

Good evening.

My name is Lisa Hastings and I live and breathe in Philadelphia. Environmental quality and science are my life's passions and my former profession.

It is critical for Philadelphia to move past its codependent relationship with fossil fuels and to provide its residents with a healthier environment.

The city can make a lot of progress meeting its legal, Constitutional, moral and scientific obligations on the environment by just closing the refinery and leaving it closed forever. They can do even more by remediating and restoring the site for any of many non-fossil fuels uses in the future.

My points:

- 1) No reopened oil refinery, other fossil fuel or other dirty energy project should be allowed at this site. The city's environment and its residents, especially but not completely those who live in South Philadelphia, have suffered enough.
- 2) Focus on the site at this time should be primarily on remediation, not on an immediate new use. The refinery is not the only place in Philadelphia where jobs can be created, and in fact, we may be better off leaving the site unused by humans while it is remediated and restored. The rationale that it's so contaminated that there is no other use for it, and thus we should allow contamination to continue or not bother with making it habitable, are wrong and very short-sighted. Contamination that is increased or not cleaned up will always cost the public more in the long run, directly and indirectly, so let's take advantage of the opportunity we've been given by the refinery closing before a catastrophe occurs.
- 3) While the city claims it has almost no power because the property has a private owner, and if it cannot at least add a zoning overlay of "No fossil fuel uses allowed" on this property or find a buyer who will request for a no fossil fuel zoning change, then it should consider using its power of eminent domain to take the property for the public purposes of
 - *saving lives and money now by eliminating a huge source of toxic and carcinogenic contaminants that sicken and kill residents,
 - *improving the quality of life for all Philadelphians,
 - *eliminating the primary stationary source of all air pollution in Philadelphia, from particulates to carbon monoxide to nitrogen oxides and more,
 - *eliminating its share of baseline emissions of ozone precursors that EPA said eastern cities, including Philadelphia, would probably need to eliminate in order to achieve the 2015 ozone NAAQS,
 - *helping to mitigate negative climate changes that are already impacting Philadelphia, and finally,
 - *benefiting from the unlimited economic and social benefit of being much more attractive to new investment, visitors and residents by taking bold action to break our city's addiction to dirty fossil fuel and take real action on climate change. We can brag about doing this!

1) Reasons to not reopen an oil refinery are numerous. The refinery has long been a serious polluter, emitting over 70% of all the toxic air emissions in Philadelphia. (The neighborhood has the worst toxic air contamination in the city, with an EPA rating of 40 extra cancer deaths a year/per million people). It exceeds AQ emissions standards frequently (paying fines but continuing to pollute). In the last few years, the refinery has been reported to have violated not only the CAA, but also the CWA and RCRA. It obviously contributes to worsening climate change. Is this really something the city wants to perpetuate?

Philadelphia can do better.

There is no reason to believe that such pollution would lessen under new ownership. Some of the best proof of that were the testimonies of all the skilled workers who explained at the last meeting how diligently they maintain the refinery.

I think the physical operation of the refinery has been the best it could be because of its workers, but it remained a horrible source of pollution.

It just doesn't make any sense to reopen another oil refinery or any other facility that will continue the pollution. The city shouldn't repeat the mistake it made a few years ago.

2) Remediation is tricky, and should be done with great care to assure that it is done as thoroughly as possible without further harming nearby residents or other. However, the contamination present must be cleaned up, especially since petroleum byproducts are especially dangerous and difficult to remove once they enter water, either on the surface or in groundwater. The site is a threat to both. Fortunately, bioremediation using microbes can help breakdown these products and is less disruptive than other types of remediation.

Several types of remediation may ultimately be necessary to contain or remove serious threats, but all of it should be done with consideration given to minimizing negative impacts it might have on the neighborhood.

After remediation under way, it will be easier to analyze what the best new clean use of the site can be. There will probably need to be ongoing remediation. Perhaps it could be an elevated solar farm with bioremediation continuing to take place under the moving panels. Perhaps it could be a ground level solar facility that covered the soil.

Perhaps some of it can be planted as a dense urban forest that would help to reduce flooding, improve air quality, reduce summer heat, reduce carbon from other nearby sources, and help beautify the area.

The area closest to the river, once it is clean enough, could be planted with appropriate grasses and left otherwise undeveloped, allowing the ebb and flow of the river and predicted rising water levels to occur without causing serious monetary damage in the future, while also restoring some of the natural habitat on this side of the river.

Thank You.

Lisa Hastings
2001 Hamilton St. P108
Philadelphia, PA 19130
Lkh1066@earthlink.net

