

Neighborhood Advisory Committee
October 15, 2015

NAC Members: NCA: Tom Giese, John Krallman; NWDA: Sharon Genasci, Bob Holmstrom, Kathy Sharp

Not Present: Aubrey Baldwin (NEDC), Mary Peveto (NCA), Bob Amundson (NWDA)

ESCO Representatives: Austin Peterson, Travis Quarles

Other Attendees: ESCO: Shannon Huggins, Jeremy Pritchett, Kat Robinson; neighbors: Effie Greathouse

Travis Quarles called the meeting to order at 5:07 PM. (It was decided earlier in the week that Tom Giese would run the meeting in lieu of Aubrey Baldwin, who wasn't able to attend this meeting. Giese was caught in traffic, so Quarles volunteered to start the meeting.)

Meeting Dates for 2016

Quarles offered 2016 meeting dates. John Krallman mentioned Baldwin's teaching schedule may require more flexibility, and after discussing several options the group decided to vote on preferred times through email. Austin Peterson suggested smaller meetings between quarterly NAC meetings to discuss specific projects in more detail, and use the quarterly meetings to discuss topics of interest to the general public. Giese arrived and assumed the role facilitating the meeting.

Project Update: Project 13 Completion

Quarles summarized the fact sheet for Project 13 and asked Krallman and Holmstrom, both present for subcommittee meetings, to share their thoughts. Krallman explained that the testing for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and organic hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) showed an operating temperature of 1200 °F is a good set point. An increase to 1300 °F didn't show a significant decrease in emissions, and caused more natural gas combustion and higher operational costs. Krallman asked if ESCO intends to update their permit calculations to include the VOC and organic HAPs emission factors determined during the testing. Quarles explained that ESCO will renew its Title V Air Permit shortly, and will revise emission factors as part of the application. Krallman added that the recent emissions testing is more in line with the GNA language, and agreed that the project is complete.

Project Update: Project 17

Peterson reminded the group that ESCO has suggested an alternative to the Slinger Bay for Project 17 because of reduced production at the Main Plant and other business conditions. ESCO recently made big structural changes, part of which included reduced production at Plant 3. Sharon Genasci noted that the President of the NWDA sent a letter to ESCO asking for a status update on Project 17, but was surprised to learn the letter was not delivered to any of the ESCO employees present. Shannon Huggins suggested all NAC correspondence be sent directly to her.

Quarles agreed to provide more information at the next quarterly NAC meeting, but still wants to meet with a smaller group in November to discuss details. Krallman agreed that more technical meetings make sense. Genasci reiterated that the NWDA considers the Slinger Bay an important project, as it's the place they see as the main source of fugitive emissions. She asked Bob Holmstrom about improvements for the area, and Holmstrom replied that he could not speak to a specific project or strategy. Quarles reminded the group that Project 17 is a study meant to select an engineering design. Genasci gave feedback from a neighbor who lives near the plant and hasn't seen any changes from the Slinger Bay. Holmstrom asked about installing a light on top of the Slinger Bay to identify when the exhaust fans are on, but Quarles explained that the fans are not directly related to pouring activity.

Kathy Sharp raised a concern about subcommittee meetings not being advertised. Quarles agreed to continue sending all meeting announcements to NAC members and alternates. Krallman noted that a mailing group for the NAC is one way to ensure everyone is included in email correspondence. Krallman also asked that the analytical reports for Project 13 be posted to the NAC website, and Quarles agreed.

Peterson reviewed the odor complaint trend report. Genasci mentioned a complaint made that week, and the group discussed various incidents of recently smelling strong odors while in the neighborhood. Holmstrom wondered if the reduced complaints are because of reduced odor and less need to complain. Genasci countered that some neighbors are almost adapted to the odor and no longer noticed it. Peterson asked the group if there's still value in the data despite the low complaint volume. Holmstrom suggested that neighbors need to hold up their end and show the value by filing odor complaints. Krallman added that the value is in determining the possible source of the odor no matter how many complaints there are.

Chapman Monitoring Update

Krallman explained that there have been difficulties with sampling, including Dr. Linda George of PSU's metrological station being damaged and several sampling days lost due to issues with the equipment. Quarles noticed that the monitors appeared to be running on non-scheduled days, and Krallman explained that the issue should be resolved. Genasci asked how results will be shared, and Holmstrom noted that Krallman previously agreed not to share preliminary data with the public outright. Krallman agreed and explained that a subcommittee has already met once to discuss the current data, although trends or final results will not be known until a full year of data is available.

Genasci asked about noteworthy level of pollutants. Krallman explained that iron and manganese are the only compounds with levels consistently high enough to be measured. Some values are one to two times the detection limit, but most other compounds are not regularly above non-detect (ND) levels. Holmstrom suggested that the air samples don't contain enough of the pollutants to establish a reading; almost all levels are extremely low. Quarles reminded the group that this was expected based on the equipment used. Krallman agreed, saying the budget did not allow for extremely sophisticated sampling.

Genasci asked if weather data is being collected, and Krallman explained that Quarles shares ESCO's weather data with Dr. George. The students performing the sampling also note weather conditions when they add or remove samples from the monitors. Genasci found it problematic that there's no metrological station at Chapman. Krallman explained that the damaged metrological station was a \$1,000 expense incurred by Dr. George, and it will not be easy to replace.

ESCO - DEQ Communications

Quarles reviewed both communications, the first being the semi-annual Title V Air Permit compliance report. The second was a notice of construction completion for finishing stations connected to a dust collector from the now discontinued Upper Finishing operations. Genasci asked when the shutdown occurred, and Quarles reminded the group that Plant 2 operations were shut down in November 2014.

GNA Negotiation Discussion

Quarles agreed to schedule a separate meeting in November for GNA negotiations. Baldwin had asked if ESCO will have counsel present, and Quarles said Mark Morford of Stoel Rives will likely be part of the discussion. Holmstrom asked if there would be another list of proposed projects developed by a consultant. Quarles explained that ESCO is developing a list based on projects not completed during the first GNA and other internal suggestions. The first meeting in November is meant to discuss expectations

and strategy for specific projects and the negotiations in general. Holmstrom noted that many neighbor groups would like to see monitoring close to ESCO, possibly focused on odor. Genasci interjected, saying the content of emissions is more important than odor. Sharp suggested equipment may be better at discerning odor than people, but Krallman, Quarles, and Holmstrom explained that the human nose is actually more sensitive and better at measuring odor. Genasci expressed unhappiness with what she perceives as small amounts of emissions being controlled as part of the GNA.

The discussion returned to how best to approach the first GNA meeting, who would be included, how projects would be identified, etc. Questions emerged about whether Jim Karas – former GNA consultant, and DEQ should be included. All agreed that the focus of the first meeting would be to establish agreed-upon ground rules, to determine who should be involved and at what point in the discussions, and how projects will be identified for consideration.

Holmstrom asked if ESCO could share future production levels. Peterson explained that such details won't be available until the next quarterly NAC meeting, and Quarles added that even he and Peterson don't have that information. Quarles continued, cautioning the group that a large scope similar to the first GNA is not realistic given ESCO's production levels and business conditions.

Genasci asked about ESCO's request that the NWDA support a zoning change. Huggins acknowledged that there may be some mistrust due to the historical relationship with neighbors or at the very least, curiosity about ESCO's plans for the future. However, the fact is that ESCO is being asked to plan through the year 2035, although most companies can't accurately project that far into the future. If the Main Plant closes in the future, zoning laws prohibit ESCO from maintaining offices on the property. Huggins explained that the zoning law was meant to encourage heavy industrial use, but because manufacturing is evolving, the City is trying to create zoning that protects it while allowing companies to grow and remain competitive. Holmstrom and Genasci both asked for clarification, and Huggins reiterated that under current zoning laws, if production at the Main Plant ends, ESCO will be forced to move its offices off the property.

Giese returned the conversation to the process meeting in November. Genasci again wondered if DEQ would pay for Karas, and Peterson suggested that NWDA make the request. Krallman suggested a letter to DEQ asking for a contractor, but not a specific person. Genasci insisted on Karas, saying DEQ's previous suggestions were sub-par. Krallman explained that DEQ likely can't legally offer a contract to a specific person; there must be a formal bidding process.

Public Comment: None

The meeting adjourned at 6:19 PM.