

Benjamin Hartung

From: Karen Guarino Spanton [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 7:23 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Karen Guarino Spanton



Benjamin Hartung

From: Kathleen Card [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 10:36 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Card



Benjamin Hartung

From: Laura Herndon [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2022 2:56 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Laura Herndon



Benjamin Hartung

From: Linda Granato [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 7, 2022 3:07 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Linda Granato



Benjamin Hartung

From: Loretta Dunne [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 6:54 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Loretta Dunne



Benjamin Hartung

From: Louis Kyle [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:22 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Louis Kyle



Benjamin Hartung

From: Margaret Sayvetz [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 11:03 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Margaret Sayvetz



Benjamin Hartung

From: Marielle Lerner [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 10:33 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Marielle Lerner



Benjamin Hartung

From: Mark Barbash [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 6:47 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Mark Barbash



Benjamin Hartung

From: Marlene Adkins [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 4:19 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Marlene Adkins



Benjamin Hartung

From: Marta Guttenberg [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 11:54 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Marta Guttenberg



Benjamin Hartung

From: Mary Ann Leitch [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 1:16 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Mary Ann Leitch



Benjamin Hartung

From: Mary McKenna [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 5:04 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Mary McKenna



Benjamin Hartung

From: Max Ojserkis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 9:51 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Max Ojserkis



Benjamin Hartung

From: Meagan Cusack [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 10:13 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Meagan Cusack



Benjamin Hartung

From: Megan LeCluyse [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 8:42 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Megan LeCluyse



Benjamin Hartung

From: Meredith Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:08 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Meredith Jones



Benjamin Hartung

From: Michael Bourg [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 10:32 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Michael Bourg



Benjamin Hartung

From: Michael Miller Jr [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 1:21 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Michael Miller Jr



Benjamin Hartung

From: Michael Zuckerman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 10:08 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Michael Zuckerman



Benjamin Hartung

From: Morgan Doyle [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 2:53 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Morgan Doyle



Benjamin Hartung

From: Norman Koerner [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 11:36 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Norman Koerner



Benjamin Hartung

From: Patricia Libbey [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 1:24 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Patricia Libbey



Benjamin Hartung

From: Paul Hagedorn [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 10:17 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Paul Hagedorn



Benjamin Hartung

From: Rebecca Ackley [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 10:53 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Ackley



Benjamin Hartung

From: Robert Aretz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 3:23 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Robert Aretz



Benjamin Hartung

From: Robert DuPlessis [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 10:10 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Robert DuPlessis



Benjamin Hartung

From: Rose Paddison [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 2:15 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Rose Paddison



Benjamin Hartung

From: Sandra Folzer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 9:17 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

I'm very concerned about the pollution in Philadelphia.

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan "minimize" and "manage" the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fence line monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fence line communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sandra Folzer



Benjamin Hartung

From: Serena Levingston [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 6:18 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Serena Levingston



Benjamin Hartung

From: Sheila Erlbaum [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 10:20 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sheila Erlbaum



Benjamin Hartung

From: Sheila Siegl [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sheila Siegl



Benjamin Hartung

From: Sheldon Isaac [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 6:35 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sheldon Isaac



Benjamin Hartung

From: Spencer Koelle [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 1:03 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Spencer Koelle

[REDACTED]

Benjamin Hartung

From: Steven Denisevicz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 3:17 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Steven Denisevicz



Benjamin Hartung

From: Susan Babbitt [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 7, 2022 6:43 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan Babbitt



Benjamin Hartung

From: Susan Morris [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 6, 2022 11:35 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect their community. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children.

I URGE you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Susan Morris



Benjamin Hartung

From: susan patrone [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 10:21 AM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

We need you to strengthen these regulations to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction.

The regulations should require

fugitive emissions controls,

hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, fence line monitoring.

Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring reporting to ensure compliance.

clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities.

AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fence line communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Patrone

Sincerely,
susan patrone



Benjamin Hartung

From: Susan Saltzman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 6:24 PM
To: Benjamin Hartung
Subject: Philadelphia Air Management Regulation VI for Toxic Air Contaminants

External Email Notice. This email comes from outside of City government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Dear Benjamin.Hartung@phila.gov,

Thank you for your efforts to better regulate toxic air pollution and reduce cancer risks from pollution emitted by large industrial facilities in Philadelphia.

The proposed regulations must be strengthened to truly ensure they achieve meaningful health protections for Philadelphians. Making simple but important changes consistent with the current science will make a real difference in preventing cancer, birth defects, and other serious health impacts from toxic air pollution in our city - especially in neighborhoods already overburdened by industrial pollution.

AMS should require an assessment of the cumulative impacts on human health of multiple air toxics from a facility. It is not adequate to individually consider the impact of each known carcinogen emitted by a facility. It would be more protective to aggregate the total carcinogenic pollutants emitted by a facility to establish the total cancer risk.

In addition, Air Management Services (AMS) should lower the health hazard benchmark used to decide when to require a risk mitigation plan or to deny a permit. AMS should require a risk mitigation plan when the combined cancer risk of a proposed facility is 10-in-1 million or more. AMS should deny a permit when the combined cancer risk of a proposal is 25-in-1 million or more.

The proposed guidelines require that the risk mitigation plan “minimize” and “manage” the health risk posed, but appear not to require or ensure actual pollution or health risk reduction. The regulation should require the adoption of additional specific pollution control and reduction measures, such as fugitive emissions controls, hazard or chemical phase-out or elimination, community buffer requirements, and fenceline monitoring. Furthermore, any permit, plan or license approved with a risk mitigation plan should include requirements for emission measurement, air monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance. The plan should also include clear consequences for not following the requirements.

The proposed regulation does not provide for public input on health risk assessments or risk mitigation plans for facilities that affect surrounding communities. AMS should explicitly provide for public review and comment to ensure community feedback can be incorporated in a timely way into decisions about the permit, license, or plan.

The Air Pollution Control Board should commit to review the rule every five years, after public notice and comment to ensure it reflects the best available science and is strengthened as needed to protect public health, particularly the health of children and fenceline communities.

I urge you to strengthen this rule in the above ways to better protect public health and advance environmental justice in Philadelphia. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan Saltzman

