

APPENDIX E

**OHIO AND NORTH CAROLINA FINAL DRAFT
REPORTS FOR FY 93, 94, AND 95**

TO: Charles Rogoff, U.S. Department of Transportation

FROM: Ohio State Emergency Response Commission, through,
Jeff Beattie, Ohio EPA/DERR

SUBJECT: Hazardous Material Emergency Planning (HMEP) Grant "3rd Year
Funding" Activity Report

DATE: February 11, 1997

=====

The following is an overview of the activities completed by Ohio's LEPCs that participated in the HMEP "3rd year funding" grant.

Training

Ohio's State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) elected to distribute the Training funds equally to the sixty-five (65) participating LEPCs; twenty-two LEPCs choose not to participate. Each LEPC received \$1,073 in federal funds to use for allowable training activities under HMEP. The following listing of courses and projects are those the LEPCs chose to do under HMEP.

Chemical Decon Training	HazMat Training;EMS
Hazard Awareness & Operations	Anhydrous Ammonia
HazMat Training slides and films	Awareness Training Supplies
HazMat Exposure	
CAMEO Training/Courses	LEPC Exercises
First Responder HazMat Operations	HazMat Basic Concepts
HazMat Technician	HazMat Incident Analysis
Incident Command	Training Books
Books for HazMat	Plan Development/review/update.
Commodity Flow Studies	Personnel Costs
Hazard Analysis	
Class "A" Foam: Awareness	
The Pesticide Challenge	
Clandestine Drug Labs	
Chlorine Emergencies	
Confined Space Entry	

attended hazmat training courses offered at the Findlay University, Cleveland State University, and Ohio Emergency Management Agency.

The State Fire Marshal utilized a data base to track the students trained, and courses taken by LEPCs using HMEP grant funds. Frank Conway, of the Fire Prevention Unit at the State Fire Academy is the contact for this data. The State Fire Academy trained:

(414) Law
(1,606) Fire
(106) EMS
<u>(396) Other</u>
(2,522) Total

Planning

The HMEP Planning funds were distributed to the sixty-nine (69) LEPCs in Ohio that submitted a workplan to Ohio EMA. The LEPCs developed their workplans based on their LEPC's planning goals for the fiscal year. The HMEP planning money was distributed to the participating LEPCs based on a funding formula weighing; population, number of EHS facilities, and roadway miles in the county. As with the HMEP training funds, the LEPCs determined which allowable HMEP activity it would undertake for planning.

The Ohio Emergency Management Agency reviewed the planning workplans and activities conducted by the LEPCs. The following is an overview of the activities conducted by the LEPCs:

- Flow Studies 13
- Majority of workplans submitted brokedown the activities between 20% exercises and 80% planning (updates, hazard analysis, salaries, etc...).

The Ohio Emergency Management Agency's HazMat Section approved all HMEP planning activities submitted by the LEPCs for reimbursement.

Summary

This year, SERC required the LEPCs to provide workplans for both training and planning activities. LEPCs failing to provide workplans to the SERC are not eligible for HMEP funding. Eleven LEPCs designated the State Fire Academy as their sole source of training. Funds will be paid to the Academy for training these LEPCs. The SERC

It would be appreciated if you provide Ohio a copy of activity reports from states you think used their HMEP grant to the greatest benefit of its LEPCs; so that we can improve our list of proposed activities for next year. Thank you for your help and continued patience in this third year of HMEP.

cc: Julianna Bull, SERC Co-Chairperson, Ohio EPA
Dale Shipley, SERC Co-Chairperson, Ohio EMA
Kenneth A. Schultz, CEPP Section Manager
Frank Conway, SFM
Jack Bossert, OEMA-HazMat Supervisor
Pat Campbell, Ohio EPA Fiscal
file

TO: Charles Rogoff, U.S. Department of Transportation

FROM: Ohio State Emergency Response Commission, through,
Jeff Beattie, Ohio EPA/DERR

SUBJECT: Hazardous Material Transportation Act (HMTA) Grant "2nd
Year Funding" Activity Report

DATE: January 12, 1996

=====

The following is an overview of the activities completed by Ohio's LEPCs that participated in the HMTA "2nd year funding" grant.

Training

Ohio's State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) elected to distribute the Training funds equally to the sixty-six (66) participating LEPCs; twenty-one LEPCs choose not to participate. Each LEPC received \$1,191 in federal funds to use for allowable training activities under HMTA. The following listing of courses and projects are those the LEPCs chose to do under HMTA.

Chemical Decon Training	HazMat Training
Hazard Awareness	Anhydrous Ammonia
HazMat Training slides and films	Awareness Training
Supplies	
HazMed 94	HazMat Exposure
CAMEO Training/Courses	LEPC Exercises
First Responder HazMat Operations	HazMat Basic Concepts
HazMat Tech.	HazMat Incident Analysis
Incident Command	Training Books
Books for HazMat	Plan
Development/review/update	
Commodity Flow Studies	Personnel Costs
Hazard Analysis	

The Ohio Fire Academy provided much of the training for the LEPCs either through outreach programs or through courses taught at the Fire Academy. LEPCs also attended HazMat training courses offered at the Findlay University, Cleveland State University,

trained, and courses taken by LEPCs using HMTA grant funds. Terry Weber, Chief of Fire Prevention at the State Fire Academy is the contact for this data. The State Fire Academy trained:

128 Law
2,930 Fire
88 EMT
20 Public officials
14 EMA
786 Other
3,966 Total

Planning

The HMTA Planning funds were distributed to the seventy-one (71) LEPCs in Ohio that submitted a workplan to Ohio EMA. The LEPCs developed their workplans based on their LEPC's planning goals for the fiscal year. The HMTA planning money was distributed to the participating LEPCs based on a funding formula weighing; population, number of EHS facilities, and roadway miles in the county. As with the HMTA training funds, the LEPCs determined which allowable HMTA activity it would undertake for planning.

The Ohio Emergency Management Agency reviewed the planning workplans and activities conducted by the LEPCs. The following is an overview of the activities conducted by the LEPCs:

Flow Studies	13	Planning the LEPD Plan	5
Exercises	20	Plan Updates	50
		-Hazard analysis	
		-Salaries	

The Ohio Emergency Management Agency's HazMat Section reviewed the HMTA planning activities of the LEPCs.

Summary

To administer the second year funds, Ohio EPA set up a much more flexible account that allowed redistribution of unused grant money at the end of the third quarter. The primary cause for lapsed HMTA funding last year was money allocated to inactive LEPCs.

This year, SERC required the LEPCs to provide workplans for both

Ohio State Emergency Response Commission

Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know
P.O. Box 163669, 1800 WaterMark Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43216-3669

George V. Voinovich
Governor

To: Charles Rogoff, USDOT

Date: 4/15/96

From Kenneth ~~A. S.~~ Schultz, Ohio EPA/SERC

Subject: Affect of HMEP Funding on Preparedness

In 1993, when Ohio's SERC applied for grant assistance under HMTA, now HMEP, thirty-one of Ohio's LEPC's had developed Chemical Emergency Response and Preparedness Plans that met the criteria of NRT-1; fifty-four had developed plans not meeting those criteria, and two counties had yet to submit their plans for our Commission's formal review. At our April 10, 1996 meeting we reached seventy-seven concurred plans. All counties have submitted a plan for review.

In State Fiscal Year '92, fifty-four LEPCs had conducted an exercise of their plan. In State Fiscal Year '95 seventy-seven exercises were conducted.

Many thousands of responders have received training using HMEP funds. This has resulted in the gain of 25 hazmat teams in Ohio, from 34 to 59. In Greene County responders had been trained on incident command and decision making. Shortly thereafter an emergency involving a chlorine reaction occurred in a vehicle, starting it on fire. The driver pulled off the road into a school parking lot. Due to the recent training the incident was handled quickly and without mishap.

cc:

Jeff Beattie
Randy Sheldon
Jack Bossert
Frank Conway

LEPCs designated the State Fire Academy as their sole source of training. Funds will be paid to the Academy for training these LEPCs. The SERC continues to look for better more efficient ways to use the HMTA grant money that brings the most benefit to Ohio's LEPCs.

It would be appreciated if you provide Ohio a copy of activity reports from states you think used their HMTA grant to the greatest benefit of its LEPCs; so that we can improve our list of proposed activities for next year. Thank you for your help and continued patience in this second year of HMTA.

cc: Jane Harf, SERC Co-Chairperson, Ohio EPA
Dale Shipley, SERC Co-Chairperson, Ohio EMA
Kenneth A. Schultz, CEPP Section Manager
Frank Conway, SFM
Jack Bossert, OEMA-HazMat Supervisor
Pat Campbell, Ohio EPA Fiscal
file

Ohio State Emergency Response Commission

Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know
P.O. Box 103669, 1800 WaterMark Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43216-3669

George V. Voinovich
Governor

TO: Charles Rogoff, U.S. Department of Transportation

FROM: Ohio State Emergency Response Commission, through,
Susan Hazzly-Ohio EPA/DERR

SUBJECT: 1993-1994 Hazardous Material Transportation Act (HMTA) Grant
Activity Report Summary

DATE: February 10, 1995

The following is an overview of the activities Ohio's eighty-seven (87) LEPCs participated in during the 1994-1995 fiscal year for HMTA reimbursement.

Ohio's State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) elected to distribute the Training funds equally to all 87 LEPCs. Each LEPC received \$1,709.09 in federal funds to use for allowable activities under HMTA. The following are many of the courses and projects the LEPCs chose to do for HMTA activities:

Chemical Decon Training	HazMat Training
Hazard Awareness	Anhydrous Ammonia
HazMat Training slides and films	Awareness Training Supplies
HazMed 94	HazMat Exposure
CAMEO	LEPC Exercises
First Responder HazMat Operations	HazMat Basic Concepts
HazMat Tech.	HazMat Incident Analysis
Incident Command	Training Books
Books for HazMat	

The Ohio Fire Academy over all provided much of the training for the LEPCs either through outreach programs or through courses taught at the Academy. LEPCs also attended HazMat training courses offered at the Findlay University and Cleveland State University.

The State Fire Marshal utilized a data tracking system to monitor the students trained and courses taken by LEPCs using HMTA grant funds. Terry Weber, Chief of Fire Prevention at the Academy is the contact for this data. Terry Weber stated at the SERC October 1994 meeting, the Fire Academy trained 6,346 individuals to the awareness level and 1,856 to the operations level. Many of these people were trained with the aid of HMTA grant money.

The HMTA Planning funds were distributed to all LEPCs in Ohio submitting a workplan to Ohio EPA. The LEPCs developed their workplans based on the LEPC's planning goals for the fiscal year. The HMTA planning money was distributed to the participating LEPCs based on a funding formula weighing population, number of EHS facilities, and roadway miles in the county. As with the HMTA

The Ohio Emergency Management Agency reviewed the planning activities conducted by the LEPCs. The following is an overview of the activities and a close estimate of the LEPCs that conducted the activity:

Flow Studies	14	Planning the LEPC Plan	8
Exercises	18	Plan Updates	46
		-Hazard analysis	
		-Salaries	

Jack Bossert is the Supervisor at Ohio Emergency Management HazMat Section. He and his staff are reviewing the HMTA activities of the LEPCs.

The Ohio EPA learned it needed to change the method funds were managed for the SERC. The method used made distribution of unused HMTA grant money next to impossible. Ohio EPA set up a much more flexible account for these funds to allow redistribution of unused grant money. The primary cause for unused HMTA money last year was due to inactive LEPCs. All LEPCs were awarded the HMTA grant money outright. Many LEPCs are not active and therefore unable to encourage responders and LEPC members to conduct reimbursable activities under HMTA.

This year, SERC required the LEPCs to provide workplans for both training and planning activities. LEPCs failing to provide SERC workplans were not awarded HMTA money. Eleven LEPCs designated the State Fire Academy as their sole source of training. Funds will be paid directly to the Academy for these LEPCs. The SERC continues to look for better more efficient ways to use the HMTA grant money that brings the most benefit to Ohio's LEPCs. The 1993-1994 HMTA carry-over will be used to develop and distribute a training program to teach LEPCs about their duties under EPCRA.

It would be appreciated if you provide Ohio a copy of other state activity reports you think used the HMTA grant to the greatest benefit of its LEPCs, list of activities that Ohio may consider for next year. Thank you for your help and patience in this first year of HMTA.

cc: Jane Harf, SERC Chair
Terry Weber, SFM-SFM
Kenneth A. Schultz, CEPP Manager

Jack Bossert, OEHA-HazMat Supervisor
Pat Campbell, Ohio EPA Fiscal
Jeff Beattie, CEPU Supervisor

Division of Emergency Management

James B. Hunt Jr., Governor

Richard H. Moore, Secretary

December 30, 1996

Mr. Charles Rogoff, Grants Manager
HMTA Grants Unit (DHM-7, Room 8104)
US Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, SW, Washington DC 20590

Dear Mr. Rogoff:

Enclosed please find the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) final Financial Status Report for the third program year, as well as our Activity Report for that same period.

Funding provided to us this current year (i.e. the fourth year of the present program) increased somewhat over what was available during the past year; and we do appreciate these additional monies. However, please recognize that we continue to be unable to support a number of valuable hazardous materials training/planning activities because of insufficient funding.

However, we do certainly appreciate the benefits that our state has derived from our past association with the HMEP program; and look forward very much to our continued relationship.

Sincerely,



Billy R. Cameron,
Director

Enclosures

cc: Bob Buchanan

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (HMEP)

THIRD BUDGET PERIOD ACTIVITY REPORT

September 30, 1995 - September 30, 1996

GENERAL:

The state of North Carolina received a total of \$125,234 during the third year of the six year Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) program; with the state providing matching funds of \$31,309. The amount of funds provided during this third year was less than 60% of the first year's amount of \$212,427. This continual shrinking of the funds provided under this grant has had a serious impact upon the effectiveness of the overall program.

PLANNING GRANT:

North Carolina has established two types of planning grant programs for which LEPC's can apply. One type of funding is the "Program Implementation Grant"; which is limited to an initial amount of \$500 for a jurisdiction and \$200 for those jurisdictions requesting a second year's funds. These monies are to be used to support routine program implementation costs that the LEPCs incur; to include plan printing, postage, the duplication of MSDS sheets for local responder agencies and the purchase of supplies necessary for the LEPC to function. The second type of planning grant is the "Special Project Grant." These funds are larger amounts of money, and are provided to selected LEPCs to support major planning activities unique to their jurisdiction. A review of the third year's activities under both grant programs follows.

Implementation Grants

A total of \$4,800 in Implementation Grants were provided to twenty-one of the state's LEPCs. Two of the grants were "first time" allocations of \$500, with the remaining nineteen being second year grants of \$200 each. Recipients of these funds used the grants to print and distribute their hazardous materials plans to local responder organizations, to print awareness information for distribution to industry and the general public, to print emergency response Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and to support normal LEPC day-to-day activities (duplication, postage, supplies, etc.).

Attached you will find copies of three documents that were used to support the processing of "Special Project Grants"; the basic application package (Attachment #1), the review criteria (Attachment #2) and the rating criteria (Attachment #3). A rating procedure for evaluating applications for the grants was thought to be necessary, as it was expected there would be more "Special Project Grant" applications than there would be money to fund them. This, in fact, proved to be the case.

The Preparedness Committee of the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) rated the fifteen grant applications that were received, using the established rating criteria. The top four "Special Project Grant" applications, as outlined below, were funded with a total of \$35,872 in planning grant monies:

<u>COUNTY/LEPC</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
Camden and Pasquotank	Conduct a commodity flow study of the major road systems within both jurisdictions, and then perform a hazard analysis to identify vulnerable facilities along these routes.
Johnston	Utilize commodity flow data collected during an earlier study to improve hazardous materials shipment routing; as well as to improve the quality of hazardous materials information available to the general public.
Wake	Utilize commodity flow data collected during an earlier study to perform risk assessments, review and update plans/procedures, design and conduct training exercises.....and to conduct an "Interstate 40 Corridor" hazardous transportation seminar as part of the "Southern Hazardous Materials Expo and Conference."
Warren	Utilize information gathered during an earlier hazard analysis program to implement a jurisdiction-wide hazardous materials threat information system; to include the training of personnel in program use.

TRAINING GRANT:

A total of \$74,030 in training grant funding was provided during the third year of the grant.

The major emphasis of this past year's training grant continued to be the fielding of the "technician level" course, as developed by the Fire/Rescue Services Division (of the North Carolina Department

Carolina does not own/operate a specific fire training facility (i.e. a "fire academy"). Funds were provided to the Fire/Rescue Services Division to acquire the means to conduct the technician program across the state. Instructor materials, student manuals, and student reference materials were printed and classroom equipment/props were acquired. In addition, instructor travel and per diem costs were also paid.

While the fielding of the "technician level" course was the priority project of the third year's HMEP program, a number of additional training efforts were also supported. These activities included:

Classes were presented by the Hazardous Materials Training Officer (a position funded with HMEP monies); including several basic radiological emergency response classes and "awareness level" and "operations level" emergency response courses.

In addition, a number of other training activities also were conducted/supported during this period, including:

"Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents" (EPA 165.15)

"Computer Aided Management of Emergency Operations (CAMEO) Training Course" (EPA conducted)

"Injury Simulation Course" (NCEM G-901)

"Resource Management Course" (FEMA G-276)

Funds were also utilized to facilitate the distribution of the US DOT "1996 Emergency Response Guidebooks" to all public sector emergency responders across the state.

A "training needs" assessment was again conducted this year. It was included as an element of the overall state emergency management training program review. In addition, a second questionnaire was provided to the attendees at the joint hosted Emergency Management Association/Division of Emergency Management state-wide conference.

CONCLUSION:

The planning and training grants available under the HMEP program have greatly assisted the state of North Carolina to better prepare local responders to meet hazardous materials emergencies across the state. However, there is a wide variety of valuable transportation related hazardous materials training/planning programs that are never conducted because sufficient HMEP supporting funds are not available to support these activities.

North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety
Division of Emergency Management

James B. Hunt Jr., Governor

Richard H. Moore, Secretary

December 18, 1995

Mr. Charles Rogoff, Grants Manager
HMTA Grants Unit (DHM-7, Room 8104)
US Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, SW, Washington DC 20590

Dear Mr. Rogoff:

Enclosed please find the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) final Financial Status Report for the second program year, as well as our Activity Report for that same period.

Please note the concerns identified at the end of the enclosed Activity Report. Receiving only 54% of the HMEP funding that was expected for the third HMTA program year did result in several valuable hazardous materials planning/training programs having to be cancelled. I do hope that no further reductions will be necessary.

Sincerely,



Billy R. Cameron,
Director

Enclosures

cc: Bob Buchanan

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (HMEP)

SECOND BUDGET PERIOD ACTIVITY REPORT

July 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995

GENERAL:

The state of North Carolina received a total of \$140,500 during the second year of the six year Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) program; with the state providing matching funds of \$35,125.

Like the first year of the program, the grant period for this second year started on July 1; however, it continued to September 30 of the following year (for a total funding period of fifteen months). In addition, the amount of funds provided during this second year was considerably less than the first year's amount of \$212,427. This caused considerable problems, trying to make less money last for three months longer than was expected.

PLANNING GRANT:

North Carolina established two types of planning grant programs for which LEPC's could apply. One type of funding is the "Program Implementation Grant"; which is limited to an initial amount of \$500 for a jurisdiction and \$200 for those jurisdictions requesting a second year's funds. These monies are to be used to support routine program implementation costs that the LEPCs incur; to include plan printing, postage, the duplication of MSDS sheets for local responder agencies and the purchase of supplies necessary for the LEPC to function. The second type of planning grant is the "Special Project Grant." These funds are larger amounts of money, and are provided to selected LEPCs to support major planning activities unique to their jurisdiction. A review of the second year's activities under both grant programs follows.

Implementation Grants

A total of \$5,600 in Implementation Grants were provided to twenty-two of the state's LEPCs. Four of the grants were "first time" allocations of \$500, with the remaining eighteen being second year grants of \$200. Fifteen of the LEPCs used the grants to print and distribute their hazardous materials plans to local responder organizations. In addition, two jurisdictions printed awareness information for distribution to industry and the general public, one LEPC printed their emergency response Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and another jurisdiction printed and mailed out a survey of local industry. The remaining LEPCs utilized the funds to support their day-to-day activities (duplication, postage, supplies, etc.).

Special Project Grants

Attached you will find copies of three documents that were used to support the processing of "Special Project Grants"; the basic application package (Attachment #2), the review criteria (Attachment #3) and the rating criteria (Attachment #4). A rating procedure for evaluating applications for the grants was thought to be necessary, as it was expected that there would be more "Special Project Grant" applications than there would be money to fund them. This proved to be the case.

The Preparedness Committee of the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) rated the twenty-four grant applications that were received, using the established rating criteria. The top eight "Special Project Grant" applications, as outlines below, were funded:

<u>COUNTY/LEPC</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
Caldwell	Conduct visits to local facilities maintaining hazardous materials and complete a mail-out to similar facilities in surrounding counties; identify potential hazards and produce a detailed commodity flow study; exchange collected information with neighboring jurisdictions.
Guilford	Develop response procedures and clean-up reimbursement options for small petroleum spills, in conjunction with three additional counties (Buncombe, Johnston and Alamance) and several state agencies (Environment, Health and Natural Resources; Transportation; Emergency Management).
Orange	Survey storers of hazardous materials within the county and anyone shipping similar materials through the jurisdiction; conduct a hazard analysis based upon the data collected and upon a study of past emergency response calls.
Person	Conduct a seminar for small facilities that generate and ship hazardous materials within the county and the two adjacent counties of Granville and Caswell. (NOTE: HMEP Training Grant funds were also used to support this project).
Rowan	Conduct a highway/rail commodity flow study; a hazard analysis based upon the collected information; and an emergency response materials and training needs assessment.
Surry	Conduct a highway/rail commodity flow study; review past accident reports; reassess past risk analysis; identify potentially dangerous routes/intersections and sensitive areas/facilities.

COUNTY/LEPCPROJECT

Union	Conduct a commodity flow study; share information collected with neighboring counties; identify vulnerable populations/facilities.
Wake	Develop a LEPC Task Force for Transportation; identify routes for moving hazardous materials between facilities within the county and along major transportation systems throughout the jurisdiction. (NOTE: This was the first year of a two year program.)

TRAINING GRANT:

A total of \$83,189 in training grant funding was provided during second year of the grant.

The major emphasis of this past year's training grant continued to be the fielding of the "technician level" course, as developed by the Fire/Rescue Services Division (of the North Carolina Department of Insurance). This course is presented by state certified fire instructors using the facilities of the state's Community College system. This approach is necessary, since the state of North Carolina does not own/operate a specific fire training facility (i.e. a "fire academy"). Funds were provided to the Fire/Rescue Services Division to acquire the means to conduct the technician program across the state. Instructor materials, student manuals, and student reference materials were printed and classroom equipment/props were acquired. In addition, instructor travel and per diem costs were also paid.

While the fielding of the "technician level" course was the priority project of the second year's HMEP program, a number of additional training efforts were also supported. These activities included:

Smoke fluid was purchased and distributed to the six Area Offices of the Division of Emergency Management for use in the smoke generators assigned to each office. This equipment is available for loan to local jurisdictions to provide more realism in local hazardous materials exercises.

A three-county seminar was conducted for managers of facilities that generate, store and ship small quantities of hazardous materials. Information available at the seminar should further emergency preparedness and prevention planning within the counties of Person (the host), Caswell and Granville.

A number of classes were presented by the Hazardous Materials Training Officer (a position funded with HMEP monies); including basic radiological emergency response classes, "awareness level" and "operations level" emergency response courses, and an "awareness level instructor training" program that was presented specifically for the North Carolina Department of Transportation personnel.

A "training needs" assessment was again attempted during this period; in order to better understand the status of the hazardous materials training program across the state. Unlike the previous year's attempt using a locally produced questionnaire, we utilized the "Training Needs Assessment Worksheet" that was included with the first year's HMEP application guidance. A copy of the questionnaire is included at Attachment #1. Response to the needs assessment from the 101 local jurisdictions within the state was very poor, with only a few counties replying. A third assessment will be attempted during the next project year; however, to insure a better response, it will involve direct tasking by the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) to the LEPCs for the completion of the report.

CONCLUSION:

The planning and training grants available under the HMEP program have greatly assisted the state of North Carolina to better prepare local responders to meet hazardous materials emergencies across the state. However, there is a wide variety of valuable transportation related hazardous materials programs that are never conducted because money is not available to support them. This is substantiated by the fact that in North Carolina, the lack of program funds resulted in sixteen local jurisdictions being turned down for "Special Project Grants". As was indicated in last year's activity report, sixteen LEPCs were also turned down during the first year of this program because of lack of funding.

To make matters worse, the funding available in the third year of the program has been reduced to approximately 54% of what was expected for that year. The amount actually received is \$87,193 less than what was provided during the first year of the program and is \$15,266 less than was received during the second year. While funding in any amount is certainly appreciated, and will be carefully managed to insure that it is spent in areas where the needs are the greatest, valuable programs have had to be cancelled because funding in the amount that was expected (and was "programmed" for) did not materialize.

North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety

Division of Emergency Management

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor

Thurman B. Hampton, Secretary

December 28, 1994

Mr. Charles Rogoff, Grants Manager
HMTA Grants Unit (DHM-7, Room 8104)
US Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, SW, Washington DC 20590

Dear Mr. Rogoff:

Enclosed please find the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) final Financial Status Report for the first program year, as well as our Activity Report for that same period.

The below listed emergency responder hazardous materials training statistics are provided, as requested by Ms. Windy Hamilton in her letter dated November 4, 1994. Please note that the figures are based upon the "best estimate" of state level training personnel associated with each responder category.

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>TRAINED</u>	<u>REMAINING</u>
Fire	50,000	15,500	34,500
Rescue	10,000	2,500	7,500
Law Enforcement	23,306	10,768	12,538
EMS	24,000	6,000	18,000
Emergency Mgm't	200	100	100
Public Officials	1,515	91	1,424
Other	<u>16,000</u>	<u>1,061</u>	<u>14,939</u>
TOTAL	125,021	36,020	89,001

Please note the concerns identified at the end of the enclosed Activity Report. Receiving only 61% of the HMTA funding that was expected for the second HMTA program year did result in several valuable hazardous materials planning/training programs having to be cancelled. I do hope that no further reductions will be necessary.

Sincerely,



Billy R. Cameron,
Director

Enclosures

116 West Jones Street • Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1335 • Telephone (919) 733-3867

An Equal Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer



FIRST BUDGET PERIOD ACTIVITY REPORT
SFY-93 (July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1994)

GENERAL:

The state of North Carolina received a total of \$212,427 during the first year of the six year Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) program; with the state providing matching funds of \$53,107.

While the grant period for this first year started on July 1; it was well into August 1993 before all program application paperwork was submitted to US Department of Transportation and the first monies were requested. However, even though the program was initiated late, all activities were completed by the end of the June 1994; thus an extension into the next year's cycle was not required.

A "planning/training needs" assessment was attempted during this period; in order to determine the true nature of planning concerns at the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) level and to better understand the status of the hazardous materials training program across the state. A copy of the questionnaire is included at Attachment #1. Response to the needs assessment from the 101 local jurisdictions within the state was very poor, with only twenty counties replying. A second assessment will be attempted during the SFY-94 project year.

PLANNING GRANT:

North Carolina established two types of planning grant programs for which LEPC's could apply. One type of funding is the "Program Implementation Grant"; which was limited to \$500 for every interested jurisdiction. These funds were to be used to support routine program implementation costs that the LEPCs could incur; to include plan printing, postage, the duplication of MSDS sheets for local responder agencies and those supplies necessary for the LEPC to function. The second type of planning grant is the "Special Project Grant." These funds were larger amounts of money, provided to selected LEPCs to support major planning activities unique to their jurisdiction. A review of the first year's activities under both grant programs follows:

Implementation Grants

A total of \$15,500 was granted to thirty-one of the state's LEPCs, in \$500 grants to each. Sixteen of the LEPCs used the grants to print and distribute their hazardous materials plans to local responder organizations. The remainder of the LEPCs used the funds for the copying and distribution of MSDS information to responder organizations, to pay postage costs and/or to cover administrative/supply costs associated with the operating of the LEPC.

Attached you will find copies of three documents that were used to support the processing of "Special Project Grants"; the basic application package (Attachment #2), the rating criteria (Attachment #3) and the review criteria (Attachment #4). A rating procedure for evaluating applications for the grants was thought to be necessary, as it was expected that there would be more "Special Project Grant" applications than there would be money to fund them. This proved to be the case.

The Preparedness Committee of the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) rated the twenty-four grant applications that were received, using the established rating criteria. With the \$49,000 remaining in the planning grant program, after the "Implementation Grants" were awarded, the top eight "Special Project Grant" applications were funded. The eight funded programs are outlined below):

<u>COUNTY/LEPC</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
Cleveland	A commodity flow study of hazardous materials being transported through the county and a hazard analysis of SARA facilities; with all collected information entered into the local computer system and made available to county/municipal planning officials.
Durham	The identification of suitable routes for hazardous materials shipments away from heavily populated areas; with the ultimate goal to be the passing of an ordinance to enforce selected routing.
Guilford	A commodity flow study of SARA transportation in and around the county and the updating of local plans and SOPs based upon this information.
Johnston	The conduct of a highway/rail commodity flow study of hazardous materials transported through the county. The information gathered will be used to select routes for future hazardous materials shipments.
Lee	The conduct of a highway commodity flow study of hazardous materials transported through the county. The information gathered will be used to assess the needs for alternate transportation routes.
Moore	The hiring of part-time personnel to assist in the development of the local hazardous materials plan, and the printing/distribution of copies of those plans to all local emergency response organizations.

New Hanover

The conduct of a comprehensive port and waterway hazard analysis; including SARA facilities and water/pipeline transported hazardous materials. The collected information will then be entered into the local computer system and will be made available to all response organizations and to county/municipal planning officials.

Pender

The conduct of a public information campaign to identify non-reporting SARA facilities, and the subsequent review of the flow of hazardous materials transported to/from these locations in order to improve the local planning process.

TRAINING GRANT:

A total of \$125,776 in training grant funding was provided during SFY-93.

At the beginning of the grant period, the Fire/Rescue Services Division of the Department of Insurance was nearing the completion of the development of a "technician level" training program. This course was to be presented by state certified fire instructors using the facilities of the state's Community College system. This is necessary, since the state of North Carolina does not own/operate a specific fire training facility (i.e. a "fire academy"). It was decided that the emphasis for the first year of the NHTA training grant program would be the fielding of the "technician level" course, as developed by the Fire/Rescue Services Division for presentation through the auspices of the Community College system.

Funds were provided to the Fire/Rescue Services Division of the Department of Insurance to acquire the means to provide the technician program across the state. Instructor materials, student manuals, and student reference materials were printed and classroom equipment/props were acquired. A "pilot" class of the program was conducted in Raleigh, NC, with seventeen experienced hazardous materials personnel from local fire departments attending and providing valuable feedback to aid in the "fine tuning" of the program. As a result, the first official technician level course was presented to twenty-four students at Rowan-Cabarrus Community College in October 1994. The "technician level" course is now established in North Carolina; with future support being limited to the funding of instructor costs, printing and the replacement of materials/supplies used during the classes.

While the fielding of the "technician level" course was the priority project of the first year's NHTA program, a number of additional training efforts were also supported. These activities included:

Twenty-six sets of the National Fire Academy's "Recognizing and Identifying Hazardous Materials" instructor materials

Concepts" and their "Initial Response Hazardous Materials Incidents: Concept Implementation" instructor materials were purchased. These training packages were distributed, through the auspices of the Fire/Rescue Services Division, to those Community College facilities across the state supporting the "awareness level" and "operational level" training programs.

Several reference publications/periodicals were purchased for the use of the Hazardous Materials Training Officer, assigned to the Division of Emergency Management, for use in the development/revision of hazardous materials training programs. In addition, 3,200 copies of the American Trucking Association "Placard Substitution Guide" were purchased for use in a variety of basic hazardous materials courses taught by the Division of Emergency Management.

Two smoke generators were purchased, and assigned to two of the six Area Offices of the Division of Emergency Management. The other Area Offices were provided with similar equipment earlier, using other funding sources. The smoke generators are available for loan to local jurisdictions to provide more realism in local hazardous materials exercises.

Blank video tapes were purchased for duplication of programs used in state-wide emergency response training activities and for the video taping of local exercises.

CONCLUSION:

The planning and training grants available under the HMTA program have greatly assisted the state of North Carolina to better prepare local responders to meet hazardous materials emergencies across the state. However, as indicated by the fact that sixteen local jurisdictions were turned down for "Special Project Grants" during the first year because of lack of funds, there is a wide variety of valuable transportation related hazardous materials programs that are never conducted because money was not available to support them.

To make matters worse, the funding available in the second year of the HMTA program has been reduced to approximately 61% of what was expected for that year, and is \$71,927 less than what was received in the first year of the program. While funding in any amount is certainly appreciated, and will be carefully managed to insure that it is spent in areas where the needs are the greatest, valuable programs had to be cancelled because funding in the amount that was expected (and was "programmed" for) did not materialize.