

2014

**California Hazardous Materials
Regional Planning Project: Phase I
Stakeholder Findings, Gap Analysis,
Next Steps and Work Plan**

*Delivered to Cal OES by the Center
for Collaborative Policy, CSUS*

DRAFT VERSION

September 22, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The Research and Stakeholder Issues Assessment Process</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Stakeholder Interviews and Assessment.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>The Stakeholder Workshop.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Recommendations—Moving Forward.....</i>	<i>25</i>
1. Develop a Project Management Governance Structure Engaging Multiple Stakeholders	25
2. Sustain Executive Support	27
3. Strategically Approach State Hazmat Regional Planning	28
<i>The Proposed Work Plan and Next Steps.....</i>	<i>29</i>
Phase I: May through September 2014 [Completed]	30
Phase II: November 2014 through March 2015 (<i>estimated depending upon start time and contracting</i>)	31
Phase III: April through June 2015 (<i>depending upon start time; may be through summer</i>)	31
Phase IV: July 2015 through September 2015 (approximately)	32
Phase V: Out Years (following this one year project as successor effort)	32
Acronyms	33

This document was developed using funds from a Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grant. Any views, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document do not necessarily represent those of the federal government.

CALIFORNIA HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REGIONAL PLANNING PROJECT

INITIAL PHASE I FINDINGS, NEXT STEPS & FUTURE WORK PLAN DRAFT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Regional hazardous materials emergency planning is required under federal law, which mandated the establishment of state emergency response commissions and Local Emergency Planning Committees. Recent high-profile accidents have focused attention on the need for California to improve regional hazardous material emergency planning. Cal OES contracted with California State University, Sacramento Center for Collaborative Policy to provide strategic development, stakeholder management, work group facilitation, and document development for a multi-phase Regional Hazardous Materials Planning project.

This document is the result of Phase 1 of that project. Phase 1 was completed in September 2014 and included: a detailed review and assessment of the available literature on hazardous materials emergency planning; interviews and meetings with key stakeholders; a workshop that provided feedback and recommendations; and, a recommended work plan and governance structure for the remaining phases of the project.

Significant findings from Phase 1 include:

- The State Emergency Response Committee is in a unique position to provide essential leadership, resources, and guidance.
- Statewide, consistent standards, with some degree of local flexibility, are needed.
- Predictable, reliable funding for regional hazardous materials emergency planning and for the effective functioning of Local Emergency Planning Committees is critical.
- The authorities, roles, and requirements of the many confusing and overlapping hazardous materials plans need to be clarified.
- There is a need for useful, functional guidance, tools, or templates for preparing and updating regional hazardous materials emergency plans.

The next major steps in the project are:

- Form an advisory group of key stakeholders, as a 'Core Planning Team'.
- Develop a model template, guidance, toolkit, or other type of planning product that can provide needed assistance and guidance for regional hazardous materials emergency planning.
- Hold workshops throughout the state to obtain feedback on the planning products.
- Apply the prototype planning product to a regional hazardous materials emergency plan in a pilot test.

INTRODUCTION

Regional hazardous materials (hazmat) planning is required under the 1986 federal law, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA). EPCRA required the establishment of state and tribal emergency response commissions (SERCs and TERCs, respectively) and local emergency planning committees (LEPCs). Although required since 1986, the law did not provide funding for these activities and the ability of LEPCs to function has depended on uncertain sources of funding and on the ability of local agencies to provide the personnel and resources. The difficulty in regional hazmat planning is increased by the geographic size, economic health, and demographic differences of the six California regional planning areas.¹ These difficulties were compounded by the inactivity of the California SERC, which was dormant for several years, until recently.

Recent high-profile hazmat incidents have focused attention on the need for California to revive support for hazmat regional planning. Some of the notable incidents include: the San Bruno Gas Explosion; the West, Texas fertilizer explosion; the Richmond Refinery explosion and fire; and a number of incidents involving hazardous materials being transported by rail. The substantial increase in the amount of a particularly hazardous form of crude oil being shipped by rail throughout the continent also has led to several serious accidents. California's response to these events has included:

- The Interagency Refinery Task Force developed recommendations for improving public and worker safety at oil refineries.
- The Interagency Rail Safety Working Group developed recommendations for oil-by-rail safety in California.
- The California SERC has been revitalized to encourage and assist with emergency preparedness and planning throughout the State.

Additionally, Cal OES contracted with California State University, Sacramento Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) using monies from the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) grant to assist Cal OES with strategic development, stakeholder management, work group facilitation, and document development for Phase I of a multi-phase Regional Hazardous Materials Planning (RHMP) project.

This document provides:

- Initial research into hazardous materials planning efforts within California and nationally that support and inform the development of a standardized planning process, template, and guidance.

¹ The six regional LEPC planning areas are coincident with the six Cal OES mutual aid regions.

- Initial assessment of current issues, policies, and trends based on research, interviews, and meetings with key stakeholders.
- Information from a workshop of key stakeholders that provided feedback on the research and direction for the statewide project.
- A recommended work plan and governance structure for development of standardized LEPC Hazardous Materials Regional Response Plans, based on an assessment of the research and stakeholder input.

This document is intended to assist 'next phase' planning efforts, to summarize the CCP assessment process, and reflect on the findings received and to allow internal discussions and decision making to occur regarding how to proceed on subsequent elements of the longer project. An addendum to this document provides the evaluations and comments collected from participants at the State HMRP Workshop held on September 10, 2014, at Cal OES headquarters.

THE RESEARCH AND STAKEHOLDER ISSUES ASSESSMENT PROCESS

CCP routinely carries out assessments as the first stage in the collaborative consensus building and data gathering process. The purpose of this assessment is to provide a baseline of key data and identification of past and current planning efforts that can be built upon and potential issues to be addressed; an analysis of key stakeholders to determine who needs to be at the table; uncovering key perspectives, viewpoints, and recommendations from stakeholders; and the development of a preliminary process design to begin detailed future phases for the HMRP project.

Research and Document Review Findings

As a first step, CCP staff reviewed more than 25 documents identified via the Internet or suggested by Cal OES and other stakeholders. The purpose of the document review was to identify best practices, methods, techniques, processes, systems, tactics, and approaches that have been successful and can be helpful in this project development. The layout and configuration of a planning document (or an element within a document) can assist in its usefulness, so during the document review attention was also given to the format, accessibility, and usefulness in providing information. This document review was a snapshot of the available literature rather than an exhaustive review. The summary document includes online links to all of the referenced documents. The documents included: federal advisories, reports and recommendations, federal and state guidance, state tool kits, primers and background information, hazmat area plans, regional plans, county plans and state plans, documents describing the legal basis for hazmat planning, and federal and state safety alerts, findings and

recommendations for oil transport and oil refineries. The research identified best practices, example plans and prototypes, useful formats, successful policies, issues and trends, potential roles of key stakeholders, and existing planning efforts that may be incorporated into or used as models for hazardous materials regional planning in California.

Key aspects of the some of the reviewed documents were presented by CCP staff at the September 10, 2014 HMRP Workshop and are provided below to exemplify the type of information that currently exists for consideration in the development of the California HMRP. The review document separates the documents into the following categories: (1) preparedness, (2) planning, (3) area plans, (4) regional plans, (5) state plans, (6) legal basis, (7) rail transport, (8) fixed facility, and (9) additional documents for review. For more information on these and the other documents included in the CCP document review process, refer to the attached report titled *Cal OES Regional Hazardous Materials Planning Document Review*.

Key Points from Documents Reviewed:

1. U.S. DHS National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Dept. Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. EPA Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
Executive Order 13650 Actions to Improve Chemical Safety and Security – a Shared Commitment²

May 2014

- Commits federal agencies to specific activities to improve operational coordination, to modernize regulations, and to identify best practices.
- Contains a link to an online repository of best practices.
- Useful Glossary of Terms with good descriptions of relevant programs and links to pertinent documents, laws, etc.
- Useful appendix containing a list of resources and applicable links.
- Lists significant recent chemical incidents in the U.S.
- Contains section on frequent topics and themes heard during stakeholder meetings.

2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Measuring Progress in Chemical Safety: A Guide for Local Emergency Planning Committees and Similar Groups

Document is undated, but website was updated on March 16, 2014

- Provides examples and planning approaches.
- Discusses how to evaluate and measure LEPC performance.

3. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

² Executive Order (EO) 13650 - *Improving Chemical Facility Safety and Security* - was issued by President Obama on August 1, 2013.

2008 Nationwide Survey of Local Emergency Planning Committees

Document undated, but survey conducted in 2008

- Survey was performed electronically, which may be a useful technique for further phases of the HMRP project.
- Survey questions are available in document.
- LEPCs that have had hazmat incidents were the most active LEPCs.
- LEPCs report needing assistance in public outreach and communication.
- LEPCs have requested that the U.S. EPA prepare a compilation of best practices or operational guidance.

4. State of California, Governor's Office of Emergency Services

Hazardous Materials Toolkit: Parts 1-4

January 2014

- Provides valuable reference tools.
- Includes concept of operations for hazmat.
- Includes agency roles.

5. Texas Governor's Division of Emergency Management

Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC): A Primer for Local Planning for Hazardous Materials

July 26, 2006

- Describes an effective working management structure for an LEPC.
- Describes attributes of a productive LEPC.
- Good format with well-organized information on legal basis, LEPC duties, reporting requirements, levels of compliance, hazards analysis, risk management, and exercises and training.
- Extensive, useful appendices, including some templates.

6. California Governor's Office of Emergency Services; the Cities of Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose; the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma

San Francisco Bay Area Regional Emergency Coordination Plan: RECP Hazardous Materials Subsidiary Plan

March 2008

- LEPC coordination plan.
- Roles and responsibilities for regional response.

7. Region IV Local Emergency Planning Committee
Hazardous Materials Emergency Plan
September 2011
 - LEPC coordination plan.
 - Roles and responsibilities for regional response.
 - Lists of trained personnel and emergency response equipment.
8. State of California, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Office of Spill Prevention and Response
California State Oil Spill Contingency Plan
2013
 - Initial section is in a convenient format relating to who has to report and the contact information for reporting.
 - Clear description of authorities, contingent on the site of oil spill.
 - Useful section on capabilities and limitations of responding agencies.
 - Statutory requirements appendix is a functional and accessible format.
9. National Association of SARA Title III Program Officials
NASTTPO Guidance on CFATS Emergency Planning
January 13, 2008
 - Comparison of key requirements of CFATS, EPCRA, and RMP.³
 - Effective format for showing overlaps and gaps in coverage by the three laws compared.
10. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Dept. Transportation
Safety Alert – Preliminary Guidance from Operation Classification
January 2, 2014
 - Rail transport safety alert.
11. Congressional Research Service , John Frittelli , Anthony Andrews, Paul W. Parfomak, Robert Pirog, Jonathan L. Ramseur, Michael Ratner
U.S. Rail Transportation of Crude Oil: Background and Issues for Congress – Document No. 7-5700
May 5, 2014
 - Summary of significant oil by rail derailments in U.S. and Canada in 2013 and 2014.
 - Discussion of issues related to the safety of rail transport of crude oil.

³ CFATS is the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards; EPCRA is the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (part of SARA Title III); and, RMP is the Risk Management Plan Rule (part of the Clean Air Act amendments).

- Little discussion of the issues of state and local response to accidents in a regulatory environment where there is federal oversight and a lack of specific, timely information.

12. State of California, Interagency Rail Safety Working Group

Oil by Rail Safety in California: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations

June 10, 2014

- Describes scope of oil shipping in the state by rail.
- Describes recent oil-by-rail accidents.
- Identifies high hazard areas not covered by emergency hazmat.
- Includes recommendations for emergency preparedness and response programs.

13. California Interagency Working Group on Refinery Safety

Improving Public and Worker Safety at Oil Refineries: Report of the Interagency Working Group on Refinery Safety

February 2014

- Report provides list of California refineries with local regulatory jurisdictions, including CUPAs, Air Districts, and CalOSHA units.
- Contains section on the major themes in stakeholder perspectives, including labor, communities, industry, and regulatory agencies.
- Contains a list of specific recommendations regarding refinery safety and response.
- Speaks to specific planning issues for oil refineries. The document includes a table with a helpful format showing the responsible agencies, applicable regulations, and purpose of the regulatory requirements.

Additional Documents to Review:

In addition to the summary of documents reviewed, the research document includes a list of “Additional Documents for Future Review.” These documents may be useful as the HMRP project moves forward.

Quick Summary: Key ‘Take-Aways’ from the Research Effort:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Because of the increase in the shipment of crude oil by rail, California must be better prepared for emergency response to accidents involving rail transport.</i> • <i>There are several documents that offer prototypes, templates, or formats that could serve as models for preparing, reviewing, and updating regional hazmat plans.</i> • <i>There are several guidance documents that address key hazmat planning concepts that could facilitate and simplify the regional hazmat plan development process.</i> • <i>California could develop an online repository of guidance documents, formats, templates, and best practices from other sources to support the development of regional hazmat plans in California.</i>

- *California can learn from the regional hazmat planning efforts of other states.*
- *LEPCs are likely to need assistance in public outreach and communication.*
- *LEPCs have requested a compilation of best practices or operational guidance.*

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS AND ASSESSMENT

To gather critical information for this assessment, the CCP conducted confidential individual and group interviews involving 18 stakeholders representing federal, state and local governmental agencies, local government associations, tribal government liaisons, and key Cal OES staff. The objective of these interviews was to:

- Identify hazmat roles and responsibilities;
- Determine stakeholder perspectives on hazmat planning in California and on the overlaps and gaps of the various planning requirements;
- Discover current plans, best practices, tools, and documents that are available for hazmat emergency planning;
- Understand potential barriers that need to be addressed;
- Obtain suggestions on coordination and project management; and,
- Identify additional key leaders that could contribute to the HMRP project.

A larger group of stakeholders identified by Cal OES staff in coordination with CCP were sent an introductory e-mail from Cal OES Hazmat Deputy Chief Thomas Campbell. This e-mail also included an invitation to participate in the September 10 workshop at Cal OES. Additional emails from Adam Sutkus and Caryn Woodhouse, CCP, notified selected recipients of the pending assessment interviews that would be conducted by CCP. These e-mails included a questionnaire so invitees knew in advance the topics to be discussed during the interview. A copy of this email including the list of addressees is included in the CD archive of this project's deliverables and products.

Keeping in mind that these interviews were confidential and the assessment results are generalized, the key results of the assessment interviews are summarized below with a focus on themes, needs, and key issues.

Hazardous Materials Roles:

The interviewees were spread over representative positions/functions in California hazardous materials planning and emergency response, including: federal EPA, Cal/EPA, Calif. Dept. Toxic Substances Control, LEPC Chairs, and Cal OES personnel. The interviewees that were at the local level demonstrated one of the main issues with the current, unfunded LEPC mandate – the interviewees served a dual role, one full-time paid and one squeezed in as opportunity allowed.

For example, the LEPC Chairs include a CHP member, and more than one local or county fire department. This issue is described more fully in the gaps and barriers discussion below.

Best Practices, Useful Tools, and Helpful Documents:

The stakeholder interviews identified existing and current best practices, successful tools, and helpful documents/guidance that could be used in the development or update of a hazmat regional plan (many of these are described more fully in the document review summary). The interviews also pointed out a desire for additional tools that were vetted, documented, shared, and accessible. In general, the respondents that were involved in LEPC activities desired tools that were easy to access and use, including prototypes of emergency plans, background information in useful, user-friendly formats, and guidance on public communication. All of the tools and documents that were identified were included in the document review (described previously and attached).

Gaps, Barriers and Challenges in Hazmat Planning:

The stakeholder interviews revealed many perceived gaps and barriers in hazardous materials planning in California. In particular, the interviews showed:

- **State Emergency Response Committee:** The LEPCs need assistance and guidance from the SERC. One commentator suggested that Cal OES, through the SERC, needs to retain the statewide ‘convening’ role because there is no other entity that can serve this function. There was strong sentiment that the SERC should continue to function and begin to offer stronger leadership, guidance, and resources. Cal OES must demonstrate a commitment to follow through on the revived SERC with clear accountability to do so. The membership issues need to be settled so that the SERC can move forward, perhaps limiting participation to emergency response organizations/agencies and including additional LEPC members in the SERC, as well as tribal representation. The SERC could also provide coordination between regions. Some felt that there is almost too much planning, but no coordination.
- **Funding:** There was considerable comment in this area. Funding is a huge challenge. The changing rules for HMEP grants need to be addressed. The U.S. EPA will be developing a small grants program as part of Executive Order 13650, and these will be available to LEPCs. Cal OES should follow up on this. Most of the funding comments fell into three areas of concerns. The first is that there is no funding provided for LEPC activities. The second is that if local agencies release personnel to take part in the LEPC or in training related to emergency hazmat response and planning, there is no funding for anyone else to perform that person’s regular job or to pay for overtime or travel. The third area is in the inequity between regions – some regions have a higher density of fixed facilities

that can be assessed fees to support hazmat activities while other regions have few fixed facilities, but high exposure due to transport of hazardous materials through the region or to illegal operations involving poorly managed hazardous substances.

- Participation in the LEPCs: Although mandated by federal law, LEPCs are volunteer organizations. Participation is inconsistent and is limited by resource and personnel shortages, and the large geographic extent of the regions. Some smaller districts do not participate. With smaller districts, there is more turnover and many changes in personnel, making it hard to ensure awareness and involvement.
- Focus of the LEPCs: Do not make anything a one-size-fits-all. Let the “real” hazards lead the conversation. Do not focus on oil-by-rail to the exclusion of the most frequent or most likely hazard across many chemical risks.
- Regional and Statewide Exercises: Some of the commentators made compelling arguments for exercises and drills. Even if there is a well-written regional hazmat plan, it is not effective without awareness, evaluation, and testing. An annual LEPC exercise would be helpful, even a one-day table top exercise. Some LEPC members cannot participate in exercises and drills because of the time and resources needed to participate.
- Training: The LEPCs need training. There is training offered at CSTI but even if funds are available for training there is no budget for travel or overtime. There needs to be a solution for backfilling and overtime during training. Most found the CSTI on-the-road classes useful, but have suggested that there should be additional regional training and new regional training centers established. One suggested establishing a COBRA-like⁴ training center in Sacramento or Los Angeles to provide a more hands-on, in-depth training for complex responses.
- Format of the Tools Needed: The LEPCs need a better way to distribute information and have access to tools and documents. A lot of smaller agencies have been sharing area plans, forms, and protocols. These should be cross-referenced and available widely. There needs to be an electronic library that the regions can use to share documents and examples. The requests concerning the format of the tools needed was broad and included:
 - A checklist for effectively evaluating and updating the LEPC plans.
 - Online examples.
 - Templates that include the required elements, but allow regions to individualize them for the hazards and structure of each region.
 - A cross-walk tool.
 - Canned public messages that can be made to fit the situation as needed.

⁴ COBRA is the Center for Domestic Preparedness Chemical, Ordnance, Biological, and Radiological (COBRA) training facility located in Anniston, Alabama.

- A primer clearly describing all of the elements of LEPC operations and plans.
- A document or tool providing planning ‘guiding principles.’
- There needs to be a two-way portal for hazmat information.
- A system to broadcast of hazmat incidents so others could learn and share.
- Plan Development and Updates: There needs to be a streamlined process to develop a regional plan but not a generic, off-the-shelf plan. The regional plans need to be updated. Some local agencies do not understand the value of a regional plan. One region does not have a regional plan. In that region, there are 13 area plans, many of which are cookie-cutter and not useful, but no regional plan to tie them together and show all the resources available. There is no funding to do so. There needs to be guidance on plan revisions.
- Rail and Fixed Facility Issues: There is a focus on oil-by-rail, but there are other hazards presented by transporting hazardous substances (rail, highway, ship, pipeline, etc.) and by fixed facilities. There needs to be timely awareness of what is traveling through a region and what is being used in a region so that plans can be customized as needed. At least one region has a rail representative serving on the LEPC. Communications with the railroads is an issue. Transportation corridors transit multiple counties and it is often not always clear in whose jurisdiction an incident occurs.
- Planning Opportunities to Coordinate Key Activities: A consistent theme that became apparent was the multiple legislative and planning changes that have emerged in recent years—most urgently the increase in the OSPR⁵ authority and planning requirements. This ‘double edged sword’ needs to be transparently discussed and addressed, since a lack of coordination of the planning beginning by OSPR with other existing planning needs could result in significant confusion; yet, the changes at OSPR bring much needed funding, staffing, and attention to the larger challenge of chemical spills overall. The terminology regarding various plans is also overlapping and confusing. The positive view is that a window of opportunity has opened now to finally align and coordinate plans and planning requirements that have been confusing to many in the field.
- Additional Comments:
 - Because of topography, communications systems do not work well.
 - Communication is vital— Cal OES and the SERC need to use email, webinar, phone calls to push out ideas and ask for input.
 - Communication and face-to-face meetings before an emergency helps with coordination during an emergency.
 - There is a tension between community-right-to-know and protecting information about critical infrastructure and confidential business information.

⁵ OSPR is the California Office of Spill Prevention and Response.

- Talk to Arizona and Nevada, which have similar challenges in making LEPCs functional.
- Wide-spread pending retirements will raise issues of LEPC sustainability, particularly for rural areas statewide.
- LEPCs need a stronger Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee (MARAC) link.
- The needs and resources of full-time, part-time, paid, volunteer, rural, and urban LEPCs are different.
- There needs to be consistency regarding notification, reporting, and training.
- One interviewee proposed that Cal OES be in charge of hazmat requirements throughout the state. Cal OES should be the central hub for notification and reporting and the information should go laterally from Cal OES.
- Some of the interviewees suggested additional people that should be included or consulted in future phases of the HMRP project. These names are listed in the attached Key Stakeholder Interview Summary.

Quick Summary: Key ‘Take Aways’ from the Assessment Effort:

- *Funding is an enormous challenge and must be addressed.*
- *The revitalized SERC must continue to function and become successful. The SERC must provide leadership, resources, guidance, and statewide consistency.*
- *There needs to be a streamlined process to develop and update regional plans that address region-specific issues, are consistent with statewide standards, and are in a useful and practical format for emergency response.*
- *Regional plans must be trained, exercised, and evaluated.*
- *Additional training is needed by the LEPCs. This is a two-part issue – the location of training must be convenient and formula for funding must account for tuition, travel, overtime, and personnel backfill.*
- *There needs to be easy two-way communication between the state and LEPCs. There should be a better way to distribute information and have access to reliable and successful tools and documents.*
- *Issues of roles, clarity of jurisdictional authorities, and understanding of the various planning requirements need to be simplified.*
- *There must be timely awareness of what hazardous substances are being transported through a region and what is being used in a region.*
- *The various requirements for multiple, overlapping plans needs to be coordinated so that critical gaps and redundancies are eliminated.*

THE STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

On September 10, 2014, Cal OES hosted, and CCP facilitated, a HMRP workshop at the Cal OES headquarters building, Mather, California (detailed notes attached).

Participants:

Invitations to the September 10 workshop were e-mailed to approximately 50 representatives of federal, state and local government agencies, and tribal interests. About 30 representatives attended the workshop, which was structured to encourage audience feedback and participation.

Purpose and Framing the Challenge:

The purpose of the workshop was to convene stakeholders to share available information identified through document research and assessment interviews, identify issues, gaps, and challenges in regional hazmat emergency planning, and set the stage for the creation of a work-product that will assist in the development, testing, and revision of Hazardous Materials Regional Response Plans.

Deputy Chief Thomas E. Campbell, Cal OES, discussed the need for hazmat planning and preparedness and described recent accidents and the movement of hazardous substances throughout the State. Chief Campbell discussed the need for regional plans to anticipate and prepare for likely hazards. Regional plans have been largely driven by specific, individual hazards. The recent report from the Oil-by-Rail Working Group calls for reevaluation of the purpose and function of regional plans. Chief Campbell encouraged participants to share their thoughts on the components that should be considered in order to clearly define a direction for this process.

The workshop was structured as an opportunity to hear diverse viewpoints from representatives of federal, state, and local governments. Participants were asked to share their perspectives on what the hazardous materials regional plan assessment project should include, how it should be structured, and how this project should be managed as it moves forward.

Presentation of the Document Review and Stakeholder Assessment Interviews:

Caryn Woodhouse, CCP, presented her document review findings (discussed above). The purpose of the review was to provide an overview of available rail and fixed facility hazmat planning documents, LEPC planning guidance and documents, documents describing the legal basis and requirements for regional hazmat planning, and guidance on hazardous materials transport emergency response. The purpose of discussing the document review findings at the workshop was to present the information to the attendees, to solicit input regarding additional

documents that should be reviewed, and to determine the applicability of the documents to future phases of this project. The detailed document summary report is attached.

Presentation of the Results of the Stakeholder Assessment Interviews:

Adam Sutkus, CCP, presented an overview of the assessment interview process (summarized above). The purpose of this assessment was to highlight issues, gaps, key topics, concerns, and recommendations of key stakeholders that could be addressed by this work group. Key challenges that were identified by the interviews include: funding issues; numerous and confusing plans; need for consistent and effective oversight and guidance; need to strengthen pre-emergency communications; overlapping structure of the LEPCs and CUPAs; the necessity for drills and exercises; and, outdated or ineffective plans.

The key recommendations for moving forward that were identified in the assessment interviews lead to the topics for the breakout sessions:

- The need to define the scope and purpose of the regional guidance.
- Identification of the components of the regional guidance (one or more tools are needed).
- Consideration to whether a statewide framework is needed.

Panel Presentations and Discussion:

A five-member panel representing local, state, and federal agencies discussed the challenges of regional hazmat coordination. The panel members and affiliations were:

- Bill Fuller, Yuba City Fire, Region 3 LEPC Chair
- Curtis Brundage, San Bernardino County Fire, Region 6 LEPC Chair
- Elise Rothchild, Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, CUPA
- Jim Bohon, Cal EPA Local Program Coordinator
- Lance Richmond, U.S. EPA, Region 9

Bill Fuller: Mr. Fuller described LEPC-Region 3, in Northern California and the challenges of regional planning in a largely rural area. The region is composed of 13 counties that are mostly rural with some urban areas. Major transportation corridors cross the region, including Interstate 5, several major state highways, and three railroad lines. There are two major sensitive environmental areas within the region: the Feather River Canyon and the Sacramento River Canyon. The region has three hazardous materials response teams that are located in the urban areas.

Two years ago, LEPC-3 had to respond to a rail incident where a rail car started leaking around 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 in order to work together. In addressing impacts to waterways or sensitive environmental areas there has to be clear communication among several agencies, including California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), OSPR, California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), cities, counties, railroads, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and others. It is often difficult to ascertain which agency has jurisdictional authority and which resources (and personnel trained to use the resources) are available for an impacted area.

Mr. Fuller stated that LEPC-Region 3 does not have a regional plan. Local and state budget cuts, funding, local attitudes toward state mandates, and the volunteer basis of the LEPC participants makes regional planning difficult. As people retire and new people filling their place, there is lack of organizational background. A key challenge to address is how to best deliver services within limited time and budget. It is important to anticipate what could happen in the region and be prepared to respond effectively and efficiently. A combined plan that identifies common resources, contact information, and is standardized regarding how to respond and who needs to be involved in a response would be helpful. A template format may be beneficial.

Curtis Brundage: Mr. Brundage 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 both rural and highly populated areas that it serves. Mr. Brundage shared the challenge of getting participation from outlying areas and difficulties of updating, implementing, and incorporating area plans into a 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. Mr. Brundage stated that 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 consistent standards, but 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 impacting the region's economy. Region 6 has a work group that meets to evaluate these experiences. Communication is important since every agency has different communication frequency and training is needed to ensure that everyone can communicate in the field. In developing future plans there needs to be a review and approval process by Cal OES to formalize and make the 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 and face-to-face interaction is important.

Elise Rothschild: Ms. Rothchild 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 facilities that handle specified hazardous substances. The Sacramento CUPA has transitioned into electronic submission and is working with businesses on the use of the 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. The CUPA requires that the information is updated every two weeks.

Ms. Rothchild stated that it is important to have regional training and collaboration. There is no hazmat mutual aid in California so there must be a new way to leverage resources. Los Angeles has developed a model strike force consisting of the CUPA and health (dealing with housing, environment, and health) to respond to disasters as a group.

Each CUPA prepares an area plan every three years, which requires a lot of resources and time. Grants provide up to 80% of the cost and the CUPA provides the remainder. 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

It is important to consider the different priorities at the various regions based on their disaster experience. A statewide effort is challenging because California is diverse and jurisdictions have different priorities, hazards, needs, and resources. Funding, training, and resources needs throughout the state must be addressed. 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 coordinate.

Jim Bohon: Mr. Bohon, Assistant Secretary of Cal EPA, remarked that this project was developed in response to interest generated by rail transport of Bakken crude oil but that is not the only concern. Mr. Bohon provided an overview of transportation corridors throughout the state and reminded participants that there are many hazardous commodities that are being transported by rail, pipeline, ship, and highway. Mr. Bohon also mentioned that mutual aid for hazardous materials incidents is nonexistent in this state because of the cost and need to maintain specialized resources.

Mr. Bohon reviewed the California's Delegated Hazmat Oversight Program (Unified Program). Area plans for CUPAs are administrative rather than response-driven. The 1990s State Hazmat Plan provides a focal point for planning that is relatively accurate today in spite of the age of the document. Response is set at the local level rather than regional but coordination needs to be regional. There are a number of plans that need to be updated. Mr. Bohon referred to the

emergency structure in California and the added layer of Emergency Support Functions (ESF). Cal EPA has a lead coordinating role in response in California thereby shifting the responsibility in state planning structure. Mr. Bohon reiterated his interest in this project because of the development in state response overlay.

Lance Richmond: Mr. Richmond provided the federal perspective on hazardous materials planning. U.S. EPA Region 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. Mr. Bohon also said that it is important to consider the difficulties of regional hazmat planning due to the LEPCs underfunding.

Mr. Richmond highlighted three key issues that need to be further addressed:

- Executive Order (EO) 13650, signed in August 2013 - *Improving Chemical Facility Safety & Security*
- Cal OSPR – overlap with Coast Guard on oil spill engagement
- Bakken crude oil transport and refining: a focal point in planning and preparedness

Discussion: After the panelists' presentations, there was discussion, and agreement, among the workshop participants. In addition to expanding the topics mentions above there were additional areas of interest, including tribal coordination and use of private businesses as a partner in this planning effort. One commentator described how the experience a train derailment created a private-public effort to create a response plan for future events. The plan – called the ROPE plan⁶ – includes detailed but easy-to-use maps, tables providing needed communications frequencies, and contacts covering an area of the Cajon Pass.

⁶ Responders Organized for Pass Emergencies (ROPE) created by San Bernardino County Fire Department Office of Emergency Services and the ROPE Committee.

Quick Summary: Key ‘Take Aways’ from the Panel Presentation and Discussion:

- *Funding is a continuing challenge and must be addressed.*
- *The various hazmat authorities and requirements can be confusing and must be clarified.*
- *The resources of each agency can be more effectively utilized if there are no gaps or overlaps.*
- *Participation in the LEPC is hampered by resource availability, large geographic scale, and low awareness.*
- *Communications are critical.*
- *There is no mutual aid for hazardous materials emergency response.*
- *Standards and support of regional planning must be consistent, but must incorporate and allow for differences in regional needs, resources, training, and hazard exposure.*
- *Regional training and pre-emergency coordination is needed.*
- *The ROPE document is an example of how a disaster motivated the formation of interested and impacted parties to develop an easy-to-use emergency response manual.*
- *Cal OES should be sure to include other interests, such as tribal concerns.*

Issue-Specific Small Group Discussions:

The afternoon was dedicated to small group detailed discussion sessions facilitated by Cal OES and CCP staff on key topics that were revealed in the stakeholder interviews and document review:

1. What should be the governance and coordination structure for hazardous materials regional planning?
 - What type of advisory group should be assembled to advise in the development of future planning efforts?
 - What other subcommittees or working groups may be needed to address key topics?
 - What types of communication, information sharing, and collaboration efforts are needed?
2. What is the best approach for hazardous materials regional planning?
 - Does the planning effort need to be formalized as a state framework (regional guidance vs. state framework initiative)?
 - What is the role of the LEPC?
 - How do we integrate multiple plans into the hazardous materials planning framework?
3. What should be the scope and structure of a hazardous materials regional plan or tool?
 - What should the planning document contain (guidance, cross-walk, toolkit, etc.)?

- How should the planning guidance/toolkit address variance in conditions (rural/urban, paid/volunteer, density of facilities, commodity flow, etc.)?
- What resources and needs should be addressed?

Participants were encouraged to participate in more than one group and to move amongst groups as they pleased but most stayed with the same group for the entire 75 minute period. All workshop participants attended these “break-out” sessions and most participated in the discussions. The Cal OES and CCP staff facilitated the small group discussions, encouraging participation from all of the members, and recorded the key comments on flip charts and in notes. Key concepts that were discussed are presented here.

Topic #1: What should be the governance and coordination structure for hazardous materials regional planning?

- The process to develop a hazardous materials regional plan should consider lessons learned through similar efforts in other states such as Texas and Arizona, understanding that the California emergency management structure is unique.
- The planning effort should utilize the federal governance structure of the SERC although some modification may be necessary to make SERC more effective.
- The planning process should involve statewide stakeholders including tribes, CUPAs, industry, and counties and cities (EMS, law, fire). Participants validated the need for subcommittees that include representatives from SERC.
- Subcommittee work needs to occur at the local level based on geographic 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. Subcommittee structure should align with existing SEMS structure rather than develop new infrastructures.
- 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 steps: (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 operational level; and (4) an evaluation and a looping back mechanism to update planning at the administrator level.
- Participants suggested that coordinated planning with 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. The

hazardous materials planning effort should explore the CDPH structure and mutual aid region planning.

Topic #2: What is the best approach for hazardous materials regional planning?

- The hazardous material regional planning program should be standardized statewide. While the standardized framework should have enough flexibility to allow local differences, it is important to have statewide standards and guiding principles that can be incorporated into local plans.
- Template or plans with basic common elements can be developed for use in different areas.
- Participants agreed that the role of LEPCs in regional planning is critical. However, important constraints were identified, including the voluntary nature of the LEPCs. There is a need to develop incentives for participation and continuity.
- A critical concern is the need to develop a consistent, reliable funding mechanism. The unified program (discharge fee program) was mentioned as one opportunity to explore. Proposition 26 (passed last year) places constraints on state agencies' ability to use fees. Although there is a funding structure there are legal boundaries regarding its use.
- It is important for Cal OES to communicate with the LEPCs throughout this planning effort and empower LEPCs to bring entities together. Support mechanisms that were suggested include funding, and partnerships. This important effort should be leveraged in addressing some of the identified issues. Cal EPA will also be a key partner in this process, given its coordination for EF 10 and the CUPA infrastructure statewide.
- There is competition among counties, cities, and agencies for limited training and equipment.
- Developing successful planning requires communication and coordination. An example was offered of collaboration in Southern California where ongoing monthly meetings encourage collaboration in future emergency events. The informal relationships formed in these gatherings are important for coordinated response. Regardless of formal relationships, the informal relationships are valuable and need to be protected.
- A recurring question is how to integrate all the existing plans into a unifying 'framework'. Participants highlighted the need to consider other existing similar plans and their gaps and overlap. A list of available plans and determining how they interrelate should be compiled. This is a project that Cal EPA is working on. There are tool kit lists for most of the plans that can be found online.

Topic #3: What should be the scope and structure of a hazardous material regional planning?

- The planning should ensure standardized elements by developing guidance for consistency. These elements can then be adopted for regional plans by regulations.
- The issue of releasing sensitive information to the public 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. Fear of misuse of the information should not be used as a reason to keep critical information from the public. There was a discussion about how much information 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 document be considered operational or administrative or both? This question needs to be addressed before starting the planning process. The plan may have an administrative component for coordination and an operational component for collaboration.
- The regional plan should address two key issues: (1) how to respond to large events that cross jurisdictional boundaries, and (2) how to access needed resources in other jurisdictions. Specifically, the regional plans should have information on identifying who needs to be contacted, what resources are available, and how these resources can be accessed. It was recognized that a key reason for the lack of a mutual aid plan for hazardous materials is lack of resources. For large events, it would be helpful to have a checklist format for what has to be done and to identify the agencies that must be contacted. It is important to keep the plan simple, user-friendly, and readily accessible. One plan format that was mentioned is one that has the immediately needed information and decision points in the front and the administrative details in the end of the document. This format combines an instantly useful operational guide with the administrative information not needed immediately.
- The plan should include triggers for reaching out to other jurisdictions and should include a resource directory. The plan should identify who is the incident command (IC), and if the IC is established what is the handoff process.

- The ROPE plan⁷ was used as an example of a clear and useful format with needed information that is immediately accessible.

Full Plenary Discussion:

After the breakout discussion, the workshop participants reconvened in full plenary session and the results of each small group discussion was presented. A collaborative discussion followed each of the three small group presentations providing additional recommendations as to what the HMRP project should address and how the project should move forward. The discussion notes and recommendations are detailed in the attached workshop summary, but key points are presented here.

- 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 to the state emergency plan.
- A participant encouraged including pipeline operators and private industry in this process.
- 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 on a regular basis.
- 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.
- A California Department of Fish and Wildlife representative commented that being involved with LEPC is a new experience but the department is committed to continue its involvement.
- A participant suggested that small groups discuss the same question in parallel and bring back their findings to the large group before moving on to discussing additional questions.

⁷ Responders Organized for Pass Emergencies (ROPE) created by San Bernardino County Fire Department Office of Emergency Services and the ROPE Committee.

Quick Summary: Key 'Take Aways' from the Small Group Discussions:

General Comments/Recommendations:

- *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 on a regular basis.*
- *Further phases of the HMRP project must include more stakeholders, such as tribes, Caltrans, and private industry.*
- *Communication is vital. Clear, face-to-face, pre-emergency communication must be encouraged in this process.*

Governance:

- *The SERC must continue to operate and become more effective.*
- *There was not universal agreement that a statewide plan is needed, but there was general agreement that consistent guidelines and requirements that area/regional plans must meet are needed. There is a clear need to define statewide guidance principles and minimum standards.*
- *The process should continue with local level subcommittee work supported by Cal OES. The subcommittees could be aligned with the Cal OES administrative regions.*
- *Both decision makers and operational staff need to be included.*
- *Lessons could be drawn from other agencies. CDPH was used as an example of an agency that has established a funded position to coordinate local operational areas.*

Regional Approach:

- *There was general agreement that hazardous materials regional planning should be standardized statewide, providing minimum standards while allowing some degree of flexibility for local differences.*
- *A consistent, reliable funding mechanism is critical.*
- *LEPC participation needs to be encouraged, and constraints to active involvement need to be identified and addressed. Cal OES should encourage opportunities for both formal and informal networks to form.*
- *Cal OES must continue to communicate with the LEPCs throughout this planning effort.*
- *The confusing number of plans, authorities, and requirements needs to be clarified.*

Scope and Structure:

- *Guidance should address the need of local control balanced against the need for consistent statewide minimum standards.*
- *The regional plan should address two key issues: (1) how to respond to large events that cross jurisdictional boundaries, and (2) how to access needed resources in other*

jurisdictions.

- *Key components of a regional plan should include: identifying who needs to be contacted, what resources are available, and how these resources can be accessed. The plan should include triggers for reaching out to other jurisdictions and should include a resource directory.*
- *The focus should be on assisting local planning efforts, especially those with limited resources.*
- *Regional plans need to have an administrative component for coordination and an operational component for collaboration and response.*
- *There does not have to be a single answer about what tools are needed. There may be several tools that would be useful and should be developed.*
- *Tools need to complement regulations and requirements. They must be user-friendly and useful. Functional templates and checklists would be helpful. Perhaps, generic templates for specific hazards, such as ammonia and chlorine could be developed. Template or plans with basic common elements can be developed for use in different areas.*

RECOMMENDATIONS—MOVING FORWARD

1. DEVELOP A PROJECT MANAGEMENT GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE ENGAGING MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDERS

A significant ‘footprint’ of stakeholder involvement was successfully initiated in the Phase I process for the HMRP regional planning development effort. Many stakeholders and their affiliation and contact information are listed on the *Master Stakeholder List*, which is included. Many of these indicated an interest in participating in the regional development process by responding to the request on the workshop evaluation sheet. There is significant support for this project at all levels of government and community sectors that should be sustained to maximize the success of this project. Below are suggestions on how to proceed with this project with the goal of retaining the commitment and interest in the longer term hazmat regional development process.

The Core Planning Team Process

Based upon the interest and expertise of the stakeholders that were interviewed during the assessment phase and the evaluations of the participants at September 10 Workshop, a Core Planning Team (CPT), representing a broad group of stakeholders, is recommended to be assembled to lead the next phase of the regional plan development and serve as an Advisory Board to Cal OES. It is recommended that participants include some of the key contributors

identified during the stakeholder interviews and the workshop and additional stakeholders to represent as a summary (not yet inclusive):

- Each LEPC
- Key federal agencies: U.S. EPA Region 9, FEMA Region 9, U.S. Coast Guard
- Key state agencies: Cal EPA; OSPR/DFW; CDPH/Emergency Preparedness Office; Emergency Medical Services Authority
- The California Utilities Emergency Association; tribal representative(s); Access and Functional Needs/Persons with Disabilities representatives;
- Other identified supporting state agencies with key roles and/or experience. The State Lands Commission may be appropriate for its jurisdiction over pipelines.
- A broad spectrum of local governments and/or their associations representing various population sizes and demographics, geography, hazmat capabilities and experience (i.e., include some counties, cities and special districts and representatives from the California State Association of Counties and the California Operational Area Coalition).
- Volunteer Interests—Likely California Volunteers at the state level and the Southern California and/or Northern California VOADs (Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters)
- American Red Cross and/or the Salvation Army
- Others to be considered for the CPT include representatives of the railroad industry, pipeline operators, the media, and the business community (especially private-sector suppliers that support or provide infrastructure).

As described in the work plan section of this document, and in the attached timeline graphic, this CPT group would meet periodically to ‘truth test’ the organizational process underway to engage stakeholders in the development of the draft guidance/toolkit, as well as review and refine the key policy and program development elements in the issues. In recent projects where CCP has engaged a CPT format prior to development of a complex policy document (for example, Disaster Mental/Behavior Health Framework; Radiological/Nuclear Incident Planning Development) this structure has been received extremely well and highly supported by the stakeholder community and created a strong partnership with Cal OES.

Engage Statewide Interests Through Regional Workshops

Once many of the key policy issues captured in this Phase I effort have been addressed intensively by the CPT, and a draft/outline of the guidance/template document has been developed, regional workshops will be valuable to allow a wider network of groups, organizations, and key stakeholders to ‘truth test’ and comment on the direction and draft approach contained in the draft guidance/toolkit.

CPT Subcommittees or Work Groups (optional—only possibly needed, to be determined)

Cal OES may also want to consider subcommittees (or working groups) for future developmental deliberation by key stakeholders. Proposed topics to be submitted to a subcommittee can be developed with further analysis of how to address the ‘Gaps’ presented in this Phase I work, with validation by the CPT before beginning regional workshops and subcommittee work. Recruitment, chartering for mission clarity, and timelines for efforts can all be communicated to the subcommittees to allow their work to ‘roll-up’ into the development of successively mature drafts of the guidance/template itself, which will be reviewed by the CPT and Cal OES management. This step may not be necessary, or the budget may not allow this option, which can be addressed with the Cal OES project manager as this phase of work matures.

Create a Charter for the Overall Project, to Include Core Planning Team and Subcommittee Expectations.

In order to clarify roles, responsibilities, expectations, decision-making process, timelines, and scope of assignments, a *charter document* should be created for the overall project that will address the activities of the CPT stakeholder group as well as any subcommittees. This document has shown itself to be critical when dealing with multiple stakeholders across different sectors and when addressing complex and numerous policy issues being discussed. A key step for a successful engagement process is to have clarity from the beginning regarding how information gathered will be used, how any decision-making will be done (i.e., advisory only to Cal OES or consensus based) and how the valuable time of important stakeholders will be utilized. A charter document clearly lays this information out for discussion and agreement by all key entities involved. For instance, approving the project charter would be an important agenda item at the first CPT meeting.

2. SUSTAIN EXECUTIVE SUPPORT

The CCP strongly recommends on-going executive sponsorship of pre-disaster hazmat planning and executive commitment to making the development of the guidance/template a priority for Cal OES. This will be a challenge given past emphasis on emergency response planning, shifting priorities due to personnel turnover, new disasters that deplete resources, legislative mandates, and changes in Administration priorities.

Creation of a CPT as an advisory board would be a good start. This would be a forum for appropriate decision makers representing all impacted sectors to convene regularly to discuss and oversee the development of the overall planning effort and the development of a

supported guidance/template specifically. It will be important to sustain participation over time for the planning effort to be effective and provide executive support as Cal OES moves to implement the final documents and agreements.

In addition to resident expertise in hazardous materials, Cal OES would benefit from staff with expertise in emergency planning (such as the OES planning staff). This will provide the needed expertise to carry out hazmat planning activities. This assistance will be especially needed and helpful from key state agency partners such as Cal EPA, OSPR, and others who have jurisdictional authority in these areas.

3. STRATEGICALLY APPROACH STATE HAZMAT REGIONAL PLANNING

The CCP recommends a 4-pronged approach to development of a comprehensive planning effort, leading to the development and pilot testing of a guidance/template tool. The **first step** is to initiate the process and design the stakeholder engagement process to begin work on the guidance/template. **The second step** would be the convening of a CPT as described earlier. Using the policy guidance developed in the first step, the CPT would then be able to standardize activities across all phases of the planning development effort. **Third**, regional workshops would provide for critical input throughout the state to validate the draft work by the CPT and to set the stage for finalizing the guidance/template. **The fourth step** would be to engage with one LEPC for a 'Pilot Test' of the working draft guidance/template/tools and to work through the use of the developed documents and process. Following these steps in the out-years, the guidance/template would be refined based on lessons-learned during the pilot test, and then the revised materials would be 'rolled out' to the remaining LEPCs for their engagement and development of their individual regional planning documents.

Cal OES should develop and the SERC should encourage the development of statewide consistent standards for hazardous materials regional planning. The standards need to be flexible to accommodate the differences among regions and local governments including size, capabilities, expertise, and demographics.

Quick Summary: Key ‘Take Aways’ for Recommendations:

Ideas For Future Reference

- *Utilize the SERC prominently in future phases of the project as the ‘umbrella’ organization endorsing the effort*
- *Strategically involve key stakeholders in future phases to help with the design of a comprehensive planning process and tool/guidance*
- *Form a ‘Core Planning Team’ advisory group of key stakeholders*
- *Develop statewide guiding principles that will help provide for consistency across regions as they develop their regional plans/documents. A full replacement document to the HMICP as a state plan annex may not be needed to accomplish the regional planning goals*
- *Utilize regional workshops to provide for wider involvement and opportunity to comment on draft materials in the regional planning process as future phases occur*
- *Beta-test a pilot of a draft guidance document/template at one LEPC to provide for an evaluation of the materials before applying the process to all regions*

THE PROPOSED WORK PLAN AND NEXT STEPS

Overall Approach

Based on the input from stakeholders through both the assessment process and the workshop, the following proposed work plan is offered for consideration. This timeline takes into account successive blocks of work covering differing periods of time which constitute milestones, including the conclusion of this first phase of work.

All phases taken together design a comprehensive strategic approach and work plan for developing and ‘Pilot/Beta Testing’ a *Hazardous Materials Regional Planning Guidance and Template*. The initial **Phase I** effort has encompassed research, stakeholder recruitment and engagement, policy/issue identification, developing a Framework Work Plan consisting of key policy gaps for discussion, stakeholder strategies for engagement, and related findings (now completed). **Phase II** is envisioned as a working draft guidance and template and tool development phase with intensive deliberation by a selected CPT of key sector stakeholders critical to the creation and ultimate implementation of the planning documents. The CPT would also validate the engagement process for follow-up workshops and development of key subcommittees (if needed). **Phase III** envisions taking the working draft guidance/template document/tools created by the CPT to regional workshops throughout the state, to validate the draft approach through input from additional stakeholders—and then to revise the documents based on the additional input. The CPT with Cal OES would then approve the revised tools.

Phase IV then involves taking the Final Working Draft guidance/template and engaging one selected LEPC as a pilot or beta test process to proceed through the planning process to create a regional plan using the tools—and determining what needs to be updated in the guidance/template through lessons learned in the process. Throughout Phase III and IV—similar to earlier phases—the CPT will meet to provide program implementation, policy and governance guidance. The final **Phase V** in the out-years outlined in this work plan (but not expected to be part of the one-year work plan outlined here) would involve taking the revised guidance/template to the remaining LEPCs and creating their regional plans. (Please reference attached flow chart graphic for Phases I-IV visual)

Methodology

PHASE I: MAY THROUGH SEPTEMBER 2014 [COMPLETED]

The Phase I activities listed below supported initial development of the planning framework through input and support from a broad range of key stakeholders, research, policy issue identification, gap analysis, and work plan development.

Research and Issue/Stakeholder Assessment

- Reviewed existing hazmat planning efforts, strategic plans, regional plans and guidance material, and related documents within California and nationally.
- Conducted structured interviews with selected Cal OES staff and other stakeholders (local, federal, state, private sector, tribal, etc.) to identify key issues and suggestions for hazmat regional planning in the California.
- Developed a summary of current issues, policies and trends based on the research and stakeholder interviews.

Stakeholder Engagement—Workshop

- Conducted a ‘kick off’ workshop with statewide stakeholders covering all involved sectors to receive input and feedback and gain support from a broad community on the approach to develop a regional planning framework.

Develop Gap and Issue Analysis/Next Steps/Work Plan Document

- Based on the research, stakeholder assessment data, and input from the initial workshop compiled through notes of the workshop and analysis— developed a ‘Work Plan’ document outlining key issues to address governance, suggestions for stakeholder engagement, and a timeline and structure for moving into intensive guidance/template development in the next phase.

PHASE II: NOVEMBER 2014 THROUGH MARCH 2015 (ESTIMATED DEPENDING UPON START TIME AND CONTRACTING)

The Phase II activities listed below cover the range of: Core Planning Team recruitment and engagement; development of a Draft guidance/template *Discussion Draft* document through the CPT process; and initial design of regional workshops to validate/revise the draft guidance/template.

Core Planning Team Development, Recruitment, and Engagement

- Establish a CPT, chaired by Cal OES, to provide structured advice and input in the development of a *California Regional Planning Guidance and Template* discussion draft and *Strategic Approach*. Anticipated members include, but are not limited to, organizations with lead or key supporting roles in all hazmat functions representing federal, state, tribal, and local government, NGOs and the private sector. Interaction with existing local planning efforts will be key.

Develop California Guidance, Template, and Tools Discussion Draft

- The CPT will engage in several meetings to address key policy questions and issues, resolve and create baseline assumptions and statewide guiding principles, and draft an initial guidance/template document. All issues are not expected to be completely solved at this time; the regional workshop to follow will be used to vet assumptions made and to address remaining needed input.

Governance and Process Design of the Regional Workshops

- In addition to the discussions on policy and program issues to develop the discussion draft guidance/template, the CPT will also help design the structure for the location, format, and participants for the regional workshops to come in the next phase.

PHASE III: APRIL THROUGH JUNE 2015 (DEPENDING UPON START TIME; MAY BE THROUGH SUMMER)

The Phase III activities listed below cover the range of: regional workshops to validate/update the draft guidance/template/tools; convene CPT to consider regional input; and revise the documents into a Final Working Draft.

Regional Workshops

- The draft guidance/template/tool document, approved for external review by Cal OES, will undergo extensive stakeholder review and input at several regional workshops. It is anticipated that at least three workshops will be offered—likely Sacramento, Los Angeles, and the Bay Area. Others may be considered based on budget and timeline.

The input will be utilized to update the draft guidance/template and to address remaining key policy issues.

Update/Revise into a Final Draft *California Hazmat Regional Planning Guidance & Template*

- After regional workshops, develop the revised guidance and template for Core Planning Team review and recommendation for approval by Cal OES.

PHASE IV: JULY 2015 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 2015 (APPROXIMATELY)

The Phase IV activities involve the ‘Pilot/Beta Testing’ phase, by engaging one LEPC in a planning exercise to apply the guidance and template to one jurisdiction. During and after this exercise the lessons learned through applying the process in an active planning process, the guidance and template will undergo revisions and be readied for the remaining five LEPCs.

- The selected LEPC will be determined through deliberations of the CPT

PHASE V: OUT YEARS (FOLLOWING THIS ONE YEAR PROJECT AS SUCCESSOR EFFORT)

Phase V activities are anticipated to involve the application of the now revised and tested planning process, including CPT and Cal OES review, to the five remaining LEPC

ACRONYMS

Cal OES	California Office of Emergency Services
CCP.....	Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento
CDPH	California Department of Public Health
CFATS	Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards
COBRA	Chemical, Ordnance, Biological, and Radiological (Dept. Homeland Security training center)
CPT	Core Planning Team
CSTI	California Specialized Training Institute
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
Hazmat.....	hazardous materials
HMEP Grant	Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grant
IC	Incident Command
LEPC	Local Emergency Planning Committee
MARAC.....	Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee
NASTTPO	National Association of SARA Title III Program Officials
OSPR	California Office of Spill Prevention and Response
RHMP Project.....	Regional Hazardous Materials Planning Project
ROPE	Responders Organized for Pass Emergencies
SERC	State Emergency Response Commission
TERC	Tribal Emergency Response Commission
VOAD.....	Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters

Attachments
(Provided as separate reference documents)

Attachment A. Proposed project phase II design sequence

Attachment B. Project next steps timeline

Attachment C. Pertinent emails regarding project

Attachment D. Sept 10, 2014, HMRP Workshop Notes

**Attachment E. HMRP Documents Review Summary including HMRP
Additional Reference Documents List (all online references
included)**

Attachment F. Questionnaire for stakeholder assessment

Attachment G. Workshop evaluations summary

Attachment H. Master stakeholder list

Attachment I. PowerPoint from workshop

Attachment J. Workbook from workshop

Attachment K. Other key notes/misc. docs from design team work