HAZMAT REGIONAL PLANNING PROJECT

CORE PLANNING TEAM CHARTER

(DRAFT 1.2.15)

BACKGROUND

Under state and federal requirements, Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) are charged with identifying and mobilizing resources to support response activities during a hazardous materials event. As part of this planning effort a Regional Plan is called for to coordinate intergovernmental activities.

Currently there is not a consistent planning format in place to describe, organize and integrate the disaster response and recovery capabilities at the regional level in California. To address this Cal OES is sponsoring a coordination effort that will ultimately create a *Regional Plan Guidance and Template* to assist LEPCs in developing their regional plans.

MISSION

A key 'Core Planning Team' (CPT) of representative sectors across local, state, federal government, Tribal, private sector, and persons with disabilities is being convened to collectively study options, examples and best practices to ultimately design the draft Guidance and Template together as a stakeholder community.

GOALS

- Consider options, best practices, examples of existing planning efforts.
- Develop a draft Regional plan guidance and template document through CPT collaboration.
- Collect feedback, reactions and comments from additional stakeholders through statewide workshops examining the draft CPT-created Guidance and Template
- Create a final draft guidance and template that will be beta-tested by one LEPC region.

APPROACH

Preparation of the Regional Plan Guidance/Template will be accomplished through the engagement of the Core Planning Team along with input and feedback from the wider disaster hazardous materials stakeholder community. The CPT members will be actively involved in the development of a Statewide template/guidance and related materials that are as comprehensive and inclusive as possible. The members of this group are experts in the field that represent organizations and perspectives that are critical to the deliberative process and development of a sustainable, supported approach. Throughout the first half of 2015 the CPT will support the creation of a draft guidance and template. A series of workshops to test the draft product ultimately created by the CPT will be held in the spring of 2015 to gather additional information and feedback. One final round of recommended feedback will then be solicited from CPT members on the draft guidance and template before the final draft is formally provided to California OES. Lastly the final draft document will be 'beta tested' in one LEPC region. Additionally, throughout the planning process participants will be asked how they would like to continue to engage to implement and update the documents, and to develop a long term governance process

EXPECTATION

Cal OES requests that this initial Core Planning Team members stay engaged and actively participating representing their sectors through the 9 month process of January through September, 2015. Additionally, CPT members are also requested to continue in their advisory capacity beyond the initial Draft guidance and template development process that will end on September 30, 2015, so to assist with the continued effort to create ongoing products and a robust Statewide approach through Cal OES and the sponsoring organization of the SERC.

DRAFT SCHEDULE AND MAJOR PROJECT MILESTONES (Approximate)

Date	Project Element	Note/ Related Deliverable
Jan 2015	Meeting #1 | CPT Stakeholder Meeting | Sacramento & Webinar	○ Project kick-off ○ Review research, process and approach—and examine format preferred for future documents
Feb/March	Meeting #2 | CPT Stakeholder Meeting | Sacramento & Webinar	○ Review Initial 'Working Draft' of guidance/template distributed for CPT input
April/May	Meeting #3| CPT Stakeholder Meeting | Sacramento &	○ Second Draft review of guidance and template for CPT review

	Webinar	○ Discuss/design workshop schedule and format
May/June	Workshops	○ Input from wider stakeholder audience on CPT draft to be revised based on input
June/July	Meeting #4| CPT Stakeholder Meeting | Sacramento & Webinar	○ Review revised 'final draft' Guidance and Template' ○ Prepare best test Region for test case of using draft materials
July through September 2015	Beta test of draft materials in one Region	○ 'Hands on' application of draft guidance/ template in one region. ○ Understand final changes to be made to the guidance/template based on trial run

DECISION MAKING

The Core Planning Team will seek consensus on all key issues, recommendations and final format for the draft guidance and template document.

Taking a consensus-based approach to decision making does not mean that 100 percent support will be required to move forward with recommendations. It does mean that every effort will be made to reach consensus, and that opposing points of view will be presented and explained if consensus cannot be reached. Consensus can include situations where participants either "step aside" from or "agree not to oppose" recommendations. With this in mind, when differences of opinion exist, a straw poll will be taken using the Gradients of Agreement (see last page of this charter). Unless a CPT member votes to reject (level 6), the proposal will move forward.

In the event a CPT member cannot support the proposal and votes to reject, the member will be welcomed to document their perspective and the Plan will note the delineation in perspectives amongst members. In this instance a process will also be proposed for future resolution of the issue(s).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- All member organizations have a critical voice at the table.
- Intergovernmental collaboration allows for a stronger and more coordinated state emergency preparedness and response system.

- Education is the key to understanding; when a challenging issue appears, explanation is encouraged—even if takes time to work through.
- Existing statutory and regulatory authority related to programmatic efforts will not be preempted as part of this statewide effort but will be referenced as appropriate throughout the process.
- The guidance and template will describe basic roles and activities within the hazardous materials response system, in line with the emergency management structure of California's Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS).
- The Plan will support California's ability to provide assistance to local governments or Operational Areas when disasters overwhelm available resources.
- All issues raised by members are valid and will be given due attention; respecting and including all organizational and agency perspectives will be paramount.

CHANGES TO CHARTER

As the project evolves, the Charter will be updated regularly with key project information, data, deliverables and activities based on consensus input from CPT members.

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORGANIZATION

The Core Planning Team is structured as an ad hoc alliance of key stakeholders, listed here:

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
Adam Palmer	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Alexia Retallack	Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Angie Proboszcz	United States Environmental Protection Agency- Region 9
Antonio G. Duran	California Department of Transportation- Office of Emergency Management Headquarters, Division of Maintenance
Bill Jones	United States Environmental Protection Agency- Region 9

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
Bob Gorham	Office of the State Fire Marshal Pipeline Safety Division
Chris Beckwith	California Department of Fish and Wildlife- Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Craig Perkins	Bakersfield Fire Department
Curry Mayer	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Curtis Brundage	San Bernardino County Fire Department- Office of the Fire Marshal, Hazardous Materials Division
Dana Owens	Cal OES- Inland Region (Central)
Dave Dearborn	California Highway Patrol
Denise Gibson	CAL FIRE - Office of the State Fire Marshal
Denise Shemenski	Cal OES- Tribal Liaison
Don Boland	California Utility Emergency Association
Dwight Bateman	Cal OES- Office of Access and Functional Needs
Elise Rothschild	Sacramento County Environmental Management Department/CUPA
Eric Lamoureux	Cal OES- Inland Regional Administrator
Ernie Candelaria	Kern County Fire Department
Greg Vlasek	California Air Resources Board
Herby Lissade	California Department of Transportation

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
Jacob Volkov	Cal OES- California Specialized Training Institute
Jacqeuline Martinez	Cal OES- Southern Region
Jerry Apodaca	Sacramento County Fire Department
Jim Bohon	California Environmental Protection Agency
Joanne Phillips	Cal OES- Southern Region
Jodi Traversaro	Cal OES- Coastal Region Administrator
John Healy	California Public Utilities Commission- Railroad Operations and Safety Branch Safety and Enforcement Division
John Paine	California Environmental Protection Agency
Josh Clements	California Highway Patrol- Commercial Vehicle Section
Joyce Jaszarowski	California Department of Conservation- Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources
Karen Keene	California State Association of Counties
Kay Lawrence	United States Environmental Protection Agency- Emergency Response, Planning, and Prevention Branch
Kelly Keenan	California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection
Kelvin Yamada	California Department of Public Health
Ken Bobinksi	Cal OES- Inland Region
Kerri Gibbons	Merced County

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
Kristina Moffitt	Cal OES- Preparedness Division
Lance Richman	United States Environmental Protection Agency
Mark Howard	State Emergency Response Commission- Arizona
Meleni Lusi	Cal OES
Michael Brady	Cal OES- California Specialized Training Institute
Michael Horn	California Department of Fish and Wildlife- Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Michael Parissi	San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department
Michael Wilson	California Department of Industrial Relation- Office of the Director
Mike Garcia	CAL FIRE- Office of the State Fire Marshal
Mona Bontty	Cal OES- Southern Region Administrator
Moustafa Abou-Taleb	Cal OES- Preparedness Division
Paul Hamilton	California Department of Fish and Wildlife- Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Paul Penn	California Environmental Protection Agency
Randy Alva	Los Angeles County Fire Department- Fire Station BN 20
Richard Brenner	Clark County, Nevada Fire Department
Richard Devylder	Cal OES-Office of Access and Functional Needs

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
Ryan Todd	California Department of Fish and Wildlife- Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Sandra McKenzie	Cal OES- Coastal Region
Shelley DuTeaux	California Department of Public Health
Thomas Hervey	California Public Utility Commission
Tim Cromartie	League of California Cities
Tim Holmes	United States Coast Guard
Tina Z. Daley	California Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency- Fiscal Policy and Administration
William (Bill) Fuller	Yuba City Fire Department
Willy Jenkins	California Department of Public Health- Environmental Management Branch
Yvonne Addassi	California Department of Fish and Wildlife- Office of Spill Prevention and Response
Project Team	
Thomas E. Campbell	Cal OES- HazMat
Brian Abeel	Cal OES- HazMat
Ed Newman	Cal OES- HazMat
Neverley Shoemake	Cal OES- HazMat
Trevor Anderson	Cal OES- HazMat

Cal OES HazMat Regional Plans Project Core Planning Team	
Name	**Organization**
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

Gradients of Agreement

The Gradients of Agreement scale has been used as a consensus-building tool across a broad spectrum of groups and organizations, including government agencies, non-profit coalitions, professional service organizations, local, regional and national development projects – wherever participatory decision-making is practiced. The scale makes it easier for participants to be honest. Using it, members can register less-than-whole-hearted support without fearing that their statement will be interpreted as a veto and it allows for progress to continue on complex elements of public policy.

1	***2***	***3***	***4***	***5***	***6***
Fully Endorse!	Endorsement with minor issues.	Conditional Agreement	Stand Aside / Abstain/Neutral	Disagreement	Reject
I strongly support the proposal!	*I generally like it, proceed with my support.*	*I can support if some steps are taken now or in the future.*	*I neither support nor reject the proposal.* *Proceed.*	*I do not agree with the proposal in its current form, but won't reject it outright.*	*I cannot support the proposal at all.*