

Washington State Emergency Management Advisory Group

April 14, 2016

1300 – 1600

Notes

Attendees:

	Present	Absent		Present	Absent		Present	Absent
Banks	X		Heinze		X	Shipman	X	
Beck	X		Hooper	X		Sisson		X
Boggs		X	Hubbard	X		Smith	X	
Brooks	X		Jenkins	X		Ufford	X	
Duffey	X		Lewis		X	Wallace		X
Ezelle	X		McCuen		X	Weise		X
Graff	X		McDaniel		X			
Green	X		McDougall	X				
Hardin	X		Pennington		X			

Others: Jason Biermann - Phone

Visitors: TJ Rajcevich

- I. Started: 0804
- II. Review and approve minutes from Feb and Mar meetings - Approved (Attachments 1 and 2)
- III. EMPG Application and monitoring issues – Charma Anderson
 - a. A current chart of who all the recipients of EMPG currently are. You had distributed one to us in the past that showed subgrantee, original award amount, adjustments, final amount, expenditures, notes, and current status.
 - b. The federal guidance you are now following that has caused you to need a much greater level of detail for the applications
 - c. A copy of the current application locals and tribes are required to complete.
 - d. A list of common concerns you have encountered with local applications
 - e. Examples of applications used elsewhere in the country that seemed much more simplified (Brendan’s suggestion from last meeting)
 - f. Thank you very much. Hopefully, this will not only generate ideas to decrease the workload but also help inform EMAG of one of their core responsibilities which is to oversee the reallocation methodology used for EMPG.
 - g. Started in January, workload issues, contracts issues. Grants Section has restructured and added some new people. February meeting brought up another issue with EMPG applications. Reviewed history with EMPG application.
 - h. Several changes throughout process – changed from online system to excel spreadsheet, Subrecipient contracts only had the local budget and did not have federal grant budget, now has both including match. FFY15 increased workload. Need more transparency on changes and pre-emptive outreach on changes. Locals want the one on one to go over the application. PattiJean would like to see workshops.

- i. **Attachment 3** (1) – 15EMPG applicants; Can Pend Oreille and Ferry Counties merge their applications and programs.
- j. **Attachment 4** (2) – saw gaps in federal and contracts, reviewed notice of funding opportunity; HIVA/THIRA requirements are for larger jurisdictions and capabilities, How do we ease this up for those that do not have a THIRA? Some states require sub-recipients that require the THIRA. The Locals will need time (years) to start the THIRA process. Tribal HLS Grants require a THIRA. When in doubt ID the core capabilities. Feds want more milestones for the BSIR. Could have locals to their own report but that is impractical and therefore Grants wants to roll up. Feds want more accomplishments (performance measures and milestones) up front and at close out. Have merged activities and follow POETE. Have some flexibility to make adjustments to process. Grants does try to soften the edges for the locals.
- k. **Attachment 5** (3) – State used logic models to help the application, state will recommend using the logic model for locals as well. There will be a workgroup to help make this process efficient and will look at different ways to make easier for applicants. Seems to be a disconnect on the question sentence structure that does not tie into locals. Need shorter sentences, three syllable words smaller, need examples of questions. Can this be “dumbed down”/simplified? PattiJean will be available to investigate this.
- l. **Attachment 6** (4) – Lessons learned for 15EMPG; individual technical assistance helped a lot when fixing these concerns. Would be good to have bad examples as well as good examples. May need to have more help with defining objective and outcome. Need more detail especially for spend plan tab. Can explain why no details, still need know that there is a plan for the spending. FEMA wants to know what are your goals, what trying to do, capability vs sustainability, etc. State has lessons learned from their application. Need word picture for what trying to do/solve. Need some flexibility in general app and ability to have clarity/specifics in the quarterly report. Need to tell “like it is”. Plan changes mid-stream are very difficult. Grants try to work through amendments quickly. Grants team has some major concerns when it comes down to the last month and a recipient didn’t use monies and now wants to spend money for equipment to spend the money. Not happening as much as working proactive in the app process.
- m. **Attachment 7** (5) – Examples from Wyoming, questions are not much different than states, they require quarterly reports whereas does not request until at the end, budget detail is not as detailed as states, similar to state’s application; **ACTION -Need pass through % for Barb**; Missouri – no mention of threats or hazards or capability and gaps, not enough for BSIR.
- n. **Attachment 8** (6) – comparison between 15 and 16 applications, biggest difference was in the workplan, org costs into program area. Chuck likes the setup better this time but was frustrated that it was changed without being notified of the changes. **ACTION - Need a calendar of workshops for locals to attend.** Most likely June 15 through end of July for workshops.
- o. Workload – Need some advice on how the structure and how administer the program because of more mid-sized cities want to participate. May want to shift monitoring and contracting to the counties. This may cause some issues with county workload. Changing reimbursement with SHSP and UASI, reformatted the process and put more responsibility on the sub-recipient. Will look at doing samples like auditing vs doing line item audits.

- p. Moving forward –work group and start on FFY16 application in early May. Grants want to get contracts out in August so deadline for apps end of July. Try to work together with PAL to develop a local preparedness report to help influence the app process. Still working on the four EMF’s until Programmatic elements are approved (WAC 118).
 - q. How EMD spends their money – Attachment 9
 - r. Need to keep on the agenda to revisit any issues and how the new allocation structure. Need to have this discussion at the close out of 16 grant. Grants will rely on EMAG to reallocate any funds. Grants is managing 15 adjustments. It looks like if a city didn’t apply the monies when to the county. 90 day prior to grant closeout have the discussion of monies left over. Add to EMAG agenda at 90 day of close out and grant close out LL and start with 16 application. How do we show the metrics for the programs vs support to those that do not have programs?
- IV. LEP Plan – Casey Broom via conference call
- a. Update on LEP pilot program, five county central Washington area. Hired LEP coordinator; working with EM and gathering best practices, working with local media and community leaders. Working on translated all hazards materials for preparedness. Chelan county has put together survey for local schools focused on wildfires and how they handled and were affected. Making connections in the community to gather resources for next fire season. This will help inform the counties LEP plan. Working through ESF 15. Draft of LEP plan for counties. Plans are required by federal grant guidance. State’s plan is being finished and presented at PIEPC. Working with locals to get resource lists completed, networking, translated evacuation brochures, etc. Long term after the pilot program will include: build associated metrics and write up, road map for reaching out to the rest of the state, incorporate best practices in W. Washington and all their diverse languages. LEP letter sent to local EMs from Director but not to the tribes, is there a need for LEP reminder for tribes. Lee states that due to canneries there would be a need for at least Spanish speakers. It doesn’t hurt to send the letter to the tribes. ACTION – send letter to lee for changing language for tribes.
- V. Standardizations Report Out
- a. Resource Ordering - Attachment 10 (Map) – Training and outreach of the resource ordering. East side will not get touched before CR 16. WAMAS overview still needs a lot of presentations. Future resource ordering training will include WAMAS training at the same time. Will concentrate on North Central counties before fire season. Will try NE counties after then rest of East counties as soon as practical. ACTION – Resource ordering letter to Robert for signature due on Tuesday by Dan Banks (add para re training). How can EMAG support EMD to get trainers out there? ACTION - Dan will get back with EMAG on this. Robert wants to see a detailed plan for this training to complete by end of federal fiscal year. Brief to this group the progress on this plan. Tribes have been asking questions about WAMAS so need to include tribes if doing at the Regional level. State can accommodate what the customers need.
 - b. Activation Levels - Effective CR 16, state will change activation level to statewide approved standard. Higher the number is the lowest level of activation and change from four to three levels. Robert is discussing with locals during his visits that state and locals need to have common language and standards across the state.
 - c. Operational Rhythm – 30 entity call will not work, looking at breaking down into regional chunks for CR16, or have a different simultaneous calls with EMD as speakers

on the call. Need to have an agenda with specific expectations of the call and data needed. How do we really do command and control if we have a Cascadia? How do we restructure and funnel info up? Operational Workgroup has done some of this work and reached out to the participants of CR16.

VI. Human Capital Report Out

- a. EMATs – Issue raised about the purpose of the EMATs when we have the type 3 IMTs. John Unfred, Alysha Kaplan, Brendan Cowan, Jessi Chapin, Maurice Goodall, and Jason Biermann had a conference call to discuss this issues. Did discuss state’s role of maintenance and funding. Needs more discussion as a group to dig into the details of the pros and cons of both groups. Will meet April 19 and report back. There is some applicability of having both IMTs and EMATs during an incident and the incident cycle. Different perspectives: IMTs can do the job but others state that EMATs have different skill set than an IMT. IMT provides direction/control of incident vs EMAT have softer skills and work more EOC. Standardization of EOC/ECCs would help. Some are ICS tight and would work better with IMT but some are not and EMAT might work better. This would all be situation dependent.
- b. King County is moving forward with building teams.
- c. Processes and procedures are still being fleshed out. King County is further along on this piece.
- d. Jason will take on the EMAT portion but not the rest of the Human Capital workgroup pieces.
- e. Need to find a leader for the Human Capital workgroup as a whole.
- f. Funding is still an issue. How do we fund these teams? With disaster declaration, reimbursement is easier but state will look at opening up the DRA.
- g. ACTION - Robert would like to spend some time to talk to Maurice about his funding issues. Bring Maurice in to present at the EMAG? Realistically, the requesting jurisdiction is financially responsible for the assistance unless the submitting jurisdiction decides to waive the fee.
- h. ACTION – July Meeting will look at refocusing on this workgroup.

VII. Credentialing – Attachment 11

- a. Dominic Marzano started several years ago. Researched out but paper and photos did not sync with each other. Paper and photos now are synced. Mercer Island and several other EMs throughout Region 6 like it and want it implemented statewide. Biggest issue is funding of rebadging. Zone 1 (Jurisdictions above I-90 in King County) will beta test during CR16.
- b. What is the benefit of this? What is the target audience? What is the purpose? Standards/ “You know what you are getting”, access control during disaster, Robert sees value in this system. Are we talking Badging, Credentialing, or both? They are linked together. How to do we validate the skill set of people so that they are “plug and play”? Needs more thoughts into cost, who issues badge, validation/trust in the agency issuing badge, who maintains the database, etc.
- c. Do we use this form of badging for all first responders since LEs and county employees will have their own badging system? Can this system have the same type of info that would be needed to access federal properties (JBLM)? Benton and Island counties are okay with this.

- d. NEMA has had discussions on the resource typing and the credentialing of those resources.
- e. This is an issue of the professionalization of emergency management. Who validates the experience and the skill set? There has to be a governing body ie state.
- f. Do we need an EM credentialing committee? LE, Fire, and Health has these committees. Colorado has task books for EOC staff.
- g. Are we talking staff or volunteers? Kirkland does background check on all volunteers that get a badge. They do not give badges for just in time volunteers.
- h. Sandy suggested phasing in the badging system (color code and format) when badges expire. Badging would be the format whereas credentialing would be a much larger piece.
- i. ACTION - Robert will do the outreach to other states to see how they credential.
- j. EMAG will keep badging and credentialing as one proposal.
- k. ACTION – King County Zone 1 to do a project proposal and bring it back to EMAG.
- l. The earliest state can ask for resources for this is 2 years from now and implementation of getting those resources would be 3 years from now.
- m. Two schools of thought: State is the validator or the local jurisdictions are the validator.

VIII. Sustainable Funding Report Out

- a. Revenue Forecast issue – FFY17 budget picture, President’s budget request calls for another 50% budget decrease for HLS grants. Congressional delegation doubts that the proposal would turn into reality. Appropriations process has not gone through and therefore we need to look at taking what received last couple years at high level and President’s proposal at low level. Need to plan for range of alternatives. State is looking at the alternatives and how to make up the gap.
- b. Referred to Scott’s Florida research. Lee contacted the Seminole tribe and they did not participate in the Florida model. Lee really liked Scott’s report.
- c. Need to WSEMA in the room.
- d. Scott is the lead for this workgroup.

IX. Agenda for Jul Meeting

- a. Review workgroups’ objectives
- b. Workgroup report outs
- c. Building a workplan for sustainable funding
- d. CR AAR (30 mins max)
- e. EMPG report out

X. Good of the Order

- a. Seems that there are lots of workgroups that are doing tasks that EMAG is already working. How can we find out what other workgroups and tasks are out there? Who should be doing the work? Should the local workgroups be doing the tasks and EMAG support them and approve for statewide implementation? Will the CR 16 workgroups still be viable after the exercise? We need to ask who else is working this issue when the proposals come up. Can the EMAG task the other workgroups to do tasks from the EMAG? Depends on who owns the task and the workgroup. Is there a place or repository to try and get a handle all the workgroups and tasks? The state can publish a list of what the state thinks is being worked on. ACTION – John Ufford to gather from the EMC, EMAG, and other workgroups what state thinks is happening.

- b. Recommend having a constituent report out.
 - c. State CEMP review will be going out to local EMs for review.
 - d. All the local LEPC planners are in place and will be visiting their local jurisdictions soon.
- XI. **Closed:** 1300