

Washington State Emergency Management Advisory Group

February 4, 2016

0800 – 1700

Notes

Attendees:

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

Others:

Visitors: Charma Anderson (EMD), Dominic Marzano (Kent), Brendan Cowen (Island), Ute Wber (City of Tacoma), Barnaby Dow (King County)

- I. Started: 0816
- II. Review and approve minutes from July, Oct, Nov, and Jan meetings. All approved with changes/attachments
- III. Membership updates. (Attachment 1)
- IV. Charter Review
 - a. Reviewed charter as well (Attachment 2), at next review will strike out consortia (ESCA) and generalize language.
 - b. Would like to have more public visible website/SharePoint site. More emails to the locals with EMAG membership and website address. Need website to be more visible.
 - c. Consortia category – Will leave vacant for now.
- V. Legislative Update (0905-0925)
 - a. 2287 -Travis act, creation of disability placard to be placed on vehicle or house to indicate a person with disabilities, open up 38.52 to direct EMD to do study to develop 911 registry to flag a phone, Did try to talk at leg but was not given much time but did talk to bill sponsor. This bill is scheduled for executive session today. Travis Act Companion set up bill – creation of database or list for call takers for disabilities, biggest issue is maintaining databases. Barb is not a big placard fan. Placards need to also have a plan to deal with it. PattiJean – false sense of prioritization because someone was on a registry.
 - b. 2553 – COOP – Expand COOP planning, focusing on schools and school districts, have EMD provide model plans, review, E&T these plans. Was exec'd out on Tuesday. Scaled back to 295 school districts from all special purpose districts, asked legislature for funding 1 FTE to coordinate planning for state agencies and school districts, Face to face with schools would take up to 10 FTEs for plan review and exercising those plans.

- c. 6530 - LEP - Messaging and language that people can understand, directs state and local governments to provide messaging to people that live in their jurisdictions. Fiscal note could be around \$800k for translations services, ATG \$150k to defend legislation. Exec'd out of Senate yesterday. Fiscal Note includes one LEP FTE. Cannot translate using machines must use person to get the right context and tone. We should add this to Sustainable funding discussion, to accommodate LEP and Vulnerable populations. Sandi would like to have state agencies, with resources, to help with translation services. Maybe during "Peace Time" we should reach out to the different language groups to see if they are willing to help during disasters. Master contracts at state level to get some help with this. State has asked CHA to help educate elected officials but they are very reluctant to help with outreach and education. They are willing to help with elected's. EMD has a Pilot Program with coastal counties that had translation services, Tsunami focused, now going to pilot in the Eastside, directly tie to four disasters in 2015. **(Attachment 3)**. Worked well in the coastal areas. \$45k for three counties but does not include staff time.
- d. Number of Wildfire bills – Fiscal implications on several. 6347 – fire prevention and suppression, per parcel assessment to help raise monies for prevention and suppression, some money for WNG fire training; trying to field 20 strike teams and supervisory capability for these teams, challenge has been the supervisory issue. 6502 – This does the same regarding money as 6347 and adds additional for a burn management for those that do preventative burns, adds WSU fire behavior degree. 6632 – This does not seem to have an EM impact, DES to provide info on wildfire insurance carriers, meet needs of state on impacts and prevention, 20-year strategic plan for forest health, updated smoke management plan, etc.
- e. Oil Train – 2750 – update Marine Rail study, and update recommendations, proposed to hire contract to update 2006 SERC HAZMAT response capability report; 6814 –???, 6553 - Another to increase barrel tax from 5 cents to \$1.05. There is new Federal legislation for oil exportation to increase west coast ports and impacts.
- f. Feb 25 is WSEMA leg day at Capital.
- g. Robert participated and testified in front of Rep Roach re Personal Preparedness. What do the locals do to enlist HAM radio operators? Actively pursuing, Pierce ties to CERT and uses them for outreach and ECC. Pacific has a network of radios at fire stations, RACES network throughout county, and they actively drill with EM, developed large amount of capacity with lots of redundancy, one of the main ways that Pacific county reaches out to their residents. City of Kirkland has faith based orgs that have HAMS, train CERT to be intermediary between HAM and community people, they limit what use HAMS for. City of Seattle uses them a lot even for non-disaster missions, they have also created community hubs for meeting up. Grays Harbor County has a pretty big HAM network but have issues with the amount of messaging and trying to find ways to decrease the amount of messaging, problem is they cannot talk to military and state level. Snohomish County has to reach out to ARES/RACES guys but having problems with demographics (older men), not a lot of new blood. Island County has "go" boxes with packet capability and pushing hub concept with HAMS ID, promoting at schools and other organizations. Some Tribes have offered the HAM class during annual conference. Spokane has rejuvenated their ARES/RACES group and built a communications room. Robert Ezelle may reach out to EMAG to help prepare for more testimony. Not all licensed personnel are part of an ARES/RACES group. Is this a problem? Not in Pacific County

- VI. Letter to Emergency Managers regarding LEP Issue (Attachment 4)
 - a. PattiJean – best para is #4, which is the impact statement, Where is ASL as a different lang? and info for lower literacy is needed.

- VII. EMPG Applications
 - a. Charma Anderson – at last meeting expressed concern with workload of marrying 70+ and 312 contracts and applications, Charma Anderson emailed request answers to EMAG on Friday (Attachment 5). Other request was regarding grant guidance and having everything pass through to lowest levels. Team is taking steps to streamline reimbursement process and is working on getting more sub recipient monitoring. Currently they have 99 recipients, which is challenging to get on road and maximize, desk reviews are not as effective as visit. They need advice on moving forward. 5% M&A to help?
 - b. Issues with EMPG workplan document (excel). Need to look at requirements and application itself to get the information in an easier way. PattiJean would like to see a nice cheat sheet especially on wording. Need more depth of requirements and specifically the changes. EMAG should collaborate with Charma Anderson’s group to help streamline the application process.
 - c. TASK: Need a special EMAG conference call for this group.
 - d. TASK: Need to send out requirements document to everyone before meeting and add this as first agenda item for March meeting.
 - e. How can locals support us with FEMA and DHS? Robert Ezelle wants to use EMAG judiciously and when a concerted effort is needed. NEMA will add this as a topic at the Mid-Year meeting. Kurt Hardin also talked to other states about their application status and not all FEMA regions are created equal. Kurt Hardin and John Ufford had a meeting with Dep Dir at Region X to get some answers. Other states in our region had over 30 pages per application.
 - f. TASK: How is state spending their 40%?

- VIII. Review and refine EMAG Mission, visions, and objectives (1100-1530) (Attachment 6)
 - a. Would like to consolidate lines of effort to three and continue work on Human Capital. Majority of time and effort should be working on Sustainable Funding. Condense to Standardization, Human Capital, and Sustainable funding. Leave as one group working the issues.
 - b. Do we want to address the Regional Coordinator’s role? There needs to be a standard that is set to help be as consistent across the board as possible. Whatever we do needs to be transparent. Is the question before the EMC still valid? As long as state is okay with the way that Region 8 is functioning then the question is dead. Spokane region is very supportive of their Regional Coordinator and is retooling on how they are working.
 - (a) TASK: Ask regional coordinators if they still want answer from EMC.
 - (b) Original objectives are still in place and should still be coordinated. They are conduits and not decision makers for EM.
 - (c) TASK: Robert Ezelle to ask staff to draft letter that system is working.
 - c. Switch to having standing Agenda items instead of workgroups. Some of the Human Capital needs to fall under Standardization category. Need to keep vision high.

- d. Need to have documentation regarding who has grant funding that would not survive w/o it. Survey regarding budget local vs federal, what does funding provide? Now is a good time to do that. Some the data is captured in EMPG application.
 - (a) TASK: Funding Survey
- e. Questionnaire regarding impacts of state EMD moving to 4/10 schedule and specific day off. Robert Ezelle wants specific questions from locals. The answers need to be honest and how it impacts that locals and not persuaded by EMD staff.
 - (a) TASK: 4/10 schedule Survey
- f. Human Capital – Originally had 5 areas of interest. DAE, EMAT, VolMAT, SAT. Does state go into role of IMTs? No. Continue implementation of EMAT and working on VolMAT. DOH is busy building IMTs for Health type emergencies. They are training them all hazard and have volunteered them to EMD to put them out. Membership to be broadened out to not just health personnel. May need to move this to Standardization instead of Human Capital. What needs to be done to finish out EMATs? Developing the team and put the standards together. Fine tune implementation.
 - (a) TASK: John Pennington to send final paper to Hollie and Hollie to send out to group and upload to website. John will also look at Ohio and Maryland for their implementation plans.
 - (b) Need to talk about ownership and what that looks like? Single county teams not a problem but a regional/multi-jurisdictional team may be an issue. Need to have all the teams come together to talk about the operations/tactical level to synchronize all this up. Legal and financial issues still a problem. EMD only has capabilities for 20 FTE worth's of work. EMD is already taking on WAMAS, EMD maybe the repository of documents but the team leads need to hammer out the tactical. EMD can facilitate procedural and guide tactical levels. EMD does not have carte blanche ownership. Things to look at: rotation points, tailorable, find out the customers' needs as well. Need to meet again and hash out what it looks like and how it's going to work.
 - (c) TASK: Workgroup to build workplan to implement this. DAE or team structure was going to be vetted at the state level (SEOO). Deployed through WAMAS, need to ID legal issues and move forward on finding solutions.
 - (d) Who populates the DAE database? IMT personnel and other SME's to help supplement/compliment EMATs. Who vets these people? County/local emergency managers. Some of the state agencies may want to partner and be part of this. Vetting through local EM's is already done via EMAC procedures. This process being used with interstate through Mutual Aid desks is smart and will not duplicate efforts. Room for pre-validation? Yes, within the confines of basic ICS common across state. We are building capability. When build team, build capacity for A-teams. Have something rolled out by May 31, if fire season has not started. John Pennington recommends having the Central Washington meeting with state folks to plow through the tactical and implementation of database at state with team leads.
 - (e) TASK: Report back on progress at March EMAG.
- g. Structure – What is that we do in emergency management at the state level? Refer back to 38.52.030 and 040. Cities, towns, and counties are required to have emergency management functions and have CEMP and program. Still working through what program means in WAC 118.30. As of matter of policy, we ask that cities, towns, tribes, coordinate resources with counties before coming to state for resources because of better efficiency and availability. As a matter of policy, Robert Ezelle would prefer that

cities work through counties due to span of control. EMD's consistent message to cities and towns are "please work with your counties". EMD is trying to keep the Governor's outreach staff out of the local EOCs and clearly define what their roles will be. Lee Shipman is working on with the tribes to have them call the state first and not FEMA first. EMD will always recommend that the tribes work with their counties as resources maybe faster.

- (a) Robert Ezelle's look at this definition – Disasters are local, those that are directly impacted are the heads and the rest of the state are in supporting roles. Multi layered partnerships, official and non-official, and how to do coordinate to help each other. Need to articulate this in elevator speech to help with getting monies. What does a local program look like? Need to dissect this down to the program level and here is your need. It is not just the essential services but also, all the other morphed services that have come into emergency management to include LEP, Inclusive planning, and other issues.
- h. Funding Sustainment – We need to be educated and articulate on speaking points that we can hand to people on this subject. WSEMA should be providing the talking points for the legislative day on Feb 25. **(Attachment 7)**
 - (a) Need talking points, opportunities to promote this/outreach, ID what we want to fund. What we do and how we do it? WSEMA wants to do a gap analysis to describe and quantify the capabilities assessment/gaps. Need to have a narrative for the legislature. Why is this important? We don't have a collective narrative. We have been turned down repeatedly for Stafford Act disasters. We also need have solutions with the narrative. EMD can educate those that can lobby but EMD can't lobby. May need to have a shaming "feds spent \$7m for EM but State does not fund anything for the locals". Need to find the ask. Build an ask that is somewhere between EMPG ask vs Resiliency ask. Florida partnered with locals and their legislature to get all locals EMAP accredited program. What would it take to have all locals EMAP accredited in our state and sustained? Where is citizen preparedness and what does it take to get people prepared on their own in the 21st century? Does Scott Heinz have the Florida information and their programs?
 - (b) TASK: Scott Heinze to provide the Florida model.**
 - (c) Two things to be aware of: 1) Just finished 5th presidential catastrophic hurricane and 2) snuck through assessment of insurance charge, want to ground truth this model. We tried this in Washington but it was voted down. Can we determine Pre-mitigation work that resulted in decrease in insurance payouts? Bring in Rebecca Green from WWU. Insurance people to work with EMAG on getting this issue in the leg. Scott Heinze went to the insurance companies many years ago to get this started but it didn't pass. We need to slow down and be deliberate and make the business case. Need to look at a variety of funding sources and not just go after insurance.
 - (d) Lines of effort – We need to ID funding source, define the ask, define what EM does and gap analysis, What are we capable of today, and what do we need to be capable of later. Explore and ID funding sources and develop narrative. Do homework first and engage in partnerships at the beginning for the data. This is a two to three year plan. Don't discount large business for COOP. Target to business community to reopen doors faster. We have had a record # of disaster, SBA, FMAG declarations, and numerous non-declared disasters.
 - (e) TASK: Robert Ezelle to put something out on Blog.**

(f) Need “crystal” clear outcomes that we want to achieve. Then determine business case as EMAG and profession because WSEMA is small compared to legislature.

(g) This entire project kicks off with “what is the ‘ask’?”

- IX. Priorities (1530-1600)
 - a. Sustainable funding as #1 priority
 - b. Need to finish Human Capital piece as #2 priority
 - c. Standardization as priority #3
- X. Agenda for Mar Meeting (1615-1645)
 - a. Progress check on resource ordering and EMATs
 - b. Funding
- XI. April EMAG Meeting – Kurt Hardin and Robert Ezelle will be in DC for NEMA
 - a. **TASK: EMD to look at calendars and send out proposals for Apr meeting.**
- XII. Good of the Order (1645-1700)
 - a. Seattle Times Public records request to locals may have to deal with money and legislature not doing enough to help fund resiliency in the state. EMD had a conversation with reporter re CEMPs and how EMD reviews CEMPs.
- XIII. Ended: 1545

Attachment 1

Eastside	Westside
Small County Tier 1 JoAnn Boggs	Small County Tier 1 Dave Brown
Small County Tier 2 Jay Weise (Adams)	Small County Tier 2 Chuck Wallace
Small County Tier 3 Kent Sisson	Medium County Eric Brooks
Medium County Jeremy Beck Sandi Duffey	Large County Scott Heinze Jason Biermann
Large County Ed Lewis	Very Large County Walt Hubbard

Small Cities	Consortia
	None at this time
Medium Cities	Tribes
Patti Jean Hooper Tory Green	Lee Shipman
Large Cities Barb Graff	

Eastside Counties

Small County Tier 1	JoAnn Boggs	2015	JoAnn Boggs	2018
Small County Tier 2	Jay Weise	2016		
Small County Tier 3	Kent Sisson	2017		
Medium County	Jeremy Beck	2015	Jeremy	2018
	Sandi Duffey	2016		
Large County	Ed Lewis	Indef		

Westside Counties

Small County Tier 1	Scott McDougall	2016		
Small County Tier 2	Chuck Wallace	2017		
Medium County	Eric Brooks	2015	Eric	2018
Large County	Scott Heinze	2016		
	Jason Biermann	2017		
Very Large County	Walt Hubbard	Indef		

Cities

Small Cities	Gary Jenkins	2015	Gary Jenkins	2018
Medium Cities	Patti Jean Hooper	2016		
	Tory Green	2017		
Large Cities	Barb Graff	Indef		

Consortia

Tribes	Lee Shipman	2015	Lee Shipman	2018
---------------	-------------	------	-------------	------

Attachment 2

Washington State Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG)

CHARTER

I. Name

The Washington State Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG or Advisory Group) is a committee of the Emergency Management Council (EMC).

II. Purpose

The Charter outlines the Advisory Group's responsibilities and specifies its Focus Areas, Mission, Vision, Guiding Principles and Operating Requirements and Practices.

The Emergency Management Advisory Group:

- A. Serves as a collaborative forum to advise the Director, Washington Emergency Management Division (henceforth referred to as the Director) and the EMC on emergency management issues impacting state, local and tribal emergency management.
- B. Shall advise the Director on the distribution of Emergency Management Assistance Funds.
- C. Collaboratively maintains and enhances the statewide system of Emergency Management to ensure all Washingtonians are served by an Emergency Management Program.
- D. Provides a means by which local and tribal emergency managers can communicate issues and concerns to the Director.

III. Mission

Emergency management professionals working together to minimize the impact of emergencies and disasters on the people, property, economy and environment of the State of Washington.

IV. Vision

Achieving an effective statewide system of emergency management.

V. Priorities

Attachment 2

- A. The Advisory Group will provide broad-based, diverse representation to collaboratively address current and emerging emergency management issues.
- B. Advisory Group members should actively represent their constituent groups and take a statewide perspective on emergency management matters.
- C. To effectively accomplish their responsibilities, Advisory Group members should maintain a working knowledge of core legal, policy and operational documents. These include, but are not limited to, Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPD's), National Response Framework (NRF), National Incident Management Systems (NIMS), National Preparedness Goals, RCW Title 38, Related WAC's, Washington Statewide All-Hazards Emergency Preparedness Strategic Plan and the Washington State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) and Core Capabilities.

VI. Membership

- A. The Advisory Group shall consist of the Director and not more than nineteen members, appointed by the Director, representing local emergency managers. The members of the Advisory Group shall represent the following constituencies:

Counties	12
Cities	4
Consortium	1
Tribes	2

- B. County representation will be assigned according to Table 1. Each group of counties will nominate to the Director a representative or, in the case of medium counties east and large counties west, 2 representatives to serve on the advisory committee.
- C. Washington cities with independent emergency management programs meeting the criteria of WAC 118-30 will nominate to the Director 4 representatives to serve on the advisory committee. City representation will be assigned according to Table 2.
- D. Emergency management consortia such as ESCA will nominate to the Director 1 representative to serve on the advisory committee. A consortium is defined as a standalone emergency management program consisting of individual member cities or counties. A consortium is not construed to mean an emergency management program representing a county and the cities within the county.
- E. The Director will appoint 2 members from Washington Tribes to provide a tribal perspective. It is recognized that Tribes are sovereign nations. They provide only their own perspective and do not speak for other tribes.

Attachment 2

Table 1: County Representation

EASTSIDE			WESTSIDE		
Jurisdiction	Pop Estimate		Jurisdiction	Pop Estimate	
Small County Tier 1			Small County Tier 1		
Garfield County	2,250	1	Wahkiakum County	4,020	1
Columbia County	4,100		Skamania County	11,300	
Ferry County	7,650		San Juan County	16,000	
Lincoln County	10,675		Pacific County	21,000	
Pend Oreille County	13,150		Small County Tier 2		
Small County Tier 2			Jefferson County	30,275	1
Adams County	19,200	Mason County	61,800		
Klickitat County	20,700	Clallam County	72,350		
Asotin County	21,800	Grays Harbor County	73,200		
Douglas County	39,280	Medium County			
Okanogan County	41,500	Lewis County	76,200	1	
Small County Tier 3			Island County		79,700
Kittitas County	41,900	Cowlitz County	103,300		
Stevens County	43,800	Skagit County	118,600		
Whitman County	46,000	Whatcom County	205,800		
Walla Walla County	59,500	Large County			
Chelan County	73,600	Kitsap County	254,000	2	
Medium County			Thurston County		260,100
Franklin County	84,800	Clark County	435,500		
Grant County	91,800	Snohomish County	730,500		
Benton County	183,400	Pierce County	814,500		
Yakima County	247,250	Very Large County			
Large County			King County	1,981,900	1
Spokane County	480,000	Westside County Representation			6
Eastside County Representation			6		

Table 2: City Representation

Small Cities	Population less than 50,000	1 Position
Medium Cities	Population 50,000 – 250,000	2 Positions
Large Cities	Population greater than 250,000	1 Position

Attachment 2

Small Cities - 1 Position		
Skykomish	King	200
Beaux Arts Village	King	300
Hunt's Point	King	390
South Prairie	Pierce	435
Bucoda	Thurston	560
Carbonado	Pierce	610
North Bonneville	Skamania	1,000
Langley	Island	1,055
Yarrow Point	King	1,060
Republic	Ferry	1,085
Woodway	Sno/ESCA	1,310
Stevenson	Skamania	1,520
Tenino	Thurston	1,705
Carnation	King	1,785
Rainier	Thurston	1,825
Coupeville	Island	1,880
Clyde Hill	King	2,980
Medina	King	2,990
Algona	King	3,070
Forks	Clallam	3,545
Black Diamond	King	4,170
North Bend	King	5,855
Brier	Sno/ESCA	6,135
Normandy Park	King	6,350
Pacific	King	6,620
Sequim	Clallam	6,795
Duvall	King	6,900
Yelm	Thurston	7,100
Gig Harbor	Pierce	7,340
Newcastle	King	10,460
Woodinville	King/ESCA	10,960
Enumclaw	King	11,030
Snoqualmie	King	11,320
Lake Forest Park	King/ESCA	12,640
East Wenatchee	Douglas	13,280
Centralia	Lewis	16,670
Covington	King	17,760
Tumwater	Thurston	17,900
Mill Creek	Sno/ESCA	18,450

Small Cities Continued		
Tukwila	King	19,080
Port Angeles	Clallam	19,100
Mountlake Terrace	Sno/ESCA	20,090
Mukilteo	Sno/ESCA	20,360
Kenmore	King/ESCA	21,020
Oak Harbor	Island	22,200
Mercer Island	King	22,690
Maple Valley	King	23,340
SeaTac	King	27,210
Des Moines	King	29,700
Pullman	Whitman	31,000
Issaquah	King	31,150
Wenatchee	Chelan	32,400
Bothell	King	34,000
Lynnwood	Sno/ESCA	35,900
Puyallup	Pierce	37,620
Edmonds	Snohomish	39,800
Lacey	Thurston	43,600
Sammamish	King	47,420
Olympia	Thurston	47,500
Burien	King	47,730

Medium Cities - 2 Positions		
Shoreline	King	53,270
Redmond	King	55,360
Lakewood	Pierce	58,260
Auburn	King/Pierce	71,240
Bellingham	Whatcom	81,360
Kirkland	King	81,480
Federal Way	King	89,460
Renton	King	93,910
Everett	Snohomish	103,300
Kent	King	119,100
Bellevue	King	124,600
Tacoma	Pierce	199,600

Large Cities - 1 Position		
Seattle	King	616,500

Attachment 2

- F. Members of the Advisory Group shall be Emergency Management Directors or Deputy Directors, the equivalent being the position primarily responsible for daily emergency management activities.
- G. Appointment, Term of Office, and Compensation: Advisory Group members will be appointed for a three-year term by the Director, Washington Emergency Management Division. Terms shall be staggered so as to ensure continuity of membership. Members serve voluntarily, and without compensation, but may be reimbursed for their travel expenses incurred in the performance of their duties in accordance with RCW 43.03.050 and RCW 43.03.060.
- H. Alternates: Appointed members shall designate one alternate from their constituent group to attend functions on the member's behalf when necessary. Only that person shall have the voting privileges of the member.
- I. Vacancies: When an EMAG position becomes vacant, the constituency represented by that position will nominate a replacement to the EMAG.
- J. Participation: EMAG members will make every effort to attend meetings in person. However, a conference bridge will be offered for all meetings and attendance via telephone is considered present for any meeting. If a member or their alternate misses two consecutive meetings or more than half the meetings in one year without good cause, the Advisory Group may recommend to the Director that the position be declared vacant. Prior to coordinating a replacement, the Director shall send a letter to the member indicating such action.

VII. Officers

- A. The Director, Washington Emergency Management Division, shall serve as chair of the Advisory Group.
- B. A Vice Chair shall be elected or removed by members of the Advisory Group at a regular or special meeting by a simple majority vote.
- C. Duties of Officers:
 - 1. The Chair shall:
 - a. Call Advisory Group meetings, preside at the meetings, and plan and formulate the agenda for the meetings.

Attachment 2

- b. Make recommendations to the Advisory Group regarding establishment of Committees and Chairs.
- c. Perform other duties as may be necessary or prescribed by the Advisory Group for the effective operation of the Advisory Group and its responsibilities.

2. The Vice-Chair shall:

- a. In the absence of the Chair, perform and exercise the duties and functions of the Chair.
- b. Participate in committees.
- c. Perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Chair.

VIII. Members

A. The members of the Advisory Group shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for their travel expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

B. Members shall:

- a. Share the responsibilities of the deliberations of this group.
- b. Carry forward to the group the concerns of the constituency they represent.
- c. Share information with their constituencies.
- d. Be open-minded and not focused on their own interests

IX. Elections

Elections shall be held during the first meeting of the calendar year.

X. Meetings

- A. Schedule: The Chair shall publish an annual meeting schedule.
- B. Special Meetings: Special meetings may be called by the Chair, as deemed appropriate, or upon a special request of at least seven Advisory Group members.
- C. Meeting Notice and Requirements: The Chair will provide notice of meetings at least twenty days prior to such meetings.

Attachment 2

- D. All meetings shall comply with the Open Public Meetings Act.
- E. Quorum: A simple majority of the Advisory Group members shall constitute a quorum at regular or special meetings.

XI. Operating Principles

- A. All meetings are open to any emergency manager.
- B. Agendas and notes will be shared with all emergency managers.
- C. The Director will use additional collaboration methods to ensure broad access such as meeting with local directors at WSEMA and the annual Partners in Preparedness Conferences.
- D. Be collaborative.
- E. Be respectful of the opinions of others.

XII. Voting

- A. Actions and commitments will be achieved through consensus where possible.
- B. Each member or designated alternate shall have one vote and must be present, either in person or via telephone, to cast his/her vote. Passage of motions shall require the simple majority of those present and voting. Informal polling for consensus shall not be considered voting.

XIII. Parliamentary Procedure

Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall be the parliamentary authority for procedures not covered by this charter.

XIV. Amendments

The Charter may be amended, repealed, altered, in whole or in part, or a new Charter adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the entire Advisory Group at any Advisory Group meeting provided that a copy of the proposed amendment be sent to each Advisory Group member at least thirty days prior to the meeting.

Attachment 3

Attachment 4

February 19, 2016

«First_Name» «Last_Name»
Emergency Manager
«Business_Street»
«Business_City», «Business_State»
«Business_Postal_Code»

Re: Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Communications and Outreach

Dear Emergency Management Colleague:

Last year was a busy one for the Emergency Management community, with major storms in January, November, and December; and a record-setting wildfire season that demanded a major response effort. I want to thank you for your partnership and collaboration, as I truly believe our collective efforts served Washingtonians well.

After every emergency, we hold an after action review (AAR). Despite our best efforts and innovative measures to improve our outreach to those with limited English proficiency (LEP), we continue to receive feedback during the AAR process that the emergency management community needs to do more to communicate better with LEP populations.

I am hoping that I can count on your partnership again to ensure that during the next disaster your entire community receives critical information about evacuations, road closures, food and shelter availability, and health risks in a timely and effective manner in a language they can understand. I have had frequent discussions over the past several months with individuals and organizations that serve LEP communities. They are concerned that LEP individuals are placed at greater risk of harm when they are not provided emergency information in a language they understand, or it is not provided simultaneously with an English version.

If any part of your jurisdiction is a recipient of federal grant dollars from any source you are required by federal law and regulations to take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to information, programs, and services to people with limited English proficiency, as well as those who rely on American Sign Language to communicate. Failure to reduce language barriers that precludes meaningful access by LEP persons to important information and services could be considered discrimination based on national origin, and could put your federal grant dollars at risk.

Attachment 4

February 19, 2016

Page 2

In my discussions with LEP stakeholders, they have offered the reasonable suggestion that local jurisdictions that do not have an outreach plan for communicating with LEP populations before and during an emergency or disaster should prepare one. Since provision of meaningful access to LEP populations is required of all recipients of federal grant money, many of you may already be addressing the issue.

These plans should identify, at a minimum:

- Which LEP populations are in your jurisdiction
- Professional translation and interpretation resources and their availability, including American Sign Language providers
- Vital emergency information that should be provided to LEP populations in languages they understand
- Multi-lingual media outlets that serve your area
- Community groups that could be used to disseminate information to LEP populations
- Locations that are frequently visited by LEP populations (i.e. churches, schools, community centers, laundromats, convenience stores, social service agencies) where translated emergency information could be posted
- Available stakeholders within the community that serve the LEP populations who can provide guidance and support

We also suggest that you include in your exercises and drills scenarios that involve interacting and communicating with those whose proficiency in the English language is limited.

Additional information on LEP communications can be found at http://www.lep.gov/guidance/guidance_Fed_Guidance.html#DHS.

I want you to know that the state Emergency Management Division (EMD) is prepared to collaborate with you to develop tools and resources so we all can improve communications with LEP communities statewide. Additionally, other state agencies have developed valuable resources to assist with this effort. I have included a spreadsheet for your consideration, put together by the state Office of Financial Management, which lists LEP populations by county. Further, the state's Department of Enterprise Services has master contracts in place for translation and interpretation services that can be accessed quickly; copies of these contracts, available to jurisdictions, which have signed an agreement to use them, can be found at the following links:

- TRANSLATION SERVICES - WRITTEN WORD:
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ga/apps/ContractSearch/ContractSummary.aspx?c=04312>
- INTERPRETER SERVICES, SPOKEN (CERTIFIED & NON):
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ga/apps/ContractSearch/ContractSummary.aspx?c=03514>
- INTERPRETER SERVICES, TELEPHONE NASPO:
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ga/apps/ContractSearch/ContractSummary.aspx?c=05614>

Our partners with the State Commissions on Hispanic Affairs and Asian Pacific American Affairs have agreed to assist us with our outreach efforts by visiting your local elected leaders to help them understand their responsibilities vis-à-vis communicating with those in their communities whose English proficiency is limited, and offer suggestions on the best way to meet them.

Attachment 4

February 19, 2016

Page 3

EMD has also taken steps to improve our communication with LEP populations, and are prepared to assist you moving forward. To date, EMD staff have rewritten procedures for the State Emergency Operations Center and identified vital state emergency public information that must be translated or interpreted. EMD staff are currently revising the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan to incorporate communicating with LEP populations into the basic plan and appropriate annexes. EMD staff are available to work with your staffs to help you bring your plans into compliance with federal LEP requirements. Staff are also identifying information that can be translated in advance of emergency operations. Furthermore, we are finalizing and beginning to implement a work plan to enhance communication with LEP communities.

Improving our capability to communicate with LEP communities is one of our top priorities for 2016. Members of the Military Department's communications staff will be assisting with these efforts.

If you have any questions about communicating with LEP communities or our efforts to improve our communications, please contact Casey Broom at casey.broom@mil.wa.gov or 253-512-7028.

Looking forward to a productive 2016.

Sincerely,

Robert Ezelle
Director

Attachment 6

Attachment 6

Emergency Management Advisory Group

Mission – Work together to insure all Washingtonians are served by an interoperable EM process and serve as an advisory body to the Washington State EMD Director and emergency Management Council (EMC) on local/statewide emergency management matters.

Short term strategic vision: Develop the essential components of a statewide emergency management framework by the end of 2016.

Long term strategic vision: Build a sustainable, operational, and adaptable statewide framework for emergency management by 2021.

Objectives:

1. Develop a set of statewide EM processes/protocols that stresses interoperability, efficiency, and shared resources.

DEFINITION: To insure interoperability and efficiency, we will promote common statewide information and resource management processes by developing requirements, choosing and socializing processes across the state. (Priority 1)

INITIATIVE 1: Accept the King County Resource Management process as the Washington State standard.

Planning Assumptions:

- ~~Adoption takes place in April 2015 through unanimous acceptance of the Emergency Management Advisory Group (EMAG). DONE~~
- There will be an official announcement of the resource management process through the Washington State Emergency Management Division with backing from the EMAG.
- The testing and revision period will happen between May and August 2015.
- The training and exercise period will happen between September 2015 and January 2016.
- All EMAG members will be involved in the testing, revision, training, and exercise stages.
- All EMAG members will actively support and enhance the adoption of the statewide resource management process.
- All participants in the *Cascadia Rising 2016* exercise will use the Washington State resource management process.
- The resource management process will be reviewed by EMAG every-other-year to remain contemporary and flexible.

Attachment 6

2. Establish an effective, efficient statewide framework for disaster preparedness and response.

DEFINITION: To insure the best possible outcomes with the available resources, we will define the framework of a statewide process by engaging the “whole community” including tribes, in the development of the framework.

INITIATIVE 1: Create a common matrix that anyone can glean information from to get a common product.

- i. Identify risks locally
 1. Planning, Mitigation, Response, Recovery
 2. Identify the involvement
 3. Identify the resources used in the past
 4. Common After Action Report
- ii. Community Engagement
 1. Who do we need to bring to table?
 2. What is the value to the folks involved?
 3. Identify best practices
- iii. Community education, training, and exercise
- iv. Value of learning from lessons learned
- v. Look at state of California as an example of website for best practices/exercises/LLIS and recreated standard AAR.

3. Establish a statewide risk-based approach to building all hazard capabilities.

DEFINITION: To achieve optimal alignment of resources during all-hazard events, we will create a data driven method to determine and prioritize capabilities by mapping current capabilities by ownership and location, and by identifying need at a local, tribal and regional level.

INITIATIVE 1: To create and maintain a list of local and Tribal resources and capabilities that can be utilized for disaster response operations in Washington State.

Critical elements in this process:

- Use plain English and common terms
- The database should be simple to understand – keeping the assessment to major categories and functions – not an inventory of all property and human resources.
- The capabilities assessment will be updated yearly

Planning Assumptions

Attachment 6

Local and Tribal Emergency Managers who fill in the capabilities assessment sheet will:

- own and/or manage the resources they identify.
- have the authority to deploy/employ the resources they list.
- will update their portion of the list yearly.
- understand the incident will impact the ability to utilize or share any or all of the identified resources.
- have ultimate authority as to whether the resource can be shared.
- will return the resource in the same condition it was received.

4. Enhance the capability of existing statewide EM human capital

DEFINITION: In order to utilize human resources and augment them when local/tribal capabilities are exceeded, we will develop a common methodology by developing consistent standards, credentialing, and training.

INITIATIVE 1: Disaster Assistance Employees (DAE)

A Disaster Assistance Cadre should be developed, formalized and become the centralized, statewide data base of recruited, trained, and fully vetted volunteers *and* subject matter experts (SME) who are available for deployment and, when activated, carry the potential status of temporary state employees with reimbursable costs attached to the specific assignment in the event of a Robert T. Stafford Act Presidential Disaster Declaration.

The primary objective of a state wide DAE cadre is to supplement Emergency Management Organization volunteer needs on an individual basis (from generalists to specialists to subject matter experts) to any affected local or tribal jurisdiction.

~~INITIATIVE 2: Emergency Management Assistance Teams (EMATs)~~

~~EMATs are developed, deployable entities comprised of current emergency management professionals and select support functions/staff in the State of Washington.~~

~~The primary objective of an EMAT is to provide structured support to emergency management directors/coordinators and their respective Emergency Operations Centers (EOC) when requested **and/or** work in-conjunction (interface) with Incident Management Teams (IMTs) when they are conducting tactical operations for the affected jurisdiction. DONE~~

INITIATIVE 3: Volunteer Management Assistance Teams (VolMATs)

Volunteer Management Assistance Teams should be developed and consist of groupings of experienced, respected volunteer leaders

Attachment 6

(individuals) who are trained, vetted, and specifically tasked with the strategic management of **spontaneous volunteers** during an incident or disaster.

These teams are deployed, at times in concert with Emergency Management Assistance Teams, in order to effectuate the most consistent management of spontaneous volunteers when large scale incidents or disaster occur in Washington. It is envisioned that VolMATs will deploy together as a team and be the single focal point for spontaneous volunteer registration(s) and integration of these volunteers into the response phase of incidents or disasters when practicable.

INITIATIVE 4: Strategic Advisory Teams (SATs)

~~Strategic Advisory Teams will exist to support emergency managers/coordinators in their decision making process, by developing a “forum” for critical or strategic thinking during the incident or disaster. For complex incidents or disasters that have the capability to overwhelm a jurisdiction or region for an extended period, and ideally where an EMAT/VolMAT has been requested by that jurisdiction, the activated SAT will contain a **Strategic Advisory Team (SAT) Specialist** (formerly described as a Think Tank or Synthesis Group concept). DONE with EMAT~~

INITIATIVE 5: Incident Management Teams (IMT): Type 3, Type 4, and NGO

Type 3 Incident Management Teams are a standing team of trained personnel from different departments, organizations, agencies, and jurisdictions within Washington and/or DHS Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) region, activated to support incident management at incidents that extend beyond one operational period.

5. Secure ongoing, sustainable funding for all levels of EM within WA State.

DEFINITION: To equip the state emergency management communities (state, local, tribal) to prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies. We will advocate for sustainable funding for emergency management statewide by building a whole community coalition and performing a gap analysis.

INITIATIVE 1: Conduct evidence based gap analysis on funding

PattiJean Hooper from City of Kirkland and a research fellow are working on a survey that will look at the funding gaps throughout the state. They are looking at Florida and other states as models for how they fund their Emergency Management program. A white paper will be sent to WSEMA Legislative Committee once the survey is done.

Attachment 6

INITIATIVE 2: Conduct evidence based gap analysis on capability (program elements)

WSEMA Legislative Committee and PattiJean from City of Kirkland are working on a survey as a graduate student project. Will most likely be based on the EMAP standards. This survey will include a send out document or SurveyMonkey, a phone call, and a face to face visit. PattiJean will do a paper once the results and analysis are back.

Both of these initiatives were approved by the EMAG as one initiative. The goal is to get these two done before this year's WSEMA conference.

Attachment 7

The Case for Sustainable Funding:

Creating Broad-Based Support for Emergency Management

I. Situation

Jurisdictions throughout the State of Washington struggle to find and maintain adequate levels of funding for their Emergency Management programs. The State's Emergency Management Division itself is 90% funded by federal grant dollars. Without proper funding, programs stagnate and die; important initiatives are not progressed; and basic program elements are not achieved due to a lack of staff time and resources. This situation makes an already difficult task nearly, if not completely, insurmountable. (Interesting thought... not sure how it fits, but it's important: this is the struggle of our poorest citizens writ large... How can they prepare, when they can't get through the day?)

To build our case for sustainable funding, we need to be able to articulate both *what* we do and the *value* of that work. We need to demonstrate that we are neither an adjunct to Fire and Law Enforcement; nor are we in competition with Fire and Law Enforcement. We must do a better job of promoting our agenda in all the ways we touch other programs, departments, and agencies, at all levels. Preparedness for schools and businesses. Mitigation in zoning and Capital Improvement planning. Infrastructure maintenance and protection. Continuity of governance and operations. Growth and protection of a community's economic engine and tax base. Emergency Management touches all of this and much more.

We need to clarify that Emergency Management is far more than field response operations. The misapprehension that all we do is field response is at the root of our funding difficulties. Leadership (elected and otherwise) assumes that since Fire and Law Enforcement are funded, Emergency Management is all taken care of. We need to explain why that is just not so. We need to justify our existence. It's time to "sing for our supper."

II. Concept

To accomplish this, we need to work from two directions: 1) we need to define the ask. What will the money be used for? Program sustainment, incident response costs, recovery, separate from the existing Disaster Response Account? Then we research and identify the most reasonable (palatable?) source for the funding to come from. And 2) we build grass-roots support for our proposal in communities throughout the State.

A. Funding

Where does sustainable funding come from in other states? Who does it successfully? Although a number of states have funding programs, they are funded in a variety of ways and very few are built with revenue from specified sources. Florida is the best

Attachment 7

known example, with their funding coming from a surcharge on insurance policies. Texas has a 501(c)3 to which the general public can contribute. Most other states have “Disaster” accounts which are funded only through appropriations, and often only in response to an event. And it’s a given that appropriations are subject to the vagaries of budget fights and funding shortfalls.

Our challenge is to find a revenue source that does not directly compete with our response partners, one that our community members can support and not feel is too onerous. Our argument must be that Emergency Management is an excellent economic investment – investing in resiliency protects all of our citizens (private and corporate), **and** protects the State from deficit spending in the future.

B. Community Support

By clearly articulating our extensive reach and the impact of Emergency Management programs on public and private sector functions and interests, we can build a coalition of broad-based support for the creation of a sustainable funding source. This coalition will add to our voice when we go before the legislature to ask for the funding.

We begin by identifying community members (individuals and groups) to solicit for support of our proposal. These could include: local Chambers of Commerce, service organizations (Rotary, Lions), United Way, VoA, trade associations, major employers, etc.

As each individual or group is identified, we can then craft talking points aimed at their specific interest. We can describe how Emergency Management supports, protects, assists whatever it is each group is focused on; and how sustainable funding can positively impact these issues. This is an educational opportunity on multiple levels.

Identifying and connecting with our community groups can (should) start now. Cascadia Rising and the article from the New Yorker have people talking. We can engage and turn the discussion to resiliency. How is the Region going to not only recover, but prosper, following an event of that magnitude?

III. Action / Timeline

This effort ties in very well with the agenda of the WSEMA Legislative Committee. The educational piece has been started with our very first “Emergency Management Day at the Capitol” last March. We can build on this, and every effort should be made to have a well-prepared campaign ready to go for our 2016 Day.