EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP (EMAG)

MINUTES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2018 ~ BUILDING 91, CAMP MURRAY ~ 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Meeting called to order by **Robert Ezelle, Director of Washington State Emergency Management Division at 1:00pm**

In Attendance – Introduction of Attendees

Scanned sign in sheet following minutes. "*" = Phone participant

Members

☒ Christopher Alexander	☒ Jason Biermann	☐ JoAnn Boggs	☒ Eric Brooks*
☒ Deanna Davis*	☒ Sandi Duffey	☒ Robert Ezelle	☒ Chandra Fox
☐ Paul Gazdik	☒ Barb Graff	☒ Tory Green*	☒ Scott Heinze*
☒ Walt Hubbard	☒ Gary Jenkins*	☒ Scott Johnson	☒ Buster Landin
☒ Jason Marquiss	☒ Scott McDougall	☒ Lee Shipman	☒ Kent Sisson
☐ Chuck Wallace	☐ Ute Weber	☐ Jay Weise	

Guest

Pattijean Hooper, City of Redmond
John Unfred, Lakewood Emergency Management

Supporting Staff

☒ Dan Banks	☐ Michael Roberson	☒ Jennifer Schaal	☒ John Ufford
☐ Serena Segura	☒ Alysha Kaplan	☒ Tirzah Kincheloe	☒ Kim Mask
☒ T.J. Rajcevich	☐ Stacey McClain	☐ Casey Broom	☒ Sierra Wardell

Call to Order/Introductions/Opening Comments   *Robert Ezelle*

Robert called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. He opened to meeting by recognizing two new members, Chandra Fox, Spokane County and Chief Christopher Alexander, Mukilteo Fire Department.

Approval of November 2, 2017 minutes
The November 2, 2017 were accepted as written.

Opening Comments
There are a lot of bills moving in Olympia.

- SB 6011: Continuity of Government (COG)
- Amending the Governor's Powers
- Establishing Resiliency Workgroup under the Office of Insurance Commissioner

- SB 5990: Uniform emergency volunteer health practitioners act – Recognition of volunteer health practitioners licensed in other states during emergency declarations.
- Funding for stockpiling food and supplies
- Removal of the provision in nuclear attack evacuation planning
- Collection of Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP).

Status Updates

GRANTS   Sierra Wardell / T.J. Rajcevich

16EMPG
- All grant agreements closed
- Grant closed – final paperwork turned in
- Pass through returned or unallocated funds equals $80,212* *(updated since last meeting)*
  - Least populated counties: $33,872
  - All other counties: $20,411
  - Cities: $24,478*
    - King: $19,751.20*
    - Pierce: $1,781.97
    - Yakima: $2,677.21
    - Snohomish: $267.11
  - Tribes: $1,451 *($4,745.20 total with $3,294 unallocated already moved to 17EMPG available funds)*

17EMPG - Local
- 63 applications received
- 62 applications approved
- 57 grant agreements executed

17EMPG - Tribal
- $98,665 available (includes ~ $3K from 16EMPG, unable to award)
- 6 tribes were awarded funding – emphasis on sustaining capability previously funded by EMPG, filling an identified gap, funding a core emergency management activity (e.g., communications, training, etc.)
- 3 grant agreements executed - finalizing remaining 3 agreements

17EMPG Reallocation
- 4 "pots" of turnback funding identified
  - Tribes
  - Cities
  - Lowest population counties (13)
  - All other counties
- Emails sent out to each group requesting feedback on
  - Specific reallocation options for their group's returned funding
  - Included options for combining their group's returned funding with another group's funding
  - Who should make the decision
  - Allowed counties with cities that returned funding to weigh in on the city's returned funding
- Didn't include the tribes
  - The amount returned was small
  - Recipients may change from year to year
  - Will push funds forward to 18EMPG (increase amount available) as we did with 17EMPG

- City of Yakima also excluded
    - 17EMPG agreement is closed and will not be applying for future EMPG funding
- 50% of counties and cities responded
    - Results represent the group's general inclination – not regimented
    - Sometimes answered with two options; some didn't answer the decision-making question
- 13 SMALLEST COUNTIES
    - includes: Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Garfield, Jefferson, Klickitat, Lincoln, Pacific, Pend Oreille, San Juan, Skamania, and Wahkiakum
    - Feedback received from 5 out the 13 counties
    - Reallocation top 3 choices:
        - 1st: Option #1 Divide amongst counties
        - 2nd: Option #4 Combine with other returned funding, divide amongst all subrecipients
        - 3rd: Option #2 Submit an additional project
- CITIES
    - 23 cities and King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Yakima counties
    - Feedback received from 14 out the 23 counties
    - Reallocation top 3 choices:
        - 1st: Tie between Option #1 return funding to "home" counties and Option #6 combine with other returned funding, divide amongst all subrecipients
        - 2nd: Tie between Option #4 divide amongst all cities and Option #8 combine with other returned funding, divvy up per capita
        - 3rd: Option #2 divide amongst the four counties with returned city funding
- REMAINING COUNTIES - 26
    - Feedback received from 12 out the 26 counties
    - Reallocation top 3 choices:
        - 1st: Option #4 combine with other returned funding, divide amongst all subrecipients
        - 2nd: Option #3 combine with other returned funding, competitive project open to all
        - 3rd: Tie between Option #1 divide amongst all counties and Option #5 combine with other returned funding, divvy up per capita
- DECISION
    - 27 responses
    - Ranked choices:
        - 1st: Option #1 EMAG
        - 2nd: Option #4 EMD
        - 3rd: Option #3 all subrecipients having an equal vote
        - 4th: Option #2 subrecipients in the funding group
- ASSUMPTIONS
    - Any additional funding will be added to existing 17EMPG agreements
        - Application spend plans and work plans both may need to be updated
    - Subrecipient will be responsible for increased match amount
    - This fact may cause some to turn down additional monies
    - If a competitive option is decided upon, will impact PGS staff workload and delay getting the funding out to subrecipients.
- REMINDER: Everything aligned this year to allow the funding to be pushed forward – this may not be the case in the future.

- Should funding stay within the funding group? Or be looked at holistically across all subrecipients?

18EMPG
- Began internal work to prep for the State application
- Thank you for the feedback on the 17EMPG application process
- Tirzah is framing the process and timeline for both the Local and Tribal process
- Current expected subrecipients/agreements:

Subrecipient	FY16	FY17	FY18
Cities	23	24	24*
Counties	38	39	39
Tribes	4	6	TBD
TOTAL	**65**	**69**	**TBD**

* City of Yakima will not be applying for 18EMPG. City of Marysville requested consideration of eligibility to apply for 18EMPG.

SCIPT   Jason Biermann

Jason Biermann reported that the SCIPT is working on conducting webinars and to educate the workplan. The SCIPT is partnering with the National Guard. It was piloted in Homeland Security Region 1 and with Snohomish County.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT   Dan Banks
The Emergency Management's Logistics Section has been very busy. They continue to work the California wildfires and reimbursement requests. The section will be doing roadshows for WAMAS and Resource Ordering in the spring.

LEP (LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY) UPDATE   Casey Broom
There was no update for the meeting.

HUMAN CAPITAL (EMAT, IMAT, ETC.)   Jason Biermann
John Biermann and the other leads met yesterday. During the meeting, a list of problems was identified, such as pre-deployment, deployment issues. They are working with the FEMA NIMS Coordinator to develop position descriptions and descriptions for EOC staff.
WAMAS subcommittee is sending out a survey to emergency management organizations to assist with getting answers about how WAMAS works and identify was needs to improve.
- Recommend partner with jurisdictions (sister cities/counties) on each side of the state
- Recommend establishing per diem rates for those deployed
- There is a need for teams – jurisdictions don't have depth to create teams. Having a credentialing process to piecemeal teams through a state managed repository.
- Trying to streamline the process to get people deployed.

How should Emergency Management look in Washington State?   *All*

Dan Banks provided an update of the progress for those who did not attend the workgroup meetings.

- Combined the definition for Emergency Management. This will be used to develop legislation in the future. Public messaging more successful when writing at a 6th grade level. The definition is designed to be at high level.
  - Don't want to get bogged down with the definition and need to focus on moving forward.
  - The definition will be used in all the core documents.
  - The group voted on the definition as the accepted definition and it was overwhelmingly approved
- TJ developed a spreadsheet to use for data collection. At this point, the region has not been identified. Only focusing on state and local levels.
  - Some of the levels will be the lead at every level

At the last meeting, it was noted to not look at the way it was done in the past, or how it was previously funded.

- Barb Graff commented that we need to look at if did not have an emergency management and what would we do to build the system from scratch.
- Robert and Jason M. are researching other state programs. This is where there may be the need for a regional approach.
- Wanting to have this ready for the Legislative long session and keep building it year after year.

Looking at a systematic approach. What is the best way to look at this? Creating city-local resilience. Support messaging and logistics at the county level.

Does this need to start at the state level and build down or start at the city level and build up? The regional discussion is an independent issue.

Community dependent/county driven. Build from the local to state; bottom up. What is needed if building from bottom up? Where does the city end, county begin; county end, state begin?

- Need to define roles and responsibilities. Who do we go to when needing experts?
  - Need to have a discussion on how this will work. When developing plans, it will not work to use the same plans for a city of 7,000 and a city of 70,000.
- How does a city become engaged with their county? The county would support the city. The structures developed need to all look the same in order to be interoperable.
  - Hazard Mitigation planning: What if there was only one (1) plan and addendums were added to unique hazards (i.e. dams, Columbia Generating Station, etc.)

Resource requests in a disaster response start at the local (city) to the county to the state. This may change the whole business model.

At the county or city level, functions don't matter where they are housed; they just need to be identified. Chris Alexander noted that the state is the base and builds up to the locals.

Need to know what objectives are, especially in the smaller cities. Systems need to be developed based on mutual aid construct. What does a statewide organizational chart look like?

Need to establish "this is what" and what the county needs to accomplish. Need to be careful that all cities are grouped alike and counties are grouped alike. Many City level functions can be taken care of by quality county programs. This would require partnerships made prior to an incident or event.

Per RCW, "Every political subdivision…should have an emergency management program" This would not be an accurate statement.

Assuming there are no grant funds, what are you planning to do, at the city, county, region, and state? May find there are places around the state that there may not be the need to have state planners because they may able to accomplish this in house. Send a survey to all locals asking if they can do this without funding and are you able to.

The state can provide the skill sets needed (i.e. planners, grant guidance, training and exercise, and public affairs.

Next steps:

The EMAG workgroup will provide input to the matrix sent out by TJ. Will meet again on February 23 to discuss the finished product (spreadsheet). The data from the spreadsheet may develop into a menu as there are multiple overlays are being identified. The workgroup was encouraged to share the matrix or final definition of Emergency Management that we agreed upon today with local jurisdictions and ask what can be done. The EMAG will meet again on April 5th and a report out of what has been accomplished will be given by the workgroup. The workgroup would like to be transparent on what it is doing.

The workgroup will meet again in March.

Closing Remarks   *Robert Ezelle*

Sierra Wardell was acknowledged and praised for her work on the EMAG funding presentation All current concepts are open for discussion.

Barb Graff announced that a $200,000 proviso was added for inventory of Unreinforced Masonry buildings across the state. She would like to know if there is a list to be shared.

2018 Meeting Schedule

~~February 1, 2018   1:00 PM – 4:00 PM   Camp Murray~~
April 5, 2018   10:00 AM – 3:00 PM   Moses Lake
May 3, 2018   9:00 AM – 4:00 PM   KCRCECC
September 20, 2018   1:00 PM – 4:00 PM   Spokane
November 1, 2018   1:00 – 4:00 PM   Camp Murray

Adjourn

Last Name	First Name	Representation	Organization	Email	Signature
Alexander	Chris	Small Cities	Mukilteo Fire Department	calexander@mukilteowa.gov	*(signature)*
Biermann	Jason	Westside Large County	Snohomish County	jason.biermann@co.snohomish.wa.us	
Boggs	JoAnn	Eastside Small County Tier 1	Pend Oreille County	jboggs@pendoreille.org	
Brooks	Eric	Westside Medium County	Island County	E.Brooks@co.island.wa.us	
Davis	Deanna	Eastside Medium County	Benton County	ddavis@bces.wa.gov	
Duffey	Sandi	Eastside Medium County	Grant County	sduffey@grantcountywa.gov	*(signature)*
Ezelle	Robert	State	EMD	robert.ezelle@mil.wa.gov	
Fox	Chandra	Eastside Large County	Spokane County	cefox@spokanecounty.org	*(signature)*
Gazdik	Paul	Medium Cities	City of Bellingham	prgazdik@cob.org	
Graff	Barb	Large Cities	City of Seattle	barb.graff@seattle.gov	
Green	Tory	Medium Cities	City of Tacoma	tgreen@cityoftacoma.org	
Marquiss	Jason	State	EMD	jason.marquiss@mil.wa.gov	
Heinze	Scott	Westside Large County	Pierce County	sheinze@co.pierce.wa.us	
Hubbard	Walt	Westside Very Large County	King County	walt.hubbard@kingcounty.gov	*(signature)*
Jenkins	Gary	Small Cities	City of Pullman	gary.jenkins@pullman-wa.gov	
Johnson	Scott	Consortium	CRESA	scott.johnson@clark.wa.gov	*(signature)*
Landin	Nils (Buster)	Tribes	Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	nlandin@sauk-suiattle.com	
McDougall	Scott	Westside Small County Tier 1	Pacific County	smcdougall@co.pacific.wa.us	*(signature)*
Shipman	Lee	Tribes	Shoalwater Bay Tribe	leshipman@shoalwaterbay-nsn.gov	*(signature)*
Sisson	Kent	Eastside Small County Tier 3	Chelan County	kent.sisson@co.chelan.wa.us	*(signature)*
Wallace	Chuck	Westside Small County Tier 2	Grays Harbor County	cwallace@co.grays-harbor.wa.us	
Weber	Ute	Medium Cities	City of Tacoma	uweber@cityoftacoma.org	
Weise	Jay	Eastside Small County Tier 2	Adams County	jayw@co.adams.wa.us	
Banks	Dan	State	EMD	dan.banks@mil.wa.gov	*(signature)*
Dudley	Lit	State	EMD	lit.dudley@mil.wa.gov	
Hollingsworth	John	State	EMD	john.hollingsworth@mil.wa.gov	
Kaplan	Alysha	State	EMD	alysha.kaplan@mil.wa.gov	
Lang	Rob	State	EMD	robert.lang@mil.wa.gov	
Mask	Kim	State	EMD	kim.mask@mil.wa.gov	
Rajcevich	T.J.	State	EMD	timothy.rajcevich@mil.wa.gov	*(signature)*
Schaal	Jennifer	State	EMD	jennifer.schaal@mil.wa.gov	
Ufford	John	State	EMD	john.ufford@mil.wa.gov	*(signature)*

Representation	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Email	Signature
Guests CITY OF LAKEWOOD	UNFRED	JOHN	LAKEWOOD EM	JUNFRED@CITYOFLAKEWOOD.US	*(signature)*
Guests WA EMD	Kincheloe	Tirzah	WA EMD	tirzahkincheloe@mil.wa.gov	*(signature)*
Guests WA EMD	Wardell	Sierra	WA EMD	sierra.wardell@mil.wa.gov	*(signature)*
Guests WSEMA	HOOPER	PATTIJEAN		PHOOPER@redmondwa.gov	*(signature)*
Guests SAUK-SUIATTLE Tribe	LANDIN	Buster	SSIT	nlandin@sauk-suiattle.com	*(signature)*