

EMPG Steering Committee Meeting  
November 21, 2013  
Bullet Points

1. **Reviewed the round 1, round 2, and round 3 funding. Shari explained that there were 6 jurisdictions that did not meet their floor. An additional \$50,000.00 of funding would be needed to enable all jurisdictions to meet their floor for funding.**
  - a. Question - if this was the impact with a 20% of the floor, what will happen when we are at 0% of the floor?
    - i. Some of the complications of the formula were the baseline component and the over-under, which would go away when the floor is zero.
  - b. Another component of the allocation piece was the past use of the round three funding. TDEM could use the round three funding at their discretion, either to make a jurisdiction whole, or to fund a special project.
  - c. Revisit - the reason that the formula was built out the way it was. In the end, the formula was designed to be objective, not subjective.
  - d. **RESULT:** A motion was placed on the floor and seconded to drop the over/under and maintain the baseline, A vote was taken and it was unanimous in favor, with no dissenting opinion being offered by members of the committee. **The committee will look at the results first before proposing a final 2014 formula to Chief Kidd.**

As of today, it will stand as:

    - i. Baseline allocation of 40 percent of the available EMPG pass-through funding.
    - ii. The remaining 60 percent of EMPG funding was allocated to eligible jurisdictions based on:
      - a. 60 percent based on jurisdiction population from the current estimated census.
      - b. 20 percent based on compliance with EMPG standards pulled from submitted progress reports.
      - c. 10 percent based on jurisdiction threat/risk pulled from jurisdiction's basic plan.
      - d. 10 percent based on jurisdictions submitted emergency management budget.
    - iii. There will be no ceiling or floor.
2. **TDEM Question - why does the committee use the 2010 Census report in place of the 2012 census estimates?**
  - a. The committee agreed that the most current information available from the Census bureau could be used in the funding formula. There was some discussion that this would likely impact a few jurisdictions in a negative way, because they have had a decrease in population since the last census.

- b. **RESULT:** Motion on the floor was made and seconded to use the most current Census data available when the funding formula is being calculated for future allocations. Several discussions took place regarding the impact of the decision and when this would have an impact. It was agreed that it would only impact future funding formulas (not retroactive to the 2013 programs).
- 3. **How can TDEM, or the committee, do a better job of communicating what is happening regarding the EMPG funding formula?**
  - a. It was recommended that the letter, which was sent out to the six jurisdictions, (Judge Gossom copy was provided at the meeting) be created for all jurisdictions that receive EMPG funding. Additionally, language related to the jurisdictions population will related that it was determined by using the most current Census data available when the funding formula is being calculated
  - b. "Back in the day" the RLO would host an EMPG workshop in each region. This is currently not being done. Another component was for TDEM to host the "road show" again and publish the agenda, which would include EMPG funding.
- 4. **Grant Compliance Issues**
  - a. What should be done with jurisdictions that are not compliant with their EMPG requirements?
    - i. Discussion surrounded how many opportunities are given to the jurisdictions, are they placed on a warning system, removed from the program. Is it a failure on TDEM for not being accessible to the jurisdictions?
    - ii. Some discussion took place about this task being performed by the TDEM DC.
    - iii. Concern by the group centered around the impact these jurisdictions placed the entire program in and, when jurisdictions failed to comply after multiple warnings, should be removed from the program.
    - iv. The committee felt comfortable with working with the jurisdictions to assist them through the process; however, true compliance issues should be managed through the DC. Members of the committee were tasked to reach out to different jurisdictions that had outstanding issue (exercises or financials) to determine what was needed to assist them in completing the process.
- 5. **Draft 2014 EMPG Grant Guidelines Presented**
  - a. Waiting for FEMA to send their guidelines before State Guidelines can be completed
- 6. **Next Meeting: Potential date: February 24, 2014 EMAT Conference (Kevin Starbuck is confirming)**
- 7. **It was decided that Frank would make a good sheriff when he wears his hat**