

Virtual Public Meeting: Roxul Comments on Draft Permit R14-0037A (2023-09-26 18:06 GMT-4) - Transcript

Attendees

+1 240-***-**51, +1 304-***-**09, +1 408-***-**95, +1 571-***-**53, Addison Reese, Amy Piedrahita, Andrew Ard, Beverly D McKeone, Bill G, Billie Garde, Carolyn Rodis, Carrie McCumbers, Christine Marshall, Christine Wimer, Edward F Maguire, elizabeth janes, Erin PF, gerald Hatcher, gina biller, Hatcher, Ruth, Kendra Clark, Linda Kato, Linda Walker, Lynn Delles, Nicole D Ernest, Nicole D Ernest's Presentation, O. Colin Stine, Pia Peltola, Sarah Adams, Saunie H., Shetown Kids, Stephen Stahley, Steven R Pursley, Susie, Sydney L Johnson, Terri Ramos, Tracy DanZey, wbchtelfair

Transcript

This editable transcript was computer generated and might contain errors. People can also change the text after it was created.

Nicole D Ernest: Good evening, everyone. My name is Nicole Ernest. I'm an environmental resource specialist with the Department of Environmental Protections division of Air Quality. Welcome to the dep's public meeting for Roxulusa Incorporated. Permit application are 14-0037A With me, tonight is staff from the Division of Air Quality, including New Source, Review Program Manager Beth McKeon.

Nicole D Ernest: The purpose for this public meeting is to give you the opportunity to share your comments or information about the application with the DEP. If you have already provided a written comment to the agency. You do not have to provide it again during tonight's meeting. The Division of Air Quality held an in-person meeting on Tuesday, September 19th to provide information and answer questions about the application. Therefore tonight we will only be accepting comments while your comments may contain questions. There will be no responses or answers provided to the comments This meeting is being recorded, so that comments you share can be taken into consideration and entered into the public record for the application. A decision will not be made this evening all comments received by the agency, prior to the close of the comment period, including those provided here tonight will be reviewed and considered by the staff and you will receive a notification once. The decision is

Nicole D Ernest: made through the Daq's Response to Comments document The public comments period was scheduled to end at 5 pm on Friday, October, 6, 2023. However, the air quality director, granted a request to extend the public comment period. And so the comment period for this application will close at 5 pm on Monday. October 23rd 2023. Please note that any comments can be submitted via email to Stephen R. Stephen Dot our dot Pursley by regular mail to Stephen Pursley, Wvdep Division of Air Quality. 601-57th Street Southeast Charleston, West Virginia, 253 304. I will include this information in the chat box so that is easily available to you.

Nicole D Ernest: To ensure we have an accurate record of everyone attending this evening for the official record and that those in attendance, receive notification of the agency's final determination. We ask that

everyone register for the meeting. If you did not pre-register, please add your name and contact information in the meeting chat, you can access that chat by clicking, the Small Chat Bubble icon in the bottom right corner of your screen. Each commenter will be given five minutes to speak. I will call on those who indicated, they wish to speak on the registration form first and then open the floor. If there's time at the end, we will circle back to for additional comments. To ensure that we successfully achieve the purpose of this meeting. We ask that everyone be respectful and considerate of each other. By refraining from using foul language name calling and interrupting others while they are speaking.

Nicole D Ernest: We also ask that you keep your comments on the topic of this application so that our time together is used efficiently. Thank you for bearing with me through these opening remarks and instructions. We will now call on our first speaker

Nicole D Ernest: Billy Garde. You may on mute yourself and begin with your comments.

Billie Garde: Thank you very much and thank you for holding this meeting. And extending the time for written comments. I'm with the Jefferson County Foundation and we have already provided detail review objections comments and questions and we'll continue to provide more in response to the information. We learned our position is that the application is incomplete at the public meeting. We learned that Rockwell did not its engineering analysis or calculations to support its claimed emission. Reductions, We also learned that the DAQ just accepted ROCKWELL'S word instead of calculations and did not do any of its own independent analysis of those calculations or any independent calculations on its own. There's not enough information for us to confirm the claims made.

Billie Garde: First for each, operational or equipment change rocks, it should be stated What increase or decrease is expected to result from this change for each air emission Second, there needs to be better factual support for the Reductions that rock From operational limitations of particular emissions sources. There is a major lack of information in this application in its current state and because of this lackard for information, the click, including our experts are unable to confirm the emission reductions that Rockwell is claiming

00:05:00

Billie Garde: We need to know exactly what changes have led to what reductions in what emissions. And the basis for believing, this is the effect of the change so that we can properly evaluate what Rockwell is claiming. We did not have confidence in the emission values, in the original application or the purported, reductions to them due to lack of information In this submitted modified application under the Clean Air Act. the dhq is supposed to do an independent analysis of rockwell's changes. Verify its calculations and methodologies based on what we've reviewed. Although we certainly recognize the hard work that you have done, it's clear that you did not do that, and being aware of that, and being aware, that we are entitled under the law, to have that information and to utilize it. In order to do our own work, we find that the application is incomplete.

Billie Garde: And should not be ruled upon or decided until in fact, the information is submitted and the public has an Need to review it. And that should not be the night before, October 23rd. Thank you very much for considering my comments and again, thank you for coming to Jefferson County to meet with us in person. It was very useful.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Our next speaker is Jennifer. If you're on the call, please unmute yourself and begin your comment.

Hatcher, Ruth: Yes, thank you just a minute. Okay, there we go. My husband's sitting beside me. Sorry about that. My name is Ruth Hatcher, I appreciate this meeting tonight. Ruth, will now claims that, it is a minor air emissions source rather than a major air emission source because of its reductions and emissions specifically with regard to the Rock Wolf facility. The permitting rules in the West Virginia SIP can find a major stationary source that must undergo PSD permitting as any stationary source which emits or has the potential to emit, 250 tons per year or more of any regulated NR pollutant. 45 CSR Chapter 14, 2.43.

Hatcher, Ruth: dot b, the SRP rules, then define potential to emit or PTE as the maximum capacity of a stationary source to emit a pollutant under its physical and operational design any physical or operational limitation. When the capacity of the source to emit a pollutant, including emission control equipment and restrictions on hours of operation or on the type or amount of material stored or processed shall be treated as part of its design only. If the limitation or that you affect, it would have one emissions. It's federally enforceable or is enforceable about the secretary at any permanent consent order issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or by the Secretary.

Hatcher, Ruth: The emissions reductions Rock was claiming. Are due. It seems in large part. To operational limitations hours of operation, limits application rate, limits and material throughput lines, limits of one or more emission sources within the facility, the operational limits. For our operation, needs to be clear. And there needs to be clear monitoring and reporting requirements. Their permit does actually state that the fuel burning units shall not operate for more than 8,400 hours per year. modified permit at page, 29 or 0.1.8.8. However, given the importance of this limit to overall.

00:10:00

Hatcher, Ruth: Emissions. Reductions, We think it should be a stand alone limit and the permit should be clear, that Rockwell has to monitor record and report this information. We also believed at this permit show clearly The 4200 hours of operation Limit for The permit at 4.1.6 contains pounds per hour in tons per year, in mission limits. That mathematically equate to a maximum of 4,200 hours of operation, but it should clearly state. That limit and include hours of operation tracking.

Hatcher, Ruth: Please add express limits to the permit for each and every operational limit that enable rockwell to meet the permit limits, require monitoring recording and reporting of these limits such that these limits may be easily and transparently enforced. And I would just like to state why clean air is it is essential for humans to live and it should be a human right to have clean air. For ourselves for our environment. Our animals and everyone around us, and I thank you for having this meeting tonight.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you so much The next commenter is Addison Reese. If you're on the line, please, I'll meet yourself and begin your comments.

Hatcher, Ruth: it's

Nicole D Ernest: Addison, Reese, If you're available, please unmute your line and begin with your comments.

Sarah Adams: Good evening. And I agree and thank you all for holding The meeting in person meeting and this opportunity tonight to make comments. I'm speaking on behalf of my family who are owners of Hazelfield Farm, the chairs a property boundary with the former Jefferson Orchards and Rockwell. We strongly support the removal of Nicole as the use of coal as an energy source in ROCKWELL'S current air

quality permit application. We ask that the DEP specify, the operational limits that would allow Rockwell to produce. And emit pollutants, under the minor versus major permit.

Sarah Adams: This application also appears to depend solely on the strict enforcement of limitations on the emissions and there must be an independent monitoring of these emissions. That is transparent and readily available to residents of the area. We hardly support. All the comments that have been made previously looking forward to more information, Don't feel really adequately informed at this point, to comment further, but we will be submitting written comments prior to the October 23rd deadline. Thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Our next commenter is Christine, Marshall, if you're available, please unmute your mic and begin your comments.

Christine Marshall: This is Christine. I'd like to submit my comments in writing. Thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Christine.

gerald Hatcher: Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. All a mission estimates should be based on actual data from this facility and these need to be confirmed through an independent analysis. By the WVDEP This facility has now been operating for over two years. So there should be ample data from which to base all emission estimates at this time. The Wvdepf Fact Sheet and Engineering document indicate that the emissions changes at the melting furnace and West. Which is what a Leicester static precipitators. Were based on stack testing data, and SIMS. Continuous emissions, monitoring systems. In the CAN application, it shows the emission estimates are based on engineering estimates, not stack testing.

00:15:00

gerald Hatcher: In the proposed, permanent on page 8. It indicates that eight pounds per hour of CO will be moved from the melting furnace To the west potential to emit. The application that page 36 indicates that this is based upon stack testing results to a similar facility. Not stack testing at the Ranson rockwool facility. Some of the melting furnace haps are based on data from other location. Not testing at the Ranson rockwool Appendix J of the application states. That the Western missions are all based on engineering estimates. Not stacked testing data. In addition, there's a complete lack of information on the application, such that rock pools certations, cannot be verified.

gerald Hatcher: on page 20 of the engineering evaluation, it states, quote, ission calculation methodologies for the two largest emission sources at the facilities. The melting furnace. Imf01 and west e-01 changed significantly. And the 2017 application roxul based those emission. Calculations mostly on stack test from another Rockville facility. However, that facility was significantly different from the RAND facility. Given that rocks will now has both cems. And stack test data from actual operations at the RAND facility. Emissions, from those two sources are largely based on that data end quote.

gerald Hatcher: The SIMS and stack test data needs to be provided both to the DEP and the public, and the new Methodology needs to be provided and independently analyzed by the DEP before. The permit is approved, All emission estimates need to be based on data from this facility. And the wvdep needs to conduct an independent analysis to verify rock walls claims.

gerald Hatcher: I personally have been respiratory challenged due to loss of part of my lung last December. And I know there are others in the community. They're also so challenged. But thank you for the chance to comment.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Dennis. Our next commenter is Biller Gina. If you're available, please unmute your mic and begin your comments.

Nicole D Ernest: Gina to unmute your mic, it's the microphone icon on the bottom left.

gina biller: I was trying to do the microphone on my own little icon, so my name is Gina

gina biller: I've been here for almost 20 years. I've been in this county since 1977 and I was trying to make my lifetime home, I would like to petition for a air monitoring site near Rockwell preferably across the street at the elementary school. That is located directly across the

00:20:00

gina biller: Rockwell was from my understanding supposed.

gina biller: Years. And I wanted known on the record that during June or back in the spring summer when we were having the Canadian wildfires. A lot of us use The Mob, the program called IQ Air, because we didn't know that West Virginia had any monitoring site and it was

gina biller: around the area where purple and red and, showing bad air quality but the one right across the street

gina biller: Was questioned and they said, it wasn't on. So they did not fulfill their three years and I think that they should and I should do not believe in the self-monitoring part of that because they have proven that that does not work.

gina biller: I've looked at your sites, you have 18 sites in the state, nine of them are in the northern part of the state.

gina biller: Heard the way the That's not going to get anything from Rockwell because the wind goes. Past Rockwell and to the Ranson area and over just around this area. So I think that there needs to be a monitor. I would like information about that and I think it should not be self-monitored by rockwool. I'd also like to say that the DPA edep must explicitly prohibit. The

gina biller: For operational limitations that allow rock.

gina biller: If we're coming to the Jefferson County site last week, and giving us some information that was very helpful. And I think that when you do, Start to monitor.

gina biller: You should advertise in our area that you're going to be talking about that so that we can all be involved in that I think, with the night not had the state having 18 of them, I think we can deserve to have a couple of them over here, on the East Coast. Now that they're going to allow heavy industry in our county, then at least we can provide a monitor. So we can know when it's safe to go outside of our homes. I want to thank you for

gina biller: If it's cutting out. But I tried my best.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, The next commenter is Deborah if you're online you may unmute your mic and begin with your comments.

Nicole D Ernest: Deborah if you're calling by phone, you may hit Star Six to unmute yourself.

Nicole D Ernest: Okay, we'll move on to our next commenter. Sandra Holloway if you're available, please, I'll meet your mic and begin your comment.

Saunie H.: Steps. Thank you very much. Can you hear me? Okay.

Saunie H.: Very good. My name is Sandra Holloway and I want to thank you for accepting my comments today. The Department of Environmental Protection must explicitly prohibit, the use of coal. in this permit, they're considering therefore I would ask that the DEP used language that explicitly, prohibits the use of coal as a fuel source or as a raw material, The DEP did say that change could be made. The dep must add strict limits written in the for Limitations that allow rockwool, to be a synthetic quote It would only qualify as a minor with. Those operational limits. The limitations, excuse me.

00:25:00

Saunie H.: The DEP has said that they would add these limits to the permit so they were enforceable as would be required and add monitoring recording and reporting requirements for these operational limits. There should be clearer permit limits for operational limits and monitoring of those limits. Need to be included. The engineering report from the DEP, does not have any analysis of the data provided in ROCKWELL'S application. The DEP should do an independent engineering analysis of the information in the application and other relevant operations. It has collected in the last two years while the RANSON facility was operating and share this data with the public. Thank you so much for taking my time.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, The next commenter is Anastasia, if you're available, please unmute your mic and begin your comment.

Shetown Kids: Thank My comments today, I'd like to focus on the emission limits of what specified in the monitoring. Can you hear me?

Shetown Kids: Thank to Gage what is Sydney emitted from the Rockwell facility? I think it's important to know what is being used during the manufacturing process. For instance, there's information within the permit about the binder, including amounts, anticipated to be used in stored in tanks of formaldehyde methanol and phenol. There's also an understanding of the chemical composition of the stone that's being crushed and melted and spun into the fibers. But what about the composition of the raw and recycled materials and industrial slag Within the engineering evaluation. It gives a process description stating that the mineral role is partly made from the rock, but it's supplemented with recycled mineral wool and slag from the steel industry.

Shetown Kids: It also states that various raw materials used in the melting. Furnace are mixed in the correct ratio to achieve the required chemistry of the fibers. From that one, could assume that it must be known What quantities of materials are being utilized, and knowing that allows accurate determination to be made, then of what other chemicals and emissions will be emitted during the process. In particular, I'd like to ask about the hydrogen, fluoride HF, and hydrochloric acid HCl, which are released in The melting furnace uses slag as a feed material and there are several

Shetown Kids: sections within the permit that speak about the melting furnace and these emission limits for instance in Table. 4.1.4, However, there is no limit available nor any means of control for HF and HCl. In the 2017, notice of application the potential to emit, HF was 1.7 tons per year and HCl was 1.3 tons per year. without limits in the table are these pounds per hour and tons per year being accounted for there's another section that states, the melting furnace again, where these chemicals are created with the introduction of slag that they should comply with the applicable requirements of 40 CFR, 63, Subpart, D D.

Shetown Kids: Also under the evaluation, this is the engineering evaluation. There are weight emissions standards and that requires that those mineral acids should not be released from the manufacturing process duplicate source operation, in excess of the quantity given in Table. 45-7b. Which I agree with and that 457 b that ties back to 45CSR 7, which states that the melting furnace is that unit has the potential to emit sulfuric acid and hydrochloric acid. However the limits that are reference appear to be for source operations that were in existence before 1970 there are two parts of that table. it appears that the limits for this Type D source,

00:30:00

Shetown Kids: Installed after 1970 or 35 and 200 milligrams. Per m3. Now those limits have been reduced for things that come into operation after 1970, so it doesn't appear that the calculations are following the right, limitations referencing, the table and those roles in addition to that are the proposed emission rates in compliance. Then with this table, For what had been admitted previously and what it is, designated that the furnace will emit 50 and 3.9 milligrams. Respectively, it states that the performance test methods,

Shetown Kids: Follow the other Rule, 40, CFR 60, Appendix A. But what is the test method to be used to determine hydrogen chloride emissions from these stationary sources, there is nothing Only a reference to test methods, 20 under 26A, that follows these roles. So I believe that the permit is deficient in calculating the potential to emit when it doesn't list. The amount of products that will be injected and introduced into the furnace, nor the calculations as to what those limits are that are supposed to be applied, don't seem to be correct either. And I hope that there is further Or investigation into that before the final permit is released. Thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you for your comment. The next commenter is Christine, if your mike is working, please don't meet yourself and begin your comments.

Christine Wimer: Can you hear me?

Christine Wimer: Before I actually start on my own comments, I would like to Add something to what Stacey, which was excellent. And that is commenting on what goes into the furnace. And I would like to just bring forward that during the last several years, one of rock walls. stormwater experts, their testified, under oath, at the EQB, that Rockwell was burning trash in the melting furnace. And so I think that what is allowed to be put in the melting furnace is critical to be included in the permit.

Christine Wimer: Because of Thank you, Stacey. So for my comments, Rockwell needs to be regulated as a major air emission source and have the admissions control that match the fuel. That it is actually using contrary to rockwell's current assertions, that the proposed modification in the May Application of Minor Source Permitting Requirements. This facility continues to be subject to the major source PSD permitting requirements because the emission estimates and the may application cannot be confirmed and do not reflect the enforceable potential to emit of this facility as required by 45 CSR 14 to 43 B.

Christine Wimer: in the meeting last week in Westford, in Jefferson County, it was explained that Rockwell's permit retains the emission control technology required in her major permit Major heirs emission source permit. There was based on the use of coal, this control technology is the best available control technology for coal, but now Rocco is using natural gas instead of coal.

Christine Wimer: Burning Coal and Burning Natural Gas Result In fundamentally different Pollutant emission profiles, The Clean Air Act requires that new facilities under the PSD Must have a permit that subjects it to the facility to the best available control technology for each regulated, pollutant it emits and this changes based on the fuel source used. This is according to 42. See it USC. 74 75 84. While it is difficult to know because of the lack of information the application. We believe that Rockwell could have lower air emissions if it used the best available control technology for the fuel. That it is now using for example code Rock will reduce its oxides of nitrogen emissions by using Ultra lonox natural gas burners instead of the burners. It's currently using

00:35:00

Christine Wimer: the wvdep needs to do an independent evaluation of apples data and claims that it is submitting Rockwell needs to be regulated as a major error Mission source, and it needs to be required to install the best available control technology for the fuel source it now plans to use and Rockwell needs to have the lowest emissions possible. in some we want the dep to obtain information needed to do an independent analysis of the claims at Rockwell is making

Christine Wimer: and the way that it arrived at these numbers and then to perform that independent analysis to determine independently whether Rock can indeed meet the requirements of a minor air emission Source or it is indeed a major error Mission Source if it is a major air Mission Source, we want the dep to require Rockwell to use the best available control technology for the fuel that is currently using If it qualifies as a minor, then we want them to expressly require the operational limits that allow it to operate as a minor air machine source. We want them to include monitoring for those things recording and reporting, so that it is enforceable and transparent to the public.

Christine Wimer: whether it's a major or minor will have the most appropriate control technology for the fuel source used. We want to strict prohibition on coal, we want to prohibition on the outdoor storage of material not expressly permitted to be stored outdoors. We want to strict prohibition of venting of the building that is not expressly permitted in the permit.

Christine Wimer: And I just want to end. By reminding that the United Nation Universal Declaration of On human rights.

Christine Wimer: Done that Threatens fundamental human rights, the right to life, the right to health, the right to well-being and the rights of the child. So I want to thank DP and everyone else here this evening.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Christine.

Stephen Stahley: Yes, I want to begin by thanking DEP for offering this opportunity for comments. I appreciate that. Our family moved to Ranson within the last four years. We moved here from out of state to be closer to my wife's family. My wife's family is several generations in this county and what motivates me to be involved in this and to speak is the fact that we have several members of our immediate and extended family who are over 80 and of even greater importance, we have many who are under five years

old. So, especially on behalf of those children. I really feel that it's important to join my fellow citizens in raising these issues.

Stephen Stahley: So along with the ask of several of my fellow citizens is that the EP must explicitly prohibit the use of coal in the permit and also that the Department of Environmental Protection must add strict limits written in the permit for operational limitations that allow Rockwell to the synthetic minor. but to echo some of the comments made by some of my fellow citizens, it seems that they are a major, source of toxic pollution in the air.

Stephen Stahley: thank you again for the opportunity to present and I hope that the Department of Environmental Protection is going to serve as an ally to the citizens here who are very concerned about this issue. We know from hard experience that self monitoring simply does not work and we really need the support of the Department of Environmental Protection to follow through on these issues. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak. I appreciate it and I'll bow out here.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, Stephen. Our next commenter is Lynn Delles. If you're on the line, please, I'll meet yourself and begin with your comments.

Christine Wimer: She's having difficulty, Unmuting.

00:40:00

Lynn Delles: Hi, can you hear me? Okay, sorry about that. I couldn't get that thing to work. Okay thank you for having me. So here are my comments. Rockwell indicated in its application, that it will not be burning, coal as fuel. And DEP is engineering, evaluation Fact sheet states. That quote the RAN facility will not fire quote Cole and quote and quote, Combustion of coal will not be permitted in the new permit and quote.

Lynn Delles: However, the permit does not state explicitly, that Rockwell is prohibited from using recent given the permit history and significant operational change from original the permit needs to clearly prohibit Rockwell from using coal as either a fuel source or as a raw material, Please add a clear prohibition of the use of coal as a fuel raw material or any other use at the Ransom facility. Rockwell has repeatedly indicated that it stores material outside in a social media post not long ago. Rockwell stated that quote, We have an established quarantine time in an outside storage area, to ensure any issues that might arise are in a controlled environment. And quote, Rock will calls these issues Pinking and Rockwell's own definition in a patent application includes that quote order.

Lynn Delles: odors and fumes given off by such thermal decomposition, or offensive, particularly hazardous and capable of discoloring and standing adjacent materials in quote, The environment is actually simply outside and we can find no emission controls in place in the air permit. For this process storage of material outside to allow odors and fumes to be given off. And in case a potential fire is not acceptable.

Lynn Delles: Please add a clear prohibition for the outdoor storage of materials other than those expressly allowed by the permit. Especially those having the potential to give off odors or fumes spontaneously combust. It has been noted by several employees on and on several plant tours. That the building sites are frequently open in the hot end of the plant to reduce the temperature in the building. This clearly has a potential to increase fugitive emissions. Please add a clear prohibition of building openings for longer or more frequently than expressly permitted in the permit.

Lynn Delles: The 50% control efficiency of the three-sided offloading enclosures and other materials handling controls is a completely unsupported. Please require Rockwell to provide justification for all control efficiencies and please conduct an independent analysis of these claims and justifications. Tongue Time, Please make the permit specific strictly prohibiting. The use of coal for any use outdoor storage for any use not venting of the building through any openings not expressly permitted in the permit and require that justification. Is given and an independent analysis is done for all control, efficiency claims. and lastly, I want to just say that I understand that the Dep has a lot of

Lynn Delles: Constraints on their resources whether human or otherwise and I just want to say that it doesn't prohibit you from still doing this permit, a real due diligence and making sure that we're in Jefferson County well protected from the emissions of this plant. So while I understand that your short staff and you don't have a lot of people to go around, please make sure that the law still requires that. You do this to the book and to the letter of the law and we feel that this permit needs improvement. Thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you for your comment The next commenter is Stine Colin. If you're on the line, please unmute and begin with your comment.

00:45:00

Nicole D Ernest: Colin, you can also press Ctrl D, on your keyboard to unmute your mic.

Nicole D Ernest: That's not.

Nicole D Ernest: You can also try joining us by phone. I've put in the chat, the phone number and the pin number if you want to call in, to make a comment through that method. And while Colin is working that out, we'll move on to the next commenter. Catherine. Joswick if you're available, please unmute your mic and begin your comments.

+1 240-***-**51: Can you hear me?

Nicole D Ernest: Yes, ma'am.

+1 240-***-**51: Okay, I have set my comments already in writing. Thank

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: Okay, that is the end of our registered commenters. If there's anybody else who would like to make a comment, please use the raise hand At the bottom of the screen to make a comment.

Nicole D Ernest: Gina, go ahead and unmute your mic and begin.

gina biller: I just want to clarify something I said earlier because I don't think I was very clear.

gina biller: Air quality For three years, it hasn't been three years and back when the Canadian fires were going on.

gina biller: we're all showing the monitors as being read and purple and very

gina biller: the one that was at North Jefferson was green and so we all questioned it and now

gina biller: Up on the site. So I just wanted to clarify that. So that they did not monitor for three years. And I do not believe in self monitoring for this reason. And I just

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, We'll also go back through the list for those who weren't able to make a comment because they weren't on the line or weren't able to unmute their mics Jennifer Jones.

Nicole D Ernest: Reese, Addison. I know you were traveling, but if you're in a more stable place, if you'd like to make a comment on mute your mic and begin,

Nicole D Ernest: Debra royalty, if you're on the call. I would like to make a comment, please, I'll meet your mike and begin.

00:50:00

Nicole D Ernest: College.

+1 304-***-**09: Hello. Sorry.

+1 304-***-**09: I just shut off my speaker. now on my phone that we should clear.

+1 304-***-**09: so, I think. Are three sections to the air permit that do not exist at this point, but must exist in the permit before it is issues. The first is that there has to be a section on potential accidental releases of airborne pollution. One example is formaldehydes in large quantities, that are stored on the property and delivered to the factory. Regularly formaldehyde is a deadly Pollutant The standard operating procedure In the event of a spill is to evacuate the area. This may be an area as much as two miles in radius or to shelter in place. The air permit must require notification of all those individuals and entities potentially affected by an excellent police.

+1 304-***-**09: Release and require that check that there, be periodic testing of the context methods and be shown to be effective that they actually Work, There's a school across the street from the factories. If shelter in places required, the school must be safe. Currently, I believe the school does not meet standards for sheltering in place from accidental air, pollution events, the child dies in a preventable event. this would be The common compensation to the survivors of the child is 10 million dollars, who's going to pay that the state, the county, some insurance company. I do not think the taxpayer that mean myself included should be on the hook.

+1 304-***-**09: Second and section added to the air permit. Should be one. The company must detect radioactivity, Geiger counters are reliable inexpensive. But the release of radioactivity is potentially dangerous to the health of anyone Third. There must be downwind collectors collection of pollutants. The smokestack measurements are an excellent start but the material coming out of the stack is very hot and contains volatile compounds. In the plume. After the smoke leaves, the chimney chemical reactions are likely to occur creating more pollutants and that can harm downwind people on farms.

+1 304-***-**09: In England, the maximum pollution occurs three kilometers, downwind of the smokestacks of a rock tool. Facility. Therefore, the pollution monitoring stations must be set up at intervals in a circle with a radius of three kilometers from the stocks. I think each of these three sections must be included in the permit before. It is issued, there must be enforceable language in each of these three sections. Finally, the enforceable limits need to be. Punitive rather than just simply. A slap on the wrist. The factory needs to be shut down for a period of time again.

+1 304-***-**09: there's to, and be sure that the enforceable limits are not exceeded there has to be a penalty defined in the permit that says the company's going to shut down for a month if Shut down for two weeks if they go X less over the limit, that means pay a fine that was take care of the covers, some of the cost of the community. Thank you, and thank you very much for coming a week ago or whatever. Last week, eight up to Jefferson County. It was a very informative session. That's all I have to say.

00:55:00

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you. Colin.

+1 304-***-**09: You're welcome. I'm sorry. My computer's Is it working right?

Nicole D Ernest: That's okay, I'm glad we can work it out.

+1 304-***-**09: Yes, thank you.

Nicole D Ernest: If there's anybody else you'd like to make a comment please do so. It looks like Dennis. You'd like to make a comment. Please go ahead.

gerald Hatcher: Yes, ma'am. Following up on Mr. Dr. Stine's message there, the problem with the potential shelter in place with the school. Is that if there ever was? An air catastrophe in the area. And the kids shelter in place.

gerald Hatcher: The HDAC systems within the school. Continue to draw in outside air. Even during an event.

gerald Hatcher: So, you're basically trapping the kids with, and the teachers the aculty. Within a school that's drawing in the external pollution. Thus, my last comments and thank you, Dr. Stine for bringing that up.

Nicole D Ernest: Thank you, nis. There's anybody else who like to make a comment, I'll meet your mic and do so. if you're calling in by phone, you can hit Star Six. To unmute your mic. And if you're having troubles, you can also hit Ctrl D on your keyboard.

Nicole D Ernest: If there are no more comments for the Roxulusa Incorporated permit, application are 14-0037A. We will now close the meeting. The comment period will be closed at 5 pm on Monday. October 23rd 2023, written comments can be submitted via email to Stephen Dot. Our dot pursley, by regular mail to Stephen Pursley, Wvdep Division of Air, Quality 601 57th Street, Southeast Charleston West, Virginia, 25, 304. And I've also put that information in the comments box for you. Again, please make sure your name and Information are in the meeting chat. If you did not register for the meeting, thank you very much for your interest and for taking the time to attend. This meeting have a good evening.

Christine Wimer: Thank you for the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection continued dedication to air quality.

gina biller: Thank you, Nicole.

Meeting ended after 00:59:28 🙌