

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT JUSTICE  
ADVISORY COUNCIL (NEJAC)**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2022**

# CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	iv
1.0 NEJAC Meeting .....	1
1.1 Introductions & Opening Remarks .....	1
1.2 Opening Remarks & National Program Announcement .....	1
1.2.1 Robin Collin, Senior Advisor to the Administrator for Environmental Justice, U.S. EPA.....	1
1.2.2 Marianne Engelman-Lado, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator (Acting) for EJECCR, U.S. EPA.....	2
1.2.3 Matthew Tejada, Deputy Assistant Administrator for EJ, EJECCR, U.S. EPA .....	2
1.2.4 Lilian Dorka, Deputy Assistant Administrator for External Civil Rights, EJECCR, U.S. EPA.....	2
1.3 NEJAC Members Introduction .....	4
1.4 PFAS Workgroup Recommendations.....	4
1.5 Air Quality & Community Monitoring (AQCM) Workgroup Recommendations .....	6
1.6 Public Comment Period .....	8
1.7 Business Meeting.....	23
1.7.1 New Charge: Water Infrastructure Workgroup Technical Assistance Charge.....	23
1.7.1.1 Chitra Kumar, Director of the Office of Policy, Partnerships, and Program Development, OEJECCR, U.S. EPA .....	23
1.7.1.2 Jonathan Nelson, Senior Advisor for Technical Assistance and Community Outreach, Office of Water, U.S. EPA.....	23
1.7.2 EPA Updates – 2023 Priorities .....	24
1.7.3 NEJAC Workgroup Updates .....	26
1.7.3.1 Farmworker Protection & Pesticides Workgroup.....	26

1.7.3.2 NEPA Workgroup .....26

1.7.3.3 NEJAC Finance and Investment (Justice40) Workgroup.....26

1.7.4 Upcoming Events.....27

1.8 Closing Remarks & Adjourn .....27

  

Appendix 1. Agenda .....28

Appendix 2. September 2022 NEJAC Public Meeting Attendee List.....30

## **PREFACE**

The National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) is a federal advisory committee that was established by charter on September 30, 1993, to provide independent advice, consultation, and recommendations to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on matters related to environmental justice.

As a federal advisory committee, NEJAC is governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) enacted on October 6, 1972. FACA provisions include the following requirements:

- Members must be selected and appointed by EPA.
- Members must attend and participate fully in meetings.
- Meetings must be open to the public, except as specified by the EPA Administrator.
- All meetings must be announced in the Federal Register.
- Public participation must be allowed at all public meetings.
- The public must be provided access to materials distributed during the meeting.
- Meeting minutes must be kept and made available to the public.
- A designated federal official (DFO) must be present at all meetings.
- The advisory committee must provide independent judgment that is not influenced by special interest groups.

EPA's Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ) maintains summary reports of all NEJAC meetings, which are available on the NEJAC website at <https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/national-environmental-justice-advisory-council-meetings>. All meeting materials are posted in the public docket for this meeting. The public docket number for this meeting is EPA-HQ-OA-2022-0053. The public docket is accessible via [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) under its docket number, EPA-HQ-OA-2022-0053.

## **Committee Members in Attendance**

- Sylvia Orduño, Co-Chair, Michigan Welfare Rights Organization
- Na'Taki Osborne Jelks, PhD, Co-Chair, West Atlanta Watershed Alliance/Proctor Creek
- Michael Tilchin, Vice-Chair, Jacobs Engineering
- April Karen Baptiste, PhD, Colgate University
- Jan Marie Fritz, PhD, C.C.S, University of Cincinnati
- Jill Lindsey Harrison, PhD, University of Colorado Boulder
- Benjamin J. Pauli, PhD, Kettering University
- Rev. Dr. Ambrose Carroll, Sr., Green The Church
- Leticia Colon de Mejias, Green ECO Warriors
- Cemelli De Aztlan, La Mujer Obrera
- Yvonka M. Hall, Northeast Ohio Black Health Coalition
- Richard Mabion, Building A Sustainable Earth Community
- Nina McCoy, Martin County Concerned Citizens
- Andy Kricun, Moonshot Missions
- Ayako Nagano, JD, Common Vision
- Jacqueline D. Shirley, MPH, Rural Community Assistance Corporation
- Loren Hopkins, PhD, City of Houston Health Department
- Millie Piazza, PhD, Washington State Department of Ecology
- Joy Britt, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium
- Scott Clow, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- John Doyle, Little Big Horn College

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Virtual Public Meeting**  
**September 28, 2022**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

The National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) convened via Zoom meeting on Wednesday, September 28, 2022. This summary covers NEJAC members' deliberations during the meeting and the issues raised during the public comment period.

**1.0 NEJAC Meeting**

This section summarizes NEJAC members' deliberations during the one-day meeting, including action items, requests, and recommendations.

**1.1 Introductions & Opening Remarks**

**Paula Flores-Gregg**, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), U.S. EPA welcomed attendees and made announcements. She stated that everyone is in listen-and-view mode only, and public commenters are invited to speak later that afternoon. She noted that Spanish translation and closed captioning are available. She turned the meeting over to Sylvia Orduño, the NEJAC co-chair, for opening remarks.

**Sylvia Orduño** introduced herself and hoped that today's meeting continues to meet the goals of the Council.

**Na'Taki Osborne Jelks, PhD** introduced herself. She stated that she is more hopeful and committed to the cause because of the establishment of the new national office at the EPA to advance environmental justice and civil rights. She stated that she's excited about the new tools and levers and opportunities to systemically address issues that have plagued underserved and environmentally overburdened and communities of color.

**Michael Tilchin** introduced himself and stated that he is excited about the direction that EPA is taking in this work.

**1.2 Opening Remarks & National Program Announcement**

**Co-Chair Orduño** introduced the speakers from EPA.

**1.2.1 Robin Collin, Senior Advisor to the Administrator for Environmental Justice, U.S. EPA**

**Robin Collin** stated that she is excited about the work to be done. She is thankful that the administration has budgeted money to the program. She thanked NEJAC for their foresight and commitment in righting injustices. EPA is listening to and learning from the NEJAC.

### **1.2.2 Marianne Engelman-Lado, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator (Acting) for EJEER, U.S. EPA**

**Marianne Engelman-Lado** stated that she is looking forward to working with the NEJAC. She shared information about the new program and the leadership's focus.

Ms. Engelman-Lado explained that EPA is combining three existing offices into a single, new, national program office: the Office of Environmental Justice, the Civil Rights Compliance Office, and Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center (CPRC). The new office is called the Office of Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights. A senate-confirmed assistant administrator will lead this office. There is no one in that position as of yet, but the president will nominate a candidate soon. The office will be similar in importance to the Office of Air, the Office of Water, and other national programs.

Ms. Engelman-Lado explained the importance of this office. We need a high-level, coordinated effort with consistent leadership on environmental justice and civil rights. It can no longer be in the margins; it must be at the center to transform how EPA understands and implements its work as Administrator Regan has said. The office will be focused on making sure that the whole Agency reflects the focus on environmental justice and external civil rights.

### **1.2.3 Matthew Tejada, Deputy Assistant Administrator for EJ, EJEER, U.S. EPA**

**Matthew Tejada** stated that he is also excited about the new office and its potential. This is a historic milestone. To him, it means that the environmental public health regulatory endeavor of the United States that is over 50 years old is recognizing that equity and justice issues are just as centrally important as air pollution and contamination cleanup issues. He explained that complying with civil rights and doing everything that is equitable and just is a fundamental bedrock part of environmental public health protection. This is the time to set up the decades ahead and to right the wrongs of the past.

### **1.2.4 Lilian Dorka, Deputy Assistant Administrator for External Civil Rights, EJEER, U.S. EPA**

**Lilian Dorka** stated that she is also excited about the new program. The purposeful collaboration between the three offices will achieve more than three offices separately leveraging intellectual and financial resources.

**Co-Chair Orduño** stated that the announcement of the new program and recognition of past EJ leaders was quite moving since it was held in Warren County, NC, which is where the EJ movement started. She looks forward to hearing more about the program. She opened the floor for questions and/or comments.

**Leticia Colon de Mejias** agreed with the emotion of the announcement made in NC. She asked how the work will be done by this new office interact with the NEJAC.

**Chitra Kumar**, Director of the Office of Policy, Partnerships, and Program Development, OEJEER, U.S. EPA, responded that her office and the Office of Water will be sending a new charge to the Water Infrastructure Workgroup. They are both eager to get advice from NEJAC now and in the future on other topics as well.

**Dr. Tejada** also responded that the NEJAC will still be advising the administrator, but a big chunk of what EPA does is this new program. It will be just a new dimension as to how this all works together moving forward.

**Ms. Dorka** added that she is looking forward to working with the different NEJAC workgroups. **Jacqueline Shirley** asked what Dr. Tejada meant by "We have no more excuses." Does that mean the EPA of yesterday or today? She also asked how the other offices feel about this new office.

**Dr. Tejada** responded that he was referring to his office which was so small before. Now, the office is heavily funded and is taken much more seriously. It could also apply to the EPA as a whole as these are issues that need to be resolved Agency-wide. This money cannot be used to perpetuate, replicate, or resuscitate racism.

**Ms. Collin** added that there is a strategic planning process in EPA that is very detailed and must be followed by all regions and offices in EPA. Her job is to make sure everyone and every office are accountable. She encourages NEJAC to inform her of communities that aren't getting the help they need.

**Co-Chair Orduño** stated that the NEJAC needs to understand if there will be any difference in the way NEJAC will be engaged with this new office. The Council knows they are confined to certain spaces both within the public meetings and through the workgroups. She wants to make sure that the public knows about this new office.

**Ayako Nagano** stated that it bothers her that the public makes complaints in the public comments, and the NEJAC hasn't had appropriate accountability in follow-through. She asked, will this new office and budget allow for that accountability?

**Dr. Tejada** responded that instead of one person working on EJ, now there will be between 10 and 12 people. There should be no reason that there aren't regional EJ councils and that they're not meeting with communities and current and former NEJAC members in getting something done.

**Rev. Dr. Ambrose Carroll, Sr.** stated that he's excited about this new movement and accountability. The connection between EJ and civil rights is powerfully important. He asked if the civil rights part will be litigation or more self-governing.

**Ms. Dorka** responded that in the past, the EPA hasn't held violators accountable enough. Title VI is a game-changer in fighting racism. Now, the EPA has the authority to enforce civil rights laws in the way they were meant to be enforced.



**Ms. Colon de Mejias** asked if this new office opens the door to discussion on a clear, NEJAC-guided planning process related to the known documented cumulative impacts of climate change which stem from our dependence on fossil fuels.

**Loren Hopkins**, PhD, asked if this is an opportunity to expand programming, legislation change, and EPA's reach in terms of repairing damages to EJ communities in the past.

**Dr. Tejada** responded that cumulative impacts may finally be addressed. It's not just about the rules and regulations on the federal level or permits that states issue, but it also includes land use planning and zoning at the local level.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked the leaders for their time and efforts.

### **1.3 NEJAC Members Introduction**

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** invited the Council members to briefly introduce themselves and state their affiliations. She asked the four new members to give a little bit of a longer introduction to get to know them better.

**Karen Martin**, FACA Team Lead, Partner Collaboration Division, Office of Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights, U.S. EPA, recognized the members who were leaving the NEJAC. They are: Dr. Mildred McClain, Karen Sprayberry, Virginia King.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** acknowledged that members need to come and go during the meeting but reminded them that quorum must be maintained at certain parts of the meeting.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** transitioned the meeting to Dr. Benjamin Pauli who will lead the presentation and the discussion of the next agenda item.

### **1.4 PFAS Workgroup Recommendations**

**Benjamin Pauli**, PhD, thanked the members of the workgroup. He gave the timeline of the work done so far. He reviewed the PFAS strategic roadmap by the EPA Council on PFAS, which prioritizes the three "Rs": Research, Restrict, and Remediate. The workgroup wants to add a fourth category of Resource (channeling appropriate resources to affected communities) and a fifth category of Respond (an emergency response plan to severely affected areas) to the list. The workgroup will make recommendations based on those areas.

Dr. Pauli mentioned that the recommendations are draft recommendations, and some of the initiatives aren't in their wheelhouse. The impending deadline for the updated roadmap created a time crunch that limited their ability to dig as deep as they wanted. He added that the workgroup experienced some challenges working with EPA staff and hoped lessons learned could improve future workgroup experiences. Dr. Pauli explained the recommendations one by one. See the PFAS Workgroup Recommendations document for the details.

**Ms. Shirley** shared that the EPA isn't the only agency that has a PFAS roadmap or a strategic plan; DoD, FDA, USDA, Department of Homeland Security, HHS in collaboration with CDC,

the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease, and the FAA also have one. She wondered if EPA would consider opening up the budgeted \$1 billion a year to local entities instead of going through the states.

**Co-Chair Orduño** echoed Ms. Shirley's question. One concern and frustration from local organizations is the lack of immediate response from the EPA and the PFAS council. For example, getting potable drinking water to communities when there is a spill or contamination.

**Jan Marie Fritz**, PhD, suggested adding more information to literature going to communities, i.e., explaining what PFAS stands for. She also suggested asking for a timeline for when the workgroup would like the recommendations to be completed. Her last suggestion is to prioritize the list.

**Andy Kricun** emphasized the recommendation regarding wastewater treatment plants, the combined sewer system, and stormwater drainage because PFAS adheres to solids, and that would catch a lot of contaminants.

**Scott Clow** suggested that the workgroup ask EPA to fund and implement testing of traditional and subsistence foods and medicines for PFAS and assist tribes to identify contaminant pathways and limit their exposure through those pathways. **Dr. Pauli** agreed that that suggestion needs to be included.

**Yvonka Hall**, also wondered about the timeline. She wanted to ensure that there are more minority contractors involved in getting contracts, local communities are actually involved in the work, understand how governors are defining disadvantaged communities in their work and that they match NEJAC's definition, and that the word "tribal" is just as important as disadvantaged and not just in additional information. **Dr. Pauli** clarified that the draft the Council read has had some edits already that include some of the suggestions mentioned.

**Ms. Colon de Mejias** suggested that there needs to be more of an action-based approach. In order of priority, the roadmap needs to be reordered as the following: restrict, resource, remediate, research, review, and renew. She explained her thinking. **Ms. Shirley** clarified that EPA only has three Rs, and the workgroup wants to squeeze in the others. **Dr. Pauli** replied that NEJAC is always trying to straddle the line between operating with the EPA framework and introducing the Council's framework.

**Ms. de Mejias** reiterated that the lack of knowledge about PFAS is a problem across multiple communities. **Dr. Pauli** emphasized that education is key.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** echoed several suggestions. She added "precautionary principle" to the conversation about RESEARCH. As they think about prioritizing the roadmap, they need to take preventive action even in the face of some uncertainty. The burden of proof needs to be moved from the impacted people to those who are polluting. She also suggested that there should be a wide range of alternatives to combat the harm that has already been done and there has to be an increase in public participation in decision-making, rulemaking, and developing the actions that are needed to respond to impacted communities. The research has been done; we need more action to remedy the impacts.

**Dr. Hopkins** added that remediation should occur at the detection limit, not the maximum level. There should be a prioritization based on sensitive subpopulations. The application of the standard risk assessment approach under EPA is meant for future protection, but if somebody's already been impacted, then that deserves special caution.

**Ms. Shirley** added that she would like to see EPA reach out to other federal agencies and build a strong collaborative effort to battle PFAS.

**Richard Mabion** admitted that he had never heard of PFAS before reading the document. He suggested that there needs to be a dialogue and language that is understood by the people who live in low-income communities. People are totally clueless about PFAS. Statistics, scientific words, and graphs don't mean anything to the populations they need to reach. **Dr. Pauli** stated that the technical documents the workgroup produce are meant for EPA, and they are public documents, but he agreed that they also need to be written in a language that the average person can read and understand. Maybe the Agency can help with that process.

**Jill Lindsey Harrison**, PhD, reiterated that action needs to be at the forefront of the roadmap and that there is enough research done to move forward with the actions. She asked, even though they're voting on the recommendations now, will the document still be open for suggestions from public speakers and the discussions that will occur later in the day? Or do they need to hold off voting until the end of the meeting? **Co-Chair Orduño** replied they can still vote now with the understanding that there might be small revisions to the document from the proceedings of the meeting. She added her appreciation to the other members of the work that was done by the workgroup. She asked if those that are more learned about the science suggest continuing the research with industry.

**Mr. Kricun** replied that there are three main categories of technical research: one, replacement of objects containing PFAS; two, how to remediate where the contamination has occurred; and three, how to treat it at wastewater treatment facilities.

**Nina McCoy** added incinerators and waste are the top areas to clean up first because they are predominantly in disadvantaged areas.

**Co-Chair Orduño** asked if the Council felt comfortable with voting on the recommendations. The quorum has been met if they want to go ahead and finish the vote. There was a consensus to move forward, and there was no opposition. She turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Tilchin who will lead the presentation and discussion of the next agenda item.

### **1.5 Air Quality & Community Monitoring (AQCM) Workgroup Recommendations**

**Vice-Chair Tilchin** thanked the members of the workgroup, especially the three non-NEJAC members. He gave a background of the workgroup and the work done so far. He pointed out that these recommendations were not prepared in response to a formal charge from EPA. He explained the general principles and focus areas of the workgroup. He stated that the workgroup worked in partnership with EPA OAR to develop eight questions that would be the basis for the recommendations. He then explained the objectives of the letter of recommendations. They

turned the eight questions into the recommendations to EPA. He pointed out that this could be a transformative program, but there is also a risk if it is done wrong. If communities put forth great effort and are ignored, that could make things even worse.

Vice-Chair Tilchin explained each of the eight questions and their supporting recommendations. See the AQCM Workgroup Recommendations document for the details. He invited other members to ask questions and/or make comments.

**Dr. Hopkins** added that sometimes permit limits are higher than what people think is acceptable, and therefore the regulation is not enforceable. Those limits need to be reduced to an acceptable level, so the regulations can be enforceable. Those permits are often written with limits as tons per year, so communities may be exposed to smaller amounts but the cumulative effects over the years add up. The permits should be reduced to smaller time increments instead. She also spoke about proceeding with caution when connecting air pollution to local health data.

**Mr. Kricun** shared a story regarding Question 8 and the air-shed equivalent and creating a justice ordinance. There was a community that was surrounded by many industries, and those industries individually were just below the permitted limit for emission particulates. Collectively, the community was exposed to 10 to 12 times what would be the acceptable level. There's nothing enforceable because the individual industries were within their limit, so there was no remedy. The justice ordinance could protect communities like that.

Mr. Kricun stated that Question 6 recommendations need to go a bit further and that certain kinds of facilities ought to be considered. For example, it should be presumed that certain facilities give off an odor or emission at all times, but it's not a problem unless someone complains. Community monitors could help supplement that. The onus of proof should be on the industries to monitor emissions, not the communities who have to complain to get action done against it.

**Ms. Nagano** echoed shifting the onus of proof to the industry. She asked what discussion went into these presumptive approaches, and if there is room to add that. **Vice-Chair Tilchin** clarified that there is room to expand the recommendations for Question 6 to include those suggestions.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** emphasized that EPA has invested a lot into guidance, documents, demonstrations, equipment, and best practices for citizen-science techniques for community monitoring. Saying that, why isn't that data being used to inform decisions? She stated that that thinking has to change. She agreed that the burden of proof should not rest on community members; it should be shifted to the polluters. She acknowledged that will be a long and hard fight, so it should be done together.

**Millicent Piazza**, PhD, emphasized the importance of community-driven science, data, and monitoring, and how essential those are for the community to have ownership in the process. Communities are constantly bumping up against bureaucratic arguments about the legal defensibility of data that isn't overseen by the Agency even if the data are from an accredited lab. There needs to be a way to shift data gathering from just a pilot to practice. Overcoming bureaucratic hurdles needs to be addressed, and ask, is the risk an Agency risk or is it the actual risk to the communities?

**Ms. Hall** wanted to make sure that educating communities and training about the issues concerning them is a recommendation. She also stated that EPA should be communicating with the local air districts about air monitoring.

**Dr. Pauli** asked how the success story examples in Appendix 1 were identified and vetted. **Vice-Chair Tilchin** replied that those stories came from EPA OAR. **Dr. Harrison** added maybe the word "successful" can be changed because of the misrepresentation that that could entail. **Ms. Colon de Mejias** agreed that using the word successful with solution to pollution could be misleading because those people may still be dealing with the cumulative impacts. One solution doesn't fix all problems.

**Co-Chair Orduño** asked if the workgroup got a chance to review the public comments from the Environmental Justice Health Alliance made last fall. That group asked for some changes to the risk management program. She asked how they can be incorporated into the recommendations. She also asked if the workgroup got a chance to look at the proposed rule with changes to the risk management plan the administrator signed last month. **Vice-Chair Tilchin** replied that they did not go back and look at the public comments, and that was an oversight. He does recognize their importance and will remember to include them.

**Ms. Shirley** clarified for the audience that the two workgroups that presented today are not permanent. She explained that once the recommendations are finalized and sent to the administrator, the lifecycle is over. However, she encouraged the public to get those comments in before the workgroups are dissolved.

**Co-Chair Orduño** agreed and stated that they will dissolve soon, but if those issues resurface, they can be reinstated in the future. The creation of new workgroups is, in part, driven by public comments. **DFO Flores-Gregg** clarified that the public comments are used to assist the NEJAC with their recommendations for the EPA.

**Ms. Colon de Mejias** emphasized that climate change is a huge part of air quality. It's hard for the NEJAC to address that, but a global change must happen to help combat the effects.

**Dr. Hopkins** stated that her experience with EPA technical assistance with a contractor was more of a presentation, not a roll-up-your-sleeves kind of assistance with applications or questions. She also stated that the help shouldn't be just EPA with the local community, but it should be a partnership with EPA, other federal agencies, state, and the local community.

**Co-Chair Orduño** asked if the Council felt comfortable with voting on the recommendations. The quorum has been met if they want to go ahead and finish the vote. There was a consensus to move forward, and there was no opposition. She announced that it was time for a break followed by the public comment period.

## **1.6 Public Comment Period**

On September 28, 2022, the NEJAC held a public comment period to allow members of the public to discuss environmental justice concerns in their communities. A total of 11 individuals

submitted verbal public comments to the NEJAC. An additional 11 individuals had signed up to speak but were not in attendance. Each speaker was allotted three minutes.

**Co-Chair Orduño** welcomed everyone back from the break. She turned the meeting over to Co-Chair Osborne Jelks.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** explained the procedures for the Public Comment Period.

### **1.6.1 Tanisha Raj - Catholic Charities (California)**

**Tanisha Raj:** Good afternoon, everybody. I will submit a written comment as well because I have to step away from my computer. I don't have my fact sheets. And I'm sorry; I didn't introduce myself. My name is Tanisha Raj, and I'm the environmental justice program specialist with Catholic Charities. So, I would like more information regarding PFAS in communities, especially in California and the San Joaquin Valley because I plan to do my graduate research on PFAS next semester. And one comment that I did want to provide, which I will provide written comment on it with detailed facts and figures, is California's push for electric vehicles and also carbon capture sequestration. We have a symposium tomorrow regarding that as well.

I urge and request EPA to look more into the environmental impacts of carbon capture sequestration and the EV vehicles and their batteries and especially the availability of lithium and the disposition of it. That's all I had to say.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Ms. Raj. She agreed that more community information needs to be made available on PFAS. She thanked her for sharing the EV policies in California. She invited other members to ask questions and/or make comments.

**Mr. Clow** thanked Ms. Raj. He stated that he is working with solar developers on a project that is looking at an iron-based battery technology at this point instead of lithium-based. He stated that he is aware of alternative battery technology that's in development and in use at this point, and hopefully, it will steer technology away from lithium mining.

### **1.6.2 Dr. Diana Zuckerman - National Center for Health Research (Washington D.C.)**

**Dr. Diana Zuckerman:** Thank you. I'm Dr. Diana Zuckerman, president of the National Center for Health Research. We scrutinize the safety and effectiveness of medical and consumer products, and we don't accept funding from companies that make those products. Our largest program is focused on cancer prevention and treatment. And my expertise is based on post-doctoral training in epidemiology and public health. My previous positions were at HHS, and I was a faculty member and researcher at Harvard and Yale.

So, I just wanted to be here briefly to thank you for all the important work you've all been doing and will be doing on this Advisory Council. As a public health person, I've always been surprised at the lack of other public health advocates who are active on environmental issues and environmental justice issues, and I want to offer to be helpful in any way that would be useful to all of you. We all know that lives are at stake.

I want to comment very briefly on the PFAS recommendations since that's an issue we've worked on for years and let me add that we're very concerned about all endocrine-disrupting chemicals, not just PFAS. Everything that I've heard about PFAS at this meeting this afternoon was inspiring and very important. But I would just suggest that it's a huge task, and I encourage you to start a little smaller and focus a little bit more to succeed in educating the public and especially EJ communities. At the same time that you're educating, focus on some actions that are doable and that will really inspire others to make a change. Thank you very much.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Dr. Zuckerman. Dr. Osborne Jelks thanked Dr. Zuckerman for offering her expertise to this body and noted it for the Council. She invited other members to ask questions and/or make comments.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked Dr. Zuckerman for the grounded set of recommendations. She asked Dr. Zuckerman, especially from her experience, what is the most effective public education that the Council and EPA can do for a matter like PFAS.

**Dr. Zuckerman:** Well, thank you for that question. I will start by saying that a lot of the work that we've done in recent years has been in communities large and small across the country pertaining to endocrine-disrupting chemicals and PFAS and lead in artificial turf and in playground surfaces. Here, we're dealing with issues that you would think any parent or grandparent would care very much about. You would think school systems would care very much about. We have found it to be an extremely difficult issue because there is so much money on the other side. And, obviously, that's true for all environmental issues and all environmental justice issues; there's always a lot of money on the other side saying "This isn't unsafe. Where is your evidence that this is unsafe? Where is your evidence that a single person has gotten cancer as a result of this exposure," et cetera?

So, I guess all I'm saying is my experience, even when we were working on an issue that seemed so logical and doable, has been so challenging and difficult. So that's why I was saying that I think that combination of public education but also action -- because one without the other, I think -- is not going to work. You can't do everything all at once, and I think my only suggestion is to find something that you can do that will be engaging to people, make them care, and show them that change can happen.

### **1.6.3 Linda Shosie - Environmental Justice Task Force Tucson (Tucson, Arizona)**

**Linda Shosie:** Thank you. Linda Shosie. I live in Tucson, Arizona. I am the owner and the founder of the Environmental Justice Task Force. For too long, majority, minority, EJ, and BIPOC communities have been unequally protected from toxic chemicals and other environmental hazards. What I really like about this new quality plan is that the affected community members will be empowered by this study, and they will also be empowered to make decisions. Also, they will be able to decide what actions can be taken. I really like that about this project.

I would like to comment on Question Number 1, "What are the keyways in which the public and environmental justice communities would want to engage with air quality data from new technologies that may be funded under the ARP and other types of fundings?" I strongly believe

that this could be achieved by just getting the community involved and just letting them know what's going on. Put a lot of advertisements out about it because I really believe that community members are all affected. And I think this is a really good topic to start getting the community involved.

Now, concerning PFAS, I agree there is a little bit of information on PFAS in the air. But, assuming that we focus on PFAS and think of where they could be found in the air, I'm thinking that the largest contributors would be incinerators that would be polluting or nearby landfills. As we all know, incinerators pollute the air of all nearby and distant communities. Landfills all leak and eventually make their way into the water. So, I'm just wondering if we would target these areas where we could put these monitors around these areas. And perhaps, I'm wondering, if these monitors will be able to even pick up any levels of PFAS. They are complicated to even test and monitor in water.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked Ms. Shosie. She asked if she could explain what that would look like in her community. For example, how to address PFAS and its whole problem or what the public information needs to look like? Could she give a local example?

**Ms. Shosie:** Sure. Here in Tucson, we're the heart of the military Air Force bases. One of the things that have been very, very difficult for community members to get a voice in addressing PFAS is that there's a large divide between state legislators, state governments, and affected community members. I don't think that our state governments are doing enough to engage with the affected members of the community to give them any type of opportunity to participate in the decision-making around PFAS.

So, as an environmental justice activist in my community, I have organized my community, and I have just pushed and pushed my way in and put myself in their faces. We just rally. We send them letters. We just don't stop knocking and being persistent. So, the local issues here, we're lacking response because community members are not being involved in any of these decisions, and they're making all the decisions on their own. So, we've got to find these strategies that can work more towards bringing these people together and making better decisions together.

**Ms. Colon de Mejia** thanked her for bringing up the issues in her community to the Council. She stated that that has been a common theme in every meeting, that the community feels disconnected from the initial planning process or from the allocation of resources in relation to helping their state, town, or municipality direct resources to the areas that they think they'd be most useful in. She stated that it is the duty of environmental justice folks to ensure that the communities are met where they're at and provided the resources they need, not the ones we think they need. We won't know what those needs are unless we meet them where they're at and ask them.

#### **1.6.4 John Mueller - Private Citizen Activist (Guthrie, Oklahoma)**

**John Mueller:** Well, good afternoon. I am John Muller in Guthrie, Oklahoma, formally of Tulsa. I'm a retired public works licensed engineer having practiced in water and wastewater treatment for public utilities over a period of about 25 years. First off, please know I share your



tremendous excitement and optimism about the new OEJECCR and all its new opportunities. But I am also very thankful that NEJAC is still NEJAC.

I have participated in a number of earlier NEJAC and WHEJAC public meetings as a private citizen activist seeking to end the practice of artificial water fluoridation of public water. One of the main reasons for my advocacy is data showing that water fluoridation has not met the oral health needs in disadvantaged communities as originally intended many decades ago. My request today is not very different than in my request in previous public meetings.

My request today is for NEJAC and the OEJECCR to recommend, in the strongest possible terms, that Administrator Regan develop and implement a strategy jointly with the CDC, under the purview of Dr. Walensky's recent reorganization of the CDC, for ending the CDC's Community Water Fluoridation Program and for CDC's Division of Oral Health to transition into developing local community-based programs with assistance from grant funding to improve oral health in disadvantaged minority communities, which are disproportionately harmed by uncontrolled exposure to harmful fluoride chemicals from drinking water and other sources. The benefits of this transition will be in the form of targeted, localized programs providing education on dental hygiene as a personal general health priority and providing individualized professional dental care where needed most.

This is in stark contrast to the CDC's current program of mass medication without informed consent by fluoridating public water indiscriminately for all segments of the population for people of every color, whether needed or not, rich, or poor. The first, most expeditious, and cost-free step in that transition can be found in the currently pending TSCA lawsuit. The first step in the transition is for Administrator Regan and the EPA's defense counsel to concede to the plaintiffs in the current, pending TSCA lawsuit, which is Food & Water Watch versus EPA, filed in April 2017, in which plaintiffs are suing EPA "to compel the initiation of rulemaking to prohibit the addition of fluoridation chemicals to drinking water supplies." That action will change not only EPA's policy on fluoridation as a historic milestone but also change the outcome. The outcome being real improvement in the oral health in disadvantaged communities, which is so desperately needed. The additional materials I will be submitting will support a plausible strategy for due consideration by the powers that be, including the new OEJECCR and the EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, OCSPP. Thank you very much.

**Dr. Pauli** thank Mr. Mueller for his comments today and in the past. He assured Mr. Mueller that his persistence has not gone unnoticed and that it is being treated with seriousness. His workgroup has discussed if they can take up this issue. They will give information later in the meeting about a charge from EPA, but he isn't sure whether that charge will include this issue.

Because Mr. Mueller has brought it up several times before, Dr. Pauli admitted that he's done a little bit of looking into this issue personally. An acquaintance of his, Dr. Bruce Lowenstein (phonetic), kindly passed along some articles on this subject that were found to be very useful in understanding some of the issues raised. He mentioned that the Council hasn't quite figured out how to tackle this issue yet, but it's not because they're not thinking about it. It's about strategizing where it might fit into their plans. **Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** echoed Dr. Pauli's comments.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked Mr. Mueller for his comments. She wondered if this practice of fluoridating the water is a perfunctory act by the utilities or is required by the federal or state governments. It is known, for instance, that the CDC recommends this. There are some real health concerns, maybe metrics as well, that are saying that this is not the best practice to continue, even though it's become pretty standardized.

**Mr. Mueller:** Well, thank you for the question. Yeah, there are no federal regulations for fluoridating the water. The only association that EPA has with fluoride in drinking water is the maximum contaminant level goal and the maximum contaminant level. Those are both set at four parts per million. It was in 2006 that the National Academies published their report on fluoride in drinking water, and it was about a 550-page report, which the EPA requested that the National Research Council conduct that study and report. Well, the upshot of that report was that the current regulations for limiting fluoride to four parts per million are not protective of public health and that they recommended that a lot more studies needed to be done. That's been 16 years ago.

EPA has not followed their recommendation. They've done nothing to change those regulatory water quality limits. But a lot of studies have been done, and they are the emerging science. And these are by very qualified, highly respected, world-class scientists, and researchers. One of them, Dr. Bruce Lanphear, was involved in the studies that led to the legislation banning lead. So, these more recent studies on fluoride that have been conducted are showing, unfortunately, that the neurodevelopmental harm from fluoride exposure can affect children's IQ. It can increase incidents of ADHD; autism; particularly in the womb, the unborn fetus when the brain is developing at such a dramatic rate; and also, with infants that may be fed bottled water reconstituted with fluoridated drinking water. Fluoride is not stopped by the placenta. It goes through the mother. If the mother is drinking fluoridated water, that is transmitted to the new fetus. So, I've digressed a little bit here, but I've got a soapbox that is acres wide on this topic.

There is considerable pushback. The proclamation that fluoride is safe and effective has been roundly debunked even more so in the last ten years, five years maybe. But the TSCA lawsuit was filed in April of 2017 after the initial petition was filed with EPA in November of 2016. The petition was denied in February 2017. And, subsequently, the petitioners filed a lawsuit with the northern district of California, and they filed that in April 2017. There was a bench trial -- on video, Zoom, that I attended -- for seven days in June of 2020. Much of the evidence presented was from newer studies that had been conducted since the original petition three years earlier. So, the judge placed the lawsuit in abeyance to wait for an NTP report on fluoride in drinking water, which is still yet to be finalized and published.

But their initial monograph stated that fluoride is presumed to be a developmental neurotoxin, but the report is undergoing several peer reviews by the National Academies. And there may be a final report issued early next year. However, recent motions were filed with the court to lift the stay, lift the abeyance, go ahead, and make a determination, and make a ruling. So that could happen as early as October 20th. The next hearing is scheduled for October 20th, so those concerns will be heard by the judge at that time.

The concern and the strategy that I'm promoting is to have Administrator Regan and the EPA concede to the plaintiffs and the court in the case, which would be certainly a historic milestone

for the CDC and EPA to collaborate and figure out how to make the transition away from fluoridation and to accommodate the needs in a more focused and targeted way.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked him for his response and noted that the Council will delve deeper into this.

**Dr. Pauli** clarified the name he mentioned earlier; it was Bruce Lanphear that he was in touch with.

**Mr. Mueller:** Oh, thank you for clarifying that. Yes, he's a remarkable person. Yeah. And he has worked with others who are just as highly esteemed in the field of toxicology and neurodevelopmental toxicology. Dr. Philippe Grandjean from Denmark was -- and both of these people have testified at the trial. EPA really needs to concede in this because the weight of evidence is very much in favor of other plaintiffs on this.

### **1.6.5 Diane D'Arrigo - Nuclear Information and Resource Service (West Valley, New York)**

**Diane D'Arrigo:** I'm Diane D'Arrigo with Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and our organization is part of the West Valley Action Network. The West Valley Nuclear site in western New York is the only place in the country where commercial irradiated nuclear fuel was reprocessed. They disassembled it, chopped it up, extracted uranium and plutonium, and left a lot of liquid radioactive materials. Now, commercial waste, when it comes out of the core of a reactor, is millions of times hotter than when it goes in. And commercial fuel, because it stays in the core longer than weapons fuel, is actually much, much more radioactive than nuclear weapons fuel.

So, what's happening at West Valley, about 30 miles south of Buffalo, is that the reprocessing building which operated in the '60s and '70s is being demolished. Our organizations have been asking that this be done with offsite, real-time, publicly reported monitoring and with an enclosure over the entire building or the most radioactive rooms in the building as they're being demolished. And both of these requests have been denied and ignored. And one of the justifications for proceeding with demolishing the building without any public monitoring or even public information about what's in the building -- the latest inventory is an estimate from April of 2021. The estimate is that there are over 18 trillion picocuries of plutonium and many other radionuclides, some of which could be spread over western New York and around the state. Radioactivity flies with the wind.

So, what I am concerned about is that the only justification for doing this is that, supposedly, there was a prediction by the Department of Energy that they would be in compliance with the NESHAPs, the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, and they've done some computer modeling and use their estimates. But there's no real measurement, and I haven't been able to get a clear answer from EPA about what specific analysis they have done. Yet, this is being used as a justification for open-air demolition. That's my concern. I don't know if there's anyone that could help with this within EPA.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Ms. D'Arrigo. She asked if Ms. D'Arrigo could talk more about the open-air demolition and what's happening exactly in this context.

**Ms. D'Arrigo:** Yes. The building is huge, five stories above and some below ground. The walls are five feet thick because the radioactivity was so intense in the building. Many of the rooms were remote access only. To their credit, the contractors for the Department of Energy have gone in over the past years and cleaned out as much as they could from these rooms, but the problem is that this is the only commercial reprocessing that's of the hottest nuclear power fuel. So, there is radioactivity still in this building, in fact, potentially quite a lot. They're not going to explode or implode it. They're going to actually break it down with various tools and supposedly spray water down so that dust would be washed down onto the ground and then collected before being released into the waterways.

So, it's the demolition of this massive building. It's going to take 30 months. It actually started last Thursday. We still, though, would like offsite monitoring, and we would like enclosure over the hottest of the cells.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** asked Ms. D'Arrigo to provide any written materials as a part of the written comments as well.

#### **1.6.6 Joe James (phonetic) - Private citizen**

**Joe James:** Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm a former 33-year economic development professional. I've had the pleasure of being a department head in Prince George's County as well as in the state of South Carolina. I'm here this afternoon to make the Committee ever more aware of airborne pollution, two forms of it: one known somewhat and one that I think is unknown. PM 2.5, I think you understand, is particulate matter that comes out of the tailpipes of cars and trucks. But one you may not have heard much about is what I would call tire wear powder.

And for those communities that live downwind from major interstate highways with lots of traffic -- communities like Baltimore, where I currently have a project using my technology to combat climate change and promote environmental justice; Prince George's County just east of the beltway, where I served as economic development director for a number of years; and then the state of South Carolina, where on the downwind side of Interstate 95 is a location, a primarily black community, that's called Stroke Alley -- the research that I've done recently suggests that PM 2.5 can, in fact, cause stroke. And, I believe, in the information I shared with staff, there may be a citation there. But I've also discovered that tire wear -- if you know anything about tires, they're made from actually poisonous material. The tires are 30 percent carbon black powder.

Carbon black is made by purposefully under burning oil, so it has the arsenic, lead, and mercury that are found in oil. And communities of color are downwind. These particulate matters, even tire wear, create not only chunks of tire every time your tire turns but a fine powder as well. When you breathe these powders in, they're so small, they go through the walls of your lungs, into your bloodstream. So, my heart is aching for those mothers who are carrying children, and those contaminants are being passed onto the children. Also, the organs of the infected person are harmed as well.

So, I have a couple of recommendations. One, I'd ask the commission to ask staff to do a research analysis and bring back research on PM 2.5 and tire wear health impacts. There should be some sort of comparative analysis for those communities that have high rates to see what the health connection is.

And, from my own experience, EPA needs an environmental justice response mechanism. I have shared my concerns, without naming the specific people, with senior staff of EPA. I've not had any feedback at all. So, when we have people around the country that are suffering, we need to have an environmental justice feedback mechanism so that people know that their concerns have been heard. Thank you.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Mr. James and stated that she hadn't thought quite about the wearing down of tires and the particulate matter that that produces. **Mr. James** asked to add two more things to his comments.

**Mr. James:** Number one, tire wear, in some of the studies I've seen, is more prevalent than PM 2.5 in some of the same locations. Number two, because electric vehicles weigh more than regular vehicles, the tire wear generated by EVs is going to be much higher than regular cars. Thank you.

**Ms. Colon de Mejias** stated that sometimes that community perspective is literally the boots-on-the-ground perspective. The idea that something weighs more than something else and it might cause an impact that no one is thinking about, is such a highlight to bring forward as it relates to when we create transitional plans at governmental levels. She agreed that they must ensure that we consider those anecdotal sets of information or information collected from the communities which we're meant to represent.

**Dr. Piazza** seconded Ms. Colon de Mejias' comments about the type of EJ analyses that are done and that are forwarded through government decision-making. She stated that sometimes the analyses are too narrow in proposals that increase traffic in communities. They need to include more than just diesel impacts; things like tire wear or brake pad erosion also need to be included.

**Mr. James:** Thank you for that comment. I would hope that the staff research would also include research from Europe, where there's quite a bit of study that's going on. And, in fact, as you related to buses, they're actually trying to figure out how you put a mechanism on a bus to capture the powder before it gets into the environment. The Chinese have done quite a bit of study on PM 2.5 and its health impacts. And I hope that the three communities that I mentioned, Baltimore, Prince George's County, and Stroke Alley in South Carolina, will get some attention as well. My heart was broken to see that the USDA was asked to do a study on the cause of Stroke Alley. I'll let you look it up. I don't want to make a racist comment, but it was sort of, let's just do a slap-dash sort of thing so we don't have to respond further to that impacted community. Very troubling.

**Dr. Fritz** emphasized that feedback and accountability are vitally important. The documents that the Council develop not only should be either suggesting or asking for a timeline for doing something but also mentioning, when people give comments, that they need to have a response.

### **1.6.7 Dr. Donna Ott - (Pennsylvania)**

**Donna Ott:** Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Dr. Donna Desanto (phonetic) Ott, and I want to thank you for this excellent opportunity to learn and share something that I've become aware of. It's a new pollutant that many people are not aware of, but the insurance companies have designated it as an uninsurable pollutant, and this is radio frequency and microwave radiation. We have a situation here in my home state of Pennsylvania and all across the country; we have people who are becoming very ill and severely disabled. And the people who are impacted the worst tend to be people in more disadvantaged communities. They're hit very hard. It affects their housing to the point where they have no housing that they can afford anywhere. It creates a tremendous health burden and a lack of access to medical care. This a disability recognized by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

So, I would urge you to collect data on this variable as well. And, with all the data that you're collecting, I would urge you to do as much of it as you can with the transmission via wires because that will eliminate the need for radio frequency and microwave radiation to be added to the environment. We need to work to decrease exposure. Some practical ways are with smart meters. Those could be easily hardwired, preventing that form of pollution. And emissions from cell towers and Wi-Fi routers and similar things can be lessened.

The FCC is working. There was a lawsuit last summer, and the matter was remanded back to the FCC to work on the guidelines. So, we're awaiting that, but, in the meantime, I think it's really important for you to be aware of this and work to reduce it wherever possible.

People who are the most vulnerable include children, people with chronic illnesses, and the elderly. And the costs of living with this are very, very high. There are people who become more affected and develop electromagnetic sensitivity, and it's very, very expensive to work on remediation. It's really out of the hands of people who don't have a very high income. So, thank you for allowing me to bring this up.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Dr. Ott for her comments. She asked Dr. Ott to speak briefly about the greatest source of exposure in these communities.

**Dr. Ott:** Well, it comes from many, many places; cell phones are probably people's largest near-field exposures. But, if one lives near a cell tower, then the exposures are going to be much higher, especially the new small wireless facilities. Where my practice was in Philadelphia, I would see these 10 to 12 feet from people's bedroom windows. Increasingly, they were beginning to show up in more disadvantaged communities. To me, in my work at the Capitol trying to advocate for people who are most affected, that was something that I would often bring up, that this is just such an enormous burden in so many ways on people, especially if they're of lesser means. I have three calls I have to get back to people today, and I don't know what I'm going to tell them. We really need help from the federal government to be able to reduce these exposures so that people can live safely in their own homes.

**Ms. Nagano** thanked Dr. Ott for the comments. She asked Dr. Ott if they - radio frequencies; microwave radiation; cell phones; or LT, 4G, and 5G towers -- are all harmful or are some of them are more harmful than others.

**Dr. Ott:** Well, I think, as you move into the more advanced phones, there are more antennas on the phones and more radiation coming out of them. I just met with a person with a disability last week, and their Wi-Fi router was emitting an extreme amount of radiation that I had never measured before; it was 2.5 million microwatts per meter square, which is really unnecessary. It was a small apartment. So, you can have exposure in so many forms, but definitely these newer, more advanced phones, especially with the 5G antennas. Those are so close to homes.

And the closer you are to the source of the radiation, the more harmful it is. So, we have to really focus our efforts kind of on everything, especially on this newer, high-intensity -- to really use safer technology instead and wires, to use wired broadband fiber or cable. It's faster. It's safer. It's more secure. It really should be the obvious choice.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** stated that more education is still needed on this.

**Kurd Ali**, NEJAC AV support, stated that was the last hand raised.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** invited any other public commenters to speak.

### **1.6.8 Dr. Maya Nye - Coming Clean**

**Dr. Maya Nye:** Thank you. My name is Maya Nye with Coming Clean. We're a network working with over 150 organizations across the country working for environmental health and justice. I've spoken to the NEJAC a couple of different times and just wanted to, first of all, thank you for all of your work. I know that you all volunteer in this process, and you have so much on your plates right now. And I just really appreciate you navigating everything that you're navigating right now. So just wanted to put that out there.

I also wanted to follow up on my previous comments. I've made a couple of different comments over the last year. (Audio skip) wonderful in submitting a letter to the EPA about some updates that needed to be made to the Risk Management Program Rule, which is a rule that's intended to prevent chemical disasters for facilities that are located disproportionately in black, Latino, and low-income communities.

EPA has just proposed some changes to that rule, and we were really hoping that you would be willing to update the letter that you sent previously to Administrator Regan to highlight some of the very essential pieces that need to be included in that rule. And I'm sorry. It kind of caught me off guard here. I've been listening and trying to hear when the public comment was, trying to straddle a couple of meetings. So, excuse me, I just found my list. It's just really super essential that we highlight to the EPA that voluntary measures don't work, that we really need to reduce and eliminate hazards and require the implementation of inherently safer chemicals, processes, and technologies. Even though I'm here on behalf of Coming Clean, I'm from a fenceline community. I grew up a mile away from the Union Carbide facility which was the sister facility to the one in Bhopal.

So, I have experienced multiple chemical disasters in my life, as have the people in my community. And this is an extremely, extremely important rule for environmental justice communities, and we just would really like to have your additional support, the leverage of the NEJAC, on Administrator Regan to make this the strongest rule possible, to highlight the voluntary measures don't work, and that we need a reduction and an elimination of the hazards. So that's my comment. Thank you very much.

**Ms. Shirley** thanked Ms. Nye for her comments. She asked anyone from the EPA if any kind of nuclear waste, even the demolition of a building, is more on the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or DOE. She requested that EPA get back to that public commenter and point her in the right direction of which agency might better be able to help with the nuclear waste. It could be a security issue regarding how we monitor nuclear waste, activity, and radiation. It may not be in EPA's purview.

Ms. Shirley stated that she recently read that EPA does not regulate non-ionizing waves from cell phones. That might not even be in EPA's purview either. She recommended that NEJAC or EPA contact the public commenter and guide them to the right agency when the comment is not under their purview, so the commenter won't feel ignored.

**Mr. Clow** clarified Ms. D'Arrigo's comments that even though it's a Department of Energy cleanup job, the actual air pollution aspect of it that she's concerned about would certainly fall under the purview of the State of New York and EPA's obligations pertaining to that in that region. So, there is an EPA nexus here, particularly with the NESHAPs and those radionuclides.

### **1.6.9 Stephanie Herron - Environmental Justice Health Alliance for Chemical Policy Reform**

**Stephanie Herron:** Thank you very much. I want to echo Dr. Nye's deep, deep, deep appreciation for the NEJAC and all you do. I have also spoken to you many times in the past on the same topic, and I really deeply appreciate you. My name's Stephanie Herron. I'm the national organizer for the Environmental Justice Health Alliance for Chemical Policy Reform, or EJHA. We're a national network of EJ organizations that are working to bring about a pollution-free economy that leaves no community and no worker behind.

Monday, I joined Dr. Nye and a lot of other people at the EPA public hearing on the Risk Management Plan Rule to tell the EPA again that, if they really, truly want to prioritize environmental justice like they say they do, then they must prioritize protecting workers, protecting fenceline communities, and all Americans by issuing a truly protective and preventative chemical disaster prevention rule.

I'm here today, again, appreciating you all and your past letters, to ask for the NEJAC to join us in that call by writing a letter to Administrator Regan and the EPA Office of Land and Emergency Management, calling on them to issue a strong RMP rule. The proposed rule that they have come out with, the draft rule, makes some important improvements, such as requiring facilities to consider the impacts of climate change for the first time. This is critical as you know, and I've shared with you all before because about one-third of RMP facilities are located in areas



increasingly vulnerable to extreme weather. And we've seen double disasters after Hurricane Harvey, Ida, and others, where we see explosions and big releases when the community's already being hit by a storm or whatever the weather event is.

Then they're also contending with explosions and massive chemical releases at these facilities. That's great, but, unfortunately, the draft rule stops short of actually requiring those facilities to implement the safer options that they identify in their climate planning. Requiring facilities to transition to safer chemicals and safer processes is the best way to protect communities and protect workers from climate-fueled double disasters. Requiring safer alternatives is also the best way or one of the best ways in this rule to address cumulative impacts, to address the fact that these facilities disproportionately impact communities of color and low-income communities. EPA's draft rule acknowledges a lot of our concerns and implies to me that they know that this is the case, but they're only requiring safer technology alternatives assessments at about five percent of RMP facilities. And, even at those five percent of facilities, those under 600 facilities out of almost 12,000, they still aren't even requiring that those safer alternatives actually be implemented.

All facilities should be required to assess for and implement safer alternatives. Some other things that we've called for and that I've spoken with you all before about, which we think are critical to include in a final rule, are requiring common-sense measures, like enough backup power to run an entire facility or safely shut down the facility if there's a loss of power especially caused by a storm or something. Involving workers and really protecting them when they speak out about safety concerns for themselves, and their communities is critical. Establishing a clear and enforceable timeline for adding chemicals. We've seen multiple explosions at facilities that aren't covered by the RMP.

So, again, I deeply appreciate the work of the NEJAC and your past engagement on this RMP rule. And we would ask that you join us in submitting a letter to EPA recommending some strengthening improvements to this rule, and we'd love to work with you on that. The deadline is October 31st, but obviously, the NEJAC can weigh in anytime. But we'd hope you'd weigh in as soon as possible. Thank you.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Ms. Herron for her comments and for coming back again and sharing the urgency of this issue. She stated that the NEJAC did note the request to consider submitting a letter to the Administrator and OLEM, and it will be taken under advisement as a part of the business.

**Dr. Fritz** requested that Ms. Herron submit her written comments, so they remember everything she said.

#### **1.6.10 Odette Wilkens - Wired Broadband. Inc. (New York, New York)**

**Odette Wilkens:** Thank you very much. I'm Odette Wilkens, and I'm president and general counsel of Wired Broadband. We're a nonprofit whose mission is to educate the public about the hazards of electromagnetic radiation from cell towers, 4G, and 5G, which is basically an inferior broadband service, and the need for fiber optics deployment for superior broadband.

Now, I want to address one of the comments that were made. In fact, the EPA had recognized RF radiation, radiofrequency radiation, as an environmental hazard back in the 1990s. And, as soon as it did, the EPA was defunded in that area, and its jurisdiction of that area was taken away. That was when the EPA found that there were hazardous biological effects of electromagnetic radiation. I'm not sure why the EPA was defunded. I think that was the only agency that was actually proclaiming that they were hazards and was trying to protect the public.

It is time that the EPA reclaims its jurisdiction over this area. It is high time. There is no one that is protecting the health of the public. The Food and Drug Administration funded the National Toxicology Program, which found, in 2018, cancer in rats based on electromagnetic radiation. And this was, I believe, 2G and 3G. I don't even think 4G was even planned at the time when they conducted the experiments. Not only that but the cancer research arm of the WHO had determined back in 2011 that 2G and 3G was a to-be human carcinogen, was a possible human carcinogen. And a number of people in the working group are now calling electromagnetic radiation a definite human carcinogen. So, this is something that the EPA had jurisdiction over, and it should have jurisdiction over it again. There is absolutely no good reason why the EPA should not have jurisdiction over this.

And I would like to suggest that this group go back to the EPA and state that they really should have jurisdiction over this area. And it was purely political or something that was, actually, probably promulgated by the telecom industry in order to get the EPA not to indicate that cellphones were dangerous, that the electromagnetic radiation from cellphones was dangerous. And those are my comments.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** thanked Ms. Wilkens for her comments and the history lesson as well in terms of EPA's past engagement and how that has changed.

#### **1.6.11 Maria Payan - Socially Responsible Agriculture Project (Sussex County, Delaware)**

**Maria Payan:** Thank you. First, I wanted to thank the NEJAC so much. We really appreciate your work and the opportunity to comment. I wanted to bring to your attention -- I am a senior regional representative for the Socially Responsible Agriculture Project and am also involved with coalition groups on the ground in Sussex County, Delaware. We have a regional biogas facility. We have very strong industrial agriculture here. We have great problems with our waterways. Delaware is number one in the state with about 97.5 percent of our rivers and streams polluted and a hundred percent of our estuaries. We've always had a problem trying to manage waste from the economics of this industry.

This new proposal wants to bring in, as I mentioned, from processing plants within the tristate region into Sussex County, including DAF, the sludge, and a little bit of broiler litter. But it's mostly, obviously, going to be the DAF and the sludge and oils, fats, and greases into our region, into a residential area where the closest communities there are English as a second language. One is a Latinx community. The other is a Haitian community. We have had just an incredibly difficult time to even getting the state agency with the permits to -- one community has not had any public notice in Haitian Creole.

But this is all very concerning to me as this is a regional-scale new process. And the emissions from not only that process but also 20,000 tankard trucks per year bring in 250,000 tons of waste. We have health disparities in this area, and, currently, there's a composting site on that same footprint that will be part of this operation with a digestate afterward that will have to be land applied. We're very concerned about the health disparities in the community.

And the air permits are being separated between the composting operation and the anaerobic digester separately, which brings in the whole cumulative impacts of the area and even the same footprint there on the site. So, we need public education. I think that really lifts up the communities a lot of the exposure impacts there.

**Ms. Nagano** thanked Ms. Payan for her comments. She asked if the sources of the pollutants are clear and for the name of the biogas facility.

**Ms. Payan:** So, the name of the applicant is Bioenergy Devco. They have a 20-year contract to take all the waste from all the hatcheries and processing facilities which will only be a portion of what's coming into the facility. The other percentages that will be coming in are not even listed in the application. And this is to take dry poultry litter, a small percentage. I think that's like 12 percent. Most of it is going to be the dissolved air flotation, which is the waste from all the processing plants in Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, and bring it into an area that, by the way, is zoned residential. So, basically, they're putting a mini refinery in a residential community that is already overburdened with a lot of pollution there. So, it's very concerning to us, again, not only with the emissions and the truck traffic and the safety of this being put into a residential area but, as you're all aware, there's a risk of explosion.

So yeah. This is very concerning, the scale of it and where it's being located and the lack of notice within the communities. As I mentioned, one is Latinx. One is Haitian Creole. To date, zero public notices have been put out in Haitian Creole, and they have been asking the state agency to please come to hold a meeting and educate them.

**Ms. Nagano** asked if the main request is for public education or if is there more like a permitting issue.

**Ms. Payan:** Yes. So, there was a Supreme Court ruling on Title V back in 2015 that's going to be coming into play, and that is the emissions, the 100,000 tons per year, would have to be with another pollutant as well. And, as I mentioned, they're separating out on the site. It's actually happening on the site. So, there's a large composting operation that takes in the waste now from the industry. That is not being included in the permitting of the digesters, if that makes sense. So, they're not getting the full scope of what's going on within the air permitting.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** stated that time has run over and asked if the final two commenters can submit their written comments instead. She apologized for running over the scheduled time. She thanked all the public commenters and stated that it was time for a break.

## **1.7 Business Meeting**

The NEJAC will use this time to discuss and deliberate action items and finalize the next steps. **Co-Chair Orduño** welcomed everyone back from the break. She transitioned the meeting to the next presenters who will explain the new charge to NEJAC.

### **1.7.1 New Charge: Water Infrastructure Workgroup Technical Assistance Charge**

#### **1.7.1.1 Chitra Kumar, Director of the Office of Policy, Partnerships, and Program Development, OEJECR, U.S. EPA**

**Chitra Kuma** explained that this charge is about technical assistance. She reviewed the background behind the charge.

#### **1.7.1.2 Jonathan Nelson, Senior Advisor for Technical Assistance and Community Outreach, Office of Water, U.S. EPA**

**Jonathan Nelson** explained the new charge. See the NEJAC Water Infrastructure Working Group Technical Assistance Draft Charge document for details. He explained the next steps for the charge. The EPA would like to receive recommendations from the Water Infrastructure Workgroup by late winter/early spring 2023; to engage with key stakeholders, including tribal-EPA partnership groups; and to provide support through this process.

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked them for their presentations.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** stated that she is excited about finally getting the charge and working toward meeting EJ goals regarding safe drinking water and water infrastructure. She invited other members to ask questions and/or make comments.

**Co-Chair Orduño** asked for more members to join the workgroup since it is a massive task.

**Jeremy Orr, JD,** stated that this issue has finally hit a sense of urgency for so many communities, and the enormous federal government investment will help with remedying that.

**Ms. Nagano** asked the presenters how the iterative process works with utilities and states and how they see the Agency using these recommendations.

**Mr. Nelson** replied that the NEJAC has 100 percent support from the Office of Water and the OEJ, and the process is moving fast because of the unprecedented and historic investment to fix these issues. Technical assistance will help communities in that process. The EPA wants to meet the NEJAC's vision and hopes. They need NEJAC's advice on what the top priorities are and what programs work and don't work.

**Ms. Shirley** reminded everyone that the nexus of the charge came from the workgroup in collaboration with EPA. So, this is not new to NEJAC. She encouraged more members to join the different workgroups.

**Ms. Colon de Mejias** is excited about the charge. She stated that codes on water infrastructure change between municipalities and this will help bridge those gaps across the U.S. She also encouraged more members to join the different workgroups. She stated that she agreed with a statement made earlier that technical assistance needs to be more than just watching a video.

**Ms. Hall** echoed Ms. Colon de Mejias' concerns. She added that NEJAC needs to figure out a way to get more communities involved in TA. Sometimes people assume that communities trust their local agencies, and that's just not the case, so trust is an issue. She would like to see more boots on the ground regarding TA.

**Mr. Mabion** asked the presenters what conversations they feel would be appropriate with communities themselves to address the technicality of TA centers, such as the language and understanding of the technology.

**Mr. Nelson** replied that the workgroup should address that in the recommendations. Right now, TA means different things to different people and that needs to be defined. **Mr. Mabion** added that he would like to see more job training and workforce development associated with this money.

**Co-Chair Orduño** agreed and would like to see these communities economically empowered. She accepted the charge on behalf of the Council. She reviewed the 13 members in that workgroup and suggested they have subgroups to include more people to help with the workload.

**Ms. Kumar** thanked Co-Chair Orduño for accepting the charge. She acknowledged the importance of job creation in these communities.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** stated that she understands if members need to step down from the workgroup, but that opens the door for someone else to join in their place. She encouraged the members to forward names of others who might be knowledgeable about the subject to join as well. The workgroup will start meeting as early as the following week to get started. The workgroup as a whole will meet every two weeks, and the subgroups can meet on the off weeks. The first set of recommendations is due by January 31st.

**Co-Chair Orduño** turned the meeting over to Dr. Tejada for the next presentation.

### **1.7.2 EPA Updates – 2023 Priorities**

**Dr. Tejada** presented the EJ/CR priorities for 2023. They include the EPA IRA (Inflation Reduction Act) plans, particularly with respect to EJ and Climate Justice Block Grants; the development of the Cumulative Impacts Framework, Civil Rights Compliance guidance, and indicators of disparity elimination; and the organization of a youth climate justice effort.

**Co-Chair Orduño** asked about the creation of new workgroups. **Dr. Tejada** replied bringing back the Finance and Investment Workgroup to work on a future charge to help with the IRA planning. He suggested a workgroup to deal with cumulative impacts.

**Mr. Mabion** emphasized that job training, workforce development, and employment opportunities are a must, especially in the youth/young adult age group. **Dr. Tejada** agreed with him on its importance.

**Vice-Chair Tilchin** stated that cumulative impacts were a major component in the AQCM Workgroup recommendations. He welcomed any input about resources for that, especially the airshed TMDL concept. **Dr. Tejada** stated that combatting cumulative impacts will last years.

**Ms. Colon de Mejias** emphasized that we need to stay away from doing things the same way as in the past because "nothing changes if nothing changes." She stated that she is speaking for everyone who doesn't get a chance to be heard. She emphasized that a lot of the knowledge presented at these meetings never trickles down to the community members who need to hear it the most. She suggested that groups who keep getting money but make no changes should not get any more money and give it to groups that have never had a chance to get it before. She reminded everyone that the information that does come from these meetings is sometimes so complicated, so distorted, and so big that it's unreadable to the average person. Sometimes billions of dollars are spent on studies and lengthy reports that no one will ever read. It's time to do something different. **Dr. Tejada** replied that this money will help to do it differently. This is a chance to show other agencies that the system can change equitably, and the mission gets achieved better.

**Ms. Hall** echoed Ms. Colon de Mejias' comments. She noted that when big foundations and universities are in charge of the money, none goes to the community. There needs to be more "agitators" who will stir things up and make changes so the EJ communities will be heard. **Dr. Tejada** agreed with her and stated that his office wants to be the agitator. He wants the language to say that universities will not get any money unless they are in partnership with a community-based organization, not just a letter of commitment, but a financial document showing where the money goes within the partnership.

**Ms. Nagano** echoed the previous comments and added that a university must be in the communities, not just have a place on campus. The lead needs to be a community member, not a faculty member. **Dr. Tejada** agreed.

**Mr. Clow** suggested that there needs to be a person at the OEJECR who can share data with the communities. **Dr. Tejada** stated that EPA is working on that. He said that in five years the landscape of environmental public health protection will look fundamentally different because of the data that's about to get supported by the EPA.

**Ms. Shirley** stated that she hopes that the changes come to fruition. The competitive grant application system needs to have an even playing field, and EPA needs to truly listen to what EJ communities are saying to make those changes. They need to use culturally appropriate methods and training to truly listen. **Dr. Tejada** replied they are reworking the grant system to remove or minimize barriers. He stated that the old public involvement policy was mothballed 15 to 20 years ago because they didn't have the staff to do it. Because of the recent influx of money, the program is being revived and reworked to put it back into effect better. That program will not be effective if changes do not happen. **Ms. Shirley** hoped his office has a lot of money for travel to

go out into the communities. **Dr. Tejada** replied that he's fighting for it. He stated that he also looks forward to meeting the new members in person.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** turned the meeting over to Mr. Tilchin for the next agenda item.

### **1.7.3 NEJAC Workgroup Updates**

**Vice-Chair Tilchin** explained the procedures for the workgroup updates.

#### **1.7.3.1 Farmworker Protection & Pesticides Workgroup**

**Co-Chair Orduño** named the other NEJAC members in the group and stated that there are seven external community members involved as well. The group has been working on paying more attention to the Worker Protection Standards and enforcement and regulation regarding farmworker work conditions and problems with the way pesticides are being used, i.e., monitoring and use training. The workgroup is learning about the effects of working conditions on women and children. They want a charge to identify the problems; improve inspections and compliance enforcement; encourage worker complaints and reporting; limit pesticide exposure, especially to women and children; and uphold the civil rights of workers. The workgroup is consulting with many agencies. **Dr. Fritz** added that she hopes the workgroup gets a timeslot during the next meeting to discuss what they've learned and heard from the workers themselves.

#### **1.7.3.2 NEPA Workgroup**

**Dr. Piazza** shared that they have ten NEJAC members now, of which three are new NEJAC members, and three external members, who are prior NEJAC members. She explained the key motivations of the group. One is to play a critical role in identifying EJ concerns, and the other is mitigating harmful impacts of proposed impacts on communities. They try to have more substance, consistency, and accountability to the EJ considerations that are brought forward in the NEPA process and the EJ analyses. This workgroup can provide recommendations and collaborate with the new EJECR program. They are expecting a charge from the Office of Federal Activity.

#### **1.7.3.3 NEJAC Finance and Investment (Justice40) Workgroup**

**April Baptiste**, PhD, named the other NEJAC members and Dr. Sacoby Wilson as an external, but former NEJAC, member of the group. The group is working on two documents that attempt to define, measure, and track all issues related to funding as it relates to environmental justice projects. The first is a process document that raises questions related to funding, investments, benefits, and co-benefits of the Justice40 money. The second document contains the recommendations focused on defining words such as benefits, investments, and co-benefits; assuring that the funds are going directly into the EJ communities and the community is the center of the progress; and asking for clear metrics for accountability. They will have the two documents ready for the next meeting. She also requested more members to join the workgroup.

**Vice-Chair Tilchin** turned the meeting over to DFO Flores-Gregg to announce upcoming events.

#### **1.7.4 Upcoming Events**

**DFO Flores-Gregg** announced the next public meeting, which will be in person, will be on November 28 through December 2, 2022.

#### **1.8 Closing Remarks & Adjourn**

**Co-Chair Orduño** thanked everyone for their time and efforts. She highly encouraged the members to attend the in-person meeting.

**Co-Chair Osborne Jelks** also thanked everyone and gave a brief rundown of what was accomplished at the meeting.

**Vice-Chair Tilchin** stated that was exciting to meet just after the announcement of the new OEJECR program. He thanked everyone for the enormous amount of work that went into the meeting and the public commenters for their comments.

**DFO Flores-Gregg** adjourned the meeting.

**[MEETING ADJOURNED]**

I, Sylvia Orduño and I, Na'Taki Osborne Jelks, Co-Chairs of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council certify that this is the final meeting summary for the public meeting held on September 28, 2022, and it accurately reflects the discussions and decisions of the meeting.



Sylvia Orduño  
December 28, 2022



Na'Taki Osborne Jelks, PhD  
December 28, 2022



## Appendix 1. Agenda



# AGENDA

US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COUNCIL (NEJAC)  
 VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, September 28, 2022 12:00 PM – 7:30 PM Eastern	
12:00 PM – 12:15 PM	<p>Welcome &amp; Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paula Flores-Gregg, Designated Federal Officer – U.S. EPA</li> <li>• Sylvia Orduño, NEJAC Co-Chair – Michigan Welfare Rights Organization</li> <li>• Dr. Na'Taki Osborne Jelks, NEJAC Co-Chair – West Atlanta Watershed Alliance and Proctor Creek Stewardship Council</li> <li>• Michael Tilchin, NEJAC Vice Chair – Jacobs Engineering</li> </ul>
12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	<p>Opening Remarks &amp; National Program Announcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robin Collin, Senior Advisor to the Administrator for Environmental Justice, U.S. EPA</li> <li>• Marianne Engelman-Lado, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator (Acting) for EJEER, U.S. EPA</li> <li>• Matthew Tejada, Deputy Assistant Administrator for EJ, EJEER, U.S. EPA</li> <li>• Lilian Dorka, Deputy Assistant Administrator for External Civil Rights, EJEER, U.S. EPA</li> </ul>
12:45 PM – 1:15 PM	<p>NEJAC Members Introduction</p>
1:15 PM – 2:30 PM	<p>PFAS Workgroup Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Sandra Whitehead, PFAS Workgroup Chair - George Washington University</li> <li>• Dr. Ben Pauli, PFAS Workgroup - Kettering University</li> </ul>
2:30 PM – 3:45 PM	<p>Air Quality &amp; Community Monitoring (AQCM) Workgroup Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michael Tilchin, NEJAC Vice Chair – AQCM Workgroup Chair - Jacobs Engineering</li> </ul>
3:45 PM – 4:00 PM	<p>BREAK</p>

4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Public Comment Period
5:00 PM – 5:15 PM	BREAK
5:15 PM – 7:15PM	<p><b>Business Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>New Charge: <i>Water Infrastructure Workgroup Technical Assistance Charge</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Jonathan Nelson</b>, Senior Advisor for Technical Assistance and Community Outreach, Office of Water, U.S. EPA</li> <li>○ <b>Chitra Kumar</b>, Director of the Office of Policy, Partnerships, and Program Development, OEJECR, U.S. EPA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>EPA Updates – 2023 Priorities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Matthew Tejada</b>, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Environmental Justice, OEJECR, U.S. EPA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>NEJAC Workgroup Updates</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Farmworker Protection &amp; Pesticides Workgroup</li> <li>2. NEPA Workgroup</li> <li>3. NEJAC Finance and Investment (Justice 40) Workgroup</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <b>Upcoming Events</b></li> </ul>
7:15 PM - 7:30 PM	<p><b>Closing Remarks &amp; Adjourn</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dr. Na'Taki Osborne Jelks</b>, NEJAC Co-Chair – West Atlanta Watershed Alliance and Proctor Creek Stewardship Council</li> <li>• <b>Sylvia Orduño</b>, NEJAC Co-Chair – Michigan Welfare Rights Organization</li> <li>• <b>Michael Tilchin</b>, NEJAC Vice Chair – Jacobs Engineering</li> <li>• <b>Paula Flores-Gregg</b>, Designated Federal Officer – U.S. EPA</li> </ul>

**NOTE:** Please be advised that agenda times are approximate; when the discussion for one topic is completed, discussions for the next topic will begin. For further information, please contact the Designated Federal Officer for this meeting, Paula Flores-Gregg, at [flores.paula@epa.gov](mailto:flores.paula@epa.gov)

## Appendix 2. September 2022 NEJAC Public Meeting Attendee List

First Name	Last Name	State/ Province	Organization
Michael	Stroud	VA	International Liquid Terminals Association (ILTA)
Ligia	Duarte	DC	Household & Commercial Products Association
Taylor	Vaughan	OH	Oak Ridge Associated Universities
Ted	Marks	NY	Private Citizen
John	Mueller	OK	Private Citizen
Nicholas	Plebani	DC	GGA
Matthew	Jokajtys	NJ	PSEG
Stacy	Allen	MO	Ameren
Kim	Scarborough	NJ	PSEG
Traylor	Champion	GA	Georgia-Pacific
l	k	FL	Florida Crystals
Jasmin	Contreras	MD	EPA
Trish	Koman	MI	EPA
Matthew	Pezzella	DC	ASTM International
Monica	Dick	IN	AES
Danielle	Mercurio	DC	VNF
Barry F.	Boyd	CA	Concerned Meadowview Neighborhood Resident
Jennifer	Miller	KY	Kentucky Division for Air Quality
Ed	Monachino	NC	RTI International
Caitlin	Macomber	DC	WRI
Amelia	Cheek	IL	IERG
Eileen	Mayer	DC	EPA
Leanne	Nurse	VA	The Nature Conservancy
Katie	Lambeth	MI	EGLE
Tina	Davis	IL	EPA
Julian	Hong	VA	American Public Power Association
Winifred	Carson-Smith	DC	WY Carson Company
Susan	Kilmer	MI	EGLE Air Quality Division
David	Ailor	DC	American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute
Heather	Gawne	PA	Stella-Jones Corporation
Carol	Butero	CO	Kinder Morgan
Scott	Thorsgard	OR	Allweather Wood
Ryan	Pessah	WA	Western Wood Preservers Institute
Ryan	McManus	VA	APWA
Rebecca	Overmyer-Velazquez	CA	Clean Air Coalition of North Whittier Heights
Natalie	Tarini	Other	Wood Preservation Canada

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Sandra	Morse	VA	Aegis Environmental
Stacey	Callaway	WA	Ecology
Olivia	Morgan	LA	Private Citizen
Carol	Trembly	WV	FirstEnergy
Tanisha	Raj	CA	Catholic charities
Dorothy	Nairne	LA	Delta Builds Enterprises
Liz	Hoerning	WI	EHS Support
Daniel	Nierenberg	NY	NYSDOT
Michael	Keehley	GA	Strategic H, E, & S Partner
Janet	Katz	WA	Washington state university college of nursing
Diana	Zuckerman	DC	National Center for Health Research
Noble	Smith	MD	UMD SPH
Sydney	Menees	VA	The Boeing Company
Bud	McAllister	CT	Partners in Healthy Communities
Farrah	Court	TX	TCEQ
Daniel	Woodard	AL	Southern Company
Susan	Cathey	TX	Air Liquide
Wumi	Andrew	TX	TAMU-CC
Krista	Kyle	TX	TCEQ
Bobby	Janecka	TX	TCEQ
Alexandra	Olson	TX	EPA
Terry	Bowers (DoD)	VA	DOD
Joe	Weishaar	IL	Plote Construction Inc
Anne	Troutman	NY	Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC
None	Bigdeli	LA	UNO
Mike	Pitta	TX	Kinder Morgan
Cheryl	Watson	IL	Equitable Resilience & Sustainability LLC
Stacey	Lobatos	DC	EPA
Kimi	Matsumoto	CO	EPA
Monica	Espinosa	KS	EPA
Judith	Kendall	DC	EPA
Scott Wilson	Badenoch Jr	CA	Environmental Law Institute
Brian	Lynch	TX	Baker Botts
Rachel	Averitt	TX	Baker Botts
Khalila	Howze	NC	University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Brendan	Mascarenhas	DC	ACC
Leslie	Reed	FL	Brightwater Strategies Group
tony	germinario	NJ	BASF Corp.
Rachel	Strow	DC	Rutgers University

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Scott	Yager	DC	INGAA
Coral	Lozada	TX	HRI
Greg	DeAngelo	FL	Metro 4/SESARM
Morgan	Capilla	CA	EPA
Macara	Lousberg	DC	EPA
Erin	Partlan	DC	EPA
Jacquelyn	Omotalade	PA	EHP
Linda	Shosie	AZ	Environmental Justice Task Force Tucson
Ester	Ceja	ID	Idaho Transportation Department
Mark	Chambers	NY	EDGI
David	Magdangal	DC	EPA
Emma	Roy	DC	NCHR
Beth	Graves	DC	ECOS
Miranda	Chien-Hale	DC	The Environmental Council of the States (ECOS)
Paulina	Lopez-Santos	DC	Environmental Council of the States
Mia	Lombardi	OH	Marathon Petroleum
Kim	Lambert	VA	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Katy	Arnold	CA	Environmental Defense Fund
Linsey	Walsh	PA	EPA
Bridgid	Curry	DC	EPA
Julie	Van Alstine	DC	USDA
Beth	Dittman	NC	NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Charles	Lee	DC	EPA
Patricia A.	Spitzley	MI	RACER Trust
Claudia	Vaupel	WA	EPA
Brian	Holtzclaw	GA	EPA
Matthew	Brickey	NC	Forsyth County, NC Government
Katherine	Herrera	DC	American Gas Association
Anne	Thidemann	CT	USAO-CT
Alex	Guillen	VA	Politico
Nancy	Beck	DC	Hunton
Claire	Still	VA	AECOM
D	Wu	NY	NYS OAG - EPB
Mark	Huncik	PA	Highlands Civic Association
Adenike	Adeyeye	MD	Climate + Clean Energy Equity Fund
Dawn	Johnson	GA	DCJ Global Management Solutions, LLC
Dawn	Reeves	VA	Inside EPA
Nicolette	Fertakis	DC	EPA
Christopher	Smith	DC	Interstate Natural Gas Association of America

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Elizabeth	Small	NY	CDP
Ellen	Spears	GA	University of Alabama
Richard	Hamel	MA	ALL4, LLC
Barbara	Brown	NY	Eastern Queens Alliance, Inc.
Emma	Lipsky	DC	Justice & Sustainability Associates
Chris	White	IL	ASE Chicago
Lena	Epps-Price	NC	EPA
Emily	Collins	OH	City of Akron
Julia	Hathaway	DC	EPA
Brittany	Morris	VA	Private Citizen
Brian	Chalfant	PA	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
James	Tillman	LA	CGI
Juliet	Herndon	NJ	NJ TRANSIT
Sonya	Jampel	WA	EPA
Gretchen	Mallari	WA	Pierce County Planning & Public Works
Diane	D'Arrigo	MD	Nuclear Info and Resource Service
Jacky	Grimshaw	IL	CNT
Juliana	Ojeda	DC	Green 2.0
JL	Andrepoint	OR	350.org
Kate	Gill	PA	GSA
Melissa	Ezzell-Maddy	CO	LMCo
Lin	Nelson	WA	Evergreen State College
Jenn	Clarke	VA	City of Richmond
Hilary	Jacobs	DC	Beveridge & Diamond
Kate	Hutchens	MI	Michigan Dept. of Environment, Great Lakes, & Energy
Gina	Shirey	AK	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Jeraldine	Herrera	ME	Power Engineers
Neelakshi	Hudda	MA	Tufts Univ
Leah	Wood	WA	Washington State Department of Health
Madeline	Semanisin	MO	Great Rivers Environmental Law Center
Kandyce	Perry	NJ	NJ Department of Environmental Protection
Jesse	Fairweather	CO	CDPHE
Janice	Horn	TN	Tennessee Valley Authority
Alex	Porteous	DC	EPA
Jessica	Evans	DC	Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA)
Rani	Kumar	CO	CDPHE
Mitchell	DePalma	AZ	Northrop Grumman Corporation
Jack	Hinshelwood	VA	VDH

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Maryann	Carroll	DE	Croda, Inc.
Ariel	Neumann	DC	Verdant Law PLLC
Sarah	Phillips	CO	Waste Connections
Matthew	Silverman	NY	US Attorney's Office EDNY
Roberto	Ellis	FL	City of Ocala
Holly	Ravesloot	DC	HHS
Eletha	Roberts	OH	CESER
Kiera	Brown	CA	RCAC
Michael	Petroni	DC	EPA
Elyse	Salinas	DC	EPA
Julie	Jimenez	MD	Private Citizen
Ashley	Morales	VA	SERCAP
Shakenya	Jackson	FL	City of Apopka
Tania	Ellersick	DC	USDA
Telly	Lovelace	DC	ACC
Brad	Jarrett	AR	Communities Unlimited
Theda	Braddock	WA	Steilacoom Planning Commission
Rachel	Schneider	DC	CBP
LaTorria	Sims	GA	Adamantine Energy
Marley	Kimelman	DC	Babst Calland
Catie	Bartone	VT	Weston & Sampson
Meghan	Langley	MA	Private Citizen
Molly	McDaniel	FL	Pensacola and Perdido Bays Estuary Program
Leah	Harnish	VA	American Waterways Operators
Jessica	Pulliam	HI	Private Citizen
Kaitlin	Harris	TX	RCAP
John	Byrd	VA	Miller/Wenhold Capitol Strategies
John G.	Andrade	MA	Old Bedford Village Development, Inc.
Xavier	Barraza	NM	EJ Leadership Team
Zoraida	Lopez-Diago	NY	Scenic Hudson
Andrew	Donnellycolt	CT	Connecticut Department of Public Health
Marie	Collins Wright	IL	Jeffrey Manor Community Revitalization Council
Melanie	Medina-Metzger	VA	FEMA
Denise	Sarchiapone	MD	B&D Environmental Consulting
Stephanie	Hammonds	WV	WVDEP-DAQ
Kelsi	Grogan	MD	EPA
DARIA	GRAYER	DC	AAMC
John	Perkey	TX	Waste Connections
Lisa	Voss	AZ	Private Citizen
Bernice	Smith	DC	EPA

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Brandon	Hunter	NC	Center for Rural Enterprise & Environmental Justice
Cyndi	Comfort	WA	Washington State Department of Ecology
Marvin S.	Robinson II	KS	Quindaro Ruins/ Underground Railroad-Exercise 2023
Caroline	Miles Ingram	MS	Communities Unlimited
Hal	Marchand	IL	Western Illinois University Health Sciences
Stephanie	Coates	TX	EDF
Kevin	Hamilton	CA	Central California Asthma Collaborative
Julie	Childers	VA	Private Citizen
Doris	Johnson	CT	Energy & Environmental Protection
Janice	Brown	CO	Private Citizen
Steve	Moran	VA	BreezoMeter
Deldi	Reyes	CA	CA Air Resources Board
William	Nichols	DC	EPA
Samantha	Meneses	CA	Central California Asthma Collaborative
Gerardo	Acosta	TX	Office of Communities, Tribes, and Environmental Assess
Donnella	Monk	NY	City of Syracuse
Gloria	Vaughn	TX	EPA
Jamie	Banks	MA	Quiet Communities Inc.
Agatha	Benjamin	TX	EPA
Debra	Tellez	NM	EPA
Ryan	Phillips	OR	Department of Environmental Quality
Rebecca	Truka	OR	Hexion Inc
Amanda	Giorgio	VA	SERCAP
Kibri	Everett	NC	RTI International
Ronald	Zorrilla	NY	Outdoor Promise
Maya	Breitburg-Smith	WA	RESOLVE
Maria	Payan	DE	SHEN
Isabel	Molina	NJ	NJLCV
Tara	Hocker	OK	Ponca Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
Natalie	Shepp	AZ	Pima County Department of Environmental Quality
Holly	Spear	AR	Capitol Square
Dillon	Lucas	CO	DOJ
DJ	Portugal	AZ	Chispa AZ
Pamela	Winston	DC	HHS
Maya	Nye	WV	Coming Clean
Otis	Mathis	MI	AfricanTown-48217 (AT-4)
Cynthia	Peurifoy	GA	Private Citizen
Stephanie	Herron	PA	EJHA



<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Brayton	Willis	NC	NAACP
Shanika	Amarakoon	NH	ERG
Cheryl	Cail	SC	American Rivers
Ms	Shirley	GA	Agency for Humanity
Lianne	Audette	CT	10000 Hawks
Jolene	Keplin	ND	Health Education
Judith	Robinson	PA	Susquehanna Clean Up/Pick Up, Inc.
Jame	Schaefer	WI	Marquette University
Angella	Dunston	NC	NC League of Conservation Voters
Odette	Wilkens	NY	Wired Broadband, Inc.
Patrick	Ceres	FL	Lion Point Engineering
Teraine	Okpoko	NY	Teraine Okpoko P.C.
Andrew	Stoeckle	MA	ERG
Kristie	Ellickson	MN	Union of Concerned Scientists
Kris	Rusch	VA	EnDyna
Joanna	Stancil	VA	USDA
Michelle	Madeley	DC	EPA
Chris	Whitehead	NJ	ESI
James	Kenney	NM	New Mexico Environment Department
Zanetta	Bennett	LA	Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
Kim	Tucker-Billingslea	MI	GM
Stephanie	Hirner	KS	Evergy, Inc.
Jenna	Dodson	WV	West Virginia Rivers Coalition
Sherrie	Thomas	DC	EPA
Mary Anne	McDonald	NC	Duke University
Kathleen	Bland	OH	Highlight Technologies
Carolyn	Huynh	WA	Integral
Nelson	Gonzalez-Sulow	GA	USDA
Jenny	Coughlin	IA	Alliant Energy
Sharon	Cooperstein	DC	EPA
Sarah	Davidson	DC	EPA
Cristina	Villa	DC	DOI
Matthew	Johns	CA	HHS
Deanee	Rios	NY	Atlantic Climate Justice Alliance
Pablo	Mendez Lazaro	PR	USDA
Gianna	St.Julien	LA	Tulane University Law School
Jackie	Busby	WA	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
Darius	Stanton	DC	American Cleaning Institute
Kimberly	McCoy	CA	Central California Asthma Collaborative
Wynnie-Fred	Victor Hinds	NJ	Weequahic Park Association

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Samantha	Estabrook	MT	Headwaters Economics
Laurel	Lynn Rowse	MS	MSDH
Vanessa	Gordon	MD	USDA
Adriana	Ross	CA	Central Valley Water Quality Control Board
Fran	Aguirre	CO	Unite North Metro Denver
LINDA	Giles	DC	Transcription, Etc. LLC
Otoha	Tatami	IL	EPA
Rebecca	Harbage	MT	Montana Dept. of Environmental Quality
Richard	Juang	MA	Ceres
Mary	Green	WV	Private Citizen
Regan	Patterson	CA	UCLA
Patricia	Iscaro	VA	Politico Agency IQ
Sonia	Kikeri	PA	Emerald Cities Collaborative
Ora	Giles	NY	Transcription, Etc., LLC
Hope	Cupit	VA	SERCAP
Dave	White	TX	USACE
Kathleen	Dominique	Other	OECD
Don	Van Schaack	OH	DOD
Moto	Power	NM	Grants and More, inc.
Amanda	Aspatore	DC	NACWA
Michael	Hopperton	GA	BP
Randa	Boykin	NC	NCDEQ
Carlyn	Chappel	NY	EPA
Jerry	Ackerman	GA	EPA
Annisa	White	TX	Entergy
Donna	Turnipseed	WA	FPAC BC
Helen	Serassio	DC	EPA
Jake	Assael	DC	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Marjorie	Hall	GA	NEWFIELDS
Skye	Wheeler	DC	Human Rights Watch
Melvin	Keener	VA	CRWI
Neha	Sareen	NY	EPA
Larisa	Romanowski	NY	EPA
Daisha	Williams	NC	CleanAIRE NC
Crystal	Chavez	FL	Private Citizen
Natalie	Lepska	CA	OSRE
Olivia	Lopez	MD	Ocean Conservancy
Stella	Wang	NY	Integral Consulting Inc.
Nettie	McMiller	DC	EPA
Jimmy	Parrish	VA	Defense Supply Center Richmond
Grace	Elam	CA	EPA

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Jessa	Chabeau	PA	Environmental Health Project
Caitlin	McHale	DC	National Mining Association
Taaka	Bailey	MS	MDEQ
Tammie	Tucker	NC	AECOM
Dee	Vanek	IL	Argonne National Laboratory
Ken	Miller	NM	City of Albuquerque Environmental Health Department
Edlynzia	Barnes	IL	EPA
Marie	Gargas	DC	Plastics Industry Association (PLASTICS)
Isabella	Herrera	FL	American Meteorological Society
Aaron	Koka	TX	UMD - CEEJH
Tanya	Williams	WA	Safety PACE LLC
Arian	Mokhtari	MD	University of Maryland
Elizabeth	Meza	CA	University of Maryland
John	Kinsman	DC	Edison Electric Institute
Megan	Kuhl-Stennes	MN	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Dana	Williamson	GA	EPA
Karen	Beason	OH	88 CEG/CEIEC
Rick	McMonagle	OR	EPA
Lily	Rubino	NY	Cambridge University
Melissa	Collier	MS	CCAPHF
Martin	Lively	OK	LEAD Agency, Inc.
Leigh	Callahan	DC	EPA
Geoff	Hickman	PA	Upper Merion Township
Wendy	Hogg	GA	NewFields
Amy	Volckens	CO	RTI International
Kimberly	Crisafi	DC	EPA
Chad	Larsen	TX	EPA
Jorge	Acevedo	MI	MI EGLE
Pamela	Bingham	VA	University of Maryland/Bingham Consulting Services
Heather	Croshaw	CO	Private Citizen
Sydney	Boogaard	AZ	Maricopa County Air Quality Department
Lorraine	Anderson	TX	Shell
Jordan	Griffin	CA	Sacramento State
Bev	Vazquez	DC	EPA
Rachel	Patterson	NY	Evergreen Action
Mary	Strawderman	VA	VCU
Lisa	Frede	IL	CICI
Kim	Harris	IL	EPA
Jason	Torian	NC	Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Danusha	Chandy	VA	EPA
Emma	Hale	DC	HHS
Keith	Guille	WY	Wyoming DEQ
Kimber	Wichmann	WY	DEQ
Komie	Jain	DC	Institute for Scrap Recycling Industries
Mary	Peveto	OR	Neighbors for Clean Air
Liz	Lamar	CA	Bees and Teas
Marilyn	Hemingway	SC	Gullah Geechee Chamber of Commerce
Oana	Djibom	MD	CEEJH
LaShauna	Austria	NC	Kindred Seedlings Farm
Anna	Truszczynski	GA	Georgia EPD
Donna	Ott	PA	Pennsylvanians for Safe Technology
Carla	Mays	CA	Smart Cohort
Devin	Murphy	CA	City of Pinole, Movement for Black Lives
Andrea	Hubbard	CA	Líderes campesinas y alianza nacional
Marlene	Rojas Lara	CA	Alianza Nacional de Campesinas
Laurie	Casey	IL	One Earth Collective
Ines	Azevedo	CA	Stanford University
Kate	Hoag	CA	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Melissa	Horton	DC	Southern Company
Chris	Moore	TN	Eastman
Dianne	Phillips	MA	Holland & Knight LLP
Matt	Holmes	CA	Little Manila Rising
Karen	Suarez	CA	Making Hope Happen Foundation - Uplift San Bernardino
Alexandra	Archer	OR	Neighbors for Clean Air
Youmna	Ansari	MD	University of Maryland - CEEJH
Walker	Livingston	DC	AgencyIQ
Ronni	Beccles	DC	EPA
Elvira	Carvajal	FL	Alianza Nacional de Campesinas
Rowan	Bost	DC	Steptoe
Hormis	Bedolla	NY	Alianza Nacional de Campesinas
Crystal	Warren	TN	TN Dept Environment and Conservation
Donald	Lang	CA	Private Citizen
Alan	Edwards	WY	WY Department of Environmental Quality
Bennett	Thompson	DC	EPA
Jessica	Dalton	FL	DEP
Suzanne	Yohannan	VA	Inside EPA's Superfund Report
Deborah	Williams	IL	CWLP
Cynthia	Robertson	LA	Micah Six Eight Mission

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>State/ Province</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Marie	Brown	SC	SC DHEC
Bonita	Johnson	GA	EPA
Jason	Heath	OH	ORSANCO
Audelia	Garcia	CA	Lideres Campesinas
Ramona	Sanders	LA	Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement
Joe	James	SC	Aghri-Tech Producers LLC
Rita	Harris	MS	Sierra Club
Kim	Jones	GA	EPA
Amanda	Hauff	DC	EPA
Robert	Fox	DC	EPA
Dean	Scott	DC	Bloomberg
Vivian	Do	CA	Columbia
Katy	Super	DC	EJHA
Monique	Hudson	GA	EPA
Dana	M	DC	GWU
Courtney	Cecale	WA	ECY
Abby	Klinkenberg	CA	Bureau of Reclamation
Christopher	White	IL	Reclaim Evanston
Alexander	Benjamin	IN	CBRC and ACJA
Elsie	Aquino-Gonzalez	PR	ACJA
Clark	Watson	OK	Webco Industry
Rusty	Hazelton	GA	EPA
Rebecca	Adler Miserendino	DC	Lewis-Burke Associates
Joshua	Nelson	MD	CEEJH
Danny	Gogal	DC	EPA
Vikram	Iyer	DC	Center for American Progress
Kathryn	McKenzie	NY	Private Citizen
C	Liv	DC	HHS
Sheryl	Good	GA	EPA
Daphne	Wilson	GA	EPA
Alessandro	Molina	CO	EPA
Piyachat	Terrell	DC	EPA