

September 10, 2014

Cal OES
Hazardous
Materials:
Regional
Planning Project
Workshop
Summary

Hazardous Materials Regional Planning Project Workshop Summary

California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Multipurpose Room

September 10, 2014

Contents

Kick off and Introductions.....	2
Cal OES Welcome and Opening Comments.....	2
Agenda and Process Review	2
Framing the Challenge	3
Research and Documents Reviews--Findings	4
Assessment Interviews Summary	5
Comment/questions:	6
Panel Discussion: the Regional Coordination Challenge.....	6
Bill Fuller, LECP-Region 3.....	6
Jim Bohon, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) - Local Program Coordination and Emergency Response	7
Elise Rothschild, Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPA)	8
Lance Richmond, US Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	9
Curtis Brundage, LEPC- Region 6.....	9
Participants Comments and Questions.....	10
Issue Specific Small Group Discussions.....	11
What should be the governance and coordination structure for hazardous materials regional planning efforts?.....	11
What is the best approach for hazardous materials regional planning?.....	12
What should be the scope and structure of a hazardous material regional planning?	13
General Comments about the process	14
Next steps and closing remarks	15
Workshop Participants.....	16
Acronyms	17

Kick off and Introductions

Adam Sutkus, Associate Director and today's facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP), welcomed participants to the workshop and led introductions around the room.

Workshop participants represented a wide cross section of organizations dealing with hazardous materials regional planning efforts and were invited to share their expertise on this issue and join together to begin problem solving on best ways to create usable, supported regional planning tools.

Cal OES Welcome and Opening Comments

Deputy Chief Thomas E. Campbell, California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Fire & Rescue Division, Hazardous Materials Section, welcomed participants and commented on the cross section of experts at the workshop. Although the planning process may seem tedious at times, it needs to be done in preparation for future events. In California, the question is not "if" an event will happen but rather "when". California has experienced events such as the Richmond refinery incident and other oil by rail issues. Numerous chemicals are routinely transported through California and need to be tracked and potentially responded to.

Although regional plans are administrative in nature, the plans (or related tools) need to encompass all considerations before an event hits. The existing regional plans have been largely driven by basic requirements but are inconsistent across plans. Now, the Oil by Rail working group of the Governor's office and other efforts call for regional plans reevaluation. The challenge is to incorporate all these topics, plans, and related efforts into a comprehensive planning effort or 'tool'. Chief Campbell encouraged participants to share their thoughts on the components that should be included in order to clearly define a direction for this process. This is the beginning of a planning process and Cal OES staff is ready to work with stakeholders. The expectation is that this will be a 'bottom up' effort driven by the users of the tools and plans in the field.

Agenda and Process Review

Mr. Sutkus reviewed the workshop documents and agenda. The workshop was designed as a highly interactive meeting. The morning portion of the workshop is dedicated to presenting research findings from document reviews and results of the key stakeholder assessment interviews conducted by CCP. The goal of these interviews was to gain a broad perspective on current hazardous materials regional planning efforts in California; identify best practices, challenges and barriers; and solicit suggestions for moving forward with this project. The workshop also includes a panel discussion of experts involved with hazardous material regional planning efforts. This is an opportunity to hear various perspectives from representatives of federal, state, and local governments—as well as viewpoints from tribal, business, and disability

perspectives. The afternoon portion of the workshop was designed as small group discussions around three themes to encourage participation and learning from the workshop participants. Participants are asked to share their perspectives on what the hazardous materials regional plan assessment project should include and how it should be structured, and to provide input on how this project should be managed as it moves forward. The pre-workshop interviews were the data source that led to the creation of the questions and topics for the more detailed small group discussions.

Information from the meeting will be compiled and used to identify recommendations to Cal OES on how to move forward in a follow up phase. This planning phase will be completed at the end of September.

Framing the Challenge

Mr. Brian Abeel, Senior Emergency Services Coordinator at Cal OES Fire & Rescue Division, Hazardous Materials Section, provided context for this project. The Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA) requires the governor of each state to designate a State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) that is responsible for implementing EPCRA provisions within its state. Although the SERC has unfunded mandates, there is an opportunity through the Hazardous Materials grant to address these issues as they relate to transportation.

Recent incidents include the San Bruno Gas Explosion, West Texas Fertilizer Explosion, Richmond Refinery Explosion, and oil by rail. Responses to recent events in California include:

- ✓ Interagency Refinery Task Force developed recommendations for improving public and worker safety at oil refineries.
- ✓ Interagency Rail Safety Working Group developed recommendations for oil by rail safety in California.
- ✓ Since 2012, the SERC has been revitalized and future quarterly meetings are scheduled at the Cal OES headquarters.

Mr. Abeel directed participants to view the oil by rail page on the Cal OES website to obtain status regarding transportation of oil by rail. Chief Campbell added that oil shipments that exceed one million gallons are sent through the SERC to Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs). Cal OES is not satisfied with the DOT emergency order and has submitted comments and is coordinating with other agencies and the governor's office.

This project is funded by Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) funding because it involves transportation of hazardous materials. Everything used by the grant has to be tied to transportation. The project has two steps: assessment and development. The second

phase is anticipated to start October 1st and to be completed by October 2015. As with any large statewide project, there are policy, program, and implementation challenges. Key challenges that have been identified and need to be addressed as part of this longer term oil by rail regional planning coordination project include:

- ✓ Funding needs
- ✓ Numerous and confusing plans
- ✓ Oversight & guidance consistency and staff time
- ✓ Communication issues across agencies and levels of government
- ✓ LEPC/Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs) structures to address
- ✓ Exercise/drills needs
- ✓ Updating plans and procedures consistently

SERC membership includes representatives from each LEPC, county associations, league of cities, and certified programs. The SERC will be key to any statewide approach that takes shape through this bottom-up, stakeholder process for regional planning efforts.

Workshop participants are asked to provide comments on who should be a part of the plan development, what should be included in the plan, and how should Cal OES assist the plan. (Note—the word “Plan” is used broadly, to encompass any tool, guidance, crosswalk, plan, concept of operations, etc., that may come forward as desired by the stakeholders through this scoping process.)

Mr. Sutkus noted that other critical interests were invited to be part of this process including tribal interests, disability/access and functional needs representatives, and the private sector.

Research and Documents Reviews--Findings

Ms. Caryn Woodhouse from the Center for Collaborative Policy thanked participants for their input and help in identifying documents for review. The document review serves as a snapshot rather than an exhaustive review. The summary document that was provided to participants includes online links to the referenced documents. The purpose of the document review was to identify best practices, methods, techniques, and approaches that have worked for others and can be helpful in this project development. Attention was also given to the format, accessibility, and usefulness of the documents in providing information.

Ms. Woodhouse highlighted specific documents that were useful in the following categories:

- ✓ Preparedness
- ✓ Planning
- ✓ Area Plans

- ✓ Regional Plans
- ✓ State Plans
- ✓ Legal Basis
- ✓ Rail Transport

Ms. Woodhouse pointed to the executive order document and a repository of best practices and invited participants to go online and add to the repository. The primer concept was found to be useful in providing advice on how to perform functions; it has extensive appendices, and the working structure of LEPC. This document is useful for those updating their plans. The most recently updated LEPC plan is from region 4.

An example of a LEPC plan from Arizona was provided, although it was recognized that some issues may not be transferable between the states. Rural areas tend to have high exposure but no industrial base for support. The section on commodity flow was identified as potentially helpful for rural area planning. Ms. Woodhouse concluded her presentation by asking participant to share any additional documents for review as the project moves into the next phase.

A participant commented that there is a need to further review the regional contingency plans from other states. Another participant added that this was a valuable presentation that has not been available in the past, and the compiled document will be very helpful.

Assessment Interviews Summary

Mr. Sutkus provided an overview of the assessment interviews process. As with the documents review, finding of the assessment interviews were used to identify what is working well and what is not, gaps, policy issues, and program elements that need to be considered for phase II of this project. The assessment interviews provided great information and participants were encouraged to respond to the issues that were identified in the interviews. About 15 interviews were conducted by the Center of Collaborative Policy. Mr. Sutkus focused on three elements asked of different jurisdictional perspectives:

- ✓ Current state, findings, and best practices
- ✓ Gaps, barriers, and challenges
- ✓ Recommendations for going forward

The key recommendations for moving forward that were identified in the assessment interview process were:

- ✓ The need to define the scope and purpose of the regional guidance.
- ✓ Identification of the components of the regional guidance (a tool is needed).
- ✓ Consideration to whether a statewide framework is needed.
- ✓ Continue additional research and fact finding.

Comment/questions:

The following comments were offered by workshop participants:

- The document review and assessment interview presentations identified key points and was on target for the issues overall.
- A participant asked for clarification regarding the focus; is the problem oil by rail transportation or Bakken crude oil by rail specifically?

Cal OES representative responded that Bakken oil by rail is the focus because of recent events across the United States and Canada that resulted in 45 confirmed deaths, billion dollars in damages, and company bankruptcy. In Virginia, Alabama, and Nebraska there was a significant environmental damage. This project, however, although driven by the Bakken events, is going to look into needed resources and planning for all possibilities for hazardous materials response overall—not just Bakken crude.

- Concerns were raised related to the Bakken crude oil including the quantity that is being pumped out of the ground and the inability to transport everything, the fate and transport of the Bakken crude oil, carcinogenic effects, and potential difficulties in mitigating environmental impacts. From the Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) perspective, the main concern is environmental protection regardless of where the oil is coming from.

Cal OES representative confirmed these Bakken crude oil related concerns. It was reported that Bakken crude oil is shipped to the states so fast that it is backed up in the north. There are plans to bring Bakken crude oil through Arizona and into California from the east and therefore areas that are currently not impacted may be impacted in the future as more oil is coming into California—from multiple entry points.

- A participant raised the question regarding the unique state of the tribes and how tribes would be encouraged to participate in the planning process (potentially through US EPA, as well as the state).

Multiple attendees agreed that tribal lands will be impacted by this rail transport issue and individual tribes—both federal recognized and not—should be included in these ongoing planning discussions.

Panel Discussion: the Regional Coordination Challenge

Bill Fuller, LECP-Region 3

Bill Fuller, Administrative Analyst III with the Yuba City Fire Department, Chair of LEPC-Region 3, and member of SERC, provided local perspective on hazardous materials planning. LEPC-Region

3, in Northern California, is composed of 13 counties that are mostly rural but some are urban. Key transportation corridors include the Interstate 5 and 3 railroad lines. There are 2 major environmental sensitive areas within Region 3: the Feather River Canyon and the Sacramento River Canyon. There are three hazardous materials response teams to serve the entire region.

Two years ago, LEPC-3 had to respond to a transportation route incident where a rail car started leaking near Lassen County and continued leaking all the way down to Stockton, thereby impacting 6-7 counties. This example demonstrates the need to have clear communications to work together across jurisdictions and disciplines. In addressing incident impacts on rivers there needs to be clear communication among California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)/Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), cities, counties, railroads, Department of Water Resources (DWR) and others to respond and work together. There are gaps in determining who is responsible for what area and there are capabilities and resources issues—as was demonstrated in responding to a peanut oil leak in the region near Quincy.

Mr. Fuller stated that LEPC-Region 3 does not have an updated regional plan and planning continuity is a huge issue. Budget cuts, funding and the volunteer nature of the participants make it extremely difficult. As people retire and new people take their place, there is lack of organizational history and background. Cal OES' CSTI (CA Specialized Training Institute) has been available for funding key training classes that are offered in Oakland. There is an ongoing need for certification especially hazardous materials training for first responders. A key challenge to address is how to best deliver services within limited time and it is important to better anticipate what can happen and get everyone on the same page.

Agencies have limited time and resources to develop regional plans and generally the emergency operations department is staffed by one part time person, especially in rural areas. A combined plan that identifies common resources, contact information, and is standardized regarding how and with who to respond would be helpful. A template format may be beneficial, to allow for easy use as well as consistency statewide. Mr. Fuller commented that LEPC-region 3 also deals with illegal marijuana and illegal substances such as Furadan. These substances are dangerous to those going to eradicate the sites with limited personal protection. There is a need for more awareness regarding the health issues in addressing illegal substances.

Jim Bohon, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) - Local Program Coordination and Emergency Response

Mr. Jim Bohon, Cal EPA Assistant Secretary for Local Program Coordination and Emergency Response, provided the State perspective. Mr. Bohon remarked that although this project was developed in response to interest around Bakken Crude oil, that is not the only important

consideration. Mr. Bohon provided an overview of transportation corridors throughout the state and reminded participants that there are many hazardous commodities that are being transported. In addition, the pipelines are important consideration because although pipes are the safest transportation mechanism, they do leak and cause environmental and health problems. In California, because of the many waterways, any dumping triggers CDFW/OSPR action. In addition to railroads, roadways and accidents are important to consider since, although shipments are relatively small, accidents are more frequent and therefore pose threat to the environment.

Mr. Bohon reviewed the California's Delegated Hazmat Oversight (Unified Program). In California there are 121,000 sites that have hazardous materials and have fixed facilities areas of response related to issue such as earthquake. Area plans for CUPAs are administrative rather than response driven. There needs to be an overarching mechanism that can 'tie together' the diverse and sometimes confusing existing planning structures. Another important consideration is hazardous materials mutual aid which is a system not yet fully developed, mostly due to cost.

The 1990 Hazardous Materials Incident Contingency Plan (HMICP) although dated, still provides a focal point for planning that remains relevant today. Response is set at the local level rather than regionally but coordination for a large event needs to be regional in support of local needs. There are a number of plans that need to be updated. Mr. Bohon referred to the emergency structure in California and the recently-added layer of Emergency Functions (EFs). Cal EPA has a coordinating lead role in response in California (EF 10) thereby shifting the responsibility in state planning structure from Cal OES alone. Mr. Bohon reiterated his interest in this project because of the development in state response overlay.

Elise Rothschild, Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPA)

Elise Rothschild, Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Compliance Division Chief provided the CUPA perspective. CUPA handles the California Emergency Reporting System (CERS) and business plans which include inventory, storage, site map, and contingency plan for handling facilities emergencies. Her CUPA has transitioned to electronic submissions and is working with businesses on the use of computer software. Ultimately, all data will be available statewide electronically and be available to first responders. The data can be used to search any chemicals at any facility. CUPA requires that information is updated every two weeks. It is important to have ongoing training for doing things at a regional level and for regular communication and collaboration. A deficiency exists in the mutual aid area. The Los Angeles model has put together a strike force of CUPA and health (dealing with housing, environment, and health) to respond to disaster as a group.

Each CUPA prepares an area plan every 3 years which takes a lot of time to put together. The grant provides for 80 percent and CUPA provides the additional 20 percent. Updating the area plan is a struggle and requires diversion of resources and inspectors from the field to complete this task. An area or regional plan needs to be developed in a manageable and user friendly way that can assist and not cause confusion at the CUPA area plan level.

It is important to consider the different priorities at the various regions based on disaster experience. A statewide effort is challenging because California is diverse and rural jurisdictions do not have the needed resources. Priorities are different based on where regions experience disasters. Funding, training, and resources needs throughout the state should be addressed and the role of Proposition 26 needs to be discussed. Inspections are done at the local levels but responses to incidents may be at the state or federal levels and therefore it is important to plan together.

Lance Richmond, US Environmental Protection Agency Region IX

Mr. Lance Richmond, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX's coordinator for Regional Response Team 9, provided the Federal perspective on hazardous materials planning. RRT 9 supports planning and preparedness in California, Arizona, and Nevada and is one of 13 regional response teams that support the federal on-scene coordinator.

Mr. Richmond provided an overview of how hazardous materials plans relate to the National contingency plan. In California, the coastal area contingency plans (coast guard) deals with oil spills in the marine environment inland, in addition to regional contingency plans and geographical response plans.

Mr. Richmond highlighted 3 key issues that need to be furthered addressed:

- ✓ Executive Order (EO) 13650- Improving Chemical Facility Safety & Security: How is the EO relates to other efforts?
- ✓ Cal OSPR – Inland oil spill engagement is growing
- ✓ Bakken crude transport and refining: a focal point in planning and preparedness

In developing regional plans, it is important to consider the difficulties due to the LEPCs underfunding. It is also important to use a loop process that incorporates the “full circle” exercises and evaluation of results and what works as a way to close the loop.

Curtis Brundage, LEPC- Region 6

Mr. Curtis Brundage, a registered Environmental Health Specialist for the Hazardous Materials Division of the San Bernardino County Fire Department, provided his perspective as the LEPC

Chair for Region 6 in Southern California. LEPC Region 6 deals with many issues related to the cross section of rural and highly populated areas that it serves. Mr. Brundage shared the same challenges that were offered by the other panel speakers. Of particular concern is getting participation from outlying areas and difficulties of updating, implementing and incorporating the area plans into a single regional plan. At this time, the regional plan is not usable because there are many gaps and it is outdated. Since the LEPC is a voluntary effort, it is difficult to commit time to work on the plans. Mr. Brundage suggested that hospital preparedness plans be incorporated into the regional plans since these plans are exercised. It is unclear what the actual requirements for the regional plan are and the federal code is insufficient as guidance. There is a need for standards and focus on regions independently since there are different issues at the regions.

Communications is a critical issue that needs to be dealt with. Mr. Curtis used the Cajon pass 1996 catastrophe as an example where the freeway and railroad shut for a week thereby significantly impacting the economy. Region 6 has a work group that meets regularly to revisit these experiences. Communication is important since every agency has different communication frequency and training is needed to ensure that everyone can communicate on the ground. In developing future plans there needs to be an approval process by Cal OES to formalize and make plans public.

Mr. Brundage concluded by stating that workgroups and workshops are important because of the face to face interactions. Issues cannot always be worked out over the phone, or when an incident occurs and responders are strangers to each other—the face to face meetings are very important.

Participants Comments and Questions

Ms. Denise Shemenski, Cal OES Office of Intergovernmental Tribal Affairs, Tribal Advisor reiterated the importance of addressing the eradication programs of illegal marijuana. This is the first year that the Army National Guard worked with tribes and law enforcement agencies to address issues related to chemical exposure and education. It is important to work with tribes where rail goes through tribal lands. Ms. Shemenski asked if there is outreach to tribes regarding oil by rail and hazardous materials regional plan. A participant replied that US EPA has not reached out to tribes but worked with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) recently on fire. Currently, there is no special focus on tribes, which participants noted will need to change.

Ms. Shemenski reminded participants that tribes are unique in resources and needs and consortiums are not good venues to reach out. Instead, it is important to consider working with tribes independently.

Mr. Don Boland from the CA Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA) provided a private sector perspective regarding the presence of infrastructure within railroad right of way. The private industry seeks to be an asset rather than a liability. The ROPE plan (1996) was referenced as a good example. Accidents affect infrastructure—when a train derails it can affect communication lines and result in damage both on the ground and in the air affecting everything in the immediate area. Many hard utility assets follow pathways of rail tracks. Coordination with utilities must be close and consistent as this planning process moves forward.

Issue Specific Small Group Discussions

Adam introduced the small group discussion topics and instructed participants on joining the discussions. Small group discussions were developed to address three key themes that were identified in the document review and assessment interview process:

- What should be the governance and coordination structure for hazardous materials regional planning efforts?
- What is the best approach for hazardous materials regional planning?
- What should be the scope and structure of a hazardous material regional plan document or tool?

The following is a summary of participants' comments and suggestions in addressing these key questions.

What should be the governance and coordination structure for hazardous materials regional planning efforts?

- The process to develop a hazardous materials regional plan should consider lessons learned through similar efforts in other states such as Texas and Arizona. There was recognition, however, that the California emergency management structure is unique and may not easily integrate information from other states' planning efforts.
- The planning effort should utilize the federally constructed governance structure of SERC although some modification may be necessary to make SERC effective. A suggestion was to have a planning advisory team or group be a formally sanctioned subcommittee of the SERC.
- This planning effort should include tribal interests since they are not formally part of the SERC and do not otherwise have regular planning opportunities for hazardous materials.
- The SERC Executive Order should be reissued with modifications that reflect appropriate stakeholders list.
- Participants validated the need for subcommittees that include representatives from SERC/ Tribal Emergency Response Commission (TERC).

- Subcommittees work needs to occur at the local level and based on geographical boundaries. Participants suggested that three subcommittees form based on Cal OES administrative regions (Coastal, Inland, and Southern California) to ensure integration with administrative offices and other planning structures such as law and fire.
- Subcommittees should align with existing structure (e.g., SEMS, etc.) rather than develop new infrastructures.
- The planning process should include outreach to statewide stakeholders including tribes, CUPA, industry, and counties and cities (EMS, law, fire).
- It is important to distinguish between decision makers and staff in the planning process. The stair stepping process was offered as a planning approach. The stair stepping process includes four levels: (1) seminars at the administrator level to define context and obtain commitment; (2) workshops with local representatives to identify details; (3) training and exercise at the local operational level; and (4) an evaluation and a looping back mechanism to update planning at the administrator level.
- Participants suggested that planning in other disciplines be considered. As an example, the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) has statutory authority that's been used to establish a funded medical health operational area coordinator (MHOAC). The hazardous materials planning effort should explore the CDPH structure and mutual aid region planning.

What is the best approach for hazardous materials regional planning?

- The hazardous material regional planning should be formalized and become a statewide standardized program. It was further clarified that the standardized framework should have enough flexibility to allow local nuances in the implementation of response policy procedures.
- Templates or plans with basic common elements (statewide 'guiding principles') can be developed for use in different areas.
- Flexibility must be built into the planning for different incident types and localities.
- It is important to have a statewide baseline and guiding principles that can be incorporated into local plans.
- Participants agreed that Role of LEPCs in regional planning is critical. However, important constraints were identified. An Important concern is the voluntary nature of the LEPCs and the need to develop incentives for participation and continuity. Another critical concern is the need for support from statute and development of a funding mechanism. The unified program (discharge fee program) was mentioned as one opportunity to explore.
- It was suggested that LEPCs identify private interests for partnerships. The private sector may be able to lend financial assistance as well as in-kind help.

- It is important to communicate with LEPCs throughout this planning effort and empower LEPCs to bring entities together. Support mechanisms that were suggested include statute changes, funding, and partnerships. This important effort should be leveraged in addressing some of the identified issues.
- Participants highlighted the need to consider other existing plans and their overlap.
- There is limited training and equipment that creates competitions among counties, cities, and agencies. An example was offered of collaboration in Southern California where ongoing monthly meetings encourage collaboration in future emergency events. The informal relationships created in these gatherings are important for coordinated response. It was further added that regardless of formal relationships, the informal relationships are valuable and need to be protected.
- Developing successful planning requires ongoing communication and coordination—it can't be sporadic or just in time.
- A recurring question is how to integrate all the existing plans into a unifying plan. Mr. Abeel reminded participants that Cal OES staff will be reviewing the input from the workshop in developing a planning process. Participants will be provided with information on workshop follow up and are encouraged to share the information with constituents. Mr. Bohon also mentioned that the three agencies—Cal EPA, OSPR, and Cal OES—have begun meeting to compile and 'untangle' and understand how agencies' as well as local plans relate and support (or complicate) each other's efforts. This first step will assist the stated goals of the planning desired outcomes mentioned in today's workshop.
- A participant explained limitation on the use of regulatory fees due to proposition 26. Proposition 26, passed last year, places constraints on state agencies' ability to use fees and therefore, although there is a funding structure there are legal boundaries regarding its use.

What should be the scope and structure of a hazardous material regional plan or tool?

- The planning should ensure standardized elements by developing guidance for consistency. These elements can then be adopted for area plans by regulations.
- The issue of public information was discussed. For security reasons, a balance between what needs to be known and the right to know needs to be addressed in developing a public version and sensitive version. Terrorism should not be used as a reason to keep the public uninformed.
- A distinction was made regarding the information that emergency responders need; Emergency responders don't need to know every time something comes through their jurisdiction but should be informed on what can potentially come through their jurisdiction and how they may need to respond during emergencies (this was compared to fire responders).

- In developing an umbrella framework, it is important to consider the audience. Will the planning documents be considered operational or administrative? This question needs to be addressed before starting the planning process. The plan (or tool) may have an administrative component for coordination and an operational component for collaboration (Mr. Sutkus used the Disaster Mental Health project as an example of such a hybrid plan). The operational aspect of a plan comes from the local level whereas coordination comes from the administrative level.
- The regional plan/tool should address two key issues: (1) how to respond to large events that cross jurisdictional boundaries, and (2) how to access resources in other jurisdictions. Specifically, the regional plans should have information on the mutual aid process of identifying who needs to be contacted, what resources are available, and how these resources can be tapped. It was recognized that a key reason for the lack of a mutual hazardous materials plan is lack of resources.
- For large events, it would be helpful to have a checklist format for what has to be done and the responsible parties. It's important to keep the plan simple, user friendly, and readily accessible.
- The plan should include triggers for reaching outside to other jurisdictions when running out of local resources and should include a resource directory. The plan (or tool) should identify who is the incident command (IC), and if the IC is established what is the handoff process or unified command.
- The events that are considered under the regional hazardous plan need to be clearly defined and the plan should focus on regional issues, including geographic risks and mitigation options.
- State templates for specific chemicals are needed.
- A 'crosswalk' or other tool would be helpful to understand which state, local, and federal plans may have influence in a particular geographic area. A guidance document with the template would also be helpful to guide the planning process for a region to create its Area Plan.
- Participants provided examples from LEPC Region 1 and LEPC Region 2 where they are working on developing plans and focus on coordination and support at the regional level. Chief Campbell added that regional coordination is essentially the mutual aid process and there is a need to address how mass mutual aid would work in California with unified command while ensuring that local governments maintain jurisdiction.

General Comments about the process

- A Caltrans representative shared that during an emergency, Caltrans personnel coordinate with partners at the scene and follow the incident command lead. Caltrans notifies the

public with IP, message boards, and mobile devices. Caltrans uses detours to keep the public away from an emergency scene.

- A Cal-OES tribal liaison commented on the tribes' unique status and ability to deal directly with the federal government. Tribes have made efforts at collaborating with the state and local structure and Cal-OES is supporting the process of bridging this gap.
- A Cal EPA representative pointed out that Cal EPA has been more involved in emergency management since the addition of the emergency functions (EF) to the state emergency plan.
- A participant shared appreciation for the process and for the opportunity to discuss the hazardous material planning issues, and urged this project continue as a high priority for local governments as well as the state.
- A participant raised the question regarding the role of pipeline operators and private industry in this process. This stakeholder question will need to be addressed as the project matures.
- Training and funding resources are essential and it is unclear how grant money will be shared across the state and how training will be offered to large groups on a regular basis. The funding question for long term viability remains unanswered currently.
- This process is valuable in identifying linkages among counties, hazardous material teams, and stakeholders. It was reiterated that any outcome of this process must be user friendly or else it won't be used.
- The OSPR representative commented that being involved with LEPC is a new experience, given their recent increase in responsibilities, but the department is committed to continue increasing involvement.

Next steps and closing remarks

Chief Campbell offered his appreciation for participants' feedback and input. Cal OES staff will review all the issues raised by participants in drafting a work plan to move forward and will contact participants with next steps. Chief Campbell thanked participants for taking the time to be part of this successful workshop.

Workshop Participants

NAME	AFFILIATION
Anna Cortez	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
Antonio G. Duran,	Office of Emergency Management Headquarters, Division of Maintenance California Department of Transportation
Bob Gorham	Office of the State Fire Marshal Pipeline Safety Division
Brian P. Kelly	California State Transportation Agency (Cal Trans) Secretary Office
Curtis Brundage	San Bernardino County Fire Department, Office of the Fire Marshal, Hazardous Materials Division and Chair, LEPC Region VI
Dave Dearborn	California Highway Patrol and Chair, LEPC Region II
Denise Shemenski	Cal OES, Tribal Liaison
Don Boland	Cal OES, CA Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA)
Elise Rothschild	Sacramento County Environmental Management Department/CUPA
Jim Bohon	California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA)
John Healy Ph.D.	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Railroad Operations and Safety Branch Safety and Enforcement Division
Josh Clements	California Highway Patrol Commercial Vehicle Section
Kristina Moffitt	Cal OES Plans & Preparedness
Lance Richman	US EPA
Melenie Lusi	Cal OES
Michael Horn	Ca Department of Fish and Wildlife/Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR)
Michael Parissi	San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department and Chair, LEPC Region IV
Paul Penn	Cal EPA
Randy Alva	Los Angeles County Fire Department-Fire Station BN 20
Sandra McKenzie	Cal OES, Coastal Region
Rebecca Wagoner	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
Thomas Harvey	CPUC
Tina Daley	Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency
William (Bill) Fuller	Yuba City Fire Department/CUPA and Chair, LEPC Region III
Willy Jenkins	California Department of Public Health Environmental Management Branch
Cal OES Staff	
Thomas E. Campbell	Cal OES-HazMat
Brian Abeel	Cal OES- HazMat
Neverley Shoemake	Cal OES-HazMat
Ed Newman	Cal OES-HazMat
Facilitation Team	
Adam Sutkus	Center for Collaborative Policy
Caryn Woodhouse	Center for Collaborative Policy
Orit Kalman	Center for Collaborative Policy

Acronyms

BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Cal EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal OES	California Office of Emergency Services
CCP	Center for Collaborative Policy
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDPH	California Department of Public Health
CERS	California Emergency Reporting System
CSTI	California Specialized Training Institute, Cal OES
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agencies
DWR	Department of Water Resources, CA
EF	Emergency Functions (CA)
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act
ESF	Emergency Support Functions (Federal)
HMEP	Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (Grant)
IC	Incident Command
LEPC	Local Emergency Planning Committees
OSPR	Office of Spill Prevention and Response
ROPE	Responders Organized for Pass Emergencies created by San Bernardino County Fire Department Office of Emergency Services and the ROPE Committee
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SERC	State Emergency Response Commission
TERC	Tribal Emergency Response Commission