

Appendix Y
Public Hearing Written Transcript

Washington State Department of Ecology

Regional Haze State Implementation Plan, Second Implementation Period
Public Hearing: November 18, 2021

Hearing Officer: [missing first few sections of audio] On Ecology's online public involvement calendar on October 19th 2021. I will be calling people up to provide testimony based on the order which they raise their hands. Once everyone who has indicated that they would like to testify had the opportunity, I will open it up for others. Please remember that comments should be about three minutes long. When you reach that limit, I'll ask you to summarize your comments so that the next person may begin their testimony.

[silence] It looks like we have a raised hand. We will begin with Bob Poole to be followed by Colin Deverell. Please state and spell your name for the record and speak clearly so that we can get a good recording of your testimony. Bob Poole, you may begin your testimony.

Bob, Western States Petroleum Association: [silence] Current regulatory affairs for the Western States Petroleum Association, representing most of the refineries in the state. First off, when I commend Ecology, obviously, this has been a process of engagement for a number of years now. We're continuing to, I think as Mr. Ruby mentioned, underscoring the need for the data quality having a robust data so we can best understand how best to address the issue.

We're definitely committed to continuing along those lines. We will be submitting written comments and a variety of issue areas. I think the important part there is, for us, that we really do think that this subsequent RAD process that we'll be going through will give us the opportunity to really get a better handle as we, obviously, are of the opinion that the visibility impairing pollutants that are being contributed by the refinery are nominal at best.

We want to work together with Ecology to look at the data, to bear that out, to find as best an opportunity there of understanding that as we can. We do have a couple of other comments that we'll be making in some of the areas. We'll put those in writing, obviously. As I mentioned, we'll be submitting the written comments. I guess I just want to underscore that we're committed as I said going forward.

Again, this collaborative process with RAD, et cetera, and trying to look at ways to provide the most robust data sets we can, so we can better understand this. I guess I'll end it at that.

Hearing Officer: [silence] Thank you. Now, Colin Deverell, you may begin your testimony.

Colin, National Parks Conservation Association: Thanks Melanie. To make sure, can you all hear me all right?

Hearing Officer: Yes. We can hear you loud and clear.

Colin, National Parks Conservation Association: All right. Thank you very much. Thank you to Ecology staff for the opportunity to testify on Washington's Regional Haze State Implementation Plan. For the record, my name is Colin Deverell, D-E-V-E-R-E-L-L. I'm a Washington resident and third generation Pacific Northwesterner and lover of outdoor recreation and resources. Today, I'm here on behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association which is a national nonpartisan, nonprofit organization with more than 1.6 million members and supporters across the country and over 42,000 here in Washington state.

It's our role to speak up for all national parks including Mount Rainier, and North Cascades, and Olympic National Parks which together support over 4,000 jobs and generate more than \$360 million in visitor spending. I'm here today to express our concerns that the Department of Ecology has proposed a regional haze plan that doesn't require enough pollution reductions, to make reasonable progress towards the clean air goals for our parks and for healthy communities.

In addition to protecting people, haze reductions are critical under our nation's cleaner laws to benefit our natural and recreational places like our national parks but as well as the Class I Areas like Alpine Lakes, Goat Rocks and Pasayten Wilderness. NPCA was initially pleased with Washington's, the State Implementation Plan source selection process. We're really encouraged that, some pollution reductions will be required at Cardinal Glass and Ash Grove, but we really encourage Ecology to take the next step over resolving some of the technical issues with those facilities and integrating enforceable permit limits into the final rule for those particular sources. Beyond this and of major concern to NPCA and our members is that this SIP falls short of the pollution cuts needed to really reduce regional haze and produce that reasonable progress.

As drafted, the plan ignores significant emission reductions that must be required from petroleum refineries and pulp and paper mills especially where Ecology is concluded that no pollution reductions are warranted for these sectors during this planning period despite the nearly 5,000 tons of haze pollution that could be reduced from 13 specific facilities. The intent of this program, Regional Haze Program, is for the state to require these measures that will result in emission reductions through four factor analysis.

Washington's approach does not satisfy this intent and ignores the expectations EPA articulated in its July memo of what states need to do to satisfy the obligations of the Regional Haze Program because the plan does not meet these expectations, we are concerned is at risk of being rejected by the agency and delaying further needed controls. Lastly, we've asked Ecology to analyze Ardagh Glass in particular, due to its visibility impairing pollution, and harmful effects on air quality in the Seattle neighborhood of Duwamish Valley.

Ecology has not done a job at assessing the environmental justice overlays with the haze planning as EPA has recommended. Residents of this neighborhood have disproportionately shouldered the burden of industry pollution for too long and cleaning up the facility would not only help restore air quality for national parks and

public lands, but would reduce air pollution harming people of color and low income families.

In really summation, every visitor to our national parks and wilderness areas deserve to experience clean air and clear views. We expect Washington Department of Ecology to lead the nation with its plan to safeguard our public lands and our air. We urge you to revise this haze plan requirement reductions from refineries and pulp and paper, sharpening reduction requirements at Ash Grove and Cardinal and addressing emissions from Ardagh Glass. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Hearing Officer: Thank you very much. Would anyone else like to provide oral testimony? I'm not seeing any raised hands right now. We'll give you a couple of minutes to let us know you'd like to testify.

[pause 00:07:22]

Hearing Officer: Right. I am still seeing no one raising their hand.

Meeting Host: Melanie.

Hearing Officer: Ah, yes?

Meeting Host: I see Kyle has his hand raised.

Hearing Officer: Oh. Oh, yes. Thank you. Yes. Kyle, is it-- I'm sorry I cannot see your full last name. Kyle Heitkamp? You may begin your testimony.

Kyle Heitkamp: Okay. Thank you. This is Kyle Heitkamp, H-E-I-T-K-A-M-P. Thanks again for this opportunity to provide comments on the draft Regional Haze SIP. As I look through the draft SIP, I noticed that the process included Ecology requesting detailed cost estimates from facilities that they had screened out to install, or potentially install new control equipment. Based upon the review of the analyses that were supplied to Ecology it looks like those were provided roughly 18, or so months ago.

In this draft SIP, Ecology has decided to include a cost estimates from a simplified cost model developed by the EPA using cost estimates for the coal fired electric utility industry. It would certainly seem that putting controls on other industrial sources would be very different from the electric utility industry. Some of the notes that EPA has provided related to these cost estimates show that they're simply study level cost estimates and really don't take into account any site specific limitations that would apply for these retrofit projects.

In fact, EPA is also included that you should be conducting detailed cost engineering studies and preparing cost quotes that are specific to the project when those are available. The EPA cost model really is not the correct tool to be using for these project specific retrofits. I would just ask Ecology to make sure that they're incorporating these detailed cost estimates when they're looking at the four factor analysis as they're based on site specific information and data, and include that in their Regional Haze plan. Thank you.

File name: Washington States Regional Haze Implementation Plan for 2018 to 2028_ Public Hearing 2021-11-18-14-39-12.mp4

Hearing Officer: Thank you. Great. It looks like Colin Deverell still has a hand up. Okay. As Colin is finished with providing testimony. I am not seeing any more raised hands, but you still have a chance to contribute your oral comments if you so desire.

[pause 00:11:13]

Hearing Officer: Still seeing no hands raised last call if you'd like to provide oral testimony now is your chance. [silence] It looks like those who have had a chance to testify and wish to do so have already on, so I'm going to wrap this up. If you would like to send Ecology written comments please remember that they are due November 23rd 2021. You may send them electronically to aq.ecology.commentinput.com/?id=taEN9.

You may also send your comments by postal mail to Department of Ecology Air Quality Program ATTN: Linda Kildahl, P.O. Box 47600, Olympia, Washington 98504-7600. All testimony received at this hearing along with all written comments received no later than November 23rd, 2021 will be part of the official hearing record for this proposal. Ecology will send notice about the response to comments to everyone that provided written comments or oral testimony on this SIP proposal and submitted their contact information.

Also to other interested parties on the agency's mailing list for this proposal. The response to comments will, among other things, contain the agency's response to questions and issues of concern that were submitted during the public comment period. If you would like to receive a copy, but did not give us your contact information, please let one of us know contact Linda Kildahl @linda.kildahl@ecy.wa.gov.

The next step is to review the comments and make a determination whether to submit the proposed SIP revision to EPA. The response to comments will be posted on Ecology's website and Ecology director, Laura Watson, will consider the SIP submittal documentation and staff recommendation, and will make a decision about submitting the SIP revision to EPA. Ecology will submit the proposed SIP revision to EPA after adoption.

EPA will then accept public comments before making a decision to approve the SIP revision. If we can be a further help to you, please do not hesitate to ask or you can contact Linda Kindahl @linda.kildahl@ecy.wa.gov if you have other questions. On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you for coming. I appreciate your cooperation and courtesy. We'll let the record show that this hearing is adjourned at 2:54 PM.

[00:14:50] [END OF AUDIO]