Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

June 15, 2016

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

**Art Glass Permanent Rulemaking 2016**

|  |
| --- |
| Overview |

## Short summary ORS 183.335(2)(a)(B)

DEQ proposes that the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) approve the proposed rules, making the temporary art glass rules adopted by the EQC in April 2016 permanent.

## Brief history (optional)

Elevated and possibly unsafe levels of metals have been found in the air around two glass manufacturing facilities in Portland. In May 2015, DEQ received the initial results of a study the U.S. Forest Service conducted looking at moss samples as an indicator or screening tool for contaminants in the air. The study’s results showed that the moss samples in the areas near two colored art glass manufacturers contained high levels of the heavy metals cadmium and arsenic in Southeast Portland and cadmium in North Portland.

This pilot study prompted DEQ to set up air monitoring systems near a glass company in Southeast Portland. The study collected 24-hour air samples every few days over a 30-day period in October 2015. The results of DEQ’s air monitoring confirmed that the glass company was the likely source of metals air emissions. DEQ completed its quality assurance and quality control review of those samples in late January 2016. DEQ then shared its analysis of the findings with the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) and the Multnomah County Health Department.

The DEQ also identified a second area of concern near a glass company in North Portland. The glass companies were operating in compliance with the current law. One company was operating within its permit and the other company is not required to have a permit.

The U.S. Congress amended the Clean Air Act In 1990 to allow EPA to oversee the control of 188 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) in order to protect human health. The EPA works with local and state governments to implement technologies that control the emission of these chemicals.

Benchmarks are Oregon’s protective “clean air” goals that DEQ developed to address toxic air pollutants. There are no direct regulatory requirements associated with benchmarks. In 2005, with EPA funding, DEQ measured concentrations of air toxics, including metals, at six locations in the Portland area, finding levels of many pollutants above clean air benchmarks. DEQ established air toxics benchmarksin 2006 that set guidelines for 52 pollutants.

DEQ’s work in 2006 and since then has identified levels of some toxic air pollutants that are still above Oregon’s air toxics benchmarks. This is a significant problem because toxic air pollutants are connected with serious health effects like cancer, respiratory problems and organ damage. DEQ's air toxics benchmarks are very protective air concentrations that people could breathe for a lifetime without increasing their cancer risk beyond a chance of one in a million.

Air toxics emissions from certain types of industrial businesses like colored art glass manufacturers are not fully regulated under federal requirements. Based on sampling DEQ has concluded that uncontrolled furnaces used in such colored art glass manufacturing are more likely than not to emit potentially unsafe levels of certain metals, including arsenic, cadmium, hexavalent chromium and nickel. The permanent rules that DEQ proposes for EQC adoption are intended to protect the public health and the environment by ensuring the air emissions from colored art glass facilities do not cause unsafe levels of metals in the air nearby.

EQC adopted temporary rules on April 21, 2016 and this proposed rulemaking will make those rule changes permanent. If no action is taken those rules will expire 180 days after adoption, on October 18, 2016.

## Regulated parties (who these rules apply to)

The proposed rules apply to colored art glass manufacturers (CAGM) in the Portland Air Quality Maintenance Area.

CAGMs will incur expenses to obtain air permits; submit reports to DEQ; and depending on the compliance path chosen, to install, operate and maintain emission control devices, and/or perform stack testing and dispersion modeling.

## Request for other options (**THIS LANGUAGE REQUIRED BY STATUTE**)

During the public comment period, DEQ requests public comment on whether to consider other options for achieving the rules’ substantive goals while reducing the rules’ negative economic impact on business.

|  |
| --- |
| Statement of need ORS 183.335(b)(C) |

The three questions are required by statute.

## What need would the proposed rule address?

DEQ is addressing the urgent need to control metals emissions from CAGM facilities. As DEQ recently determined through air monitoring and facility inspections, uncontrolled glass furnaces processing colored glass to which metal Hazardous Air Pollutants[[1]](#footnote-1) (HAP) are added emit these metals at levels that can pose an immediate threat to the health of people nearby. Recent monitoring close to a colored art glass facility with uncontrolled furnace emissions has shown metals concentrations at levels that can significantly increase risks of cancer and other health problems.

These rules are necessary to address a regulatory gap. A federal regulation called NESHAP 6S[[2]](#footnote-2) is applicable to some furnaces at the largest CAGMs, but smaller facilities and furnaces also use and emit metal HAP in quantities likely to pose an unacceptable risk to people nearby. No other state and federal standards currently apply that would limit potentially unsafe levels of metal emissions from these types of colored art glass facilities.

## How would the proposed rule address the need?

The proposed rules would fill the regulatory gap by setting operational standards for art glass businesses that emit air toxics and potentially cause serious health effects.

The proposed rules create two tiers of CAGM based on production and furnace type. The larger Tier 2 CAGMs would be required to install emission control devices on all furnaces using metal HAP, and to perform source testing and dispersion modeling to measure and limit emissions of chromium VI. The smaller Tier 1 CAGMs can install emission control devices on all furnaces using metal HAP, use source testing and modeling to demonstrate that emissions are below source impact levels without controls, or stop using metal HAP in one or more furnaces.

These rules would decrease the risk from airborne metal exposure to people nearby, including children and other sensitive or vulnerable individuals.

## How will DEQ know the rule addressed the need?

The rule requires source testing to demonstrate the effectiveness of emissions control devices and to measure emissions in several other cases (chromium 6 emissions from Tier 2 facilities and metal HAP emissions from Tier 1 facilities opting to operate uncontrolled furnaces). Source testing will quantify metal HAP emissions and emissions reductions.

DEQ is also performing ambient air monitoring near several CAGM, which can verify whether metal HAP concentrations in the air people breathe has been reduced to safe levels.

|  |
| --- |
| Rules affected, authorities, supporting documents ORS 183.335(2)(b) |

## Lead division

Operations

## Program or activity

Program Operations

## Chapter 340 action

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Adopt |  |
| Amend | OAR 340-244-0010, OAR 340-244-9000, 340-244-9010, 340-244-9020, 340-244-9030, 340-244-9040, 340-244-9050, 340-244-9060, 340-244-9070, 340-244-9080, 340-244-9090 |
| Repeal |  |
| Renumber |  |
| Amend and Renumber |  |

## The authorizing statute is the statute that gives EQC the authority to make a rule on a general topic. The statute being implemented is the specific statute that a rule is explaining or expanding on.

## Statutory authority

## ORS 468.020, 468A.025, 468A.040, 468A.310

## Statute implemented

## ORS 468A.025, & 468A.040

Documents relied on for rulemaking ORS 183.335(2)(b)(D)

none

|  |
| --- |
| Fee Analysis ORS 291.055(1)(d); [Fee Approval](http://deqsps/programs/rulemaking/SitePages/Fee%20approval.aspx) |

This rulemaking does not involve fees.

|  |
| --- |
| Statement of fiscal and economic impact 183.335 (2)(b)(E); 183.540 [Fiscal Impact Analysis](http://deqsps/programs/rulemaking/SitePages/Fiscal%20and%20economic%20impact.aspx) |

The sections and questions in this section are all specifically required by statute.

Fiscal and Economic Impact

The proposed change to make the CAGM rules permanent would have fiscal and economic impacts on businesses, DEQ, and the public. It is not anticipated to have fiscal and economic impacts on federal government, other state agencies, or local governments.

Statement of Cost of Compliance

If unable to estimate or quantify the impact, say something like, “DEQ is unable to quantify the impact at this time because …” then explain why. It is OK to say we do not have available data to make this estimate. Rather than repeat identical impacts, its OK to reference the impact on other entities such as, “For large businesses, the cost to comply with the proposed rules is identical to costs described under small businesses. Do not change the order of the entities in the list below because it aligns with our electronic filing with Secretary of State.

**State and federal agencies**

Direct Impacts

The proposed rules would require Tier 1 CAGMs to apply for and maintain Air Contaminant Discharge Permits (ACDPs), which these businesses would not otherwise be required to have. The permit application fees (currently $7,200 per facility) and annual fees (currently $4,608 per facility) would be additional revenue to DEQ. However, those fee amounts would roughly be offset by DEQ’s additional costs for permit writing, compliance monitoring and inspections.

Tier 2 CAGMs that must comply with the substantive requirements of NESHAP 6S will be required to have Title V operating permits whether or not the proposed rules are adopted. In this case, adoption of the proposed rules would not impact DEQ revenue or costs for these facilities. If a Tier 2 CAGM is not required by NESHAP 6S to have a Title V permit, the proposed rules would require them to get an ACDP similar to Tier 1 CAGMs. Bullseye Glass currently has an ACDP.

The US Environmental Protection Agency has been in contact with CAGMs and DEQ but they would not be directly involved in implementing the proposed rules. DEQ does not anticipate impacts to federal agencies or other state agencies besides DEQ.

Indirect Impacts

DEQ does not anticipate indirect impacts to DEQ or other state and federal agencies.

**Local governments**

DEQ does not anticipate direct or indirect impacts to local governments.

**Public**

Direct Impacts

DEQ does not anticipate direct impacts to members of the public, because they are not subject to the rule.

Indirect Impacts

The proposed rules are intended to measure and reduce emissions of metal HAPs from the CAGMs subject to the rule. Decreased emissions of metal HAPs and other particulate matter may have significant health benefits for the public, particularly those who live, work or otherwise spend significant time near a CAGM.

Cadmium, arsenic, and lead, three of the metal HAPs regulated by the rule, have been found to exceed human health-based benchmark concentrations near CAGMs. Exposure to metal HAPs through inhalation or other means is connected with serious health effects like cancer, respiratory problems and organ damage. DEQ's air toxics benchmarks are designed to be very protective air concentrations that people could breathe for a lifetime without increasing their cancer risk beyond a chance of one in a million.

The compliance route chosen by many CAGMs will likely be installation of one or more particulate matter control devices such as baghouses. In addition to reducing metal HAP emissions, installation of these devices would reduce emissions of other particulate matter, including fine particulate matter (less than 2.5 microns in diameter). Fine particulate matter causes serious health problems ranging from increased respiratory and pulmonary symptoms, hospital admissions and emergency room visits to premature death for people with heart and lung disease.

Health problems have negative economic impacts to the people experiencing them. The proposed rules would create positive economic benefits and improvements in public health and welfare by reducing these emissions. DEQ currently does not have an estimate of avoided health impacts, but the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) is working on Public Health Assessments to estimate the health impacts of emissions from Bullseye and Uroboros. OHA plans to release those reports in late fall of 2016.

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimated the costs and benefits of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments[[3]](#footnote-3), which among other things expanded regulation of air toxics and led to regulations such as NESHAP 6S. EPA’s estimate was that the health benefits of that set of regulations were 30 times the costs of compliance, with a range between 3 and 90. However, it is unknown whether numbers would be similar for these proposed rules.

The source testing, modeling, and reporting components of the rule provide the public information about the amount and composition of emissions. This information appears to have value to members of the public, though DEQ is unable to quantify that value in monetary terms.

The public would not incur direct compliance costs because they are not subject to the rule. Members of the public that are customers of CAGMs may pay higher prices, if CAGMs raise their prices to recoup their compliance costs. DEQ lacks information to estimate the impact of price increases but expects this impact on the public to be small relative to the health benefits.

**Large businesses - businesses with more than 50 employees**

Direct Impacts

Currently there are five CAGM that would be subject to the proposed rules. One of those, Bullseye Glass Company, has more than 50 employees and is therefore considered a large business for the purposes of rulemaking fiscal impact analysis.

Compliance cost may vary depending on facility-specific circumstances. In particular, Bullseye is making changes to comply with NESHAP 6S at the same time as this proposed rule. Even if this proposed rule is not adopted, Bullseye would need to install one or more baghouses to meet NESHAP 6S requirements. Because the number of baghouses that would be installed for NESHAP 6S alone is uncertain, the number of additional baghouses needed for compliance with the proposed rule is also uncertain. (Bullseye is planning for installation of a total of 4 baghouses.) DEQ has incorporated that uncertainty into this fiscal impact analysis by estimating that Bullseye would install between zero and two additional baghouses to comply with the proposed rule, over and above what they would install for NESHAP 6S compliance alone.

If no additional baghouse costs were attributable to the proposed rule, compliance with the proposed rule would cost Bullseye about $70,000 to $100,000 in initial costs for permitting, source testing, and modeling, with no ongoing costs.

If all costs for two additional baghouses were attributable to the proposed rule, compliance with the proposed rule would cost Bullseye about $578,000 to $930,000 for permitting, baghouse installation, source testing, and modeling, and ongoing costs of $54,000 to $174,000 per year to operate and monitor the baghouses.

It is possible that Bullseye may be able to offset the cost of compliance through increased prices. However, this potential may be limited if prices are set in a market that includes competitors located outside the jurisdiction of the proposed rules.

Further details on these cost estimates can be found in the attached tables.

Indirect Impacts

To the extent CAGMs raise their prices in response to the proposed rules, the increased prices represent an indirect fiscal impact on their customers, some of whom may be large businesses. DEQ does not have sufficient information to estimate this effect.

**Small businesses – businesses with 50 or fewer employees**

Direct Impacts

Four of the five businesses subject to the proposed rules have 50 or fewer employees and are therefore considered small businesses for the purposes of rulemaking fiscal analysis.

Of these, one (Uroboros Glass Studios, Inc.) is in Tier 2 of the proposed rules. The other three (Glass Alchemy, Northstar Glassworks, and Trautman Art Glass) are in Tier 1.

Like Bullseye, Uroboros is making changes to comply with NESHAP 6S at the same time as the proposed rule. Uroboros stated that in 2015 all of their furnaces were below the throughput thresholds for NESHAP 6S applicability. But, they intend to comply with NESHAP 6S because future throughput may be higher. Uroboros plans to install one baghouse at their facility. Because that baghouse is partially attributable to this proposed rule, DEQ calculated Uroboros’ costs with between zero and one additional baghouse to comply with the proposed rule.

If no additional baghouse costs were attributable to the proposed rule, compliance with the proposed rule would cost Uroboros about $66,000 to $89,000 in initial costs for permitting, source testing, and modeling, with no ongoing costs.

If all costs for the baghouse were attributable to the proposed rule, compliance with the proposed rule would cost Uroboros $421,000 to $699,000 for permitting, baghouse installation, source testing, and modeling, and ongoing costs of $27,000 to $87,000 per year to operate and monitor the baghouse.

Facility-specific data for the Tier 1 CAGMs was not available, so their costs were estimated as a class. The proposed rule gives Tier 1 CAGMs multiple compliance options.

One option is to install an emissions control device such as a baghouse. DEQ estimates that the cost of compliance through this method is approximately $261,000 to $422,000 per facility in one-time costs and between $32,000 and $92,000 per facility in ongoing annual costs. The Tier 1 facilities are not subject to NESHAP 6S and would likely install only one baghouse per facility. All three Tier 1 CAGMs indicated that they planned to pursue this compliance option.

Alternately, Tier 1 CAGMs can operate without an emissions control device if they show through source testing and dispersion modeling that the impact of their emissions on the nearest sensitive receptor is within acceptable source impact levels. DEQ estimates that the cost of compliance via this pathway would be approximately $32,000 to $127,000 in one-time costs and $5,000 in ongoing annual costs for permitting. However, this estimate does not include the cost of reductions or changes in the type or amount of products produced, which could potentially be required in order to maintain emission impacts below limits. The proposed rules also prohibit chrome VI from being used in furnaces that are using this compliance pathway. DEQ does not have sufficient information to estimate whether reduction or changes in production would be necessary.

Tier 1 CAGMs also have the option to stop using some or all of the metal hazardous air pollutants (HAPs)[[4]](#footnote-4) regulated by this rule completely. While this option is available, this would limit the range of glass colors that can be produced, and the lost revenue would likely make this an expensive compliance option.

Trautman Art Glass, one of the Tier 1 CAGMs, said that the proposed rules may prompt them to move their facility to a new location. That decision would depend on whether the current property owner agrees to allow installation of a baghouse, as well as other factors internal to their business. The company estimated that moving their factory and complying with the rules at the new location would cost approximately $2 million, plus lost revenue of $1 million during the moving process. DEQ does not have data to verify the necessity to move or the facility’s cost estimates for doing so.

As for large business CAGMs, it is possible that small business CAGMs may be able to offset the cost of compliance through increased prices. However, this potential may be limited if their prices are set in a market that includes competitors located outside the jurisdiction of the proposed rules.

Further details on these cost estimates can be found in the attached tables. The impact on small business is summarized below.

Indirect Impacts

To the extent CAGMs did raise their prices in response to the proposed rules, it would represent an indirect fiscal impact on their customers, some of whom may be small businesses. DEQ does not have sufficient information to estimate this effect.

**a. Estimated number of small businesses and types of businesses and industries with small businesses subject to proposed rule.**

Four of the CAGMs directly impacted by this rule are small businesses. Some other small businesses may be indirectly impacted if they are customers of CAGMs.

**b. Projected reporting, recordkeeping and other administrative activities, including costs of professional services, required for small businesses to comply with the proposed rule.**

Tier 1 CAGMs would be required to obtain an Air Contaminant Discharge Permit (ACDP) that they wouldn’t otherwise be required to have. Tier 2 CAGMs would be required to obtain an ACDP, if an ACDP or Title V is not already required by other regulations.

CAGMs complying using an emissions control device are required to do an initial source test, and ongoing monitoring and reporting to show proper operation of the emissions control device.

CAGMs complying using source testing and modeling would be required to perform source testing and modeling, and may also need to do recordkeeping and reporting to show that production levels remain below limits established through that process.

**c. Projected equipment, supplies, labor and increased administration required for small businesses to comply with the proposed rule.**

CAGMs complying using an emissions control device would be required to install the control device, which may require replacement parts and supplies.

**d. Describe how DEQ involved small businesses in developing this proposed rule.**

DEQ allowed for a two week public comment period on the temporary rule, which is not required by law. DEQ received comments on the temporary rule from three of the four small businesses affected by the rule. DEQ proposed changes in the rules for Tier 1 CAGMs as a result of these comments.

## Documents relied on for fiscal and economic impact

none

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Document title | Document location |
| none |  |

## Advisory committee

DEQ appointed an advisory committee.

As ORS 183.33 requires, DEQ asked for the committee’s recommendations on:

* Whether the proposed rules would have a fiscal impact,
* The extent of the impact, and
* Whether the proposed rules would have a significant impact on small businesses and complies with ORS 183.540.

The committee met on May 27, 2016 and June 10, 2016 to review the draft fiscal and economic impact statement. Committee members were asked individually to respond to the questions listed above.

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.

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.

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.

The committee determined the proposed rules would have a significant adverse impact on small businesses. As ORS 183.333 and 183.540 require, the committee considered how DEQ could reduce the rules’ fiscal impact on small business by:

* Establishing differing compliance or reporting requirements or time tables for small business;
* Clarifying, consolidating or simplifying the compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for small business;
* Utilizing objective criteria for standards;
* Exempting small businesses from any or all requirements of the rule; or
* Otherwise establishing less intrusive or less costly alternatives applicable to small business.

Committee members were asked whether they could suggest ways to reduce the negative economic impact of the rule while still meeting its 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.

## Housing cost

As ORS 183.534 requires, DEQ evaluated whether the proposed rules would have an effect on the development cost of a 6,000-square-foot parcel and construction of a 1,200-square-foot detached, single-family dwelling on that parcel. DEQ determined that the proposed rules could affect the development cost if a house is constructed using colored art glass as a material, and if CAGM increase their prices in response to the proposed rule. However, the possible housing cost impact of these proposed changes appears to be infinitesimal because colored art glass represents an exceedingly small proportion of the development cost of a home.

|  |
| --- |
| Federal relationship ORS 183.332; 468A.327; OAR 340-011-0029 |

## Relationship to federal requirements

ORS 183.332, 468A.327 and OAR 340-011-0029 require DEQ to attempt to adopt rules that correspond with existing equivalent federal laws and rules unless there are reasons not to do so.

The proposed rules add requirements additional to those in federal requirements.

**OPTION 4** – where rules apply to facilities that pay fees under ORS 468A.315 and requirements are in addition to federal rules

Explain the public health, environmental, scientific, economic, technological, administrative (statutory categories) or other reasons DEQ is imposing requirements that are in addition to related federal requirements. Enter information about how and why the proposed rules are different from the federal requirements here.

What alternatives did DEQ consider if any?

If the proposed rules differ from or impose additional requirements above the federal requirements, include this section; otherwise delete it:

DEQ considered the following alternatives TEXT and did not adopt them because TEXT.

Enter description about why DEQ did not pursue these alternatives. If other parts of this document describe alternatives considered, DOJ advises us to duplicate the information here.

|  |
| --- |
| Land use ORS 197.180; OAR 340-018-0070; 660-030-0005, 660-030-0075 [Land Use](http://deqsps/programs/rulemaking/SitePages/Land%20use.aspx) |

## Land-use considerations

In adopting new or amended rules, ORS 197.180 and OAR 340-018-0070 require DEQ to determine whether the proposed rules significantly affect land use. If so, DEQ must explain how the proposed rules comply with state wide land-use planning goals and local acknowledged comprehensive plans.

Under OAR 660-030-0005 and OAR 340 Division 18, DEQ considers that rules affect land use if:

* The statewide land use planning goals specifically refer to the rule or program, or
* The rule or program is reasonably expected to have significant effects on:
  + Resources, objectives or areas identified in the statewide planning goals, or
  + Present or future land uses identified in acknowledged comprehensive plans

To determine whether the proposed rules involve programs or actions that affect land use, DEQ reviewed its Statewide Agency Coordination plan, which describes the DEQ programs that have been determined to significantly affect land use. DEQ considers that its programs specifically relate to the following statewide goals:

**Goal Title**

5 Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources

6 Air, Water and Land Resources Quality

9 Ocean Resources

11 Public Facilities and Services

16 Estuarial Resources

Statewide goals also specifically reference the following DEQ programs:

* Nonpoint source discharge water quality program – Goal 16
* Water quality and sewage disposal systems – Goal 16
* Water quality permits and oil spill regulations – Goal 19

## Determination

DEQ determined that these proposed rules do not affectland use under OAR 340-018-0030 or DEQ’s State Agency Coordination Program.

|  |
| --- |
| Stakeholder and public involvement ORS 183.333; 183.333(3) [Advisory Committee](http://deqsps/programs/rulemaking/SitePages/Advisory%20committees.aspx) |

## Advisory committee

## Background

DEQ convened the COMMITTEE NAME advisory committee. The committee included representatives from (generally describe committee makeup) and met two times. The committee’s web page is located at: LINK TO COMMITTEE WEB PAGE.

The committee members were:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Representing |
| Enter name, Chair |  |
| Enter name, Co-Chair |  |
| Enter name, Member |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Meeting notifications

To notify people about the advisory committee’s activities, DEQ:

* Sent GovDelivery bulletins, a free e-mail subscription service, to the following lists:
  + On DATES DEQ sent a one-time notice to Name of permittee or other group notified subscribers to describe how to sign up for advisory committee meeting notices, and
  + People who signed up for the advisory committee bulletin.
* Added advisory committee announcements to DEQ’s calendar of public meetings at [DEQ Calendar](http://oregon.gov/deq/Pages/Events.aspx).
* On DATES DEQ provided notice of meetings and links to committee information through postings on Facebook and Twitter.

## Committee discussions

In addition to the recommendations described under the Statement of Fiscal and Economic Impact section above, the committee (summarize committee charter, topics, discussions, conclusions, recommendations).

## EQC prior involvement

DEQ shares general rulemaking information with EQC through the monthly Director’s Report.

**OPTION 1** DEQ did not present additional information specific to this proposed rule revision.

**OPTION 2** DEQ shared information about this rulemaking with the EQC

Choose one and delete the other options:

at a facilitated hearing on DATE

through an informational item on the DATE EQC agenda

in the Director's Report on DATE.

|  |
| --- |
| Public notice and hearings ORS 183.335(1); 468.020(2) [Public Hearings](http://deqsps/programs/rulemaking/SitePages/Hearings.aspx) |

## Public notice

DEQ provided notice of the proposed rulemaking and rulemaking hearing on June 15, 2016 by:

* Filing notice with the Oregon Secretary of State for publication in the Oregon Bulletin on June 15, 2016,
* Notifying the EPA by email,
* Posting the Notice, Invitation to Comment and Draft Rules on the web page for this rulemaking; located at: <http://www.oregon.gov/deq/RulesandRegulations/Pages/2016/Rartglass2016.aspx>,
* Emailing NUMBER OF PARTIES interested parties on the following DEQ lists through GovDelivery:
  + TOPIC
  + TOPIC
  + TOPIC
* Emailing NUMBER OF PARTIES stakeholders on the Enter other mailing lists here
* Emailing the following key legislators required under [ORS 183.335](http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/183.html):
  + Enter name, title, committee here.
  + Enter name, title, committee here.
  + Enter name, title, committee here.
* Emailing advisory committee members,
* Postings on Twitter and Facebook
* Posting on the DEQ event calendar: [DEQ Calendar](http://oregon.gov/deq/Pages/Events.aspx)
* Enter other notices here
* Publishing notice in the following newspapers:

(choose the appropriate ones and delete the rest)

* *The Oregonian* PUBLICATION DATE
* *East Oregon (Pendleton)* PUBLICATION DATE
* *Register Guard (Eugene)* PUBLICATION DATE
* *Mail Tribune (Medford)* PUBLICATION DATE
* *Klamath Herald & News (Klamath Falls)* PUBLICATION DATE
* *La Grande Observer (La Grande)* PUBLICATION DATE
* *Daily Journal of Commerce* PUBLICATION DATE

Public hearings

DEQ plans to hold one public hearing. The table below provides the details.

DEQ will consider all written comments received at the hearings listed below before completing the draft rules. DEQ will summarize all comments and respond to comments in the Environmental Quality Commission staff report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hearing 1 | |
| Date | **Tuesday, July 19th 2016** |
| Time | **6pm** |
| Address Line 1 | **811 SW 6th Avenue** |
| Address Line 2 | **10th Floor, Conference Room EQC-A** |
| City | **Portland** |
| Presiding Officer | **???** |
| Staff Presenter | **???** |
| Call-in Phone Number | 888-363-4734 |
| Call-in Participant Code | 1910322 |
| Webinar link: | <https://www.connectmeeting.att.com> |

How to comment on the proposed rules:

**Submit comment online**

LINK TO RULEMAKING COMMENT PAGE:

http://www.oregon.gov/deq/RulesandRegulations/Pages/comments/Ccodename.aspx

**Note for public university students: Optional p**

ORS 192.501(29) allows Oregon public university and OHSU students to protect their university email addresses from disclosure under Oregon’s public records law. If you are an Oregon public university or OHSU student you may omit your email address when you complete the online form to submit a comment.

**By mail**

Oregon DEQ

Attn: Joe Westersund

811 SW Sixth Avenue

Portland, OR 97204-1390

**At the hearing**

Close of public comment period

The comment period will close at 5 p.m. on July 29, 2016

Accessibility Information

You may review copies of all documents referenced in this announcement at:

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

811 SW Sixth Avenue

Portland, OR, 97204

To schedule a review of all websites and documents referenced in this announcement, call Joe Westersund (800-452-4011, ext. 5622 toll-free in Oregon).

Please notify DEQ of any special physical or language accommodations or if you need information in large print, Braille or another format. To make these arrangements, contact DEQ, Portland, at 503-229-5696 or call toll-free in Oregon at 1-800-452-4011, ext. 5696; fax to 503-229-6762; or email to deqinfo@deq.state.or.us. Hearing impaired persons may call 711.

1. The metal HAP governed by the proposed rule include arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, manganese and nickel. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Glass Manufacturing Area Sources, 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart SSSSSS. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act, 1990 to 2020”, <https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/benefits-and-costs-clean-air-act> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The metal HAPs regulated by the proposed rule include arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, manganese and nickel. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)