

MINUTES
Nevada State Emergency Response Commission (SERC)
Planning and Training Subcommittee Meeting
Thursday, February 18, 2016 – 9:00 am

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors
Board Room
1755 East Plumb Lane, Suite 135
Reno, NV

Members Present

Carolyn Levering, Chair
Robert Fash
Richard Brenner, Ex-Officio
Brett Waters
Aaron Kenneston

Members Not Present

Patty Polish
Cherie Nevin

Staff

Stephanie Parker
Gwen Barrett
Nathan Hastings

1. CALL TO ORDER

Carolyn Levering called the meeting to order at 9:07am.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

Members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. APPROVAL OF MARCH 18, 2015 MINUTES

Carolyn Levering: Board members were sent the meeting minutes on line and have had a chance to review them. Were there any corrections, additions, deletions, concerns, problems, or complaints?

Robert Fash: Motioned to approve the minutes.

Brett Waters: Seconded the motion.

Carolyn Levering: All are in favor. Motion carries.

Stephanie Parker: We are going to have to pass that one; we have to table that one until we get the actual quorum.

Carolyn Levering: Do we not have a quorum of three?

Richard Brenner: We have one.

Stephanie Parker: We do have a quorum? The subcommittee must fall under different guidelines.

Gwen Barrett: Who made the motion?

Stephanie Parker: Robert Fash

Brett Waters: Bob made the motion and Brett Waters seconded it.

Gwen Barrett: Okay, thank you.

***A quorum was not established for approval of the March 18, 2015 minutes. Approval will be on the agenda for the March 16, 2016 meeting.**

5. EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

Carolyn Levering: Item 5, Executive Administrator's Report.

Stephanie Parker: I am really new, so this is probably going to be a hard process for you guys. I did a recent review of meeting minutes from 2015 Planning and Training Subcommittee meetings, it was requested that checklist and format of Tier II reports be taken before the Policy Committee. The checklist was brought before the Policy Committee and a final determination at the August 24 meeting in Item Number 17 which you have other there, the checklist would be a tool and not be required. Several of the LEPCs were in support of it being a great tool and not required. The format of the Tier II reports was not discussed and not on the agenda. We are working with the vendor on the database and anticipate providing training resources with the LEPCs on pulling useful reports. Training for the LEPC users, when I looked through the different submissions, all of the different formats on how they are reporting the Tier II facilities are completely different. Per the previous minutes, we are looking for standardization for reporting. A couple of LEPCS have called for assistance, but a lot haven't. I know from experience going to the Public Information and Warning Conference in Reno that I spoke with a couple of LEPC people that said they were not familiar with how to pull the reports, but they had not called SERC to ask for assistance. I have online training coming up with the database vendor and they supply monthly training to the LEPCs. There is a chance for us to get them into that mode anyway and I don't think it's because they don't want to. I think it's because they're intimidated by the system. It hasn't been addressed yet, but that's something that we are looking at addressing before I read the minutes of your previous meeting.

Brett Waters: So we are looking at a standard format as to how to, and then a cheat sheet for all the LEPCs as to how they will pull the reports, is that what you have?

Stephanie Parkes: Yes, an easier way, a step by step.

Carolyn Levering: It seems to me the vendor should make it available to build a template, so that when you go to report type there is a dropdown box that says whatever we want to call the template, you know the SERC Annual Plan Update template. The previous coordinator was to create a template.

Discussion ensued about the database updates and delays.

Stephanie Parker: The August 24, 2015 and December 18, 2015 Policy and Legislative Committee Meeting were actually joined together that came up with the minutes that you have looked at.

It also resulted in the ability of the LEPCs to implement the nine (9) key elements within a three-year period. I do not know what those nine key elements are.

Richard Brenner: Nine (9) key elements are the NRT1-A. Every plan has to have that. There are some issues with that policy because I was just talking to anyone who was reading it. In the three years before, this was to do with an actual event every three years.

Stephanie Parker: Alright and this was brought up at the January meeting too, where we went through the policy and the changes. I don't remember anybody having an issue with it.

Richard Brenner: They probably didn't know.

Stephanie Parker: That is something that we may want to address. How are they going to track it? I won't be able to track that they've met, although I can come up with some type of draft that may be useful. But if you're saying that it can't because it's federally or a state violation, then...

Richard Brenner: No, what we are saying is you have to do an exercise every year.

Stephanie Parker: Yes they still have to do an exercise every year.

Richard Brenner: Okay, so they do the exercise every year and then you address on the bottom where the comments section is. They have an exercise report where you can actually identify the corrective actions.

Carolyn Levering: You have to do your corrective actions

Richard Brenner: But the nine (9) elements are not that important from that standpoint. It is important to do an exercise every year.

Stephanie Parker: Yes, they still have to do that.

Richard Brenner: And then you're able to do a real world incident every three (3) years.

Stephanie Parker: Okay, and the feedback that they got during the meeting, because there were a couple of LEPCs that did show up, is that and I can't remember if it was John or Stacy had more knowledge about it. But they said in real world, even if we do an exercise or a real life event, it's hard to address all nine (9) key elements. So that's where they went, that's why they said well, what if we gave them up to three (3) years, and in year two (2) if you have not exercised or implemented all nine (9) key elements, you have to have done it in the third year. That was the dialogue that transpired.

Robert Fash: I think Stacy had mentioned that.

Stephanie Parker: They still have to do the exercises every year.

Richard Brenner: It just makes it difficult from your standpoint on how you're going to monitor that.

Stephanie Parker: Well, yes, they would have to do it, because they would have to say I've done this one and this. Maybe this will force them to provide more detail on the narrative on the exercise report.

Discussion ensued about the forms.

Stephanie Parker: We are trying to work on a form that LEPCs can use to help them track that they're on track, because year three (3), if you don't have all of them, then that next year you go into review; you're not in compliance.

Carolyn Levering: Well, the thing is how do you exercise a training schedule?

Richard Brenner: You can't.

Carolyn Levering: So that's the problem with the way this is written in the policy. Well, and you want to exercise the plan. You're not exercising the checklist. You can't exercise a training schedule.

Stephanie Parker: Here's another thing when we we're talking about definition, this says "provide a training program for emergency responders," the checklist that I have to provide to you guys says "is there a training schedule and an exercise schedule," In the policy, it says "the current year training schedule." So half of the people gave me a schedule, a tentative schedule for 2016, some people only addressed , yes, we have a training program and they're required to follow X, Y, and Z, but not really a training schedule.

Discussion ensued about the checklist.

Carolyn Levering: Yes, we always have people who meet the criteria of a checklist, but the quality of how they met those criteria is questionable. But we've had that conversation many times.

Stephanie Parker: So that was just one of my issues that I uncovered while going through – and I know I'm not supposed to really review the, but that's the only way I can kind of get a flavor of what was going on. So I identified that there were plans without the actual schedules, but they addressed training in their plan very vague and ambiguous. And some didn't know that some of their funding that they could get from SERC could allow them to have somebody come in and help them update their plan, so that it is appropriate and so they are doing the right things. I actually had someone from Mineral County who wants to have a schedule, and he has a very vague one. So being able to share that information with them is great.

Brett Waters: So what can actually be spaced that over three (3) years, just exercising the plan, either table top one year, full scale the next...

Stephanie Parker: Right.

Carolyn Levering: The trouble is you get some jurisdictions that just rely on the tabletops all the time and they don't really exercise the full capability of something that comes up, and so that's why, yes the idea was that they have to physically do something with functional or full scale, you know go out and

test your equipment, test your plan, you know call down your contact list, something to show that you've done more than just sit around the table and talk about your plan.

Stephanie Parker: Some people are just confused. There's been a lot of attrition going on through the counties as well. Not many people that are coming on board. Some people who may have come on board within the last few years, I had one person saying – oh no, we were told that we're an all hazard, but it doesn't have to be a hazard scenario for exercises or training and stuff like that. Being able to get them clarification on that; that some of the stuff is specifically hazardous, it is hazardous materials but the DOT can't support unless it is hazardous materials and it's really brining those people, along with myself up to par and understand what's required and what's expected.

And some people sent stuff in piece by piece so I may have missed something. But the checklist I went through again, so on the spreadsheet that you have the summary over here, even though these things don't, yes, these things are not all these things, they don't think are listed in the policy, so some of them I just have to follow up with.

Carolyn Levering: So in the box, in the check off, if not check off.

Stephanie Parker: That means that I don't have it, I'm waiting for it, yes.

Carolyn Levering: So I just want to make sure I understand. Churchill doesn't have a training schedule, exercise schedule.....

Stephanie Parker: Yes, they have a plan. In the plan itself, they didn't submit anything in 2016 addressing 2016 on under their schedule.

Carolyn Levering: Alright, so all of their required annual updates they did not submit?

Stephanie Parker: Correct.

Carolyn Levering: That they're supposed to update the contact list annually and they did not do that, right.

Stephanie Parker: Right.

Carolyn Levering: Is that what I'm hearing here?

Stephanie Parker: Right, for the emergency contact, which is different than the membership roster, yes.

Carolyn Levering: And Clark is missing the training and exercise schedule.

Stephanie Parker: Right. They're counting on us and I've gotten mixed messages. They're only giving us things that are changed. So in their plan, Washoe County for example, they have a plan, well, I think I checked them because although they didn't submit an annual emergency contact, I think it was, they have a standard emergency contact? That number's never going to change on how they actually implement; that's addressed in the plan - that the entire plan was reviewed, and I think it was done, I can't remember who it was, but it's not individuals.

Robert Fash: So Washoe was the only one that really has a complete package, at least as far as your first review?

Stephanie Parker: I would say probably the most thorough that I addressed to my understanding; I went to the letter and maybe not to the spirit or the intent, do you know what I mean? Everything is addressed on their NRT-1A. Some of the things are existing in their plans that I may not have received new of because it didn't change, do you know what I mean? Like is said some things are not – like everything is addressed on their NRT-1A. Some of the things are existing in their plans that I may not have received new, because of the change.

Richard Brenner: A lot of the training schedule or the exercise schedule they usually have a statement, do they not?

Stephanie Parker: Yes. There's normally in their plan a statement an FDA or an OSHA required training, but it's not a schedule. So on the spreadsheet it says schedule, and so are we going by schedule or by the policy where it has policy schedule that the spreadsheet has schedule, but a lot of the plans have a plan – a program. So if I was to meet certain guidelines of the training class. I leave that up to you guys. So in other words, in lieu of an exercise, they can use a real event, and that is in policy.

Discussion ensued about which counties had real event exercises.

Carolyn Levering: The first thing we should do is go through the exercise reports and read for clarity, find out who's doing what out there and whether they meet the requirements that they exercise for the new requirements.

Brett Waters: So reviewing Stephanie's report? We're on item number 6?

Carolyn Levering: Well, unless you've got anything else to...

Stephanie Parker: That's all.

Carolyn Levering: So I think we'll be moving onto this section here, Section 6. Recess for schedule review.

Gwen Barrett: Carolyn, is this the portion that I do not take records on?

Carolyn Levering: Yes, we're just going to go through these, and then we'll come back on the record and talk about each one.

6. REVIEW OF EXERCISE/INCIDENT REPORTS SUBMITTED BY LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEES (LECS) AND STATE AGENCIES

Carolyn Levering: We're coming back from our recess of exercise review of exercise reports. Welcome new attendees, Nathan Hastings and Aaron Kenneston. We're on item 6 of the agenda. We've just reviewed our exercise incident reports. We're going to go through them in alpha order down the spreadsheet to briefly describe the nature of the exercise or real world event that was submitted and make recommendations as to whether the exercise that was reported and submitted to us meets the reporting requirements for the purposes of this committee and we'll take the vote action for the on

each jurisdiction report. Any corrective actions, Stephanie will follow up with those jurisdictions to get them back into compliance with the requirements for doing their annual exercise activity. Any questions? We will start with Carson City's report.

Brett Waters: First thing is we had a real event, a structure fire at the hazardous materials plant. And they had identified their operations brought in the hazmat team interfaced with some of the other local agencies to assist them; East Fork was brought in for recon, used the CS team, did some modeling, looks like there was probably 44 fire personnel, six (6) law enforcement, 14 public works, Emergency Management, one elected official, and one reporting official. So it was a good interface with everybody. Evacuated roughly 200 people.

Carolyn Levering: What was the material?

Brett Waters: Fifty gallons of nitric acid, and 50 gallons of hydrochloric acid, and the room was on fire.

Carolyn Levering: On fire, okay.

Brett Waters: The facility reported 500 gallons of 623 agents, 100 pounds of ferric chloride, 25 pounds of hydrochloric acid and 600 pounds of nitric acid, what was on site. So they had a real potential. It looks like they did have a good real event and it turned out to be not too bad, that was recommended. This one meets the criteria.

Carolyn Levering: So you're making a motion?

Brett Waters: I want to make a motion that we accept Carson City's exercise for 2015.

Carolyn Levering: Will you verify the date of the event?

Brett Waters: It was 11/13/2015.

Carolyn Levering: I just want to make sure. Alright do we have a second on the motion?

Aaron Kenneston: I'll second it.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you. Any discussion? Questions? Nothing.

Stephanie Parker: I have a question. So in the report are we identifying which parts of the NRT-1A and...

Richard Brenner: We don't do that, no.

Stephanie Parker: We don't?

Carolyn Levering: No, that's never been done before.

Richard Brenner: That's part of the plan, not the exercise, that's why there's so much confusion, that's why we had our discussion earlier. This is for the plan not so much the exercise.

Carolyn Levering: Just the fact that they responded to a hazmat incident and used the hazmat plan is really what we are looking for.

Nathan Hastings: I've got a question on that too, it's more just sort of curiosity than anything. How did they provide - or I guess it's report by report by report, but for example on this one, how did they describe and is it pretty similar to the typical report how they applied the plans were instilled in the exercise? And can you describe really briefly for me how they would kind of describe their...

Carolyn Levering: In general, typically in the narrative of the scenarios, whether it's an exercise or a real event in the narrative they'll say - they'll describe the use of the communications plan as far as notification and warning. And they'll talk about setting up for and establishing a safe corridor, decontamination and examination and talk about the plan - portions of their plan to utilize. So the elements of the plan that are put into play are part of the narrative description.

Nathan Hastings: So they're not necessarily explicitly saying our plan said we would do this.

Carolyn Levering: Some of them actually do, but not all of them.

Nathan Hastings: But it's - sometimes it's kind of a natural thing that they're just explaining what they did and it happens to fit what's in the plan.

Carolyn Levering: Right.

Richard Brenner: How they used the plan, and you know the corrective action.

Carolyn Levering: I would say this is more natural right, instead of focusing on the combined we're just making sure that they actually...

Nathan Hastings: Yes, no, that makes sense. I was just curious. Cool, thank you.

Carolyn Levering: Yes. Any other questions? Alright, all in favor? [ayes around], opposed? Motion carries. Churchill.

Robert Fash: Churchill County, the event date is 5/9 of 2015. This was an actual event, a natural gas leak in a residential area. A number of participants, four (4) appointed officials, one (1) elected, two (2) emergency management, 30 fire, four (4) health and medical, 15 law enforcement, four (4) LEPC, six (6) private industry, one (1) public information, four (4) public works, eight (8) school and four (4) others went through with us, and hospital.

Carolyn Levering: This was a table top?

Brett Waters: No, this was real.

Carolyn Levering: Oh, a real event

Robert Fash: Churchill looks like it was a real event. And so this was - they had 150 people they note down here as evacuated. This was May 9th, 2015, when a suspected natural gas leak. And by 21:00 hours a strong odor of gas right off of Highway 50. There were 100 residential units, initial - on first

arriving, law enforcement officer established an IC, and they talked about using their hazardous materials emergency response plan. This was in numerous times, articulating where they were using it, and how they actually associated with the responsibility to the plan. So different than the others, where generally what we were talking about. They did a good job with interface to fire department to IC as soon as they arrived, the EOC was contacted, they cut in with the school system for evacuation shelter, to help, Red Cross was notified, the hospital was notified, and worked with them. Ultimately 60 residents were placed on buses for transport to shelters. The Southwest Gas Company cut in because it was their product, and we went through their product and have a separate corrective action form talking about just using their hazardous material emergency response plan and having the IC doing a better job there. They opened up the back of a fire department vehicle to give a unified command with law enforcement but it was noisy. So, an actual experience. And so they decided that they're probably going to get into one of their - I guess they got a Sheriff 's command vehicle and they were going to use that. The EOC handled all the communications, which went really well, but they needed to do it by cell phone and identified that the cell phones may go down, they needed to establish radio link as a backup. They delayed activating the EOC, they might want to do that again because they know that it was more a municipal support function, and the apparatus placement was not as good as it could be, so they identified that they will do a better job of that in the future.

Carolyn Levering: Excellent.

Brett Waters: All in all I would recommend the approval of Churchill County's exercise for 2015 dated 5/9/2015 as a real event. Yes, that is a motion.

Carolyn Levering: We have a motion? Do we have a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you. Any discussion or questions about Churchill County's report? All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed? Motion carries. Clark. Keeping you busy today. Clark.

Brett Waters: Clark County's event was 10/21 of '15, functional table top. Identified - focused on mitigation, response and recovery. And we had one (1) emergency management person, four (4) fire people, two (2) law enforcement people, one (1) PC, one (1) from Public Works and 12 other which were Kinder Morgan which is the energy department that they used with this exercise, as well as NOAH, EPA, Air Force, NV Energy, Union Pacific with their crew and PHMSA for natural gas. Tabletop scenario was a release of 671,000 gallons of unleaded fuel from an underground fuel pipeline, operated by Kinder Morgan. Location of the incident was in the desert area just outside of the Las Vegas Valley. Kinder Morgan pipeline operates two pipelines throughout the southwest including Clark County. The participants in the exercise include Union Pacific, EPA Water Reclamation, Las Vegas Valley Water District, NV Energy, NHP, Las Vegas Metro, Clark County Fire, Nellis, and Kinder Morgan, the specialized service, NOAH and Clark County Firefighter Hazardous Safety Administration. So we had the initial notification through 911 dispatch center, the notifications were made there, response is Incident Command came through the lead agency which established a unified command, which managed ICS, man staffed positions were all filled. And then incident and action plan of time was established using various ICS forms, cleanup and recovery Kinder Morgan has contracted or private company to come in and do the cleanup and mitigate the event. During the exercise, discussion was focused on safety with certain personnel working in the area, proper PPE, atmospheric monitoring, environment captured coming from the ground, and plus additional resource. Parts of the plan were referenced, supervised the

necessary guidance with emergency responders. So I also have the Kinder Morgan has a critical participant's manual with a list of who was there, an overview of the picture and of course the scenario itself. So I would make a motion that Clark County's exercise event for 10/21/15 meets the criteria.

Aaron Kenneston: I will second that motion.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions or comments about...

Brett Waters: What was identified I would say is the after action because the oil and that's the plan we referred to provide the necessary guidance for the initial responders, so I do take that as referenced identified with the plan, didn't specifically identify corrective action.

Carolyn Levering: Any other questions? No; all in favor [ayes around]. Opposed? Motion carries.

Douglas County. I reviewed this plan. They did a functional exercise dated June 3rd, 2015. And this scenario; at the Bentley Biofields Transfer Station and it started off as a medical emergency causing an accident. A vehicle crashes into the pumping station, it's a fixed facility with a transportation twist. But really what becomes a problem is extricating the victim who can't get out of the vehicle on their own. The chemical in question is BTDE, don't ask me to try and pronounce the actual word. The tank is surrounded by a containment system - their goals for the exercise, identify the substance, mitigate immediate life safety, finding the leaking product and identification attachment, and preventing contamination. They did determine they had good communications but some of their after action includes doing additional in-service training for personnel for the new equipment prior to placing it in service, and they determined they needed additional training on spill containment and use of foam footballs, I don't know where that term comes from. It looks like there were upwards of 50 people involved in the exercise overall. I don't know, as Chair can I motion? I move that we accept Douglas County's exercise as per the findings for our committee. Anyone second?

Robert Fash: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you Bob. Any questions or comments on Douglas County? All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed? Motion carries.

Elko Alright, Elko, we didn't have a report for Elko. The last report was 2014. And I assume...

Richard Brenner: Are they working on trying to put something together?

Stephanie Parker: Well, he said he was dropping everything off yesterday and he did while I was not there. I was conducting an interview, but I was able to send an email.

Brett Waters: What is the requirement timing wise?

Stephanie Parker: On January 31st.

Brett Waters: But is it like you have one every two (2) years or something.

Richard Brenner: Every year.

Carolyn Levering: Every year.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay so, got it, 2014.

Carolyn Levering: Alright, so note for the record, Elko requires communication from staff.

Next is Esmeralda. There wasn't much for Brett and I to review here. They did send in a reporting form indicating a full-scale exercise dated August 29th, but there is no narrative description whatsoever, so we can't determine eligibility of this exercise as to whether it complied with the requirements. So we need to decide if we send notification sent to them to provide additional information.

Richard Brenner: Is there anything that they mentioned, I mean is it chemicals or do they...

Carolyn Levering: Well, they're using old reporting forms, and they're indicating a total of 28 participants. They're saying - you know they circled that it was under the terrorism box, chemical. Indicated that it was highway, that there were two (2) appointed officials, and two (2) elected emergency management, nine (9) fire, eight (8) health medical, two (2) law, six (6) LEPC, and ten (10) public participants and also 10 under other; fire, EMS, NDOT, law enforcement that...

Richard Brenner: But under the corrective action, they don't have...

Carolyn Levering: There's nothing, there's nothing, no narrative, no...No idea what action, what scenario it was supposed to be, whether they followed their plan or what references so it requires...

Aaron Kenneston: Will you get that eastern part of the state under control?

Carolyn Levering: Alright, so we'll need to have staff address that as well then. Next on the list, Eureka.

Brett Waters: Eureka had a tabletop on 4/2 of '15, that was a tabletop, and they focused on response. They did a local declaration. This was a hazardous material primary at a fixed facility. They brought in two (2) elected officials, two (2) emergency management, two (2) health and medical, one (1) law enforcement, one (1) LEPC, one (1) private industry and one (1) Public Works, and one (1) DOT. They took the functional area and tested the form itself, and went through and checked off everything that they had done with the event from response, recovery and communications...

Carolyn Levering: They use a really old form.

Brett Waters: I was going to say, I've never seen this form, I was going to ask where it came from.

Carolyn Levering: That's like the FEMA form. It's like wow.

Brett Waters: They indicated that they had held everything from communications, coordination and control, emergency and public information, damage assessment, health and medical, individual family assistance, public safety, public works, transportation, resource management and warning, they did not use an outdoor indoor, I guess. They did not indicate any corrective actions upon this.

Carolyn Levering: Okay. So we used to use this form a long time ago, but nobody would take the time to fill it out.

Brett Waters: They do about the checkmarks.

Carolyn Levering: Wow.

Brett Waters: And then we have - then I have a round of some emails that if someone wants to just take a look at this. Then we have the narrative implementation of the hazardous materials emergency response plan. The scenario was a hazmat spill of sulfuric acid. 911 was called about a hazmat spill, about 60 gallons. Sheriff of Pleasant Valley, fire, EMS were all called. The questions that they were reviewing; was the spill contained, notification, nearby populated areas have they been notified, has any neutralizing agent been applied, prior explosive been ruled out, soil in the neighboring area and the river has been contained, areas around the facility require testing and was the spill requiring that EPA plans of actions and established command. Realized the Eureka County hazardous materials file plan, proper and communications, the DOT and the first facility supervisor. Scenario - or summary, spill was 93 percent sulfuric acid. The exercise facility of training and awareness of residents, incident and whether we could kind of - you know like to see - see exercise participants through the commission meeting, they used for the facility, scenario mapping. The facility supervisor was a participant and talked about when - what the facility has on site. The spill was over 50 gallons; of course the facility was notified. And then it talks just a little bit more about what the facility has.

Carolyn Levering: Sounds good.

Brett Waters: Yes. I would make a motion that Eureka County exercise for 4/2 of 2015 be accepted as meeting all the requirements.

Carolyn Levering: Do we have a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second it.

Carolyn Levering: Are there any questions on Eureka's report? All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed? Motion carries. Humboldt.

Robert Fash: I have Humboldt.

Carolyn Levering: Now, I have two dates back here. Do they have a...

Stephanie Parker: They did two different ones, just two different...

Carolyn Levering: Oh, I see, they have a real event on 8/20/15 and an exercise on 16th.

Robert Fash: I have one here for the postal exercise.

Carolyn Levering: Is that January 2016? There should be a date in the upper right corner.

Robert Fash: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Okay. Very good.

Robert Fash: 98 people did participate. There were a number of agencies that took place for the functional exercise with - it involved a mercury contamination in a local school. So it did involve a local school and a number of neighboring agencies. It showed good experience and cooperation. Everything appeared to be in order, the only suggestion; indicate that they didn't necessarily reference the operations plan.

Carolyn Levering: They don't refer to the plan at all.

Robert Fash: No, not necessarily. You know I have looked through this a number of times. There's a very long narrative, they explained everything that took place and how they approached the incident. They followed a particular procedure and plans and that's the only thing I found wrong. But overall, they outlined their functional outside very well. They also identified a number of things that they need to do in the future, especially dealing with the students and all of the number of parents that get involved when their children are talking to family. So as far as lines of communication and possible using the media to get could get the word out, there's no need to worry, but we have to go through the steps to make sure the children don't bring the toxin home with them.

Carolyn Levering: Your kids are playing with toxic heavy metal.....

Robert Fash: Overall, I don't know if there are any other questions or things like that, but I would make a recommendation that we accept this.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, that's a motion, and do we have a second on that?

Robert Fash: Yes it is.

Carolyn Levering: Do we have a second on that?

Aaron Kenneston: I'll second that motion.

Carolyn Levering: You seconded that, any questions for Humboldt's exercise report? All in favor? [Ayes around] Opposed? Motion carries. Lander.

Robert Fash: Unfortunately Lander's presents some challenges. They indicated in their cover sheet that it was a full-scale exercise, that it took place on November 4th, 2015, and there were were 42 participants overall, one (1) from emergency management, four (4) from fire, six (6) health medical, two (2) from human services and eight (8) from the LEPC. Their submittal was not signed and/or dated. Looking at the narrative, they did not indicate anything - that it was a full-scale exercise, training was a tabletop exercise in 2015 and then underneath this it says there was no tabletop exercise performed.

Carolyn Levering: Oh, that's a little contradictory.

Robert Fash: They've gone into - this was a local event including EMS local. They never really identified the agencies involved.

Carolyn Levering: Or even the use of a plan.

Robert Fash: No. There was indication there was some type of brush fire inside a trailer, you know that off gas, but other than that they said they referred to Lander's County ELT at times and worked with all entities to their strengths. That's very lacking in detail. There's no action steps identified or corrective actions as part of the learning process identified. I cannot support this.

Carolyn Levering: Again, I think I was remiss probably with-we didn't take a vote on Esmeralda. So what I think then what we'll need to file as a motion -to not accept the Lander report as recently described and to direct staff to communicate this with them for deficiency and correction by within whatever 45 days or whatever. So that would be the motion that we need.

Robert Fash: Motion to not accept.

Carolyn Levering: Yes, we're not accepting this. Do we have a second on that? Were you able to capture all that, Gwen?

Brett Waters: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Very good. Any other discussion about the Lander report? All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed.

I would like to go back to Esmeralda because they did submit a report but they did not have a narrative. But they did submit something. I would like to make the motion to not accept Esmeralda's report due to the lack of a narrative to describe the actual activities that took place and whether they completed the exercise. And that's my motion.

Aaron Kenneston: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you Aaron. Any other discussion on Esmeralda? All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed. And then Elko, there was no report. So there's no action to take.

Nathan Hastings: Although is there an action to - if a letter needs to be...

Carolyn Levering: It's purely administrative at this point, yes. You know they failed to send anything at all, it's administrative compliance this year.

Richard Brenner: It is important that you send that 45-day correction notice? So I mean the clock is ticking.

Nathan Hastings: From when they get the letter?

Stephanie Parker: Yes, from when I make the notification to them. So if they dropped their stuff off yesterday, we have to take questions to move forward. Still I will give them a commissioned officer from the subcommittee, they have 45 days to submit that, which will probably be sooner, but I think that it will be sooner. There were several others.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, Lincoln.

Robert Fash: Okay, I have Lincoln also. What they submitted was a full-scale exercise that took place June 15th, 2015. It was a hazardous material event - at a fixed facility but also involving permutation. They indicated that there were 46 participants and the event actually centered around the municipal swimming pool, which had a spill of chlorine.

Carolyn Levering: Or it was an indoor pool?

Robert Fash: They don't say. So they did have a few people that went down to the pool, and a few people that complained of fumes inside. This scenario of exercise also involved some city officials. They did identify a number of volunteer agencies involved, the OSHA, the Sheriff's office of Lincoln County. They didn't in their narrative - they didn't indicate - they did indicate they went through the basics of their operations plan. Their action - reported actions showed that they did identify that they have a lot of issues. One of the things that they did say they need practice their apparatus drill and transport so you know things like that. So they've identified communicating with communications between and things like that.

Carolyn Levering: They've come a long way in the last couple of years.

Robert Fash: It is my recommendation that we accept.

Carolyn Levering: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Aaron Kenneston: Second .

Carolyn Levering: Any questions on Lincoln? No. All in favor. [ayes around] Opposed. Motion carries. Lyon.

Richard Brenner: Lyon had two (2) forms that they submitted, and I'll go with the latest which was 11/9/2015, and that was a functional exercise. They had a total of 15 participants. This one I thought was quite creative. It was a transportation type accident.

Carolyn Levering: Functional exercise with 15 people?

Richard Brenner: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Okay.

Richard Brenner: Well, it was actually the Quad County hazmat team that they pulled together. So I'm giving a little more detail. This one was kind of interesting because it was actually a - it was a tractor-trailer that was a mobile meth lab. And they also had marijuana growing in there too. They also had an infant in the car seat in the front, and they had a person in the back of the truck that was unconscious. And so they actually decided to give this as a hazmat incident. The hazmat team went in and they identified the different section of the hazmat plan that they used. They also had an after action review where they talked about some of the problems they had, collected information, and when we have an infant involved there is a whole process there, with rescuing the victim and they could have slowed down afterwards, but they indicated that was going too fast, and they were going to slow this process down. I would recommend that we approve this Lyon County exercise and in compliance.

Carolyn Levering: Do we have a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Very good, any questions on Lyon County? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Mineral.

Richard Brenner: Mineral County - I have Mineral and they actually had a real world event. So it happened 10/27/2015

Carolyn Levering: So the 10/27/15?

Richard Brenner: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Is a real event?

Richard Brenner: They had a real event. They have a local declaration. They actively - got called to an incident where they found in a storage garage some dynamite that was sweating and blasting caps and so what they did was the fire department worked with the DOD people. They mentioned about the hazmat plan and how they identified getting in touch with the Sheriff and setting up an IC and coordinating with the military. They did a good job in talking about that. Corrections; they really didn't mention corrections, but in their final statement they actually do talk that they reviewed all the policies and procedures to see if there were any corrections, so I think they tried to do a good job in identifying. They had a total of 22 participants that responded to this real world event.

Carolyn Levering: They had DOD?.

Aaron Kenneston: Military, Hawthorne

Brett Waters: They had a couple people from the Civil Air Patrol, emergency management, fire, medical, three (3) law enforcement, three (3) LEPC, and Public Works. It's signed and I would recommend approval of this exercise report and it meets our intent. That would be my motion

Carolyn Levering: Okay. Do we have a second on that?

Aaron Kenneston: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions or discussion on Mineral County? All in favor? [Ayes around] Opposed. Motion carries. Thank you. Nye, Nye County. What happened to Nye this year?

October 18th, 2015, Nye - obviously, I know what happened in Nye County on these date. Unfortunately what they attached isn't very descriptive. So I wish they had provided...

Robert Fash: Is that the incident with the...

Carolyn Levering: This is Beatty incident.

Stephanie Parker: Well, it's like 203 pages total with all the agencies there who participated, and so I got a little parts from two or three people I thought.

Carolyn Levering: Yes, what's missing, I mean obviously we've got the letter from DEM giving them full scale exercise credit. And we've got an introduction, the events that occurred had been categorized as a full-scale exercise. Events received exercise credit for real world events, known as Nye County flooding and Nye County hazmat fire, US Ecology that occurred on successive days in Beatty, but there's no description of the activities that meets with the hazmat plan, I have a problem with this one because yeah, we know they implemented the plan, but there's nothing in here that says what they did.

Discussion ensued about the lack of documentation.

Aaron Kenneston: You know it's easy to be in a committee and be harsh, you know I - maybe it's an education thing. You know my sense is that they're trying to cover maybe many requirements with that event, and perhaps that's why they asked for a letter and maybe that's going to be - somehow they're going to get credit for an exercise somewhere and they're going to you know do many things, and maybe they probably even had a disaster declaration. But you know somehow we need to communicate that what we're looking for from the hazardous materials perspective is we always want a narrative, some proof that you're using your plan, you know the other things were probably appropriate, maybe for other committees, but not for this group, right?

Carolyn Levering: Yes, I agree with you, because you know the thing I wrote down on the back of this, what corrective actions were identified. We all know there were a ton of corrective actions identified, but they don't even reference any of them in here. So I guess - I mean I hate to not accept the report, but I don't know how I can accept this report in its current form.

Aaron Kenneston: I agree. I just get the sense that they came in with this broad brush and maybe the same report has been sent to two or three agencies, but you know we're not picking on anybody, but we all just need to once a year let SERC know that we've exercised our emergency plan, and here's what we found and that doesn't do that.

Carolyn Levering: And I think they have these reports done, so I guess this is what my motion will be as to not accept Nye County's report, to request additional information regarding a brief descriptive narrative of the event, how their county hazmat plan was utilized for this incident, and a description of corrective actions that were identified. That's what this committee needs and it's just not in this report. So with the 45 days to respond. So that's my motion for Nye County.

Aaron Kenneston: I second that motion.

Carolyn Levering: All right, other discussion?

Aaron Kenneston: Well, I'll just add. I don't know if there is a way, you know I don't know how we communicate this, but you know it would be nice when we communicated that we say you know we...

Carolyn Levering: We recognize...

Aaron Kenneston: We recognize, you know we appreciate the hard work they're doing but administratively we just all need to show that we're learning and growing and improving our plan.

Carolyn Levering: I agree. Because I know Vance is working really, really hard with this stuff. I totally appreciate it. Any other comments? Okay. All in favor? [ayes around] Opposed. Motion carries.

Pershing County tabletop identified. I like this one because they actually did cite portions of their hazmat plan that they utilized, so this scenario was a train derailment scenario. And they actually ran through the scenario three separate times with different variances, and so they started off with a relatively inert material that they saw it was mostly an identification exercise, where they would have to identify the material and possible fire in their fuel tanks, accessing both sides of the tracks for this issue. And their second scenario, physical damage to the fire house building and hazmat equipment trailer was involved in that scenario. And so it was like an increasing response issue. The third scenario was a deadly material in the scenario, so not as inert as the original scenarios went through. So they combined a lot of their hazmat and EMS in this exercise. But I liked you know they reference an annex, you know how their response to the hazmat incident occurred. They referenced pages 21 and 22 for the response checklist, and also talked about mutual aid, reaching out for additional response. They even went as far out to Churchill, Fallon, Fernley, are referenced in there as well. But I thought it was a pretty good report and they even attached their sign-in roster, so you can see all the people that participated in this activity, and they did identify in their corrective actions that they didn't have equipment to decon patients before having them access to hospitals. So I thought that something they you know wanted to look into is pre-hospital decon with authorities. I thought it was good. So my motion is to accept Pershing County's annual report. Second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions, discussion? All in favor? [Ayes around].

Storey. Well, this was a quad county exercise, Storey report dated October 17th. They utilized the civil support team in this exercise. It was a fixed facility scenario. Interesting unique factor to the exercise is they employed the use of a drone device with a camera on it, as part of their exercise scenario. They actually utilized the drone to get images of the incident area for command personnel data and of course the personnel into the area, and then they continued to use the drone to document the activities of the exercise. The spill was 250 pounds of hydrochloric acid, there were a couple of victims involved, they go into detail over their entry. They found that there were some glitches in dispatching, victims were not getting the communications that they should have been getting when they're relating to medical attention. Some minor communications breakdowns and they felt that there were no issues for the use of their response plan that exercise routinely, a lot of interactive communications, they cooperated, and they attached details regarding the exercise. So I make a motion to accept Storey County's exercise report. Is there a second?

Robert Fash: I second it.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions on Storey County? Aaron.

Aaron Kenneston: I shouldn't be, but you know this is an unrelated issue, but I just think we have to be careful, you know when we put in an official report that we're using drones, for a public safety agency to fly a drone, you have to have FAA approval, you have to have a thing called a COA, Certificate of Authorization, you know in coordination with the tower. There's a tendency I think for people that believe that the same rules apply to a private citizen with a little hobby device, apply to public safety.

They don't. There are big differences. We can really - this is just in a general sense, we can really get ourselves in trouble as public safety officials if we bring private drones into play. And we all have the temptation to do it, because it's new technology and maybe it can help. So I just say that.

Carolyn Levering: So they didn't say whose drone they used.

Aaron Kenneston: Good point.

Carolyn Levering: I was assuming it belonged to the civil support team.

Aaron Kenneston: And perhaps the federal government has a COA or the civil support team to fly in air space, I'll make that presumption and let it die.

Carolyn Levering: I am with you there. No, you're right the whole drone issue is a massive problem all over the country.

Discussion ensued about drones.

Carolyn Levering: Any other comments? All in favor. [Ayes around]. Motion carries. Washoe.

Brett Waters: Washoe County was listed as a real event as well as a look forward exercise. This is a real event dated February 3rd, 2015 declaration a clinical biological event as a material spill at this facility. They had one (1) communications person, one (1) risk management, 13 for fire, three (3) for health and medical, one (1) for law enforcement and also information through Public Works, some contractors. This was an actual occurrence where two people were injured, 16 were evacuated. The event occurred with the deployment of the hazmat triad team. Citizens were evacuated. The EMS was and law enforcement was deployed. Public Works blocked roadways, health district consulting, and contractor support. There were 23 LEPC people and three (3) contractors were involved in a suspected chlorine gas event in an apartment building. Gas smell indicated it was probably chlorine gas, found a gallon of bleach, and an unknown quantity of muriatic acid poured into an exterior drain. Police secured the area, received the fire department command, hazmat units arrived, decon line was established as a precaution, transport and communications, 16 others it looks like were evaluated and not transported. Hazmat team was ready to go, health district was brought in to help the contractors on the pipes. After the review of this incident, the LEPC decided to submit this real world event as an exercise. Appropriate notifications to the level two incident occurred to dispatch prior to EMS, Public Works, public information and emergency management. Triad was used, the two patients were treated and released. The plan was validated. So I would make a motion to accept Washoe County's February 3rd, 2015 actual event as meeting the exercise requirements.

Carolyn Levering: Second for that?

Robert Fash: I'll second that.

Aaron Kenneston: Speaking on behalf of Washoe County. We hadn't submitted a real world one for credit in quite some time. It was a good drill. You'll see that one of the biggest things that came out is when we updated our plan this year, we included contact numbers for private support companies. Prior to that, I don't know why we had never done it. We really didn't have numbers in there for HT Lowell and these other people. So that was one thing that came out of it, it makes it a little quicker

when we do ask for backup from private folks. It was a good real world thing, but I guess we can also consider it a drill.

Carolyn Levering: Awesome. Alright, any other comments on the Washoe report? All in favor? [Ayes around]. Motion carries. White Pine.

Richard Brenner: I did White Pine. White Pine was a full scale exercise on 12/9 of 2015. They had an exposure; the chemical was hydrogen sulfite that they chose. And it was a hazardous material fixed facility. They had 102 participants, good golly, that's impressive.

Carolyn Levering: It's all of White Pine.

Richard Brenner: Private industry is 75. Did a really good job of writing out the briefing from the standpoint of who the drill participants were, the objectives, whether they were met or not met, I really liked that format, it made it really easy. The timeline was there too, and then you also had your strengths and weaknesses, your opportunities, squat analysis basically. So the corrective actions were listed.

Carolyn Levering: It should be held up as a standard exercise.

Richard Brenner: Well, everybody's a little bit different and you know from the standpoint of what they can work on. What we've gotten in the past is nothing like this from White Pine. Good job. So I make the motion that we approve this exercise as approved for White Pine County.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, we have a motion, a second?

Aaron Kenneston: I'll second that, Aaron.

Gwen Barrett: Can Richard make a motion?

Richard Brenner: I don't know if I can or not. Because I'm an ex-officio, so that's why I haven't done it.

Aaron Kenneston: Oh, well how about if I make that motion.

Robert Fash: And I'll second.

Gwen Barrett: And Bob second. Okay.

Carolyn Levering: Did you want to expand anything in additional detail on that.

Brett Water: No, we actually had four (4) exercises this last year. This was the only one that was hazmat related, but the setting in the hospital turned out very well and our exercise where we were dispensing shots which you have everybody working together and getting public information out. This worked out really well. This next year, we're actually going to do a more significant and full-scale event. Brett Waters went on to explain ideas for their next event.

Richard Brenner: Good job, though. The exercises I think that really get the community involvement are just wonderful.

Brett Water: The new people that came in really took a part in it.

Richard Brenner: Good job.

Crosstalk

Carolyn Levering: Very good, thank you. All in favor? [Ayes around]. Motion carries. So Nevada DPBH.

Stephanie Parker: She brought up a good point, I went back to check our motions and saw a few that I think we need to correct.

Carolyn Levering: Yes, because I think Richard made a couple.

Stephanie Parker: Yes, there were two of them Lyon and Mineral.

Richard Brenner: I've done it in the past.

Stephanie Parker: All right, I don't know why you're ex-officio though.

Richard Brenner: Because this Committee is actually part of the Funding Committee, and that's really why. So that's why they did it. So in the past we've done it. Or, have done it, last year, and the years previously before that.

Nathan Hastings: I don't know. I'd have to do some research on that. I mean...

Stephanie Parker: Just to be safe, to err on the side of caution. There was a motion made by Mr. Brenner to approve the Lyon County exercise report and to meet the requirement and Robert Fash seconded that.

Brett Water: I would like to ratify the motion to approve Lyon County exercise report.

Robert Fash: I will second.

Carolyn Levering: Any other discussion on Lyon County? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Alright, was there another one did you say?

Stephanie Parker: Mineral County.

Aaron Kenneston: We're on a roll.

Brett Water: I move to ratify Mineral County as presented.

Carolyn Levering: A second?

Robert Fash: I'll second it.

Carolyn Levering: Any discussion? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Are we better? Alright.

So I have an exercise report for jurisdiction that's listed as State DPS, and assuming that matches up to what is the spreadsheet says is Nevada DPBH.

Aaron Kenneston: Behavioral Health.

Carolyn Levering: Yeah, but there two of them. I mean the dates match. Or is it State Fire Marshal? I don't know. So yes, I'm not sure which - okay. So which report is for Behavioral Health?

Stephanie Parker: That's State Fire Marshal.

Carolyn Levering: Okay.

Stephanie Parker: And then where's the other one? Sorry.

Carolyn Levering: I'm looking for Behavioral Health.

Stephanie Parker: And they used the same event too, that event in Mineral County, right? So I have to tell you that I think we better not get into that event report, so we may have to table them. They do have after action, report that was included with the plan.

Aaron Kenneston: From Behavioral Health?

Stephanie Parker: Behavioral Health, yes.

Aaron Kenneston: Well, I am probably the contrarian on this and I've said this at almost every meeting I've ever been to. But I am sure against these state agencies coming in and having access to the money, especially when we're turning around and cutting local jurisdictions from \$30,000 to \$25,000, and I know that you know the one coming up, the UNLV one is near and dear to Richard's heart too. Our university is part of our LEPC, in fact they just reported this morning, that's why I was late. So I just - let me just for the record, I sure am not in favor of these state agencies coming in and you know that clearly they don't have affidavit of publication, they don't have LEPC membership, they don't have by-laws, I mean they just come in and present things and ask for money. And I love them dearly on a personal level, but on a profession level I just - I think - I sure encourage the SERC to focus on 17 counties, these agencies are all part within the county, they have a LEPC, they should be working with their LEPCs. Thank you for your time.

Richard Brenner: I know, we have reporting procedures...

Stephanie Parker: We have - yes, policies and procedures which they already have been included and they shouldn't get any?...

Richard Brenner: Well, it really occurred, in past history to help, you know the LEPCs were on this account then what happened was United We Stand presented to the Legislature and that was dictated more by the Legislature. And that's when they also mentioned LEPC and State agencies.

Aaron Kenneston: We got the zero United We Stand grant dollars last year and...

Richard Brenner: Well, that's how the State agencies got drawn into this, and now with the NAC they're moving more towards the combination - and I think it's prioritized and...

Stephanie Parker: That's a priority and as far as the funding sources I know United We Stand is behind the base. So now we've started asking LEPCs to help market. They make United We Stand license plates to build up funds for them. But I mean that's an opportunity that they have.

Aaron Kenneston: That's nice. I'll get a bumper sticker.

Stephanie Parker: Yes, \$30,000 you can't...

Discussion ensued about the license plates.

Aaron Kenneston: I'm sorry, I'll just make one more comment, and I promise I'll be quiet. People like Behavioral Health, they have this giant CDC grants that fund them to do things that have to do with biological and chemical and they all have other funding sources. I just feel like they're poaching on the local hazmat responders and you know that's just my opinion. I will be quiet now and we can proceed.

Carolyn Levering: I'm with you there. Well, because I question too who do we have staffing these committees and doing the heavy work and doing all this work. And then just show up with a couple pieces of paper in their handout. You know, but...

Aaron Kenneston: Yes, so I'm not sure what the Department of Behavioral Health is trying to do here, whether they are out doing exercises, or what they're doing, but I defer to the Chair.

Stephanie Parker: And they have, they started at least in December reaching out to LEPCs to provide assistance and offer training and that's the only reason that they're actually putting in for this. But this is not a Funding Committee thing.

Aaron Kenneston: We have a health district. You know but thank you. Our health district is part of our LEPC by the way.

Carolyn Levering: Well, and I guess they're meeting the compliance requirement.

Aaron Kenneston: I guess.

Carolyn Levering: But in this case, we don't have the compliance requirement being met. We don't have a report from DPBH, and it's an administrative action. LCB Police did not submit a report?

Stephanie Parker: Actually no, and they're waiting for approval to submit the forms to me.

Carolyn Levering: Administrative. So the State Fire Marshal office submitted their report with respect to the Beatty incident and the activities that took place through the Department of Public Safety. This actually has a summary about what happened. We can maybe photocopy this and attach it to Nye County's report for them.

Aaron Kenneston: Does the State Fire Marshal update their hazardous materials plan?

Carolyn Levering: Well, we haven't got to the plans yet, we're just doing the exercises.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay, I mean in the report, does it say that they pulled their plan out and updated it.

Carolyn Levering: Right, so well they have the executive summary of what happened.

Stephanie Parker: They're doing that because they're the State Comprehensive Plan. They are on a five year schedule.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay.

Carolyn Levering: Listing of observations, they obviously went through a process again, one like earlier reports, they don't specify what elements of their plan they tested, but they go through in pretty good narrative detail what the situation was, what the concerns were, and what the response activities were that occurred. In their conclusion, it's not so much a conclusion regarding corrective actions as it is a conclusion of you know what the eventual resolution to the situation was. So this report would be strengthened by a narrative on corrective actions, but at least it has a little bit more meat on the bones. So I would make a motion to accept this exercise report for submission by Nevada State Fire Marshal office as meeting their compliance for the exercise.

Robert Fash: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Any other commentary? Aaron?

Aaron Kenneston: After saying I wouldn't, I don't get it. I mean has the State Fire Marshal ever been part of this before? I don't remember...

Carolyn Levering: Actually they were the first State agency that was part of the process from what I recall.

Richard Brenner: Jim Hopstead. And we actually gave grant to them.

Carolyn Levering: They used to be like the only State agency that was in there.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay, all right, well then, like I say I will admit when I am wrong, it just - these all look very odd to me, and they don't look right, but apparently I'm misinformed and I will support their exercise report.

Carolyn Levering: Alright, any other comments? All in favor? [Ayes around] No opposition.

Aaron Kenneston: I mean if it's within the rules, then I will support it, if it's within the rules. I just - it seems irregular, but apparently our historian says that this is an approved thing that's happened in the past.

Richard Brenner: It has, and my whole thing you know if we can get decent help, and there are a lot of current State agencies that need funding. That's the whole idea here, especially with United We Stand. You know and if we can get people to interact with the LEPCs, that's the whole idea here.

Stephanie Parker: But to help maximize our - you know the stuff that we can actually use for the LEPCs and stuff and especially when it comes to the training too. So I mean in the past, I know not on funding, but one of the reasons is so that we can actually maximize and not send that money to the federal government that we have in the past on training, but we can get them here and provide maybe funding for our LEPCs to travel to it too. There are just some caveats that we haven't addressed. How's that?

Richard Brenner: But the whole thing as I see it is if you give people the tool to emergency planning, that's the critical thing. The plan, as long as they have the plan.

Aaron Kenneston: Right. Totally, I agree, I agree.

Carolyn Levering: The last item was UNLV and their report.

Stephanie Parker: They emailed it to me last night.

Carolyn Levering: Now, that's referred to as administrative action.

Stephanie Parker: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Alright.

Stephanie Parker: And as a matter of fact, I just got an email from Elko saying "oh sorry."

Richard Brenner: Did they miss the deadline of the January 31st?

Stephanie Parker: A lot of people missed the deadline of January 31st, and most of them think you're just going to tell me that I have 45 days to get it - you know that might be, but no, you're absolutely right. There are some that were absolutely awesome that got them to me starting in December.

Richard Brenner: Okay.

Stephanie Parker: So some people don't meet until quarterly, so again, we're...

Richard Brenner: You submit something you have a placeholder. If you don't submit it then you have to think there's no longer a placeholder.

Stephanie Parker: Yes, well a placeholder they need to submit one thing, that's a placeholder.

Richard Brenner: Right. But they think if they submit something - if they submit something. If they don't submit anything, like you said UNLV for example. Did they submit anything before January 31st? Nothing?

Stephanie Parker: No, they did not.

Richard Brenner: Okay.

Stephanie Parker: And I have to tell you I bill for some of these agencies, because of their attrition and not knowing what to do and not knowing who to go to get the correct - we have the forms. We can direct them. And we try to talk...

Carolyn Levering: But if they haven't applied for money, though, you know...

Stephanie Parker: They did apply for some funding for, what was for FireShows West to send some people, but we didn't get to spend a lot of it because they didn't comply. They have a new person that didn't understand what they had to do.

Discussion about LEPCs ensued.

Aaron Kenneston: We have the same problem. I'll just toss this out. We have the exact same problem in Washoe County. Until such time that our county manager said the LEPC will reside in the County Emergency Management office, and I will provide a staff member to be the records keeper. Because prior to that we move the files each year and elect different people and do things and you know so I do feel for these folks as well, but I think they all have an avenue, and that is to go to their local LEPC. And it would probably help strengthen their LEPC and like ours, we still struggle trying to find a state official to come to our LEPC. One of the categories is the state elected official, we can't find one. Perhaps if these state agencies...

Carolyn Levering: I don't think I've ever seen a state elected official at a LEPC.

Aaron Kenneston: Perhaps if these state agencies were engaged at the LEPC, there probably is one somewhere in their agency that could strengthen.

Carolyn Levering: We're to item 7, the review of the level of response questionnaires and updates to the emergency response plan. So before we close the session, I just want to make sure we've got all the plans out on the table. And so what we can do as long as nobody is reviewing their own agency's plan, we will go into closed session again and begin to go through that review process. And Richard- I don't know about an hour, is that enough time.

Richard Brenner: It should be. We're going to check the RNP.

Carolyn Brenner: Yes, so we're reconvene in about an hour or two, again go through our list alphabetically and make recommendations on acceptance of their questionnaires and the plans. Any questions? All right, we'll go ahead and go in the closed session now.

7. REVIEW OF LEVEL OF RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRES AND UPDATES TO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANS SUBMITTED BY LEPCS AND STATE AGENCIES

Carolyn Levering: I'm going to call the meeting back to order. We'll go through our list of plan reviews and level of responses to the questionnaires. Let's make sure there's not something else we're supposed to do in this action letter. Alright, so we'll go ahead and just go down our list like we did before with the exercises. First we will start with Carson City.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay, Aaron Kenneston for the record. I reviewed Carson City, as I discovered that I've done several years in the past. And as per usual they did a really credible job. I'm always happy

when I see the page numbers lash up, they completed it, and signed it in December of 2015. They're pre-review on the NRT-1A lines up with my review which again they made it easy. I thought that it was very nice that they have listed dates in their update for their training and exercises. I reviewed their level of response, they're at Technician Level. It's greatly appropriate. Therefore, I make the motion to approve both their hazardous materials plan and their level of response to the questionnaire.

Carolyn Levering: And they're at Technician Level, right?

Aaron Kenneston: They are Technician.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you. Do we have a second?

Brett Waters: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Very good any questions about Carson City's submission. All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Churchill.

Brett Waters: Brett Waters, I have Churchill County's, I looked at the NRT-1, I find that my review is consistent with that, and they meet all of the requirements as identified in our NRT-1 and would make a motion that we approve Churchill County's hazardous materials emergency response plan as presented.

Carolyn Levering: And their level of response to the questionnaire.

Brett Waters: Their level of response to the questionnaire is also correct.

Carolyn Levering: What is their level, do you know?

Brett Waters: Their highest level is operations.

Carolyn Levering: Operations, okay, very good. Thank you. All right, so we have a motion to accept Churchill's plan and Operations Level response.

Aaron Kenneston: I will second that.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you. Any questions on Churchill? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Clark.

Aaron Waters: Okay, for the record, Aaron Kenneston, I had the pleasure of reviewing Clark County's plan.

Carolyn Levering: Really? Pleasurable?

Aaron Kenneston: It is a good plan. My only comment, and I made the recommendation that I think they should have a simpler page numbering scheme, but that's just a recommendation, certainly that has nothing to do with the content. For example, the Tier II pages aren't numbered, but I understand why, they're burning them out at the State Fire Marshal's database, but they do meet all of our criteria on the NRT-1A checklist. They are - their level of response is Technician Level. I make the motion to

approve the Clark County hazardous materials plan and approve their level of response questionnaire at the Technician Level.

Carolyn Levering: Excellent. Do we have a second?

Brett Waters: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, any questions on Clark? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Douglas. I reviewed Douglas' plan, I had them before. Their level of response questionnaire is Technician Level. This aligns with their plan submitted. I reviewed all of their updates and most of their plan remained the same but all the required updates as far as updating facilities and contacts and training schedule, and exercise schedule were all completed. So my general comment was good overall updates. My motion is to accept Douglas County's plan submission and level of response questionnaire, Technician Level. Do I have a second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions on Douglas County? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Elko.

Aaron Kenneston: Circles right back around to me again, Aaron Kenneston. I reviewed the Elko plan; it is also a good plan. Now, I started to make a recommendation that they work on their page numbering system, and then I realized that the page numbers are actually fairly solid when they completed the NRT-1A, the numbers they put down on their form didn't jive with what I found in the plan. So it's not a planning numbering issue, it's just whoever filled out the NRT-1. So they have the elements that we require, looks solid. Their questionnaire, their level of response questionnaire, they're listed as technician and it appears appropriate for Elko County. So therefore, I make the motion to approve the hazardous materials plan for Elko County and to approve the level of response questionnaire at the Technician Level.

Carolyn Levering: Any second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, any questions on Elko? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries.

I got Esmeralda. Esmeralda is at an Awareness Level, I take that back. Esmeralda is Awareness Level, they submitted a sort of slightly confusing plan update, but once I got the hang of it, I found things. Most everything was updated in accordance with the requirements. The only thing I could not find and this will be my motion to accept their level of questionnaire response form and to accept their plan with the contingency that they submit an updated equipment list. The appendix was blank - it was empty, where the update was supposed to be - it says, "insert here". So with that contingency, that's the only thing I found missing in their plan. Otherwise, they're listed as compliant. And that's my motion. Any second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions about Esmeralda? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Eureka.

Aaron Kenneston: All right, I'm having every other one evidently. This is Aaron again for the record, and I reviewed the Eureka plan. I found some minor things and at first I was a little critical but I kind of lightened up as I went through the plan. You know I recommend that they reference their evacuation shelter plan from 2010. I know they have a more complete evacuation plan. What they have in here suffices, but is in great detail, and I recommend that they update their training and exercise sections. I mean, basically what they have is starting in 2001. So their training section lists the training for 2001, that was more than a decade ago, but it catches up to date. When I reviewed their level of response and realized they're at the Awareness Level, I realized that yeah, you know for an Awareness Level county, this is probably a sufficient plan. I make a recommendation that they consider doing an update, but it's certainly not a showstopper, based on the fact that they do actually have the pieces we asked for, and they're at the Awareness Level. So it would be nice to have it updated, but it's not a showstopper. So to kind of circle back around, I'm making a motion that we approve the Eureka County plan for this year, and that we approve their level of response questionnaire at the Awareness Level.

Carolyn Levering: Very good, we have a motion, do we have a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Any other questions on Eureka's plan or level.

Gwen Barrett: Who did we count, Bob? Okay.

Carolyn Levering: Yes, that's Bob, sorry. What was their level of response again?

Aaron Kenneston: Awareness.

Carolyn Levering: All right, all in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Humboldt.

Robert Fash: This is Robert Fash for the record. I had Humboldt submittal. Everything appears to be correct as far as the NRT-1A checklist, it appears that they operate at the Technician Level from what I gathered from the plan. The only item to note was the list of outside sources for equipment was out of date, specific people, equipment, contact info should be updated, was this list from 2012 or 2001. Other than that I would recommend.

Carolyn Levering: That's a good recommendation.

Stephanie Parker: So the recommendation is on the list of the outside equipment needs to be updated with the last date?

Robert Fash: Yes.

Stephanie Parker: Reviewed and contact information or not?

Robert Fash: Well, yes, that too. Any lists that and this could probably go across any plan, where you reference specific people, equipment or contact information; it should have a date stamp on it.

Carolyn Levering: And it's required. Those are sections that are required to be updated every year.

Richard Brenner: Yes.

Robert Fash: But in this plan in particular they did have...

Stephanie Parker: But the problem is sometimes in the minutes it says that they went through it, but the plan there is no date on it. So yes, you're right.

Robert Fash: And on this particular plan, they had a listing of outside vendors or sources for equipment but the equipment that could be attained from his outside sources was not listed. But then again bulldozers from this one or that one. They probably know since they're mobile and they know where to call, but it just wasn't specified. Other than that, I would recommend approval for the Technician Level.

Aaron Kenneston: This is Aaron, I will second that motion.

Carolyn Levering: Very good. Any questions on Humboldt?

Gwen Barrett: I have just to clarify. Is that part of approving them, or is that just comment.

Robert Fash: Just a comment.

Gwen Barrett: Okay. That's what I wanted to make sure of, thank you.

Carolyn Levering: Are we good? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. We move onto Lander.

Robert Fash: I too have Lander. I reviewed all the elements, the NRT-1A checklist. I believe they were operating at the Operations Level. Other than that there's only one - again, one suggestion as far as the page numbers, it's quite extensive, and as you go through there is no page numbering at all, so if you lose your way through the book you don't know which section the annex tabs that they have. So that every page should be some kind of indexing to make sure that you're in the right section.

Carolyn Levering: I've seen that before. Welcome to our world.

Robert Fash: But you know all the information is there. But the other suggestion may be is to double side it...

Carolyn Levering: Oh that's a single...

Robert Fash: Okay, might save some trees.

Carolyn Levering: And their level of response was?

Robert Fash: Operations.

Carolyn Levering: Alright, so you made a motion, do we have a second?

Brett Waters: Second, Brett.

Carolyn Levering: And any other discussion on Lander? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Lincoln.

Brett Waters: For the record Brett Waters, I have Lincoln County. I reviewed their plan and their NRT-1 checklist and that it's appropriate. Their level of response questionnaire is at the Operations Level. They show they do have one technician, but the Operations Level. They meet all the other requirements, so I would make a motion to accept Lincoln County's updated plan and level of response at the Operations Level.

Carolyn Levering: We have a motion, do we have a second.

Aaron Kenneston: Sure, Aaron, I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you, any discussion or questions about Lincoln County. All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Lyon.

Richard Brenner: I have Lyon and I must say out of all those plans I could ever review, I thought it was the best plan, they've put a lot of work in to this and I've got to tell you it is awesome. I've never seen anything like this.

Carolyn Levering: Note for the record Richard Brenner is [inaudible 00:50:06].

Stephanie Parker: They provided a CD too.

Carolyn Levering: They put it on a CD?

Richard Brenner: Yes, absolutely amazing. Letter of promulgation, everything was in here; the level of response is operations technician. Going through each of the main elements, you can find them very easily, and I didn't have...

Carolyn Levering: Did they use that kind of built-in software or is this just Word document.

Richard Brenner: I think Rob used to do this on a regular basis. It was awesome. I've never seen anything like it. I was really impressed. So somebody could make the motion that the letter of promulgation and the level of response questionnaire have been submitted, they're at the Technician Level and that they've met all of the elements.

Aaron Kenneston: Well, with such glowing reviews, I will make the motion that we approve the Lyon County plan and their level of response at the Technician Level.

Carolyn Leering: All right, is there a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Okay. Any other questions about Lyon County other than what the program they used to...Inquiring minds want to know. Alright, very good, all in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Mineral.

Brett Waters: Mineral County, I reviewed their plan, checked the NRT-1, in my review, I find that to be accurate. Their level response questionnaire, they are at the Technician Level themselves as well as the SOC and the military institution out there. So I would make a motion to accept the Mineral County hazmat plan as presented and the level of response at the Technician Level.

Carolyn Levering: All right, we have a motion. Do we have a second?

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Thank you. Any questions about Mineral County's plan and questionnaire? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Nye County.

Aaron Kenneston: For the record, it's Aaron and here we go with Nye County. I think they have a good plan, but my comment, not a showstopper, my comment is I recommend they do some updating to make a little more modern, and parts of it - I'm not going to say the parts that looked like they were typewritten, but parts that do look like it was produced with the older programs. And I'd recommend that they print the Fire Marshal's database to help update their Tier II facilities. Everything looks accurate and looks updated, but it was all done on a PC I think. So anyway, with those comments, they do meet the criteria. Their NRT-1 lines up not always with the page number that they put on their form, but it lines up as being present in the document. They're listed as a Technician Level in their level response questionnaire. I'm making a presumption that this is because of their association with the mines. I see some mines listed in here; I think that's where the technician comes from.

Carolyn Levering: They've done a huge investment

Aaron Kenneston: Good, and I know part of what Vance's challenge is with the plan why some of it looks less modern than other parts, because he's dealing with everything from duck water to mini communities in the area. So with all those editorial comments aside, I recommend - I'm making a motion to approve the Nye County plan and to approve their level of response questionnaire at the Technician Level.

Carolyn Levering: Good, do we have a second.

Brett Waters: I'll second that.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions about Nye County? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Pershing.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay, this is Aaron again, and I'm kind of on a roll, you get me for three plans. This is Pershing County, near and dear to our hearts and their plan is okay. They're at the Awareness Level. So I guess we shouldn't expect that they're going to have - you know they probably don't have the personnel to spend a lot of time with it. It's listed as annex Q to their EOP. So they obviously have an EOP, and then they have these different annexes of which this is part. With that said, I went through the NRT-1A, it matches up fairly close to the page numbers that they put on their NRT-1A, but again, I found every piece that we require in the plan. So I'm making a motion that I recommend that we approve the Pershing County plan, approve their level of response at the Awareness Level, that's my motion.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, do we have a second?

Brett Waters: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, any questions or discussion. All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. Storey County.

Aaron Kenneston: And Storey County here I am again, it just happened to be that I got them in alphabetical order. So I reviewed the Storey plan, I'm not going to give it as glowing remarks as Richard did, but it is a good solid plan. It's obviously been updated lately, and I can see that they used a vendor to help them, and it looks nice. So I went through and their NRT-1A matches up with the page numbers that I found. They reference their county evacuation and shelter plan, which I always appreciate, because a lot of folks spend a lot of effort on that. The only issue is that we identified, we believe it's administrative, but their level of response questionnaire is not included here.

Stephanie Parker: I think it is in the office.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay. And so my belief is that they did it in a timely manner. My belief is that they're technician; I guess I defer to the committee, to the chair on how I should handle that portion. I'm certainly ready to make the motion to approve the plan; I'm not sure how we address their level of response questionnaire. So should I make a motion that includes level of response, or should I...

Carolyn Levering: Just pending.

Aaron Kenneston: Okay, I like that, thank you for helping me out with Robert's Rules of Order. Okay, so I make the motion that we approve the hazardous materials response plan for Storey County. I also move that we approve their level of response at the Technician Level, pending the administrative confirmation that it's on file. That's my motion.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, do we have a second?

Brett Waters: I'll second it.

Carolyn Levering: Okay. Any other questions on Storey? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries.

Washoe, I have Washoe, finally Aaron gets a break. Washoe's stated level of response is Technician. Their plan was updated, no changes to the majority of the sections. They did submit updated resource section under seven. Their training and exercise lists training is compliant, exercise the plan annually. Updated facility section is in place. The only comment, again it's not a requirement, there were good maps of the facility site locations, I would recommend adding maps of transportation routes to strengthen the plan. Since you always have such a good map section, add to it. And that would actually strengthen the NRT number one item about identifying transportation routes with pictures. So that is the - my recommendation is to accept Washoe's plan and level of response questionnaire. Do we have a second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions about Washoe? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. White Pine.

Richard Brenner: I have White Pine. This is Richard. They did submit their letter of promulgation. They also sent in their level of response at an Operations Level. And the plan, it's much better than last year's; I mean it's getting better, much, much better. I was able to find the nine elements. So that there were a couple page numbers that I already discussed with Brett about they're not interpretative. These are all A's and it mentioned BP, I couldn't find BP.

Brett Waters: So that was in the other part of the plan which came bound which I sent months ago. So it's in the office.

Stephanie Parker: So the previous on that part of the update, okay.

Richard Brenner: So the only thing that I would recommend and I know Brett's working on this to changing their plans, but identifying, but this is just the council it indicates the level of a responsible plan - there's a line for it, it says an operations title. And then page numbers. That was it. So I'd like to have somebody make a motion that we approve this plan.

Carolyn Levering: I will make that motion to approve White Pines' plan and level of response as Operations Level.

Robert Fash: I second that.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions, discussion on White Pine? All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. We don't have a plan submitted for Behavioral Health, do we?

Brett Waters: Brett Waters for the record. We have a level of response questionnaire that has been provided and then portions of a plan, the NRT-1A was not submitted, so I would not review it, because it is not compliant. So I would make a motion to not recommend compliance for the Department of Public and Behavioral Health Radiological Control Program at this point, because it is not complete.

Carolyn Levering: The plan is not complete and the NRT-1A is not...

Brett Waters: The NRT-1A is not done, correct.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, we have a motion, do we have a second.

Robert Fash: I'll second.

Carolyn Levering: Any discussion or questions?

Richard Brenner: Is there anything we can help them with?

Stephanie Parker: Yes, I do have a question about that, because I had also gone ahead and submitted some of their stuff too, so is there the 45 day contingency for them to rewrite?

Brett Waters: That's what I would say, because they didn't submit and so if they want it to be reviewed again, then I would think that they need to submit it properly for consideration. A submission which is not done properly shouldn't have any consideration.

Carolyn Levering: Any other discussion. All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries. LCB Police.

Stephanie Parker: Hold on a second. You made a motion, who seconded it, before you...

Robert Fash: I did.

Stephanie Parker: Oh, you did, okay fine, thank you.

Robert Fash: The LCB Police, this whole process is more like a business plan or response plan if something happened on site. Training and exercise - exercising the plan were not identified. And I cannot a recommendation to approve.

Stephanie Parker: Did they not have an NRT also did you say?

Carolyn Levering: Did they had a checklist form.?

Robert Fash: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Did they submit a level of response questionnaire?

Robert Fash: Awareness.

Carolyn Levering: All right, so we - that was the motion, yes?

Robert Fash: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: Okay, we have a motion not to accept the LCB Police plan do we have a second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Any discussion or questions on that?

Richard Brenner: Do you think they can become compliant?

Robert Fash: Yes.

Carolyn Levering: All in favor? [Ayes around] Motion carries.
State Fire Marshall office did not submit...

Nathan Hastings: I'm sorry, I need to leave.

Carolyn Levering: Oh, okay, we're almost done.

Nathan Hastings: I want to get that on the record.

Carolyn Levering: All right, thank you.

Nathan Hastings: Thanks.

Carolyn Levering: Moving out to the middle level of response questionnaire forms so they're deficient in that area. They did submit a copy of the State Department of Public Safety's State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, which is a plan that's maintained by the Division of Emergency Management. That plan does reference in specific sections rules and responsibilities for the State Fire Marshal, specific to ESF-10 which is the support function. As far as the Tier II facility reporting, referenced the statewide database, they don't have any specific facilities subject to the [inaudible 01:06:51] jurisdiction. A couple of areas that I noted that they could improve upon in order to better meet the NRT-1A checklist in this. It is hard for a state agency to meet a checklist designed for county LEPCs, right, I mean that's pretty obvious as you know square peg, round hole type situation. So areas that I think that need to meet in order for us to approve their plan submission is that question 3, designation of a community coordinator and facility coordinator is not specific enough for the State Fire Marshal office in this plan, so then to provide some sort of addenda or appendix to the document that states what level of accountabilities State Fire Marshal office personnel have. So item 6 describing emergency equipment located within the community and actually provide an equipment list let's hope they have something that they could document, but they did not supply anything in addition to this State plan. Item 8, they did not provide a specific training program detail, they don't list any kind of website or reference or where to go for training information, that's something that they could have added to this document and also nine exercises, they need to detail more specific commitment to exercises in hazmat. All of those things are things that they could do as a supplement that would help them with these criteria of a successful plan submission. Those are my comments for that. My motion is to not accept this submission based on those notes as well as also the fact that they don't have their level of response submitted. Do I have a second on that?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: Any questions about the State Fire Marshal's submission? All in favor? [Ayes around]

UNLV, was there a plan for UNLV? Nothing to vote on there.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Carolyn Levering: Okay, as far as I can see, we've completed the bulk of our work. I will move us onto item 8, Public Comment. Do we have any comments?

Stephanie Parker: I do. I just have a question, and this is because I want to identify things that the LEPCs can work harder at after reviewing plans. And if there's anything additional that you identify after going through the plan; the training or other recommendations that they could actually submit for funding, they have a plan that comes in from some of the people that actually have PC documents. And I'm trying to develop a three-year plan for Nevada for federal funds too. So any recommendations that you guys have that I've gone through. You can tell me now, or email me.

Aaron Kenneston: Well, I'll just say as part of the public comments, I am still an advocate of maybe some outreach to the smaller counties that have an Awareness Level. I don't know if that could be a project that is spearheaded from your level or how we would to do it, or if we'd want it to be kind of grass roots up. But it would be appropriate, I think to have an vendor or somebody knowledgeable; kind

of be the circuit judge, go around to these counties and work with them, and help them create a better plan.

Carolyn Levering: It would be a good statewide initiative. Maybe that's something you can do Because we've seen it - you know some of us for a lot of years have seen a disparity from community planning, and I mean everybody has a slightly different approach, some of the hazmat plans are part of a bigger comprehensive plan. Others have standalone plans. You know that's fine to have that separate approach, and we don't want to try to cookie cutter it, but it would be nice if there was just a little bit more uniformity amongst the plans themselves, and yes like Aaron said outreach for the specialty small borough communities that could use a little help on, even just getting Awareness Level, and if they have a goal to move towards Operations, try to help them do that.

Richard Brenner: A lot of them, they have enough issues if the plan is working for them, I mean that's one thing. And it's just another thing that they have to manage, and that's fine. They know what their needs are. And they wear some of the hats out amongst their counties. You know I can remember Clark County and sending disks to help where they could insert the information, just so they could break it up, and it's tough. It really is. I was talking to Kelly Barrati when we were in San Diego and where emergency managers really kind of discussed this kind of thing; you know at the state level, and kind of looked at how the plans would come together. Well, it's important that it works for them, at their level, to have it and the nine elements in the plan. And exercising their plan and you know where there's a try in there. Brett, you took over a gentleman that was there for years and years, and you know for us it's just that they did the bare minimum and then with this. You know when you get new leadership, I mean things will change...

Aaron Kenneston: Right, fresh energy.

Richard Brenner: Exactly, fresh energy, it's amazing.

Crosstalk

Richard Brenner: Yes, but the from the Tier; it's difficult, it really is. And then they're looking for getting home on \$30, and other dollars, that money is going down too, I mean they have the latest budget, and chances are that's not going to happen, but you know that money is - well, we know Stephanie and myself know HMEP is going down. The new formula will affect us here in Nevada. It's not the population anymore, that's not the big factors.

Aaron Kenneston: And we understand this prospect as like what's the level of pain I render for this amount of money. And then I mean I'm kidding when I say level of pain I'll endure, but filling out the forms, sending them in and answering the questions, and doing the things is a problem, and it's not just - as you know it's not just hazardous materials. We're also concerned with everything - from all hazards and all disappointments and if it's a part-timer or just the sheriff covering it makes it hard. But if I may, I'll just add again, some kind of statewide program where we actually went to the rural county and sat down with them would increase the quality of their plan and maybe help them to increase public safety.

Richard Brenner: I agree with you. We haven't been staffed at any level in the past. We were at one time - we had...

Carolyn Levering: In the records that I've found then we went down to four, then to three, then to two.

Richard Brenner: I don't really remember having that many, but I know we had three, we had a grant person and...
Crosstalk

Richard Brenner: You've got to go out there and gauge people, you know and that's critical. We're fortunate because we do have that terrible stick called money, and that way we have close to \$100,000 you know if the LEPCs participate and put their stuff in there, they're eligible for that money.

Carolyn Levering: It's going to be \$5,000 every time.

Stephanie Parker: Although the grant applications from SERC are a lot easier than the grant applications like in DEM. I think they're more user-friendly to fill out.

Richard Brenner: We worked on them. We tried to make it very easy. Again, what Aaron is saying I mean we tried over the years to make it very easy for them, just check the box, and sign your signature you know.

Stephanie Parker: And Brett's helped me work on a compliance form so we can come up with a document that real easy for us to use.

Brett Waters: And it's really true, because it's probably going to have to be an outreach from here to those rural counties, because unless they took the initiative like I did to come and meet with all you guys numerous times to get the assistance, they're just not going to get it. And most of them are, whether they have limited travel funds or whatever it may be which a lot of them are in this - have some real significant financial problems, or it's part-time or very part-time, that they just can't do it, and that's - so the outreach is probably going to have to go out to rural counties.

Stephanie Parker: And we're willing to, I mean if we can get the expert, because I'm not an expert in any of this too, I mean not at all, but I'm willing to - or I'm just willing to set up locations, or multiple locations or we can get a conferencing call so people can send, or maybe was closer to their jurisdiction. We could arrange that.

Richard Brenner: Or some kind of entrance program.

Stephanie Parker: Right, right.

Brett Waters: Take one county that's more up to speed and say "hey would you take on these other two counties and just kind of help them you know get through that."

Stephanie Parker: They would appreciate that.

Brett Waters: I mean what I've found being new in this position is that all you have to do is ask in this state, and everybody has been absolutely fantastic about whatever we have is yours, and really supportive, so - but I think that there's probably some, without a change in personnel, there's probably some that are just barely hanging on and so if they may make compliance up they're happy, but if they don't.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Carolyn Levering: Any other public comment? Alright, I'll move to adjournment, do we have a second?

Brett Waters: Second.

Carolyn Levering: All right. We can call the meeting closed at 2:10.

DRAFT