From:	Shawn Ingersoll
To:	INAHARA Jill
Subject:	Comment on Glass Making Temp Ruling
Date:	Wednesday, March 30, 2016 14:45:04

Got an error when I tried to submit my comment and could not find it at the last page (or the few in front). Would like for this to be added.

Thank you

"I am a father of a boy who was at the daycare less than a 1/6 mile from Bullseye (where 100's of other children have/do attend, all breathing the same air). He has elevated cadmium levels (2.5x that of 6-11 yo). How this will impact his future is unknown and terrifying. He is only 4. His cancer risk is increased due to this exposure, let alone countless other diseases (kidney function, respiratory, neurological) and potential lifelong impacts that may take decades to surface as a result. I hold Bullseye and DEQ directly responsible for that exposure. We will unfortunately never know what his Arsenic or Chromium exposure was. We will forever wonder if any abnormal illnesses/diseases that arise or difficulties he faces in regards to his health resulted from Bullseyes glass making and environmental negligence.

I'd like it noted how heavily Bullseye is pushing their customers/glass artists, including many outside Portland and Oregon, to weigh in on the temporary ruling. There have even been sponsored Facebook ads by Bullseye promoting comments on this ruling. Many unaware of how big of an issue this really is, especially due to the continually downplaying of exposure. 2 people with concerning levels of Cadmium seems grossly inaccurate considering my sons levels.

Please keep in mind that the majority of pro-glass/anti-pollution control posts are from these likely contributors. It is important that our future health/environment not be undermined by those merely concerned with glass availability or pollution control costs businesses will face. Health before profits. Make it so that it is more fiscally sensible to implement pollution control than to pollute unabated. This is the cost of doing business. We've done it before with industries, and we need to do it again. Have fines/penalties/closure notices incorporated into this ruling. So important! Otherwise whats the point. Expand this ruling beyond the simple few metals that have been included. Provide language that allows the addition of new metals/toxic material down the road. Require glass companies to list the material they use in their glass annually. Make it public. This is also just the beginning, as this goes so far beyond just glass. Dirty diesel, wood stoves, metal plating, PCC, McClure, schools next to freeways. DEQ has a lot to do, especially for those at risk.

There has been mention that Chromium 3 does not turn into Chromium 6 in a glass making environment. Maybe that is so, but we better be absolutely sure that is indeed the case before allowing glass makers to use this material again if it is allowed to leech into the air, water, or soil. We can not rely on a single individuals opinion no matter their experience. Doing so would be highly irresponsible.

We need to be a society that puts health over profits. There will be comments claiming how businesses will not be able to afford controlling the pollution they emit/potential job loss. These are tactics. Oregon can be a place for clean businesses. Polluters need to be responsible for the cost (health, environmental, and economic) that they force on their neighborhoods. There is no reason why they should not be responsible.

For every comment you receive from a concerned citizen advocating for these rules and/or expanding upon them, there are more likely hundreds of others that will not be able to share their voice. Many do not have the luxury of time, awareness, information access etc. Please do not let out of state customers of Bullseye drown out the voice of citizens who now face decades of unknown related to the exposure Bullseye has put us through.

Polluters claiming unawareness is negligence. Negligence is unacceptable. Businesses have a duty to ensure that what they do will not negatively impact the health and well being of those around them.

DEQ is not be in the business of economic development nor should industry be the hand of DEQ as they write regulation. Pollution control costs is not DEQ's concern. DEQ is environmental quality, and ensuring it does not put citizens, the environment, and the economy at risk. I have seen the community do much more than DEQ these past months. Do what your agency was created for. Protect us and implement the Precautionary Principle moving forward.

Thank you,
Shawn"