Volume 1-3
North Central Region
Technical Data Report

CHAPTER IV

REGIONAL VULNERABILITY AND POPULATION ANALYSIS

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

REGIONAL VULNERABILITY AND POPULATION ANALYSES 1
A. Introduction 1
B. Risk And Vulnerability Assessment 1
C. Population Estimates and Projections 2
1. Small Area Data: Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) 2
2. Traffic Evacuation Zones (TEZs) 3
3. Traffic Evacuation Areas (TEAs) 3
D. Hurricane Vulnerability 3
1. Hurricane Evacuation Levels 3
2. Delineation of Hurricane Evacuation Zones 4
3. Hurricane Wind Vulnerability: Manufactured Housing 6
4. Wind Vulnerability of Site-Built Residential and Commercial Structures 9
5. Population-at-Risk 10
6. Evacuation Population 11
7. Property at Risk 23
E. Flood Evacuation Levels 24
1. Delineation of Flood Evacuation Zones 24
2. Population-at-Risk 25
3. Critical Facilities 25
F. Hazardous Materials 26
1. Delineation of Hazardous Material Vulnerability Zones (HMVZ) 26
2. Population-at-Risk 26
3. Critical Facilities 26
G. Wildfire Evacuation Levels 26
1. Delineation of Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) 26
2. Population-at-Risk 26
3. Critical Facilities 27
H. Critical Facilities 27
1. Hospitals and Skilled Nursing Facilities 30
2. Assisted Living Facilities (ALFs), Residential Treatment Facilities 34
3. End Stage Renal Dialysis Centers 34
4. Home Health Care 35
5. Critical Infrastructure (Water Systems, Waste Water Systems, Power, Communications and Transportation) 35
6. Response and Recovery Facilities 35
7. Other Critical Facilities 36

List of Tables

Table IV-1 Potential Storm Tide Height(s) by County 4
Table IV-2 Mobile Home/ RV Parks in the North Central Region (2009) 8
Table IV-3 Population-at-Risk from Hurricanes by Evacuation Level, 2010 13
Table IV-4 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Level, Base Planning Scenario 2010 14
Table IV-5 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Level, Operational Scenarios, 2010 16
Table IV-6 Population-at-Risk from Hurricanes by Evacuation Level, 2015 18
Table IV-7 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Level, Base Planning Scenarios, 2015 19
Table IV-8 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Level, Operational Scenarios, 2015 21
Table IV-9 The 30 Costliest Tropical Cyclones to Strike the U.S. Mainland 23
Table IV-11 Population-at-Risk from Flooding, 2010 - 2015 25
Table IV-12 Population-at-Risk from Wildfire, 2010 – 2015 27
Table IV-13 Critical Facility Types and Codes 28
Table IV-14 Health Care Facilities in North Central 31

List of Figures

Figure IV-1 Traffic Evacuation Zones (TEZs) in the North Central Region 37
Figure IV-2 Hurricane Evacuation Zones in the North Central Region 38
Figure IV-3 North Central Region 100-Year Flood Plain 40
Figure IV-4 Wildland-Urban Interface Evacuation Areas in the North Central Region 41

List of Appendices

IV-A Alachua County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-B Bradford County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-C Columbia County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-D Dixie County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-E Gilchrist County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-F Hamilton County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-G Lafayette County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-H Madison County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-I Suwannee County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-J Taylor County Vulnerability Assessment
IV-K Union County Vulnerability Assessment

IV. REGIONAL VULNERABILITY AND POPULATION ANALYSES

A. Introduction

In the previous chapter the ***hazards analysis*** was presented. The hazards analysis is the first step in effective evacuation planning – going through the process of identifying the hazards that face the community and the level of risk they represent[1]. Once the potential hazards and impacts have been identified, a vulnerability analysis can be conducted to provide information on the location and extent of risk and vulnerability. The ***vulnerability analysis*** is the susceptibility of people, property, environment and social and economic activity to injury or damage and the degree to which they are at risk[2].

"Risk is the probability of a hazard occurrence and vulnerability is the susceptibility of people and property to injury or damage. Risk and vulnerability mapping is simply a procedure for locating areas with different degrees of hazard probability and susceptibility."[3] Through the hazards analysis, specific hazards were recognized as having the potential to initiate a regional or multi-jurisdictional evacuation. These included tropical storms or hurricanes, flooding, hazardous materials incidents and wildfires. Therefore, the next step is the vulnerability analysis and risk mapping of these specific hazards.

B. Risk And Vulnerability Assessment

The vulnerable areas within each county can be mapped by risk to determine the potential impact to the population, property, critical facilities and the environment. This was accomplished using the hazards analysis data for each hazard facing the community

[1] ICMA, *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*, Drabek, Hoetmer, editors, 1991, pg 80.
[2] Pg. 144.
[3] Pg. 143.

which was determined to have the potential to initiate a regional evacuation; including tropical storms and hurricanes, flooding, and wildfires.

The SLOSH Model Maximum of Maximums (MOMs) storm surge runs were utilized to determine the evacuation levels for each category of storm and tropical storm scenarios. The vulnerability analysis for flooding used the FEMA National Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to present the velocity and 100-year flood zones. The vulnerability to hazardous materials relied on the Regional Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan (2009) and the County Hazardous Material Facility Hazards Analyses to present a compilation of all vulnerability assessments. The wildfire risk was identified by the Dept. of Forestry assessment of the urban wildland interface. The risk and vulnerability assessment for each specific hazard will be discussed in further detail.

C. Population Estimates and Projections

1. Small Area Data: Census Block Groups

The most recent small area data available is from the 2000 Census and is available at the block group level. This socio-economic data provides the number of households, population and vehicle projections. Alachua County is the only county in the region that has traffic analysis zones and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Data was provided for the base year of 2000 with projections for 2006, 2010 and 2015.

The data provided the number of permanent occupied dwelling units (single family and multi-family) and permanent population and the percentage of vacant and seasonal units. Using this percentage and subtracting the percentage of vacant units, an estimate of the seasonal dwelling units and seasonal population was determined. In addition, in all counties the anticipated hotel/motel visitors were incorporated in the evacuation population. This data was interpolated to generate estimates for 2010 and 2015.

The number of mobile home and recreational vehicle spaces within each evacuation zone, was derived from an inventory of mobile home and recreational vehicle (RV) parks from the Florida Department of Health enhanced with the property appraiser parcel data and Census data (American Community Survey, 2008). This listing was geo-coded using the GIS and aerial photography.

For purposes of this study, seasonal factors as determined by the 2000 Census by housing type could not be augmented with the American Community Survey data because only Alachua County and more recently Columbia County where populated enough to be included . The high seasonal occupancy factor was used in the Base Planning Scenarios.

2. Traffic Evacuation Zones (TEZs)

The Small Area Data from the Census was used for the transportation modeling process because of the predominately rural nature of the region. provide the first level of vulnerability and population analysis. Unlike most of the other regions, it was not necessary to aggregate the small area data into larger zones. The North Central Regional Evacuation Transportation Model incorporates the eleven counties within the North Central Region as well as adjacent counties which serve as external destination assignments. Created for the purposes of the Evacuation Transportation Model, Traffic Evacuation Zones (TEZs) form the basic unit of evaluation in the modeling process. The TEZs represent geographic areas and contain the demographic information crucial to modeling evacuation traffic. Each TEZ includes one or more Small Area Data Zone. The Traffic Evacuation Zones offer the model a balance between specificity in traffic assignment and model flexibility and economy. A regional map of the TEZs is presented on Figure IV-1. County TEZ Maps are presented in the Appendices IV-A through IV-K. The TEZs are discussed further in Chapter VI, Evacuation Transportation Analysis.

3. Traffic Evacuation Areas (TEAs)

There are approximately 200 TEZs in the North Central Region, so there is no need for additional aggregation necessary. This is in contrast with most other region which needed to combine TEZs into TEAs in order to present the multi-hazard vulnerability analyses and population data in a meaningful way. Existing local emergency management plans were also utilized in the designation of evacuation analysis zones.

D. Hurricane Vulnerability

1. Hurricane Evacuation Levels

As indicated, the SLOSH model is the basis for the "hazard analysis" portion of coastal hurricane evacuation plans. Thousands of hypothetical hurricanes are simulated with various Saffir-Simpson Wind categories, forward speeds, landfall directions, and landfall locations. An envelope of high water containing the maximum value a grid cell attains is generated at the end of each model run. These envelopes are combined by the NHC into various composites which depict the possible flooding. One useful composite is the MEOW (Maximum Envelopes of Water) which incorporates all the envelopes for a particular category, speed, and landfall direction. Once surge heights have been determined for the appropriate grids, the maximum surge heights are plotted by storm track and

tropical storm/hurricane category. These plots of maximum surge heights for a given storm category and track are referred to as Maximum Envelopes of Water (MEOWs).

In order to determine a scenario which may confront the county in a hurricane threat 24-48 hours before a storm is expected, a further compositing of the MEOWs into Maximums of the Maximums (MOMs) is usually required.

The MOM (Maximum of the MEOWs) combines all the MEOWs of a particular category. The MOMs represent the maximum surge expected to occur at any given location, regardless of the specific storm track/direction of the hurricane. The only variable is the intensity of the hurricane represented by category strength (Category 1-5).

The MOM surge tide heights, which were furnished by the National Hurricane Center, have 2 values, mean tide and high tide. Mean tide has 0' tide correction. High tide has a 1' tide correction added to it. All elevations are now referenced to the NAVD88 datum. The range of maximum surge heights (high and low) for each county in the region based upon the model is provided for each category of storm on Table IV-1. **It should be noted again that these surge heights represent the maximum surge height recorded in the county including inland and river areas where the surge can be magnified dependent upon storm parameters.**

Table IV-1 Potential Storm Tide Height(s) by County

(In Feet above NAVD88)

*Storm Strength	Dixie	Taylor
Category 1	5.3-10.6	8.9-11.1
Category 2	8.2-17.4	15.6-19.5
Category 3	18.0-23.6	21.6-27.7
Category 4	22.6-29.3	26.9-33.5
Category 5	26.9-34.2	31.2-38.5

** Based on the category of storm on the Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale*
*** Surge heights represent the maximum values from selected SLOSH MOMs*

2. Delineation of Hurricane Evacuation Zones

As in the original study one of the keys for effective implementation of the study is the delineation of evacuation zones throughout the region. The delineation of evacuation zones is an essential part of any hurricane evacuation plan for two reasons. First, the creation of zones allows for the assignment of population and vehicles for the transportation analysis. Secondly, the creation of zones allows preparedness and response officials to identify areas predicted to receive a common level of storm surge and areas that should use the same major evacuation route.

The **storm tide limits** were determined using the maximum surge from landfalling hurricanes (Categories 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5). County emergency management agencies delineate the **evacuation zones** based on the storm tide limits. However, in order to relay this information to the public in a meaningful way, the emergency management agencies use roadways, waterways and familiar landmarks combined with parcel data as the boundaries for the evacuation areas.

This is a very painstaking and deliberate process. It requires knowledge of the area, the land use and population density. Judgments must be made about the potential for isolation in areas which may not receive storm surge yet are surrounded by areas which will. Potential freshwater flooding is also a consideration in some cases.

Conversely, the inability to forecast exact hurricane track, intensity, size and forward speed as well as the limitation of the SLOSH model, encourage many county emergency management officials to simplify the evacuation zone patterns. This more flexible concept allows a more generalized zone scheme which may be easier to convey to the public.

County Evacuation Zones in the Region are presented on Figure IV-2. The Evacuation Zones are also presented in the County Appendices.

3. Hurricane Wind Vulnerability: Manufactured Housing

Mobile homes and recreational vehicles are extremely vulnerable to hurricane force winds and severe weather. Statistics document that mobile homes and RVs receive a disproportionate share of the damage from severe weather, and residents are far more likely to be injured or killed in these structures compared to site built homes.[4]

Because of this vulnerability hurricane evacuation plans in Florida have called for the evacuation of all areas subject to potential storm surge (coastal flooding) and the complete evacuation of all mobile home/RV residents no matter where they are located within the county.

In the 1930s the beauty of America and the draw of the open road attracted campers and their families to "travel trailers." Later the product and its name evolved into "trailers," and still later "mobile homes[5]." The changes were far more than changes in nomenclature. In 1976 the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established construction and safety standards for mobile homes, which for many people were now being used as permanent residences. In 1999 HUD added new anchor, strapping, and tie down regulations to make manufactured homes safer[6].

In the 2004 hurricane season it seemed new manufactured homes held up relatively well, even when compared to site-built homes. Since 1999, manufactured homes have been built and installed to tougher standards but not equivalent to the most recent codes for site-built structures. As required by HUD all manufactured homes sold in Florida's coastal counties since 1994 are

---

[4] For example, in February 1998, a tornado destroyed many site-built homes, mobile homes and RVs in the Kissimmee/Orlando central Florida area. There were 42 people killed: 34 resided in mobile homes, 7 in RVs and 1 was in an automobile. No one living in a site-built home died; although there was **more** traditional concrete block and stick-built homes destroyed (385) than mobile homes (373) yet without any fatalities.

[5] *Mobile home* is actually a term that was used for manufactured homes produced prior to June 15, 1976, when HUD began to administer the federal code which governs the construction of all manufactured homes. Note: Modular homes where the walls are constructed off-site but assembled on site and affixed to a permanent foundation are now evaluated and inspected against the Florida Building Code. They are built to the same construction standards as site-built structures in the community and are not subject to evacuation orders for wind only.

[6] Stronger wall sheathing, headers above windows and multiple studs at windows and doors meet post-1994 requirements and add strength to the structural envelope. The result is a home better able to withstand the buffeting of high wind and the impact of wind-borne missiles than the pre-1994 manufactured housing. http://www.fmha.org/hurricane.html

engineered to withstand sustained winds of 110 mph and 3-second gusts of 130 to 150 mph. (http://www.builtstronger.com/history.html)

This is good news for state and local mitigation efforts and public safety and it is evidence that we are moving in the right direction; however, it does not alleviate the concern regarding evacuation. While the manufactured home industry may have a case regarding the benefit of stricter standards, they need to present it to the Florida Building Code officials. Manufactured homes are not currently evaluated against the Florida Building Code; so no matter how strong the industry says they are built, they are not evaluated using the same construction standards as site-built homes. While it is clear that those homes built and installed after 1999 are more hurricane resistant, they must be measured against the same construction standards as site-built homes. Otherwise, there is no way to confirm how well they will perform.

There are several additional factors to consider:

- Unless a structure is permanently attached to a foundation, there is no way to assume that the structure will remain "tied down" in hurricane force winds. With Florida's climate, salt air and sandy soils, tie-down systems would not be expected to perform optimally without constant vigilance.
- Currently, most mobile homes in the region were built prior to 1999 and do not meet current standards for wind load or anchoring systems.
- Additions, such as carports, siding and cladding, and attached storage units did not perform well in hurricane conditions even on newer units.
- Newer manufactured homes would be at risk from flying debris from older units within the same mobile home park.
- It would be difficult, at best, to implement evacuation orders based on the age and maintenance of individual units.

Therefore, no change in evacuation strategy is identified in this report. In addition to residents vulnerable to storm surge, those residents vulnerable to hurricane force winds (74+ mph) must be evacuated in advance of the hurricane. Basically, residents of buildings without traditional structural foundations are more vulnerable to such wind speeds. In the North Central Region, this includes residents of substandard housing, mobile homes and visitors in recreational vehicles and travel trailers. Since hurricane force winds can extend inland many miles, all mobile home residents and travel trailer/RV visitors must be evacuated, regardless of their location in the region.

To update the mobile home population a list of mobile home/ RV parks was obtained from the Florida Department of Health. This list was geo-coded using the geographic information system (GIS). County maps identifying the locations

of mobile home parks are included in the Appendices (Appendices IV- A through IV-K). This data base provided an accurate up-to-date inventory of mobile home/ RV spaces within licensed parks. However, it was necessary to supplement this data with the Census in order to derive an estimated number of occupied residential mobile homes outside of designated parks. (Note: Most mobile homes / RVs are located within the licensed parks given the urban nature of the region.) The estimated and projected mobile home populations were incorporated in the evacuation population analyses.

Table IV-2 Mobile Home/ RV Parks in the North Central Region (2009)

County	# of MH/RV Parks	# of Mobile Homes Spaces	# of RV Unit Spaces	Sum # of Spaces
Alachua	31	2,450	328	2,778
Bradford	18	228	209	437
Columbia	88	1,224	861	2,085
Dixie	16	138	363	501
Gilchrist	8	14	417	431
Hamilton	14	173	187	360
Lafayette	5	-	98	98
Madison	34	423	251	674
Suwannee	22	457	1,036	1,493
Taylor	24	223	491	714
Union	11	267	8	275
Region	271	5,597	4,249	9,846

Source: Florida Department of Health, 2009

4. Wind Vulnerability of Site-Built Residential and Commercial Structures

The existing regional hurricane evacuation studies have focused on the storm surge hazard with detailed evacuation areas based on the potential coastal flooding. Historically, the storm surge hazard has caused nine out of ten hurricane-related deaths. An equally important goal is the evacuation of mobile home/ RV residents regardless of their location due to their life-threatening vulnerability to hurricane force winds. However, hurricane force winds can cause significant injuries and property loss even in conventional site-built structures -- commercial and residential.

The winds of a major hurricane (winds exceeding 120 mph) will have an impact on the safety of all counties in North Central residents as demonstrated by past storm events including Hugo (1989), Opal (1985), Andrew (1992) and Wilma (2005). There is evidence to support the fact that winds are significantly reduced as the hurricane crosses the coastline. However, the reduction of wind fields and wind speeds to safe limits depends a great deal on the individual parameters of the storm (strength, size, forward speed, etc.), the geography of the area, and the type/ construction of the buildings in harm's way.

Much of the wind damage in hurricanes Andrew, Hugo and Wilma was not confined to waterfront properties. Andrew literally destroyed many single-family site-built homes 10-20 miles inland. Hugo caused serious wind damage as far inland as Raleigh, North Carolina. Wilma caused significant wind damage as it exited the east coast of Florida.

Results of the recent experiences of hurricanes Charley, Frances, Jeanne and Wilma indicate that because of the uncertainties of the hurricane and the dangers of the major storm winds, it is imperative that emergency managers:

(1) Strongly encourage all residents who are not ordered to evacuate to secure their homes before the storm arrival;

(2) Recommend evacuation policies which address the closure of potentially vulnerable buildings with large expanses of glass (even those outside surge vulnerable zones);

(3) Local governments, in cooperation with school boards, American Red Cross and the private sector should continue to support policies and funding mechanisms to implement the statewide program to upgrade primary and special needs shelters, health care buildings and other critical facilities. This would include window and door protection, generators, roof/truss improvements, etc.

The new Florida Building Code addresses "fortified criteria" designed to make new construction more hurricane-resistant. Ultimately, this will have a positive impact on future storm losses; however, currently, we must rely on retrofit of the more than 1 million existing homes.

Code plus improvements, as defined in the "Blueprint for Safety" developed by the Florida Alliance for Safe Homes (FLASH) in coordination with the Home Builders' Association, covers both new construction and retrofit of existing structures.
The major components of this program are:

- Window protection which meets the Dade County protocol as defined in the Florida Building Code
- Roof and truss connections; reinforcement of gable ends
- Wall and roof connections
- Roof covering
- Garage door and entry door protection
- Safe rooms (FEMA standards)

Through the **Local Mitigation Strategies** and public information campaigns, state and local governments and the North Central Regional Planning Council are working to encourage residents and businesses to mitigate potential wind and flood losses at the local level

5. Population-at-Risk

In order to quantify the hurricane evacuation times as well as hurricane response and recovery needs, it is essential to know how many persons must be evacuated from the hazards associated with a tropical storm or hurricane -- the **population-at-risk**. First, it is necessary to enumerate the entire population residing within the areas predicted by the SLOSH model to require total evacuation from storm tide flooding under the five evacuation levels (Evacuation levels A, B, C, D, and E). As discussed in Chapter I and II, these evacuation levels correspond to the maximum storm tide flooding from each category of landfalling hurricane on the Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Scale (Category 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5). The Evacuation Zones or areas are defined by the county emergency management agencies based on the expected inundation areas and definable boundaries.

Second, it is also necessary to quantify all mobile homes and RVs throughout the region -- even in areas not vulnerable to storm tide. These structures are particularly vulnerable to property damage and their inhabitants vulnerable to potential injury and loss of life due to hurricane force winds.

While it is clear that we are in a period of more active and intense tropical activity, this also reflects the exponential growth in population and property at

risk. A study (Pielke and Landsea, 1999) of coastal development warned *that more and more Americans have put themselves and their property at risk by flocking to vulnerable coastal locations.* There is 400 times the number of people in Florida today as there was at the turn of the century. In the North Central region the population has grown from 120,000 in 1921 (when the last major hurricane made landfall in the region) to approximately 500,000 today.

The population-at-risk by hurricane evacuation level for the years 2010 and 2015 are presented on Tables IV-3 and IV-6.

6. Evacuation Population

The population-at-risk is the number of persons residing in evacuation areas or mobile home residents who would be directly affected by a future evacuation order. In every evacuation, however, a percentage of persons who live outside of the surge-vulnerable areas and who do not live in mobile homes or substandard housing will evacuate. Whether this is the result of confusion, a desire to be extra cautious or the desire to avoid the impacts of storm aftermath (loss of power and/or utilities), this phenomenon, termed ***shadow evacuation*** was documented in many parts of Florida during the post Hurricane Elena, Georges, Charley, Frances, and Jeanne surveys as well as in other post-storm surveys conducted in other parts of the country over the last few decades (Hazard Management Group (HMG), 2009). Due to the small populations in Dixie and Taylor Counties, shadow evacuation is not an issue like it is in most of the heavily populated coastal areas of Florida.

In addition, there will also be a percentage of persons inside the evacuation areas who will NOT evacuate and, to a certain degree, a percentage of persons who live in mobile homes who will not evacuate. After the destruction in South Florida following Hurricane Andrew, it was expected that more people would evacuate than ever before. The post 2004 and 2005 season survey seems to contradict this assumption -- at least in the North Central area which has been spared a hurricane strike for so many years. Regardless, it is expected that there will be difference in the population-at-risk and the actual evacuation population.

In the Evacuation Behavioral Analysis, planning assumptions were identified to assist in the development of the anticipated Evacuation Population under different storm scenarios.

Evacuation participation rates are influenced by the perceived risk and location of the residents. Evacuation rates and shelter use are also influenced by age and income which are significant factors. These assumptions are discussed in more detail in Chapter III **Behavioral Analysis Summary**.

Two sets of behavioral assumptions were made in the Statewide Regional Evacuation Study (SRES) to determine the Evacuation Populations. The first is considered the ***Base Scenario***, which represents 100% participation of the population-at-risk plus "*shadow evacuation*". The Base Scenario is considered the "planning scenario", which will also be used for growth management planning purposes.

A second set of assumptions is termed the ***Operational Scenario***. The county planning assumptions as presented in Chapter III and in more detail in Volume 2 of this report were used in the calculations for the evacuation population under the Operational Scenario. Unlike most of the rest of Florida, the impacts from a storm striking an adjacent densely populated urban area (Tampa Bay, Jacksonville or even Tallahassee) are used as the basis for the Operational Scenarios. The traffic leaving a threatened Tampa Bay is more of a regional concern than a few hundred shadow evacuees from the two coastal counties in this region.

Other differences in the two scenarios are presented in Chapter VI: Regional Evacuation Transportation Analysis.

The evacuation population by evacuation level for the region for the Base Planning Scenario is presented for the years 2010 and 2015on Tables IV-4 and IV-7, respectively.

The evacuation population by evacuation level for the region for the Operational Scenario is presented for the years 2010 and 2015 on Tables IV-5 and IV-8 respectively.

It should be noted the 2010 regional evacuation study update modeled the population-at-risk ("Perfect Response" Scenario) for each of the hurricane evacuation levels plus a "shadow evacuation rate." These sets of assumptions will be used to develop the scenario used for growth management planning.

Table IV-3 Population-at-Risk from Hurricanes by Evacuation Level, 2010

	Evacuation Zone A	Evacuation Zone B	Evacuation Zone C	Evacuation Zone D	Evacuation Zone E
Dixie County per Evacuation Zone					
Site-built Homes	2,157	521	92	1,773	1,043
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	1,099	490	20	1,929	987
TOTAL	3,256	1,011	112	3,702	2,030
Taylor County per Evacuation Zone					
Site-built Homes	1,813	54	119	777	896
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	1,818	47	91	512	537
TOTAL	3,630	101	210	1,288	1,433
Inland Counties Totals					
Alachua	27,931	27,931	27,931	27,931	27,931
Bradford	8,067	8,067	8,067	8,067	8,067
Columbia	22,076	22,076	22,076	22,076	22,076
Gilchrist	7,519	7,519	7,519	7,519	7,519
Hamilton	5,218	5,218	5,218	5,218	5,218
Lafayette	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300
Madison	6,965	6,965	6,965	6,965	6,965
Suwannee	16,867	16,867	16,867	16,867	16,867
Union	5,170	5,170	5,170	5,170	5,170

Note: Vulnerable population determined for Dixie and Taylor Counties using SRESP behavioral data and county provided evacuation zones. Vulnerable population numbers are not inclusive, meaning population numbers listed for a higher zone are not included in the lower zone. For example, vulnerable population listed for Evacuation Zone B does not include vulnerable population listed for Evacuation Zone A.

Table IV-4 Hurricane Population by Evacuation Level, Base Planning Scenario 2010

	Evacuation Level A Base Scenario	Evacuation Level B Base Scenario	Evacuation Level C Base Scenario	Evacuation Level D Base Scenario	Evacuation Level E Base Scenario
Alachua County					
Site-built Homes	10,632	21,264	42,527	53,159	63,791
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	27,945	27,945	27,945	27,945	27,945
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	38,577	49,209	70,472	81,104	91,736
Bradford County					
Site-built Homes	1,088	2,176	3,264	5,440	6,529
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	8,065	8,065	8,065	8,065	8,065
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	9,153	10,241	11,329	13,505	14,594
Columbia County					
Site-built Homes	2,342	4,684	9,367	11,709	14,051
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	22,080	22,080	22,080	22,080	22,080
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	24,422	26,764	31,447	33,789	36,131
Dixie County					
Site-built Homes	3,084	3,386	4,068	6,049	7,155
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,439	7,439	7,439	7,439	7,439
Tourists	156	172	172	172	229
TOTAL	10,679	10,997	11,679	13,660	14,823
Gilchrist County					
Site-built Homes	556	1,113	1,669	2,225	2,781
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,506	7,506	7,506	7,506	7,506
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,062	8,619	9,175	9,731	10,287
Hamilton County					
Site-built Homes	981	1,472	1,962	2,453	2,943
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	6,202	6,693	7,183	7,674	8,164
Lafayette County					
Site-built Homes	614	614	920	1,534	1,841
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	2,295	2,295	2,295	2,295	2,295
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2,909	2,909	3,215	3,829	4,136

	Evacuation Level A Base Scenario	Evacuation Level B Base Scenario	Evacuation Level C Base Scenario	Evacuation Level D Base Scenario	Evacuation Level E Base Scenario
Madison County					
Site-built Homes	1,359	2,038	2,718	3,397	4,077
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	6,968	6,968	6,968	6,968	6,968
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,327	9,006	9,686	10,365	11,045
Suwannee County					
Site-built Homes	1,333	2,665	3,198	5,330	6,663
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	16,855	16,855	16,855	16,855	16,855
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	18,188	19,520	20,053	22,185	23,518
Taylor County					
Site-built Homes	3,141	3,195	4,683	6,573	8,141
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,616	7,616	7,616	7,616	7,616
Tourists	246	246	246	246	246
TOTAL	11,003	11,057	12,545	14,435	16,003
Union County					
Site-built Homes	627	1,254	1,881	3,135	3,762
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,802	6,429	7,056	8,310	8,937

Table IV-5 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Evacuation Level, Operational Scenarios, 2010

	Evacuation Level A Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level B Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level C Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level D Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level E Operational Scenario
Alachua County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	10,632	10,632	42,527
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	16,767	16,767	20,959
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	27,399	27,399	63,486
Bradford County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	1,088	0	1,088
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	4,033	0	4,033
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	5,121	0	5,121
Columbia County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	2,342	2,342	2,342
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	13,248	13,248	13,248
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	15,590	15,590	15,590
Dixie County					
Site-built Homes	2,219	2,554	0	2,219	6,406
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	4,769	5,221	0	4,769	7,001
Tourists	156	172	0	156	229
TOTAL	7,144	7,947	0	7,144	13,636
Gilchrist County					
Site-built Homes	556	556	0	556	1,669
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	4,129	4,129	0	4,129	5,630
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	4,685	4,685	0	4,685	7,299
Hamilton County					
Site-built Homes	0	981	0	981	981
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	2,872	0	2,872	2,872
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	3,853	0	3,853	3,853

	Evacuation Level A Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level B Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level C Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level D Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level E Operational Scenario
Lafayette County					
Site-built Homes	614	614	0	614	1,534
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	1,262	1,262	0	1,262	1,950
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,876	1,876	0	1,876	3,484
Madison County					
Site-built Homes	1,359	2,038	0	0	1,359
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	3,833	4,181	0	0	3,833
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,192	6,219	0	0	5,192
Suwannee County					
Site-built Homes	0	1,333	0	1,333	1,333
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	9,270	0	9,270	9,270
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	10,603	0	10,603	10,603
Taylor County					
Site-built Homes	2,416	2,632	0	2,416	7,646
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	4,814	5,288	0	4,814	7,098
Tourists	246	246	0	246	246
TOTAL	7,476	8,166	0	7,476	14,990
Union County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	627	0	627
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	3,105	0	3,105
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	3,732	0	3,732

Table IV-6 Population-at-Risk from Hurricanes by Evacuation Level, 2015

	Evacuation Zone A	Evacuation Zone B	Evacuation Zone C	Evacuation Zone D	Evacuation Zone E
Dixie County per Evacuation Zone					
Site-built Homes	2,498	604	107	2,054	1,208
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	1,099	490	20	1,929	987
TOTAL	3,597	1,094	127	3,983	2,195
Taylor County per Evacuation Zone					
Site-built Homes	1,930	57	127	827	954
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	1,818	47	91	512	537
TOTAL	3,748	105	218	1,338	1,491
Inland Counties Totals					
Alachua	27,931	27,931	27,931	27,931	27,931
Bradford	8,067	8,067	8,067	8,067	8,067
Columbia	22,076	22,076	22,076	22,076	22,076
Gilchrist	7,519	7,519	7,519	7,519	7,519
Hamilton	5,218	5,218	5,218	5,218	5,218
Lafayette	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300
Madison	6,965	6,965	6,965	6,965	6,965
Suwannee	16,867	16,867	16,867	16,867	16,867
Union	5,170	5,170	5,170	5,170	5,170

Note: Vulnerable population determined for Dixie and Taylor Counties using SRESP behavioral data and county provided evacuation zones. Vulnerable population numbers are not inclusive, meaning population numbers listed for a higher zone are not included in the lower zone. For example, vulnerable population listed for Evacuation Zone B does not include vulnerable population listed for Evacuation Zone A.

Table IV-7 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Evacuation Level, Base Planning Scenarios, 2015

	Evacuation Level A Base Scenario	Evacuation Level B Base Scenario	Evacuation Level C Base Scenario	Evacuation Level D Base Scenario	Evacuation Level E Base Scenario
Alachua County					
Site-built Homes	11,322	22,643	45,285	56,607	67,928
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	29,787	29,787	29,787	29,787	29,787
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	41,109	52,430	75,072	86,394	97,715
Bradford County					
Site-built Homes	1,158	2,315	3,473	5,788	6,945
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	8,065	8,065	8,065	8,065	8,065
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	9,223	10,380	11,538	13,853	15,010
Columbia County					
Site-built Homes	2,611	5,222	10,445	13,056	15,667
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	22,080	22,080	22,080	22,080	22,080
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	24,691	27,302	32,525	35,136	37,747
Dixie County					
Site-built Homes	3,569	3,918	4,709	7,003	8,285
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,439	7,439	7,439	7,439	7,439
Tourists	156	172	172	172	229
TOTAL	11,164	11,529	12,320	14,614	15,953
Gilchrist County					
Site-built Homes	658	1,316	1,973	2,631	3,289
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,506	7,506	7,506	7,506	7,506
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,164	8,822	9,479	10,137	10,795
Hamilton County					
Site-built Homes	1,030	1,545	2,059	2,574	3,089
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221	5,221
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	6,251	6,766	7,280	7,795	8,310

	Evacuation Level A Base Scenario	Evacuation Level B Base Scenario	Evacuation Level C Base Scenario	Evacuation Level D Base Scenario	Evacuation Level E Base Scenario
Lafayette County					
Site-built Homes	664	664	996	1,660	1,992
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	2,295	2,295	2,295	2,295	2,295
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2,959	2,959	3,291	3,955	4,287
Madison County					
Site-built Homes	1,439	2,159	2,879	3,598	4,318
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	6,968	6,968	6,968	6,968	6,968
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,407	9,127	9,847	10,566	11,286
Suwannee County					
Site-built Homes	1,528	3,056	3,667	6,112	7,640
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	16,855	16,855	16,855	16,855	16,855
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	18,383	19,911	20,522	22,967	24,495
Taylor County					
Site-built Homes	3,343	3,400	4,984	6,996	8,665
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	7,616	7,616	7,616	7,616	7,616
Tourists	246	246	246	246	246
TOTAL	11,205	11,262	12,846	14,858	16,527
Union County					
Site-built Homes	669	1,337	2,006	3,343	4,011
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,844	6,512	7,181	8,518	9,186

Table IV-8 Hurricane Evacuation Population by Evacuation Level, Operational Scenarios, 2015

	Evacuation Level A Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level B Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level C Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level D Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level E Operational Scenario
Alachua County					
Site-built Homes	11,322	0	0	22,643	45,285
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	17,872	0	0	19,362	22,340
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	29,194	0	0	42,005	67,625
Bradford County					
Site-built Homes	1,158	0	0	2,315	1,158
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	4,033	0	0	4,033	4,033
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,191	0	0	6,348	5,191
Columbia County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	0	2,611	2,611
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	0	13,248	13,248
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	15,859	15,859
Dixie County					
Site-built Homes	0	2,568	4,175	2,568	7,418
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	4,769	5,690	4,769	7,001
Tourists	0	156	172	156	229
TOTAL	0	7,493	10,037	7,493	14,648
Gilchrist County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	1,316	658	1,973
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	4,504	4,129	5,630
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	5,820	4,787	7,603
Hamilton County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	1,545	1,030	1,030
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	3,133	2,872	2,872
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	4,678	3,902	3,902

	Evacuation Level A Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level B Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level C Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level D Operational Scenario	Evacuation Level E Operational Scenario
Lafayette County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	664	664	1,660
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	1,377	1,262	1,950
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	2,041	1,926	3,610
Madison County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	2,879	1,439	1,439
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	4,878	3,833	3,833
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	7,757	5,272	5,272
Suwannee County					
Site-built Homes	0	0	3,056	1,528	1,528
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	0	10,113	9,270	9,270
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	13,169	10,798	10,798
Taylor County					
Site-built Homes	0	2,572	4,652	2,572	8,139
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	0	4,814	5,699	4,814	7,098
Tourists	0	246	246	246	246
TOTAL	0	7,632	10,597	7,632	15,483
Union County					
Site-built Homes	669	0	0	1,337	669
Mobile/Manuf. Homes	3,105	0	0	3,364	3,105
Tourists	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,774	0	0	4,701	3,774

7. Property at Risk

Seven of the top ten most destructive U.S. hurricanes have made landfall in the past five years, including Katrina (2005), Charley (2004), Ivan (2004), Wilma (2005), Frances (2004), Jeanne (2004) and Allison (2001). Six of these seven made landfall in the state of Florida.

Table IV-9 The 30 Costliest Tropical Cyclones to Strike the U.S. Mainland

(Damages are listed in US dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.)

Rank	Hurricane	Year	Category	Damage
1	Katrina (FL, MS, LA)	2005	4	81,000,000,000
2	Andrew (SE FL, SE LA)	1992	5	26,500,000,000
3	Wilma (FL)	2005	2	20,600,000,000
4	Charley (SW FL)	2004	4	15,000,000,000
5	Ivan (AL/NW FL)	2004	3	14,200,000,000
6	Rita (SW LA, N TX)	2005	3	11,300,000,000
7	Frances (FL)	2004	2	8,900,000,000
8	Hugo (SC)	1989	4	7,000,000,000
9	Jeanne (FL)	2004	3	6,900,000,000
10	Allison (N TX)	2001	TS[a]	5,000,000,000
11	Floyd (Mid-Atlantic & NE U.S.)	1999	2	4,500,000,000
12	Isabel (Mid-Atlantic)	2003	2	3,370,000,000
13	Fran (NC)	1996	3	3,200,000,000
14	Opal (NW FL, AL)	1995	3	3,000,000,000
15	Frederic (AL, MS)	1979	3	2,300,000,000
16	Dennis (NW FL)	2005	3	2,230,000,000
17	Agnes (FL, NE U.S.)	1972	1	2,100,000,000
18	Alicia (N TX)	1983	3	2,000,000,000
19	Bob (NC, NE U.S.)	1991	2	1,500,000,000
20	Juan (LA)	1985	1	1,500,000,000
21	Camille (MS, SE LA, VA)	1969	5	1,420,700,000
22	Betsy (SE FL, SE LA)	1965	3	1,420,500,000
23	Elena (MS, AL, NW FL)	1985	3	1,250,000,000
24	Georges (FL Keys, MS, AL)	1998	2	1,155,000,000
25	Gloria (Eastern US)	1985	3	900,000,000

(Damages are listed in US dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.)				
Rank	**Hurricane**	**Year**	**Category**	**Damage**
26	Lili (SC LA)	2002	1	860,000,000
27	Diane (NE U.S.)	1955	1	831,700,000
28	Bonnie (NC, VA)	1998	2	720,000,000
29	Erin (NW FL)	1998	2	700,000,000
30	Allison (N TX)	1989	TS	500,000,000
30	Alberto (NW FL, GA, AL)	1994	TS	500,000,000
30	Ernesto (FL, NC,VA)	2006	TS	500,000,000
30	Frances (TX)	1998	TS	500,000,000

ADDENDUM (Rank is independent of other events in group)

19	Georges (USVI, PR)	1998	3	1,800,000,000
19	Iniki (Kaukai, HI)	1992	3	1,800,000,000
19	Marilyn (USVI, PR)	1995	2	1,500,000,000
25	Hugo (USVI, PR)	1989	4	1,000,000,000
30	Hortense (PR)	1996	1	500,000,000

Source: NOAA online web site at www.nhc.noaa.gov

E. Flood Evacuation Levels

1. Delineation of Flood Evacuation Zones

In order to determine the vulnerability of the flood prone areas, the digital Q3 Flood Data[7] (100-year flood zones) was used. This allows the data to be

[7] The digital Q3 Flood Data product is a digital representation of certain features of FEMA's FIRM product, intended for use with desk-top mapping and GIS technology. The digital Q3 Flood Data are created by scanning (producing raster or grid data files) the effective FIRM paper maps and vectorizing (converting to lines and areas) select data features into a countywide format. The digital Q3 Flood Data are designed to serve FEMA's needs for disaster response activities, National Flood Insurance Program activities, risk assessment, and floodplain management. The data are expected to be used for a variety of planning applications including broad-based review for floodplain management, land-use planning, commercial siting analysis, insurance target marketing, natural resource/environmental analyses, and real estate development and targeting.

The digital Q3 Flood Data are designed to provide guidance and a general proximity of the location of Special Flood Hazard Areas. The digital Q3 Flood Data cannot be used to determine absolute delineation of flood risk boundaries, but instead should be seen as portraying zones of uncertainty and possible risks associated with flood inundation. Users must apply considerable care and judgment in the application of this product.

presented in a consistent format with other hazards. This data is unavailable for Bradford County.

2. Population-at-Risk

The population –at-risk was determined using the small area data (Block Groups) to estimate the population within the flood zones within each Block Group. This methodology does not take into account site specific data and is not considered very accurate. Estimates and projections of the population-at-risk for flood for 2010 and 2015 are presented on Table IV-10.

3. Critical Facilities

As indicated previously, the Critical Facility Inventory (CFI) includes a Vulnerability Assessment from (1) Hurricanes and Tropical Storms, (2) the 100-year flood plain, and (3) Wildfire. Refer to Appendices for vulnerability of specific county critical facilities.

Table IV-10 Population-at-Risk from Flooding, 2010 - 2015

County	Population-at-Risk from Flooding 2010	Population-at-Risk from Flooding 2015
Alachua	36,243	38,614
Bradford	N.A.	N.A.
Columbia	13,276	14,305
Dixie	8,329	9,134
Gilchrist	4,858	5,396
Hamilton	4,356	4,490
Lafayette	4,717	4987
Madison	5,894	6,116
Suwannee	5,884	6,414
Taylor	10,170	10,558
Union	5,459	5,725

F. Hazardous Materials

1. Delineation of Hazardous Material Vulnerability Zones (HMVZ)

In order to determine the vulnerability of the county to potential hazardous material incidents, it is necessary to determine the HMVZs[8] of each of the Section 302 Facilities (Facilities which use/store Extremely Hazardous Materials). Through the LEPC and the County Hazardous Material Section of the Emergency Management office, detailed vulnerability areas can be determined in real time using the specific chemical, amount of release, wind direction and wind speed. Due to the specificity of each hazardous material release, it was not possible to determine the HMVZ or population exposure for the county.

2. Population-at-Risk

Due to the specificity of each hazardous material release, it was not possible to determine the HMVZ or population exposure for the county.

3. Critical Facilities

As part of the determination of the HMVZ, critical facilities including hospitals, nursing homes and schools affected are determined at the time of the incident.

G. Wildfire Evacuation Levels

1. Delineation of Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI)

In order to determine the vulnerability of the counties to potential wildfire, the assessment from the Florida Division of Forestry (DOF) risk maps[9] for wildfire was used to identify areas susceptible to fires.

2. Population-at-Risk

The population at risk was determined using the small area data (Block Groups) to estimate the population within the Wildland Interface High and Very High zones within each Block Group. This methodology does not take into account site specific data and is not considered very accurate. The estimates for the

[8] Hazardous Material Vulnerability Zones

[9] The web-based risk system produces maps for Level of Concern (LOC), Fuels, Wildland Fire Susceptibility Index (WFSI), and the likelihood of the number of fires per 1000 acres per year (FOA).

population-at-risk for the Wildland Interface within each county for 2010 and 2015 are presented on Table IV-11.

3. Critical Facilities

As indicated previously, the Critical Facility Inventory (CFI) includes a Vulnerability Assessment from (1) Hurricanes and Tropical Storms, (2) the 100-year flood plain and (3) Wildfire.

Table IV-11 Population-at-Risk from Wildfire, 2010 – 2015

County	Population-at-Risk from Fire-High 2010	Population-at-Risk from Fire-Very High 2010	Population-at-Risk from Fire-High 2015	Population-at-Risk from Fire-Very High 2015
Alachua	10,964	2,108	11,675	2,248
Bradford	2,094	799	2,188	836
Columbia	6,737	2,661	7,255	2,901
Dixie	2,265	135	2,465	147
Gilchrist	1,701	46	1,894	50
Hamilton	969	113	1,002	117
Lafayette	391	66	414	71
Madison	1,613	141	1,676	149
Suwannee	4,019	1,619	4,379	1,767
Taylor	2,686	729	2,802	767
Union	832	16	874	17
Region	34,271	36,624	8,433	9,070

H. Critical Facilities

The identification of critical and sensitive facilities is an important factor for emergency management planning. The Critical Facilities Inventory is maintained by state and local emergency management agencies and updated to ensure that preparedness and protective actions can be focused to provide efficient evacuation, sheltering and recovery operations.

Typically critical facilities include transportation facilities, including roadways, bus depots, ports, airports; communications facilities; utilities such as power plants, water treatment plants and water distribution systems; wastewater treatment plants and lift stations; health care facilities such as hospitals, nursing homes, hospice and dialysis facilities; assisted living and residential treatment facilities; schools and day cares; correctional facilities and sheriff/police stations; fire stations; and county and municipal buildings. Volunteer and relief agencies, potential staging areas, recovery centers and points of distribution (PODs) were also included in the critical facilities inventories.

The county inventory was obtained, updated and coded by type of facility. Facilities were coded as follows:

Table IV-12 Critical Facility Types and Codes

TYPE OF CRITICAL FACILITY	CRITICAL CODE
Health Care Facilities	
Assisted Living	
Assisted Living Facilities/ Adult Family Care Homes	11
Adult Family Care Home	52
Long Term Care	
Skilled Nursing Facilities	35
Intermediate Care Facilities	25
Transitional Living Facilities	34
Residential Treatment Facilities	32
Hospitals	
Hospitals	23
VA Hospital	24
Residential Treatment Facilities	32
Ambulatory Surgical Center	14
Crisis Stabilization Unit	17
Hospices	22
Laboratory	
Clinical Laboratory	26
End Stage Renal Disease Facilities	18
Critical Response Facilities	
Law Enforcement	74034
Fire Department	74026
Call Center	11318
EMS	74017
EOCs	74044
PODs	90003
Relief Agencies	74002
Disaster Recovery Center	90006
Logistical Staging Areas	90002

TYPE OF CRITICAL FACILITY	CRITICAL CODE
National Guard	67306
Coast Guard	74010
Community Resources	
Designated Shelters	90004
Faith-based Facility	82020
Community Centers	82011
Public Buildings –State	83034
Public Buildings – Local	83026
Public Schools	73002
College	73004
Private School	73007
Correctional Facility	74036
Library	82024
Stadium	82046
Attraction	82002
Transportation	
Transportation – Seaplane Base	81072
Fuel Facility – along evacuation route	72004
Fuel Facility - FDOT	75018
Transportation – Commercial Port	81044
Transportation – Airport	81006
Transportation – Heliport/Helipad	81026
Transportation – Major Intersection	90001
Communication	
Phone/ Satellite/ Cellular Towers, etc.	11303
Electrical Systems	
Electric Power Plant	75030
Nuclear Power Plant	75034
Electric Substation	75038
Infrastructure	
Solid Waste Facilities	75041
Waste Water Facility	85006
Water Treatment Plants/ Public Water Supply	85004
Hazardous Materials	
Hazardous Materials – 302 facilities	10400
Miscellaneous	
Television	88012

Source: Health Care – AHCA online at www.fdhc.state.fl.us
Schools – FDOE online at www.fdoe.state.fl.us
Shelters and PODs – County Emergency Management Agencies, August 2009
Hazardous Materials – County Hazards Analyses, 2009

These facilities were geo-coded and the risk assessment was conducted to determine potential vulnerability to storm surge flooding, coastal and inland flooding and wildfire. The electronic database was provided to the State Division of Emergency Management and the County Emergency Management for official use only (FOUO). The lists and vulnerability assessments of selected facilities with the corresponding maps are provided in the back of this report (See Appendix IV-A through IV-K).

1. Hospitals and Skilled Nursing Facilities



Particular attention was paid to health care facilities due to their potential need for evacuation support and the special needs of their patients.

In the North Central Region there are no hospitals or skilled nursing facilities which may require complete patient evacuation from vulnerability to storm surge. The potential effects of a hurricane's hazards on these residents would be greatly compounded by their lack of mobility and need for continuity of care.

Past experience in Florida of medical facility evacuations has pointed out that a medical facility which can serve as an emergency shelter for even twice its normal patient capacity is still more capable of providing the necessary medical care to those sheltered patients than would a public shelter such as a school building. This is due to the medical manpower and equipment already in place in the host facility. As a result, low-lying vulnerable medical facilities are now encouraged by local officials to make individual hurricane contingency plans to evacuate to a similar facility located outside of areas vulnerable to storm surge instead of to a designated public shelter. The surge vulnerability results are essential for this facility-to-facility concept of planning not only to help determine the need for evacuation, but also for the selection of non-vulnerable host shelter facilities for the reception of the evacuated facility's patients.

Chapter 400, Florida Statutes and Chapter 10-D29, Florida Administrative Code, (FAC), mandate and provide guidance in the development of evacuation plans for nursing homes. The procedures to be followed include the designation of a host facility and a written agreement from the host facility, as well as the evacuation transportation providers. Chapter 10-D29 also requires nursing homes to exercise both the internal (fire, etc.) evacuation and external (hurricane, tornado, flooding, etc.) evacuation plans annually. The county emergency management agencies must review the disaster plans before a license is granted by the state[10]. In addition, the county emergency management agencies provide

[10] The state Agency for Health Care Administration (AHCA) administers Florida's $16 billion Medicaid program, licenses and regulates more than 32,000 health care facilities and 37 health maintenance organizations, and publishes health care data and statistics.

training and assistance in the development and maintenance of the nursing home plans.

Table IV-13 Health Care Facilities in North Central

Type of Facility	Alachua	Bradford	Columbia	Dixie	Gilchrist
Abortion Clinic	2	0	0	0	0
Adult Day Care Center	2	0	0	0	0
Adult Family Care Home	1	0	1	0	0
Ambulatory Surgical Center	7	0	2	0	0
Assisted Living Facility	9	2	7	1	0
Birth Center	1	0	0	0	0
Clinical Laboratory	83	4	19	2	3
Crisis Stabilization Unit/ Short Term Residential Treatment Facility	1	0	1	0	0
End-Stage Renal Disease Center	7	1	1	0	1
Health Care Clinic	11	0	5	0	0
Health Care Clinic Exemption	68	3	17	0	1
Health Care Services Pool	3	0	3	0	0
Home Health Agency	13	0	6	0	1
Home Medical Equipment and Service	11	1	4	0	2
Homemaker and Companion Service	62	3	8	0	0
Hospice	1	0	0	0	0
Hospital	5	1	2	0	0
Intermediate Care Facility for the Developmentally Disabled	9	2	2	0	0
Nurse Registry	4	0	0	0	0
Nursing Home	8	2	3	1	2
Organ And Tissue Procurement	9	0	0	0	0
Portable X-Ray	1	0	0	0	0
Prescribed Pediatric Extended Care Center	1	0	0	0	0
Rehabilitation Agency	3	1	2	0	0
Residential Treatment Facility	2	0	1	0	0
Rural Health Clinic	3	4	5	1	0
Total	327	24	89	5	10

Table IV-14 Health Care Facilities in North Central Continued

Type of Facility	Hamilton	Lafayette	Madison	Suwannee	Taylor
Abortion Clinic	0	0	0	0	0
Adult Day Care Center	0	0	0	0	0
Adult Family Care Home	1	0	0	2	0
Ambulatory Surgical Center	0	0	0	0	1
Assisted Living Facility	2	2	4	2	0
Birth Center	0	0	0	0	0
Clinical Laboratory	2	1	2	5	4
Crisis Stabilization Unit/ Short Term Residential Treatment Facility	0	0	0	0	0
End-Stage Renal Disease Center	0	0	1	1	1
Health Care Clinic	0	0	1	0	2
Health Care Clinic Exemption	0	0	1	4	4
Health Care Services Pool	0	0	0	0	0
Home Health Agency	0	0	0	3	1
Home Medical Equipment and Service	2	0	1	1	2
Homemaker and Companion Service	3	0	2	9	3
Hospice	0	0	0	0	0
Hospital	0	0	1	1	1
Intermediate Care Facility for the Developmentally Disabled	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Registry	0	0	0	1	0
Nursing Home	1	1	3	3	1
Organ And Tissue Procurement	0	0	0	0	0
Portable X-Ray	0	0	0	0	0
Prescribed Pediatric Extended Care Center	0	0	0	0	0
Rehabilitation Agency	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Treatment Facility	0	0	1	0	0
Rural Health Clinic	1	1	1	6	7
Total	12	5	18	38	27

Table IV-15 Health Care Facilities in North Central Continued

Type of Facility	Union	Region Total
Abortion Clinic	0	2
Adult Day Care Center	0	2
Adult Family Care Home	0	5
Ambulatory Surgical Center	1	11
Assisted Living Facility	0	29
Birth Center	0	1
Clinical Laboratory	3	128
Crisis Stabilization Unit/ Short Term Residential Treatment Facility	0	2
End-Stage Renal Disease Center	0	13
Health Care Clinic	0	19
Health Care Clinic Exemption	2	100
Health Care Services Pool	0	6
Home Health Agency	0	24
Home Medical Equipment and Service	1	25
Homemaker and Companion Service	0	90
Hospice	0	1
Hospital	2	13
Intermediate Care Facility for the Developmentally Disabled	0	13
Nurse Registry	0	5
Nursing Home	0	25
Organ And Tissue Procurement	0	9
Portable X-Ray	0	1
Prescribed Pediatric Extended Care Center	0	1
Rehabilitation Agency	0	6
Residential Treatment Facility	0	4
Rural Health Clinic	1	30
Total	10	565

2. Assisted Living Facilities (ALFs), Residential Treatment Facilities

In addition to the medical facilities there are 29 licensed assisted living facilities (ALFs) in the North Central region. ALFs are living arrangements where adults live together to receive room, meals, and help with their daily living. ALFs are not nursing homes.

ALFs offer a variety of personal services like supervision of medications, or assistance with daily tasks such as bathing, dressing, etc. Recent administrative changes will allow some ALFs to provide limited nursing services such as injections, prescriptions, dressing changes, etc.

The majority of ALFs were built as private homes and care for four or five residents. In addition to one and two story dwellings, some ALFs are located in high rise buildings, or multi-unit buildings. Three groups of people live in ALFs: the elderly, the physically disabled, and the mentally disabled. ALFs may also distinguish residents according to specific health problems. For example, providing they can care for themselves, some homes will accept people with Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, incontinence of bowel or bladder and those who require oxygen. While residents of ALFs do not require the constant attention necessary in nursing homes, in a stressful situation such as an emergency evacuation or public shelter stay, residents will need support and continued assistance.

Chapter 10-A5, FAC, requires that ALFs have an evacuation plan (both internal and external) with written agreements with other similar host facilities if evacuation is necessary. The Florida State Department of Health and the Department of Elder Affairs provide guidance in disaster planning for ALFs. In addition many of the county departments of emergency management provide training and assistance in the development and maintenance of the hurricane evacuation plans. Assisted living facilities and predicted storm surge under each evacuation level also are presented in the Appendix IV-B.

3. End Stage Renal Dialysis Centers

Patients on dialysis face increased risks and challenges in disaster situations. Their treatment requires electrical power and a source of pure water. The Florida Agency for Health Care Administration (AHCA) requires that their providers identify their patients on dialysis and ensure they are dialyzed at their assigned centers within 24 hours of a hurricane warning. They are encouraged to make sure they have an emergency contact number for the dialysis centers, place their patients on their “disaster diets” and provide a list of all dialysis centers in the state as well as patient treatment sheets. After the storm, patients are directed

to call the dialysis center to determine if it is operational. If it is not, they are to the call the emergency contact for the facility. If these contacts fail, patients are to call Network 7 at 1-300-826-3773. Health care providers are instructed not to assume that local hospitals will be able to handle their patients' needs. They are also responsible to provide receiving facilities with the appropriate needs, supplies and sufficient staff. (See ***Guidance to Health Care Providers***, AHCA, July 6, 2006)

4. Home Health Care

On any given day in the North Central region it is estimated that thousands of residents are receiving some type of home health care. Those assisted residents will not be the same residents next month. New legislation in 2006 has identified the challenges to providing continuity of care especially in a hurricane evacuation. The legislation has assigned responsibility to home health care providers to identify their vulnerable patients, assist them in finding appropriate shelter for the storm depending on their clients' needs and appropriate level of care and to provide sufficient staff and supplies to the receiving facilities.

Each county has established special needs shelters for those residents on the special needs registries as well as plans for transportation of those residents and their care providers. Home health agencies are now required to work with the county emergency management agencies and health departments and to augment staff at those shelters if required.

5. Critical Infrastructure (Water Systems, Waste Water Systems, Power, Communications and Transportation)

The Critical Facilities Inventory also includes a listing of critical facilities/infrastructure necessary for response and recovery. County emergency management worked with providers including local government, utility companies, phone and cellular companies and transportation entities in the region.

6. Response and Recovery Facilities

State and county emergency management agencies have pre-identified potential sites for Points of Distribution of emergency supplies in the community as well as potential Staging Areas and Recovery Sites. These facilities are included in the Critical Facilities Inventories and are mapped. In addition certain community resources such as community/recreation centers and churches were included. This preliminary information will be evaluated looking at key factors such as

hazard vulnerability, neighborhood access, and income levels. (See maps in Appendix IV-A, B, C, and D)

7. Other Critical Facilities

The Inventory also includes the most current listing of hazardous material (Section 302) facilities, mobile home and RV parks, as well as both public and private resources.

Figure IV-1 Traffic Evacuation Zones (TEZs) in the North Central Region



Sources: North Central Regional Planning Council, Wilbur Smith Associates

Map Printed: June, 2010

Figure IV-2a Hurricane Evacuation Zones in the North Central Region



Figure IV-2b Hurricane Evacuation Zones in the North Central Region



Figure IV-3 North Central Region 100-Year Flood Plain



Figure IV-4 Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Areas in the North Central Region



This page intentionally left blank.