

Hazardous Materials Regional Plans Project

Phase II: Core Planning Team

Meeting Summary

April 29, 2015 10am-11:30am

At the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services & Webinar

Action Items: (Highlighted in yellow at the end)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Welcome and introductions	1
High level comments.....	2
Key Questions for SERC Discussion.....	3
‘Walk through’ review of changes to the Guidance Document—Discussion of remaining issues.....	3
Next steps and closing thoughts.....	5
List of Participants.....	6

Welcome and introductions

Adam Sutkus, Associate Director and facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP/CSUS), welcomed participants to the third Core Planning Team (CPT) meeting and led introductions around the room and on the phone. This is a busy day with SERC meeting happening this afternoon as well.

Neverley Shoemake, Cal OES, provided opening remarks and commented on how well this project is coming together with the input of the participants. The Guidance document has incorporated all shared perspectives in effort to make the document relevant to the LEPC regions. Following the CPT meeting, the next step will be to test the Guidance with a pilot project to develop a regional plan with LEPC Region 3. It is hoped that this effort will have a statewide impact and policy discussions around issues that have come up in the guidance development discussion will continue on. Neverly concluding by thanking participants for the valuable contribution to this project.

Adam explained that participants will be offered the opportunity to provide general comments first and then the discussion will focus on key questions that will be presented at the SERC meeting which is scheduled following this meeting. The perspectives on the key questions have

been discussed in off line conversations with CPT members, in a separate Cal EPA and Cal OES meeting, and at a recent table top exercise. These issues will be important to work through in the upcoming pilot test. Overall, there seems to be strong support for the Guidance document. This document is not being finalized today; The Guidance document will continue to be revised as additional information is provided and issues clarified. The intent is to make the Guidance document useable and valuable to LEPCs.

The CPT members were provided with a new version of the Guidance document with highlighted changes and a comment matrix that tracks the comments and how and where they are addressed in the new version. Green highlights in the document represent language related to the key areas that will be shared at the SERC meeting to encourage further policy dialogue.

High level comments

Bill Fuller, LEPC Region 3 chair, shared that a recent table top exercise was well attended by a variety of agencies. Participants in the exercise identified the need to develop a list of agencies that would need to be contacted in response to an emergency. In addition, it was apparent that agencies are running similar projects (Cal OES, OSPR, and others) and it would be beneficial to have some coordination and collaboration with these efforts. It is important to develop a framework to determine how these different planning efforts should interface and how contact be maintained among all the region's resources. These issues that came up at the table top exercise are in line with the Guidance document. A key challenge is how to identify the contact persons at the different agencies and who needs to be contacted.

Tina Daley, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency- Fiscal Policy and Administration, reviewed the Guidance document and felt that her agency's concerns were well covered in the Guidance document.

Paul Penn, Cal EPA, suggested that although this document is administrative, operational components addressing emergencies will be bundled together either in the front or the back of the document so they can be easily accessible. Suggested changes to the section regarding EF 4 and EF 10 will not be available until the Capstone California Exercise series is completed (May 11th, 14th).

Jim Bohon, Cal EPA, added that regional working capabilities, as they develop, need to be kept in mind in going forward. The CUPA forum board has a project to develop a hazmat assessment mutual aid team around the state. It is important to capture these emerging resources as they become available, potentially as an operational component. Adam replied that the document can always be amended to reflect emerging changes.

Adam reminded participants that this is the last CPT meeting for now. The project's efforts, for the next 2-4 months, will focus on the pilot test in Region 3. Lessons from the pilot test will be brought back to the CPT.

Key Questions for SERC Discussion

Adam highlighted the following key issues, based on the Guidance document development processes, to be shared with the SERC.

1. LEPC Regional Plan Development and Review Mechanism
2. Expectations and Resources for the LEPCs
3. LEPC Community Emergency Coordinator
4. Public information for community right to know

‘Walk through’ review of changes to the Guidance Document—Discussion of remaining issues

Adam directed participants to the comments matrix which provides a summary of all comments and suggested changes as reflected by the Guidance document (version 3)

Comment 2: Pipeline hazardous materials transport

- Products are transported in 6 day cycles. Language may be added that the pipeline vendor needs to be contacted to identify the type of product that is being transported during a spill.
- Possible contacts are: PHMSA, Fire Marshal, and the Public Utilities Commission.
- In Region 3 there are several pipeline owners throughout the county including private pipelines that transport natural gas. It is important to recognize that there are many players involved in this process. The plan should identify the potential sources since specific products may not be known.
- Existing maps that can be used to identify line owners and locations are published by the California Energy Commission on their website. Another resource is NOAA which has ERMA with lists of rail lines.
- During a leak emergencies, CHP needs to have a list of contact to help identify what is leaking.

Comment 8: Emergency response coordinator

- Add to the ‘at a glance’ box and paragraph below: “coordinate **regional** response implementation.”
- Language needs to be clarified on the first paragraph, 5 lines from bottom: The words “full force” are too strong for explaining the authority. Language from the State plan can be used.
- In the recent regional coordinator meeting, the general understanding is that LEPCs see their role as regional coordinators. There was no push back from participants.
- The language needs to reflect that we want to comply with EPCRA while clarifying how this is done in California.

- The statement in this section regarding plan development and its maintenance may not be accurate.
- This comment will be brought to the SERC meeting. The plans need to be prepared by the LEPCs but LEPCs are a voluntary effort with limited resources. There needs to be clarity on who is responsible to making sure that the plans are created.
- The SERC has oversight over the LEPCs and therefore carry the responsibility.
- Resources and staffing of LEPCs is a stumbling block beyond the development of the plan since the plans needs to be updated and contacts need to be maintained. LEPC is a volunteer efforts and currently several chairs are stepping down for different reasons including workload and retirement. In the past, Region 3 had a Cal OES staff but that is no longer the case. The key issue to address with the SERC is how the LEPC can be supported.
- The Statute requires the SERC to supervise and coordinate these activities.
- Standardized support for the LEPCs is an ongoing and unresolved discussion for LEPCs and Cal OES.

Comment 24: Update of the Regional Plan

- The language in the Guidance document fits for right now.
- The issue of funding mechanism ties directly to the plan update issue. This guidance document development project is being funded but each state has different funding mechanism including fees collected to fund LEPC, setting the LEPCs as a county government entity. California is different and this CPT may be able to provide a recommendation on LEPC support. The funding mechanisms remains a primary obstacle to developing and maintaining the regional plans.
- Internal change in Cal OES responsibilities impacted LEPCs and now there is a movement to restart the SERC. There is hope that with the SERC revitalized things will come together including a funding mechanism.
- The SERC is an evolving process right now and will have to grapple with long term funding. It is appropriate to bring these comments from the CPT to the SERC.
- Moving funding from grants to the LEPC is complicated by the organizational structure since funding has to move through government agencies on behalf of the LEPCs. Another way to think about support for LEPC is by shifting the discussion from funding to capacity; although here is no cash money there may be opportunities to provide staff support. OSPR may be an opportunity to explore in addressing capacity. At the last SERC meeting, Mark Ghilarducci of Cal OES said that there was a legislative agenda to look at funding for training and certification. Sustainability and continuity are important to ensuring that this work will continue since currently this is not a priority of staff time.

Comment 11: Tribal considerations

- Tribal information was not inserted into this version but information will be included subsequently.

Comment 12: Worker Safety requirements

- During the recent Region 3 table top exercise the issue of identification of appropriate PPE for cleanup was discussed. Protection for clean-up crews for petrol chemicals and marijuana in the northern state were identified as lacking. The plan should include language on PPE for first responder cleanup.
- Include a reference to OSHA standards code.

Comment 13: EF definitions

Resources from USEPA and the Coast Guard should be included.

Include information on EF 10 and ESF 10 to highlight the intent of Federal and State to work closely with resources.

Bill Jones offered to provide information on ESF 10.

Information from Cal EPA will be provided following the Capstone exercise.

The Guidance document provides a list of scenarios. Paul Penn of Cal EPA offered to help with these scenario examples following the Capstone exercise.

CCP will update the Guidance document with today's changes and prepare for the R. 3 Pilot.

Next steps and closing thoughts

The guidance document will be further revised based on the discussion at the CPT meeting and then the project will focus on moving forward with the pilot test at LEPC 3.

Bill added that, as with the table top exercise, it is expected that in working on the pilot test, new issues will be uncovered to be addressed. This is a good framework to build on. There are several plans such as the Feather River Geographic plan that can be incorporated to the planning effort. Currently there are plans but they are not user friendly. It is important to rethink the format to ensure that it is user friendly.

List of Participants

Core Planning Team Members	
Bill Jones	US EPA Region 9
Curtis Brundage	San Bernardino County Fire Department- Office of the Fire Marshal, Hazardous Materials Division
Dave Dearborn	California Highway Patrol
Don Boland	California Utility Emergency Association
Dore Bietz	Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians
Dwight Bateman	Cal OES- Office of Access and Functional Needs
Jacqueline Martinez	Cal OES, Southern Region
Jerilyn Anderson	Cal OES - Inland Region
Jerry Apodaca	Sacramento County Fire Department
Jim Bohon	California Environmental Protection Agency
Joanne Phillips	Cal OES, Southern Region
Paul Penn	Cal EPA
Tina Z. Daley	California Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency- Fiscal Policy and Administration
William (Bill) Fuller	Yuba City Fire Department
Project Team	
Neverley Shoemake	Cal OES- HazMat
Facilitation Team	
Adam Sutkus	Center for Collaborative Policy/CSUS
Caryn Woodhouse	Center for Collaborative Policy/CSUS
Rebecca Wagoner	Center for Collaborative Policy/CSUS
Orit Kalman	Center for Collaborative Policy/CSUS