

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP (EMAG)

MINUTES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2019 ~ CAMP MURRAY ~ 9:00 AM TO 1:40 PM

Meeting called to order by Robert Ezelle Director of Washington State Emergency Management
Division at 9:00 AM

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jody Ferguson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chandra Fox | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barb Graff | <input type="checkbox"/> Pattijean Hooper |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Jenkins | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Johnson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brendan McCluskey | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jason Marquiss |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott McDougall | <input type="checkbox"/> Jay Weise | <input type="checkbox"/> Ute Scofield | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ron Cameron |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ada McDaniel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lorraine Churchill | <input type="checkbox"/> Cherrie May | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Steven DeLos Angeles | | | |

Guests

Laurel Nelson, Seattle DEM

Kurt Hardin, Thurston County DEM*

Amy Gillespie, Pierce County DEM

Supporting Staff

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sue Vezeau | <input 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"/> Nancy Bickford* |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regan Hesse | | | |

Call to Order/Introductions/Opening Comments

Robert Ezelle

Chair began the meeting with approval of the August 22 meeting minutes.

Deanna Davis noted she was physically present.

Barb Graff motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Deanna Davis seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

Chair began opening comments by advising that based off the agenda, he was not going to spend too much time giving a full run-down of EMD activities, in order to allow time for discussion. He asked Jason Marquiss to discuss new members.

Jason Marquiss advised that Ron Cameron and Willie Bence have been appointed as Primary and Alternate for Westside Small Counties Tier 2. Additionally, all Tribal Liaison positions had been filled. Primary members are Ada McDaniel and Cherrie May. Alternate members are Lorraine Churchill and Steve De Los Angeles. He added that when EMD put out the call for representatives to the tribal community, they received multiple responses. He concluded by stating that EMD and EMAG encouraged anyone that expressed interest that was not designated to one of the positions to still participate in the meetings as non-voting guests.

Chair advised that he was going to go ahead and turn the meeting over to Jason Marquiss to begin the next agenda items.

WAC 118-09-040

Jason Marquiss

Jason M started the conversation by bringing everyone's attention to the updated comments document which captured the discussions during the August 22 meeting. He opened the floor to members to give them the opportunity to raise any comments, concerns, or questions based off the updates that were captured. If there were any members who wanted to revisit each recommendation specifically the group could go through them.

He followed that if there were no comments, the group would continue to the next document which is the tribal input. The document was in response to the EMAG's request during the last meeting that EMD reach out to other states with large tribal populations to inquire how they allocate EMPG funds to the various tribes.

Kurt Hardin inquired if EMD received any additional input from states after October 4, to which Jason replied they had not.

Jason M reopened comments on the first document to the room.

Jason Biermann commented that during the previous discussion about 1.1 regarding aligning core capabilities, the group had discussed a greater need for transparency, particularly from EMD. Although EMD had sent around the program narrative from the state EMPG application, it really didn't address core capabilities. He inquired how EMAG was going to achieve alignment moving forward.

Jason M acknowledged that this was a previous discussion and it is certainly a conversation for EMAG to have, not only within the group but across the broader community including other agencies and divisions with the state and local jurisdictions. What that looks like going forward will need to be a broader conversation to include SAC and other groups with equities.

He added the alignment is certainly something that can be done within EMAG from the perspective of grant applications and agreements; and would allow everybody to see what is being investing in across the regions and state. From a boarder perspective we need to determine how investments are being aligned, not within only the EM portfolio, but to include port security, transit security, as well as investments inside and outside of the DHS portfolio.

Barb Graff commented that it sounded like the group agreed that they wanted to focus on building core capabilities and that it would impact who receives funding at what level. If that is how things are moving forward she is still unclear what the state's strategy is. The information provided by EMD does not provide the information on building capabilities and sustaining operational coordination. She would need more information to provide recommendations as it isn't clear what the target is.

Jody Miller added that it seems to be a sharing issue. There is not really a synchronized way to get everybody aligned and moving forward. She inquired how EMAG could get everybody “rowing in sync” as it is something she also isn’t fully clear on that currently.

Jason M. inquired if there was a specific recommendation regarding the discussion or just comments.

Barb responded that it was both. The first question would be how does EMAG have transparency on how they are using EMPG funding and the second question would be how to move forward with a recommendation as some of it would be dependent on the goal. If the goal is to build capacity “where the rubber meets the road” than investment should be heavier at the local level. EMAG can look at the numbers and see that the state gets a disproportionate amount. If the goal is to just look at numbers and ensure everyone gets a percentage then the state getting a larger amount is fine. But, the conversation going forward should be how we build capacity and not how to make sure everybody gets a specific percentage of the award.

Kurt added that when locals submit applications, they must include the work plan, why the work is being done, and the results of the work. It’s not just about the cost share or allocation method. The EMAG is looking for something similar from the state so we can align our efforts at all levels to achieve greater outcomes.

Jason M. advised that EMD does have submit work plans for their EMPG programs and if the community wants to see what each program is doing as far as outcome and activity, EMD can absolutely share the information. He added that EMD could also share the quarterly reports so that EMAG could see what each EMPG dollar is going to.

Chair noted that when looking at a longer-term direction, he believed everybody participating is in strong agreement that we can all show each other what we are doing in terms of building and sustaining capabilities; and it will be beneficial. It will however take some time. EMD will have to work with EMAG to see what “right looks like”. If the idea is to make a recommendation today however, he is unsure if the group will be able to get to that level of detail and fidelity within a very short period of time. He inquired with Sierra W. if she thought it would be possible within one application cycle. She responded that it would likely take a couple cycles.

Barb suggested that maybe a discussion regarding what the EM community would want to be able to do in certain events and use that as a guide to the discussion. Doing that type of discussion in advance of changes to allocation methodology would be helpful, and it is not something EMAG current does. Before that is done isn’t the goal just consistency? Although EMD state that they do submit all the same information, it appears things are slightly different because EMAG wasn’t aware of that.

Jody added that she believes transparency is the key. The state sees all the local jurisdictions’ information, but the locals do not see the State’s. Maybe that is why some of the gaps exists. She doesn’t think it is necessarily immediately about changing EMD’s business practice, but maybe just showing the greater EM community what is being done and how it ties back to core capabilities

The Chair noted that the comments being made lead EMAG into looking at the entire preparedness cycle. This involves determining how; do you start with the THIRA, to do that assessment of capabilities and gaps and setting those target capabilities, which tie into how many people to shelter and how do we build that. How do we train, how do we exercise, and how do we assess “right”? If it is something the EMAG can commit this is the direction we need to go; we get some impetus into really doing the assessments and really spending the time to assess the gaps and capabilities at all levels of government.

Chair also inquired if the request for transparency from the group was only for EMAG, or across the board.

Jason B responded that although he personally thinks it should be across the board, he believes the group is currently discussing EMPG. He added that he agreed with Barb and that it may be more important than just the initial transparency, that there should be conversations about what part of that is at the local level and what part of that is expected of the state level. Because again, all disasters begin locally, so there's a strong case to say, some of that capability needs to get pushed down to a local level where response will really happen. That is a conversation EMAG needs to have so the group doesn't just assume that the state is going to do certain things and the locals will be able to do certain things.

Jason M commented that is one of the three items on the workgroup agenda list. I think we define part of the work group as delineating roles and responsibilities, and make sure we're aligning those roles and responsibilities of the correct player of government or the whole community. That should be we were going to take on as EMAG and try to work through the mechanics and determine what will be needed to get better. Following that, the group will need to look at aligning basically response and procedures with how we do things pre-disaster. That was item 2 and item 3 was based on those two things, yield, let's go back then. The group has already said we, the group not just EMD, need to do that and it is just a matter of when we're able to get back to looking at each of those items and coming up with a plan that gets us there.

Barb inquired if the goal was to provide a firm recommendation by the end of the day.

The Chair stated that if EMAG chose as a group to provide us with a recommendation, EMD will take that recommendation, assess it, and determine what we're going to do with that recommendation. However, EMAG does not have to give a recommendation if they chose not to. It is really up to the group whether they want to produce a recommendation or not.

Jason M. noted that going back to the basics, EMAG is in our five-year window to review the WAC. The only requirement is to review, not to change it. He added that the charter allows any member at any time, in any meeting to make a motion. If any member today or in the future, says they believe the WAC should be changed, then that is their right as members of this advisory body. The basic question is what does the EMAG want. He believes EMAG has done enough work through member outreach with your stakeholder groups, EMD hosted conference calls, and the prior meetings to determine what recommendations are out there. EMD has additionally done a lot of analysis and can identify the cascading impacts.

He added that EMD would certainly welcome if EMAG wants to make a formal recommendation verbally or in writing or even through multiple motions.

Barb inquired if the group, as an EMAG, agreed on what we are recommending. She further inquired if counties and cities willing to take on subcontracting and the extra work involved. If the group has not come up with a recommendation as a body, she would think that is something they would do today.

Jason M. noted that determining a formal recommendation was something that came out in the last meeting. Several of the members present wanted to discuss it outside of the official meeting, and the notes and recording of the meeting, and had some of those discussions. He doesn't know if they occurred or whether the state can expect to receive a formal recommendation today. But they are certainly happy to receive one.

Jason Biermann introduced a draft letter regarding recommendations and provided copies to those who did not already have one. In developing the letter, he reviewed the program guidance, listened to all the previous conversations, and spoke to some members individually. The draft recommendations are what he understands were the main themes of all the discussions. He noted the last section referenced the ongoing discussion about using disaster method pre-disaster so that jurisdictions are asking each other for help, instead of immediately going to the state and expecting they're going to solve problems. Although he is not speaking for anybody, he understood from most of his conversations that there's a commitment at the local level to do that. However, he also understood from the last meeting that cities did not want to lose their funding. Regarding recommendation number four, he

stated that adding home county capabilities review was a way to address some of the concerns about cities taking away some county capability without having a program that cannot meet the capability.

Scott J noted Brendan's proposal of small counties receiving more than \$18,000 was not specifically in the recommendations.

Jason B advised that he is proposing a 7% instead of a hard dollar amount. This would account for any changes to the level of EMPG funding. The amount received by stakeholders will rise and fall together. He added that while he did not have the numbers in front of him, he believed the 7% would increase the small county award from \$18,000 to approximately \$28,000; and would increase the number of applicants from 13 to 19. He asked Brendan or Sierra to advise if he was incorrect.

Brendan C advised that while he hasn't had a chance to look at the draft letter, what he was seeing looked very similar to the things the draft he sent around to everyone. He believed there were some differences in percentages and numbers, but the overall concept was the same. He reiterated the proposal was not a 100% solution, for tribes, it goes from 1% at 2%, how that gets allocated, if that's per capita or project based, it would depend on EMAG, but it does increase their allocation from 1%

Scott M inquired how many tribes are currently participating in EMPG.

Sierra advised that there were six tribes in 2019 grant period. She added that there has been some reluctance from the tribes to participate because of the small amount available. They did not view the work required to apply as worthwhile when compared to the amount.

Brendan C stated that he believed any recommendations EMAG suggested to EMD is proposed as a three-five-year trial period. EMAG should evaluate the allocation method carefully to make sure there are no inadvertent ripples or challenges that currently can't be seen.

Barb concurred there should be a trial period.

Jody inquired about previous discussions about encouraging smaller jurisdictions that may not qualify independently to band together. She encourages smaller jurisdictions within Pierce County to do that. She inquired if it was too difficult to include at the level they are looking at, or if it should just be noted.

Jason B commented that increasing the minimum award for applying cities and towns to \$30,000, would increase population requirements. There is already a mechanism within the RCW that allows them to combine and form their own groups. His thought was to avoid a couple of tiny cities trying to get to a number and maybe still not having a lot of capability. The higher threshold would require formation of a larger group.

Chandra questioned if there is an efficiency to gain regions have found benefit in regionalization. However, the resounding comments were that in a regionalization format, cities would be stripped of the funding that they are now getting because they would be too small to contribute. The idea of increasing population requirements would have to be approached in the manner that would insure that wouldn't happen.

Jason B stated that he felt like the proposal aligns with the discussion about building core capabilities. If allocations are focused on that, some jurisdictions will realize they will have to partner to get to a certain capability level. It's just not possible to do on their own.

Scott M stated that while he sees where the proposal is going, in his county they have internally addressed some of the concerns. He would not, at first glance, be in favor of forcing more regionalization. Jurisdictions already form partnerships and thinks it is something that can be explored internally among jurisdictions. His agency is fully funded without EMPG, but it's fully funded at a bare bone, minimum level and EMPG allows them flexibility to

enhance the service that we provide to county residents and cities. He doesn't mind the idea of regionalization, but he would rather see it explored at the local level than have it mandated.

Chandra stated that like it or not, there is a separateness between the West Side and the East Side that exists, and it is an ongoing problem. She mentions this because anything the EMAG does has to be respectful of the small counties. As we are a home-rule state, the mere suggestion that we're going to come in and have a different way of doing it and mandate it will upset a number of people. Her HLS Region works together on a daily basis anyway, and her regional partners understand that her office is a resource for them, regardless of what the topic is. She would like to see their capacity increase, but when 85% of your county is federal land, you don't have a lot of revenue or resources to work with. While she appreciates that the regionalization concept is important, she thinks having it as an automatic aid type of thing as opposed to a forced structure is preferred.

Scott J. stated that to the degree that we can talk about expanding capabilities, within regions whether geographic or homeland security, and he thinks recommendation number six on this might go a certain way towards doing that. One of the issues his two smallest regional partners have is that when they're not able to make an EMPG match, the funding goes back into a general pool for reallocation. Their preference would be that it goes to their largest, most likely to give support, regional partner. In practicality, smaller jurisdictions will call nearby jurisdictions for support. If EMAG came up with an allocation methodology that ties it into the concept of increased capabilities and sharing some of the funding, but not reduce anyone else's capabilities, and respects jurisdictional autonomy; he could see some value in it.

Scott M inquired about suggestion number five and the raising the FTE requirement from .5 to 1 minimum FTE; and asked if it would be at the county level. He stated that there are some counties that will not be able to meet the requirement. Although his small county can, he knows there are some that would not be able to get there financially. Even the proposed increased small county allotment would not cover a full-time employee. There needs to be consideration to that if raising the FTE requirement.

Jason B reiterated that the proposal was not set in stone and was capturing some of the previous conversations.

Brendan C noted that he had suggested a half-time FTE, who has a dedicated job position. While he didn't disagree with increasing the requirement, he agrees with Scott that 1.0 is probably too high. He wondered if .75 was a more reasonable threshold that could be met by counties.

Jason B inquired if a .5 FTE can build capabilities.

Deanna noted that for some counties that .5 FTE is the difference between having someone who can respond to wildfires and having no one to help. For that county, the .5 FTE really does build capacity.

Kurt inquired how many counties an increase would impact.

Chandra noted that when a jurisdiction has taken EMPG dollars that are meant to be 100% emergency management, and assign to a law enforcement officer or firefighter, what are you doing to build capability for that county.

Jason B commented that EM work exclusively, is probably the key, regardless of the size. He has heard some FTEs were being funded 50% by EMPG and EM duties were only additional duties as assigned.

Scott M concurred. When looking at Wahkiakum county, and they have someone who is a full-time employee and they could show the FTE is completely dedicated to emergency management one half-time. However, anything above the 50% and they would not be able to meet it.

Chandra added that EMAG would review to the job description and the work plan and see what is appropriate for the county. What are the duties and responsibilities for the EM in the unique situation of that county? What works for that county?

Deanna stated that EMAG must make clear “Emergency Management activities” because not all core capabilities reside in emergency management. They’re actually delivered by somebody else in your jurisdiction. The focus needs to be on the emergency management side because this is the emergency management performance grant. If we are saying screening and detection is a capability, and a jurisdiction chooses to invest EMPG to sustain the capability is that meeting the standard or not?

Jody stated that they saw EMPG as supporting their basic program. Planning, training and public education are their basic program. Not interdiction, detection and some other things jurisdictions spend EMPG on. While she appreciates the core capability conversation and is a proponent of the core capabilities, she is not concerned with capabilities outside the Emergency Management purview. She believes those capabilities are an example of the federal government trying to enforce a structure that doesn’t fit. The fundamental purpose of the funding is to support emergency management programming and that is what we need to focus on, not the larger core capabilities that don’t have anything to do with our day-to-day business.

Jason B stated that should be a conversation at the SAC level. There are other grant dollars and even other agency dollars. The law enforcement community gets law enforcement specific grants to build core capabilities and we let them come up and say, “Hey we need you to buy this x-ray machine out of the EMPG.” There should be some vetting of some requests to make sure that it aligns with the intent of the grant

Jason M inquired if that would be allowable within the grant. Sierra responded that there are some things that EMD doesn’t think should necessarily go that way, but they’re allowable through the grant.

Brendan C asked to bring the conversation back to the FTE question. He stated that when the current allocation was determined, the idea was for small counties to match enough to have a half-time person. He believes the numbers no longer reflect the cost. He believes the increased allotment currently under review for small counties is more realistic to cover a half-time person and expenses to run a decent program. While he agrees that every county should have a full-time FTE and should be a long-term goal, due to financial and budgetary status of some smaller jurisdictions, he believes keeping it at .5 makes the most sense right now. He added that EMAG will never be able to review applications to the degree that there is 100% certainty of what we’re getting but having a dedicated job description and forcing the jurisdiction to go through the exercise of doing that is valuable both for EMAG and for the person who holds that position.

Jason B confirmed Brendan is proposing a .5 FTE and keeping the additional language of exclusively working emergency management.

Brendan confirmed and added that the last thing he would want to see is for anything that EMAG recommends to push out small counties that are already struggling to provide adequate Emergency Management.

Scott M. concurred. He followed with a suggestion that the group go down each item in order, discuss, and come to consensus on if the recommendation should be acted on or not.

Jason M inquired if the group would like to adjourn or suspend the meeting so they could have those discussions off the record.

The group agreed to stay in session with some members noting they preferred the conversations be on the record.

Recommendation #1: Fixing the state’s portion of EMPG allocation to 35% exclusive of the allowable 5% M&A. This removes the possibility that future leadership may use EMPG to offset shortages within the EMD budget and mitigate the potential negative impact on sub-recipients.

Scott J. inquired what the effect of the proposed allocation change would mean for the state.

The Chair advised the state's allocation would be reduced \$211,000. This would result in a loss of a minimum 2 FTEs. When looking at the way EMD's programs are structured, the positions would come out of the Planning, Training, Exercise or Geo-Hazards program. This impacts the direct assistance and the technical assistance that is provided to local jurisdiction. The state hasn't done a full review of the impact and explicitly what programs, but that would be the high-level impact.

In response to an inquiry about the current number of state staff, Jason M stated that currently 103 staff members, which includes 10 vacancies. When looking at core, non-disaster related staff, and removing restricted funding, such as E911, the number is in the low 70s. When looking at positions truly EMPG funded, some of that capacity resides in the exercise and assessments, training, even logistics and the infrastructure and cyber side to some extent. When determining where the reduction would be pulled from, EMD would need to review and determine where the risk can be assumed based off what core capabilities they're trying to address at the state level and whether there is another program they could do less of.

Kurt asked for more specifics on what technical assistance would be reduced and the Chair reiterated that EMD has not done a detailed analysis to provide specifics, but some would be training that is delivered and exercise assistance.

Kurt mentioned that when faced with budget shortfalls, he will leave positions vacant, and that is the approach at the local-level.

Chair advised that EMD is also leaving some vacancies open to account for budget shortfalls. Chair continued that the \$211,000 translates to about a 7.5% or 7.9%, reduction in the State's EMPG award. The jurisdictions that do not receive increased awards, would see a .6% reduction in their awards. The highest non-state reduction would be the City of Seattle at \$2900, or a flat .6%.

He inquired if there was something EMAG would consider that would result in a greater burden sharing across state and local level, that still allows building up smaller jurisdictions.

Scott J. stated that when referencing number two, he is committing to capping his program's EMPG funding at 33%. To the point they made the previous meeting, part of the obligation is to convince our policy makers that they need to invest locally in what we're doing. If they consistently feel that there's a federal pipeline that they can tap into, they don't see that happening. EMAG struggles to establish what we mean by base level service and they struggle to reconcile the needs of a Ferry County with a King County. But they think a place to start is to say the state of Washington will commit to funding EMD department at that 60% level and Clark County will commit to funding their program. He thinks the allocation change is a place to start to communicate, a base level, the buy-in that our policy makers need to make, and he does understand that may translate into a potential reshuffling of capabilities. That, that was approach to the recommendations, and not a focus on the exact dollar amount.

Jason B stated that while the state may lose 2 FTEs, there would be four counties that will now be able to hire some people and have a level of capability. He added that, based on rough calculation, EMPG represents 19% of his budget, so he believes it is a reasonable request.

In response to an inquiry, Jason B added that the recommendation references a jurisdiction's overall budget, including general funds, as well as UASI, SHSP, or Stonegarden funding jurisdictions may receive. The proposal is that EMPG should represent no more than 1/3 of your overall program budget.

Jason B added when he looked at the responses provided to an EMD data call, a couple he recalled were two local programs that responded they were above a 1/3 threshold, although he didn't recall who it was. He reiterated the proposals were not perfect or popular with everyone, but the idea was if a program is solely relying on EMPG, there is a potential for single points of failure. The body does understand that we're making a recommendation to the

state and that you will balance that recommendation against your obligation to provide the level of service you need to.

Sandy mentioned that she had heard the state will not fund EMD for items they already receive federal funding for. She inquired if the local jurisdictions demanded the money, would the state not then have the responsibility to fund their obligations with general funds?

Chair noted, that EMD had to work hard to close that federal gap last time it occurred.

Jason M added that there is no guarantee EMD would be successful again. The state would essentially look at the total grant award that was received and likely say EMD chose to give more money to the local jurisdictions when they did not have to. The reduction of funding would be self-induced, and we would be told no.

Reagan concurred that OFM, the office of financial management, reviews all the funding recommendations requests, for every state agency and drills into why exactly they need the money and how did you find yourself in this situation. In this instance, they would say "you received your grant and elected to give more money away even though you didn't have, it sounds like that you made that choice and the state is not obligation to compensate you for that choice that you made". While not impossible, it is unlikely the funding would be replaced.

Barb commented that she did not believe EMAG is making the case to have the funding "replaced". It should be framed to them as critical. Imagine if the briefing papers said, two FTEs were offered up at the state level to increase capabilities at the county level. Now we go back to the legislature saying, yes – my jurisdiction has more capability. I think it's a false argument to say the state must always have 101 FTEs. We need to discuss what is it they used to do and what can local jurisdictions do more of.

Jason M noted that he believed it would be a false assumption to believe just because EMD would passthrough more dollars that that's an argument to get more money out of the state government.

Jason B noted the same could be said for the local jurisdictions. To which Jason M agreed everyone was in the same boat, regardless of the level of government.

Scott J stated that at some point, as emergency management professionals, we need to somehow communicate to the policy makers, like it or not. This is a critical service to all the people in our state and it must be supported. Regardless of if the funding is kicked down from the feds to the state, the state to the county, or even further, at some point thresholds of buy-in have to be articulated. I think it's a recommendation that we're making to begin that conversation.

Chair inquired about a recommendation that would share more of the burden plusing up the other jurisdictions.

Jason B stated that local jurisdictions will be sharing the burden as larger counties and cities will also take a reduction.

Chair noted the reductions currently being discussed are the State taking an 8% reduction while other jurisdictions see a .6% reduction.

Jason B countered that conversely the state takes a dis-proportionate amount at the start, so it was relative.

Based on the recent Homeland Security Coordinator meeting, Sandy noted it was important to comment about the personnel cap waiver. If recipients are truly capped at 50% with no variance allowed, people will need to think about how that will affect their programs as well.

Sandy added that in light of yesterday's HLS coordinator meeting, and knowing how we all fund our people, depending upon which grant we're using and how they're funded. Some counties rely on EMPG to fund positions.

You may be capped off and so think about your emergency management money, your EMPG money, how are you going to balance this all out? If you're having to cut your personnel cost.

Jason M noted that there is a clarifying statement that will be going out today to all HLS coordinators. The community probably needs to have a heart to heart about what does this look like in the future. While some members are not the problem, there are problems elsewhere in the applicant pool. EMAG must come to terms with it.

Chair inquired if there was a motion to put forth recommendation number one. The motion was brought by Barb and seconded by Chandra. He asked if there was any further discussion.

Barb commented that the reduction in EMPG for the state should be looked at as an opportunity to really look at the mission of EMD and review different ways of providing services.

Jason M noted that as a by-product of the recent EMD reorganization and last budget build, some things were revealed. EMD needs to look at alignment of program priorities based off for capability gaps, and where we need to sustain tasks, as well as looking at it from a strategic outcome perspective; what is it EMD is trying to be in five-10 years from now. Once the process is started early next year it will drive EMD's internal physical alignment across the portfolio of funding streams. EMD has made the commitment in-house to start that process. The hope is to have it out by the next budget build. If the recommendations are adopted, the best he could see the changes being implemented to EMPG is probably 2021 award at the earliest.

Chair confirmed any changes adopted would follow phase-in pattern where it is phased in over a few years.

Scott M noted he had no expectation that any changes would be reflected immediately, he had assumed it would be something for the 2020 or 2021 award.

Chair asked if there was any more discussion.

Deanna asked for clarification on if the proposed state allocation limit was inclusive of the 5% M&A.

Brendan noted that his understanding was the current allocation is 5% off the top and then EMD takes 38% of what's remaining. He noted the group wanted to be careful because if the amount is made inclusive of M&A, then there is a shift and it is not just a 3% difference between 38% and 35%.

Deanna asked for confirmation that Brendan's model was all of these percentages for the small counties, tribes, and for others is off the top once M&A is taken.

Brendan stated that for consistency, it is easier to say we take the 5% off the top just put that aside, and of the remaining for distribution, that's when those other percentages come into play.

Chair proposed in order to capture Brenden's proposal, the motion be amended to say the state will receive 5% M&A off the top of the grant. Of the remainder of the grant, EMD retains 35%, with 65% passed through to the local jurisdictions. Brendan agreed the wording matched his intent.

Chair inquired if there was any more discussion. Hearing no comments, he put the motion to a vote.

All voted in favor of the motion.

Jason M inquired if the recommendation was to change the WAC. When asked about alternatives to the WAC change, he added some states do an application guide every year, that describes grant award allocation. EMD could also change the allocation process under a memorandum of understanding.

Barb noted that as someone preparing for retirement, it would be nice to know there is an authorized code where it was institutionalized. This would allow successors and other people can look at later and know that was the intent of the group.

Scott M. noted that Barb's assessment was correct. After being gone for a few months, there are people in the group that he didn't recognize when they arrived. He agrees that the allocation should be codified so that we preserve the intention of this group down the road.

Break 10:41 Reconvened 10.51

Recommendation #2: Insert language into the WAC that caps any emergency management organization from using EMPG to fund more than 33% of their overall budget. Encouraging greater buy-in from the recipient or sub-recipient and help prevent any program from becoming overly reliant on EMPG funds.

Joann Boggs noted that she is unsure if some of her counties would be able to make the 33% work. She's only previously inquired about match requirements.

Scott J noted that the ideas behind the suggestion was to start setting a threshold, but maybe 33% would negatively affect some counties and is not a good number. As noted previously, in some jurisdictions most of the land is federal land, so they do not have an economic base to meet 33%. He stated that he still thinks there should be some level of buy-in, or investment point, formalized as part of the overall long-term goal of establishing a baseline level of service with emergency management.

Scott M noted that while he does not want to see any jurisdiction negatively affected, the recommendation is consistent with the conversations EMAG has been having for the last 12-18 months that we implement something that provides an expectation of the legislature to fully fund or at least to increase the funding to make sure we're meeting that threshold. He added that his county is small and struggles with the financial stability yet, they have found a way to appropriately fund their share of Emergency Management.

Jason M noted it appears that getting the right percentage may take a little bit more discussion. He also inquired if the concept could be addressed in the grant application and not have to be codified in the WAC. He suggested possibly making an eligibility requirement of sub-recipients to show that EMPG will not comprise more than "x" percentage of their budget.

Scott J stated that it would need to be strong enough to become a catalyst where someone can show their local legislative body that they will not get EMPG unless the threshold is met. If it can be done effectively through the application process, it would be a more effective way to phase it in and not cause harm to local programs.

Chair inquired if emergency managers that are also law enforcement, would be able to separate out their emergency management budgets. Ron Cameron confirmed that it was.

Brendan Cowan asked for clarification on the difference between a percent match and the current hard match. While different than the way the match has been handled, isn't it just a change in the amount of match EMAG is asking for? He added that including other grant programs creates undue administrative difficulties, particularly when other federal sources are not guaranteed from year to year. Because the purpose is to build local capacity, it should just be viewed as a local match, increasing the requirement to 67%, or whatever the group determines is right.

Barb stated that since homeland security dollars have been available she has heard from different programs that if SHSP dollars go away, their capability goes away. Homeland security dollars had a different genesis of what we were trying to build nationally than EMPG which recognizes all hazards, all phases, and builds a basic program. She believed a 50% match made sense when first enacted. We have wound up building emergency management

programs throughout the state and country with SHSP that I think now have to be counted and recognized. She is sympathetic to programs, who without SHSP, could never have had the money to put a base program together. If that goes away, the entire emergency management program goes away.

Brendan C noted that while he does not know about other small counties, if SHSP goes away, he has a good local capacity that was built over time and is not dependent on SHSP. While it is appreciated and useful, there is no federal program that we count on. He suspects most other small counties are similar in the foundation of their programs being locally funded.

Scott M concurred with Brendan. But he also thinks we need to be sensitive to bringing it along incrementally.

Brendan C concurred that it should be incremental but again stated local dollars should be used as the match requirement. Including federal dollars in our calculation is creating a new level of bureaucracy.

Jason B. noted that when looking at match, EMAG needs to remember that a couple years ago, DHS was throwing around the idea of a 25% match on SHSP. If EMAG tells small counties we are going to raise their match for EMPG, and then suddenly they become ineligible for SHSP, we can be inadvertently doing more harm than good. He added that either a local dollar match, or supplement of other federal funds are both fine. The main point is to not have a program that is 50% EMPG that pays for a person only and has no money for supplies or programs.

Scott J noted that the various federal funding sources may not be available to everybody, which is why he believes the recommendation was for EMPG and General Fund only. Regardless of how the group decides to handle, they need to start moving the larger discussion forward so that they can begin encouraging more local buy-in.

Brendan C agreed that the conversation made sense but noted that as a three-quarter EM with limited resources, he can get quite a lot done. He added that sometimes there is a gap in the perception from larger jurisdictions of exactly how capable the smaller jurisdictions are even with very limited resources.

Jason M noted that based off the discussion, EMD will have to do some analysis and outreach. He added that EMD understands the intent of the recommendation and asked if there was a motion on the matter.

Barb inquired if the overall goal would be if the 33% applied to all jurisdictions eventually.

Jason M. responded by requesting time for outreach and analysis. He added that he could potentially see a situation where 33% will likely work for X number large cities, large counties, and medium counties – but there is concerns with some or all small counties. He stated that EMD will do some of that research and get back the membership.

Scott J motioned that EMAG partner with EMD to establish the optimal buy-in commitment point that is sustainable across all jurisdictions.

Scott M. seconded

Chair inquired if there was any further discussion and hearing none put the motion to a vote. All vote in favor and the motion passed.

Recommendation #3: Create a base percentage allocation for tribes (2%) and small counties (7%) providing these jurisdictions access to increased resources.

Ada M asked for more clarification on tribal allocations as her tribe hasn't historically used EMPG grants, so she is not familiar with the entire process.

Sierra briefed the current allocation procedure for tribal grants.

Scott M Moved that the amount of base percentage allocations be increased to 2% for tribal jurisdictions and 7% for small counties.

Chair inquired about further discussion

Brendan clarified that the all members had the same understanding that the percentages were applied to the amount available after the 5% MA costs. In response to a question, he confirmed that 7% would increase the award amount to around \$28,000.

Barb noted that she believed recommendation 1 and 3 are interdependent; and that the small county and tribal percentage will only increase if the state takes a smaller percentage.

Scott M amended his motion to read that if the state's allocation is limited to 35%, exclusive of the 5% M&A, then the base allocations be increased to 2% for tribal jurisdictions and 7% for small counties.

Scott J. seconded the amended motion.

Chair inquired if there was any further discussion and not hearing any put the motion to a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Barb noted that recommendations 1 and 3 should only be considered together and recommendation 3 should only be put into place if recommendation 1 is.

Recommendation #4: Increasing minimum award for newly applying cities and towns to \$30,000, adjusting the population requirement commensurately. Include home county's emergency management organization in a capability review of new sub-applicant, ensuring jurisdictions do not inadvertently reduce their home county's capabilities.

Scott J. explained that the idea behind the recommendation is to avoid splintering and decreasing county capabilities if jurisdictions decide not to cooperate with one another. While EMAG emphasizes collectively working together and partnerships, jurisdictions are also political entities, and that might not be always viable. A concern that has been brought up is that if jurisdictions start independent programs taking EMPG funding they may still have limited capacity. By cities taking EMPG, the county has a reduction in capacity, but it still has an obligation to respond. The recommendation could be a compromise by requiring some level of acceptance from the county programs that a sub-recipient award is not going to diminish county capabilities

Chandra added that speaking from their experience, it would help ensure that the city applying fully understand what they are committing to. There is some assumption that EMPG is just a pot of money and they don't fully understand the deliverables and responsibilities that go along with it. She added the commitment absolutely needs to be part of the conversation, especially when looking at potentially taking away resources from the county program. The jurisdiction receiving the money needs to be able to demonstrate that they have the intent to build a program and they're not just looking for another funding source.

Jason M. asked if the matter is better accomplished in the application requirements or the WAC. EMAG could add some pre-application steps that will be required before a jurisdiction can apply for funding.

Barb stated that she would lean toward the WAC on this issue and not guidance. The idea of a city or town, from scratch starting a program potentially taking away capability from counties is a fundamental thing in emergency management. She questioned if there was a way to build into the recommendation the time necessary for a jurisdiction to build a program that meets the requirements. Further, she noted, a jurisdiction deciding to start their own program, and subsequent loss of EMPG for the county, will change the way things are funded. She suggested possibly a one-year period between application and receipt of funding for new applicants; so that their county has an opportunity to adjust the way they do business and account for the funding difference in their award.

Jason M summarized the discussion as stating that if someone wanted to build their own program and meet the requirements to be a sub-recipient; EMD would respond with a checklist of things that needed to be completed before the application was approved. The applicant would also be advised that the earliest they would receive EMPG funding would be the following year.

He added that there would be work needed regarding process and determining pre-application requirements.

Barb noted that the main focus is to establish a methodology so that everybody knows how to budget for the next year. Additionally, if smaller cities and towns observe their right to develop their own program, it needs to be balanced with the way service had been provided at the county level.

Deanna added that it must be worded in a way that avoids the perception that the county is making some kind of assessment or decision. There needs to be a positive context behind it.

Scott J added that there is an administrative burden for every new contract and there needs to be an education piece. Sub-applicants need to understand the administrative and financial burden of being a sub-recipient. He believes a waiting period would not only be capabilities balancing, but administrative education.

Jason M. raised that the discussion appears to also be simultaneous change to 118-09-30. EMAG's discussion is fundamentally an eligibility discussion.

Scott J. agreed and seconded Barb's comment about need to be a WAC modification. If it becomes a possibility that an application is rejected, there needs to be a codified reason for the "no".

Sandy stated that she was in agreement with the discussion. She proposed the possibility of phasing the amount of the grant so that the county does not feel the immediate effects of the shortfall. Phasing over two-three years would allow budgets to be adjusted.

Barb countered that while she could see the logic in that proposal, when a city starts their own program they may need EMPG to have a dedicated Emergency Manager, and if there is a phased in award, EMAG is possibly guaranteeing a failure of the new program.

Sandy acknowledged the logic of Barb's point and proposed a compromise of a two-year qualifying period.

Deanna noted that being told no, right now you don't meet the eligibility for EMPG, is not saying just give up and don't do anything to continue building a program and apply again. The WAC as currently written in 118-09-30, says for eligibility of funds, you must demonstrate the EMPG funds will only be used to sustain and enhance the state emergency management program capabilities. Which is why, that a city asking for funds have an established emergency management program. Because of that, there is some of that language already there and EMAG is just looking at applying the intent. She further agreed with Barb that it would be too difficult to phase in the award amount because if they've already done the work to get there, it would be a tough call to withhold funds.

Chair inquired if the group was comfortable making a recommendation without having heard a direct small city voice as part of this discussion?

Sandy noted that most of the voices we would hear would be recipients and not voices of those cities that may apply in the future.

Barb motioned that EMAG increase the minimum award for small cities and counties to \$30000 adjusting population requirements commensurately. Allow a two-year (biennial budget period) for the jurisdiction and home county the ability to move eligibility criteria.

Seconded by Scott J.

Chair inquired if there was any more discussion and hearing none put the motion to a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Recommendation #5: Increasing the requirement for all sub-recipients to include a minimum 1.0 FTE or equivalent emergency manager(s) who work exclusively on emergency management; ensuring awarded funds are used solely for emergency management.

Scott J. stated that the concern this recommendation is meant to address is ensuring the jurisdiction whose program is nested within other types of agencies and emergency manager wears multiple hats, is providing the maximum amount of Emergency Management focused work for the emergency management performance grant that a jurisdiction receives.

Scott M. stated that he would really like to have had Chris Alexander still be on the phone to provide input because he's a fire chief. None the less he believed it's important to have this provision in what we're doing going forward.

Scott J noted that during earlier discussions, the 1.0 was too big of a reach for several jurisdictions, but he also believed .25 is too low. He noted EMAG had to find a reachable percentage to achieve their goals, while not negatively effecting jurisdictions. He believes .5 FTE is probably as robust of a requirement that could be sustained uniformly across 39 counties.

Jason M: noted an .5 FTE is already in the WAC and inquired if there was a way to enforce by requiring documentation, such as the position description that can be developed into the application process.

Scott J concurred that doing it within the application process would probably be the most effective way to do it. He agreed that a WAC change would not address the issue as it already contains an FTE requirement; however, there does need to be some type of mechanism in place to show that the EMPG funded positions are spending the dedicated time on emergency management. He added that .5 FTE is probably as robust as can be uniformly maintained across 39 counties.

Jody added that even though the half-time requirement is not changing, it is a progression forward because it is adding an element of documentation, it's putting some teeth behind it.

Jason M noted that during background research prior to the August meeting EMD learned that some states have EMAP like standards as a part of their EMPG application. They're not telling their jurisdictions they have to achieve accreditation, but they're pulling great things out of EMAP standards and they're applying it into the application process.

Barb added that in addition to supplying the job description, it should be codified however their jurisdictions codify all job descriptions.

The Chair inquired if there was a motion being put forward

Barb motioned that EMAG disregard a change to the WAC but add the eligibility requirement of a job description showing at least 50% focus on emergency management. Further the job description must be codified according to the jurisdictions system of codification.

Scott M seconded.

Chair inquired if there was any further discussion.

Scott J stated that there should be a two-year phase in to allow jurisdictions, who do not already have the requirement in place, have time to ensure they meet the requirement. Particularly if they need to address changes with their Human Resources Departments.

Chair inquired if there was any further discussion, of which there was none. Chair put the motion to a vote and motion passed unanimously.

Recommendation #6: Revising the way unspent EMPG funds are reallocated, creating a uniform method for reallocation of unspent EMPG funds at both the local and state level.

Scott J stated that he believes Scott M and himself are a great example of where we're at with this now. They both partner closely with Wahkiakum county. Currently, if they were unable to use or spend all their EMPG money would it go into a small county pool where Scott M. can say he can do something to support them and has the match, or does it go into a homeland security region pool where he can do something and meet the match? Currently, it would go to the small county, which isn't necessarily wrong. But, if EMAG is looking to a regionalization model, maybe EMAG should allow other regional partners that may be in separate tier.

He added that having a first right of refusal helps support the concept of regionalization without some of the fear because it is an opportunity to share and not another jurisdiction "taking" something from them. The greater flexibility would allow us to align core capabilities around a shared need or identified gap within a region. It would further create an impetus for jurisdictions to establish a good regional collaboration if they're not. Instead of keeping money they may not be able to do much with, jurisdictions would be more open to return funds if they know they will receive some level of benefit.

Barb noted that when it comes to returned funds, currently small county goes to small county, large county goes back to EMAG to determine how to spend. She inquired what happens to State funds that are not used.

Chair advised that the state have not had any excess EMPG funds. They spend all their portion "down to the penny".

Barb inquired if the current reallocation method is part of guidance or the WAC.

Jason M noted that the WAC states "Any allocated EMA funds not expended by, or accepted by an EMO will be reallocated among remaining eligible EMOs as the Director determines will best sustain and enhance state-wide EM"

Chair noted that the State has always done what the EMAG has recommended.

Jason M noted some previous meeting recommendations are within the recommendation. One of the initial ones can be paraphrased as returned funds stay within the region to create that regional capacity. One recommended a sequence of recipients. Another reallocated funds as close to per-capita to eligible EMOs before subtracting the least populated counties allocated funds and then to an EMO for enhancing multijurisdictional capabilities across two or more counties, including municipalities within counties.

Barb added that by the time we know there is going to be reallocated funds from a large county we have a short turnaround.

Sierra noted that after the FY18 grant cycle, there will be an extra year to decide. But agreed it would be contingent on the state having the expenditures from jurisdictions to move forward with reallocation, so the extra year is not guaranteed.

Chair commented that he was not sure that we have a problem that needs to be fixed right now, because ultimately the way that it works, we've got a lot of flexibility. He noted he is not going to unilaterally determine what happens with the money. If the focus of the group is regional investments, then EMAG can choose to do that. However, when you start writing things down, you're reducing flexibility. The state follows what the group recommends in terms of re-allocating local funds because it's a measured, considered, deliberative process that the group participates in to determine where those funds need to be.

Jody suggested that maybe there be an extra section in the work plan, inquiring what jurisdictions would do if they had the opportunity to receive additional funding.

Jason M noted that every year in our budget cycle, we build unfunded list requirements, whether it's people, professional development equipment, or anything else. As state money, or some other grant source, has a few dollars, EMD sees if it's an allowable expense and fund something off the list.

Scott J stated that he felt this was something that did not need to be codified in any way. He believes it should be more of a working policy or a guideline because he does want to keep that flexibility that EMAG currently has.

Kurt stated that the reason he brought up this proposal is that EMAG made a recommendation to use returned funding and spend it on CEMNET, which is a state requirement and responsibility. In his county, he had several projects he could've used the money for and had the required match. Had he known the money was available, he would have put an application forward. He believes the money should've stayed at the local level because it was part of the local EMPG allotment. His concern is that something similar will happen in future years.

Deanna noted that EMAG agreed during a meeting to spend the funds on CEMNET because it was an issue that affected several jurisdictions. It was decided by the group that the re-allocation to the state specifically for CEMNET made sense.

Kurt added that his representative did not advise stakeholders that EMAG was considering doing that. He suspects several counties represented by EMAG were also not aware. He believes there was an EMAG process failure in not notifying jurisdictions before the vote.

Deanna agreed that, especially when talking about reallocation to dollars, notifying grantees of proposed reallocations does not seem that hard to do.

Joann further agreed that EMAG should notify every one of the proposals first. Particularly as they will always face this issue as representatives may be unable to attend the meetings. While not trying to subvert the representational structure of EMAG, when it comes to reallocation of money, everyone should be aware of what EMAG is planning to do with returned funds.

Jason M reminded the group that beginning with 19EMPG, there is a 3-year performance period which will give EMAG more time to determine what to do once it is identified there is money for reallocation. EMAG would not have to render an immediate decision. He suggested the possibility of staying on the same timeline as the 2-year performance period and give EMAG the third year to reallocate excess funds.

Deanna stated that although the language recommended would not have changed the issue with that decision, some people see there could've been a better way. In the specific instance it was money from an eastside large county that was determined there was no other immediate need for eastside counties.

Barb stated that she believes the issue does point out the need to have a more robust meeting agenda with a specific item of discussion that allows the group to discuss the needs of the greater EM community. Having a list of needs will help with deciding in a timely matter.

Jason M: stated that if EMAG wants to be good at forward planning, there is a need to clearly identify what are the gaps and what EMAG will invest in. Once all the grant applications are submitted, we can determine where everybody's investing money start seeing what is not having investments. He proposed using the SPR as a guideline.

Barb agreed to using the SPR, if EMAG only looks at EM related capabilities.

Scott M stated that while he made the original recommendation about providing money turned back by small counties, go to other small counties; the other work that had been done during this meeting has eliminated the need and he supports the idea of a regional approach.

Scott J stated the WAC gives the flexibility we need. He agreed that EMAG has previously faced time constraints imposed by the grant deadlines and it may be an artificial issue with the extra year and the ability to forecast. He suggested to possibly add a general question to jurisdictions that if there is excess funds, what are some projects you would like to support that would also help provide guidance to EMAG. He suggested maybe the formal recommendation be not to make any formalized changes to the current WAC language.

Jody stated that she is hearing the group talk about several different things. She is concerned about where the process will be documented for current and future emergency managers.

Jason M proposed a document related to the charter, that list priorities and goals in general terms.

Scott J agreed that the charter would be a better place because the group is looking more at guiding document. The charter has more flexibility than the WAC. He added that the current WAC language is good because it gives the group flexibility to address needs as they arise.

Jason inquired if there is a formal recommendation, or if the group agrees to table until the charter discussion later in the meeting.

The group agreed to table until the Charter discussion.

Chair inquired if there were any other motions or recommendations by the group on the topics. Hearing none he inquired if the group wanted to break for lunch, or just take a short break.

The committee agreed to a 10-minutes recess and reconvened at 12:20 p.m.

Charter Review

Jason Marquiss

Moving to the Charter discussion Jason M asked Brendan M to summarize the comments he had previously sent via email for attendees who may not have seen it. There is an element in the charter that discusses who serves as officers and Brendan's comments would reflect a fundamental shift in EMAG as a body. Jason believes the group should have that discussion first; and further review the charter based off what direction they decide to go.

Brendan M stated that regarding the EMD Director serving as Chair, if the function of this group is to advise the Director, he believes that the Director should be an ex-officio member. While it is critically important for the Director to be at the meetings, another member of EMAG should serve as the Chair with the committee advising him.

Barb agreed that it does make sense that when you have an advisory group, someone other than the person being advised serve as chair. She added that when EMAG was first formed it made sense for the state to facilitate. She is comfortable with either way.

Chair noted he asked the question when it was first decided he would serve as Chair but does not remember the final reason. He asked other long-serving members if they recall why it was decided he would be Chair.

Barb stated she believed it was because the group was tight-knit, well-coordinated, and all agreed on allocation. Because they did not want to play "Game of Thrones" it made sense to have the state Chair. She added that it doesn't mean that is the way it has to be.

Scott J believed the proposal makes sense. He noted there are several advisory groups in his county where a member is selected chair.

Chair stated that he is happy for other members to serve as chair. He noted that as some members know for other chairmanships, serving as a chair requires a lot of work and whoever steps into the role will need to be prepared to accept the extra responsibility.

Deanna questioned how the change would be viewed by other EM partners. Currently, there is no appearance of bias towards any particular side of the state because the state is the chair.

Jason M To address that concern, proposed if something should be written into the charter requiring the chair and vice chair be from different sides of the state, and the representation must swap with each term expiration.

Scott J noted that there are other governing bodies structured with Chair/Vice Chair rotations.

Jody noted that EMAG is an advisory board and only gives guidance. She believes there is too much time spent on charters, governance, and even voting; given that EMAG does not govern or make final decisions. The most important thing is getting together to talk, not who chairs the board. She does not want to see things formalized to a point where it appears to be governance when it really isn't.

Barb suggested that the group determine if there is interest in serving as chair. If not, the board should move ahead without further discussion. She further suggested that the group agree to spend no more than 5% of each meeting to discuss membership and charter issues.

Jason M noted that EMAG is required to review the charter every year due to what was previously adapted. He noted that EMAG can amend the charter to include a longer period.

Barb asked again if anyone was interested in serving as chair, or if there are any members that are not here that may be interested in serving as chair.

No one in room expressed interest.

Jason M added that the idea is something that can be socialized for the future and revisited later. As it appeared it wasn't going to drive the rest of the conversation, he wanted to go ahead and move forward.

He discussed that one of the fundamental things that he would like to do with the charter going forward is to pull out of the base document, all tables regarding population and representation groups, and make them attachments. This will make it easier to make changes and updates based off EMPG applicants and population changes. He inquired if anyone had any objections. Hearing none, he moved forward in the charter.

He inquired if the group believed section 2 and 3 still captured the purpose of the group or is there a need to update or make changes. He inquired if anyone was opposed to the language currently in the charter. Hearing none, he moved to the next points within the charter.

Scott M stated that he is comfortable with all the language in sections two through five

Jason inquired if anybody did not concur with Scott? Not hearing any opposed, he continued.

He noted most important was that EMAG on top of making sure stakeholder groups always have representation and that stakeholder groups take the lead in designation of replacements. He continued with 6A and inquired with staff if there were any discrepancies found in the numbers. Staff responded the only discrepancy was the number of actual county representatives versus what was in the charter.

JM continued that he didn't note anything in section 6 that deviated from current practices, but if there is anything others notice, to let him know.

Chandra noted in section B, that it states each group will nominate to the Director a representative. Given the fact that there are vacancies, that was clearly not happening, and they inquired if there is a way to better facilitate or support the process.

Jason M: stated that EMAG could leave it up to that membership group to nominate or the state could stimulate that conversation. It could be done either way.

Chair noted that the state is usually the one to initiate, and they typically ask the departing representative to go back to the stakeholder group for a new nomination. In some cases, such as when Chelan county stepped down, no one within that constituent group was willing to serve. So, there was no representation for that group.

JM: suggested removing part C through E and craft language stating EMD will engage with stakeholder groups to identify a representative.

SJ: agreed that it could be changed to say the chair will engage. It would could mean the chair has the responsibility to ensure a healthy and robust membership.

JM: noted that based off how he observed any alteration of vacancies, he did not see anything in items F through J that significantly needed to be changed. He did note that EMD needed to go back and try to align D through E with the group's intent on how to identify future members.

He continued to the section discussing Officers and noted there has always been a Vice Chair on paper, but the group has never elected a Vice-Chair. He noted that while he typically takes over when the Chair is not attendance, he views the capacity as more filling in for the chair, and not necessarily filling the vice-chair position.

Joann noted that it works for her because Jason and Robert do see each other a lot more often than the rest and can discuss what should be on the agenda as opposed always try to hunt someone down and try to create a conference call

Chair inquired if he would be continuing to serve, was there a need for a vice-chair. He did note that if the Chair is moved to a local emergency manager, that there be a vice-chair position.

SJ: proposed the language be "The director of the emergency management division, or designaee shall serve as the Chair of the Advisory Group"

It was agreed that based off the striking of 6B, the duties of the Vice-Chair will be struck until it is decided to elect a vice-chair.

Jason continued by noting he did not see anything inflammatory in section 8. He proposed removing section 9 regarding elections, based on the current construct where no one is necessarily being elected. Regarding meetings he asked if there was anything the charter was not documenting, or if there is anything the group would like to see.

An inquiry was made about publishing agendas earlier.

Jason noted EMD has been trying to get the agendas published sooner. As soon as it is finalized it is sent to members via email to share with their stakeholders, and posts on the external facing website to meet the public meeting act. He noted that unfortunately EMD does not control the website so sometimes it does not get posted as fast as he would like.

Scott M Noted that if the meetings are open meetings by law, the language that all meetings are open to any emergency manager is probably redundant. He further noted he had no concerns leaving the language in based off the chair's recommendation. Chair recommended leaving the text because it makes it explicitly clear to stakeholders and their community, that they can come in and are welcome.

JM: continued the review noting there were no further changes needed within the charter itself. He proposed changing the review schedule from annually to every two or three years, or even on an as needed basis. He inquired if anyone had a preference. Chair noted the charter should be dusted off and looked at periodically.

Referring back to reallocation recommendations, Jason stated that he thinks EMD understands the intent and they will draft up language to be shared with members and their constituent groups. Once approved the language can be included before the amended charter is adopted.

Jody stated that while the group previously stopped the discussion, she believed the reallocation should be in the WAC. The WAC is fairly specific about allocations and re-allocation should be a part of that. To which Barb agreed.

SJ: noted reallocation is the one thing he didn't want to put in the WAC. Having it more as a process or policy would give flexibility to address needs as they are presented.

Jody responded that flexibility is part of what has created some issues. While she supports flexibility, depending on what the issue is, there is currently a different process for each. There is a gap where some of the partners feel like they weren't fully informed or don't fully understand the process. It needs to be documented somewhere and because the WAC contains everything else, she believes it should go there.

Sierra noted that her concern with putting reallocation in the WAC is when there is an emergent need that the group decides they want to spend money on, they may not be able to. It will have to follow the mechanics as laid out in the WAC.

It was noted that currently the mechanics are not in any written document but tracked by Sierra. Barb noted that whatever the reallocation decision is, it should be written someplace.

Jason advised that EMD can document the information. The question is, how much of the reallocation method is "what is done" and how much is "how it's done". The how is probably an internal rule or procedures. The what is done is probably a WAC.

Barb suggested the possibility of updating the WAC to list Option 1, Option 2, or defer to EMAG if an urgent decision is made. As it currently is, the WAC has flexibility but does not refer to a specific document or operating rule somewhere.

She continued by proposing Sierra lay out the current methodology in a document and share with EMAG. Then the group can review the methodology and determine if it was what they want to endorse.

Jason and Sierra agreed to providing the document to the group.

Jason inquired if there are any other comments on reallocation. Hearing none, he asked if there were any final comments or recommendations on the charter.

Chair added that as a standing request of all EMAG members, to please coordinate with their constituencies. They need to make sure to talk, share issues, and receive feedback. It has not always happened over the years even though it is a fundamental responsibility outlined in the charter.

Scott M: agreed but added the caveat that, at least in his experience, it is sometimes difficult to elicit responses from constituencies. He has two counties that he has a very difficult time engaging with in any way.

Chair acknowledged the caveat.

Jason encouraged HLS region leads to share information there as well. He further offered EMD to attend meetings if needed, to reinforce something or answer questions. With enough advance notice, they would try to attend in person, but at a minimum could dial in.

Chair inquired if there were any other county, city, tribal topics the group wished to discuss, hearing none he moved to the next agenda item

Good of the Order

Robert Ezelle

Barb recalled that the auditor's office recommendation specifically talks about credentialing and the group had talked about regional liaisons, and what credentialing means to the community as a state. Because she found the document presented during the WAC discussions to be very helpful, she asked if EMD could create a document laying out the options and effects of credentialing, regional liaisons, and other matters. She believed it would foster better engagement on the issues. She inquired if there were any auditor recommendations that EMAG needed to review.

Chair advised that there were recommendations on better communication, EOC/WebEOC training and a recommendation on rules and responsibilities. He believed the current discussions being had by EMAG is hitting on most of their recommendations.

JM: noted that this performance audit, the Auditor's Office used very soft language compared to what you would normally have seen in previous years. Instead of "get this thing done". For example, what EMD saw on the credentialing piece is "recommend EMD look at their internal resources and potentially if you need more come back to legislature" In past it's been very clear; "We recommend as the auditor's office that the state agency ask for more resources".

He continued that the credentialing piece was more optimistic. It briefed well to EMD's OFM analyst and his boss; and conceptually a lot of the things were met with open ears. The issue is going to be when they're faced with the 2.4 million resilient communications decision package and they're looking at Governor priorities of what can get funded and then balancing all the other decision packages. It is unclear how they are going to prioritize against other state agency priorities.

While on the subject, he advised that one of the things EMD asked for is a dedicated exercise program manager that can be solely focused on Cascadia Rising. It would be complementing some of the technical assistance that we were being told is going to come out of FEMA Region 10 to help those jurisdictions that need exercise design support too. EMD consciously asked for a project FTE to avoid losing capacity in the exercise program, but still give capacity and help with Cascadia Rising.

Jody stated that she hoped the state would utilize EMAG where they may not be able to put forth a decision package or it may not be approved. EMAG might be able to collectively come together to create a capability, you don't necessarily need to dedicate money to. If it's important to all of us, there may be some creative solutions to items that were identified in the audit that wouldn't require a decision package.

Chair noted some of that has been happening because credentialing was jointly spirited by Justin and Jason. So, there is that involvement right there.

JM: added that some of the recommendations being put forward as motions during the current meeting are part of looking at other capabilities that we're trying to build and sustain. We can potentially be looking at reducing a capability to gain one that potentially, hopefully, has broader impact in so we're truly generating something that is of more value.

Chair inquired if there were any other good of the order, comments?

Chandra updated the group about the recent WEA alert sent out by her jurisdiction. The alert was set for only a two-block radius of the incident but was received by people throughout the county. They discovered that the FEMA phone app allows you to register for alerts and if you have registered for alerts in your area it gives you basically your entire county. This overrides the intensive geo-targeting. Chris Utzinger is now working the issue with the person responsible for the FEMA App. There may be some other technical stuff that because of the transmission happening from one to two, but just so that you're all aware of that case you must do a WEA, it's not currently as locked-down as we hoped it would be.

Barb shared that while she knows EMD cannot weigh in on state legislation, she wanted to let everyone know there is a green energy housing coalition from the last legislative session. They are providing grants and any local jurisdictions, county, city or housing authority can create a program and make use of it. They're all about clean energy and how do we make buildings more efficient. Unlike a conventional loan, it uses private dollars to front the cost of fire mitigation, flood mitigation, whatever you want and then you're allowed to use your property tax assessment over as much as a 30-year period to pay back the money. It's very successful in 30 states. It will be very helpful to have a lot more voices at the table. Nothing kills state legislation more than having Seattle EM show up to the hearing. The more voices we can get east, west, big and small, regardless of the hazards faced would be helpful. If a jurisdiction doesn't like it, it doesn't hurt anyone to have it there and jurisdictions can decide if, and at what level, they would want to take advantage of it.

Chair inquired if there any further good of the order comments.

Jason advised that Sue Vezeau had previously sent out a save the date for the 6th of November for our state's Cascadia Rising C&O meeting. We met with FEMA yesterday and asked to slide that to the right a little bit, so our new date is 4 December. It will be on Camp Murray in the PCRC, and EMD is expecting, potentially, upwards of 100 people.

He advised there will be a second meeting where the agenda will look very similar to what a C&O looks like. The outcome should be the same however, it is not designed to be a working session, but to try and figure out what the concept should be and what the scope should be. He noted that once the National exercise is officially announced, the State will have less control over the exercise and even FEMA Region 10's ability to run-it is taken a little bit out of their hands. EMD has clearly communicated the local jurisdictions comments and concerns. Further, it is still planned as a "Pick and Play" as you choose. The exercise will not be mandatory participation for local jurisdictions.

Chair provided an update on the Operations Unit Manager vacancy and inquired if any members would be willing to help the State in various access of the selection process such as participating in interview panels and assessments. He would like local involvement at the very beginning of the process. He stated he would reach out to everyone to put together interview and screening panels.

Chair moved to the next comment by asking who had satellite capability beyond a global star or an iridium-handheld device.

Scott M stated his county was implementing a new iridium satellite and will have capability to stream data. When tested it worked well enough he could use one phone. It is an economy version of a more robust satellite system. He added that it will probably support a single device, but it gives them capacity that they didn't have and couldn't afford otherwise

Joann advised they have a mobile command vehicle and we have computers and we hook TVs up to it. We just used it last week for fire prevention week and have 500 kids come through it with everything turned on.

Scott J stated they have a SAT phone and old PSP. They are on a no-pay monthly plan, so it is considerably expensive to turn on.

Chair explained he posed the question because EMD is trying to think of how to have an absolutely fail safe, fool proof way of communicating after Cascadia. There is UHF, which we rely on heavily however, when looking at things like CEMNET, OSCRR, and State Patrol Radio Systems, because of the way they are built, will probably fail. He views the current systems in place as point to point and doesn't have great confidence in anything that we would be able to invest in under from hundreds of thousands to multiple, millions of dollars in, is really going to survive the Cascade type of events. The only answer he sees is satellite. And so how do we do that cheaply?

The state currently has two Sprint COWS parked in the parking lot on Camp Murray and we can plug them into the building and run the building off those cows if something happens. With them, the SEOC can reach a satellite, operate phones, populate a Wi-Fi network, and move communications off a hard-wired setup. The state also has an offer from Verizon to bring one of their big rigs in here.

He asked if anyone would be interested in housing one on-site of their EOC if the State can convince Sprint, T-Mobile, AT&T and Verizon to do so. All carriers, except FirstNet, have expressed willingness to do so. The caveat would be if there was a disaster somewhere else, they would take their units to respond to that. He is not sure if anyone would have the rights to take it on the road and that would need to be figured out. He is just pitching the idea during this meeting.

Chair added he would also like to explore small satellite programs run by the carriers that may be able to be leased or bought. If someone was to have 20-30 thousand, they could buy Sprint satellite capability that can be connected to a building to run the EOC. Why should the community spend millions of dollars building a radio network if they can buy satellite capability? He believes there's a lot of room for exploration of a concept that might give something that the community might not otherwise have.

Scott J stated that as an economy of scale, he believes the second options would be the only way to effectively create redundancy. If there was a state-wide supported system in every EOC where we could do regular tests, then it really does become a practical option. His jurisdiction currently has a portable satellite that is supposed to run 15 computers, however he can't afford to turn it on to test because the only price point he could sustain was a no-test, no-use payment plan. He added this situation is probably familiar to other jurisdictions. Because he can't turn it on, there is no way to train anyone how to use it and they must rely on a short instruction manual.

Chair noted that he does not have a lot of information now, and he will still need to determine what is available, however he believes there is a lot of room for exploration that can be done to find a lower cost solution, and an easier solution than relying on radios.

Chair continued with the next Good of Order:

He stated he and the recently departed Operations Unit Manager had been discussing the idea of an elected officials guide. He noted that NEMA just did a push to collect all the ones that exist out there and Washington did not have one. He inquired if the group would be interested in partnering together to create a state-wide elected official guide that would be produced at the state level and customizable at the local level.

Barb noted that there are similar products that already exist in the region that could be drawn from, so they would not have to create from scratch. She pointed out that while creating a guide is good, there must be a way to insure elected officials review and use it. She added that one of the most objective things she participated in was a "speed-dating" type set up during an elected officials forum. It was quite effective.

Scott M stated that his successor created a core program statement that he keeps updated. Whenever there are elections, he requests 45 minutes of the official's time to meet and go over the information with them. He also finds it effective in terms of getting them that information and making them think about their responsibilities.

Scott J stated that having a product produced by EMD would make sure it is one cohesive document. Even though it is the same information. The presentation he gives his officials looks different than the one they get in Olympia, so he always receives questions.

Sandi noted that under the Association of Washington Counties there is a document that was created years ago but they still use. Some officials are unaware of their responsibilities and if the greater community wants them to understand emergency management, we must push the information to them.

Chair noted he didn't believe EMD had the bandwidth to put something together at the moment, but he wanted to bring it up. If there is value in the idea, he did not want to let it go.

Barb added that Renton EM was recently invited to give a presentation to a mayors' consortium. They reached out to other EMs who would have mayors in attendance to ask if there was anything in particular they should add. After the presentation, it was scheduled for around 8 mayors to go tour the Renton EOC. Getting elected officials talking to each other goes a long way.

Closing Remarks**Robert Ezelle**

Chair thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and noted he thought the conversation was really valuable. He inquired if there was anything else to discuss, and hearing none inquired if there was a motion to adjourn.

Motion made by Scott J

Seconded by Scott M

Meeting adjourned at 13:40

Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG)

Thursday, October 24, 2019

Last Name	First Name	Representation	Organization	Email	Signature
Alexander	Chris	Small Cities	Mulholland Fire Department	alexander@mulholland.gov	
Bierman	Jason	Westside Large County	Spokane County	jason.bierman@co.spokane.wa.us	
Boggs	Jason	Eastside Small County Tier 1	Pend Oreille County	jboggs@pendoreille.org	
Brooks	Eric	Westside Medium County	Island County	ericbrooks@co.island.wa.us	
Carver	Don	Westside Small County Tier 2	Columbia County	rcarver@co.columbia.wa.us	
Conan	Brendan	Westside Small County Tier 1	San Juan County	brendan@sanjuandem.net	
Davis	Deanna	Eastside Medium County	Benton County	ddavis@bcwa.wa.gov	
Duffy	Sandi	Eastside Medium County	Grant County	sduffy@grantcountywa.gov	
Eaton	Robert	State	EMD	rob@emad.org	
Fox	Chandra	Eastside Large County	Spokane County	cf@co.spokanecounty.org	
Griff	Barb	Large Cities	City of Seattle	barb.griff@seattle.gov	
Hay	Cherie	Tribe	Squamish Tribe	cherry@sqwamish-nsn.us	
McDouley	Brendan	Westside Very Large County	King County	brendan.mcdouley@kingcounty.gov	
McDaniel	Ada	Tribe	Muckleshoot Tribe	ada.mcdaniel@muckleshoot-nsn.us	
Hooper	Patricia	Medium Cities	City of Redmond	phooper@redmond.gov	
Jenkins	Gary	Small Cities	City of Pullman	gary.jenkins@pullman-wa.gov	
Johansen	Scott	Consortium	CRCSA	scott.johansen@crca.wa.gov	
McDougal	Scott	Westside Small County Tier 1	Pacific County	smcdougal@co.pacific.wa.us	
Scarfield	Ute	Medium Cities	City of Tacoma	ute@cityoftacoma.org	
White	Jay	Eastside Small County Tier 2	Adams County	jwhite@co.adams.wa.us	
Stachew	Tirah	State	EMD	tirah.stachew@gmail.com	
Merritt	Jason	State	EMD	jean.merritt@co.ni.wa.gov	
McDunn	Stacy	State	EMD	stacy.mcdunn@co.ni.wa.gov	
Roberson	Michael	State	EMD	Michael.Roberson@co.ni.wa.gov	
Wardell	Sierra	State	EMD	Sierra.Wardell@co.ni.wa.gov	

Churchill, Loren
 Vezeau
 Herdin
 Todd Ferguson

State State EMD

Svegaard