

EMPG Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 2, 2011
1000-1400

State Operations Center, Governor's Conference Room, Austin

In Attendance

- Members: Joe Ferro (Chairman/City of Webster); Tim Ocnaschek (Secretary/City of Beaumont), Larry Trevino (City of San Antonio); Sarah Somers (Grayson County); Mike Fisher (Bastrop County); Billy Ted Smith (Jasper, Newton, Sabine Counties); Chuck Frazier (Brazos County); Frank Patterson (City of Waco); Dale Little (Midland County); Judge Joe English (Nacogdoches County); David Coatney (City of Round Rock); Michelle Carrahan (Harris County);
- Visitors: Tara Triana, (EMC, Nacogdoches County)
- Liaisons: Shari Ramirez-MacKay (TDEM); Lisa Resendez (TDEM); Esther Corwin (TDEM); Vera Hughes (TDEM); Doris Grisham (TDEM); James Kelley (TDEM);

Meeting Recap

Overview of discussion topics:

- Chairman provided background of past meeting population and budget formulas
- TDEM feedback from the 27 June consensus to use a budget based formula was to review and add an additional specific input for population and one for risk/threat. A further TDEM suggestion was made that 10% would be reasonable for the threat factor since that factor was likely to be subjective and difficult to assess.
- Key concerns included:
 - Goal to avoid subjective inputs as much as possible. Annex P's nineteen hazard priorities as reported by jurisdictions are fully subjective and reflect a forward planning concept rather than based in actuality. There are no universal risk formulas in national use, nor uniform agreement on inputs for accepted risk formulas like MSRAM, CARVER, ETC. Further, the intent of EMPG is performance (a part of which is planning), not risk, so risk should be a minimal consideration.
 - Population should be a factor, but as previously and unanimously agreed upon in the June 27, 2011 meeting, budgets traditionally reflect population size as well as jurisdictional support for the program, risk and other factors.
 - Should population density as well as base population be assessed?

- Allowing new applicants would reduce the funding available to currently funded jurisdictions, however, as was unanimously agreed upon in the 27 June meeting, the focus of EMPG is to encourage participation and program development and meets with the spirit of the program directives. The net reduction in total available funding by adding jurisdictions is very minimal, and guidelines were recommended for new program applicants in the 27 June meeting as well.
- Additional 2011 requirements and changes will likely prevent a surge of new applicants. Further, the majority of large jurisdictions are already under an EMPG program.

Decisions made: (Recommendations)

- A final adjustment in membership was made by TDEM. No further changes will be approved for the current committee mission.
- Multiple votes were taken regarding a funding formula based on weighted inputs.
 - A proposal made by David Coatney and seconded by Sarah Somers for formula (30% Population + 60% Budget + 10% Threat) failed with one abstention, seven votes against, and four affirms.
 - A second proposal was made by Billy Ted Smith and seconded by Mike Fisher for formula (10% Population + 80% Budget + 10% Threat) passed with one abstention, seven votes against, and four affirms. The main discussion point was that population was accounted for and reflected largely in the budget as well as having additional dedicated focus to assist large jurisdiction, yet without being unduly disadvantageous to the small and sparsely populated jurisdictions.
 - A third proposal was made by Chuck Frazier and seconded by Jeff Kelley for formula (15% Population + 75% Budget + 10% Threat) which also passed with one abstention, seven votes affirming, and four against.
 - The abstention was based on a desire to have accurate input data to review the potential jurisdictional impacts. The counter discussion was that the goal for the funding formula is equitability. The revised funding formula will be targeted for use in 2012 and no 2012 budgetary numbers have been submitted nor are the threat inputs available. Further, all data and even pass-through funding are likely to frequently change so the formula itself needs to be equitable and based on as objective of factors as possible.
- A TDEM challenge was made to complete the funding formula recommendation by the end of September 2011.
- Unanimous consensus was that the 10% “Threat/Risk” factor should be derived from as objective of sources as possible. A suggestion was made to rely on Federal Disaster declarations and potentially other incidents reported to the SOC or Fusion Centers, or that could be collected from jurisdictions based on existing records. A Subcommittee was formed to assess these “threat factors” and the 10% budget input these factors would represent. The subcommittee will be chaired by Chuck Frasier. Almost all members agreed to participate in a subcommittee meeting to be hosted in Bryan/College Station, with access for

others on conference call as desired to review potential inputs. The meeting will be held on 17 August at 10:00 AM.

Issues requiring further discussion/next meeting:

- Review the outcome and impacts of the recommended formula.

Assignments

Item	Assigned to:	Date due:
Write cover letter with consensus vote results for prospective funding formula	Chairman Ferro	8 August 2011
Provide specific population counts IAW 2010 census data and population covered specifically by multi/single jurisdictional plan	Lisa/ Michelle	17 August 2011
Provide "threat/risk" input numbers for each EMPG jurisdiction based on TDEM data	Lisa and Shari	9 August, 2011
Provide Updated formula spreadsheet for review	Joe and Lisa	1 September 2011
Chief Kidd requested review of reimbursement suggestions for committee attendance. What kind of consideration should be given?	All	Next Meeting

Next Meeting

Date/time:

- September 7, 2011/ 1000-1500

Location:

- SOC/ Governor's Conference Room

Past meeting Decisions:

June 27

- Committee rules and guidance approved
- 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
- 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.
- 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.

May 31

- TDEM/EMPG program management should be supported in enforcing current EMPG guidance regarding compliance. Additionally, at the 30 day past due mark, a formal letter will be submitted to the Chief Elected Official, CEO (i.e. City Manager), EMC, and relevant RLO
- Committee recommends adjusting guidance wording regarding eligibility to remove “generally”. Jurisdictions in non-compliance should automatically lose funding for the non-compliant periods as well as lose funding the following year.
- Hardship waivers may be relevant for extraordinary circumstances (i.e. disaster) and will require a written extension request from the chief elected official. TDEM staff will review and assess the waivers on a case-by-case basis.
- Available funding will be allocated only to compliant jurisdictions once approved