



DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Appendix D to
Concise Explanatory Statement
Chapter 173-442 WAC
Clean Air Rule
Chapter 173-441 WAC
Reporting of Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

Transcript from July 12, 2016 public hearing

September 2016
Publication no. 16-02-014

Publication and Contact Information

This publication is available on the Department of Ecology's website at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1602014.html>

For more information contact:

Air Quality Program
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Phone: 360-407-6800

Washington State Department of Ecology - www.ecy.wa.gov

- *Headquarters, Olympia* 360-407-6000
- *Northwest Regional Office, Bellevue* 425-649-7000
- *Southwest Regional Office, Olympia* 360-407-6300
- *Central Regional Office, Union Gap* 509-575-2490
- *Eastern Regional Office, Spokane* 509-329-3400

Ecology publishes this document to meet the requirements of the Washington State Administrative Procedure Act (RCW 34.05.325)

To ask about the availability of this document in a version for the visually impaired, call the Air Quality Program at 360-407-6800.

Persons with hearing loss, call 711 for Washington Relay Service. Persons with a speech disability, call 877-833-6341.

Appendix D to Concise Explanatory Statement

**Adoption of
Chapter 173-442 WAC
CLEAN AIR RULE**

and

**Amendments to
Chapter 173-441 WAC
REPORTING OF EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES**

Prepared by
Capitol Pacific Reporting, Inc.

Air Quality Program
Washington State Department of Ecology
Olympia, Washington

This page is purposely left blank.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RULE

CHAPTER 173-441 WAC

and

PROPOSED NEW CLEAN AIR RULE, CHAPTER 173-442 WAC

JULY 12, 2016

Davenport Grand Hotel

333 West Spokane Falls Boulevard

Spokane, Washington 99201

Taken Before:

Terri Rosadovelazquez, RPR, CSR #3070

of

Capitol Pacific Reporting, Inc.

Corporate Headquarters

2401 Bristol Court SW, Suite C-103, Olympia, WA 98502

360.352.2054 Fax 360.705.6539 Toll Free 800.407.0148

Tacoma, WA Seattle, WA Aberdeen, WA

253.564.8494 206.622.9919 360.532.7445

Chehalis, WA Bremerton, WA

360.330.0262 360.373.9032

www.capitolpacificreporting.com

admin@capitolpacificreporting.com

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 MS. BALDWIN: Okay. I'm Karin Baldwin, the hearings
4 officer for tonight's action.

5 This evening we're conducting a hearing on the proposed
6 amendment to the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule, Chapters
7 173-441 WAC, and the new proposed Clean Air Rule, Chapter
8 173-442 WAC. We have a court reporter with us tonight who
9 is transcribing the hearing.

10 Let the record show it is 6:39 p.m. on July 12th. And
11 this hearing is being held at the Davenport Grand Hotel,
12 333 West Spokane Falls Boulevard in Spokane, Washington.
13 Legal notice of this hearing was filed in the Washington
14 State Register, Number 16-12-098, on May 31st, 2016. On
15 June 1st, 2016, Ecology issued a statewide news release on
16 the rulemaking and hearings.

17 Ecology also placed information on their website for
18 the rule and in the online public calendar, and
19 announcements went out by e-mail to the Clean Air Rule
20 e-mail distribution list, the Air Quality Rule and SIP
21 listserv, the Greenhouse Gas Reporting listserv,
22 Washington Carbon Reduction listserv, and the WAC Track
23 listserv. Ecology sent a reminder about the public
24 hearing dates and times to the Clean Air Rule list on
25 July 6th, 2016.

1 So I will call people up to provide testimony based on
2 the order your name appears on the sign-in cards. Once
3 everyone has indicated they would like to testify has had
4 the opportunity, I will open it up for others. Each
5 person is given one opportunity to comment. You can
6 summarize lengthy or similar comments and submit more
7 details in writing by July 22nd.

8 If people would like to testify as a group, they will
9 be given the same amount of time as an individual
10 commentor, three minutes. And due to the number of people
11 we have testifying, you are not able to give your time
12 away to another commentor.

13 Remember, comments should be about three minutes. And
14 after that, with 30 seconds remaining before you reach
15 that limit, Angie is up front and she will hold a sign to
16 let you know you need to summarize your comments so the
17 next person can come up to testify.

18 When I call your name, please come up to the stage and
19 sit right here next to me. Because we want to make sure
20 we get a good recording of your comments, please speak
21 into the microphone. If you haven't given us contact
22 information, such as an address or e-mail, please do so
23 before you begin, or provide this after the hearing. You
24 may, however, remain anonymous if you wish. Speak clearly
25 and not too fast so that we can get a good recording of

1 your testimony.

2 And we will begin with Dan Wilson, to be followed by
3 Jessica Spiegel.

4 Is there anybody else who would like to provide
5 testimony at this time?

6 Okay. Can you please -- we have a -- we'll have a card
7 that we can have you fill out. And then after you've
8 filled out the card, you can hand it to Angie as well.

9 So, Dan, you can go ahead and come on up.

10 Okay. Are you ready?

11 MS. FRITZ: Yeah.

12 MS. BALDWIN: You can start any time.

13 MR. WILSON: Good evening. My name is Dan Wilson. And
14 I want to thank both the governor and the Department of
15 Ecology for your efforts over the last two years in
16 crafting a Clean Air Rule.

17 As president of the United Steelworkers Local 338, I
18 represent more than 1100 workers in the Spokane area.
19 Many of these workers work in energy-intense,
20 trade-exposed industries, like Kaiser Aluminum, which will
21 be directly affected by the rule. So leakage or the
22 transfer of good-paying, middle-class jobs and carbon to
23 other parts of the world where emissions are not regulated
24 has been a big concern for us.

25 There are those who say the rule is not aggressive

1 enough and doesn't fully address the problem, while others
2 say the rule is unnecessary and punitive. Even though I'm
3 concerned about the lack of detail in portions of the
4 rule, I believe the rule will effectively curtail the
5 production of greenhouse gases and help preserve jobs.

6 Again I want to thank you for your work and for
7 affording us the opportunity to participate and provide
8 input throughout the rulemaking process.

9 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

10 Jessica Spiegel, followed by Amber Waldref.

11 MS. SPIEGEL: Mr. Clark, Ms. Rees, and all of the
12 representatives of the Department of Ecology, hello and
13 thank you for letting me speak.

14 My name is Jessica Spiegel, and I represent the Western
15 States Petroleum Association, a nonprofit trade group
16 comprised of 25 companies that explore for, develop,
17 transport, refine, and market petroleum products in five
18 states, including here in Washington.

19 Let me start by saying that WSPA has the utmost respect
20 for Ecology and its staff. In our long-shared experience,
21 we have always had a solid working relationship with the
22 Department. While we may not always see eye to eye, we
23 have been able to rely on the fact that the relationship
24 is open and transparent. It is because of this
25 relationship that we are deeply concerned about the lack

1 of transparency with this particular rulemaking.

2 WSPA is not opposed to well-designed, market-based
3 programs to reduce carbon emissions so long as they are
4 cost effective and they do not unduly burden businesses.
5 Unfortunately, this rule simply does not meet these
6 criteria. Specifically I will highlight our concerns with
7 three main points.

8 One: The fact that the rule is only 29 pages could
9 give the impression that it is simple or straightforward.
10 However, we found the exact opposite. It is short because
11 it has very little detail or specificity. For example,
12 definitions are not provided for key words such as
13 "producers" and "final distribution." Concepts are
14 abstracted across sections. Key pieces of information are
15 never analyzed, such as how many ERUs and allowances
16 should be anticipated by the rule.

17 And digesters is a great example. I think we have an
18 inordinate amount of dairies within the state, so we can
19 actually interpret how many credits would be available
20 from that.

21 All of this reinforces our belief that the process to
22 develop this rule has been rushed. We represent the
23 single most impacted sector in this rule many times over.
24 We should be able to read the rule documents and decipher
25 how we are obligated, how we can comply, what things mean,

1 and so on.

2 Number two: Refining in Washington is significantly
3 energy intensive and trade exposed. This is relative to
4 other jurisdictions throughout the country and world.
5 Using Waxman-Markey as a guide, which is a big guidance
6 that's used, refining is similarly situated to many of the
7 entities which are listed in the document.

8 As an example, after aerospace, petroleum is the
9 largest value exported product that is manufactured in
10 Washington, but it's fourth on the list. Washington
11 really deserves a better evaluation on EITE, one that is
12 fair to all impacted industries in the state.

13 Now, I would like to identify subpart mm today. I do
14 realize it's a very technical comment. But by not using
15 the traditional kinds of distribution as a point of
16 obligation, that is, at the loading rack, the rule creates
17 an unnecessary data quagmire. The best way to describe
18 this use of subpart mm is asking us to figure out how many
19 eggs were used in a bakery based on bread-sales
20 information at nearby grocers.

21 Any rule that impacts such a fundamental component of
22 our lives should be well thought out.

23 Thank you. And thank you for your time.

24 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

25 Amber Waldref, followed by Pauline Druffel.

1 MS. WALDREF: Good evening. My name is Amber Waldref,
2 and I'm a current Spokane City Council member and I chair
3 the city council's Public Works Committee. And I'm
4 pleased to offer some comments related to the Clean Air
5 Rule.

6 I believe strongly in our state making investments that
7 will reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and I've been active
8 in environmental advocacy personally in Washington state
9 for over 18 years, and I appreciate and support the
10 governor's climate-protection goals.

11 You may not know that Spokane has been actually
12 contributing to carbon-emission reductions in our state
13 for the last 25 years with the choice to incinerate rather
14 than landfill our solid waste.

15 When I was elected to office, I had many questions
16 about our Waste to Energy facility; was it efficient in
17 managing our waste, was it the best option for managing
18 our waste as compared to land filling. And over the years
19 I've gained a greater understanding of the trade-offs and
20 the choices. There's obviously no perfect solution in how
21 we manage our solid waste, but the Waste to Energy
22 facility was a choice our citizens made for disposing.
23 And these are the facts about its carbon footprint.

24 Over the lifecycle of the waste, EPA has estimated that
25 a minimum of one ton of carbon dioxide equivalents are

1 avoided for every ton of municipal waste directed to Waste
2 to Energy rather than transported to a landfill.

3 So using this EPA estimate, that would translate to
4 about 250,000 tons of avoided carbon dioxide equivalent
5 emissions annually; and at that rate, over the 25-year
6 life of our Waste to Energy facility, that means we have
7 avoided 6.25 million metric tons of carbon dioxide
8 equivalent. Without Waste to Energy, we would have to
9 long-haul our solid waste to a landfill at least 200 miles
10 away, further adding to the carbon footprint.

11 With these facts in mind, I'd like to ask Ecology to
12 reconsider how Spokane's Waste to Energy facility is
13 affected by the proposed rule. I believe the Waste to
14 Energy facility should either be exempted from the rule
15 because of the ongoing carbon-emission-reduction benefit
16 provided by the facility compared to land filling, or at a
17 minimum I believe Ecology needs to consider the overall
18 benefits of our solid waste disposal program here in
19 Spokane.

20 The biogenic carbon portion of our emissions should be
21 exempted, a credit should be provided for our energy
22 creation at Waste to Energy, a credit for avoided tons of
23 carbon dioxide resulting from our recycling and
24 composting. Carbon-reducing investments made by the City
25 should be valued higher than purchasing of credits from

1 others outside of our state.

2 Solid waste collection and disposal is obviously a
3 critical community service, and we do it here in Spokane
4 without any profit motive. We do it here locally. And I
5 believe the State should recognize that Spokane's Waste to
6 Energy facility has avoided carbon dioxide. And we don't
7 see that that's considered in this proposed rule.

8 The State does need to work with Spokane to develop
9 programs in investments that will reduce waste, because
10 ultimately that's the best way to reduce carbon -- future
11 carbon emissions from all types of solid waste, is to
12 reduce the waste stream. Thank you.

13 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

14 So Pauline Druffel, followed by Laura Ackerman.

15 MS. DRUFFEL: Hi. I'm Pauline Druffel. I live in
16 Spokane, and -- excuse me -- and I'm grateful for the
17 opportunity to speak here. Thank you.

18 I've been aware of the reality of human-caused global
19 warming since the mid 1970s. I am relieved that our state
20 government is now acting to decrease the human-caused
21 production of greenhouse gases. But I hear and read about
22 others objecting to regulations, saying these regulations
23 will raise the cost of energy. And I want to speak to
24 that.

25 Over many years we have had relatively cheap energy.

1 And I'm aware of a fair amount of coal being mined on
2 public lands at very low rates. This is partly -- that's
3 one of the reasons why it's been low. And it's also low
4 because gas -- coal and oil production was subsidized
5 through the government. But the low cost is also because
6 the producers and users of fossil fuel energy did not have
7 to pay for the negative consequences of the burning of
8 fossil fuels.

9 My brother and others -- people have suffered from
10 asthma and has been paying that price. And now that
11 global warming is leading to climate change, more of us in
12 Eastern Washington have had to deal with droughts and
13 wildfires. Huge areas of tribal lands burned in 2015,
14 farmers in the Palouse have poorer crops because of the
15 drought, and those dependent on fishing have been
16 economically affected by streams that were too warm and
17 too shallow to support the aquatic life. The west side of
18 our state is going to be affected economically, or already
19 is, by sea-level rise and acidification of the waters.
20 These realities carry a huge economic cost for the people
21 affected.

22 But the good news is that alternative energy is
23 becoming more common and the price is going down and there
24 are more jobs developing in that area. More solar panels
25 and windmills are getting produced and utilized.

1 I urge the Department of Ecology to set even higher
2 standards for greenhouse gas emissions so as to reduce
3 these gases even more and to protect long-term health of
4 our economy, our people, and our environment.

5 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

6 Laura Ackerman, followed by Breean Beggs.

7 MS. ACKERMAN: Good evening. I'm Laura Ackerman of the
8 Lands Council here in Spokane. Thank you, Department of
9 Ecology, for having this hearing here.

10 The Lands Council is interested in reducing carbon
11 emissions, not only because it makes our work harder in
12 advocating for Inland Northwest forests, water, and
13 wildlife, but also because it's perilously harmful for the
14 health of Washington state citizens, especially those of
15 lower incomes, people of color, the disabled, elderly, and
16 children. In other words, there's a huge percentage of
17 people in this state harmed from carbon emissions.

18 Writing in a commentary in Environmental Health
19 Perspectives, Frederica Perera, the director of the
20 Columbia Center for Children's Environmental Health,
21 identifies fossil fuel combustion and associated air
22 pollution and carbon dioxide as the root cause of much of
23 the ill health of children today. Because of their
24 inherent biological vulnerability, children now bear a
25 disproportionate burden of disease from both pollution and

1 climate change.

2 The single most important action we can take for our
3 children and their future is to cure our addiction to
4 fossil fuels, she says. The commentary summarizes robust
5 scientific evidence by the Columbia Center for Children's
6 Environmental Health and others, concluding that by
7 sharply reducing dependence on fossil fuels, children's
8 health would benefit and the billions of dollars spent to
9 remediate health problems could be saved. All children
10 would benefit, especially poor children who are most
11 affected by toxics and stressors due to air pollution and
12 climate change.

13 Among the conclusions, reducing air pollution will see
14 fewer babies born at low birth weight, fewer children
15 suffering from asthma and neurological development
16 problems such as lower IQ and ADHD. Lower emissions of
17 CO2 and mitigation of climate change will reduce the
18 number of children dying as a result of floods and
19 drought, and fewer children will suffer from heat stress,
20 malnutrition, infectious disease, respiratory illness, and
21 mental illness from displacement, social, and political
22 instability. It is a moral imperative to reduce our
23 dependence, she says.

24 I will be sending you other studies on air pollution.
25 I just want to briefly mention one from the Columbia

1 University's Mailman School of Public Health on the Great
2 London Smog of 1952 caused by air pollution. Five days,
3 4,000 people killed, premature death. Sixty years later
4 the study had been done. It's resulted in thousands of
5 cases of childhood and adult asthma. You can read about
6 it in the American Journal of Respiratory Critical Care
7 Medicine. And Beijing has the similar problems.

8 Now, we may not have a London in Washington state, a
9 London-like thing in Washington state, but we often have
10 long-term, cumulative exposure to pollution. And that is
11 the killer as well.

12 So do it right the first time in these rulemakings. We
13 can't allow for loopholes. If we want to reach our goals,
14 this is just a first step. And we need legislative work
15 on air pollution. Just the health data alone necessitates
16 this rule. Thank you.

17 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

18 Breean Beggs, followed by Scott Simmons.

19 MR. BEGGS: Good evening. I'm Breean Beggs. I'm a
20 Spokane City Council member from the South Hill,
21 District 2.

22 And if you walk around in our district, you talk to
23 people and you see the signs in their yards, you'll see
24 they're very concerned about climate change and the costs
25 we're all going to be paying for our children and

1 grandchildren.

2 The City of Spokane is -- wants to commend the State
3 and the governor for moving ahead. We long ago passed an
4 ordinance to reduce the city of Spokane's greenhouse gas
5 emissions by 2030 from the -- 30 percent reduction by 2030
6 from the 2005 baseline. We've also taken other actions to
7 reduce greenhouse gases, including converting all our
8 solid waste collection fleet -- fleet to natural gas and
9 diesel, included work on our urban forest, making our
10 streets and sidewalks more pedestrian and bike friendly,
11 and just recently passed a Green Building ordinance.

12 Our concern, in addition to what Council Member Waldref
13 stated and some other members are going to say, is that
14 really this rule be applied fairly, that we share the
15 burdens equally across, not based on political exemptions,
16 and especially that we include enough incentive --
17 creative incentives that even if you have a fixed
18 situation, you can find other ways to reduce your
19 greenhouse gases and be part of the system. And the more
20 incentives that are there, the more likely we'll make
21 greater progress.

22 My personal concern is that even though this rule is
23 going in the right direction, it's still not going to
24 address the problem fully. 1.7 percent reduction per year
25 is probably not enough. My sense is, even on the chart

1 that you showed at the beginning, we're still not going to
2 meet that political goal. And the way that climate change
3 is accelerating and the fact that much of our city
4 couldn't breathe for a couple weeks last summer during
5 wildfire season shows us we're probably going to have to
6 do more.

7 So I suggest that we increase the reductions. And the
8 best way to do that would be cover more of the sources and
9 spread that more fairly throughout.

10 I think everyone, or at least most people know the
11 truth of climate change. And as long as the State uses
12 good data and is effective in their rule, transparent, and
13 they spread the burden fairly and creatively, people will
14 get behind it. But to the degree that it's political and
15 it's not data-centered, then people will be skeptical.

16 So I encourage you to dig even a little bit deeper, be
17 more creative in your incentives, cover more of the
18 producers. Thank you.

19 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

20 Scott Simmons, followed by Matthew Pederson.

21 MR. SIMMONS: Good evening. My name is Scott Simmons,
22 and I'm the public works director for the City of Spokane.

23 I'd like to discuss some of the circumstances and facts
24 around costs of implementing the Clean Air Rule for the
25 Waste to Energy facility that the Spokane -- City of

1 Spokane operates and how those dollars might be more
2 effectively spent implementing programs that consider the
3 totality of solid waste practices.

4 Remember, our community's household -- median household
5 income is significantly lower than the state's average
6 income, which requires us at the City to be particularly
7 sensitive and conscious about the affordability of our
8 services.

9 Carbon dioxide is a byproduct of combustion. Today at
10 the Waste to Energy plant, we do not have a technology
11 that exists to further reduce the carbon emissions as long
12 as we continue to process the material. That means, in
13 order for us to comply, we have to do one of two things.
14 We have to buy our way out of the regulation by purchasing
15 credits or accepting fines. Buying credits will be
16 expensive and won't achieve any advances in reducing the
17 greenhouse gas impact of the solid waste disposal. And
18 while we have some questions about how fines would be
19 calculated under the rule, the cost is substantial, again,
20 without having any effective gains in environmental
21 improvements.

22 We also question whether the purchase of credits is an
23 appropriate expense for public utility ratepayers. Such
24 credits wouldn't be directed to the improvements at our
25 public facilities.

1 Number two: We close our facility and landfill our
2 waste, dumping our solid waste problem and subsequent
3 greenhouse gas emissions on another county and quite
4 possibly another state which don't have these regulations
5 in place.

6 Our carbon footprint would increase substantially
7 because each ton of trash would now be responsible for an
8 additional one ton of CO2 equivalents, based on EPA
9 analysis, and we would also have to long-haul our trash to
10 a regional site.

11 Additionally, landfills in our state are in a similar
12 predicament. Emissions will actually go up in the large
13 landfills over time as the waste decomposes on a lifecycle
14 basis. They have no effective option to meet the
15 regulation.

16 The City is asking Ecology to consider the following:
17 (1) exempt the Waste to Energy facility here in Spokane
18 from the rule because of its historic and ongoing positive
19 impact of avoiding greenhouse gas emissions that was
20 mentioned earlier by our council member; (2) recognize the
21 statutory obligation of local governments to manage solid
22 waste by exempting from the Clean Air Rule in favor of a
23 holistic effort to reduce waste, increase recycling, and
24 create markets of recyclable material within our state for
25 greenhouse gas-emission benefits and job-creation

1 benefits; (3) look at the overall benefits of the
2 Spokane's solid waste collection disposal system rather
3 than isolating a single component, recognizing exemptions
4 for its biogenic carbon portion, providing a credit for
5 the energy produced, show a credit for the avoided tons of
6 CO2 that are eliminated from recycling and composting
7 efforts, and recognize some of the carbon investments --
8 carbon-reducing investments the City has made and value
9 those at a higher level.

10 So in closing, I'll just say that 25 years ago the
11 State of Washington actually joined Spokane in creating
12 and selecting waste to energy as our means of disposal in
13 the community. The State actually provided a \$60 million
14 investment in that facility. So it makes sense today for
15 the State to continue to seek greenhouse gas benefits from
16 that investment in a way that is sustainable. Thanks.

17 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

18 Matthew Pederson, followed by Jennifer Calvert.

19 MR. PEDERSON: Thank you very much. My name is Matthew
20 Pederson. I'm municipal relationship manager for Republic
21 Services based out of Spokane office at 421 West
22 Riverside.

23 These statements are being made on behalf of Republic
24 Services who is the owner and operator of the Roosevelt
25 Regional Landfill, a regional municipal solid waste

1 landfill in Klickitat County. These statements will be
2 brief and echo the most important substance of the written
3 comments that were supplied previously.

4 Republic Services is a leader in sustainability across
5 the country and understands the intent of the Clean Air
6 Regulation being proposed by Ecology as a movement towards
7 worldwide stewardship of our planet in a responsible
8 manner.

9 We do have concerns, however, that the rulemaking
10 activity to enact that what appears to be a workable
11 emissions cap-and-trade regulation is being overreached in
12 the state of Washington by the inclusion of landfills,
13 which we strongly believe are inappropriate for this type
14 of rulemaking.

15 Landfills do not fit the intent of the proposed rule.
16 As described by the EPA, and I quote: Landfills are
17 different than any other traditionally regulated
18 emission-source categories. Typically, entities regulated
19 for air emissions are involved in manufacturing or
20 production, and their emissions are directly related to
21 processes involved in creating products or commodities.
22 When manufacturing or production facilities cease to
23 operate, their emissions typically cease. Landfills are a
24 service industry, and -- a repository of waste that needs
25 to be properly disposed, and their emissions are

1 byproducts of the decomposition of that waste.

2 The proposed rules expects facilities to reduce
3 emissions over time, while, in fact, landfills will have
4 an increasing emissions rate during the operating life.
5 Thus the only ways that they could attempt to comply with
6 the proposed rule would be to buy their way out of it by
7 paying a penalty in the form of emission-reduction units
8 or cease operations.

9 The unintended consequences of forcing -- force fitting
10 landfills into this type of regulation with the existing
11 Roosevelt Waste-to-Rail -- Waste-by-Rail Regional System
12 is the lowest carbon footprint system in the region.

13 The economics of the -- okay. The economics of the
14 additional cost of purchasing emission-reduction units
15 would make the system uncompetitive with solid waste
16 facilities that would not have to comply with the
17 rulemaking because of their size or with facilities that
18 are located in other states which do not have such rules.
19 In effect, leakage would occur.

20 The leakage of waste outside of our borders or shipping
21 of waste to smaller facilities would increase greenhouse
22 gas emissions from the extra transportation that any
23 additional 600 trucks -- truck trips per day that would be
24 added to our state highways.

25 Thank you for your consideration.

1 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

2 Jennifer Calvert.

3 MS. CALVERT: Hello. My name is Jennifer Calvert, and
4 I live in Spokane Valley. I'm a mother, a grandmother,
5 high school teacher, bicycle rider, and elderly person
6 with COPD, 71 -- go figure -- and a dedicated air
7 breather.

8 So on behalf of all the attributes of myself, I am very
9 grateful that our state of Washington is one of the best
10 states to live in because of the awareness that we have of
11 the importance of clean air for all the citizens of
12 Washington and the willingness to take action to protect
13 our health and well-being.

14 The major element in assuring that we have clean air to
15 breathe, now and for generations to come, is reducing our
16 dependence on fossil fuels. We need to garner the
17 political will to make the rules, regulations, and laws
18 that support that reduction. And sadly, we are actually
19 coming to this point very late in the game. We should
20 have been working towards this reduction vigorously for at
21 least the last 30 years.

22 Every year the level of CO2 and other pollutants
23 increases steadily, and we simply must use every tool in
24 our arsenal to force industry and individuals to change
25 our ways. And we can only hope that we are not already

1 too late.

2 We have experienced a number of wake-up calls as we see
3 forest fires destroying our communities and causing the
4 State many millions as they continue to increase in
5 frequency and intensity. We are seeing our annual
6 snowpack reduced to unacceptable levels, causing river
7 temperatures to rise and causing harm to fish and problems
8 with agricultural production. Our oceans, which have
9 always somehow seemed intimately vast and impossible to be
10 affected by anything we humans can do, those oceans are
11 warming and acidifying.

12 Life as we have always known it is changing right
13 before our eyes, and we simply must put our every effort
14 into reducing our impact on the environment.

15 The Clean Air Rule is a good step towards making the
16 changes that we must make. We must insist that the
17 legislators of both parties work together to ensure real
18 emission reductions, keeping in mind that this is but a
19 first step and that we must allow science-based evidence
20 to determine the very important next steps we must take to
21 preserve life on Earth.

22 And I feel like what I've been saying and everybody's
23 been saying, they've all been saying it for, but I'm just
24 not sure that we all agree on the urgency. And I'm just
25 here to say, for all those things that I told you, about

1 me being a mother, a grandmother, about, it is urgent.

2 And I am empathetic to business and jobs and those
3 kinds of things, but if there's no world here left to --
4 for us to live, then those businesses are going to go away
5 anyway, so please, please understand the urgency of the
6 problem.

7 Thank you very much.

8 MS. BALDWIN: Thank you.

9 Okay. Is there anybody else who wishes to provide
10 testimony at this time?

11 Okay. So just to clarify that there are -- there is a
12 box on the table outside the room where you could submit
13 your comments, or you can submit comments to me. There's
14 a form you can write your comments on as well out on the
15 table. So please either submit those, if you wish,
16 tonight in the box or to me.

17 And if you would like to send in written comments,
18 please remember they're due by July 22nd, 2016. Please
19 send them to Sam Wilson, Department of Ecology, Air
20 Quality Program, P.O. Box 47600. The e-mail address is
21 aqcomments@ecy.wa.gov. Or fax to (360) 407-7534. You can
22 also use the online comment form available on Ecology's
23 web page. All of this information is also available on
24 the handouts for you to take home.

25 So all testimony received at this hearing, a hearing

1 held in Olympia on July 14th, 2016, webinar hearings held
2 July 7th and July 15th, 2016, along with all written
3 comments marked no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 22nd,
4 2016, will be part of the official record for this
5 proposal.

6 The Concise Explanatory Statement, or CES, contains
7 Ecology's response to questions and issues of concern
8 submitted during the public comment period. We will send
9 notice about the CES publication in a news release to the
10 list services. And if you have not already provided us
11 your contact information, please either see me or Angie
12 after the hearing, and we can get you added to the list.
13 And please note, if, when you submit comments, you elect
14 to stay anonymous, Ecology will be unable to notify you
15 that the CES is available.

16 So the next step is to review the comments and make a
17 determination on whether to adopt the rule. Ecology
18 Director Maia Bellon will consider the rule documentation
19 and staff recommendations and will make a decision about
20 adopting the proposal. Ecology expects to adopt the rule
21 no earlier than August 31st of 2016.

22 If we can be of further help to you, please do not
23 hesitate to ask.

24 On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you for
25 coming this evening.

1 And let the record show this hearing is adjourned at
2 7:14 p.m. Thank you very much.

3 (Proceedings concluded at 7:14 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2)
)
3 COUNTY OF SPOKANE)

4 I, Terri Rosadovelazquez, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter in and for
6 the state of Washington, do hereby certify:

7 That the foregoing hearing is a full, true, and
8 correct transcription of my shorthand notes, to the best
9 of my ability, of the requested hearing, transcribed by me
10 or under my direction;

11 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
12 counsel of any party to this action, or relative or
13 employee of any such attorney or counsel, and I am not
14 financially interested in the said action or the outcome
15 thereof.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
17 this 19th day of July 2016.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TERRI ROSADOVELAZQUEZ, RPR
WA CCR No. 3070, ID CSR No. 966