

Neighborhood Advisory Committee
July 11, 2014

NAC Members Present: NEDC: Aubrey Baldwin; NCA: Tom Giese, John Krallman, Mary Peveto; NWDA: Bob Amundson, Sharon Genasci, Kathy Sharp

Not Present: NWDA: Bob Holmstrom

ESCO Representative: Travis Quarles

Other Attendees: Shannon Huggins, Emily Owens, Kat Robinson

Meeting called to order at 9:07 AM.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Aubrey Baldwin announced that she is starting a new job and likely won't continue to work with the NAC. Baldwin and Mark Riskedahl, NWDA Executive Director, haven't discussed her replacement on the NAC.

2. Report back from annual tour

Baldwin described the annual tour of the Main Plant and Plant 3, which included NAC members and four neighbors. The Slinger Bay seemed more active to her than on previous tours. The neighbors asked a lot of questions; it was a good opportunity for them to see the plants. Sharon Genasci was surprised at the low attendance. Baldwin suggested the next tour be planned earlier. Travis Quarles asked if the evening tour was better, and it was agreed that an evening tour accommodates more neighbors' schedules.

Mary Peveto suggested tying the annual tour other GNA topics so it's not just an open house. John Krallman said that when the Emergency Response Plan is complete, neighbors could visit the site and see concrete examples of how the plan would work. Peveto offered that low tour attendance might be because neighbors are growing confident in the GNA and acknowledge that the process is working. Baldwin added that people are less involved if they think someone else is responsible, so neighbors may be disinterested in the tour because they see the GNA as under control. Genasci disagreed, and said that neighbors are discouraged because they don't think they will have any serious impact on what they see as an ongoing problem. Baldwin suggested Genasci talk to those neighbors to determine what would entice them to get involved. Kathy Sharp noted that many neighbors she works with don't want to sign up for emergency notifications, and many don't trust government programs.

Bob Amundson wondered if neighbors could post their availability to build the tour date around their schedules. Baldwin suggested the NAC website be used to collect contact information and availability from interested neighbors. Shannon Huggins, ESCO Public Affairs Manager, suggested other neighbor groups link to the NAC webpage. Baldwin suggested this be set up soon so neighbors can sign up when they're interested. Peveto reiterated that the discussion is less about scheduling the next tour and more about creating a communication tool to inform the broader neighborhood of NAC accomplishments. The tool would help bring in people who are concerned that the GNA is not making progress.

3. Emergency Response Plan

Krallman said that the Emergency Response Plan is in progress, and the NAC will have an opportunity to comment before the plan is finalized. Baldwin suggested the NAC make some comments through email and have a substantive conversation on a conference call. Scheduling and availability was discussed, and Quarles agreed to send out the updated plan with several options for the conference call. If NAC members aren't able to attend, they can provide their comments to Quarles or Huggins.

4. Chapman Monitoring Update

Krallman described the Chapman Monitoring Plan. The monitoring will consist of 24-hour runs every 6 days for one year, and weather conditions will be monitored. PM_{10} will be the primary measurement because EPA uses PM_{10} to test for metals. Both monitors will initially test for PM_{10} for colocation. If the results from both monitors match, the data is precise. Once colocation has been established, one of the monitors can be switched to measure secondary factors like total suspended particulate (TSP) or $PM_{2.5}$.

Amundson wants the data to provide information on health effects, specifically for children. He recommended that $PM_{2.5}$ be the primary measurement because it's an indicator for human health effects. Neighbors are also interested in small metals spheres associated with ESCO. Those particles are too large to be measured with PM_{10} , but could be measured with TSP. Krallman agreed to consider it, but reiterated that $PM_{2.5}$ and TSP were originally intended to be secondary factors.

Genasci said that the monitoring should identify ESCO as a source of pollution, and Krallman said that the monitoring can't be expected to identify a source. Genasci suggested that monitoring be performed at ESCO's fence line, but Tom Giese noted that ESCO didn't agree to fence line monitoring. Baldwin explained that the monitoring was never intended to find a source of pollution, but rather to establish pollutant levels at the elementary school. Amundson suggested that wind data can be used to correlate the results with ESCO pours, but Baldwin reiterated that those correlations are not part of the GNA. Baldwin added that the president of the NWDA agreed to monitor at Chapman. Genasci said she never agreed to that location. Baldwin and others said that Genasci agreed to the location by signing the GNA. Genasci also said that people want to know if ESCO's controls are working. Quarles explained that the monitoring results will show the air quality at Chapman. The method of confirmation on Attachment A items is used to show that the controls are working.

Peveto asked if Amundson expects historic monitoring to be comparable to the Chapman monitoring. Amundson replied that the historic data is not very precise, but $PM_{2.5}$ results could be comparable. Sharp is concerned about comparing historic data and using rough data as a scientific basis. Quarles added that ESCO's goal is to perform a scientifically defensible study that meets DEQ approval. Giese agreed, and said the meaning of the results can be argued and discussed for years.

Quarles explained that ESCO's concerns are similar to Sharp's point; the data should be scientifically robust. One concern is about improvising when collecting secondary data; Quarles suggested a plan be developed for the second monitor before starting data collection. Krallman countered, saying the monitoring should have flexibility. Quarles added that measuring TSP and $PM_{2.5}$ without strong QA/QC might not yield accurate results or strong conclusions. Krallman said that Colocation for PM_{10} will show the data is precise, and colocation won't need to be repeated when measuring secondary factors. Quarles suggested the colocation be spread throughout the year to show precision over the span of the monitoring, and Krallman agreed to consider it.

Peveto said the budget set by ESCO limits the scientific robustness of the data. Beyond the \$25,000 investment from ESCO, paid time for NCA staff is being used to address ESCO's concerns. Quarles understood that the original intent was to find other sources of funding beyond the \$25,000 offered by ESCO. Baldwin said that wasn't her understanding, and others agreed. Baldwin explained that Peveto and Carter Webb, previously with ESCO, were unsuccessful in getting funding from the state legislature. There was never other money on the table. She said ESCO made the final decision on budget and location, and the NAC is struggling to work within that scope to create an acceptable monitoring plan.

Genasci asked if ESCO would consider monitoring at a new location that would assess ESCO's controls. Quarles agreed to take the request back, but warned that it was highly unlikely that the location would change.

Krallman said that the NAC will be given the opportunity to comment on the plan before voting, then GCM will begin training and monitoring. Genasci asked Krallman to hold training until Quarles gives ESCO's response on the change in monitoring location. Quarles reiterated that it's very unlikely for the change to be approved. Genasci replied that she wouldn't vote in support of the location, and Baldwin replied that the monitoring location was already established and is not subject to a vote. Krallman asked the NAC to provide additional comments by the end of the following week.

5. Review ESCO and DEQ Communications

Quarles reviewed recent communication between ESCO and DEQ. The first item is DEQ's approval of a minor permit modification for source testing at the Main Plant.

The second communication is related to Project 6, alternative binders. ESCO switched to a new binder in the Chain Room. VOC emissions are slightly higher when molding, but phenol and naphthalene (two main HAPs) emissions are lower during pouring, cooling, shakeout. The manufacturer ran tests that show reduced VOC emissions during pouring, cooling, shakeout; and opacity measurements show smoke generation is also lower. Quarles provided an MSDS for each chemical and a technical data sheet outlining the tests performed by the manufacturer. Baldwin asked about the manufacturer tested product and what ESCO uses. Quarles explained that the catalyst is slightly different, but the difference should not be noticeable because the catalyst is a small portion of the binder formula. Genasci asked if Quarles would send out the documents, and Quarles agreed to publish the documents or provide a summary.

Genasci asked if the new binder is for the Slinger Bay. Quarles replied that the new binder is different from what's used in the Slinger Bay, but very similar to the cores used in the Doghouse. Molds and cores in the Chain Room use the same material, so changing the binder in the Chain Room has the biggest return over other areas of the plant. Baldwin asked about calculating reductions, and Quarles replied that reduction calculations could be linked to annual production. Amundson asked about emission control in the Chain Room, and Quarles replied that the area is generally uncontrolled. Amundson said that the Chain Room could be a significant portion of odors reaching the neighborhood. Quarles agreed that this might be true, and commented that it's good to see the completion of another GNA project.

The third communication is a notification to DEQ for the direct replacement of equipment because the old equipment wore out. The equipment is hooked into a baghouse, so DEQ was notified.

The fourth item is for Project 1, the new Doghouse dust collectors. DEQ approved the source test results; Project 1 is complete. The emissions factors for the new collectors are lower than collectors in the same area, which was expected. Genasci asked if calculations combine Plant 1 and 3, and Quarles replied that the results are for two dust collectors used at the Main Plant. DEQ decided to combine the plants in the 1990s. Separate calculations are performed for each plant and summed.

The Pouring dust collector's removal efficiency of 68% is misleading because the collector sees very little material at all. Krallman suggested the particles could be too small to capture. Amundson asked about the weigh tests. Quarles explained that ESCO completed the initial weigh tests required by the GNA and

doesn't plan to keep weighing dust until the test is repeated in two years. Most of the dust collected by the Pouring collector was previously released. The Shakeout dust collector pulls and pushes material into the collector, so the weight collected is more than what was previously emitted. Amundson asked about metals content. Quarles said that the Shakeout collector has almost no metal because the material is mostly sand. The Pouring collector might have a slightly higher metal content.

Quarles reviewed the second quarter trends for odor complaints. There were more complaints than in previous second quarters; possibly because of nicer weather and because several people made multiple complaints. Production is steady compared to last year.

6. No Public Comment

Meeting adjourned at 10:41 AM.