

Jill Inchara's notes
6/16/2016
art glass fiscal advisory committee meeting #2

Glass Fiscal Advisory Committee Meeting

How do you address comments? Who decides what rule changes are made?

Al - Sept? ~~the~~ Oct is close to expiration of temp rule

Jacob - out of state comments?

Amanda - EPA clarification on how many bayhouses?

Chris - Bulky to clarify how many furnaces subject to GS?

Eric - need to decide which furnaces will produce what glass looking @ historical info.

Chris - will figure out which furnaces are GS? - 50tpy

Jacob - 1 for bayhouse (in notes from spreadsheet) in side boards?

Al - Include 0, 1, 2 bayhouses costs?

Jacob - more accurate info in Sept for CDC presentation

Chris - EPA cost estimates - in terms of annualized costs? Capital expenditures? Amortizing capital outlay? Better represents costs to businesses

Paul - not maintenance/bayhouse/motors -

Amanda - One time cost and amortized costs

Al - Access to economists to approach this kind of analysis - EPA economist?

Eric - realistic set of #'s

Abe - cost / bayhouse (annual) costs - maintenance? bags? (All costs)

Chris - ST costs? based on actual ~~baghouse~~ Bulky test?

Eric - represents test done in April

Chris - successful?

Eric - Submitted to DED

Narrative - Added health impacts discussion - real estate

Amanda - public health / ~~test~~ housing prices - cost

add this to the rulemaking process? Partner

WOTHA - pilot for future projects.

- Public health costs, taxpayers

Jacob - emailed similar costs to Joe, economic development

Chris - reflect costs that can be incurred

Directly values secondary costs

Jacob - "may" have significant health benefits
Al - OK w/ "may" because many other sources
of exact metals, even decreased
glass emissions - may still have
health impacts. No guarantee we
will reap significant health benefits

Amanda - "is beneficial to public health"

Al - Flanked by 2 huge polluters, monitoring
data will not show significant
benefit from Alchemy reductions

Paul - Look @ all sources - not just glass -
colored art glass is scapegoat.

Jacob - Bullseye increasing prices by 12%
to offset (Mercury article)

Paul - Chinese competitors do not control ^{undercut} prices.

Eric - price increases don't ^{necessarily} compensate for
sales

Amanda - competitors ^{in US} have controls?

Paul - Chinese, Indians

Abe - under attack by competitors

Al - unintended side effects - take minimum

Abe - add lower threshold to castor gauge

"melting ~~batch~~ batch" { glass melter, using drier hose to
melt materials. Pay cash. don't
deal w/ DSHA. Smaller glass ~~melter~~ melter
should be evaluated.

Chris - < 10 tpy in PDX? yes < 50 tpy Nationwide
- ^{rules should} apply statewide? Could change
locations and avoid regulation

Jacob - relevant to fixed impacts

Abe - why just ADMT?

Eric - glass blowers?

Amanda - big step between glass blowers and
9 tpy producers to avoid regulation

Al - small glass blowers can use metals too.
No one can buy colored glass from Tier 1s
so market is not being served.

Paul - economic ~~impact~~ impact to Tier 1s.

Boilers that use glaze - use some chemistry.
welding? Need to decide how small of
businesses to ~~regulate~~ regulate?

Al - if minimum threshold brought way down - DEC

Chris - recognize that IDPP + PDXAQMA -
may result in existing competition
at economic disadvantage and
damage to public health.

Abe - already seeing this happen - garage melters.

Jacob - Submit as comments, talk w/ legislators too.

4 Questions - Eric

- 1) yes - fiscal impact
- 2) estimates are legitimate
- 3) yes - ~~adverse~~ impact on ^{small} businesses
- 4) ways to mitigate adverse impacts? NOT

Jacob - Drop ^{through} limit down would have positive
impact on economics and still improved.

Al - Increase applicability to smaller businesses -
so sig adverse impacts not unmanageable

Jacob - Expand to whole state

Al - 1 pound of glass as lower threshold.

Paul - regulatory nightmare

Al - just because law is not enforced doesn't
mean it's not a law.

Tier 1 is not using metals until
beginning installation

Jacob - unanimous support of lower threshold
+ statewide

Paul - amount of HAP metals or glass produced?

Al - Should be material used.

Paul - careful to not get too myopic. Other
small businesses have low emissions.

Abe - 100 - 1000 pounds/year better ~~than~~ threshold

Al - OK w/ 100 - 1000 #/yr.

Amanda - no cd in gauge! 1 #/year,
statewide.

Eric - statewide applicability + lower threshold
Glaziers, Glass blowers too. Other activities
Others use similar materials but not
in glass. ~~OSHA~~ OSHA has consulting
process to evaluate compliance concerns
→ DEQ ~~has~~ should have similar
process for consult.

Glass Blowers?

↳ furnaces, not blowers

Eric - include phase change of glass vs. bottles?

Al - different rulemaking for all glass makers?

Al - very few customers use more than 50-100 pounds

Eric - manufacturers vs. users

Al - Δ production volumes - commercially possibility?

Al - \$40 - \$100 / lb retail
\$20 - \$50 - wholesale

Paul - police?

Al - EPA has list of all glass makers - Katie

Public Comments:

Cindy Young - wants statewide rules & larger area, need more control @ federal level - consider health risks

Dan Forbes - 12.5% was Bullseye press release - correction.

- DEQ or OS rules - Uroboros will have 1 bighouse?

- Bullseye bighouses? Eric - 4 bighouse HCs, working on installation concurrently.

- Uroboros declined participation

- HAP chemicals easy to obtain - attracts

OSHA attention? Al: No - can order any material anywhere