation Criteria For Department of Energy Facilities" (DOE-STD-1020-2002, January 2002), Performance Category 3, or similar design criteria approved by DCA. DOE-STD-1020-2002 may be found at the following URL address:

<http://floridadisaster.org/bpr/Response/engineers/documents/STD-10202002.pdf>

Operational workspace requirements will be based on national guidance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The EOC workspace criteria are established in FEMA "Emergency Operations Center Handbook" (CPG 1-20, May 1984) with occupancy and floor area recommendations determined by county population, EOC concept of operation and other factors. For the purpose of this application process, the workspace occupancy and floor area will be based on county population. The "Florida Statistical Abstract 2005," Table 1.41, for Year 2010 with medium growth will be used to determine county population. FEMA CPG 1-20 can be found at the following URL address:

<http://floridadisaster.org/bpr/Response/engineers/documents/EOCHandbook.pdf>

For assistance in determining the recommended workspace occupancy and floor area for a specific county, please contact programmatic staff listed in this NOFA.

The emergency management EOC function shall be the primary design consideration for facilities constructed or improved with funds awarded under this grant application process. Workspace for Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP), Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other local public safety and administrative functions are not to be included in EOC floor area construction proposals, though such facilities may be co-located in areas adjacent to the EOC. Only the proposed EOC's workspace construction and improvement costs are eligible under this grant application process. Funding may not include land acquisition, purchase of equipment, furnishings, communications and other operational systems, or recurring expenditures. The Applicant must state in writing that the EOC will be dedicated for emergency management purposes for a period of not less than 15 years. Also, as provided in Rule Chapter 9G-6, Florida Administrative Code, "Emergency Management Capabilities Assessment Checklist," the completed EOC must remain demonstrably capable of being fully activated within one hour of detection of an emergency.

As directed by HB 7121, 2006, criteria for prioritizing and recommending the funding for county EOCs and designated alternate state EOCs will include, but is not limited to, county population, hurricane evacuation clearance time for the vulnerable population of

the county, structural survivability of the existing EOC, and workspace floor area of the existing EOC. First priority for funding recommendations shall be for county EOCs where no survivable facility exists and where workspace deficits exist. The ARC 4496 status of existing EOCs will be determined by DCA through assessments, documentation or collection of applicable data. In reviewing proposals, DCA will consider all state and local funds committed for the project which have not been expended, and that will decrease the project's fiscal need under this grant program once expended.

Eligible activities include construction or structural renovation of the county EOC facility and essential infrastructure needed to meet the structural and siting survivability requirements and FEMA workspace recommendations. Funding may not include land acquisition, purchase of equipment, furnishings, communications and other operational systems, or recurring expenditures.

Application and attachments are not to exceed 8½ x 11 page size, and attachments are to be limited to a maximum of 15 pages. The cover page of the application must contain an original authorized signature by the chief elected official or the chairman of the governing board, or duly authorized chief executive officer or other government official. The signature demonstrates endorsement of the application and commitment of funds, if applicable. Evidence of the delegation of authority shall be supplied with the application.

In order to be considered for funding, one (1) original plus four (4) identical hard copies of the completed applications with attachments must be received by 4:00 p.m. local time, August 15, 2006 at the following address:

Florida Department of Community Affairs
Division of Emergency Management
Bureau of Preparedness and Response
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100
ATTN: EOC Construction and Improvement Initiative

Division of Emergency Management staff will be available to assist in the application process. If there are any questions, please contact Mr. Danny Kilcollins at (850) 413-9859 or e-mail at danny.kilcollins@dca.state.fl.us , or Mr. Dean Griffin at (850) 413-9954 or e-mail at dean.griffin@dca.state.fl.us .

Appendix B

Summary of Applications Submitted in Response to NOFA for
Statewide Competitive Grants to
Construct or Improve County Emergency Operations Centers

HB 7121 Statewide Competitive Grant Initiative to Construct or Improve Emergency Operations Centers

County	Existing EOC's ARC 4496 Status	Proposed Solution #	Proposed Solution Type (N-New, R-Remodel, A-Addition)	Proposed Solution Facility Function (E-EM EOC only, M-Multiagency)	Basic Wind Design, mph (3-sec. gust)	Proposed Wind Design, mph (3-sec. gust)	Proposed EOC Floor Space Requested, sq.ft.	State GR Funds Requested under HB7121, \$	Federal HMGP Funds Requested under HB7121, \$	Local Gov'n Participation/ Funds Committed, \$	Other Unexpended State Funds Already Provided for the Project, \$
Alachua	Yes	1	A	M	100	150	11,668	\$4,733,200	\$1,166,800	\$2,261,515	\$0
Bay	Yes	1	N	M	125	200	0	\$322,727	\$0	\$500,000	\$4,260,000
Bay	Yes	3	N	M	125	200	0	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$4,260,000
Bay	Yes	1	N	M	125	200	0	\$76,500	\$0	\$0	\$4,260,000
Bay	Yes	3	N	M	125	200	0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,260,000
Brevard	Yes	1	A	?	125	155	2,120	\$424,000	\$616,000	\$479,750	\$500,000
Citrus	Yes	1	N	M	110	165	24,194	\$0	\$2,274,207	\$113,710	\$2,500,000
Clay	No	1	N	?	110	160	8,330	\$2,915,500	\$941,290	\$3,000,000	\$0
Clay	No	2	N	?	110	150	8,330	\$2,186,625	\$728,875	\$3,000,000	\$0
Collier*	No	1	N	M	130	175	17,255	\$4,451,790	\$1,639,225	\$47,000,000	\$0
DeSoto	No	1	N	E	110	185	3,485	\$1,308,590	\$191,117	\$400,000	\$0
Dixie	No	1	N	M	120	165	3,000	\$2,150,000	\$450,000	\$750,000	\$0
Dixie	No	2	N	E	120	165	2,500	\$1,750,000	\$350,000	\$750,000	\$0
Gadsden	Yes	1	N	E	110	Ineligible Project	0	\$89,900	\$0	\$0	\$0
Gadsden	Yes	2	N	E	110	Ineligible Project	0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Gadsden	Yes	3	N	E	110	Ineligible Project	0	\$26,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Gilchrist	No	1	N	M	105	180	2,465	\$900,000	\$0	\$999,956	\$200,000
Glades	No	1	N	M	115	175	2,635	\$1,161,180	\$105,600	\$500,000	\$0
Glades	No	2	N	M	115	175	2,635	\$127,274	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hendry	No	1	N	E	115	180	6,450	\$1,500,000	\$377,575	\$750,000	\$0
Holmes	No	1	N	?	115	170	2,550	\$774,456	\$331,910	\$55,766	\$0
Jackson	No	1	N	E	110	160	3,995	\$593,950	\$254,550	\$0	\$350,000
Jefferson	No	1	N	E	110	150	2,380	\$583,100	\$249,900	\$200,000	\$0
Lafayette	Yes	1	N	E	110	160	2,200	\$643,159	\$275,640	\$160,000	\$0

HB 7121 Statewide Competitive Grant Initiative to Construct or Improve Emergency Operations Centers

County	Existing EOC's ARC 4496 Status	Proposed Solution #	Proposed Solution Type (N-New, R-Remodel, A-Addition)	Proposed Solution Facility Function (E-EM EOC only, M-Multiagency)	Basic Wind Design, mph (3-sec. gust)	Proposed Wind Design, mph (3-sec. gust)	Proposed EOC Floor Space Requested, sq.ft.	State GR Funds Requested under HB7121, \$	Federal HMGP Funds Requested under HB7121, \$	Local Gov'n Participation/ Funds Committed, \$	Other Unexpended State Funds Already Provided for the Project, \$
Lake	No	1	N	M	100	160	13,000	\$4,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$10,260,000	\$1,000,000
Lee	No	1	N	M	125	200	13,780	\$2,346,000	\$1,759,500	\$6,566,700	\$0
Liberty	No	1	N	M	110	165	8,000	\$2,000,000	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$0
Madison	No	1	N	E	105	105	2,550	\$433,500	\$76,500	\$150,000	\$0
Manatee	No	1	N	M	125	125	17,293	\$4,150,320	\$1,383,440	\$5,297,760	\$0
Marion	No	1	N	M	100	160	12,438	\$3,573,847	\$845,801	\$1,250,000	\$0
Monroe*	No	1	N	?	150	150	20,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,240,000	\$802,050	\$0
Nassau	No	1	N	M	110	165	9,740	\$2,454,480	\$613,620	\$183,587	\$0
Nassau	No	2	N	E	110	165	9,289	\$2,353,775	\$588,444	\$183,587	\$0
Okaloosa	No	1	N	M	125	190	14,000	\$3,020,007	\$1,509,993	\$450,000	\$1,000,000
Okeechobee	No	1	N	M	115	175	9,483	\$2,139,445	\$1,152,009	\$1,019,854	\$0
Polk	No	1	N	?	105	165	8,005	\$2,306,580	\$868,620	\$2,334,825	\$0
Putnam	Yes	1 & 2	R	M	105	150	20,618	\$0	\$200,000	\$1,125,000	\$200,000
St. Johns	No	1	N	E	120	200	22,390	\$3,740,441	\$935,110	\$727,954	\$0
Taylor	No	1	N	E	115	165	3,200	\$448,000	\$185,600	\$126,032	\$0
Union	Yes	1	N	E	100	100	4,300	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Volusia	Yes	1	N	M	120	165	41,724	\$5,900,000	\$1,400,000	\$5,000,000	\$0
Washington	No	1	N	E	115	175	4,000	\$967,040	\$414,440	\$650,000	\$0
							340,002	\$76,421,386	\$26,925,766	\$97,648,046	\$22,790,000

