



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Funding Formula Workgroup – LGEMAC Meeting 12/17/24

Summary

The Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Funding Formula Workgroup (Workgroup) met over several months to review current EMPG guidance and State requirements, then make recommendations regarding the future of the EMPG funding formula in Oregon. The Workgroup identified four potential options and presented and solicited feedback on the options to currently eligible jurisdictions on October 17, 2024. In support of engaging all eligible jurisdictions, the Workgroup and Oregon Department of Emergency Management (OEM) provided an electronic survey after the meeting which was open for three weeks to solicit feedback on the proposed formula options. On November 7, the Workgroup met to review and summarize the feedback for presentation to the Local Government Emergency Management Advisory Committee. The outcomes of the survey and meeting are attached to this summary and recommendations.

The collective opinion of currently eligible jurisdictions and the Workgroup is to first implement a short-term solution with a focus on maintaining current programs to the greatest degree possible and providing time for capacity building within OEM. The consensus was that a long-term solution could include a performance-based funding formula as long as sustainable funding could be found to support baseline emergency management programs. The administrative burden of a performance-based formula was identified as too significant at this juncture to transition immediately. A long-term solution will require additional workshops and engagement with stakeholders in coordination with potential legislation around funding concepts.

Recommended Options

The two options listed below were identified as implementable in the short-term, in alignment with OEM capacity, and had the most support from eligible jurisdictions. Option A received the largest amount of support as a short-term solution followed by Option D. See below for a summary and the pros and cons of each option.

Option A – Award a base allocation with population addition.

Like the current formula, this formula provides a \$62,500 base allocation to all eligible jurisdictions with the remaining funds allocated on a per-capita basis. For the purpose of this formula, the population of each eligible city is split evenly with their home county.

Pros

- It addresses the current double counting of city populations. In the current formula, the per capita allocation for each county and eligible city uses the full population of each jurisdiction.
- The formula is clear and easy to understand.

- Many jurisdictions will receive similar funding to the current fiscal year.
- It is implementable by the State with minimal adjustments and administrative burden.
- Achievable in the short-term to maintain most programs until long-term solutions are identified.
- It normalizes the current formula by applying a per capita calculation to the population funds.
- Maintains current funding for tribes.

Cons

- It still uses population to fund jurisdictions.
- Those with the greatest reduction from the current formula are large counties and their eligible cities.
- Does not specifically address the intent of EMPG which is to provide funding to fill capability gaps
- Does not address ORS 401 which states counties shall and cities may have emergency management programs.
- Maintains subjective size of cities for eligibility.

Option D – Award based on 50% of salary and fringe for every eligible jurisdiction.

This formula uses the salary and fringe costs of each emergency manager position in every eligible jurisdiction to set the funding level for each jurisdiction. Jurisdictions would submit their costs for one position (salary and fringe) and receive funding for 50% of that position.

Pros

- Ensures funding is directed to support an Emergency Manager for each eligible jurisdiction.
- Achieves the majority opinion of emergency managers to prioritize funding for staff.
- Option is easy to understand and clear.
- Supports ORS 401 to have an emergency manager in every county.

Cons

- Salary and fringe costs across the state are inconsistent and likely will create funding inequity between jurisdictions.
- Almost universally decreases the allocations to tribes and smaller counties.
- Administratively burdensome for OEM to identify salaries and fringe costs for jurisdictions prior to award.
- Amplifies the disproportionate nature of salaries that exist between jurisdictions.
- Smaller jurisdictions may be unable to attend training and exercise (or other activities funded by the current formula) due to a potential reduction in funding.
- Does not specifically address the intent of EMPG which is to provide funding to fill capability gaps.
- Maintains subjective size of cities for eligibility.