

Minutes

Nevada State Emergency Response Commission (SERC)

Planning and Training Subcommittee Meeting

Professional Engineers & Land Surveyor's State Board Room
1755 E. Plumb Lane, Suite 130
Reno, Nevada

February 18, 2009

Members Present

Carolyn Levering, Chair
Aaron Kenneston
Steve Tognoli

Members Absent

Richard Brenner, Ex Officio
Gary Corona

Staff

Suzie Adam
Shelley Fleming
Karen Pabón
Glade Myler

I. Call to Order

Carolyn Levering called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

II. Introductions

Members and staff introduced themselves. A quorum was present.

III. *Approval of the October 2, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Aaron Kenneston made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 2, 2008 meeting. Steve Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

IV. New Business

A. *Discussion/Review updates to hazardous materials emergency response plans submitted by Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs)

Ms. Levering stated the members will review the hazardous materials emergency response plans submitted to the SERC. Esmeralda, Humboldt and Washoe LEPCs did not submit hazardous materials emergency response plan updates.

The Committee adjourned at 9:07 a.m. to review the plans.

The Committee reconvened at 10:36 a.m.

Elko LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Elko LEPC’s plan was substantially compliant. Ms. Levering stated the drills and exercises of the emergency plan types and schedules are missing. Ms. Levering recommended the LEPC update their resource list on the table of contents to match their plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to approve Elko LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on updating the resource list on the Table of Contents to match the plan, submittal of drills and exercises schedules, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct these deficiencies. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Eureka LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Eureka LEPC’s plan was compliant. Ms. Levering recommended the LEPC integrate the two-volume emergency response plan into one volume.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Eureka LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan with the recommendation to integrate the two volumes into one volume. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Storey LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Storey LEPC’s plan had some minor updating required of phone contacts and street addresses. The methods for determining occurrence of release were not in the plan where the LEPC indicated they were as stated in their National Response Team (NRT)-1 form. Ms. Levering advised the evacuation section was useful. The new resource annexing is pending via a grant by the SERC.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to approve Storey LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on submittal of their plan with updated phone contacts and street addresses, methods for determining occurrence of release to coincide with where it was as stated in the NRT-1 form, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct the deficiencies. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Douglas LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Douglas LEPC’s plan was compliant.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Douglas LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Churchill LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised Churchill LEPC’s plan was basically in compliance but missing a current training schedule. Mr. Tognoli stated the NRT-1 form should reference page numbers instead of tabs.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Churchill LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on submittal of a current training schedule, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct the deficiency.

Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Pershing LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised there was confusion of organization of Pershing LEPC’s plan. There were two conflicting dates for an exercise, difficulty comparing the NRT-1 form to the plan, and the page numbers were hard to find throughout the plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to approve Pershing LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan with a recommendation the LEPC clarify the date of their exercise and better organize their plan. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lincoln LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised Lincoln LEPC’s plan was missing types and schedules for exercises.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to approve Lincoln LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on submittal of types and schedules for exercises, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct these deficiencies. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

White Pine LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised White Pine LEPC’s plan was difficult to review. The appendix to the LEPC’s operation plan and the emergency response plan need to be integrated into one hazardous materials plan. Mr. Tognoli stated the plan needs to be completely updated.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to approve White Pine LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan with a recommendation to reorganize their plan. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Carson City LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Carson City LEPC’s plan was compliant. Mr. Kenneston stated the LEPC could include specific dates for exercises.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Carson City LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Clark LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Clark LEPC’s plan was compliant. Mr. Kenneston stated there could be more specific dates for the exercises.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Clark LEPC’s hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously. Ms. Pabón stated staff did not receive an updated training schedule.

Revisited Churchill LEPC

Ms. Pabón advised staff does not have meeting minutes from Churchill LEPC

approving their hazardous materials emergency response plan.

Mr. Tognoli amended the motion for Churchill LEPC to add a contingency of submittal of LEPC meeting minutes approving their hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Kenneston seconded the amended motion which was approved unanimously.

Lyon LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Lyon LEPC's plan was compliant. Some sections could be consolidated. A discussion ensued about LEPCs submitting a Letter of Promulgation.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Lyon LEPC's hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on submittal of an updated Letter of Promulgation, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct the deficiency. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Mineral LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Mineral LEPC's plan was compliant.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Mineral LEPC's hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Nye LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Nye LEPC is compliant but recommended they reformat their plan for next year. In the plan, Nye LEPC states they are waiting for guidance from SERC for the reformatting.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Nye LEPC's hazardous materials emergency response plan with the recommendation they reformat their plan similar to Mineral, Churchill or Carson City LEPCs' plans. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lander LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Lander LEPC's plan was compliant. The formatting was difficult to follow. A discussion ensued about the Letter of Promulgation and why they submitted a letter to the Lander County instead of using the letter included which is less than a year old. Ms. Pabón stated the LEPC is redoing the Letter of Promulgation because the Policy Committee stated, when reviewing the policy regarding plan updates, every year a plan update will be required for resources, contact list, training and exercise schedules. In the process of updating those items, a LEPC would need to update the Letter of Promulgation making it an annual requirement.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve Lander LEPC's hazardous materials emergency response plan contingent on submittal of an updated Letter of Promulgation, and requested staff send notification allowing 45 days to correct the deficiency. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

UNLV – Mr. Kenneston advised UNLV is the first State agency to submit a hazardous materials emergency response plan. This plan does not follow the other

plans, i.e., no Letter of Promulgation or meeting minutes to approve the plan. Ms. Levering advised UNLV participates in the Clark LEPC. Ms. Pabón stated from the State agency's viewpoint, their intent was to apply for a grant as a State agency. UNLV's plan is not part of the LEPC. They do not have those requirements because they are not a LEPC.

Mr. Kenneston advised it was a good first year plan but recommended it be expanded for next year. Mr. Kenneston added UNLV does need a more thorough evacuation plan and expansion of the methods for determining occurrence. SERC may want to consider more specific guidance to universities/colleges as to whether the Dean of the University/College signs the Letter of Promulgation.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to approve UNLV's hazardous materials emergency response plan and recommended further guidance from the SERC. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion. Mr. Tognoli stated UNLV is within a county that has a hazardous materials plan and operations plan. A discussion ensued. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ms. Pabón stated Esmeralda, Humboldt and Washoe did not submit updated hazardous materials emergency response plans and staff needs to send notification allowing 45 days for submittal of an updated plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to request staff send notification allowing 45 days for Esmeralda, Humboldt and Washoe LEPCs to submit their updated hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

B. *Discussion/Review exercise/incident reports submitted by all seventeen LEPCs

Ms. Levering advised the Committee will address each LEPC exercise/incident report submitted.

Carson City LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Carson City LEPC had two incidents of white powder at two different facilities. During one of the responses, a news reporter, an FBI agent and a Department of Public Safety (DPS) officer crossed over a hazard zone and were quarantined.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Carson City LEPC's exercise report. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Douglas LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Douglas LEPC had a full scale exercise. The report was unclear as to whether the LEPC's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) was activated in the scenario.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Douglas LEPC's exercise report. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Elko/Eureka LEPC – Ms. Levering advised this was a multicounty exercise involving law enforcement with a small hazardous materials component. Ms. Levering stated the exercise report did not state which LEPC’s plan was used.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Eureka/Elko LEPC’s exercise report with the recommendation for future exercises to be more specific about how the elements of the plan are tested and any corrective action to the plan as a result. Mr. Tognoli seconded motion which was approved unanimously.

Eureka LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Eureka LEPC had a tabletop exercise involving sulfuric acid. The LEPC does not specifically reference their plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Eureka LEPC’s exercise report with the recommendation for future exercises to be more specific about how the elements of the plan are tested and any corrective action to the plan as a result. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Humboldt LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Humboldt LEPC submitted an exercise form. Ms. Levering stated she would not call this an exercise report but rather an attempt to reconstruct LEPC meeting minutes that were not recorded. There were no exercise objectives identified or updates to the plans discussed. This report does not qualify as showing an exercise of the hazardous materials plan. Ms. Pabón advised Humboldt LEPC is out of compliance in other areas as well. For the LEPC to meet compliance, Ms. Levering recommended they schedule a tabletop exercise with goals and objectives and use their plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to request staff send notification allowing 45 days for Humboldt LEPC to schedule a tabletop exercise identifying the goals and objectives, including what the LEPC learned through the course of the event and how the LEPC’s plan was used. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lincoln LEPC – Ms. Levering stated Lincoln LEPC had an exercise where schools were evacuated.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Lincoln LEPC’s exercise. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lyon LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Lyon LEPC’s exercise went according to plan. The LEPC does not reference the plan specifically or make any recommendations to updating the plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Lyon LEPC’s exercise report. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Mineral LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Mineral LEPC’s exercise was a response to unexploded ordnance. The LEPC does not address the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD).

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Mineral LEPC's exercise report with the recommendation the LEPC add an Explosive Ordnance Disposal section and exercise reports better summarize whether updates are made to their hazardous materials emergency response plan as a result. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Nye LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Nye LEPC's exercise did not explain the scenario and there was no specific reference the plan was used.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Nye LEPC's exercise report with the recommendation on future exercise reports to include changes made to their plan and the corrective action as a result. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Pershing LEPC – Ms. Levering stated Pershing LEPC had an incident in July 2008 involving a hazardous materials response. Ms. Levering advised with regards to the crowd management, the Incident Command System (ICS) needed to be stronger.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Pershing LEPC's exercise report. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Storey LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Storey LEPC had an incident involving fuel that was accidentally poured down the sewer by a Golden Gate Petroleum Refinery employee. Storey County fined Golden Gate Petroleum \$13,000 plus the Nevada Department of Environment Protection is also going to fine the refinery. Correct notifications were made to the proper agencies and corrective actions were mentioned in the report.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Storey LEPC's incident report. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

White Pine LEPC – Ms. Levering advised White Pine LEPC's incident report notifications needed to be improved. The LEPC does not specifically reference their plan.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept White Pine LEPC's incident report with the recommendation in future exercise/incident reports to reference their hazardous materials emergency response plan. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lander LEPC – Ms. Levering stated Lander LEPC had a tabletop exercise entailing a fuel truck involved in an accident. There was little mention of the LEPC's plan. Notification, identifying the scope and securing the scene were listed.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Lander LEPC's exercise report.

Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

C. *Discussion/Review Levels of Response Questionnaires submitted by all seventeen LEPCS

Ms. Levering stated the members should have each received the questionnaires submitted by the LEPCs.

Douglas LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Douglas LEPC submitted two questionnaires, one for East Fork and one for Tahoe Douglas. Both East Fork and Tahoe Douglas are technician level, type two.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Douglas LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaires. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Elko LEPC – Ms. Levering advised she was concerned about Elko LEPC submitting a questionnaire indicating they were operations level. The LEPC selected type two but everything checked on the questionnaire was type three. Ms. Levering recommended accepting the LEPC's questionnaire contingent on submittal of a revision changing type two to three.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Elko LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire contingent on submittal of a revision changing type two to type three. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Eureka LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Eureka LEPC has identified operations level of response but lists type one elements. Some of the questionnaire is incomplete. Ms. Levering recommended the LEPC be a type three.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Eureka LEPC Level of Response Questionnaire contingent on submittal of a revision changing type one to type three. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lyon LEPC – Ms. Levering advised there were no problems with Lyon LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. They are a technician level, type one.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Lyon LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Nye LEPC – Ms. Levering advised Nye LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire did not include the attachment. The LEPC states they are a technician level, type two but without the attachment it cannot be verified.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion Nye LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire be returned and resubmitted to the SERC with an attachment. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Storey LEPC – Ms. Levering stated Storey LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire did not include the attachment. They are stating operations level, type three.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion Storey LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire be returned and resubmitted to the SERC with an attachment. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Pershing LEPC – Mr. Tognoli stated Pershing LEPC has only listed 20 awareness level people and stated they are operations level, type three. At an awareness level, they cannot go into any situation. Ms. Levering advised perhaps a level four needs to be added to the Level of Response Questionnaire.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion Pershing LEPC reevaluate their response level at awareness based on the information provided. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lincoln LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised Lincoln LEPC was at an operations level.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Lincoln LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Lander LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised Lander LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire states they are at the operations level, type three. A discussion ensued about what type the LEPC falls under. Mr. Tognoli stated it is difficult to understand what the LEPC’s capabilities are. Ms. Levering recommended accepting their questionnaire but requests Lander LEPC reconsider their level of response as awareness level as opposed to operations level based on the limited nature of their capabilities.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept Lander LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire with the recommendation they reconsider their level of response to an awareness level as opposed to an operations level based on the limited nature of their capabilities. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

White Pine LEPC – Mr. Tognoli advised White Pine LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire states they are an operations level, type three. The LEPC did not attach any supporting documents.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to accept White Pine LEPC’s Level of Response Questionnaire contingent on submittal of an attachment. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Humboldt LEPC – Mr. Kenneston stated Humboldt LEPC is at an awareness level.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Humboldt LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Carson City LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Carson City LEPC is at a technician level, type one.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Carson City LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Mineral LEPC – Mr. Kenneston stated Mineral LEPC is at an operations level, type three.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Mineral LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Clark LEPC – Mr. Kenneston advised Clark LEPC is at a technician level, type two.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to accept Clark LEPC's Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Shelley Fleming advised Churchill, Esmeralda and Washoe LEPCs did not submit a Level of Response Questionnaire.

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to request staff send notification allowing 45 days for Churchill, Esmeralda and Washoe LEPCs to submit a Level of Response Questionnaire. Mr. Kenneston seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

D. *Discussion/Review/Recommendation on possible utilization of the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) report form for LEPC reporting to the SERC

Ms. Levering advised the intent of this item was if a LEPC completed a Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) report form for the Department of Homeland Security, they could also submit the HSEEP report form to SERC in lieu of the SERC form or the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) report form. The HSEEP report form exceeds what SERC requires. Ms. Levering suggested the SERC accept the HSEEP report form in lieu of current requirements but wanted to ensure the LEPCs do not surmise they must complete the HSEEP report form for reports to the SERC. A discussion ensued.

The Planning and Training Subcommittee recommended against the replacement

of the SERC or FEMA report forms with the HSEEP report form.

Mr. Kenneston made a motion to recommend LEPCs can use the HSEEP report form in lieu of the SERC or FEMA report forms, but not replacing the SERC report form with the HSEEP report form. Mr. Tognoli seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment.

VI. *ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Tognoli made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:21 p.m.

DRAFT