EMPG FUNDING FORMULA COMMITTEE MEETING
October 16, 2012
9:00 – 3:00
Salem

Members in Attendance: Nancy Bush, Chair; JB Brock, Vice Chair; Mary King, Secretary; Todd Felix, Dean Bender, , Mike Davidson, Glenda Hales, Rob Hunsucker, and Joe Rizzi.

OEM Staff: Paulina Layton, Dan Gwin, Kelly Craigmiles, and Tracy Miller

Nancy reminded everyone that this is the last time we would be meeting together in person. She would like to spend this time looking at what is on the website and make a decision on how we want to collect information and input from other emergency managers. Once everything is collected we can put it together and discuss by email or phone conferences to have something ready for Marti in January.

Feedback received by the Committee and Discussion (*Note: local EM names have <u>been deleted, and "he" is used generically</u>*<u>):</u>

- There is an appearance of a power grab from the cities to take more of the EMPG funding (commenting on formula that was sent out incorrect earlier the previous week). He felt that the cities have several staff and his allotment has diminished. If it continues to go down there will only be enough funds to minimally do his job.

- Would like to see something like a Survey Monkey or some other form of collecting input made available to the locals, would also allow people to vote on the funding formula they preferred.

    - *Note: The Committee determined this would be an ineffective approach and we would stick with the preplanned distribution to the locals.*

- What is the purpose of the program? Is it to insure a modicum of emergency managers across the state or to support increased programs that are robust but do serve the majority of the population? For a small county, a few thousand dollars one way or the other is the difference between having a minimal program or not having one at all, while a larger entity would not have the same challenge.

- A Commissioner and Sheriff were not against cities getting funding, but were not in favor of cities getting funding in lieu of the county.

- This is the first year that not everyone's proposed budget was funded. Even though there were no cuts to amount of funding, people lost money because there was no formula in place and some asked for more. It was not a fair reduction in funds since only some jurisdictions were impacted.

- *OEM Note: There was not a drop in funds this year, but an increase in requests. This facilitates the need for a formula, and it is important that the formula stays standard.*

- The focus should be on maintaining the programs. If some of the options that were presented are chosen then the smaller counties are done. Most of those he talked to are at minimum already, coming up with match is a challenge, so any cuts will be the end for them.

  - *Note: The Committee agreed, maintain programs is the focus. Several will lose money, like the more urban counties, but we don't want to see their programs destroyed either. But for the greater good, the urban areas may take a reduction in order to keep the smaller ones alive.*

  - *Note: The Committee agreed* ***"For the greater good" is how the formula needs to be looked at, for the entire state, not how it will affect "my" jurisdiction. The greater good should be the foundation of the recommendations as we work on the formulas.***

- There are some concerns that large urban areas have different challenges than rural areas. A lot of people in a small area use up resources quickly. The issue with rural counties and smaller EM programs is not only land mass, but also lack of resources. It does not make sense to have every city be able to get funds.

- Cities do not want their funds to be "pass through funds" via the County. They agree joint development of work plans and collaboration should occur, but city funds should not be dependent on county performance.

  - *OEM Note: We will continue to do separate stand-alone grant agreements with any EMPG funded jurisdictions.*

- Population should not be counted twice, ie: city funded population should not be included in the county population.

  - *OEM note: All OEM spreadsheets reflecting a population category is based on stand-alone jurisdictional specific population from the 2010 US Census Data. In other words, Lane County figures do not reflect Eugene population, Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties have been reduced by Portland's population, etc.*

Historical EMPG Funding:

Dan shared a spreadsheet with historical data on the EMPG awards. The award has increased over the years from a low amount in 07. The spreadsheet shows:

- Each county and city (when they came on);
- Total amount paid;
- The average for each month over all the months they received funding; and
- What is being done with left over 11 funds, some was estimated because not everything had been turned in yet.

Formula Discussion:

There was extensive discussion about the pros and cons of each formula which is on the OEM website, or was shared at this or previous Committee meetings. Each spreadsheet/formula needs some minor tweaking to reflect funding of up to three (3) additional cities, or of a Tribal Nation.

- *Note: The Committee does not feel the Tribal Nations should be funded, and are recommending they not be considered in a formula.*

- *Note: We were tasked to develop a formula which would include Tribal Nations. If Tribal Nations are funded, it should be limited to no more than 5% of the State's allocation, similar to the SHSP grant allocation for Tribal Nations.*

It was agreed to present three recommended options to Director Plotner:

- One with no cities or tribes;
- One with the tribes and the current five cities; and
- One with the 2% of state population additional cities (adds 3 additional cities to program eligibility).

It was further agreed we would not say "this is THE FORMULA" but rather present our recommendations and discussions to Marti, to include those items which we recommended should not be included in a formula. (Reference meeting minutes from September 18, 2012).

Process Utilized:

Each potential variable for inclusion in a funding formula was identified and listed on the whiteboard. Then, each variable was discussed, and ultimately a vote taken to include/not include, with consensus vote ruling.

Committee Concerns:

- Population being double counted. (county/cities.)
- Which is harder: larger population using large amount of recourses, or smaller population who have larger landmass with a minimum EM program? Different dollar needs for different counties.
- Adding cities and tribes with unknown future funding levels.
- Maintaining at least minimum program (opportunity) for all counties.
- Phasing awards down over time instead of in large amount all at once, allow time to restructure projects/programs over time.
- Reallocation of funds: use these funds to offset cuts.
- Roles/importance/level of response of City EM vs. County EM.
- Need for interaction and coordination between counties and cities.
- Some programs are large and robust, some are small and just hanging on.
- When/if funding drops below the minimum level to fund the counties, how/will the cities be dropped off?

Agreed Upon Variables to Consider for Formulas:

- **Formulas to be developed without the 5% for Tribes:** (Everyone agreed)
- **Formula from August:** Use as starting point for the formulas recommended (Everyone agreed)
- **Base Award:** $62,500 which for most covers: (Everyone agreed)
    - Salary + Benefits
    - 30% S&S
- **Tiered Base** (cities recommended formula): much discussion but not agreed upon by all.
- **Population Multiplier:** Some agreed, but others were concerned about a double count or taking money away from the county. As long as there is no double count of population, then most agreed.
- **Including Tribes:** Cap at 5% AFTER state and base allocations have been made. (Everyone agreed)
- **Competitive Grant:** Criteria discussed:
    - Population
    - Jurisdiction
    - special projects
    - maintain carryover
- **Redistribution of unspent funds:** If a jurisdiction does not need their identified allocation on the first round then they are not included in the redistribution process.
- **Existing Cities:** Keep existing cities but look at how to deal with keeping/removing them in the event that future funding drops below the agreed upon base award for counties. (Everyone agreed)
- **New Cities:** Add?

- **Prioritization:** If funding falls below the ability to support the counties base allocation needs, the cities would be dropped. “last in, first dropped” (Everyone agreed)

<u>Agreed Upon Formulas for Primary Consideration:</u>

Formula #1:
- OEM % (17-20% of total award)
- County Base ($62,500)
- City Base
- Population Multiplier
  - Second Allocation on Population, or
  - Separate Competitive Application (to be further developed)

Note: Formula 1 is the preferred alternative by the Committee.

Formula #2:
- OEM % (17-20% of total award)
- County Base (45% of allocation)
- City Base (35% of allocation AFTER state and county allocations)

Formula #3 (Competitive):
- Base (Salary, Benefits, and S&S - $62,500?)
- Population Base
- Tribal Max (5%)
- Unspent Funds (Redistribution)
  - Criteria
  - Population
  - Jurisdiction
  - Special Projects
  - Maintain Carryover

Formula #4:
- OEM % (17-20% of total award)
- County/City Base (Tiered Approach)

The intent is to distribute these minutes, as well as samples of the three recommended funding formulas, to the Committee for final review. This will be followed by distribution to the local EMs for their review and comment prior to presentation to OEM Director Marti Plotner.

The meeting with Director Plotner has been moved up to December 11th, from the original projected January 15th deadline. Nancy (Chair), JB (Vice Chair), and Mary King (Secretary) will be representing the Funding Formula Committee members and presenting the formulas.