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Meeting Minutes

Meeting #1

# Art Glass Permanent Rulemaking 2016

# Fiscal Advisory Committee

Friday, May 27, 2016

DEQ Headquarters Office

Conference Room EQC-A (10th Floor)

811 SW 6th Avenue

Portland, OR 97204

List of Attendees

Advisory Committee members:

Abe Fleishman, Northstar Glassworks

Al Hooton, Glass Alchemy, Ltd

Amanda Jarman, Eastside Portland Air Coalition

Chris Winter, CRAG law center

Jacob Sherman, South Portland Air Quality

Mark Riskedahl, NW Environmental Defense Center

Paul Trautman, Trautman Art Glass

Advisory Committee members not present:

Eric Durrin, Bullseye Glass Company

Members of the public:

Bob Heath

Bob Nemhauser, Trautman Art Glass

Cindy Young, East Portland Air Coalition

Cynthia Morgan

Frank Peters

Jenn Ferrante

Jessica Applegate, East Portland Air Coalition

Katharine Salzmann, East Portland Air Coalition

Mary Stoneman

Mitzi Kugler

Pam Archuleta

Scott Cura

Sky Archuleta

DEQ staff:

Jaclyn Palermo

Jill Inahara

Joe Westersund

Leah Feldon

The above list is based on the sign-in sheet. Some public attendees may not have signed in. In addition, an unknown number of members of the public participated in the meeting by phone.

List of Handouts and Presentation Notes

* Draft fiscal impact narrative and calculations
* Proposed rule language (same as current temporary art glass rules)
* Text from ORS 183.540, Reduction of economic impact on small business

Agenda

Overview of today’s meeting

Committee member introductions

Walk-through of draft fiscal impact calculations

Walk-through of draft fiscal impact narrative

Request for committee member recommendations

1. Would the rule have a fiscal impact?

2. If so, what is the extent of that impact?

3. Would the rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses?

4. If so, can the economic input be reduced, consistent with the public health and safety purpose of the rule?

Opportunity for audience member comments and questions

Summary of committee comments

1. All committee members agreed that the rules would have a fiscal impact. Several members commented that there is also a fiscal impact on the US EPA. Other committee members stated that in addition to negative fiscal impacts of the rule, there are positive impacts because of avoided health impacts.
2. Committee members felt the range of costs reflected in the DEQ fiscal impact estimates were reasonable. Some commented that there is high uncertainty about the numbers, and some requested that the health benefits of the rule be quantified. One commented that costs could be significantly higher than the cost range given if a CAGM had to move their facility to install controls.
3. Committee members agreed that the rule would have a significant adverse impact on small businesses. Several members commented that small businesses located near the facilities or whose employees are located hear the facilities would be negatively impacted if the rule were not implemented, because of the health impacts of uncontrolled emissions.
4. Committee members did not identify changes to the rules that could reduce their negative economic impact while still meeting their public health and safety purpose. Several committee members commented that DEQ could reduce uncertainty for small businesses by clarifying whether they can operate during the period between submitting a permit application and DEQ issuing the permit. Some committee members mentioned that the rule already attempts to reduce impacts on small businesses by having different requirements for different tiers.

Next steps

* The committee requested a second meeting, which has been scheduled for Friday, June 10th at 2pm.
* The public comment period for this rule is scheduled to begin June 15, 2016, and close at 5pm on July 29, 2016.
* A public hearing will be scheduled for mid-July.
* DEQ plans to bring the proposed rules to the Environmental Quality Commission for their vote in October 2016.