EMPG FUNDING FORMULA COMMITTEE MEETING

August 14, 2012

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

Staff: Dan Gwin, Kelly Craigmiles, and Paulina Layton

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Formula Committee: Nancy noted that after discussion with Marti Plotner, Director, OEM on July 25th. Paulina and Nancy had a follow up meeting with Todd on July XX. The possibility of adding another city representative was discussed at both meetings and it was eventually decided to add Joe Rizzi as another city representative. It was noted that a county member, Joe Partridge, had been added earlier in the process as well.

2. Nancy noted the following items were discussed during the meeting with Marti Plotner:

    a. EMPG History

    b. Process: The Committee Members discussed the letter that was sent to Mr. Plotner by the five EMPG funded cities. The Committee Members asked that Mr. Plotner allow the process to continue and to allow the Committee to do the job it was charged to do. Mr. Plotner stated that he expects the Committee to continue its work and that he views the letter and formula attached to the letter as another variation to be considered.

    c. Tribes: Committee Members provided examples of variations of formulas that could possibly be considered for the Tribes. Mr. Plotner stated that he is not looking for just one formula or just one way to handle the Tribes, but a variety of ideas that may be used.

    d. Cities: Committee Members noted a fair and consistent process is preferred. It was noted by the Committee members that regardless of how cities are considered in the formula that it should be transparent and fair. Mr. Ploter agreed and again noted that he does not want just one formula or idea regarding funding the cities, but choices.

    e. OEM goals: Marti did not prescribe what he wanted the group to bring to the table as far as recommendations, however asked for many options. Mr. Plotner noted to the Committee Members that he is looking at several different funding formulas in other states and is looking for the best ideas. The recommendations that the Funding Formula Committee provides to him will be another

recommendation that OEM will consider when making final decisions. Recommendations due by January 15 to OEM. The Committee will have a meeting with OEM staff to present final recommendations.

3. Dan drafted a spreadsheet with formula providing 61,825 as a base, what is left gets placed into population percentage, readjusting balance of funds based on populations. Using this formula 30 jurisdictions would receive what they asked for, however 9 would not. Dan passed around the spreadsheet and answered questions regarding the spreadsheet as well as possible variations using the same basic formula.

4. It was requested that during the EMPG Conference Nancy give a brief presentation on work being accomplished by the EMPG funding formula. It was agreed that Nancy would give a presentation; however, Committee Members will be available to help answer questions.

5. Nancy noted that Linda Cook, Lane County, provided a formula, and is accounting based on population. In addition there were other suggestions made to possible include a formula that included land area.

Comments made:

- Concerns about population based formulas and how it would affect small communities and formulas based on land area may address the larger less populated counties.

- Comments were made about the diversity of the salaries of EM personnel.

- Discussion regarding using base amounts for an Emergency Management Program and the calculation used which includes cost of living. If the formula uses actual base amounts of salaries, how often should they be calculated? Annually, two years, three, etc?

- Suggestion was made to reach out to other states. Committee members noted that they had done research with many states and there was a wide variety of funding formulas used. The list of the states researched was passed around for the Committee Members to review.

- Why are we only funding 5 cities, there is no rational or reason that they are funded. It was discussed again that there should be reasoning as to why we fund the cities that we do.

- Should we look at what goals we want to accomplish as a state and provide funding reflective of what counties are doing towards that goal.

- Discussion about objective vs. subjective factors.

- Do we accept cities only with certain population numbers?

After discussion Nancy noted that all committee members agreed to the following as options:

- **Base: $62000 (salary plus benefits) + 30% for Supplies and Services**
- **---Population Base**
- **---Tribes 5% cap, treated like other jurisdictions (same as earlier recommendation)**
- **-five cities**
- **Unspent balance -competitive. Possibilities of how to use the unspent balance are:**
  1. **Redistribution by criteria set (ie risk/threat based)**
  2. **Redistribution by population**
  3. **Redistribution by jurisdiction**
  4. **Redistribution for special projects (capital projects)**
  5. **Maintain carryover- offset six months (not equitable split, keep billing month to month expenses)**
  6. **Maintain five cities (grandfathered) if other cities are added new criteria should be put in place**

Comments:

- Suggestion that new cities added should be required to have an IGA with County.
- That EMPG is not for special projects but for people.
- Discussion around the IGA requirement and what would happen if either jurisdiction did not meet EMPG, would it be pass through funding which may have legal issues.
- Kelly/Dan will put the above recommendations on spreadsheet as a visual.

Further Discussion regarding formulas:

Glenda Hales discussed an option that Maine and Alaska use in which they divide their state into three areas with populations, land area mass, and have percentages based on population and land area mass and divided by three.

Another consideration is to look at highly concentrated areas and less populated areas. Do we break down the state in regions/sections that is highly concentrated populations? One factor of population and land mass and number of towns apply those factors to each, percentage /weighted.

Comment was made do we consider economic vs. population?

<u>After above discussion the following option was discussed:</u>

- **Base (See above)**
- **Land Mass – 20%**
- **# of incorporated cities – 40%**
- **Population – 40%**

Look at a whole new formula. Dan will work the details in this option. Take base take balance and weight the other three items.

If no base amount the # of incorporated cities would not work out.

Additional Option: Run it without a base. Counties drop below the base, maintain the capability.

All concurred that a base is important.

Another approach:

- **Tiers:**
- **Counties have EM ($2.5 M)**
- **Qualifying (existing) Cities**
- **Accessory programs**

  Minimum amount of what we need

Other considerations:

Do we want to prioritize collaboration, cooperation is ideal. Quantify: suggested number of 2 or more partners, letter of intent to match funds, can be fire district or special district, not hospital, commit to the partnership. This would get one of the allocation or extra funds. The jurisdictions that are eligible for this would get a percentage of funds outside of base. IGA should be consistent EMPG wide.

Next Meeting: September 17, 2012 – 6 pm – 8 pm. The meeting will take place after the EMPG Workshop.

Meeting adjourned.