

EMPG Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 27, 2011
1000-1500

State Operations Center, Governor's Conference Room, Austin

In Attendance

- Members: Joe Ferro (Chairman/City of Webster); Pat McMacken (Deputy Chairman/City of Irving); Tim Ocnaschek (Secretary/City of Beaumont), Larry Trevino (City of San Antonio); Sarah Somers (Grayson County); Juan Ortiz (City of Fort Worth); Mike Fisher (Bastrop County); Billy Ted Smith (Jasper, Newton, Sabine Counties); Chuck Frazier (Brazos County); Frank Patterson (City of Waco); Dale Little (Midland County); Danielle Hale (Nueces County); Patrice Reisen (Travis County);
- Visitors: Cassandra Wallace (City of Dallas); Tara Triana, (EMC, Nacogdoches County)
- Liaisons: Shari Ramirez-MacKay (TDEM); Lisa Resendez (TDEM); Raoul Rivera (TDEM); Esther Corwin (TDEM); Vera Hughes (TDEM); Doris Grisham (TDEM); James Kelley (TDEM);

Meeting Recap

Overview of discussion topics:

- Introductions since new members and some missed last meeting
- Brief review of Committee guidance
- Chairman provided background of past meeting progress to bring new members up to speed. He also discussed some research of other States funding formulas and IAEM regarding EMPG passthrough (average 33%).
- Review of funding formula based on population. Had arbitrary per capita cost associated with nine population categories. These were used to calculate jurisdictional programs; however, there is need to ensure population counts are based on 2010 census data and are commensurate with the single or multi-jurisdictional impact identified by EM Plan. Not all jurisdictions had responded to the EM data call Lisa sent out the previous week. Formula data difficult to develop, relies strictly on population, and concern was raised about how often updates would be required and what data source(s) to rely on.
- Reviewed difficulty of using a baseline funding allocation since there is a 50% local match requirement, and some jurisdictions would not be eligible for the proposed amount. (review baseline calculation from last meeting minutes)
- Reviewed proposal to use a funding formula based on an equitable percentage of **eligible** jurisdictional EMPG budgets. This is similar to Washington State's

methodology. Funding percentage is calculated by simply taking whatever funding is passed through from the state and divided by the **aggregate of the total eligible** EMPG budgets. Each jurisdiction (total eligible budget) is multiplied by that percentage. Calculations are simple, can be quickly revised, and reflect equitability for all jurisdictions.

- Chief Kidd requested review of reimbursement suggestions for committee attendance. What kind of consideration should be given? He also discussed recent state conference calls regarding evacuation and requested feedback.
- Discussed Budgets and compliance:
 - EM budgets appear to reflect a jurisdiction's population, risk, and emphasis based on amounts they are willing to fund.
 - Committee support for jurisdictional EMPG audits have been recorded in previous minutes. Application and budget review process as well as periodic audits and currently published standards should encourage strict adherence to program eligibility requirements.
 - Discussed redemption if a jurisdiction becomes ineligible after award (see recommendation below)
- Key concerns included:
 - Allowing new jurisdictions may impact funding for previously approved jurisdictions; however, the program is getting more strict, requiring more performance, and is unlikely to cause major negative impact overall. Using the budget formula, approving the current seven applicants would only reduce calculated EMPG awards by one percent.
 - 2011 FEMA EMPG guidance adds a lot more requirements and provides several changes. Members are concerned with what changes the state will pass down. Particular note is given to the multi-year training plan and conduct as well as the participation and performance of "exercises". DEM 100 reported under re-write.

Decisions made: (Recommendations)

- Approval of committee guidelines with:
 - Membership capped with current designees to provide continuity at advanced stage of discussions
 - Remove attendance parameters since members lose a voice if they are not present at voting time. Additionally, there may not need to be many more meetings to accomplish current obligations.
- Redemption process if removed from award eligibility:
 - If the reason is intentional misconduct (particularly Fraudulent), the jurisdiction is not eligible for five years at which time they will have to reapply as a new applicant (See "new applicant request guidelines")
 - If the reason is non-compliance (forced), or inability to comply (voluntary), then not eligible to apply for one year and then start as a new applicant.
- New Applicants will be required to demonstrate full eligible program compliance for one full year with no funding, after which the eligible jurisdiction will be considered on an equitable basis with every other previously approved jurisdiction

Issues requiring further discussion/next meeting:

- EMPG formula proposals calculation review. Look at jurisdiction impacts.

Assignments

Item	Assigned to:	Date due:
Review jurisdictional eligible budget spreadsheet and confirm numbers are correct	Shari Ramirez-Mackay	ASAP then email to committee

Next Meeting

Date/time:

- August 2, 2011/ 1000-1500

Location:

- SOC/ Governor's Conference Room