

**Local Emergency Planning Committees
and Risk Management Plans:
Encouraging Hazard Reduction**

Prepared by:
National Institute for Chemical Studies
Charleston, West Virginia

under a cooperative agreement with
the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(#CX 824095)

Prepared for:
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office
(EPA/CEPPO)

June, 2001

Contents

	Page
Section 1: Introduction	1
Section 2: Background	3
Local Emergency Planning Committee responsibilities under EPCRA	3
Risk Management Plan requirements under CAA Section 112(r)	3
Role of LEPCs in RMP and hazard reduction	4
Section 3: Review of LEPC involvement in RMP Program and Hazard Reduction Activities	9
Methodology	9
Findings	11
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How LEPCs have been involved in RMP• How LEPCs have used RMP and similar information to encourage hazard reduction• Factors affecting LEPC role in encouraging hazard reduction	
Conclusions	22
Section 4: Recommendations	25
Appendices	
A: Resources Reviewed	28
B: LEPCs Contacted	30
C: Examples of LEPC Activity:	33
Centre County, PA	
Cuyahoga County, OH	
Philadelphia, PA	
Fayette County, GA	
Washtenaw County, MI	
Johnson County, KS	
Springfield, MA	
Deer Park, TX	

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA) called for the establishment of local emergency planning committees (LEPCs). LEPCs were established to be broad-based membership groups with the responsibility to receive information from local facilities about chemicals in the community, to use this information to prepare a comprehensive emergency response plan for the community, and to respond to public inquiries about chemical hazards and releases. There are approximately 4,000 established LEPCs in the United States, ranging from single-city to statewide organizations.

Section 112(r) of the federal Clean Air Act requires that facilities that pose the greatest harm to the public and the environment as a result of an accidental chemical release must prepare and submit a risk management plan (RMP) to EPA. The plan must describe the facility's chemical accident prevention program, emergency response program, and off-site consequence analysis (OCA). The OCA must evaluate the potential for hypothetical worst-case and alternative accidental release scenarios. Congress mandated that RMPs be available to state and local governments and the public. As of May, 2001 approximately 15,000 RMPs have been filed with EPA in accordance with the RMP rule (promulgated June, 1996).

Both EPCRA and Section 112(r) recognize that planning for and responding to accidental chemical releases is ultimately a local responsibility. Accordingly, LEPCs have a key role in carrying out the intent of the Risk Management Plan program.

Since the promulgation of the RMP rule, and the initial submissions of RMPs in June, 1999, issues have been raised regarding how these plans are being used to reduce the potential impacts of accidental chemical releases. Specifically, EPA/CEPPO has expressed interest in identifying how LEPCs might be using the RMP information to encourage facilities within their jurisdictions to reduce or eliminate chemical hazards.

The purpose of this study is to identify opportunities and challenges for LEPCs in using the RMP tool to improve community safety, and to highlight those LEPCs that use RMPs to promote hazard reduction. The goal of the study is to develop useful information that can be used by other LEPCs, by State Emergency Response Commissions (SERCs), and by EPA, to more fully take advantage of the RMP program to improve community safety.

Because of the interconnectedness between RMP requirements and those previously established under EPCRA, many of the hazard reduction activities identified during this study were not driven solely by RMP information but also by LEPC efforts to meet their EPCRA responsibilities. Both are included in this report.

The National Institute for Chemical Studies (NICS), is uniquely qualified to conduct this study. Since 1985 NICS has worked to help communities around the United States manage chemical risks. A significant part of the work of NICS has focused on supporting local emergency managers through training and information. With the support of EPA/CEPPO, NICS convened a focus group of LEPCs from around the country in 1995 to identify challenges and opportunities facing these organizations. The findings of this study were summarized in a report issued in 1995, Focus on the Future of LEPCs. Since that time NICS has continued to support LEPCs through information and training on protective actions during chemical emergencies and on hazardous materials transportation studies. NICS also participates as a member of the Kanawha Putnam Emergency Planning Committee, which is recognized as one of the most active LEPCs in the nation. Additional information about NICS may be found at www.nicsinfo.org.

The following report presents the results of the NICS study on LEPCs and their use of the Risk Management Plan program to encourage hazard reduction.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND

Local Emergency Planning Committee responsibilities under EPCRA

EPCRA establishes the LEPC as a forum at the local level for discussions and a focus for action in matters pertaining to hazardous materials planning. LEPCs also help to provide local governments and the public with information about possible chemical hazards in their communities. Under EPCRA, LEPCs have two primary responsibilities:

- (1) LEPCs annually review, test, and update emergency plans for their planning district. The plan must include the identity and location of hazardous materials; procedures for immediate response to a chemical accident; ways to notify the public about actions they must take; names of coordinators at chemical plants; and schedules and arrangements for testing the plan through emergency drills.
- (2) LEPCs also collect emergency release and hazardous chemical inventory information submitted by local facilities (called Tier 2 information) and make this information available to the public upon request.

Risk Management Program requirements under Clean Air Act Section 112(r)

The RMP regulation (40 CFR part 68) is designed to prevent accidental releases to the air of substances that may cause immediate, serious harm to public health and the environment, and to mitigate the effects of releases that do occur. The RMP regulation applies to processes at facilities that have more than a threshold quantity of any of 77 acutely toxic substances, and 63 highly volatile flammable substances. A subsequent law excluded flammable substances from the RMP requirement when those substances are used for fuel or held for sale as fuel at a retail facility.

The main elements of facility compliance with the RMP regulation are:

- (1) A hazard assessment, including a five-year accident history involving the regulated substances and descriptions of the worst-case and alternate-case accident scenarios for those substances;
- (2) A management system to oversee implementation of the RMP elements;
- (3) A prevention program to analyze the hazards that are present and describe the systems and practices for managing the risk of a chemical accident;
- (4) An emergency response program which is coordinated with the local LEPC; and
- (5) A Risk Management Plan (RMP) that describes these activities.

Information in the RMPs is required to be updated every five years or sooner under certain circumstances, including major changes to the facility or its covered processes. In addition, facilities are required to keep additional supporting documentation on their risk management program on site.

Role of LEPCs in RMP and Hazard Reduction

Local emergency planning committees are not mandated or required to take action under the risk management program established by Section 112(r). However, the 112(r) rule promulgated by EPA offers the opportunity to increase the scope of LEPC activity from just preparing for and responding to releases to taking a proactive role in helping facilities in their communities prevent releases.

LEPCs serve as a central point around which emergency management agencies, responders, industry and the community may work together to find solutions to hazardous material risk management issues. As a result, LEPCs may play an active role in RMP-related activities including risk communication, public education, industry outreach, mitigation, and emergency planning.

A fundamental goal of EPCRA is making communities aware of hazardous risks so they can take steps to minimize those risks and to prepare for potential accidents. Under this law, LEPCs have the responsibility for increasing hazardous materials safety by educating the public, coordinating emergency planning, training emergency responders, conducting exercises, and reviewing actual responses to releases. This authority allows LEPCs to enhance and refine the information provided under RMP to improve community safety.

The RMP program also provides opportunity for LEPCs to better coordinate their current responsibilities with ongoing industry hazard reduction activities. According to EPA's Guide to Accidental Release Requirements:

In the broadest sense, risk management planning relates to local emergency preparedness and response, to pollution prevention at facilities, and to worker safety. In a more focused sense, it forms one element of an integrated approach to safety and complements existing industry codes and standards. The risk management planning requirements build on OSHA's Process Safety Management Standard, the chemical safety guidelines of the Center for Chemical Process Safety of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, and similar standards of the American Petroleum Institute and the American Chemistry Council, as well as the practices of many other safety-conscious companies.

This study was developed to examine how LEPCs may be using their EPCRA responsibilities and the information provided by the RMP program to reduce hazards in the community. EPA has recognized that one of the most important, but not mandated, measures that LEPCs can take is to make hazard reduction or prevention

recommendations to industry and local government. In the 1994 national survey of LEPCs conducted for EPA by George Washington University, nearly half (48 percent) of the functioning LEPCs responded that they have taken this step as part of fulfilling their EPCRA responsibilities. The RMP program offers additional opportunity to encourage hazard reduction at facilities based on the hazard analysis and accident prevention requirements of the RMP.

Numerous roles for LEPCs in encouraging hazard reduction have been suggested by EPA and other chemical safety organizations. These have included the following:

1. Potential roles identified in 1992 Texas A&M national LEPC survey (from NICS, Focus on the Future of LEPCs)
 - Use the authority of SARA Title III to get information from private facilities that is needed for planning, through on-site visits, surveys, and other means.
 - Set up meetings with industrial safety management to discuss safety.
 - Set up “good neighbor” agreements or other negotiations with facilities concerning safety and accident prevention.
 - Ask facilities to use methods of accident prevention such as reducing or breaking up volumes of chemicals stored on-site or improving maintenance.
 - Ask local or state agencies to re-route hazardous substance carrier traffic to avoid vulnerable populations.
 - Make comments on a proposed land use plan, or new zoning or subdivision ordinance, concerning chemical safety and population protection issues.
 - Ask facilities to reduce use of toxic substances by substitution of less toxic chemicals or changes in chemical processes.
 - Make comments to a local planning/zoning commission concerning a proposed industrial zone change or land use permit that involves facilities using toxics.
 - Create a local zoning ordinance to regulate certain industrial activities using toxics in or near residential or other areas.

2. Recommendations by EPA (from RMPs Are on the Way):

- LEPCs should work with facilities to reduce chemical inventories, substitute less hazardous chemicals, use inherently safer technologies, and add new prevention measures.
- LEPCs should develop a public recognition program to honor facilities who have a noteworthy accident prevention program.
- LEPCs should serve as a forum for the community and industry on accident prevention. LEPCs should meet with industry officials to discuss the off-site consequence analysis, understand the facility's prevention program, and perhaps suggest additional steps to prevent accidental chemical releases.
- Using the national RMP database, LEPCs will be able to gather information necessary to compare practices at local facilities with other facilities in the same industry in the state or even in other parts of the country. With RMP data from other facilities, LEPCs can make comparisons with a local facility by asking the following questions:
 - (1) Is the quantity of the chemical the facility is using or storing unusual?
 - (2) Has the facility identified the same major hazards as similar facilities?
 - (3) Does the facility have the same kinds of process controls as similar facilities?
 - (4) Does the facility use the same kind of mitigation systems as similar facilities?
 - (5) Do facilities in this industry generally have detection systems?

If the facility being reviewed has not listed major hazards that similar facilities have identified, this may indicate a problem with the facility's hazard review or PHA. If it has fewer controls, mitigation systems, or detection systems than similar facilities have, the LEPC may want to talk to the facility about possible changes that could reduce risk. If the local facility does not have certain process controls or detection systems typically used by similar facilities, or if it stores ten times as much of the regulated substance as anyone else, the LEPC may have solid information with which to start a dialogue on risk reduction.

3. Recommendations from AIChE, Center for Chemical Process Safety (from Local Emergency Planning Committee Handbook):

CCPS recommends several proactive options for LEPC involvement in using RMP data:

- Use worst case scenarios to pinpoint potential problem areas in the community.
- Use alternative release scenarios to build decision trees for determining when to call for shelter in place or evacuation.
- Use alternative release scenarios for preplanning evacuation routes.
- Use alternative release scenarios for planning drill scenarios and training exercises.
- Use five-year accident scenarios for planning realistic drill scenarios.
- Use five-year accident histories for developing LEPC tabletop studies to help understand the best practices and weaknesses from past performance.
- Systematically begin requesting emergency response plans for review and arrange meetings to discuss them with stationary sources.
- Target those facilities whose RMPs indicate more attention and request further information such as detailed alternative release scenarios and prevention program data.
- Approach facilities for assistance in planning out drill scenarios using actual data from their RMPs.
- Consider revising the community response plan based upon reviews of the plans from each stationary source in the response area.

4. Recommendations by U.S. Public Interest Research Group (from Too Close to Home report):

U.S. PIRG has recommended that LEPCs use RMPs to emphasize accident prevention and inherent safety as an integral part of their activities. Strategies for LEPCs to promote inherent safety and source reduction recommended by the Great Lakes Pollution Prevention and Chemical Safety Project Team include:

- Adopt and implement a policy, goal or mission statement of working toward inherent safety and source reduction.
- Make it a high priority to network with providers of prevention-based technical assistance for industry.
- Introduce inherent safety and source reduction concepts to industry during Risk Management Plan review and plant tours – either themselves or by

working with other local agencies such as fire prevention or pollution prevention officials.

- Create opportunities to impart expertise to industry, including better economic analysis methods.
- Publish (or otherwise present to LEPC members, industry, labor, the public, and government agencies) information from footprints/vulnerable zones, Tier 2 inventories, and TRI in order to track and improve inherent safety and source reduction progress.
- Network or form partnerships with compliance and enforcement agencies and others, such as insurance companies, both in providing incentives for compliance and “beyond compliance” and in enforcement (e.g., increasing the rigor of fire department or other agency inspections of uncooperative facilities.)
- Understand, and where appropriate, take a role in compliance assistance and enforcement. This may involve such activities as LEPC review of emergency response plans, working creatively with State Attorney Generals offices, and Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) in settlements.
- Use community pressure by publicizing which facilities have made progress toward inherent safety, as well as instances of noncompliance or non-cooperation.
- Obtain more (and sustainable) funding for inherent safety and source reduction, including facility fees as an appropriate mechanism. Other funding mechanisms include creative enforcement settlement, networking with other agencies and organizations to use their resources, including in-kind donations of equipment or services.
- Encourage public awareness and participation, including recruitment of LEPC members from community groups, community colleges or school districts, labor, pollution prevention agencies, etc.)

SECTION 3: REVIEW OF LEPC INVOLVEMENT IN RMP PROGRAM AND HAZARD REDUCTION ACTIVITIES

METHODOLOGY

This review was conducted using the case study method, in which NICS examined selected LEPCs to determine their role in the Risk Management Plan program and hazard reduction activities. The specific methodology used included the following steps:

- (1) NICS reviewed previously published material on LEPCs and on the Risk Management Plan program. This material included EPA guidance documents; previous surveys of LEPCs; reports by other chemical safety organizations; and selected SERC and LEPC websites. A listing of these resources is included in Appendix A.
- (2) NICS identified LEPCs around the United States that are generally considered “active.” The organizations included in this group are those who were identified as meeting or exceeding the EPCRA-mandated duties for LEPCs. This selection was done to develop a representative sampling of LEPCs rather than an exhaustive list of active groups. NICS identified these LEPCs by contacting each of the ten EPA regional CEPP offices and asking for their suggestions of LEPCs that could be described as “active.” Additional organizations were identified by reviewing previously published reports on LEPCs and RMPs. Others were identified through referrals from those LEPCs initially identified by the EPA regional offices.
- (3) NICS contacted the identified LEPCs by letter, followed up by telephone calls. Several of the LEPCs contacted by letter could not be reached or did not return phone calls. The remainder were contacted by NICS by telephone for conversations ranging from 30 minutes to an hour. During these conversations the LEPC contact person was asked to describe their LEPC’s general level of activity; involvement in the RMP program; their use of RMP data or similarly available data to encourage hazard reductions at facilities within their jurisdictions; and their opinions on opportunities and challenges for LEPCs in seeking to encourage hazard reductions.

A total of 32 LEPCs were contacted for this study; those contacted are listed in Appendix B.

- (4) NICS summarized the materials reviewed and the conversations with the LEPCs into this report. Included are findings regarding LEPC activity in hazard reduction; conclusions that may be drawn regarding this activity; and recommendations for further action by EPA.

Notes on the methodology

This study was not designed as a comprehensive analysis of LEPC activity across the United States. Given the limitations of time and resources for the study, a representative group of active LEPCs was selected for examination. NICS recognizes that there are likely other examples of LEPC efforts in hazard reduction that are not examined here. It is hoped that this report will lead to additional examples of LEPC involvement being identified and shared.

The study was also not designed to be a statistical analysis of this sample population of LEPCs. Because the conversations with the selected LEPCs were designed to be open-ended, and the sample size is too small to draw statistically-significant inferences, the results of the study are expressed in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. Descriptions such as “a few,” “some,” “many,” or “nearly all LEPCs,” rather than numbers and percentages, are used to convey the study results.

While NICS believes that the study findings are representative of a cross-section of these organizations, the report is not intended to draw generalizations about the opinions of all LEPCs. Additional input from other LEPCs, SERCs, EPA, and other chemical safety organizations would be most welcomed and would further inform the study of this issue.

It was recognized at the outset of the study that LEPCs vary widely across the country in terms of existing hazards, organizational capabilities, and available resources. The examples offered in this report are not necessarily intended as ones that should be replicated by all LEPCs. What works for one organization may not work for another. These examples are offered to suggest ideas that may be adapted for use by other LEPCs, or that may lead to other approaches to hazard reduction.

Finally, this study was intended to supplement the findings of the most recent national survey of LEPCs conducted by George Washington University for EPA/CEPPO. However, the results and findings of this survey were not made available to NICS during the project period and thus are not addressed in this report.

FINDINGS

How LEPCs are involved in the Risk Management Plan Program

The LEPCs contacted for this study were first asked to describe their organization's involvement in implementing the RMP requirements. The following is a summary of this activity:

1. Staying informed of RMP requirements

Nearly all of the LEPCs reported that they had made efforts early on to develop an understanding of who was required to file RMPs and what filing requirements existed. This information was obtained predominantly from EPA regional offices, although some LEPCs reported receiving early information from industrial groups and facility members on the LEPC. In addition, a few LEPCs reported that they did not make a significant effort to become informed of RMP requirements because their state did not seek delegation of the 112(r) program and thus they did not expect to have a role in RMP implementation.

2. Helping identifying facilities required to file RMPs

Some of the LEPCs reported that they had used information about RMP requirements to identify facilities within their jurisdiction that were required to file RMPs. In several cases contacts were made with these facilities to ensure they were aware of filing deadlines and requirements.

3. Assisting facilities in preparing RMPs

Some LEPCs state that they served as an information clearinghouse for facilities required to file RMPs, and provided technical guidance to smaller facilities and others that did not have staff expertise in RMP. Two LEPCs – Fayette County (GA) LEPC, and Jefferson County (KY) LEPC – reported hiring consultants to train facilities in complying with RMP requirements. Another LEPC – Springfield (MA) LEPC – reported preparing the RMP for the city wastewater treatment plant.

4. Assisting in public disclosure of RMPs

By far the greatest area of involvement in RMP reported by the LEPCs was in assisting and participating in the public rollout of the plans. Nearly all of the LEPCs stated their belief that this represented an extension of their public outreach responsibilities under EPCRA. In several cases, LEPCs participated in the public meetings when requested to do so by the facilities. In some cases – such as the Clark County (NV) LEPC – a coordinated approach to public presentation of the RMP was developed by the LEPC and provided to all reporting facilities. Some of the LEPCs – such as the Kanawha Putnam Emergency Planning Committee – hosted or sponsored the public rollout of their facility RMPs at a regular LEPC meeting or at a special community event.

5. Working with new facilities to meet RMP filing requirements

In a few instances LEPCs noted that they are working with new facilities in their district to comply with the requirements for filing RMPs.

6. Maintaining copies of RMPs at the LEPC office

Some of the LEPCs reported maintaining copies of RMPs, or the executive summaries of RMPs, at the LEPC office. In a few cases the LEPCs sought out copies of the plans from their reporting facilities; in a few other cases the LEPCs reported that facilities voluntarily provided copies of their RMP to the LEPC. For the most part, however, the LEPCs reported that they did not maintain copies of the plans but could obtain them from the facility if needed. There appeared to be some uncertainty regarding whether these plans were required to be maintained by the LEPC, or whether it was appropriate to do so. This issue is further examined later in this report.

How LEPCs have used RMP and similar information to encourage hazard reduction

Nearly all the LEPCs contacted for this report expressed the belief that encouraging hazard reduction is a logical role for their organizations. Many of the LEPCs reported seeing hazard reduction as appropriate because of their access to risk information and their responsibilities for coordinating emergency planning and response activities.

Much of the reported activity in encouraging hazard reduction is the result of LEPCs exercising their responsibilities under SARA Title III. In these cases, the planning activities which LEPCs are required to carry out, the training and support provided to emergency responders, and the outreach to the public regarding risk information, are viewed as ultimately resulting in safer facility operations and fewer accidental releases.

Examples were also identified of LEPCs that have used the RMP information to both indirectly and directly encourage hazard reduction. In these cases, the LEPCs had viewed the RMP as either offering new risk information or supplementing existing information, and providing an opportunity to engage in further dialogue regarding accident prevention and hazard reduction.

The following are examples of how RMPs and similar information have been used by LEPCs and other organizations, in both direct and indirect ways, to encourage hazard reduction:

Actions taken pursuant to RMP

- (1) Providing a forum through the LEPC by which industries present their RMP plans to each other and exchange information on safety programs (Example: York County, PA LEPC)
- (2) Using RMP information on chlorine hazards in the community to obtain funding

for a chlorine safety training program for local industries and utilities
(Example: Fayette County, GA LEPC)

- (3) Surveying companies following RMP submittal to identify what changes were made at the facilities to reduce chemical hazards as a result of preparing the RMP
(Example: Deer Park, TX LEPC)
- (4) Requesting quarterly reports from facilities identifying ongoing efforts to reduce hazards and decrease the vulnerable zones identified in the RMP (Example: Community Advisory Committees in La Porte, Pasadena, and Deer Park, TX, in cooperation with the LEPCs)
- (5) Revising community emergency plans using the RMP program design guidelines, focusing on the greatest chemical risks identified by the RMPs: Chlorine, ammonia, propane, LPG (Example: Honolulu, HI LEPC, through industrial association Campbell Local Emergency Action Network)
- (6) Revising county emergency plan using RMP by doing GIS modeling of facility hazards and vulnerable zones to pre-determine zones for evacuation (Example: Linn County, IA LEPC)
- (7) Developing protective action training programs and establishing and upgrading community warning systems (Example: Union County, AR LEPC)
- (8) Using RMP accident scenario modeling to re-run scenarios previously modeled using CAMEO/ALOHA, in order to present a more realistic assessment of threatened areas (Example: Cuyahoga County, OH LEPC)
- (9) Using RMP data as justification for establishing a program jointly funded by local industry for the purchase of emergency response equipment to be available for any public or private response agency (Example: Fayette County, GA LEPC)

Actions taken pursuant to EPCRA

- (1) Conducting inspections of SARA Title III facilities and including a focus on hazard reduction and pollution prevention opportunities (Example: Springfield, MA LEPC)
- (2) Participating in community fairs to promote hazard reduction and encourage public awareness (Example: Anchorage, AK LEPC)
- (3) Reviewing and critiquing recent accidents and training exercises to identify lessons learned for future prevention (Example: East Baton Rouge, LA LEPC)

- (4) Sponsoring industry roundtables and committees as a regular forum to address mutual safety and hazard reduction concerns (Example: Centre County, PA LEPC)
- (5) Partnering with local industry groups to disseminate information on safety and hazard reduction through regular LEPC meetings and special seminars (Example: Monroe County, PA LEPC)

**Examples of Hazard Reductions
Achieved through RMP and SARA Title III**

Allegheny County, PA: Preparation of RMPs for regional wastewater treatment plant and city water plant identified chlorine risk from tank cars parked near a hospital, shopping mall, and downtown business area. Both plants subsequently switched to solid chlorination to reduce risk.

Honolulu, HI: Wastewater treatment plant changed from chlorine treatment to ultraviolet and chlorine solution treatment.

North Central Florida: Local plant reduced ammonia storage from 5 ton containers to 100 pound cylinders after it was determined that larger supply was not needed.

Harford County, MD: Administrative controls used to reduce chlorine inventory and use at city water plant; Army water plant switched from liquid to powdered chlorine.

Fayette County, GA: Public pressure resulted in elimination of chlorine storage tank at a new industrial facility built near a residential subdivision.

Washtenaw, MI: EHS inspection by county and LEPC at local manufacturing facility resulted in reduction of bulk storage of toluene diisocyanate from bulk rail storage to “just in time” delivery.

Springfield, MA: LEPC worked with chemical warehouse to encourage switch from on-site storage of 1000 lb. container of cyanide to delivery only when needed, and worked with local facility to replace sulfuric acid with citric acid in its process.

Deer Park, TX : Facility reported eliminating 90 tons of ammonia by replacing its refrigeration system, thereby reducing the WCS zone from 8.1 to 1.3 miles.

Factors affecting LEPC role in encouraging hazard reduction

While there was a recognition that encouraging hazard reduction is a logical role for LEPCs, there are many factors identified by LEPCs as obstacles or challenges to carrying out this function. During the course of this study, numerous issues were raised by the LEPCs that were seen as limiting their ability to make any real difference in hazard reduction. These issues represent a wide range of concerns that will need to be addressed if these local emergency planning organizations are to make a meaningful contribution in this area.

The following is a summary of these concerns:

1. Lack of mandate under EPCRA or 112(r)

Several LEPCs expressed the belief that there is no mandate for their organizations to play a role in encouraging the reduction of chemical hazards at facilities. EPCRA authority is seen as limiting LEPC involvement to emergency planning and informing the public of risks; hazard reduction is seen as outside the scope of this authority or outside the LEPCs' area of responsibility. 112(r) authority appears to be unclear regarding the role of LEPCs, but there is no perceived mandate in either the RMP statute or rule for LEPC involvement in hazard reduction. The absence of a clear requirement is seen as limiting the ability of LEPCs to gain industry cooperation to jointly pursue hazard reductions.

2. Lack of resources to devote to hazard reduction

Nearly all the LEPCs stated that the greatest obstacle to actively engaging in encouraging hazard reduction is the lack of staff and financial resources. It was continually noted that LEPCs are comprised of volunteers who do not have the time to devote significant effort to hazard reduction. Several of the LEPC contacts pointed out that their role as coordinator or chairperson of the LEPC is in addition to a full-time job or other competing duties.

In addition, it was reported numerous times during this study that funding is not available for hazard reduction activities, even in states that have assumed 112(r) delegation. This relates to the more fundamental problem that there is no stream of federal funding provided to either LEPCs or SERCs, and they are often quite short of resources to carry out their EPCRA-mandated responsibilities. It was noted that while EPA assumed the Risk Management Plan would be an additional tool to help LEPCs with their EPCRA responsibilities, many and perhaps most LEPCs are struggling to meet the basic requirements of EPCRA, much less promote hazard reduction.

The lack of resources for LEPCs was cited by EPA in its justification of public disclosure of the Offsite Consequence Analysis in the RMP:

“In general, LEPCs have not made a concerted effort to bring hazardous materials issues to public attention, focusing instead on technical aspects. Further, given the constraints under which LEPCs operate, it is unrealistic to expect LEPCs to attempt to foster debate of environmental issues or to focus on hazard reduction rather than emergency response.” (emphasis added)

EPA, Assessment of the Incentives Created by Public Disclosure of Off-Site Consequence Analysis Information for Reduction in Risk of Accidental Releases (p. F-8).

3. Lack of technical expertise

Several LEPCs expressed the belief that they are limited in their ability to encourage facilities to reduce hazards because they lack the necessary engineering knowledge or expertise to identify how chemicals or processes in a plant could be changed. This was expressed by one LEPC contact person as “We are not process engineers or production engineers,” and thus do not have the technical background to work with plant personnel who have this full-time responsibility. The lack of technical background was seen as limiting LEPC credibility with plant personnel and management.

Where LEPCs have experienced some success in working with facilities to reduce hazards – including the Springfield (MA) LEPC, and the Washtenaw County (MI) LEPC – they reported that they were only able to develop this ability through years of experience or by investing significant time in learning the technical aspects of plant operations through “familiarization audits.”

4. Unclear about responsibilities in hazard reduction

Several LEPCs also reported that they are unclear of what responsibilities they are expected to assume regarding hazard reduction, and how those responsibilities might be carried out given the limited resources available to LEPCs. Along the same lines, several LEPCs said they were unclear about their role in the Risk Management Plan program, and that neither the statute nor the rule made this clear. It was noted that additional guidance from EPA is needed on how they are expected to participate, and that this guidance should be developed in consultation with LEPCs.

As an example of the concern created by this perceived lack of guidance, one LEPC noted that during the rollout of RMPs in spring of 1999, a local reporter reviewed some material developed by EPA which appeared to be a “wish list” of how LEPCs could be involved in the RMP program. Although the LEPC did not understand this to be a list of mandated 112(r) duties, the reporter did interpret the guidance in this way. This resulted in negative press coverage about the LEPC’s failure to carry out these actions, and was seen as hurting the LEPC’s credibility with the public.

5. Hazard reduction more effectively achieved through other programs

Nearly all the LEPCs expressed their belief that the most significant achievements in hazard reduction in their jurisdictions have already occurred due to programs other than RMP, or will continue to be driven by forces other than the LEPC.

Several LEPCs noted that most hazard reductions in their communities occurred as a result of SARA Title III activities. In particular, it was stated that Tier 2 chemical storage data was being used to accomplish the same objective as RMP, and that most of the information on community chemical hazards had already been provided to the LEPCs through Tier 2 data. This in turn has been seen as driving facility efforts to reduce hazards. As an example, the North Florida Regional Planning Council cited alternative chemical strategies and reduced inventory strategies that had been used by area facilities to reduce their Tier 2 reporting. The York County (PA) LEPC noted that Tier 2 reporting fees have been declining and that this suggested industry efforts to reduce on-site inventories. Similar examples were provide by other LEPCs.

An additional driver for hazard reduction that was identified is the OSHA Process Safety Management (PSM) requirement. Many LEPCs noted that the PSM requirement has been effective in hazard reduction by forcing facilities to conduct comprehensive process safety reviews of their processes. Through this requirement, risk reduction and pollution prevention opportunities have been identified for those parts of a facility that posed the greatest risk.

Several LEPCs identified initiatives by individual facilities and by the chemical industry at large as more significant in reducing hazards. Many of these initiatives are seen as driven by an effort to reduce operating costs, a desire to reduce liability, and in some cases to improve their public image. One opinion frequently expressed was that facilities that have good safety programs are already working to control and reduce hazards. Companies that follow the American Chemistry Council's Responsible Care Code are already committed to continuous reduction of risk. This commitment is shared by companies that are ISO-14000 certified or that have otherwise adopted an environmental management system. Many LEPCs viewed the facilities within their jurisdictions as safety conscious, and felt existing regulations and practices already required a safety improvement plan. For these LEPCs, the RMP was seen as just another process to go through what the facilities were already doing.

At the same time, several LEPCs noted that the requirement to prepare a Risk Management Plan was in itself a driver for hazard reduction. This was seen as occurring in two ways. First, a number of facilities were reported to have made process changes as a result of preparing the worst-case and alternate-case accident scenarios. For example, the Union County (AR) LEPC reported that a local refining facility switched from hydrogen chloride to liquid chloride in its

production process, as an effort to reduce a risk identified during the preparation of its RMP. The Deer Park (TX) LEPC conducted a survey of its RMP facilities immediately following RMP submission and identified numerous hazard reduction efforts made as result of preparing their RMPs.

Second, several LEPCs acknowledged that some facilities within their jurisdictions had reduced the amount of chemicals stored on-site in order to get below the threshold for RMP filing. These reductions allowed the facilities to maintain only those quantities of chemicals needed for immediate, short-term use while maintaining continuity of operations with “just in time” shipments. This was generally acknowledged as positive for reducing on-site storage of hazardous materials, although a number of the LEPCs noted that the reduction in on-site storage risk may have been offset by additional transportation hazards resulting from increases in chemical shipments.

Finally, it was noted that additional reduction of hazards may be more effectively promoted by emergency management organizations other than the LEPC. For example, LEPCs in Adams County, CO, Clark County, NV and Washtenaw County, MI reported that fire service officials in their jurisdictions regularly visit with hazardous facilities and have better knowledge and training to identify hazard reduction opportunities than the LEPC. Other LEPCs noted that their organization’s work is conducted through a county emergency management agency, which already has the responsibility for hazardous materials management as well as the needed expertise and training. Still another LEPC reported that hazard reduction within its jurisdiction was more likely to occur through the work of citizen advisory groups, where plant managers are more likely to attend, than through the LEPC, where primarily emergency responders attend. In all these cases the LEPC was not seen as adding value to the hazard reduction work already being done by others.

6. Higher priority given to other responsibilities

Many of the LEPCs reported that hazard reduction was not seen as a high priority for their organizations. In part this is because LEPCs view emergency response and emergency planning, whatever the cause of the emergency, as their most important jobs and have little time or budget for what they see as peripheral duties. More often, however, LEPCs are more concerned with making sure all industries are meeting SARA Title III reporting and RMP filing responsibilities. Several LEPCs reported that they were having to devote significant time in outreach to industry to ensure compliance with these reporting requirements. Focusing on hazard reduction was seen as secondary to this task.

Other LEPCs reported that conflicting duties required them to place a lower priority on hazard reduction. For example, LEPCs in some states are constrained because they are run by agencies with both emergency planning and

environmental regulatory duties. Other LEPCs that are responsible for all-hazards planning are further constrained from devoting time or resources to hazardous materials risk reduction.

7. Lack of access to RMPs

In order to use RMPs as a tool for promoting hazard reduction, it is necessary to first have access to each facility's plan. However, nearly all of the LEPCs contacted for this study reported that they did not obtain or maintain copies of RMPs in their office. Some LEPCs said they made a conscious decision not to obtain copies of the plans because of the volume of material it would generate, but stated they could obtain the plans from the facilities if needed. Others maintained copies of the RMP executive summaries. In both cases, members of the public requesting RMP information would be directed to a facility contact for further information.

There appears to be some uncertainty regarding LEPC responsibility for maintaining copies of these plans, and for how they are to be obtained. Some of the LEPCs expressed concern that it appeared EPA expected them to have the plans available, but that there was no mechanism in place for this to occur. This in turn results in confusion among the public about where RMPs may be obtained. For example, one LEPC noted that persons who access the Vulnerability Zone Index on the EPA/CEPPO website and are advised that their zipcode is within one or more vulnerable zones are directed to contact their local LEPC for further information. Without a means to ensure that the LEPC has the information, however, such public inquiries may not be satisfactorily addressed. Another LEPC reported that one of its facilities had a corporate policy stating it was EPA's responsibility rather than the company's responsibility to provide their RMPs to the LEPC.

8. Public apathy

Nearly all of the LEPCs contacted noted that public apathy toward chemical risks in their communities made it difficult for the LEPC to generate support or demand for hazard reduction. Reasons for this apathy varied widely, but it was generally believed that either the public did not perceive the risk from chemical hazards to be great, or they believed the government was taking care of managing these risks and therefore the public does not need to worry about it. As evidence of this attitude, nearly all of the LEPCs reported little or no public attendance at RMP rollout events and few or no requests for RMP data or any other hazard information.

9. Perceived value of RMPs

Some of the LEPCs expressed the view that Risk Management Plans have limited value as a tool to encourage hazard reduction. One common concern raised

related to the number of chemical risk management plans currently required. It was noted that RMPs are in addition to the required county emergency plans and facility off-site emergency plans. While ideally these plans should be coordinated, doing so was seen as a challenge for many LEPCs. Further, the requirements for these other plans reduces the impact the RMP might have had since it was frequently seen by both LEPCs and industries as “just one more requirement.”

A secondary concern related to the requirement for worst-case accident scenarios. For some LEPCs, these scenarios were viewed as being of some benefit for emergency planners and responders in improving emergency response plans, but of little use to industry and misleading to the general public because they are not likely scenarios. Worst-case scenarios were seen by some as raising unrealistic concerns about potential chemical accidents and thereby increasing the difficulty in communicating with the public about risk.

10. Concern about relationship with industry partners

LEPCs generally viewed their relationship with regulated facilities as an important factor in determining their organization’s success. Most frequently this is because of the support provided by industry for LEPC operations, for training and equipment for responders, and for mutual aid for response to accidents. A few of the LEPCs contacted for this study stated that they did not see a role for themselves in encouraging hazard reduction because it would appear they were taking on a regulatory role and “policing” the industry. While this is certainly not a universally held view, it was deemed noteworthy as a potential obstacle for other LEPCs.

11. Lack of state support

Many LEPCs viewed their ability to engage in activities encouraging hazard reduction as being limited by the absence of state-level support for such efforts. For example, it was noted that LEPCs follow the direction of their State Emergency Response Commissions and may receive, at most, only partial grant funding to cover training and other responsibilities mandated by EPCRA. There is little or no funding available for functions not mandated by EPCRA, such as hazard reduction. In addition, several LEPCs noted that they participated in RMP in only a limited way because their state had elected not to pursue 112(r) delegation and the SERCs or state emergency management agencies were reluctant to add any RMP duties to the existing LEPC responsibilities.

12. Unwilling partners

Because LEPCs do not have regulatory power or a statutory mandate to affect hazard reductions, any achievements in this area will require the cooperation and participation of industry or government regulatory authorities. As presented earlier in this report, some success has been achieved in encouraging facilities to reduce hazards. Other LEPCs, however, reported difficulties in affecting such

changes. One LEPC reported that it was unsuccessful in persuading a facility to relocate an ammonia storage tank that posed significant potential risk to a nearby commercial airport. Other LEPCs reported their inability to convince their planning and zoning boards to restrict locations of industrial facilities near residential subdivisions, in spite of evidence of hazardous materials risk. While the outcome of such situations will be based on a unique set of circumstances, it is noteworthy that in these cases the LEPCs viewed the unwillingness of industry or government authorities to act as a factor limiting the LEPC's ability to encourage hazard reduction.

13. Concern about liability

As reported earlier by EPA in its justification for public access to offsite consequence analysis data, some LEPCs would rather not take possession of the RMPs, regardless of whether they are entitled or have access, because of the severe potential penalty for improper public disclosure. These perceived negative impacts were seen as having a chilling effect on the desirability and use of OCA data and even other associated RMP information.

Some of the LEPCs contacted for this study noted that recent legislative efforts to limit public access to OCA data raised concerns about their potential liability if they got too involved in using RMP data. There were no specific examples of how such problems might arise; rather, it was a general concern that made these LEPCs reluctant to make much use of RMP information.

14. Most significant hazards not addressed by RMP

Nearly all of the LEPCs reported that the Risk Management Plan program does not address the risk from transportation of hazardous materials, which is seen by many LEPCs as the most significant hazmat risk faced by their communities. While regulation of hazardous materials at fixed facilities has resulted in significant reductions of risk, the movement of such materials on highways, railroads, barges and pipelines is viewed as a greater threat which is not nearly as tightly controlled and which has no RMP equivalent. As a result, even if LEPCs are willing and able to encourage hazard reduction at RMP facilities, many of them believe that overall risk to the community may not be significantly reduced if transportation concerns are not similarly addressed.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Nearly all LEPCs contacted recognize the value and importance of the Risk Management Plan program.

There appears to be a good working knowledge of the RMP program among active LEPCs. Risk Management Plans are seen as having several benefits:

- RMPs have helped shed light on areas where risk could be reduced;
 - For the regulated community, RMPs have heightened their awareness of risk and provided them with an opportunity to talk about chemical threats with the public;
 - Developing RMPs has caused facilities to face risk and make changes in facility operations to reduce risk, especially for municipal authorities;
 - Many companies have been continually looking at risk reduction and reviewing safety processes, but the RMP has forced more attention to this due to public disclosure. RMPs have forced other facilities to look at the community impact of their operations and “talk to the neighbors;”
 - RMPs have provided an opportunity for LEPCs to increase dialogue with the public;
 - RMPs have also provided an opportunity for LEPCs to work more closely with industry, whom LEPCs see as an important partner in emergency management; and
 - RMPs have provided additional information to both LEPCs and industry to improve existing emergency planning and response.
2. Many LEPCs see a potential role for their organizations in encouraging hazard reduction using RMP or similar information.

LEPCs recognize that although encouraging hazard reduction is not an statutory mandate, it is a fundamental goal of EPCRA and of risk management generally. They also recognize that their organizations have the structure and the access to much of the risk information needed to carry out this function. The most likely opportunities for LEPCs to encourage hazard reduction are:

- Identifying the greatest risks in the community;
- Reviewing accidents for lessons learned;
- Providing a forum for dialogue with and among facilities; and

- Providing information to the public to increase pressure on facilities for further hazard reductions.

3. With a few exceptions, LEPCs do not believe they are positioned to effectively encourage facilities to reduce chemical hazards.

While LEPCs see a potential role in encouraging hazard reduction, most believe there are significant obstacles that limit their effectiveness. LEPCs see themselves as loose coalitions of organizations and individuals working on a voluntary basis. Most do not have the time, resources or expertise to encourage hazard reduction. Most also see that significant reductions in hazards at facilities are more effectively achieved through other programs or actions of others which are outside the influence of the LEPC. Other legal and institutional barriers are seen as limiting accomplishment in this area.

4. LEPCs see their role in hazard reduction as resulting more from carrying out their EPCRA responsibilities than from RMP.

Most LEPCs have focused on the emergency planning and training aspects of their jobs, and have not made a concerted effort to encourage facilities to reduce hazards at their sites. However, many also see that carrying out these EPCRA-mandated responsibilities indirectly contributes to hazard reduction by insuring that off-site consequences of accidental chemical releases are minimized by coordinated planning and well-trained and equipped emergency response personnel. Moreover, LEPCs view their role in providing risk information to the public as a major driver of hazard reduction at facilities.

5. Since initial submission of RMPs in June, 1999, most LEPCs have not continued to be actively involved in the RMP program.

LEPCs contacted in this study reported that they have had minimal involvement in implementing the RMP program since the initial plan submission. While some LEPCs have used the RMP information to review their emergency response plans, and in a few cases have worked with facilities to encourage further hazard reduction, most have not seen RMP as a significant new tool to guide their work.

6. Any expansion of LEPC involvement in the RMP program, particularly in hazard reduction, will require that EPA address the factors affecting LEPC involvement addressed in this report.

If congressional and agency intent for SARA Title III and CAA Section 112(r) is for LEPCs to encourage hazard reduction, a reconfiguration of LEPC responsibilities and evaluation of the factors affecting their involvement is in order. While the obstacles listed in the report are based on discussions with the 32 LEPCs

examined for this study, it is reasonable to assume they also represent concerns of the broader LEPC community. These organizations look to EPA and the SERCs for leadership, and believe that further involvement in encouraging hazard reduction will require that these obstacles be addressed.

SECTION 4: RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the National Institute for Chemical Studies believes there are significant opportunities to strengthen the role of Local Emergency Planning Committees in reducing chemical hazards. Information gained from the LEPCs examined for this report suggests there is interest and desire to work toward this goal, but that challenges exist which need to be addressed if this is to occur. Because of its leadership role in chemical emergency prevention and preparedness, EPA is encouraged to examine how these challenges might best be met, in order to more fully achieve the intent of both EPCRA and CAA Section 112(r).

The following recommendations are offered for consideration by EPA/CEPPO:

1. EPA should publicize the best practices of LEPCS in hazard reduction that are highlighted in this report.

An initial objective of this study was to identify examples of LEPCs that have utilized RMP or other chemical risk information to encourage risk reduction at facilities within their jurisdictions. Because of the factors noted in Section 3, many LEPCs have not pursued this opportunity. However, the descriptions of actions that have been taken may offer ideas that could be adapted or modified by other LEPCs. Several LEPCs contacted for this study expressed an interest in learning how others are approaching hazard reduction.

We recommend that EPA/CEPPO make this report available to all LEPCs and SERCs through its website and electronic newsletter, and provide opportunities to share the information through national, regional and state meetings of emergency managers and other interested groups. We also encourage EPA to solicit feedback and other examples of LEPC activity to add to the knowledge gained during this study.

2. EPA should clarify its expectations of the role of LEPCs in implementation of the Risk Management Plan program, and in hazard reduction generally, and develop guidance for LEPCs and SERCs.

During the course of this study, many LEPCs expressed uncertainty about their expected role in RMP implementation generally and hazard reduction specifically. Basic RMP guidance for LEPCs has been previously developed by EPA, some of which was reviewed during this study. There is less guidance available to suggest what is expected for LEPCs in encouraging hazard reduction. Given the complexity of the RMP program, the connection between RMP and other risk management programs, and the existing responsibilities of LEPCs, further

clarification of the LEPC role is needed. Additional guidance would serve two purposes: (1) it would help LEPCs more effectively comply with their EPCRA responsibilities; and (2) it would make better use of this national network of emergency planning organizations in meeting the fundamental goal of Section 112(r).

We recommend that EPA develop additional guidance on the benefits and potential uses of RMP data for hazard reduction, specifically as it relates to the LEPC responsibilities under EPCRA. This guidance should be developed in consultation with LEPCs, SERCs, and other appropriate stakeholders.

3. EPA should re-examine and re-evaluate the support structure for LEPCs and its priority within EPA/CEPPO.

The purpose of this study was to examine how LEPCs are using the RMP to encourage hazard reduction. During our discussions with the LEPCs contacted for the study, it was evident that their role in RMP is part of the larger issue of the purpose and intent of local emergency planning committees under EPCRA. Much of the involvement, or lack of involvement, of LEPCs in RMP and hazard reduction appears to relate back to basic questions of what LEPCs are required to do and how they are supported to carry out these duties. These organizations have made significant achievements given limited financial resources and almost entirely volunteer support. At the same time, such resource constraints will continue to limit the effectiveness of LEPCs in meeting the intent of both Section 112(r) and EPCRA.

We recommend that EPA re-examine and re-evaluate the role of LEPCs in implementing national chemical risk management priorities and the existing support systems for LEPCs, and work to ensure support at a level appropriate to their intended role.

4. EPA should seek to improve its understanding of the characteristics of active LEPCs, and use this information to focus its efforts on LEPCs that are not currently active.

Throughout this study we talked with several LEPCs who are actively working to meet or exceed their responsibilities under EPCRA. While each has its own unique characteristics and issues, there appeared to be certain factors common to those organizations that have succeeded in spite of the constraints faced by most all LEPCs. Some of these factors include a well-defined organizational planning process, a committee structure for conducting LEPC business, and a strong LEPC-industry partnership. There are undoubtedly many other factors that contribute to LEPC success. Recent national surveys have shown that while some LEPCs are considered active, many more see themselves as inactive or struggling to meet the basic requirements of EPCRA. Assuming that LEPCs will continue to

play an important role in implementing national chemical risk management programs, it would be desirable to identify factors that determine LEPC success and use that information to strengthen LEPCs nationwide.

We recommend that EPA undertake a study of the characteristics of active LEPCs, and apply the knowledge gained from that study to improve support of LEPCs through CEPPPO, the EPA regional CEPP programs, and through the SERCs.

Appendix A:

Resources Reviewed

Adams, Mary Pat. LEPCs in Colorado: How Does Public Participation Fit Their Mission? Paper submitted to University of Colorado at Denver, Graduate School of Public Affairs, May, 1998.

Chemical Education Foundation. LEPCs, SERCs, and CAPs Help Protect Your Community's Environment, Health, and Safety. Product Stewardship Bulletin No. 15 (no date).

Colorado SERC. Colorado Local Emergency Planning Committee Handbook. (no date).

Community Members' Role in EPCRA. Discussion paper at www.chemicalspill.org (no date).

National Institute for Chemical Studies. Focus on the Future of LEPCs. Charleston, WV: 1995.

Nationwide LEPC Survey. William C. Adams, Stephen D. Burns, and Phillip G. Handwerk, Department of Public Administration, The George Washington University. October, 1994.

Ohio SERC. Local Emergency Planning Committee Member's Handbook. Revised August, 1998.

Region 6 Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) Handbook. Steve Mason and Keith Reddick, USEPA Region 6. April, 2000.

The Role of Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) and Other Local Agencies in The Risk Management Program (RMP) of Clean Air Act (CAA) Section 112(r) – Subgroup #7 Report. Report to USEPA's RMP Implementation Workgroup. March, 1998.

USEPA/Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office. Assessment of the Incentives Created by Public Disclosure of Off-Site Consequence Analysis Information For Reduction in the Risk of Accidental Releases. Washington, D.C.: April, 2000.

USEPA, Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office. RMPs Are On The Way! How LEPCs and Other Local Agencies Can Include Information from Risk Management Plans in Their Ongoing Work. Washington, D.C., November, 1999.

U.S. Public Interest Research Group. Too Close to Home: A Report on Chemical Accident Risks in the United States. Washington, D.C.: July, 1998.

Walter, R.J. Local Emergency Planning Committee Guidebook: Understanding the EPA Risk Management Planning Program Rule. Center for Chemical Process Safety, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York, 1998.

Appendix B:

LEPCs Contacted

Alaska:	Nikki Stokoe Anchorage LEPC
Arizona:	Reg Campbell Cochise County LEPC Letha Wilcox Maricopa County LEPC Bob Chipman Pinal County LEPC
Arkansas:	Nick Macciarolo Union County LEPC
Colorado:	Rosalie Dukart Adams County LEPC
Connecticut:	Jack Kuzorchowski Danbury LEPC
Florida:	Jeff Alexander North Florida Regional Planning Council
Georgia:	Pete Nelms Fayette County LEPC
Hawaii:	Leland Nakai Honolulu LEPC
Iowa:	Brad Storm Linn County LEPC
Kansas:	Charlie Marlow Johnson County LEPC
Kentucky:	Bud Fekete Jefferson County LEPC

Louisiana: Kiernan Shannon
 Ascension LEPC

 JoAnne Moreau
 East Baton Rouge LEPC

Massachusetts: Jim Cantrovich
 Springfield LEPC

Maryland: Mary Moses
 Harford County LEPC

Michigan: Ernie Close
 Washtenaw County LEPC

Nevada: Bob Andrews
 Clark County LEPC

Ohio: Michael Kalstrom
 Cuyahoga County LEPC

Pennsylvania: Joseph Schwartz
 Adams County LEPC

 Tom Puzniak
 Allegheny County Health Department

 Romaine Nailler
 Centre County LEPC

 Ted Wise
 Cumberland County LEPC

 Harry Ribidoux
 Monroe County LEPC

 Martha Anderson
 Philadelphia LEPC

 David Cohick
 Tioga County LEPC

 Kay Carman
 York County LEPC

Texas:

Phil Johnson
Deer Park LEPC

Joe Leonard
Houston LEPC

Washington:

Rich Tokarzewski
King County LEPC

West Virginia:

J.R. Bias
Kanawha Putnam Emergency Planning Committee

Appendix C:

Examples of LEPC Activity

LEPC FOCUS: Centre County, Pennsylvania

Although Centre County is located in rural Pennsylvania, the LEPC has its share of hazmat risks from propane suppliers, chemical manufacturers, and water and wastewater treatment facilities. Also, like many agricultural areas Centre County must deal with chemical hazards at farming operations. The LEPC regularly uses Tier 2 reports to review community risk and focus its emergency planning efforts. Two programs have been initiated to collect information from farms and gas stations, which otherwise are not required to report. Gas stations are asked to fill out an information form showing the amount of gasoline stored on-site; this data is used to support emergency planning and response. Farmers are asked to provide a list of their chemicals stored on-site, in exchange for a highway-quality sign with the warning "Danger – Chemical Storage." The LEPC reports good cooperation with the Farm Sign Program because the participants see it as a way of protecting their neighbors.

LEPC FOCUS: Cuyahoga County, Ohio

Cuyahoga County LEPC covers 59 political subdivisions including the City of Cleveland, and includes over 260 SARA Title III facilities. The LEPC has sought to encourage hazard reduction by annually surveying facilities to determine what EHS reductions they have achieved, and providing public recognition of these companies through an environmental awards program. The LEPC has also sponsored a seminar for industry on hazard reduction, in conjunction with a local organization Environmental Health Watch. A technical consultant is also retained by the LEPC to assist RMP facilities update their alternative case accident scenarios.

LEPC FOCUS: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The City of Philadelphia's LEPC has actively worked for several years to identify hazmat risks and coordinate emergency response plans in this major metropolitan area. Hazard reduction has been encouraged through dialogue with the community and with industry. The LEPC regularly participates in community environmental fairs, which were used to promote the RMP and focus on environmental improvements. A facility committee within the LEPC was also established to enable roundtable discussions of safety issues among member facilities. Following a 1997 release at a local refinery, the City asked the LEPC to bring the refinery in to discuss what could be done to prevent future occurrences. As a result, additional safety measures were identified, and a Community Advisory Committee was established for ongoing dialogue with the refinery.

LEPC FOCUS: Fayette County, Georgia

The Fayette County LEPC, the oldest LEPC in the state, is located 25 miles south of Atlanta in a low population density area with predominately high tech industries. A 1995 hazard analysis showed the greatest chemical hazard is chlorine used for treatment in local water treatment plants and local industrial facilities. The LEPC worked with local chlorine users to review RMP requirements and prepare for plan submission. Working in close partnership with the State of Georgia and industry, the LEPC worked to ensure that safety plans were developed for each of the chlorine-using facilities. These efforts resulted in several facilities reducing or eliminating chlorine treatment. A plant-specific chlorine safety training program by the Georgia Institute of Technology was also developed with EPA funding.

LEPC FOCUS: Washtenaw County, Michigan

This LEPC is located in Ann Arbor, Michigan and includes approximately 65 SARA Title III facilities, primarily wastewater treatment plants and facilities related to the automobile industry. Since the passage of EPCRA the LEPC has worked in conjunction with county officials to conduct regular inspections of all SARA facilities. Currently these inspections are conducted with the county Environmental Services Division and provide an opportunity to both review emergency planning information and discuss pollution prevention opportunities. The inspections include a review any chemicals stored in quantities of 5 gallons or more, not just EHS chemicals. As a result of a recent inspection of a manufacturing facility, it was determined that the facility could significantly reduce risk from storage of TDI (toluene diisocyanate) by switching from bulk rail storage to just-in-time delivery, without interrupting the production process.

LEPC FOCUS: Johnson County, Kansas

Although Johnson County, which is part of the Kansas City metropolitan area, is not a major chemical producing area, its LEPC has developed a proactive approach toward improving safety by focusing on hazard reduction at wastewater treatment plants and other facilities. Working with the LEPC, six area wastewater treatment plants found they could easily switch from chlorine treatment to ultraviolet treatment, thus eliminating a potential major hazard. An LEPC site visit to a printing company led to elimination of an ammonia storage tank in favor of more frequent but smaller shipments. Although the facility initially saw this as a costlier alternative, the reduction in risk of off-site consequences was viewed as providing sufficient savings on insurance costs to justify the change.

LEPC FOCUS: Springfield, Massachusetts

The Springfield LEPC, which includes over 200 SARA Title III reporting facilities seeks to promote hazard reduction as part of its EPCRA responsibilities through facility inspections and training. The LEPC participates on a team that conducts regular inspections of all SARA facilities, with a focus on opportunities for risk reduction. The team includes police, fire, health department and LEPC representation. The inspections have received favorably by the facilities because it is seen as bringing outside perspectives to identify areas for improvement without the threat of regulatory action. The LEPC also conducts a general chemical safety course, with a focus on toxic use reduction, for local industries and emergency responders, and has worked with local schools to identify and dispose of unneeded chemicals.

LEPC FOCUS: Deer Park, Texas

The Deer Park LEPC is located in southeast Texas in one of the most active chemical manufacturing and refining areas in the United States, and has a strong history of leadership and activity in community safety. The LEPC works in partnership with the East Harris County Manufacturers Association (ECHMA) and the Association's Community Advisory Councils. Together these three groups saw the RMP program as an opportunity for risk reduction. The LEPC actively participated in the ECHMA rollout of the RMPs, and maintains copies of the plans at its office, categorized by flammables and toxics. A survey was conducted two weeks after the public RMP rollout, asking the facilities to identify changes they made to reduce risk as a result of the RMP hazards analysis. The LEPC also used the plan information to rank community hazards by end-point distance, and intends to use the analysis to identify opportunities for further risk reduction. Facilities are also asked to regularly report to the Community Advisory Councils on progress made to reduce the hazards and vulnerable zones identified in their plans, and a public report is prepared.