



MARINETTE COUNTY
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Philip Everhart
Chairperson

Dan Nyman
Vice-Chairperson

MINUTES
Marinette County
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE (LEPC)
Monday, April 27, 2015 at 3:00 pm.

- Members Present: Lt. Jim Albright, Marinette County Sheriff Dept.
Steve Anderson, BPM, Inc.
Jim Brien, Area Assoc. of Rescue Squads
Eric Burmeister, Marinette County Emergency Mgt.
Phil Everhart, Citizen
Ron Gerbyshak, Farmer's Rep.
Mike Kitt, Citizen
Jeff Lautenslager, WI DNR
Sgt. Joe Nault, Marinette PD (alt)
Dan Nyman, Waupaca Foundry
Ted Sauve, Citizen Rep.
Vilas Schroeder, Marinette County Board
Karen Stacy, Kimberly-Clark Corp
Scott Stacy, Tyco Safety Products – Ansul
Nicole Swanson, Bay Area Medical Center
Chief Bob Thull, Marinette FD/Hazmat Team
- Members Excused: Rep. John Nygren, 89th Assembly Dist. (Assoc.)
Rep. Jeff Mursau, 36th Assembly Dist. (Assoc.)
Robin Elsner, Marinette County Health & Human Services (alt)
Mary Rosner, Marinette County Health & Human Services
Don Schmidt, AgVentures, LLC
- Members Absent: Darin Bellile, WI Public Service
Wade Fronsee, Marinette County Fire Association
Dennis Greil, KS Kolbenschmidt US, Inc. (alternate)
Wendy Kabacinski, Marinette Marine Corp. (alternate)
Raymond Palonen, Marinette County Highway Dept.
- Others Present: Kathy Frank, LEPC Secretary
William Clyma, Peshtigo Times

1. Call meeting to order.

Chair Everhart called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Quorum present.

2. **Approve/amend agenda items.**
Motion (Anderson/Thull/) to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.
3. **Approve/amend minutes of January 26, 2015**
Motion (Anderson/Thull) to approve the minutes of January 26, 2015 as presented.
Motion carried.
4. **Public comment period. (Speakers will be limited to 5 minutes)**
None
5. **Greg Stegge, TransCanada Representative: TransCanada Pipeline presentation.**
Information only.
6. **Emergency Management Report; information only**
 - Confined Space Technical Rescue training grant awarded in the amount of \$6352. HazMat Technician Refresher training grant awarded in the amount of \$4,086. Both trainings will occur in May.
 - Planning Facility Off-Site HazMat Response Plans: Crivitz Wastewater Treatment Plant, Crivitz Water Well 2 and Crivitz Water Well 3 have been completed. ChemDesign Corp plan work is in progress.
 - 2015 EPCRA Computer/HazMat Equipment Grant application was submitted to WEM in the amount of \$7,999.23
 - Eric Burmeister is a member of the newly formed statewide EPCRA Workgroup to review and refine EPCRA processes
 - Membership requirements/status: Absenteeism is not a large issue.
7. **Discuss/consider change of membership status for Sgt. Joe Nault from Alternate to Member, replacing Captain Doug Erdmann, representing Marinette Police Department. Action if any.**
Motion (Thull/Schroeder) to approve change in membership status of Sgt. Joe Nault from Alternate Member to Member, replacing Capt. Doug Erdmann, representing Marinette Police Department. Motion carried.
8. **Discuss/consider appointment of Lt. John Corry as the Alternate Member replacing Sgt. Joe Nault, representing Marinette Police Department. Action if any.**
Motion (S. Stacy/Albright) to recommend approval to the County Administrative Team of LEPC membership for Lt. John Corry to replace Sgt. Joe Nault as the Member representing Marinette Police Department. Motion carried.
(Attachment A)
9. **Discuss/consider correspondence to WI Emergency Management Administrator, Brian Satula, regarding Wisconsin Hazmat Online Planning and Reporting System (WHOPRS) functionality and use as a planning tool. Action if any.**
Motion (Thull/Schroeder) to approve Eric Burmeister and Philip Everhart to jointly sign and submit a letter to WI Emergency Management Administrator Brian Satula expressing concerns with the WI Hazmat Online Planning and Reporting System (WHOPRS). Motion carried. (Attachment B)

10. **Updates from Committee members regarding training, equipment, processes or membership. Action if any.**
 - Discussion on media membership requirement vs meeting attendance as a reporter
 - Discussion on whether an Alternate Member can represent two organizations
11. **Identify future items to be placed on the agenda.**
LEPC membership composition and dual organization membership
12. **Set next meeting date.**
Monday, July 27, 2015
13. **Adjournment**
Motion (Brien/Thull) to adjourn at 3:59. Motion carried.

Kathy Frank
EM Program Assistant/LEPC Secretary

Date approve/corrected:

From: [Erdmann, Douglas](#)
To: [Kathy Frank](#)
Cc: [John Mabry](#)
Subject: LEPC
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2015 1:14:50 PM

Kathy,

With my recent promotion to Captain at the Marinette Police Department, I will be resigning my position on the Local Emergency Planning Committee. Sgt. Joe Nault has been our alternate and I am recommending that he take my place at future LEPC meetings.

I am recommending Lt. John Corry as the alternate for the Marinette Police Department. Lt. Corry has 26 years with the Marinette Police Department and has been a patrol lieutenant for 14 of those years. I believe that Lt. Corry will be able to use his years of training and experience to be an asset to the Local Emergency Planning Committee. Please forward my recommendations to the committee at the next meeting.

Thank you.

Captain Doug Erdmann
Marinette Police Department

City of Marinette Police Department

02/05/2015

To: Marinette County LEPC

Attn: Emergency Management

I appreciate the consideration of appointment as the LEPC representative (alternate) for the Marinette City Police Department. I have been in Law Enforcement for over 29 years. I have had 3 years experience in the Military Police before becoming a certified law enforcement officer for the State of Wisconsin. I have been a supervisor for the Marinette Police Department for over 17 years. My duties included being the night shift Lieutenant for 14 years.

During my employment with the MPD, I have had extensive training in the ICS program. I have had occasion to deploy or be a part of the ICS system in several incidents including our high school shooting back in 2010. I was an incident commander for a barricaded suicidal subject in 2013. I understand the importance of drilling/training and the cooperation needed to have an effective program.

In January of 2012, I attended the FEMA funded Enhanced Incident Management Unified Command Course held in College Station, Texas. This was a 3 day school (28 hours).

My involvement in the LEPC will be helpful as a trained individual that could add insight to future training, drills and focus of this committee.

In addition, I look forward (if accepted) to build relationships with other members of the committee that share a common goal of keeping our area safe and ready to handle any emergency that may arise.

Thank you,

Lieutenant John M. Corry

Marinette City Police Department

715-732-5212

jcorry@marinette.wi.us



MARINETTE COUNTY
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Philip Everhart
 Chairperson

Dan Nyman
 Vice-Chairperson

April 27, 2015

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Wisconsin Emergency Management
 Brian Satula, Administrator
 2400 Wright Street
 Madison, WI 53708-0587

Dear Administrator Satula;

The intent of this letter is to bring to your attention our concerns of continuing to develop the Wisconsin Hazmat Online Planning and Reporting System (WHOPRS) as a tool for planning purposes. The original use of the program, by several other states, was intended to be an automated process to collect annual Tier II Emergency and Hazards Chemical Inventory submissions. The WHOPRS system for Tier II collection has been successful in creating a central repository of information and in automating the reporting process. Marinette County fully supports the original intent of WHOPRS to collect Tier II information; however, the planning application has been extremely frustrating and disappointing.

The creation of a new planning module for WHOPRS was put out for a Request for Proposal (RFP) by WEM without any input from County Emergency Management Directors/County EPCRA planners or emergency responders, who are the developers and end users of the off-site plans. Aside from a quick presentation in October 2011, on the concept of using the WHOPRS software for planning (only a handful of counties stayed for the discussion), the first time the counties were introduced to WHOPRS was in the fall of 2011, with the 2012 Plan of Work. The original 2012 Plan of Work mandated WHOPRS usage for the EPCRA County-Wide Strategic Plan, newly created off-site plans, and the negotiated off-site plan updates. The first round of WHOPRS training was conducted in January 2012, which was 4 months into the plan of work.

After several months of testing the software (in a live environment) and documenting issues with the planning module, an e-mail was sent to the County Directors on January 13, 2012, stating that several issues had been identified and that it would take the vendor some time to make the necessary changes, so WEM was no longer requiring counties to continue plan development in WHOPRS for the 2012 POW.

The second half of the 2013 POW also had WHOPRS as a requirement for planning; however, after forming a user group and performing several months of additional documentation of issues and testing, an e-mail was sent on February 26, 2013 stating that the cost estimates from the vendor would cause a delay; therefore the 2013 POW guidance was amended to remove the requirements for submission of EPCRA facility plans in WHOPRS in the second half.

The 2014 and 2015 Plans of Work did not require use of WHOPRS. Meanwhile, the user group continued to meet and test the software changes from the vendor and to document and discuss the planning process. WEM performed the final testing in September 2014, giving their approval in October 2014. The counties and the user group have yet to see or test the final product.

The following is a list of **major** issues that were identified and documented with WHOPRS from the onset:

1. The WHOPRS planning module was designed without planner/county input.

The first time counties were introduced to WHOPRS planning module was in the fall of 2011, when it went “live” as a requirement of the 2012 POW. At the end of March 2012, after being forced to remove it from the 2012 POW due to multiple issues, WEM hosted a “WHOPRS Planning Module Issues Webinar” and invited all the counties to participate. The webinar was hosted in order to develop a complete list of issues with WHOPRS. After the webinar, with encouragement by the counties, WEM decided to create a WHOPRS workgroup, comprised of County EM’s and EPCRA planners. The workshops were conducted to test vendor changes, document additional issues, and to design end user training/documentation. Had the workgroup of experienced planners been created and utilized to help create the Request for Proposal (RFP), many of the problems with WHOPRS planning module would not exist. WEM and IDSI continue to refer to any changes made to the software as “enhancements” because they were not included in the original RFP. In truth the issues being documented are NOT enhancements or system upgrades, but functionality the EPCRA planners need to make WHOPRS viable as a planning tool. In order to successfully implement a new system “user buy in” is necessary, and to successfully get users to accept the system they need to be involved from the onset.

2. The WHOPRS System is EXTREMELY slow.

Some of the original documentation submitted to WEM in November 2011 indicates the system is extremely slow, to the point of users walking away to do other tasks until the system finishes processing. I do not believe this was ever rectified. The speed will continue to get worse, as the software is implemented by the counties. More data and attachments being added will continue to overload the system. I have also been informed that the system is slow during the Tier II update process, which has its “busy time” from the end of January until March 1 (when Tier II updates are due). This will also be a problem for planners trying to use WHOPRS, as many counties complete their EPCRA off-site plan updates during the winter months.

3. Not enough software licenses were purchased for the users.

Each county was assigned one WHOPRS planning license because only a limited number of licenses were purchased with the system. While it is a normal practice of software companies to sell their products by the license, enough licenses need to be purchased to support the number of end users using the product. Each county only having one license is a problem, as asking employees/planners to share passwords goes against all security standards. As more plans are put into WHOPRS the number of end users will continue to increase, thus forcing the purchase of additional licenses.

4. WHOPRS reports show incorrect data.

As part of the Plan of Work, Counties are required to submit the WHOPRS List of Planning Facilities by Municipality to indicate which off-site plans will be updated (and in which half). This report has NEVER been correct as the most recent EPN Submission date and last plan approved date are incorrect. Due to the fact that the dates show incorrectly, county planners often write the correct dates on their POW submission, however this seems to be futile work as the dates have never been fixed. Since the reports are incorrect, counties are forced to keep their own list of planning facilities to ensure they

remain compliant with their scheduled updates, keeping separate lists is counterproductive to the purpose of having one system.

5. There was NO level of security built into the planning module and end users see different screens.

From the beginning planners have documented the lack of security in the system. A county can enter data and other counties are allowed to not only see the data, but to change the data. The lack of security also carries through to the plans, a county can enter a plan (even after final certification) and another county can edit, update, and delete it. Data integrity and security are basic principles of any software system. Most good systems have levels of security built in. EPCRA plans should be shared between the counties (especially if a vulnerability zone carries into another county) so viewing capability is fine, but being able to edit another counties information is a HUGE problem. I have been informed by WEM that security issues were fixed in the last update, yet I'm not sure the workgroup has been informed or tested the fix. In addition, there is still the issue that different users see different screens, which I have been informed is how the system was designed and will remain. The problem with the administrator or planner not being able to view the same data/screen as the end users is that it becomes very difficult to assist the users with questions or issues if you cannot see what they are experiencing.

6. The printed version of the WHOPRS EPCRA Off-site plans does not include the attachments and is very awkward and difficult to read.

One of the main premises of EPCRA planning is to create a product for the responders to use. The local first responders (Fire & HazMat) are the main end users of an EPCRA plan. The responders use the off-site plans to prepare themselves for an incident at a facility, by reviewing the information and training on it. From the onset, the final reports have not been acceptable to give to an end user, as they do not contain the necessary information, including the attachments. If the end product is not useful to the end users, the process is useless.

7. The certification process may not be completed.

During the work group meetings, the process of certifying a plan was never tested. Currently, when an EPCRA off-site plan is completed it must be signed by the County EM, LEPC Chairperson and the Facility Coordinator. The plan is then sent to the Regional Director for final signature and submission to WEM. In the WHOPRS module, the County EM was able to electronically certify the plan and then it was sent to the facility contact for certification. It has been my experience that many of the facilities put down a different facility contact in the Tier II report, than the person who actually certifies the plan update. This usually happens when a corporation has several locations or has hired a consulting company to complete the Tier II reports. If the person receiving the certification alert was not part of the update process they would not be aware of the need to complete/certify the plan for final submission. The process remains a concern, as it would be very difficult for planners to complete their yearly updates if they do not get approved/certified by the facility.

8. There is NO system documentation or end user training.

In order, to properly implement a system and train the end users there needs to be documentation and training materials. It is my understanding that the system developers didn't develop any type of system documentation and that WEM is responsible for this. With the turnover of staff in the department and lack of planning experience, it will be very difficult to accurately document the system and create user manuals. This information should have been part of the original RFP, and if it was WEM's intent to perform the task, it should be completed BEFORE introducing a system and mandating its use. It is very difficult to get end users to "buy into" a system, or a new way of doing things, without giving them proper training and documentation on how to use it.

In looking at the history of the project one can see that excessive amounts of time and money have been given to WHOPRS. Yet, after four (4) years we still do not have a usable product. The functionality of planning in WHOPRS remains a burden on the counties, unusable to the responders, and has yet to be introduced to the facilities. I am proposing that you, Mr. Satula, make the imminent decision of discontinuing the use of WHOPRS, as a planning product. To continue to test and make software changes to WHOPRS as a planning tool is a waste of tax payer dollars and a waste of time for county planners and WEM staff.

In closing, may I suggest that WEM work with the user group to define the purpose and scope of what is needed for planning and come to an acceptable process and/or system that meets the needs of everyone: the counties, the responders, the facilities, and Wisconsin Emergency Management.

Sincerely,

Eric Burmeister
Director
Marinette County Emergency Management

Philip Everhart
Chairperson
Marinette County Local Emergency
Planning Committee