Meeting called to order by Jason Marquiss, Deputy Director of Washington State Emergency Management Division at 1:10 PM

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
☐ Barb Graf ☐ Tory Green ☐ Scott Heinze ☐ Pattijean Hooper
☒ Jody Miller* ☐ Gary Jenkins ☐ Scott Johnson ☒ Jay Weise*
☒ Jason Marquiss ☒ Scott McDougall ☒ Ute Scofield*

Guests
Jim Sande, Swinomish Tribe #1 EM
Greg Wright, Olympia
*Lynn Sterbenz, Bellingham EM
*Brendan Cowan, San Juan DEM

Guests
*Tammi Wright, Mason County
*Tim Day, Kirkland
Doug Ten Hoopen, Skagit County EM

Supporting Staff
☒ Alysha Kaplan ☒ Tirzah Kincheloe ☒ Jordan Oden ☒ T.J. Rajcevich
☒ Sierra Wardell ☒ Nicole Mock ☒ Gail Cram ☒ Kathryn Zetzer
☒ Serena Segura

Call to Order/Introductions/Opening Comments

Approval of November 1, 2018 minutes

It was noted that Alysha is listed on the attendance list twice.

Sandi Duffey motions for the November 1 meeting minutes to be approved as written with the minor correction noted above. JoAnn Boggs second the motion. The motion stands to approve the minutes as written.
Opening Comments

As mentioned in the EMC, EMD has recently finished a reorganization. Recent staff turnover and retirements gave us a chance to review our structure and how we can serve our customers better.

- Everyone is still doing the job they were doing. Any movement was a result of application. All contact information is the same.
- Any physical relocations of desk space have been postponed until any plus ups are determined.
- Each position will now have a primary and alternate contact to increase depth of program knowledge.
- A large percentage of the positions have been moved to fall under an Operations Unit, led by Alysha. This is to help facilitate communication between different sections and programs.
- The move will help us better align with the FEMA FIT Team.

JoAnn Boggs asked about the possibility of 1stNet coming under EMD

Jason advised that everything is still in the discussion phase and we must first determine what can be done within the confines of the grants that currently support the program. Based on the focus of the program, it may be decided it fits better under the Department of Commerce’s Broadband division, but again, it is all only in the discussion phase. He emphasized that no E911 funding would be used to fund 1st Net or any other program outside of E911.

Jim Sande asked if anyone has looked into the Plan C of when 1stNet fails.

Jason advised that that was part of a broader issue currently being discussed between the CIO and TAG and that there will be a briefing later when there is a better grasp on the issue.

Sandi Duffey mentioned that the phone list in the lobby at EMD was out of date, and Alysha responded she would take care of it.

Status Updates

SCIPT

Serena Segura provided an overview of the SCIPT team and their current status.

- The team is focusing their efforts on developing better scenario-based exercises. The M9 study will be completed next week and will be incorporated into their planning for a WA region 10 specific scenario.
- They are working with Ecology and DNR to incorporate their models into the exercises (SLIDES)
- Infrastructure and communication planning have slowed recently due to staff turnover, but they are moving forward. SCIPT is also developing outreach programs that include critical infrastructure.
- Phase 2 has begun and is being well received among interagency and partners.

Jim S. brought up his concerns regarding reliance on road transportation. All it would take is one bridge out and some areas would not be able to get fuel. They already have an agreement with local companies and first responders regarding fuel supply on the reservation, but he recommends others due the same.

Jason advised that Tristan is leading a working group focusing specifically on infrastructure and supply issues.

CEMP

Although not on original agenda, Alysha asked that Jacob provide an overview of the upcoming CEMP changes.

Sandi inquired if the template will be sent around for input.
Jacob advised that currently it has not. They have “case studies” in progress with a selection of jurisdictions currently using the template, but none have been completed and returned yet. Jason added that the intent was to test, evaluate, test, and evaluate again before publishing.

Jason B. asked if there would be a mechanism in place on the new template for Counties to see what anyone in their jurisdiction is submitting before State approval (to avoid commitment of the county without its knowledge)

Jason M. advised that would be addressed in small group.

Sandi stated that she is currently seeing some of the template when others email it to her asking questions. She recommends that it be sent to everyone (even before approval) to avoid confusion and more questions.

**WAC 118.30 AND LPR REPORT**

Alysha discussed the LPR report. It was discussed during the previous EMAG and it appeared the consensus was using the report to meet WAC 118.30 was not a good format to use. Currently, anyone receiving EMPG grant money is meeting the WAC requirements with their applications.

WAC does not reflect current way of doing business and is unnecessary due to all other documentation being required.

Alysha would propose requesting amendment to WAC 118.30 to reflect current business practice.

All members agreed and had no questions.

**GRANTS**

Ferry county stated that it was working to see if they can accept funds. The EM Office has moved out from their Sheriff’s Department, so it is now considered a “new” EM Department.

Possible uses for the county returned funds were discussed including state provided translation, CEMNET, and mobile emergency communication vehicles.

It was decided that although useful, it was unlikely that translation could be considered “state wide support” due to the geographical concentrations of LEP.

CEMNET is not working as it should be, and it really needs to be fixed if it is going to be a redundancy, however, it needs to be determined if the 30,000 USD available would have an impact on the system performance.

A mobile communication vehicle could be useful, but it is not known the usefulness to all counties and cities.

It was determined that the topic would need to be brought back to the group, in the meantime what could be done to CEMNET with the amount available would be researched. They want to get the most return for investment. It was suggested that members let any other ideas that have be known in the meantime.

General
TJ brought up reconciliation and applications. The process moves slowly because of cross due dates, staffing shortages, etc. He reiterated that all gaps in funding need to be laid out in detail to avoid even further delay caused by his staff having to go back to the applying agency for details.

FY19

Still in appropriations. PGS is trying to be proactive by planning/budgeting the same amount as last year. There are 2 new applicants for FY19 (City of Bainbridge Island and the City of Covington). Enumclaw and Twisp were turned down for being too small.

Sandi asked if the 19 applications would be the same format as the current ones, which would allow jurisdictions to get a “start” on completing

Tirzah answered that she plans to add more clarification information the “informational” column, but that the information requested of the jurisdictions would remain the same

TJ advised that he heard FEMA may be increasing required information, but he did not expect it to take affect for 19.

Jason advised that he believed FEMA was getting pushback from decision makers about showing a return on investment for the grant money it is providing. Additionally, there is concern that some states are using the money to fund regular expenses and not to improve their responsiveness.

This was followed by a discussion on funding and possible reasons for funding issues. Some felt that FEMA does not understand that EM is not a one size fits all. For some jurisdictions, sustainment is only possible with grant funding. Additionally, some of the core capabilities are equipment heavy, which requires a large investment. If the core capabilities focused more on knowledge heavy capabilities which can be completed with less financial cost. Further, not all capabilities are relevant to each jurisdiction.

It was also discussed that part of the issue is the Emergency Manager’s ability to do more with less which bring unfunded mandates. Because the work is still “getting done”, it is believed that the money is not really needed, and that EM’s can continue to do more with less. However, the fact that appropriations are needed after emergencies shows that EM’s need more funding. Jody discussed how with her recent budget request, she focused on what wouldn’t get done due to funding gaps. Although she could’ve “made magic happen” as always, the county needed to see what lack of full funding would do.

Jody mentioned that during her excursion assignment with FEMA, she discovered that a lot of it has to do with the fact that it tends to be non-emergency managers setting guidance and policy. Once they are able to get out on sight visits and see exactly what is entailed, they tend to be more understanding of the overall environment.

Jason stated that EMD was aware that they are not always the best at communicating non-emergency information and asked if the Legislative updates being sent were helpful, or if they needed to be changed at all. It was requested that notifications be sent sooner if possible so that EM’s can lobby with locally for bills.

Jason B also mentioned that when it comes to budget talks, the focus should be about what citizens need and the services provided to them by EM.

**EMAG SMALL GROUP UPDATE**

The group continued the discussion while moving into the EMAG Small Group Update.

Jason began the update with a presentation on the “why/how” of the small group.

The current focus of the group is to determine how we define EM to decisionmakers and how we sell our “product”.

**EMAG SMALL GROUP UPDATE**

Jason Marquiss
Although what an EM “does” can vary among jurisdictions, the core concepts/principles are the same. In order to be effective at lobbying and public information, we need to make sure there is no disconnect within our own profession.

In regard to EM - what is ideal, what do we current have, what is the consequences of the difference?

Doug mentioned that as a smaller county, the list shown in the presentation is not representative of what he does. As a one-man shop, it would be impossible for him to provide all of those services. Scott seconded this by saying that while he thought he was doing quite well, the list shown humbles him as is doing a little of everything but nothing to its full amount.

Jason stated that the list of what an EM “does” and what they are currently doing to full capacity could be used for justification to hire more employees and invest more resources. Also, the list should not make them feel that they are not doing their jobs, they are doing well for their counties in spite of their limited resources. He also added that most EM’s would agree with the “humbling” aspect. Even EMD at the State level has found through the accreditation process that they are not doing everything to the full ability.

The group then moved to possible ideas on what can be done to streamline emergency management in the state. The first suggestion was a center of excellence design like the DOH uses, with specific jurisdictions being the subject matter experts on particular programs.

1. Center of Excellence

There was strong objection by some Emergency Managers to this term/idea. Some of the points against were:

- Sharing information and knowledge is something already done, where is the need to formalize a structure.  
- What will happen to the CoE with the change of jurisdiction leaders? Will a new mayor/administrator come in and decide they do not want their jurisdiction performing this role? 
- Will there be funding requirements and where will the funding come from? 
- Could it be deferred to the State in order to avoid the funding issues. 
- Some regions with capacity may not to defer to the state or another jurisdiction on the matter. 
- Can create a have/have not situation

San Juan shared that they would be leery of adopting the DOH model. In some smaller jurisdictions it was not received well, and some comments heard from smaller departments of health echo the concerns previously mentioned. As a group we should focus on bringing jurisdictions up to full service and not subsidizing.

There was also strong support for the general concept of a center. Some of the points in favor of the idea were:

- With a formalized structure sharing of information would be easier. 
- There is a need for some sort of formal mentorship program for newer EM’s coming in. Olympia added to this point that as a new EM it was three years before he realized he could attend the EMAG without being on the council. Most of the information he learned was from his Fire Chief that has been in the business for a long time and knows the EM side of things.

Jim S added that one way to address funding is through community outreach. By getting the attention of the citizens and their buy-in, they are more likely to support initiatives without relying solely on administratively allotted funds.

2. Standardize and Align Pre-disaster Process with Post-disaster Process

There was no discussion on this option as all agreed there is a need to align the two

3. Review/Update RCW 38.52 and WACs

No discussion due to running length of meeting
4. Regionalized Service Delivery

The concept of formal regionalized services was touched upon. Jim S. mentioned that he would like to see regionalization based on challenges and not geography. For instance, while in the same “area” an ocean side jurisdiction would not face the same challenges/focus as jurisdictions further inland.

Due to the meeting running over, the discussion was cut short to a general “round-up”

TJ mentioned that the ideas were focused on how to provide EM services appropriately and which would be the best model.

Jason clarified that there is still work to be done on the concept. The ideas presented may not be what is ultimately implemented, but the WG wanted to get the conversation started. There is a need to develop plans and objectives so that we can further lobby the Governor’s office. EMD is restricted from lobbying for anything not in the Governors proposed budget, so they are the first stop. Further, some of these ideas do not require legislation but are policies that can be enacted.

Chandra Mentioned that it is difficult to get money from local agencies as they feel the state should pay for EM. The idea of risk was also brought up in regard to funding. Because of the lack of state funding, the state is taking on liability in the event something was to occur.

Jim S. discussed the need for cohesive asks and for doing leg work on the local level as well.

Jason wrapped up the decision by reiterating the points mentioned were just ideas. The group should look into ideas that are also policy and can be initiated without legislation. He asked the attendees to review the listed suggestions, as well as any they themselves have, to discuss later.

April Agenda Suggestions

Agenda items were not discussed.

2019 Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2019</td>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Camp Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2019</td>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>PIEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Time- TBD</td>
<td>WSEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2019</td>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Camp Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned approximately at 4:20 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.smith@cityoftacoma.org">michael.smith@cityoftacoma.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jordan.thompson@cityofseattle.org">jordan.thompson@cityofseattle.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.johnson@cityofbellevue.org">scott.johnson@cityofbellevue.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.lee@cityofspokane.org">mary.lee@cityofspokane.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bob.clark@cityofeverett.org">bob.clark@cityofeverett.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.davis@cityofrenton.org">jane.davis@cityofrenton.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.brown@cityofbainbridgeisland.org">ken.brown@cityofbainbridgeisland.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.taylor@cityofkirkland.org">lisa.taylor@cityofkirkland.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.clark@cityofbellevue.org">mark.clark@cityofbellevue.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.williams@cityoflynnwood.org">steve.williams@cityoflynnwood.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG)**

**Thursday, February 7, 2019**