

# EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP (EMAG)

# MINUTES

FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019 ~ CAMP MURRAY ~ 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

---

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

---

## **In Attendance – Introduction of Attendees**

---

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

### **Members**

- |  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christopher Alexander* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jason Biermann* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> JoAnn Boggs       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Brooks*   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brendan Cowan          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deanna Davis*   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandi Duffey      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robert Ezelle  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jody Ferguson                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chandra Fox     | <input type="checkbox"/> Barb Graf                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Pattijean Hooper          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Jenkins                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Scott Johnson              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brendan McCluskey | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jason Marquiss |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scott McDougall                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jay Weise       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ute Scofield*     |  |

### **Guests**

Laurel Nelson, Seattle DEM

Sandy Eccker, Thurston County DEM

### **Supporting Staff**

- |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alysha Kaplan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tirzah Kincheloe | <input type="checkbox"/> Kim Mask       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sierra Wardell |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicole Mock   | <input type="checkbox"/> Gail Cram                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Kathryn Zetzer | <input type="checkbox"/> Serena Segura             |

---

## **Call to Order/Introductions/Opening Comments**

**Robert Ezelle**

---

Approval of February 7 minutes. No discussion or corrections.

Sandi Duffey motion to approve February minutes, second by Chandra Fox. All information of approval as written.

### **Opening Comments**

Chair began meeting by giving an overview of the agenda as posted.

### **2019 Legislative Session**

The Director stated several EMD supported bills were passed this session. SSB5012 has been signed but will still need to be voted on by referendum as it modifies the constitution.

The State budget passed includes:

- \$1m for EEW monitoring stations (one-time cost) (GF-S)
- \$928k for Tsunami siren installation (one-time cost) (GF-S)

- \$1m+ to continue the LEPC program (Oil Spill Prevention Acct - OSPA)
- E911 is fully funded (E911 acct), including \$9.975m towards remaining transition costs and sustainment and \$100k to conduct a 911 study
- \$240k to fund EEW outreach and public education (one-time biennial investment) (GF-S)
- \$236k to fund SSB 5012, COG (GF-S)

Separately, the school safety bill passed. Part of the bill makes earthquake drills mandatory.

Feedback was requested on the utility and substance of the legislative updates sent to local jurisdiction during the session. The only comment received was that they were appreciated and helpful.

The Director announced that EMD will begin working on decision packages for next session and solicited suggestions. The group was reminded that the upcoming session is a short session and that must be considered when deciding what to put forward.

EMD Staff provided a summary of some of the decision packages they are already working on:

Resilient Communications: The overall costs are too prohibitive to due in one year so will continued to be submitted as a decision package each year. Components include SEOC and, AWC upgrades, a new AWC database and WebEOC GIS add-on, as well as replacement of the mobile communications vehicle. As part of alternate EOC plan once the vehicle is functional it would be housed on the eastside of the State at Fairchild AFB.

Tsunami Siren updates: Costs have gone up since original submission and need to go back and request additional funding. Grant money cannot be used for satellite time anymore, so funding will be needed for maintenance and operation of the system. EMD is attempting to covering the fund shortages using various methods. Including performing maintenance during a recent Spanish language upgrade but will have to adjust internal programs to cover a \$200,000 cost that cannot be covered by other means.

The lack of a state Individual Assistant (IA) program was also discussed. Previous attempts have failed due to costs involved. Although it is state law to have a program, there are no resources for it. If the local jurisdictions feel it is important, they will need to help approach their local elected officials to build consensus. In previous discussions with Association of Washington Counties they have shown interests and their assistance could also be an option.

Input for the next long-term legislative session were also solicited. Group members were reminded that EMD cannot lobby/push up an idea that conflict with the Governor's priorities.

Laurel Nelson raised the Department of Commerce study on unreinforced masonry and stated she would like to see that addressed. This is an issue that affects all localities. Would help to get financial incentive to retrofit. In the event of an earthquake, there will be loss of life due to lack of retro-fitting, so we need to continue to advocate.

The program is currently under Department of Commerce, so we would need to work with them. The idea could also be included as part of the SSB 5016 resiliency workgroup's report to the legislature.

### **SAO Discussion:**

The discussion started with a summary of the audit's inception. It is connected to the Oso commission report and EMD's response to two of the 17 recommendations. The auditors provided 7 recommendations for improvement of EMD's operations and state-wide emergency preparedness.

One recommendation was regarding roles and responsibilities during a disaster.

The audit teams expressed concerns and would like EMD to provide guidance to local jurisdictions on what everyone's specific roles and responsibilities are, outside of the NIMS and ICS provided instructions. It was clarified that the recommendation is in terms of emergency management roles themselves, and not specific state positions. Feedback on this recommendation and if the group felt this is something jurisdictions need, or want, from the state was requested.

Barb Graff stated that there needs to be a better understanding of the State-Liaisons as well as what role State Agency liaisons play in a multi-level response. However, she did not feel that local jurisdictions need EMD to advise on emergency management roles.

It was mentioned by multiple members that more information and training on state liaisons and how to use them would be helpful.

Chris Alexander, on behalf of WA Small Cities, stated that they would like to see more training on general emergency management roles. As a small city, most of their EOC workers are not in the emergency management field and wear multiple hats. They would appreciate training on key roles for those staff members that are not in the field but will be expected to function in an EOC. They would stand a better chance to succeed, without the need for a full IM team, if they are able to start-off in the right direction. He agreed there would be an interest in joint county/state localized training on the basic SEOC functions for non-traditional EMD workers. Particularly if it was focused online that could be put out to department heads in addition to regular staff training.

It was noted by some group members that when reading report, it expressed lack of clarity about emergency management itself by the auditors. It was suggested that the audit be used as an opportunity to educate the legislature as others have done with their locality and local governments. The compliance reporting process was also inquired about. The Director stated that EMD's specific action plan was put in their response to the audit, and he testified in front of the JLARC. It is suspected he may have to testify again at some point, but there is no specific requirement to report compliance.

A second recommendation was regarding incident management teams.

The auditor recommends that reach out and facilitate training to local jurisdictions on what IMT can offer. EMD plans to partner with communities to see what that can look like, need, desire, and resources to do it. It was noted by one member that they did not want EMD put in the position of saying every IMT is used the same way, every jurisdiction does the same thing, the same way. A second member questioned whether IMT training was EMD's responsibility. The local jurisdictions the lead agencies and already have training in place.

Jason Biermann, on behalf of the westside large counties, stated it would be helpful to have a diagram and understanding of where EMD and the state agencies fit in at the state level and who has responsibility for what. He added that having just gone through the winter snow storms, they were receiving calls and guidance from multiple agencies and they were not sure who was "on first" and who they should turn to. An example would be salt deliveries, regional WADOT calls were providing different information than EMD calls. There is a need to clarify of whose doing what.

Alysha Kaplan asked for feedback offline about the DOT/EMD calls and clarification on the differing information.

A third recommendation was to continue to work with local jurisdictions to identify and resolve WebEOC software issues, as well as identify opportunities for EMD and local jurisdictions to use WebEOC more frequently. EMD continues to partner with local jurisdictions

A fourth recommendation was the development of the state-wide credentialing program. Discussion on this recommendation was deferred to the planned presentation later in the agenda.

The final recommendation discussed was to make meetings more effective. The report mentioned discussions with some local emergency managers about the timing of EMD meetings (e.g. holding during another event), making sure EMD allocate time in meetings to have give-and-take of ideas vice report-outs and to make sure we have dial-in capability for all meetings.

The Director advised that to address the last point, a portable telephone conference unit has been purchased and EMD is no longer reliant on equipment availability of meeting location. Additionally, EMD has already made the effort to ensure calendar invites are sent out regularly (in addition to email notifications). The Director solicited ideas from the group for other ideas on where communication is not working and what EMD can do to be better.

Barb Graff mentioned that one area for improvement was the substance of the meeting and how the time is used. She would like to see more substantive discussions, and not just read-outs and updates. She suggested the format be changed to a short read-out/EMD updates and then pick a topic for discussion (e.g. an item on someone's AAR)

Numerous group members agreed that they did not want the meetings added onto an existing conference. Joann Boggs stated due to timing, money, and staff "If I'm sending them to conferences, I want them to attend the conferences".

Barb Graff thought it was good to pair with conferences because it saved costs and that EMD should never try to satisfy all of them. Attendance is waning because it is just report outs that can be read. Meat of meeting is important. She would find value in weighing in on something to create or solve. A suggestion would be addressing an issue in the Cascadia 1 after action report. She suggested moving the report outs at the end of the meeting so those who wanted to leave could.

Alysha Kaplan asked if there was an appetite for quarterly meeting/briefing from the Director? She inquired what the local jurisdictions needs are and maybe there should be a different format/style than pairing with conferences.

Jason Biermann agreed that he would want to attend a meeting to engage on a topic. He suggested EMD investigate doing something like the Fire Marshall's office who sends out a one-page briefer that can be read.

The Director agreed that during the last couple of meetings there was not enough time for engagement but reiterated that the standard format is to provide quick read-out from him and each unit, and then turn the conversation over to the attendees to have a give and take on what's working and not working. He is however getting a sense the appetite is gone and there is a desire for more topic specific discussion. As the meetings during conferences are sometimes his only change to engage with and hear from others, he does not want to lose that. He is willing to spend less time on reporting-out and add depth if the group feels it would be useful.

[2:02pm] The director had to depart for another meeting and turned over to deputy.

As mentioned earlier, a regional credentialing program was also discussed by the SAO. While there is a value, more work is needed to determine what is needed. EMD will need to investigate. EMD will also need to perform a risk assessment on scaling back other program to support the addition.

The SAO also commented on improving relationships. SAO was not able to necessarily provide specific enough feedback for EMD to determine what the issue, or problem, is. EMD is working to understand the root cause before determining what changes should/can be made. EMD staff may be reaching out to the group to solicit information to try and understand what the issues are and needs to be addressed.

Group members were encouraged to read the full report, if they have not already done so. EMD is open to unsolicited clarification and feedback.

Regarding improving relationships, Barb Graff offered that audits doesn't mean an agency is broken. She had discussed with the auditors how a previous staff member would attend some of their city council meetings and staff to meet with her. The physical attendance naturally provided more communication.

Another member expressed an issue with staff turnover. While there is nothing wrong with the training and exercise program, for example, there is no consistent point of contact for the regions.

Barb Graff added for certain things a subject matter expert is needed, but on a majority, they would just like to have a point of contact with general knowledge of EMD and time to meet. An example would be DHS and FEMA have interdepartmental relation employees whose job is to put a face to the name/program.

The group inquired about accreditation within the report and were advised that there was a comment in the narrative, but when reading the report, the overall concept did not seem to resonate with the auditors, just aspects.

Jason Biermann raised that some parts of the community (for example TYPE 3) are looking for standardize credentialing.

Alysha Kaplan mentioned that while doable, it is not clean-cut when it comes to volunteers. How do you facilitate a voluntary action that relies on local jurisdictions? Jason Marquiss added that without authority or funding, it is difficult for EMD to oversee these programs.

Jason Biermann suggested that there not be a formal oversight structure, but EMD could simply create a standard and oversee from a high-level.

---

## **Status Updates**

---

### **GRANTS**

**Tirzah Kincheloe**

17 EMPG turnback funds:

Total turned-back fund was \$31,551.66. Group had previously discussed using the returned funds for necessary upgrades to the CEMNET system. The Alert & Warning Center and Telecommunications worked on a proposal and the funds would cover upgrades of the two sites where it is most needed. An EHP will need to be submitted and PGS will need approval of EMAG to proceed.

The group discussed location of the sites and sought clarification on how substantial the issue is. The two sites are both on the western side of the state and operating with obsolete equipment which is hard to find parts for. When questioned, the operations manager confirmed that there are sites on the eastern side that also need updating, but it just happened that the two that need the most work, are on the western side. In total there are 7-8 sites within the state that need rejuvenation and you cannot get parts for. Funding will be a continued ask

because of the aging infrastructure. She further agreed for the full project sheet be sent out so that they can review and discuss possible funding alternatives for the site upgrades.

The group agreed that as previously agreed to move ahead with attempting to apply the funds to the two CEMNET stations so PGS will move-ahead with the EHP.

Discussion was had that although operating CEMNET benefits local emergency management, the WAC Codifies it as the State's responsibility. Jason Biermann iterated that the local jurisdictions must be careful not to take over long-term responsibility for the system.

Further use of turnback funds will be decided event by event at the end of each cycle, with no long-term authorization given for future fund use.

Barb Graff added that she would like to see excess funds, at some point, used for caching of frequently used supplies as she believes it is a good idea.

#### 18EMPG STATUS

Approximately 48% of pass through funds spent. There are three months left in the performance period for most grants.

#### 19EMPG STATUS

PGS is working on budget narratives and finishing application. They expect the award to be a little larger than last year. It is expected pass through funds will increase a couple hundred dollars across all counties/cities

PGS Is currently expecting 65 applications this year including a couple new cities. A few tribes have expressed interest this year. A couple more cities have also expressed interest in FY20 funding.

In response to a question, PGS stated that project-based applications for tribes did not see much interest last year, but they believe it may have been an outreach issue. This year, they plan on doing more outreach to the tribes once the applications are released. They hope a larger response will be seen.

PGS plans to follow the time frame as last year.

#### OTHER EMPG:

During the region 8 meeting, a discussion was had as to whether the personnel cap waiver is applied by region or contract? The question arose because there are some localities that do not use their EMPG for personnel costs, but others that use more than the allowed percent – can the cap be shared?

PGS manager advised that the amounts cannot be co-applied. Any application for a waiver must include all personnel costs and not just amount over.

#### WAC 118.09.040

**Jason Marquiss**

Both WAC 118.09.040 and 060 require that EMPG fund allocation be reviewed every 5 years. The last review was 2014. This discussion is to determine how the group wants to handle the review. Questions include:

Should it be part of a formal meeting, a separate discussion, and what should be the timeline?

Barb Graff stated that during the previous review, the EMAG invited comment from everyone with equities in the program and it was very helpful. She would like to see possibly an opportunity for call-in discussion to allow feedback before the greater discussion.

Sandi Duffey stated that some areas are not as strongly represented, and she would like to ensure that everyone is aware of the opportunity, specifically region 8. She stated that if the topic/opportunity is announced by all regional managers to their groups that would ensure everyone is aware for the conversation.

It was agreed to allow 30 days for the group to socialize with their respective groups, followed by a series of call-in comment opportunities. The notes from the various discussions will be consolidated and taken into consideration during the formal review, to be held during the next meeting.

The group agreed that between each member taking the information to their respective constituents, discussing during regional meetings, and the call-in opportunity will give those with equities in the decision a chance to be heard.

A white paper of talking points to start the conversations was requested and will be distributed to the group.

#### **STATEWIDE CREDENTIALING WORKGROUP**

**JASON BIERMANN**

The briefing began with an overview/recap of the background of the committee's creation, the initial discussions, and the results of the survey taken of jurisdictions.

Key points of the survey were that most people admit having an EOC but not having standards for their EOC staff. 93% of respondents said they would participate in a state-wide credentialing program if it was optional. Several responses were concerned about mandated participation due to budget and staffing constraints. In addition to the base benefits (performance standards, coordination, etc.) There would also be benefits such as career path mobility for workers.

California was used as the case study as they developed something like what the group is looking at for Washington. They focused on developing a standalone EOC credentialing program that is married. Jason Marquiss reiterated that the differences between California's OES and Washington EMD must be considered with any decision we make. California has a greater capacity and is aligned differently within the state structure. Barb Graff stated that she still sees the benefit as we can use them to make the argument that that their program is what we would like to model ours after but accepting there are going to be some differences. The group can supply the standards and then put the decision to meet them on the counties.

The focus of the program would be on EOC's and local jurisdictions.

The workgroup recommends phasing initiation and reaching sustainment in a couple years. This is based on California's timeline of 3 years. Since we are smaller it is expected we could do sooner.

Costs are difficult to determine objectively as some things that would be required for credentialing are already covered under other programs. For example, some EMPG requirements, would also satisfy a credential requirement.

California has not yet seen any legal issues. The WA Assistant Attorney General advises that if it is an opt-in program, there are no legal issues. If made mandatory, authority would need to be codified and there would also need to be an appeal process in place to address decisions made by the governing authority.

The formal recommendations of the workgroup are:

- A Washington state EMD-sponsored credentialing program
- Opt in/out
- Include a pathway to make credentialing a WAMAS standard (3-5 years)
- Utilization of the national qualification system and one responder
- Establish a qualification review panel

Discussion:

Although counties and cities could run their own “credentialing” programs, it is recommended for there to be a third-party (neutral) reviewer of the credentialing applications to ensure even application of standards and no bias in decisions. The assistant attorney general requested that this panel not be referred to as a “board” because it indicates statutory authority.

It is believed that as the program becomes socialized, it will grow. Particularly as most of the requirements would already be covered under existing program and there is no additional large burden.

It was clarified that no questions being raised indicated someone was against a state program. Everyone is supportive of the idea, but need to make sure it is meeting expectations and can be done with resources

The next step in the process is to create an implementation committee and discussions were had as to where the committee would (and program) would be placed. Some members felt the process should be started first as the best location may become clear during that process.

Discussions were also had on what “mandates” the committee should be given. Should it include determining if any changes to the RCW can, or should, be made to support the project? Would having the legal mandate help requesting resources or whether it would give an opportunity for the legislature to be against the program? Is it better to develop the program and then seek mandate.

To continue the discussion on what a possible program would look like, Chris Utzinger provided handouts on what the SEOC is doing as a participant of a FEMA driven pilot program. He explained that the SEOC is currently in the process of reviewing the skill sets needed for each ESF position and how they will focus on credentialing people based on those skills and not necessarily what their regular duties are.

Some group member stated that they did not want to see the program fail in pursuit of perfection and that it is important to remember it's sometimes more productive to start with “ok” and improve as the program grows. Important to remember that as building new things, it's ok to be satisfied with 70% solution. Get toes in the water and then continue to perfect things.

The deputy director requested time for discussions within EMD regarding what they could and could not support with existing resources. He advised that due to travel schedules, it may take a few days for discussions to happen, but committed to a response within a couple weeks.

## **EMAG WORKGROUP**

**Jason Marquiss**

Deputy director provided a briefing on the EMAG workgroup that was originally scheduled for the February meeting.

The group reviewed the workgroups time schedule and did not express any concerns

The deputy director then briefed on the responses to the course of action (COA) survey that was discussed within jurisdictions and groups.

There no real sense of consensus on best course of action. Some regions had concerns with regional services.



It was noted that although no one specific COA was preferred, due to the minimal steps in #3, anyone who supported #1 and #2 would in theory support the steps taken in #3.

The deputy director asked if there was anyone in the group who did not think COA 3 was not an acceptable action to take, and there was no disagreement.

The deputy director continued the brief stating there was not a lot of feedback on a standard definition of emergency management. He inquired if that is an item the workgroup should set aside and asked if there was a risk in each jurisdiction using a differing definition of what an emergency manager does.

One group member responded that it was not a problem to have different definitions.

The deputy director advised that the next step is to determine what partnerships would be created and their structure. The group also needs to determine what is the right membership of the workgroup to succeed and number of workgroups needed.

The group agreed that each step to be taken in COA 3 were intertwined and would be better suited to one workgroup instead of multiple. They also agreed to start within EMAG and then open the workgroup up to any interested party with equities in the results.

It was requested that a white paper be sent around before the next meeting. Knowing expected results and what decisions need to be made during the next meeting will help members be prepared for the discussions. Further, it will allow an opportunity to avoid acting on "non-problems" and focus attention where needed.

#### **FEMA INTEGRATION TEAM**

**Jason Marquis**

Staffing summary (who, what) don't know what FEMA will decide for GS13 may not see people for several most months, but are progressing.

#### **JFO UPDATE**

**Alysha Kaplan**

Update: out and about in counties and in touch with insurance companies. Most of the "kick-off" Meetings are almost complete. Start seeing work on putting project into new PA delivery model. The way we integrate with the teams, (2<sup>nd</sup> one) we are taking lessons learned and feeding that to Oregon – test best practices for new delivery model and how to run effective state led disaster. Pushing costs out to recipients. Going slow and FEMA didn't account for process holes. For example, setting up conference calls for applicants. FEMA had to figure out how to give us pin numbers – how to support calls. The work around was to assign the code to the recipient if can't give to State staff. Money about 3 months out

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Alysha Kaplan Add DART discussion on next agenda. While their value is recognized they do need to be brought under more control or authority as they are sometime operating without coordination of the local EM and is creating a significant issue. She would like to discuss their incorporation and relationship management.

---

### **August Agenda Suggestions**

---

- County/City/Tribal topics
- State topics
  - EMAG Small Workgroup next steps
  - WAC 118-09-040
  - JFO update
  - CR22

- DART

---

## 2019 Meeting Schedule

---

February 7, 2019	1:00 PM – 4:00 PM	Camp Murray
May 17, 2019	1:00 PM – 4:00 PM	Camp Murray
August 22, 2019	1:00 PM-4:00 PM	Camp Murray(T) November 7, 2019
PM – 4:00 PM	Camp Murray	1:00

---

## Adjourn

---

Meeting adjourned approximately at 4:20 PM

Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG)

Friday, May 17, 2019

Last Name	First Name	Representation	Organization	Email	Signature
Alexander	Chris	Small Cities	Mulliteo Fire Department	calexander@mulliteowa.gov	phone
Biermann	Jason	Westside Large County	Snohomish County	jason.biermann@co.snohomish.wa.us	phone
Boggs	JoAnn	Eastside Small County Tier 1	Pend Oreille County	jboggs@pendoreille.org	phone
Brooks	Eric	Westside Medium County	Island County	E.Brooks@co.island.wa.us	phone
Cowan	Brendan	Westside Small County Tier 1	San Juan County	brendane@sanjuandem.net	phone
Davis	Deanna	Eastside Medium County	Benton County	ddavis@boes.wa.gov	phone
Duffey	Sandi	Eastside Medium County	Grant County	sduffey@grantcountywa.gov	phone
Ezelle	Robert	State	EMD	robert.ezelle@ml.wa.gov	phone
Fox	Chandra	Eastside Large County	Spokane County	cefow@spokanecounty.org	phone
Graff	Barb	Large Cities	City of Seattle	barb.graff@seattle.gov	phone
McCluskey	Brendan	Westside Very Large County	King County	brendan.mccuskey@kingcounty.gov	phone
Ferguson	Jody	Westside Large County	Pierce County	jody.ferguson@piercecountywa.gov	phone
Hooper	Pattean	Medium Cities	City of Redmond	phooper@redmond.gov	phone
Jenkins	Gary	Small Cities	City of Pullman	gary.jenkins@pullman-wa.gov	phone
Johnson	Scott	Consortium	CRESA	scott.johnson@clark.wa.gov	phone
McDougall	Scott	Westside Small County Tier 1	Pacific County	smcdougall@co.pacific.wa.us	phone
Scotfield	Ute	Medium Cities	City of Tacoma	uscotfield@cityoftacoma.org	phone
Weise	Jay	Eastside Small County Tier 2	Adams County	jayw@co.adams.wa.us	phone
Kaplan	Alysha	State	EMD	alysna.kaplan@ml.wa.gov	phone
Kincheloe	Tirzah	State	EMD	tirzah.kincheloe@ml.wa.gov	phone
Marquiss	Jason	State	EMD	jason.marquiss@ml.wa.gov	phone
McClain	Stacey	State	EMD	Stacey.McClain@ml.wa.gov	phone
Roberson	Michael	State	EMD	Michael.Roberson@ml.wa.gov	phone
Wardell	Sierra	State	EMD	Sierra.Wardell@ml.wa.gov	phone
Nelson	Laural	Seattle	Seattle	laural.nelson@seattle.gov	phone

