

**State Emergency Response Commission (SERC)
LEPC/SERC Liaison Committee Meeting
Tuesday September 17, 2019 – 10:00 AM**

Committee Members Attending

- Chris Bell – VDH, Committee Chair
- Kim Lapierre – SERC Chair
- Todd Sears – AOT, SERC Vice Chair
- Matthew LaRock – EHS Seat on the SERC
- Erik Rosenbauer – LEPC Seat on the SERC
- Victoria (Tory) Littlefield – RPC Seat on the SERC
- Josh Cox – Non-Voting Member – Vermont Emergency Management
- Glenn Herrin – Non-Voting Member – Vermont Emergency Management

Interested Persons Attending

- Phil Marquette – Chair, LEPC 10

Call to Order – 10:04 AM

No public comment.

One addition to the agenda proposed by Glenn Herrin: Discuss the LEPC Plan Template

Approve Minutes from July 31 2018 meeting – Unanimous approval

LEPC Plan Template:

- Glenn H. spoke about the LEPC Plan Template. He has received and reviewed LEPC 8 and 9's Plans and would like to edit them and send them to this Committee and/or the SERC for comments.

Re-Alignment of LEPCs Discussion:

- Erik R. gave a brief summary of why it is necessary for consolidating LEPCs – Less and less involvement/engagement of volunteers at the LEPC level.
- Kim L. stated she had spoken with Bob S. of LEPC 2 and she stated they have an interest in reforming as a viable LEPC.
- Erik R. stated that LEPC 6 has competing interests as many members have left to form other groups.
- Todd S. – Messaging from the SERC for the past 5 or 6 years has been mixed regarding planning guidance to the LEPCs (all hazards planning vs. Hazmat specific planning). The SERC needs to give clear guidance to the LEPCs. Directing LEPCs to plan for only HazMat related threats is not ideal.
- Various other discussion ensued regarding LEPC Plans and how they relate to EHS facilities specifically.
- Tory L. spoke about the relationship between RPCs and LEPCs. She conducted an informal survey of RPCs as to how many are fiscal agents of LEPCs. She stated about half of RPCs are no longer the fiscal agent of LEPCs due to a perceived liability issue which has since been addressed by the EPA in previous SERC meetings.
- Todd S – There was even low engagement and low attendance numbers when VEM was engaging more heavily with LEPCs as far back as 2013. Is there a model where the RPCs become LEPCs? Tory stated

that LEPC 12 and TRORC have a very close relationship but TRORC is not the complete entity of LEPC 12.

- Models were discussed where RPCs play a more central role with LEPCs.
- Kim L. stated she spoke with a member of LEPC 7 recently who quit due to perceived onerous accounting responsibilities. At previous SERC Finance Committee meetings a tiered level of funding was discussed so that more busy LEPCs would be funded at a level commensurate with the number of Tier II facilities within their boundaries
- Kim L. stated she was supportive of LEPC consolidation however she wanted to be very careful that whatever consolidation occurs we should not discourage active LEPCs.
- Josh C. listed the LEPCs that applied for and were awarded Hazchem funding in fiscal year 2020 and the LEPCs that did not apply for funding as a baseline for determining which LEPCs are currently active. This list is below:

Performing vs. non-performing LEPCs: Active LEPCs (defined as LEPCs that applied for Hazchem funding in FY'20):

LEPC 1 – Chittenden County
LEPC 3 – Windsor County
LEPC 5 – Washington & Orange County
LEPC 8 – Addison County
LEPC 9 – Caledonia & Essex County
LEPC 10 – Orleans County
LEPC 11 – Lamoille County
LEPC 12 – Windsor & Orange County

Inactive LEPCs (defined as LEPCs that did NOT apply for Hazchem funding in FY'20):

LEPC 2 – Rutland County
LEPC 4 – Franklin County
LEPC 6 – Windham County
LEPC 7 – Bennington County
LEPC 13 – Grand Isle County

- Tory L. stated that consensus of LEPC 12 is that they didn't want to pick up slack of other non-performing LEPCs.
- The tension for consolidation is that fewer LEPCs makes it easier to attain statutory requirements however we don't want to discourage active LEPCs.
- Long travel times to LEPC meetings were discussed.
- Tory L. stated she thought 1, 2, or 4 LEPCs may be too much consolidation and perhaps 8 LEPCs is a more realistic consolidation model.
- Various other political boundaries were discussed AOT, VDH, DPS all have districts and regions that don't typically correspond to any other political boundaries. Chris B. agrees with the principle of fewer LEPCs. Vermont has one Healthcare Coalition that is a successful model of engagement.
- Erik R. stated that there would presumably be an opportunity to fund a position to support LEPCs if there were less LEPCs.

- Glenn H. stated that one option for consolidation would be to look at one statewide LEPC. Vermont is probably small enough to make this work. Another option is to tie LEPCs to RPCs 11 RPCs would be paired to 11 LEPCs. A third option would be another undetermined number.
- Todd S suggested a five LEPC model. Or even possibly a four LEPC model pairing an existing strong LEPC with each of the new LEPCs. Kim L. suggested this could work.
- Presentation of the consolidation models to the LEPC Chairs was discussed. The pros and cons of each consolidation model should be part of this presentation to the Chairs and RPC staff that support LEPCs.
- The RPCs that are currently active with LEPCs were discussed.
- Kim L. stated there should be four models considered: Stay the same, 1 LEPC, 4 LEPCs, and 6 LEPCs
- Todd states there should be consolidation down to 3 to 6 LEPCs
- Maps should be presented to the LEPC Chairs.
- Statewide model pros: Could possibly hire a position Con: might lose funding.
- Various consolidation models Pros: Increased funding, alignment of reports, uniformity of effort, templated plans.
- Todd S. suggested one consolidation model: 5 LEPCs based on active RPC involvement;
 - o New LEPC: Old LEPCs 3 (lead), 6, 7
 - o New LEPC: Old LEPCs 2, 8 (lead)
 - o New LEPC: Old LEPCs 1 (lead), 4, 11, 13
 - o New LEPC: Old LEPCs 9, 10 – NVDA (lead)
 - o New LEPC: Old LEPCs 5, 12 (lead)
- Tory L. suggested the following: 5 LEPCs consolidation model based on geographic considerations (with active RPCs noted):
 - LEPC 3, 6, 12 merges - TRORC
 - LEPC 2, 7, 8 merge – Addison RPC
 - LEPC 9,10 merge - NVDA
 - LEPC 5,11 merge – Central RPC
 - LEPC 1, 13, 4 merge – Chittenden RPC
- Presentation to the LEPC Chairs and RPC support staff would be to solicit support of the LEPC Chairs. The goal would be to have a consolidation model before the full body of the SERC on the Nov. 13 meeting.
- Glenn H. stated he would create GIS maps on these various models
- Erik R. discussed that we have to have incentives for the new LEPCs and this primarily means increased funding.
- The week of October 7th was decided upon for the LEPC Chair/RPC dinner at the Vermont Technical College in Randolph. The meeting will begin at 6:00pm.
- Glenn H. – Does this body want to recommend a model to this group? The consensus was to put the option out there and see how the discussion evolves. Todd S. – We need to lay out the pros and cons and we want to hear the dialogue. Kim L. – We should make it clear we want their input but it is the SERC that will make the decision.
- Glenn H. will draft the maps and the list of pros and cons of each model and email to this body.

Meeting Adjourn: 11:48am

