

Retrofit Compliance 2021 Rulemaking

Summary

Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Jan. 26, 2021, 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.
Online Webinar



State of Oregon
Department of
Environmental
Quality

Committee Members in Attendance

Committee Member	Affiliation	Representing
Audrey Lawson	Commerce and Compliance Division (Oregon Department of Transportation)	State of Oregon HB 2007 Partner Agency
Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association	Small Fleets
Cory Hansen	Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association	Solid Waste Management Industry
Dave Scarfe	Elite Emission Products	Retrofit Technology Installation and Service
David Breen	Port of Portland	Intermodal Freight, Ports and Drayage
Jana Jarvis	Oregon Trucking Association	Private Heavy-Duty Fleets
Jason Novak	United Parcel Service Fleet Services	Fleets Regulated by HB 2007
Kenechi Onyeagusi	Professional Business Development Group	Disadvantaged, Minority-, Women- and Service-disabled Veteran-owners
Kevin Brown	Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association	Emission Control Industry
Mary Peveto	Neighbors for Clean Air	Clean Air Community-Based Organization
Morgan Gratz-Weiser	Oregon Environmental Council	Environmental Community-Based Organization
Rich Angstrom	Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association	Concrete and Aggregate Business
Steve Hoke	Diesel Emission Service	Retrofit Technology Installation and Service
Tom Keyser	Washington County Fleet Services	County Regulated by HB 2007
Tracy Olander	Policy and Operations, Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (Oregon Department of Transportation)	State of Oregon HB 2007 Partner Agency
Warren Gadberry	Clackamas County Fleet Services	County Regulated by HB 2007

Vehicle Inspection Program

1240 SE 12th Ave.
Portland, OR 97214
Phone: 503-229-5066
877-476-0583
Fax: 971-673-1640
Contact: Rick Reznic
reznic.rick@deq.state.or.us

www.oregon.gov/DEQ

DEQ is a leader in restoring, maintaining and enhancing the quality of Oregon's air, land and water.

Committee Members Not in Attendance

Committee Member	Affiliation	Representing
Allen Schaeffer	Diesel Technology Forum	Diesel Equipment and Technology
David Silva	Multnomah County Fleet Services	County regulated by HB 2007

Larry Gescher	Association of General Contractors	Construction Companies
Tommy Moreno	Franz Bakery Corporate Fleet	Fleets regulated by HB 2007

Staff Present

Staff Member	Affiliation
Rick Reznic	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Gerik Kransky	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Michael Skorupka	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Michael Orman	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Gary Beyer	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Eric Feely	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Penny Mabie	Definitely Mabie Consulting
Sidney Orr	EnviroIssues
Max Farbman	EnviroIssues

Community Members Present

Community Member	Affiliation
Chrys Dawes	Klamath Falls City Schools
Ezra Finkin	Elite Emission Products
Jeremy Ostrander	Diesel Exhaust and Emissions
Jordan Bice	Oxley and Associates
Les Schwindt	McCoy Freightliner
Mark Gibson	Oregon Trucking Association
Spencer Ehrman	Not listed
Susan Mates	Not listed
Tracy Fisher	City of Portland
Tucker Billman	Oregon Farm Bureau

Meeting Commencement

Rick Reznic (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, DEQ) began the meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending. He explained that in this meeting, the committee would review the key changes that DEQ made to the retrofit compliance draft rules based on previous feedback from the committee, discuss the draft Fiscal Impact Statement and provide input on the fiscal and economic impacts from the proposed rules.

Facilitator Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues) asked participants to introduce themselves. Their names and affiliations are listed in the table above. Mabie then walked committee members through the following agenda for the meeting:

- Review advisory committee ground rules and webinar practices
- Rule review and discussion
- Fiscal Impact Statement discussion
- Public comment period
- Next steps

Mabie also reminded committee members of the following ground rules for the meeting:

- Stay focused on the specific agenda topics
- Comment constructively and in good faith
- Treat everyone and their opinions with respect
- Allow one person to speak at a time
- Be courteous by not engaging in sidebar discussions (including chat discussions)
- Speak for yourself or your organization when engaging in the conversation

Draft Proposed Rule Review Summary

Rick Reznic (DEQ) explained that he would guide the committee through each section of the new proposed rule language and identify any key changes. He would then ask for committee members' input on the changes in each section.

Definitions (340-256-0010)

Reznic explained that the definitions from this rule will be incorporated in Division 256 as part of the Vehicle Inspection Program list of definitions. He noted that DEQ has added a definition for "Diesel Engine" to the list of definitions and that this definition comes from HB 2007, Section 1. Reznic noted that no other definitions had been added to the rules since the last committee meeting, but that other definitions had been slightly modified to ensure clarity and intent match the rule language.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee. There were none.

Requirements for Approved Retrofit Technology (340-256-0510)

Reznic noted that at the last meeting, a committee member mentioned that the rule language in (1)(a) referred to a licensed installer and asked if Oregon was going to have a licensing program. Reznic clarified that that is not the agency's intent. He explained that DEQ revised the language to read, "installer authorized by the Approved Retrofit Technology manufacturer" to clarify the agency's intent.

He also stated that the retrofit manufacturer authorizes and maintains the most up-to-date list of installers and DEQ plans to collaborate with retrofit manufacturers to provide retrofit installer information and technical resources to assist businesses, registrants, counties and municipalities. Reznic stated that this new rule language clarifies the requirements of the retrofit manufacturer and the installer.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee. There were none.

Certification of Approved Retrofit Technology (340-256-0520)

Reznic explained that at the last meeting, committee members wanted to know DEQ's requirement for the data log time and date in section (1)(c) of the draft rules and recommended that DEQ add the engine family number to section 3(h).

Reznic stated that DEQ updated section (1)(c) by removing the requirement for submitting the data log results and left the pre-installation compatibility assessment because the assessment includes the data log results that are prescribed by the manufacturer.

He noted that DEQ is proposing to approve diesel particulate filter technologies from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) lists of currently verified technologies as long the technology results in a reduction of diesel particulate matter of at least 85%.

Reznic explained that the current verified technologies on both lists include the engine families and operating criteria appropriate for the installation and use of the retrofit technology. He noted that the manufacturer prescribes the pre-assessment parameters. He also stated that the currently verified devices on the EPA and CARB lists include the manufacturer specifications based on the approval criteria.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee. There were none.

Issuance of Approved Retrofit Compliance (340-256-0530)

Reznic explained that this section of the rules establishes the process for DEQ to approve or deny a request for a Certificate of Approved Retrofit Compliance.

He explained that committee members' input at the previous meeting was focused on section four regarding the requirement to submit maintenance and operational records to DEQ within 60 days of the registration renewal date. He noted that the updated rule language no longer requires the registrant to submit maintenance and operational records within 60 days of the registration renewal date. Instead, he explained that the rule requires that the registrant keep these records for a period of 24 months.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee.

- A committee member asked Reznic to clarify whether DEQ is proposing to require individuals who put retrofit devices on their vehicles to keep the data themselves but not require them to submit that data prior to annual registration.
 - Reznic confirmed that was correct. He explained that DEQ will require registrants to maintain maintenance and backpressure records for 24 months and that DEQ may request this data as part of an audit. He noted that the retrofit installer or manufacturer may want registrants to keep these records for longer.

Periodic Verification Process (340-256-0540)

Reznic stated that during the last meeting, committee members provided input on the logistical challenges for DEQ to review and interpret retrofit data logs and maintenance records. He noted that committee members suggested that DEQ instead require proof of annual maintenance, a visual inspection and an opacity test. He stated that the committee also provided input on the type of records DEQ should require.

Reznic explained that the new rule language requires an annual inspection and opacity test and that registrants keep maintenance records for 24 months and provide them for DEQ review upon request. Reznic noted that the agency anticipates requesting the maintenance records as part of a random audit to make sure the retrofit

continues to be maintained for the life of the system. He stated that the required records include temperature and backpressure logs, filter cleaning, filter maintenance and retrofit repair.

Reznic asked committee members how long DEQ should allow for a registrant to submit the results of the annual inspection and opacity test. He suggested that DEQ could provide 30, 60 or 90 days for the registrant to submit these results prior to the renewal date.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee.

- A committee member asked how long DEQ would need to receive and review the documents. He suggested that DEQ use that amount of time to determine how many days to provide.
 - Reznic responded that DEQ anticipates being able to process the documents with a first come, first served approach. He noted that for the purpose of this input, DEQ wants to assess what committee members feel is an appropriate length of time for registrants to have to submit their documents.
- A committee member noted that, given the challenges everyone faced in 2020, anything with a strict deadline could be challenging. She noted that she would want DEQ to provide flexibility for registrants regardless of what time period the agency decides upon.
- Michael Skorupka (DEQ) suggested having a renewal window that opens 90 days before the registration renewal deadline where registrants can submit documents for the first 60 days and DEQ can use the last 30 days to process any outstanding documents.
- A committee member agreed with Skorupka. She noted that leaving the window open for too long can make it difficult for registrants to keep track of the deadline.
- A committee member noted that the rule requires “A supplementary certification signature from an installer, authorized by the Approved Retrofit Technology manufacturer, or an Approved Retrofit Technology manufacturer designated representative, stating that the installer or manufacturer conducted a visual and other inspection of the Approved Retrofit Technology and that it conforms to the manufacturer’s specifications of function and is not operating with decreased efficiency or effectiveness.” He noted that he was concerned that the installer would be required to “certify” a system’s effectiveness from just a visual inspection. He said that to truly certify the system’s effectiveness, an installer would need to remove the system, inspect it, and review the data.
 - Reznic clarified that the visual inspection would be used in combination with an opacity test and a review of the system’s data logs to ensure that the system was functioning appropriately.
 - The committee member later reiterated this concern.
 - Skorupka asked if the committee member would be more comfortable if the certification noted that it was a certification based on a snapshot in time and did not guarantee that the system would continue to function if conditions changed.
 - The committee member agreed he would be comfortable with that. He noted that the systems have their own warranties and noted that CARB’s rules have much higher verifications and penalties for systems that do not function adequately than DEQ’s rules have.
 - Reznic noted that this approach of certifying the system for a point of time meets the intent of the certification process. He said that the point of the inspection is for the agency to receive confirmation that the system is installed correctly, it is operating as it should and it is not smoking excessively.
 - The committee member asked if DEQ has anything in the rules to require manufacturers to report sales or warranty issues on a yearly basis.

- Reznic stated that the rules do not have a reporting requirement for sales or manufacturing issues. He explained that the agency has established criteria and methods for certifying the retrofit technology and ensuring that it continues to operate for the life of the technology.
- A committee member asked if the opacity test requirement means that an installer will need to maintain EPA Method 9 Certification for conducting opacity reads.
 - Reznic noted that the opacity standard that the rule requires uses a CARB standard [Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Section 2193(d) (2020)].
 - The committee member followed up to ask if the installer will need to obtain the Method 9 Certification to perform those tests. He noted that that would put an additional burden on the installer.
 - Reznic explained that the installers would have to conform to the requirements prescribed in the California Code of Regulations.
 - A second committee member noted that all installers should theoretically have opacity machines and have the certifications to operate them.
- Reznic asked committee members if this new process addresses their concerns about continued compliance of technology and if this process simplifies the inspection for all involved.
 - A committee member said it addresses some of his concerns. He noted that it addresses his concern that DEQ would not have the capacity to interpret huge amounts of data from registrants. However, he thought that the rules are vague on what exactly should occur in the supplementary certification inspection and that different inspectors might interpret the rules differently.

Approved Retrofit Technology Labeling Requirements (340-256-0550)

Reznic explained that the labeling requirements in the proposed rules largely remained the same as the previous draft rules. He noted one addition was to clarify the visibility requirements for labels that are located in areas that need illumination.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee. There were none.

Swapping or Re-designating Approved Retrofit Technology (340-256-0560)

Reznic explained that DEQ updated the rule language to clarify the process of component swapping and re-designation. He noted that this includes submitting an application to DEQ for approval before performing any swapping or re-designation actions.

Reznic reminded committee members that not all manufacturers allow for this type of activity and that anyone who wants to swap or re-designate technology will need to obtain documentation from the manufacturer as required in Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Section 2706(i).

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee.

- A committee member suggested that DEQ remove the term “used equipment” from the rule language. He explained that this term will confuse the public as selling used emissions control devices is illegal and a person cannot go out and buy a used emissions control device. Instead, he noted, people can swap or re-designate equipment within a common fleet.
 - Reznic noted that the Oregon Department of Justice reviewed the rules and interpreted re-designated equipment as technically used. For that reason, Reznic stated, DEQ needs to make sure that used equipment is allowed under the rule.
 - The committee member responded that when re-designating or swapping a device within a common fleet, it is not considered “used equipment” and that by allowing used equipment, DEQ opens itself up to fraudulent activity.

- Reznic clarified that the intent is for retrofit equipment to be purchased new. He explained that the rules justify the conditions under which a person can swap or re-designate equipment. He noted that DEQ would look into the committee member's concern further and discuss it with the Oregon Department of Justice.
- A second committee member suggested changing the language from "used equipment" to "re-designated equipment."
- Michael Skorupka (DEQ) followed up on the first committee member's question, noting that the language in 340-256-0560(2) says that registrants can only swap or re-designate a system with prior approval from DEQ. He asked if DEQ should add approval from the manufacturer to that requirement.
 - Reznic noted that approval from the manufacturer is already required because Section 1 of 340-256-0560 states that the swap or re-designation must comply with Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Section 2706(i) which requires prior manufacturer approval.

Final Questions

Penny Mabie opened the floor for final questions or comments from the committee members on any element of the proposed rules.

- A committee member suggested that DEQ needed provisions in the rule that would allow the agency to censure or remove people who were violating rules from the program. He suggested that given the amount of money related to the program, people would try to take advantage of it. He stated that DEQ needs to protect truckers, installers and manufacturers by removing bad actors. He specifically suggested that DEQ adopt rules on reporting similar to those that California has so that the agency can see where bad devices are being sold or if there are other problems.
 - A second committee member suggested that if DEQ includes punishments for not following the rules, then there should be a cure period to give people, especially small businesses, time to fix mistakes that unintentionally violate the rules.
 - Reznic responded to these concerns by noting that the protections and requirements that DEQ has for installers and manufacturers are similar to what California has. He explained that there are requirements for manufacturers to get on the CARB and EPA approved lists and they can also be removed from these lists because of complaints. He noted that since DEQ is only allowing CARB- or EPA-approved devices, these protections are built into the DEQ rules. He also explained that DEQ plans to have information on its website about how to remain in compliance with the program and will make staff available to answer questions. He also explained that if DEQ is missing any required forms or documentation from an applicant, then the agency will work with that applicant to resolve the issue.
- A committee member noted that this regulation only applies to medium- and heavy-duty trucks in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. He asked how the State intends to prevent someone from re-registering their truck outside of these counties and evading the rules. He stated that he has seen this occur in another state.
 - Reznic explained that for the purpose of this rulemaking, DEQ is only focusing on the retrofit criteria. He stated that he could not speak to registration or to people re-registering their vehicles in other counties. He explained that HB 2007 requires that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) report certain information and data to the legislature, and that DEQ is solely responsible for implementing this program for vehicles that need to register, renew or title in Clackamas, Multnomah or Washington County.

Draft Fiscal Impact Statement

Reznick explained that state agencies must provide estimated fiscal impacts for proposed rules (either positive or negative). He noted that if there is a possible significant adverse impact to small businesses, agencies must consider mitigation ideas.

He stated that the scope of the draft Fiscal Impact Statement is limited to the impact related to the proposed rules. He elaborated that State statute requires that this program exist, but the criteria and requirements in the proposed rules may impact the persons and entities identified in the draft Fiscal Impact Statement.

Reznick asked committee members if they had questions or comments on any general aspects of the draft Fiscal Impact Statement.

- A committee member noted that the Fiscal Impact Statement talks about the funding available for fleets to retrofit their vehicles. He asked if the State intends for the available funding to cover most of the vehicles that need retrofits.
 - Reznick noted that the committee member was referring to the grant program that is mentioned in the Fiscal Impact Statement. He explained that this grant program is part of HB 2007 and was adopted by the Environmental Quality Commission the week prior. He stated that the funds in that grant program are available for a variety of diesel projects including vehicles subject to retrofit rules in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. He explained that small businesses receive preference points in the grant applications. He also noted that the grant program is not exclusively for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles but also includes non-road vehicles, electrification, and locomotive projects, among others.

Will the Proposed Rules Have a Fiscal Impact?

Reznick explained that this rulemaking does not impose any mandatory requirements. He stated that for those who wish to participate in the program and retrofit medium- or heavy-duty trucks, DEQ anticipates that the proposed rules may have several fiscal and economic impacts. He said that the agency anticipates that persons, businesses, agencies and units of local government in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties who own or are considering purchasing a medium- or heavy-duty truck may experience fiscal or economic impacts because of the proposed rules. He noted that DEQ also anticipates that diesel retrofit installation companies, manufacturers of retrofit components, truck service departments, used truck parts manufacturing and distribution as well as businesses or persons who sell new and used vehicles may experience fiscal or economic impacts because of the proposed rules.

Reznick opened the floor to the committee to provide their input on the following question: Will the proposed rules have a fiscal impact?

- A committee member asked if state agencies, local governments and county governments would need to comply with the regulation.
 - Reznick confirmed that they would.
- A committee member noted that the agency needs to factor in the administrative costs for local governments and state agencies to comply with the program. She suggested that these would be a fiscal impact.
- A committee member stated that she was confused about the specificity of the Fiscal Impact Statement for the retrofit compliance component separate from the rest of the program. She noted that this program has key public health and public good benefits and that this retrofit compliance component is a key piece of the overall program. She stated that the fiscal impact of this element of the program can be mostly beneficial to regulated entities.

- A second committee member noted that she did not disagree with the first committee member. She stated that she would like to see a clear and easy to follow program, but that it should not exclude the fiscal impact. She explained that the question is not whether the program is a public good, but whether or not it has a fiscal impact.
- A committee member stated that the rules would have a fiscal impact but that he was not sure if it would be significant or not. He noted that the level of impact would be dependent on how DEQ approaches compliance as the program is implemented and how much of a burden that becomes for people installing retrofits.
- A committee member noted that it would cost approximately \$60 million to retrofit all affected vehicles (based on DEQ's assumption that there are 4,000 affected vehicles and the committee member's assumption that each retrofit costs an average of \$15,000). He noted that Oregon only has \$40 million in grant funding leaving a \$20 million shortfall.

The Extent of the Impact

Reznic explained that DEQ provided charts 1A and 1B in the draft Fiscal Impact Statement to include the approximate costs that have been provided by members currently on the Rulemaking Advisory Committee representing retrofit installation and or manufacturing companies.

He explained that negative fiscal impacts of the rules may include:

- The direct costs associated with the compliance option for registrants including equipment, installation, maintenance and repair of the approved retrofit technology.
- The indirect costs including the time spent preparing and submitting the retrofit approval application as well as the time associated with maintaining records for the retrofit certification and engaging in any necessary periodic verification.

He also noted that some of the positive fiscal impacts of the rules may include:

- An increase in sales and demand for services from retrofit manufacturers and installation companies (identified in Chart 1A and 1B). An increase in sales for truck service departments, used truck parts businesses, and businesses in truck part manufacturing and distribution due to higher demand for parts and services related to diesel retrofit components. Increased sales of new and used trucks as some owners may choose to purchase a truck with a newer engine model year rather than retrofitting their existing vehicle.

Reznic opened the floor for questions or comments from the committee. There were none.

Impact on Small Businesses

Reznic explained that this rulemaking does not impose any mandatory requirements for small businesses. He stated that businesses that choose retrofit compliance as an option for subject vehicles prescribed in ORS 803.591 are anticipated to incur costs associated with the installation and maintenance of retrofit technology devices (identified in Table 1A and Table 1B of the statement of fiscal and economic impact). Reznic noted that for the purpose of this rulemaking, Oregon defines small businesses as businesses with fewer than 50 employees.

Reznic also listed the following ways that DEQ is mitigating the negative impact of these rules on small businesses:

- DEQ is working on a separate rulemaking, authorized by HB 2007, to develop and implement a grant program for Oregon with available funds from the Environmental Mitigation Trust Agreement and small businesses will get preference points on their applications.

- DEQ is not imposing an application fee for certification, periodic verification or any of the services designed to facilitate the registration or titling processes with ODOT.
- The retrofit technology remains certified as long as the processes and criteria per the rule language are met.

Reznic opened the floor to the committee to provide their input on the following question: Do the proposed rules have a significant adverse impact on small businesses; if so, how could DEQ reduce that impact?

- A committee member noted that she read that small businesses will not necessarily be required to go through this process if they do not own a medium- or heavy-duty truck. She asked what percentage of grant funding small businesses could expect to get to cover their costs of retrofitting their vehicles?
 - Reznic noted that they could expect up to 100%.
 - A second committee member noted that they could expect up to 100% as long as the money lasts. He stated that the money probably will not last more than two years and there is little assistance to help people access the grant funding.
 - The first committee member asked if some of that funding could be set aside for small businesses and if more technical assistance could be provided.
 - A third committee member noted that there is a group with a contract to do outreach about the grant program to minority-owned and small businesses.
 - Gerik Kransky (DEQ) noted that the Environmental Quality Commission had adopted the rules for the Volkswagen Settlement Fund Grant Program so they are now final and waiting for approval from the Oregon Secretary of State. He summarized the available funding, noting that the Volkswagen Mitigation Trust allows the State to use \$10.9 million for administrative costs or technical assistance. He stated that the DEQ rules allow up to 15% of project costs to go towards technical assistance for applicants that are certified by Oregon's Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID-certified). Kransky explained that in addition to providing that technical assistance funding, DEQ staff will do everything they can to provide technical assistance.
- A committee member stated that outside of the retrofit compliance process, HB 2007 convened a joint task force that met to identify additional revenue sources to continue the implementation of diesel reduction programs beyond the Volkswagen funding. She suggested that committee members share their input and energy to advocate for a revenue package from the legislature.
 - A second committee member asked if a specific bill had been introduced to provide that funding.
 - The first committee member said that there was a bill coming out of Representative Rob Nosse's office, but it did not yet have a bill number.
- A committee member noted that he thought these rules would have an impact on small businesses and while DEQ has great programs to help reduce that impact, he was concerned that funding for those programs would run out and many small businesses would be left with no assistance. He noted that the public health benefits of diesel emission reductions are indisputable, so he suggested providing permanent funding to get older diesel equipment retrofitted or off the road.
 - A second committee member agreed.
- A committee member asked how many vehicles would be impacted by the rules. He noted that based on a database he has access to, he thinks there are only 592 vehicles that will be impacted by the 2023 deadline, and only 406 of them are candidates for retrofits. He also noted that these numbers did not take the exemptions from HB 2007 into account. He suggested that there should be enough funding from the Volkswagen grants to retrofit all of these vehicles.
 - Reznic explained that the first engine model year (EMY) phase out and retrofit compliance opportunity will occur in 2023 when vehicles with an EMY of 1996 and older will have to be

phased out or retrofit. He noted that the numbers the committee member mentioned sounded accurate based on the number provided to DEQ in May of 2020, but DEQ is working with ODOT to get a full picture of how many vehicles will be impacted based on the requirements and exemptions of HB 2007.

- A committee member stated that there are several exemptions in HB 2007, but the legislation does not say that exempted vehicles cannot participate voluntarily. He noted that they could apply for funding to support their retrofits, even if they are not required to install a retrofit.
 - Reznic noted that he believed that to be the case and stated that the Volkswagen Grants and other Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) funding opportunities are available for whomever applies and meets the criteria.
 - Kransky confirmed that anyone could apply for Volkswagen grant funding, but that any business subject to the regulation will receive a preference point for their application.

Public Comment

Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues) opened the floor for public comments. No observers shared a comment. Mabie noted that the deadline for written comments is February 2, 2021, at 5 p.m. She stated that written comments could be emailed to HDDR&R2021@deq.state.or.us.

Next Steps

Reznic explained that DEQ would revise the rules based on this conversation and open a public comment period on the final proposed rules from mid-March to mid-April. He stated that DEQ will present the proposed rule package to the Environmental Quality Commission for approval in July 2021.

Reznic thanked the committee members for their input and the meeting adjourned.

Alternative formats

DEQ can provide documents in an alternate format or in a language other than English upon request. Call DEQ at 800-452-4011 or email deqinfo@deq.state.or.us.