

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes
May 7, 2020

Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) Members Present (joined via WebEx)

Patrick O'Neill	John Walliser
Gary Merritt	John Shimshock
Robert Altenburg	Michael Winek
Josie Gaskey	Kevin Stewart
John Tissue	Joseph Guzek
Joseph Duckett	John Slade
Jayne Graham	Kimberly Coy
Michael Fiorentino	Michelle Homan
Charles McPhedran	Richard J. Shaffer
Judy Katz	

Department Staff Present (joined the WebEx):

Kirit Dalal	Allen Landis
Krishnan Ramamurthy	John Krueger
Hitesh Suri	Jessica Shirley
Viren Trivedi	Sean Wenrich
Jesse Walker	Jennie Demjanick
Susan Hoyle	Hayley Book
Naishadh Bhatt	Darek Jagiela
Deborah Wehr	

Others Present (Individuals who joined the WebEx):

Robert Ruth – Clean Air Council	Joseph Kushner – Indiana County Resident
Tom Schuster – Sierra Club	Tony Henry – Conemaugh Station
George (Tad) S. Aburn – MD DEP	Glenn Johnson – Dominion Energy
Brianna Esteves - Ceres	Ronald Itell – Conemaugh Station
Paul Cameron – IBEW 459	Shawn Steffee – Boilermakers Local 154
Kenneth D. Schisler – Vicinity Energy	Evan Midler – Washington County Resident
Kevin Panzino - Geneon	Eric Bedilion – Green County Resident
Jacquie Fidler – Env. Affairs Consol Energy	Barry Hixson – IBEW 459
Aric Baker – Keystone Gen. Station	Elizabeth Kim – Cambria County Resident
Matt Lockhart – Keystone and Shelocta	Mark Szybist - NRDC
David Fyock – Keystone Station IBEW 459	Brian Rhoades – Union Worker

Jim Struzzi – State Rep. (62nd Legislative District) Freda Tepfer – Private Citizen
Matthew Robb – John T Voight Company Dean Van Tassel – Shawville Power Plant

The following individuals did not speak but provided written comments:

William Weaver – Shawville Station	Robb Westwood – Keystone Generating
Terry Bossert – Marcellus Shale Coalition	Jim Welty - Marcellus Shale Coalition
Vince Brisini – Olympus Power	Patrice Tomcik – Moms Clean Air Force
Venessa Nelson – Temple Student	Kathleen Robertson – Exelon Corporation

The following individuals were on the call but could not connect to provide comments due to technical difficulties.

Anthony Demarines - NRG	Sean P. Lane - Olympus Power
Daniel Kim - Private Citizen	Mark Thomas - Private Citizen
Donald McKnight - Private Citizen	Dave Judy - Private Citizen

There were more than 195 total participants on the call including several individuals from the public and from the Department who joined the WebEx as a listener only.

CALL TO ORDER

Patrick O’Neill, AQTAC Chair, called the May 7, 2020 meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. through WebEx.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Patrick O’Neill made a roll call for the AQTAC committee members. Due to the technical issues with the audio systems, some members responded to roll call by the chat function and most of them were able to use the audio.

Approval of Minutes

Patrick O’Neill proposed to postpone the approval of the February AQTAC meeting until June meeting. The AQTAC members decided to postpone the approval of February 13, 2020, minutes at the next meeting.

Patrick O’Neill explained the procedure for the public comments including the procedure for regulation development and mentioned that this is just the beginning of the official regulatory process. Mr. O’Neill explained that the AQTAC is not passing the rule today and it is not final as it has to go through several different advisory committees and EQB (Environmental Quality Board) prior to publishing in the *PA Bulletin*. Once approved by EQB which would still not be final, the regulation is open for the official public comment period prior to going through the final draft proposed rulemaking process.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Draft Proposed RACT III Rulemaking

Sean Wenrich provided a PowerPoint presentation on the draft proposed RACT III Rulemaking.

Michael Winek showed concern about the cement kilns emission limits. Mr. Winek asked if DEP conducted an analysis for technical feasibility and the cost effectiveness of the controls to meet those limits or DEP simply looked at the limits in the consent decree and applied those to all kilns in the State. Sean Wenrich responded that DEP looked at both the consent decree to make sure the limits can be met and the available technology including the test results. Mr. Wenrich indicated the understanding is that all the kilns in the state are equipped with a selective non-catalytic reduction technology and DEP believes that the limit in the consent decree can be met in general.

Mr. Winek commented that the consent decrees was for the PSD and the NSSR violations. Mr. Winek mentioned his understanding that those limits were representative of best available control technology (BACT) and the lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) which should be considered more stringent than RACT and wanted to know if the RACT analysis was done by DEP. Mr. Winek suggested to strongly consider the proposal limits for the wet kilns because the proposed limits will be difficult to meet by the wet kilns, especially at the Lehigh cement plant and suggested to revise those limits to 3.88 (which is RACT II standard for wet kiln) when revising the natural gas transmission definitions. Mr. Wenrich thanked Mr. Winek for the comment and mentioned that DEP will take it into consideration for the revision.

Patrick O'Neill asked if anyone from the committee had any further questions. There were no further questions.

Public Comments

Mr. O'Neill explained the process for the public comments.

Tom Shuster, Sierra Club (submitted written comment)

He stated that Sierra Club requests AQTAC recommend that the proposal move forward for notice and public comment, contingent on the DEP investigating and analyzing the technological and economic availability of devices or methods to operate SCR controls on coal-fired power plants at inlet temperatures below 600 degrees.

Tad Aburn, Maryland Air Director (submitted written comment)

He supported PA in updating RACT III. He expressed concerns on specific requirements for NO_x at coal plants, which are the largest single set of sources for NO_x. He mentioned that EPA determined that PA contributes to MD's 3 Nonattainment Areas. He requested PA to be sure coal plants with existing SCR control run at optimal manner every day to reduce NO_x. He also discussed a few areas where the PA RACT III rule could be modified.

Glenn Johnson Dominion Energy (submitted written comments)

Dominion Energy supported the rulemaking. Asked for TSD to be public as regulation moves forward. He discussed three areas that could be improved moving forward including the practical application of reporting/complying with rule and was supportive of the alternative compliance schedule.

John Krueger informed that there was an updated list of public comments with some people who signed up in the morning and will be forwarded to the committee chair.

Patrick O'Neill asked if there were any further questions from the committee members. There were none.

Mr. O'Neill asked for a motion to "concur with the Department's recommendation to move the proposed rulemaking for additional RACT requirements for major sources of NO_x and VOC for the 2015 Ozone NAAQS forward to the EQB for consideration". Rob Altenburg made the motion, Jayme Graham seconded it.

John Tissue asked if DEP would make changes and then bring it back to committee after changes were made.

Patrick O'Neill indicated his understanding to move with motion and DEP will make the changes as described by Sean Wenrich.

Mr. O'Neil asked Sean Wenrich if the intent was to have Committee vote today, with the understanding that DEP would adjust the definition of "natural gas compression and transmission facility VOC air contamination source". Sean Wenrich agreed with the change to be explained in the preamble of the rulemaking and indicated that this is to clarify the original definition in the rule.

Joe Duckett asked about reviewing the technical support document before the vote. Mr. O'Neill explained that a TSD is not a normal part of the procedure and discussed the normal rulemaking steps and the official public comment period after the EQB meeting.

Sean Wenrich mentioned that the TSD would be finished and presented with the proposed rulemaking package when it goes to EQB, whenever that date is.

Michael Winek asked Sean Wenrich to look into the cement issue (wet kiln limit) prior to submittal to EQB. Mr. Wenrich confirmed that DEP will look into it and if a change is made, it will be noted in the preamble of the rule that it was done in response to AQTAC comment.

Joe Duckett asked that the motion be modified to reflect that DEP would be making changes. Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Duckett discussed whether the motion needed be changed or just adding a line in the AQTAC letter of concurrence was the appropriate course of action. This

generated a lengthy discussion from a plethora of members on mandating vs. suggesting DEP make changes that were committed to and the possibility of adding other items the DEP must or should look into being written into the motion or simply requested in the AQTAC letter. Mr. Duckett made a motion to modify the original motion, which was eventually withdrawn to accommodate the members' expressed opinions in the modified version of the original motion.

Josie Gaskey agreed with Mr. Duckett that she wanted to see a TSD. She asked that in the future DEP bring a TSD to the committee.

Rob Altenburg reiterated the DEP procedure and the difficulty in preparing the TSD before the concepts of a rule have been discussed at AQTAC whose job it is to bring up the issues.

AQTAC concurred with the Department's recommendation to move the proposed rulemaking for additional RACT requirements for major sources of NO_x and VOC for the 2015 Ozone NAAQS forward to the EQB for consideration with the understanding that the DEP will be updating the definition of "natural gas compression and transmission facility VOC air contamination source".

Rob Altenburg accepted Gary Merritt's above motion as a "friendly amendment" of his original motion. Kim Coy seconded the motion.

Vote: Altenburg Y, Coy Y, Duckett Y, Fiorentino Y, Gaskey N, Graham Y, Guzek Y, Homan Y, Katz Y, McPhedran Y, Merritt Y, O'Neill Y, Shaffer Y, Shimshock Y, Slade Y, Stewart Y, Tissue Y, Walliser Y, Winek N.

Total: Yes 17, No 2. The motion carries.

Kevin Stewart requested that the public comments be presented to AQTAC with technical responses, specifically to Sierra Club and Maryland's comments.

Draft Proposed CO₂ Budget Trading Program Rulemaking

Hayley Book provided a brief update of the CO₂ Budget Trading Program.

Robert Altenburg thanked Hayley Book and the DEP's efforts on the regulation. Mr. Altenburg pointed out that there were some concerns in the beginning about the public participation due to COVID crisis, but the early public engagement almost doubled the numbers in capacity from the in-person meeting. Mr. Altenburg voiced support for the rulemaking and encouraged the public participation in further development of the rulemaking.

Charles McPhedran presented concern about environmental justice and presented a comment on the change program which is to move emissions around compared to site specific standards. In the allowance change program, there is potential to move emissions not just for CO₂ but the co-pollutants on the map. He questioned if the DEP proposal takes into consideration the effects of those co-pollutants on overburdened communities representing environmental justice component.

Hayley Book responded that the Department is coordinating with DEP's Office of Environmental Justice to make sure they are doing adequate outreach to affected and marginalized communities and will continue to do so. She continued to explain that the goal of the program is to benefit not only to the revenue investment side but also on the CO₂ emission reduction side for all Pennsylvanians. Ms. Book offered an explanation of some modeling results which show direct emission reductions and direct emission impacts that are occurring immediately in 2022. She acknowledged that it is different than a site-specific standard. However, the model predicts significant CO₂, NO_x and SO₂ reductions in 2022-2030 especially to Pennsylvanians who live near where the facilities are. Ms. Book stated that the Department has not done a GIS evaluation, but staff have looked at facilities affected by this regulation and where they overlap with environmental justice areas. She acknowledged that more work will need to be done on facility-specific emissions.

Mr. McPhedran questioned if there is any supporting documentation available for the discussed analysis. Ms. Book said there are no supporting documents on specific facility by facility emissions with respect to environmental justice. Joseph Duckett asked about the slide with the title "Climate Impacts in Pennsylvania" and how each will be affected by the proposed reductions. Ms. Book said that is being continually evaluated. She stated that the goals for PA were set to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, but the exact PA impacts are not a part of the power sector modeling.

Mr. Duckett asked about Ms. Book's written response to the committee that the most important benefits are the short-term CO₂ reductions, not the co-benefits. Ms. Book responded that we will not have to wait 10, 20 or 30 years on long-term co-benefits to meet climate change goals. She stressed that PA would see emission reductions very quickly in 2022.

Mr. Duckett asked specifically of a connection between CO₂ reduction and health benefits. Ms. Book stated that DEP will continue to look into quantifying health benefits. He also asked about the cost to the Department. Ms. Book stated that there is not a cost by cost breakdown, and they have not established a climate change budget. However, other RGGI states have historically used 6% of revenue to estimate administration fees, which was what PA used in the modeling.

Kevin Stewart discussed that greenhouse gas is a global problem and gave an analogy to a boat with lots of holes in it and everyone should chip in to fix what they can. He discussed the long-term nature of the problem where benefits would not be seen immediately. He also discussed the health consequences: that climate change causes higher temperatures and higher temperatures result in more ozone formation which contributes to health consequences.

Patrick O'Neill assured the public that there would be a public comment after the committee has concluded their discussion, even if the time goes over that scheduled in the agenda.

John Shimshock expressed concerns that the work is still ongoing and technical information is still being presented. He discussed the complex technical aspects of the modeling and sources and new information on facilities being constructed in Ohio presented in an email by Vince Brisini and how they would need to be included in the modeling. He also mentioned a letter sent

by PA Representatives to the Governor requesting that in light of the complex issues and Covid-19 pandemic that the Executive Order 2019-7 be rescinded. He stated his concern that the committee is being rushed to make a decision without the promised public outreach and requested technical information.

Hayley Book acknowledged the large amount of technical information and the Department's attempt to respond to the Committee's questions. She said that the detailed files which were used for the "high level summary" have been posted on the DEP's website for weeks and have been specifically sent to AQTAC members. She further explained that the Ohio facilities under construction would be included in PJM information that was inputted into the IPM modeling. She stated that she feels it would be inappropriate to rescind the executive order at this time because of the health benefits and creating jobs for energy efficiency. She concluded that today's step of moving the regulation forward is the first step in the regulatory review act process which will officially open the record to public comment. She stated that even during the pandemic there have been numerous participants in the informational webinar and public participation and engagement virtually has increased from the traditional methods.

John Shimshock rebutted that he is looking for a technical support document including all PJM states, and feels that the brief 3-minute allocation for public comment is not what was expected by the request in the executive order.

Patrick O'Neill reiterated that this is the beginning of the public process, and that AQTAC has been open to hearing public comments, as evidenced by the increased number of public participants. He expressed that AQTAC was not the place for lengthy oral testimony.

John Shimshock encouraged that the DEP should take seriously the letter to the Governor and reach out to the legislature to hear their comments. Hayley responded that we are.

John Walliser reiterated this is the start of the public process and supports moving the package forward.

Charles McPhedran asked about the back end environmental justice opportunities. Hayley Book responded that the DEP is looking into how the revenues can be best invested into the affected communities. She stated that DEP would put out a draft plan and take public comment on that plan before any decisions would be made. This would occur after the regulatory process gets underway and would be ongoing during the review of the regulation.

Joe Duckett asked about the model assumptions and what is the error band on the model results. Haley stated that was included in the written response to committee questions.

Patrick O'Neill requested that the written question/answer document to which Hayley is referring be included in the minutes for today's meeting. He also requested that it be posted on the AQTAC website with the minutes so that it is publicly available. (It was decided at the August 13, 2020 meeting that a separate document will be posted on the AQTAC website to satisfy Mr. O'Neill's request and is accessible to everyone.).

Gary Merritt disagreed with some of the responses in the referenced document and does not feel that the questions were fully answered. He expressed concern over reduction in demand in the short term. He further stated that he does not think he has a handle on the model input.

John Slade stated that CO₂ reductions and greenhouse gas were important to be addressed. He questioned how combined heat and power units would be impacted by the regulation. He explained how the definition of “cogeneration unit” is different from that of “combined heat and power” term which has been used. He stated that the definition of “useful thermal energy” in the rule specifies electric generation and steam but does not include hot water or thermal energy from exhaust gases. He would like confirmation that the DEP is considering a more robust definition of combined heat and power in the rule.

Ms. Book acknowledged that cogeneration is a larger umbrella covering “CHP” (combined heat and power) and it was not the intent to exclude CHP from the definition. She stated that based on John’s comments more discussions may be needed to clarify the definition in the rule.

Patrick O’Neill noted that EPA supports CHP and there are facilities in the Philadelphia region utilizing the technology.

Rob Altenburg reminded the committee that many have asked for a full TSD before the rulemaking is presented. He cautioned that it could inhibit the committee’s ability to weigh in on the technical aspects of a rule if the DEP has already finalized the details before presenting it to AQTAC.

Hayley responded that DEP is keeping a watch on “leakage” as a part of PJM’s carbon pricing tax force. She explained that in terms of renewable energy and efficiency benefits, DEP has a goal of programs accepting investment the first year of the program. However, they have inputted a lag in the modeling to account for new energy to come online; hence the uptake in 2028. She noted that efficiency improvements could be seen immediately.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Patrick O’Neill apologized to the commentators for the lateness of this portion but noted the statement on the agenda about timing. He explained the 3-minute limit, the option to echo those comments already stated if that is agreeable and requested one speaker per organization.

<p>Mark Szybist, Attorney Natural Resource Defense Council (NRDC), working on energy policy.</p> <p>Joined in Sierra Club comments. Strongly supported moving the rulemaking forward into the public comment process. PA participation</p>	<p>Paul Cameron, Business Mgr. IBEW Local 459</p> <p>Requested committee to vote no on rulemaking package moving forward.</p> <p>Represents appx 1,700 union members working at Keystone, Shawville, Homer City</p>
---	--

<p>in RGGI is the best way to reduce climate pollution through state policy.</p> <p>Acknowledged that rule is not perfect, and they look forward to doing that during the formal comment period. Expressed looking at opportunities to use funds from trading to invest in communities where the coal plants close. He stated that NRDC modeling results show that DEP emission reduction estimates may be low and that answers to policy questions on “leakage” and clean energy in PA are out there.</p>	<p>& Seward. Workers are currently “essential workers” fulfilling electricity demand of PA. Expressed disappointment in lack of compassion of DEP to move forward with a rule that will affect the livelihood of PA workers. Reiterated that DEP modeling shows 90% of plants will shut down immediately due to RGGI and no environmental benefit because of emission “leakage” to non RGGI states. Would like a just transition plan for displaced workers and information on what will replace tax base in communities.</p>
<p>Kenneth Schisler, Vicinity Energy (submitted written comments)</p> <p>Vicinity Energy supported Pennsylvania’s RGGI. He stated that the proposal presented will still have the unintended consequence of <i>increasing</i> emissions.</p> <p>Vicinity Energy proposed that the Pennsylvania RGGI CHP set aside program be modified so as to recognize and realize the full carbon reduction performance and capabilities of CHP-fed District Energy facilities.</p>	<p>Shawn Steffee, Business agent for Boilermakers Local 154 in Pittsburgh & resident of Indiana Co.</p> <p>Thought RGGI would hurt Pennsylvania’s economy and that it should be tabled until the COVID crisis was over and further public outreach could be facilitated.</p> <p>He expressed concern that COVID-19 has inflicted PA with massive job loss and economic hardship. He stated belief that cheap, reliable electricity will be the key to economic recovery. He expressed concern over the lack of public outreach for this rule which will affect thousands of jobs. Mentioned issues with renewable energy.</p>
<p>Tom Schuster, Sierra Club PA Chapter (submitted written comments)</p> <p>The Sierra Club strongly supported the Draft Proposed CO2 Budget Trading Program, which would place limits on CO2 emissions from fossil-fueled power plants and enable linking to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI).</p>	<p>Kevin Panzino, Plant manager of Cheswick and Brunner Island power plants. Resident of Butler County (submitted written comments).</p> <p>Urged committee to vote No on proposal to move rule forward.</p> <p>Concerned over lack of public outreach and “leakage” of emissions in other non-RGGI states in an already economically struggling area. He believes the DEP presentation lacked “technical” information on RGGI, focusing on</p>

	CO2 trading, auction process and financial details.
<p>Robert Routh, Attorney for Clean Air Council (CAC) (submitted written comments)</p> <p>CAC strongly supported the proposed CO2 budget trading program rulemaking and urged the committee to advance the proposal forward to the EQB for consideration and open it up for public comment process.</p> <p>He stated that DEP modeling shows significant emission reductions of CO2 from the electric power sector which translates to significant public health benefits. He asked for DEP to look into mitigating any negative environmental impact on vulnerable communities as is proposed in VA.</p>	<p>Barry Hixson, IBEW local 459</p> <p>Asked committee to reject draft proposal.</p> <p>Thought RGGI would hurt Pennsylvania’s already struggling economy and that it should be tabled until the COVID crisis was over and it could go through the legislative process, not be pushed through on the Governor’s executive order.</p> <p>Expressed desire for elected representatives in government to make decisions on rule, not executive order. Concerned over lack of just transition for displaced workers.</p>
<p>Brianna Esteves, Ceres Investment (submitted written comments).</p> <p>Ceres hoped that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) would vote to support Pennsylvania’s draft CO2 Budget Trading rule and enable the draft rule to move forward.</p> <p>She explained that Ceres is a nonprofit organization that works with investors and companies to create a more sustainable economy. She stated that Ceres supported RGGI because of its many economic and environmental benefits.</p>	<p>Dean Van Tassel, Employee Shawville Power Plant and member of IBEW 459.</p> <p>Urged committee, to stop the process of RGGI moving forward.</p> <p>He expressed views that RGGI is a plant-killing tax on electricity produced at coal-fired and gas power plants with little impact on CO2 emission reduction due to transfer of electricity generation in non-RGGI states. He stated his facility has invested in NG conversion from coal and is in compliance with current regulations. Thought RGGI would hurt Pennsylvania’s economy, losing countless jobs throughout the state and increased electricity prices.</p>
<p>Joseph Kushner, Indiana County resident (submitted written comments)</p> <p>Asked that AQTAC table the discussion until future date.</p> <p>He echoed sentiments of Mr. Cameron, Steffe, Panzino, Hixson, Van Tassel and Henry.</p>	<p>Rep Jim Struzzi, PA House of Rep for Indiana County.</p> <p>He stated his district has 2 of larger coal fired plants. He acknowledged AQTAC is focused on air quality, and most comments have been about economy. He stated his belief this is not the beginning of the process. He and other</p>

<p>He presented numbers on current reductions in CO₂ emissions from power generation as compared to other industry. He stated that there has already been a decrease in PA coal fired plants due to regulations and natural gas boom. He discussed possible capacity and cost effects to the electric power generators and consumers; and expressed concern over “leakage” to other non-RGGI states.</p>	<p>legislators sent a letter to the Governor asking him to stop RGGI in light of COVID-19 pandemic, and response today was no. Furthermore, he expressed concern for local and PA economy of RGGI and has not been given answers. He expressed belief that environmental impact is negligible and urged committee to stop the process now due to the detrimental economic impact on communities. He stated a desire to not import energy from Ohio and West Virginia who choose not to participate in RGGI.</p>
<p>David Fyock, Keystone Station IBEW 459</p> <p>He agreed with previous comments of other union members. He restated that coal plants are struggling and cannot absorb the tax of implementing RGGI. He expressed concerns over emission “leakage” to other states.</p>	<p>Matt Lockhart, Keystone Generating Shelocta IBEW 459 (submitted written comments).</p> <p>Strongly urged Committee, Governor & elected representatives to stop DEP moving forward with RGGI. He stated that he believes the lack of technical information on “leakage” to other states should sway committee to not proceed with DEP proposal.</p>
<p>Aric Baker, Keystone Generating Station employee (submitted written comments).</p> <p>Requested that all involved pull back on RGGI legislation. Thought RGGI would decimate local Pennsylvania economies and RGGI should be tabled until the COVID crisis was over and further public outreach could be facilitated.</p>	<p>Ronald Itell, Employee Conemaugh Station IBEW Local 459</p> <p>Expressed concern over loss of coal-fired electric generation jobs, lack of emission reduction due to “leakage” to other non-RGGI states and unreliable electricity generation from NG generation supply lines. He stated his belief that a mix of generation is a more stable and reliable supply, specifically during cold periods. Also stated economic concerns over loss of family-sustaining jobs. Thought RGGI would hurt Pennsylvania’s economy and that it should be tabled until the COVID crisis was over.</p>
<p>Tony Henry, Conemaugh Generation Station employee, member IBEW 459 & Indiana Co resident.</p> <p>He stated that RGGI is a plant killing tax resulting in job loss, while he noted DEP</p>	<p>Elizabeth Kim, Resident of Cambria County</p> <p>She expressed concern over job loss, which carry an average of \$110,000/year and community impact. Believes environmental impact will be negligible due to “leakage” to other states.</p>

<p>information that 90% of plants will close in first year of regulation. He expressed concern over lack of a just transition plan for workers, especially during COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	<p>She was cut off due to the bad connection.</p>
<p>Rev. Mitchell Hescox, Evangelical Christian representative of PA Pro-Life Christians (submitted comments submitted)</p> <p>He stated support for PA moving to a clean energy economy and support RGGI.</p> <p>He stated view of supporting the moral cause due to health impacts and deaths due to fossil fuel pollution. He expressed his opinion on the need to correct the market through RGGI cap and trade. Supported a just transition for the mining industry and communities in moving forward with the standard.</p>	<p>Eric Bedilion, Resident of Green County, worked in gas and coal industry.</p> <p>He stated that the coal industry provides the best family sustaining jobs in the area. He expressed concern over “leakage” to other states, of emissions and jobs. He stated that SWPA already economically challenged and should not have more.</p> <p>He expressed belief that the Department of Highways are responsible for recent flooding, not Climate Change.</p>
<p>Matthew Robb, John T. Voight Company, mining company. Washington County, PA resident.</p> <p>He asked Committee to heed recommendations of PA Representatives and Senators submitted to Governor Wolf to suspend regulatory efforts to implement RGGI or other CO2 programs.</p> <p>He stated that domestic coal market is distressed due to closing coal-fired generation. He expressed concern that there would be a farther disadvantage to PA coal maintaining generation if we proceed with RGGI. He mentioned there has already been a large capacity retirement in PA and others are scheduled for retirement in the near future. He stressed that this does not account for the RGGI tax and impacts it will have on plants not scheduled for retirement.</p> <p>He expressed concern over devastation of coal industry if moving forward with RGGI as well as community economic implications, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	<p>Jacquie Fidler, Director of Environmental Affairs @ Consol Energy.</p> <p>She requested that the Committee advise DEP to revise the model to account for the current economic conditions and complete a more robust analysis of alternatives that could achieve the same net benefit.</p> <p>She stated that Consol Energy is an exporter of high-quality bituminous coal in SWPA. She stated that the CO2 budget trading program is impactful, not beneficial because it lacks the thorough analysis of environmental benefits & alternatives. Furthermore, she stated that since 2010, CO2 emissions have decreased by 30% from electricity generation based on market conditions & innovations. She explained the minor benefits shown in DEP modeling is 1% of PA CO2 emissions from other sectors and they will be negated by “leaking” to other non-RGGI states. She explained that other technologies could be investigated to achieve similar reductions.</p>

<p>He stated his belief that economic effects will proceed immediately, even this is just the start of the process.</p>	<p>She expressed concern over loss of family-sustaining jobs in Green and Washington counties in coal production and electric generation stations. She stated it is poor timing of the proposal during the COVID-19 pandemic while communities are already struggling is counter to the economic recovery efforts that should take place.</p>
<p>Evan Midler, Washington County PA resident, Cross Creek Township Supervisor and an employee of Alliance Coal. (submitted written comments)</p> <p>Urged the complete cessation of the PA DEP's efforts in moving forward with this proposed CO2 budget-trading program applicable to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative or RGGI.</p>	<p>Brian Rhodes, Member Local 140 Western PA.</p> <p>He echoed the thoughts of previous speakers about current economic situation and expressed his fear of losing his job and relocating to a different state to find a job.</p>
<p>Freda Tepfer, Erie Citizen (submitted email comment). Concern over Federal Gov rollback of Mercury Air Toxic Standard (MATS). Ask Committee to be knowledgeable and ask PA Attorney General to take action against Federal Gov.</p>	

Patrick O'Neill doubled checked those who registered but didn't/couldn't speak and offered a last chance effort.

Mr. O'Neill asked for AQTAC committee further comments. Kevin Stewart read a statement from the American Lung Association. ALA supported RGGI and reduced pollution; however, they advocated environmental justice and economic development for affected communities and workers. ALA suggested environmental justice and resources to be dedicated to legacy health impacts. ALA stated that benefits outweigh the costs, but there are costs and we all must bear them not just displaced workers and communities.

John Shimshock suggested rule creating a longer glidepath (more than 18-22 months) for community and facility transition.

Michael Fiorentino said he still supports moving the proposed rulemaking forward and wants the DEP to look into retraining and transferring the workers to other energy industries.

Patrick asked for a motion for AQTAC to concur with the Department's recommendation to move the proposed rulemaking *Pennsylvania's CO₂ Budget Trading Program* forward to the EQB for consideration.

Rob Altenburg yes, John Walliser, second.

Vote: Altenburg Y, Coy N, Duckett N (via text), Fiorentino Y, Gaskey N, Graham Y, Guzek N, Bowman Y, Katz Y, McPhedran Abstain (with comments to work on economic impact), Merritt N (with comments on economic impact), O'Neill Y (with comments to further work on economic impact through public comment), Shaffer N, Shimshock N, Slade Y (with comments to further work on economic impact through public comment), Stewart Y, Tissue N, Walliser Y, Winek N.

Total: Yes 9, No 9, 1 abstain

Mr. O'Neill, Ms. Graham and Mr. Stewart agreed that motion does not carry.

BUSINESS / OPEN DISCUSSION

Patrick O'Neill opened the meeting for other AQTAC business/open discussion.

John Tissue commented that this was a difficult topic, but it can be fixed as this committee and DEP knows about the gaps and which can be worked out to resolve those gaps to be looked at with rest of the package.

Patrick O'Neill asked John if there was anything particular should be fixed in his opinion. John Tissue indicated that the major impact definitely with folks, the environmental justice impact and everyone heard about the price on the electricity etc. and the leakage that is important and is big in his opinion in addition to transportation issue.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made but was not clearly heard and it was seconded by Kevin Stewart.

Patrick O' Neill thanked everyone in attendance including Committee Members, DEP and public for their hard work on the meeting.

Minutes prepared by Hitesh Suri, Air Quality Program Specialist (AQPS) assisted by Deborah Wehr, Air Quality Program Specialist (AQPS). For additional information about AQTAC, please contact Kirit Dalal at kdalal@pa.gov or (717) 772-3436. For any minutes related questions contact Hitesh Suri at hsuri@pa.gov or (717) 772-3963 or by visiting the AQTAC Web page at: <http://www.dep.pa.gov/Business/Air/BAQ/AdvisoryGroups/Air-Quality-Technical-Advisory-Committee/Pages/default.aspx>