

## BEFORE THE

## UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS LOUISIANA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In the matter of:

PUBLIC MEETING

STATUS OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS IN LOUISIANA

FOLLOW-UP TO THE 1993 LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

Best Western-Richmond Suites Hotel 2600 Moeling Lake Charles, Louisiana

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

PRESIDING:

Roberta Madden, Chairperson Louisiana Advisory Committee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

ROBERTA MADDEN, Chairperson, Baton Rouge LORNA E. BOURG, New Iberia DR. ROBERT L. FORD, Baton Rouge SALVADOR G. LONGORIA, New Orleans MICHAEL R. MORRIS, Metairie GLENDA KELLER PARKS, Baton Rouge RUPERT F. RICHARDSON, Baton Rouge FARELLA ROBINSON, New Orleans STACY E. SEICSHNAYDRE, New Orleans





## INDEX

SPEAKER	PAGE
Melvin L. Jenkins	7
Mark McMurray	10
Michael Tritico	30
Damu Smith	57
Jerry Clifford	75
Monique Harden	106
Peggy Franklin	122
Lois Malvo	124
Edgar Mouton	139
Elizabeth Teel	155
Elizabeth Alderman	157
John Koeferl	180
Pam Dashiell	180
Gerald J. Dicharry	208
Tia Edwards	233
Edward J. Flynn	239
Richard Metcalf	276
Geoffrey Reeder	298
Milton Neal	312
Mike Glackin	. 334
Mike Kerlegon	340
Monica Welch	344
Betty Gasaway	346
Bill Easter * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	357
Lanny Roy	382

\_\_\_\_

SPEAKER	PAGE
Deborah Ramirez	387
Teresa Richard	391
James A. Bellamy	394
Patricia Gotte	397
Lee A. Sherman	402
Allerine Pat Hartman	404
Harold Areno	406

## PROCEEDINGS

MS. MADDEN: I need to ask all the members of our State Advisory Committee to take a seat. I think we all are here.

And Ms. Robinson from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is going to sit right here.

The meeting of the Louisiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights shall come to order. For the benefit of those in our audience I'm going to introduce myself and our colleagues. My name is Roberta Madden. I'm from Baton Rouge, and I'm the chairperson of this advisory committee.

The members of the committee are -- I'd like to start over on my left -- Dr. Beverly Wright, Glenda Parks,.

Bob Ford, Lorna Bourg. This is Fay Robinson, who is on the staff of the Civil Rights Commission. Rupert Richardson, Michael Morris, and Stacy Seicshnaydre.

Also present with us are Melvin Jenkins,
Director, Fay Robinson, who you've already met, Ascension
Hernandez, Civil Rights Analyst, and Jo Ann Daniels,
administrative assistant to the Central Regional Office
Director of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

We're here today to conduct a fact-finding meeting to assess the progress or lack thereof regarding the status of environmental justice issues and civil

rights in Louisiana since our committee's report in 1993, which was called The Battle for Environmental Justice and the People. There are copies of that in the back of the room.

The focus of our review are the communities in Calcasieu Parish. However, environmental concerns in other parts of the state will also be reviewed. During a major session of our meeting on Wednesday, the committee will also take a careful look at where residents can turn for civil rights assistance related to the environment, housing, education, health, and legal services at the federal, state and local level.

The jurisdiction of the U.S. Civil Rights

Commission includes discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, national origin, or in the administration of justice.

I'd like to add that the State Advisory

Committee has no enforcement powers, but we try to turn a searchlight onto these issues related to civil rights.

The proceedings of our meeting, which are being recorded by a public stenographer, Ms. Wall, will be sent to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for its advice and consideration. Information provided may also be used by our advisory committee to plan our future activities.

At the outset, I'd like to remind everyone present of the ground rules. This is a public meeting open to the media and the general public. We have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations within the limited time we have available.

The time allotted for each presentation must be strictly adhered to. This will include a presentation by each participant, followed by questions from our committee members. To accommodate persons who have not been invited but wish to make statements, we have scheduled open periods on our agenda during the evening session tonight at 8:15 p.m. and tomorrow at eight o'clock.

Anyone wishing to make a statement during that period should contact a staff member for scheduling.

There's also a sign-up sheet on the table outside of this room, and if you would like to make a statement, please sign that up and make a notation that you would like to do so.

Written statements may also be submitted to committee members or staff here today, or you may send them by mail to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Gateway Tower II, 400 State Avenue, Suite 908, Kansas City, Kansas, 66101-2406. The record of this meeting will close on October 13 2000.

Though some of the statements made here today

may be controversial, we want to make sure that all invited guests do not defame or degrade any person or organization. In order to assure that all aspects of the issues are represented, knowledgeable persons with a wide variety of experience and viewpoints have been invited to share information with us.

Any person or any organization that feels defamed or degraded by statements made in these proceedings should contact the staff during the meeting so that we can provide a chance for public response.

Alternately, such persons or organizations can file written statements for inclusion in the proceedings. I urge all persons making presentation to be judicious in your statements.

The advisory committee appreciates the willingness of all participants to share their views and experiences with the committee.

I'm going to call on Mr. Melvin Jenkins now who will share some opening remarks with you.

MR. JENKINS: To the members of the Louisiana Advisory Committee, I'm very happy to be with you this afternoon and this morning.

The topic that you are undertaking is a very important topic, not only to the citizens of Louisiana but to the nation as a whole. In 1993, this committee

released a report on environmental justice that set the tone for our national commission to take a look at

environmental justice issues.

The particular report has sparked a lot of conversation and a lot of discussion among our commissioners. It was recently noted in a meeting last month that this report on environmental justice has been at the foremost requested report in the history of the commission.

We have important tasks. You have an important task, an awesome responsibility as the eyes and ears for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Not only are we following up on the 1993 report but one of the important segments that we will be dealing with for the next couple of days is: Where do citizens turn for civil rights enforcement matters?

So often in our travels through the United

States that we handle, we encounter a lot of persons not

knowing how and where to file complaints on civil rights

in terms of employment, in terms of fair housing, in terms

of public accommodation, education.

As a segment of this particular meeting, we have invited representatives from federal and state agencies to provide information to you, the committee members, and to the general public on where and how to

turn for civil rights information.

As we go through the deliberation for the next couple of days, we often ask: Where do we go after we leave Lake Charles? What happens? The committee has the responsibility of gathering all the information from these two days in addition to the thousands of pages of information that we have collected for the last eight months.

All this information will culminate in a written report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

That report will be shared not only with the commissioners in Washington, both the citizens of the state and with members of Congress.

We have a responsibility that's been charged by the Federal Advisory Committee Act to have copies of our report in all regional libraries so our report will be completely accessible to the general public.

As we look at the topic of environmental justice, we have invited many federal officials, state officials, community organizations. We've also invited the Governor of the state, but unfortunately, he or a representative could not appear today.

But as we review the information, let's keep in mind that you are the eyes and ears for the U.S.

Commission on Civil Rights. You have the responsibility

of keeping us apprised as to developments on civil rights matters. Not only in the field of environmental justice but any civil rights matter that comes to your attention, you have that responsibility as the eyes and ears for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

I wish you a very successful meeting. I will be in and out of the meeting for the next couple of days, and I'm quite sure, with the able guidance of the staff, that you will receive the information that's necessary for us to provide a well-written and well-documented report to our commissioners in Washington.

Thank you.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Jenkins.

First we're going to hear from the Honorable

Mark McMurray, the parish administrator for the Calcasieu

Parish Police Jury.

Welcome, Mr. McMurray. For the record, would you please state your name and your occupation.

MR. McMURRAY: Yes, ma'am. My name is Mark
McMurray. I'm parish administrator for Calcasieu Parish,
under the auspices of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury.

I want to make it clear at the outset, I was introduced to Mr. Jenkins earlier. As the president of the police jury, I have never run for political office nor do I intend to do\_so. I am an appointed official by the

members of the members of the police jury.

I want to apologize to you at the outset for my voice. I'm about five days into a nasty summer cold, and I'm going to do the best I can. I know it's as grating on your ears as it is on my throat, so --

On behalf of my bosses, the 15 elected members of the police jury, I am pleased to welcome you and your staff to Calcasieu Parish. We certainly look forward to being your hosts over the next couple of days, and hope that somewhere amid your very busy schedule you will find a little time to enjoy the beauty and hospitality of Calcasieu.

We also look forward to hearing what the distinguished presenters and the wide array of interests they represent have to say about us and our quality of life here in Calcasieu Parish. My compliments to you and your staff for putting together such a broad spectrum of speakers with such varied backgrounds and missions.

It appears you've covered the waterfront of ideas and opinions, and you will no doubt have conflicting views expressed to you over the next couple of days.

While I'm severely underqualified to debate on the same level the environmental justice concept with many of those that will speak during your hearings here, I can say with some degree of confidence, as a person who has

2 except
3 school
4 admini

spent his entire life in Calcasieu Parish with the exception of time away for undergraduate and graduate schools, and who has spent the last 24 years in an administrative capacity in parish government here, I can say to you that when it comes to environmental issues in general, we are perhaps neither as good as we are striving to be nor as bad as some would have you believe.

The parish's role in regulating environmental matters is limited under Louisiana state statutes, as you know. However, Calcasieu Parish has exercised over the years the limited authority available to us under the statutes in ways that have proven helpful in environmental issues.

A few examples of the policy jury's actions.

One, almost 40 years ago the police jury used their statutory authority to establish industrial districts, which created certain tax advantages for industries developing or expanding within those boundaries. But which more importantly clearly defined areas within the parish where industry was to grow -- it was to go and to grow.

These districts have changed very little over the years and the public has been quite safe, I think, in relying on these long-ago set boundaries as primary locations for industrial development.

·18

Secondly, the police jury has administered a comprehensive zoning program since the late 1970s providing for ample public notice and hearings on any proposed changes in land use throughout the parish. Zoning processes weren't perfect, but the advance notice and the healthy exchange of ideas provide the public and the decision-makers with opportunities not available in communities without zoning provisions.

Third, the parish most recently took a leadership role in the establishment of the Calcasieu Estuary community task force, which I chair. The makeup of this group is perhaps the best example of a broadbased community effort that you will find in any community in this state or nation.

It was developed in response to EPA's announcement that they were going to perform a study of the Calcasieu Estuary that could possibly result in a declaration of a Superfund designation or a national priorities listing.

To lose control of our community's destiny in such an important way, we felt, was unnecessary and unthinkable. We went to work immediately to assemble this task force which brings together at one table for the first time public officials from the local, state and federal agencies and levels, citizens representing

\_

environmental groups within the parish, industry leaders at the decision-making level, professors from McNeese State University departments of environmental science and economics, and resource persons from six federal and state regulatory agencies.

The mission statement of the task force is succinct and focused. It is to provide community-based leadership in ensuring that the current condition of the estuary is accurately determined and that timely, optimum corrective actions are taken so that designation of the estuary as a Superfund site will not be necessary.

This group is in its infancy, but we are growing quickly. The dialogue has been informational, enlightening, and occasionally lively, but we remain focused on the mission. Members of this task force have been invited to be featured panelists at the 2001 conference of the Louisiana Environmental Health Association in New Orleans in January.

The toughest part of our job lies ahead, but I believe we will measure up to the task, and by working together collaboratively, we will accomplish our mission. On behalf of the police jury, I submit to you my belief that our heart's in the right place and that our goal is to not only -- is not only to do things right but to do the right things.

We welcome your findings, your suggestions, and your criticisms about how we can do better. We covet your compliments on things we have done and are doing that are right and good.

Again, welcome to Calcasieu Parish. I appreciate the opportunity to address you this morning and hope that your stay here is both productive and enjoyable.

Thank you.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. McMurray.

Are there questions? Yes.

If you could stay for a moment on this board?

MS. MADDEN: Ms. Borg.

MS. BORG: Good morning.

MR. McMURRAY: Good morning.

MS. BORG: The Estuary task force, Calcasieu . Estuary task force -- when did it start? How old is it?

MR. McMURRAY: We got cranked up in the spring -- or excuse me; in the fall of last year. We had our first meeting really in January, and we've been operating through this year. We've had several meetings this year.

MS. BORG: Some of the readings that I've been doing showed that there were dioxin levels detected in people as far back as '96. The other thing that you said was that 40 years ago there were established industrial

boundaries. How do those boundaries work with air emissions?

MR. McMURRAY: I am so ill-prepared from a technical point of view to really discuss some of those. Those are not things I'm really that aware of in terms of --

MS. BORG: But even if you were to set the boundaries and there were hearings so that people knew where the industrial areas were, if in fact there is some release that is beyond that, then I don't understand how the 40 years ago notice to the public that these are the boundaries would work.

MR. McMURRAY: Well, I mean, I guess if you -and this is speaking entirely from a layman's point of
view, because I am not a scientist. I'm a manager, okay.
You know, given a stiff wind, we have problems. What we
have tried to do is put working with the local industries
and what's called the Care Group.

We have established sirens in numerous locations throughout the parish that will notify residents in areas that are anywhere close to industry that there is some sort of release. They've been instructed to go in their homes and turn on a radio or TV to find out what is where.

There've been efforts taken to try to solve

that problem. I don't know -- if you look at the 1 industrial districts within the parish, what I can tell you, and I don't think this is any great profound notion Ż here, but the industrial districts pretty well follow the lines of the Calcasieu River, for obvious reasons. deep water channel coming up there serves most of these industries.

That was part of the reason the public voted, I think, back in the late '20s to dredge the river and have the channel put in, so the industrial districts really kind of follow up on the river.

MS. BORG: Last question I have, if I may. You mentioned you're limited in what the parish can do, but that one of the things the parish does have at its disposal is tax advantages. How has the police jury used the tax advantages to perhaps take action where an industry -- you know, where there's a serious problem that's been brought to your attention?

MR. McMURRAY: Good question. What we have -one of the -- as you know, the five- and ten-year tax exemptions that are available to industry are not decisions for the police jury. The State Commerce and Industry Board is the agency that divvies up those tax incentives.

But the one area that the policy jury has some

25

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

control of tax incentives for industry is the enterprise zone program. And what we have done here that was unique to this area -- I don't know that any other area in the state has done this with their enterprise zone program -- is we put some regulations in that require any industry asking for an enterprise zone designation to stipulate to any violations, any air quality, water quality, or any environmental violations that they have against them -- that has to be submitted on their application, and the police jury has the right, or have given themselves the right, to consider that as to whether or not to grant an enterprise zone designation, which of course carries with it sales tax advantages, corporate franchise tax advantages in terms of number of employees and that sort of thing.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Dr. Wright.

DR. WRIGHT: Yes. I'm just wondering if you have demographics for the industrial districts that were carved out 40 years ago by race and income; people who live near or around those districts? Is that information available?

MR. McMURRAY: Yes. It's available. I don't have that, but it is available. It would be a matter --

DR. WRIGHT: You could make that --

MR. McMURRAY: -- of taking census tracts

and -- sure, we could do that without too much trouble. 1 DR. WRIGHT: So you don't have it readily 2 available. You have to produce it? 3 MR. McMURRAY: Yes. DR. WRIGHT: I'd like to see that. 5 MS. MADDEN: Yes. We would appreciate it if 6 you could get that for us. 7 MR. McMURRAY: Sure. 8 MS. MADDEN: All right. Dr. Richardson. 9 DR. RICHARDSON: Good morning, sir. 10 MR. McMURRAY: Good morning. 11 DR. RICHARDSON: My voice thing is due to old 12 It takes about a couple of hours for it to clear up, 13 so I apologize back to you. 14 I was concerned, too, as Lorna was about 15 16 statutory limitations. And I'm not sure exactly what 17 those are. I very much understand the asset of the tax What I was concerned about is whether or not there 18 base. 19 are things that the police jury would like to have under its jurisdiction but for those limitations. 20 21 I'm a person who kind of hangs around the Capitol. I'm a glutton for punishment, I guess. And I 22 would very much be interested in statutory relief that 23 24 would help you to make the environment better, and the

commission can consider what or if it wants to do

25

something on that.

MR. McMURRAY: Well, on the tax side, which, as the question prior indicated, the tax side -- the tax incentives are a great way to perhaps enhance environmental concerns that local governments would have. We have passed resolution after resolution asking the state to allow us to have some play, some authority, in the giving of the ten-year tax exemption.

It's interesting that the State of Louisiana has a ten-year tax exemption, but they have no ad valorem tax that's collected for the state, so that in effect, the state agency that is delving out the tax exemptions for -- ad valorem tax exemptions -- are really messing with our tax base; not their own.

And we felt like that should give -- that should cause rise for something to be done to allow us to have some input in that. However, we've been unsuccessful in those -- in that area.

DR. RICHARDSON: Might you be able to submit to us some ideas that the police jury would like to see that would --

MR. McMURRAY: Sure. Sure.

DR. RICHARDSON: -- assist you in doing your work?

MR. McMURRAY: Happy to try to do that. Yes,

.

ma'am.

DR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

MS. MADDEN: Any other questions? Ms. Seicshnaydre.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: Yes. I just wondered in order to avoid the Superfund designation, it sounds like you've developed a task force; the Estuary task force.

Does that task force -- and you may have mentioned this already -- have specific goals for reducing toxicity releases, or have you gotten there yet? What are your specific goals as part of that task force?

MR. McMURRAY: The specific goal as stated in the mission was to identify the current -- whatever current level of contamination was there and to establish what available corrective actions were in place and to try, as a community, to see that those corrective actions were taking place so as not to cause the EPA, if they were inclined to do this anyway, to name us as a Superfund site for the obvious reasons.

No area wants to have that kind of a tag established on it. Now, I can tell you that since the creation of the task force for that very specific mission, since the creation of this committee, there have been several suggestions about how we could expand the committee's role into a number of other areas.

One's been suggested as air quality and some other areas. The task force has yet to take up any of those considerations, because it's trying to stay focused on its original mission. At the conclusion of that, which should be some time, I'm told, by summer of '01, at that time I think it would be fair to say, I think the task force is going to have to address some of these other requests that have come in for it to deal with.

MS. MADDEN: Any other questions down here?

All right. Ms. Borg, did you have another one?

MS. BORG: Just -- I know that we're going to

have testimony on some other industries today -- PPG and I

think Condea Vista. Do you know if either of those two

industries are in the enterprise zone area that receives

the tax breaks?

MR. McMURRAY: Offhand, I would say I don't think either of those have been granted enterprise zone designations. I don't know that they've applied. I'm not sure.

MS. MADDEN: Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: On the Calcasieu Estuary community task force, what's the makeup and how are they appointed?

MR. McMURRAY: The police jury appointed them.

It is a committee made up of a representative of the local governing body, the mayor of the City of Lake Charles,

representative of Congressman Johns' office, Senator

Landrieu's office, the Port of Lake Charles, which is also
a public body.

It also includes three citizens representing environmental committee or environmental interests locally, local Calcasieu Parish citizens. It has two members of the faculty of McNeese State University; one in environmental science, one in economics.

It has four representatives of industry broken down into a refinery that was part of what was called a Sea-Ag group, and that's kind of a long explanation there, but that was a group that was put together at one time that tended to dissolve or drop in numbers.

A chemical plant that was part of Sea-Ag, a continuing member of Sea-Ag that -- one of the few that was left, and then lastly, an industry that was not involved in Sea-Ag, and that is a new industry. Was not -- because the look at this estuary thing was to look at situations that developed some 30 years ago.

So to kind of be fair, wanted to put an industry on there that was only developed here in recent times to provide some perspective to that. And then in conjunction with those people, we have six federal and state regulatory agencies; one from EPA Superfund, one from EPA RCRA, the DEQ, the Department of Health and

.1

Hospitals, the Federal U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the NOAA service that works together with the Superfund people.

So it's quite a broad collection of folks; a lot of varied interests and a, you know, real diverse background to the committee.

MR. McMURRAY: We've met so far averaging probably every couple of months, as what we've tried to do is track our meetings together with events that are part of the Superfund study, as information comes available.

As that information flow begins to pick up a little steam, we will meet more often. We've just tracked our meetings

MS. PARKS: Do you meet on a regular or what?

MS. PARKS: Thank you.

with information flow.

MS. MADDEN: Dr. Ford.

DR. FORD: I just want to pursue a little bit Ms. Richardson's line of questioning relative to local authority in environmental matters. As an administrator for a parish police jury, and if you can speak to some degree relative to your bosses, is there a notion that local government should have a more substantial involvement in enforcement, regulatory issues associated with environment.

And could you go even further to say anything

about whether there were discussions at the level of the Louisiana Police Jury Association in terms of the devolution from state to local, because our history shows that enforcement clearly was a federal authority oriented issue that has now become very much accepted as a state enforcement mechanism.

Should we look forward to and is there any good reason to think that we should move to the local level in terms of enforcement?

MR. McMURRAY: That's a good question. I'll just answer it with an opinion is about all I can give you. Trying to state what the position of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury is on almost issue is pretty tough. As a governing body of 15 members, as you can imagine, there's widespread opinion and disagreement over almost any matter that comes. There's very few unanimous opinions on things, as you can well imagine.

I'm sure you run into that with your committee here. So to speak to what they, as a body, wants to do is kind of tough. There are some members, I believe, have expressed in the past that they would like to see more regulation available to them in environmental matters.

There are others that believe that that's just adding one more layer of government. When you have EPA and the DEQ already there, that that's putting a very

highly technical regulatory situation in the hands of local elected officials who would have to hire technical staff that are -- because staffs generally are not prepared to do that.

We have a very highly professional planning staff, but they are not microbiologists. They are not trained in environmental science. We would have to beef up our staff to do that.

So I think it's a good news/bad news story.

There is some plus to be able to have additional regulation to somewhat control your own community's destiny in some ways. Yet the price tag for that, in both actual dollars and in adding one more level of bureaucracy to an already fairly heavy-laden bureaucracy is not viewed by some as a good positive step.

MS. MADDEN: Are there any other questions?

All right. I have one. Would you please
identify resources and/or civil rights assistance that are
available in your parish to help citizens who have
concerns about the environment, housing, health,
education, legal, and health services. Where can they go
for help?

MR. McMURRAY: I think there'd be several areas. The public library system in Calcasieu is among the best systems in the state. They have a wealth of

information on all the topics that you just mentioned.

In addition to that, the EPA has opened an outreach office here as part of their Calcasieu Estuary initiative that has available for citizens online services and computer services where they can go in and get all the latest data that is part of the Calcasieu Estuary initiative.

The McNeese State University library, I am told, has significant resources on a lot of those environmental -- on data. They are a repository for a lot of the data that has been collected over the years. We have numerous environmental committees in the parish that are made up of citizens who have their own source of resources that are also available.

I don't know that that -- that my statement there is an all-inclusive list, but that's an attempt to try to give you an idea of the kind of resources we have.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Thank you. I also wondered -- are you familiar with environmental concerns in Mossville and Willow Springs? We've been given some background about some concerns raised in those areas.

MR. McMURRAY: Some. I read the -- in your 1993 report about the Willow Springs issue, and of course we are somewhat aware of that from discussions that took place at that time over a period of years.

1	MS. MADDEN: Okay. You haven't taken any
2	action or been in a position to do that?
3	MR. McMURRAY: No, ma'am.
4	MS. MADDEN: Any other questions?
5	All right. We thank you very much, Mr.
6	McMurray.
7	MR. McMURRAY: Sure. My pleasure. Thank you.
8	MS. MADDEN: Our next presenter is Jerry
9	Clifford, the regional administrator of the U.S.
10	Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI. Is Mr.
11	Clifford here? Perhaps not.
12	VOICE: Excuse me.
13	MS. MADDEN: Yes, ma'am.
14	VOICE: I'm sorry. Are we supposed to be
15	hearing this? I'm not hearing a thing, and I've made a
16	motion that I cannot hear.
17	MS. MADDEN: You can't hear? Oh, I'm sorry.
18	VOICE: And the speaker, Mr. McMurray, I can
19	barely hear.
20	(Pause.)
21	MS. MADDEN: Well, if Mr. Clifford is not here,
22	maybe he'll come later.
23	Okay. Yes. If you would, raise your hand if
24	you can't hear us. That will help us.
25	VOICE: Is Mr Smith here?

MS. MADDEN: Damu Smith. 1 VOICE: We can go to Mr. Mike Tritico from the 2 Calcasieu League of Environment Action now, because I 3 4 don't see Mr. Mouton. MS. MADDEN: What about Monique Harden? No? 5 Okav. Edgar Mouton. Lois Malvo. Okay. Some of these 6 people are not scheduled until a little bit later on. 7 VOICE: Here's Mr. Damu Smith. 8 MR. SMITH: I didn't hear you exactly --9 VOICE: Okay. Mr. Smith is here now. Mr. 10 Smith is here now. 11 MS. MADDEN: Mr. Smith. Yes. Come right --12 13 come forward. Oh, okay! VOICE: Mr. Smith just walked in. 14 MS. MADDEN: Okay. Damu Smith. Okay. We're 15 ready for you if you're ready for us. Yes. If you don't 16 mind coming ahead right now? Are you prepared to do that? 17 MR. SMITH: Okay. 18 MS. MADDEN: Damu Smith is with Greenpeace USA 19 20 out of Washington, D.C. Come forward and sit right here if you would 21 please, Mr. Smith. We're putting you in a little bit 22 ahead of where you were expecting to be. 23 MR. SMITH: Yes, and I need a -- I was sort of. 24

25

planning that time.

the people of Willow Springs since -- well, I guess about

25

ġ

1976. That's in Calcasieu Parish. I grew up here in Calcasieu Parish.

I've known Mr. McMurray for many years, and two or things he said I'd like to clarify or give my perspective. I've worked with Mr. Lanny Roy, who's going to speak tonight, for maybe 20-something years.

It's been a long hard fight; a real long hard fight, and we have, in Louisiana, in my opinion, traded the old way of life for new ways of death. We had a renewable resource-based economy. We could eat the fish, which we can no longer do in Calcasieu Parish.

We had the trees. The trees are dying. We had good clean milk from the cows, good gardens, and now all of that's threatened. In 1997 I organized some blood tests, and I tested the people of Bayou d'Inde, Mossville, Hackberry, De Ridder, and we had a hospital sample that was 100 people blended together. That was our control sample.

We wanted to know how the people in these most impacted neighborhoods would compare to a background sample. What was shocking was that the background sample, 100 people blended together, turned out to be five times the national average for the worse dioxin 2378-TCDD.

And then Mossville turned out to be 17 percent higher than the background sample. That was very, very

scary, but then Bayou d'Inde turned out to be 13 percent higher than Mossville; or 30 percent higher than the background sample. And that is really scary.

Now, Mossville and Bayou d'Inde neighborhoods are the neighborhoods closest to the fluorinated hydrocarbon factories. And what this should tell everybody is we have got a serious health problem here in Calcasieu Parish. But also it should tell you that what is happening here is not contained. There's no fence.

If you look at what's happening in the estuary, you know that it's running down through the waters headed for the Gulf. If you look at what's happening in the air, you can see acid rain up to the northeast. You can see in Beauregard Parish, there's a high cancer rate, and they don't have the chlorinated hydrocarbon industries there.

So what's happening here in Calcasieu is a bellwether that affects the whole planet. We've said that Calcasieu is the front line in a global war for survival of the human species, as well as the animals. This is something that some of us have thought for many, many years.

well, that was a tragedy. We were complaining, some of us. They called us environmental wacko's and eco freaks, and we were saying, The air is terrible around here. The

fish are dying.

So what they did, they said, Okay. Well, we'll just stop dumping it in the river as much, and we'll stop putting it in the air as much. We'll take it to some hazardous waste sites. So it's partly our fault that they took it to Willow Springs.

They told the people -- people out there said,
What are you digging those big pits? They said, Oh, we're
going to build a resort. We're going to give you all
jobs. Those are swimming pools. Well, that was the first
lie. Into those pits came thousands and thousands of
truckloads of hazardous chemicals.

The hazardous waste stream that caused the Rawlins incinerator upset came from the PPG site here in Calcasieu Parish. But they were also putting it into the pits at Willow Springs. The Exxon waste stream that caused a problem at Grand Bayou came to the Willow Springs.

All of these different classic, famous hazardous waste streams that have caused problems in other neighborhoods -- they've all come to Willow Springs and its open pits and its tombs. And the people of Willow Springs were dying.

In 1968 Mabel Jones, Mabel Rigmaden [phonetic], said, We can't take this. We're dying. And she passed a





petition in 1968, and here we are in the year 2000, and Mabel's family -- many of them have died. They've had birth defects; not just Mabel. Just the whole neighborhood has had a terrible nightmare.

So we -- those of us that were environmental activists were asked, If you really think you got problems down there in Lake Charles, come to Willow Springs. And I went, and I said, Well, this is where my grandfather's swamp is. He had a swamp out there, and I realized, yes, this is terrible.

We couldn't breathe. Our skin felt like they were putting needles in it. But those people lived there 24 hours a day. That was their life. They had been there because it was a beautiful pristine place. They could raise their cows, they could have their pecan trees. They loved it. And they were away from all the rat race and politics, and here comes this resort full of hazardous waste.

There were black people, there were white people, there were rich people, there were poor people. There were Christians and Jews, Protestants and Catholics, but everybody was dying, and they knew it. So they all worked together. That to me is the heroic truth of Calcasieu Parish was the Willow Springs fight, which still goes on.

Those people, with help from outside as much as anybody could do, have worked together since 1968 with no infighting. It's a model of the American way, the way we're supposed to do things; yet we failed. Now, if you do it the right way, if you don't go blow up the injection well, if you don't ambush the convoys with your deer rifles -- things that were talked about and rejected -- if we don't do those wrong things, we're supposed to win. But we lost.

A civil suit was filed in 1980. It got to trial in 1994. Now, that's environmental injustice right there. Fourteen years before it got to a jury, and what happened? Who came before the jury? Before the jury came former state regulators and even one state regulator that was still on the staff and is still on the staff at DEQ.

And the impression they gave the jury was,
These people are their own worst enemy, because they
complained, because they did petitions, because they went
to the DNR, the ECC hearings and all of those things and
raised hell, because of all that uproar, we, the DEQ,
couldn't issue the permits. So the company was
grandfathered in.

Therefore, it's the people's own fault that they suffered. If they'd shut up and if they'd just bowed down and let us handle it, they wouldn't have had all

these problems for so many years. And you know, the jury bought it.

The foreman of the jury was a hazardous waste tank car regulator. Now, if I'd been a lawyer, I wouldn't have let him on the jury. I'd have used one of my preemptive challenges. For some reason, they let him on the jury, and I think that was a factor.

Now, I don't think that was the only factor in the jury's decision, but the upshot is the civil suit was lost. The tremendous pressure that the people put on has had some results, and I think it was through the help of the Creator more than any bureaucrats or any politicians.

I think that the Lord Jesus had mercy, because he saw these people were dying and suffering and praying. They never quit praying. We always opened our meetings with prayers. That's what made the difference as far as I can see.

I don't see any real evidence that any of the stuff we did with all of the meetings really made much of a difference. Some science helped. The Creator gives us knowledge. He gives us the way to look for facts. We drilled wells. We had -- the former governor, Edwin Edwards -- which is a sad tale in itself; thank goodness he's going to jail -- anyway, he would never help us.

He had a meeting with us, and we got there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

finally to the state -- I mean, the governor's mansion. We sat around in a circle. He kept us waiting an hour and a half. He came in, and he pitched this ring, this big jewel-encrusted gold ring, across the room to some guy who grabbed it, and Edwards said, How much you think that's worth? And the man said, Well, probably about 15-, \$20,000.

Edwards went over and picked it up and said, Now that's reality. And he walked out. And that was reality. That was reality. Then they -- the Democrats knew that they were -- we getting ready to have an economic recession, so they let a Republican governor go in. His name was Treen. They let him go in and take the fall.

But he gave us \$150,000 from his emergency fund, and we drilled wells. We drilled a well right outside the Willow Springs fence, because Willow Springs Company was saying, We got clay underneath all this stuff. It's not going to get in your drinking water.

So we drilled a well on the outside of the Hurricane fence, and we hit sand. It was the 200-foot sand of the Chicot Aquifer, came all the way to the top. And we found chemicals in there. And Mr. Vincent, who was drinking from his shallow well, his wife had died of cancer. His next wife had died of cancer.

His neighbor across the driveway that was hooked into that same well died of cancer. Mr. Benois [phonetic] died of asthma, because he couldn't afford the inhalers like I had. That cluster of people right there on the fence line, right there where all that so-called clay was, they're all dead now. They're all dead. They were the most exposed, and they're dead.

The sheriff's department did go tell Mr.

Vincent, You can't drinking from that well because we checked it. The sheriff's department -- the crime lab -- I got the crime lab to go do some tests. We couldn't get real tests. I mean, it's been a nightmare all the way through.

But science every now and then has helped, and that's where -- that's why I did the blood tests. I knew that if we could just get some hard data, maybe we'd have a breakthrough. So it's been a long hard struggle. The people have done things right.

I know I'm probably at my 15 minutes. I could just go on forever. I would like to say a couple of things about Mr. McMurray's presentation. He said that the new estuary task force, which first was named the Calcasieu River Remedial Action Plan Task Force, CRRAP, the CRRAP task force, they've renamed it.

Well, anyway, he said that was the first time

different parties. But the truth is there was another task force -- the Governor's Calcasieu Estuary

Environmental Task Force, and it had almost the same kind of representation.

there was ever a body with broad representation of many

It went on for about five or six years, and Representative Dan Flavin of Lake Charles crushed it.

Told the Governor Foster, Don't renew it. About six months later Superfund -- I mean EPA -- said, Well, no more task force. What are we going to do? We're going to have to take over and just declare the place a Superfund probably and do something, because locally, obviously, there's too much political resistance.

So they -- EPA started talking about Superfund, and here comes Flavin saying, Wait, wait. We need a task force. We need to do this locally. So they created the CRRAP task force, which they then promptly renamed. So that's one thing that was a little bit -- Mark is -- was new. He was dragged into this, so he doesn't know a lot of the history.

But another thing he said was that the enterprise zone is the only involvement that police jury has in the financial leverage that you were asking about, and could it not be used to help bring about environmental justice.

Industrial Development Board, which is a function of the -- it's a subunit of the police jury. They give low interest loans. They arrange low interest loans for companies. And the low interest loans are paid to whoever lends them who don't have to pay taxes.

So it's a double advantage for the financial community. But who gets these loans? Not the small business people, but the same giant companies that get the ten-year exemptions at the state level. And I have gone to those meetings and said, Wait a minute. You're getting ready to give a big loan to PPG or somebody to build a whole new incinerator or something.

Now, if somebody I knew wanted to get this much money at this low interest and have all this time to pay it back, could you give them the loan? Oh, no, no. We're trying to enhance economic development. But they call it pollution enhancement loans, and most of those projects, or many of those projects that they financed have actually contributed to the problems.

Mark did mention something about 30 years ago the problem began developing. Here's another place where government failed. That was one of the things Ms.

Robinson asked me to talk about is examples of how government failed.

In 1972, soon after EPA was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

created, it came down, looked at the estuary and said to PPG, Hey, you're putting some stuff in there that's going to build up in the seafood. This could be a hazard to the people who eat the seafood, and it could cost you your seafood industry. Stop doing that.

Well, no response. Three years later in 1975 they did -- the EPA came and did another report and said, They haven't done anything. They don't intend to do anything. We think we ought to give them a big fine. in 1972 and 1975, EPA knew what was coming. They named the chemicals. They said what was going to happen.

In 1987 we had to have signs put up telling people, Don't eat the fish. So, I mean, when you know what something is -- when you know it's a problem and you still, even though you're EPA, you're a federal agency, and you can't get it done, there is something wrong. It's environment injustice.

It affects everybody in the parish. It affects beyond the parish, and it also completely undermines confidence in America. So I think we have some major problems here. We're on the front lines. I've done the best I could in my 15 minutes, but if you got questions, I'll try to answer them.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Tritico.

Are there any questions? Yes. Mr. Morris.

MR. MORRIS: You said that you had the sheriff's department do a crime lab report. Do you have a copy of that report?

MS. MADDEN: Could you speak up. We can't hear on this end.

MR. MORRIS: You said that the sheriff's department did a crime lab report. What did the report show, and do you have a copy of it, and can we get a copy?

MR. TRITICO: I can get you a copy. I don't have one with me.

MR. MORRIS: Well, what did the report.

MR. TRITICO: The report -- Deputy Starkovich took some samples from the pits, and he reported that he was almost overcome trying to get the samples. And it showed several carcinogens. I think it was something like eight to ten priority pollutants he had the capacity to check for. Things like benzene, toluene, chloroform -- things like that were in the pits and they were vaporizing out into the neighborhood.

That was, I think, about 1976 or -7. That was our first piece of hard information that it was something other than just harmless, nonhazardous material.

MR. MORRIS: What laboratory did the tests on that sample?

MR. TRITICO: The Calcasieu Parish sheriff's

department crime laboratory.

9,

MS. MADDEN: Ms. Richardson.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. Good morning, sir. By way of commentary and background to the question I'm going to ask, I first would like to say -- refer to two old maxims; the first being, Justice delayed is justice denied. But on a much more positive note, there is a corollary that says that the wheels of the gods grind finely -- slowly, but they grind very fine. So let's hope we are on the fine road to getting some of these things eradicated.

I'm a native of Calcasieu Parish, and it amazed me that I didn't know half the places you were talking about. And -- like Willow Springs, Bayou d'Inde, for purposes of my trying to get a total picture, would you kind of describe, particularly by racial makeup, the communities that are most affected as you see them, because we look at certain protected classes, race being one.

And for God's sake, tell me where these two places are so I won't be as ignorant when I leave here as I came.

MR. TRITICO: Well, Willow Springs is about -from here, it's about seven or eight miles to the west
northwest. It's north of Sulphur. If you know where the

Sam Houston Jones State Park is --

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, I do.

MR. TRITICO: -- it's about a mile upstream from that on the west of the West Fork River. And the people who lived nearest the fence line, right up against the pits -- in fact, there were no fences at first -- those people were black people.

But if you get about a quarter of a mile to a half-mile away, there are white people. The fumes could be -- I smelled the fumes seven and a half miles away down where I used to live in Ryan Street. The fumes were horrendous, so it affected everybody in the parish.

Now, Mossville, which is heavily impacted, is about halfway between here and Willow Springs. I'd say it's about four miles or five miles to the west of here. It's just west of West Lake.

Bayou d'Inde community is just south of that by about a mile and a half or two miles. Bayou d'Inde community -- Mossville is mostly black, and Bayou d'Inde is all white. The Bayou d'Inde community is surrounded on about -- well, I'd say half the compass by industries, and it's right in, next to the -- Mossville is about a third of the compass, and it's right next to some of the plants.

So Bayou d'Inde and Mossville are the two communities most surrounded by the big factories. There

are other communities that are close, like, for instance, the Vincent settlement in West -- the community is by the new West Lake plants -- not West Lake, the town, but West Lake, the company. Those are adjacent to some of the plants.

But the most surrounded are the Bayou d'Inde and Mossville communities. Now, there's another giant hazardous waste site down at Carliss [phonetic]. That one's at five feet above sea level. Nothing between it and the Gulf except marsh. The hurricane slosh model, if that -- if a storm comes in, supposed to be 27 feet of seawater all the way to I-10. It will roll right across those hazardous waste and contaminate the whole west side of the parish.

I mean, there's so many things in this parish that are just models of what is wrong; that the only thing that's kept me and a lot of other people going is the model of what is right, and that is the way that the people of Willow Springs all work together and always have and always will.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. Are there other questions? Ms. Borg.

MS. BORG: Mr. Tritico, you spoke rather eloquently about the American way and how you did





everything right within the law. And you basically said that, But government failed us. Why do you think government failed you; specifically, the EPA? And then when you finish that, specifically, the DEQ -- the two arms of government that are in fact supposed to hear the citizens when they bring concerns of the nature that you've spoken to today.

MR. TRITICO: Well, the main proof that they failed us the blood data. We wouldn't be contaminated if they --

MS. BORG: But my question is why?

.MR. TRITICO: Why did they fail us?

MS. BORG: I heard you speak eloquently that they did. But my question in both instances for EPA, DEQ is why do you think they didn't work for you?

MR. TRITICO: I think they didn't work because the forces of evil, the people that are putting these molecules out without regard for the consequences, have far more political influence than do average citizens. There's no way that the people of Willow Springs or the people of Calcasieu Parish, even if everybody in the parish joined together and said, We've had enough. It's going to stop now. There's no way it would stop now, because the system has been constructed to give all sorts of buffers, all sorts of protections, to the ones who are

doing wrong.

Now, if -- even if the police jury voted unanimously, even if the governor said. This is going to change within 24 hours, the companies would get their lawyers and their lobbyists, and they would go to Congress; or they would go to the President. They would get some kind of executive stay.

There -- I have no confidence that we have power the way the people are supposed to have power. The ones who have power are the ones with the money, the ones who have the capacity to blackmail key congressmen. They have all sorts of power that we don't have, and they use it.

And even if we were to be just like Willow Springs, everybody working together and united, even if that were to go parishwide, we would probably not be able to prevail in time to save ourselves. What we think is going to happen is that y'all are all going to see us. You're going to see what happens here, and eventually, with a national uproar about, We don't want that to happen to us. It happened to them. Too bad, but don't let it happen to us. Then you're going to be able to override some of that corporate, carpetbagging power.

But I don't think that there's anything we can really hope for in the way of saving those of us that are

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already contaminated. The levels in our bodies are too high. You're just going to have to use as an example.

MS. MADDEN: Mr. Tritico, if I may say so, let me caution you about using extreme language. We do have a rule about not using defamatory statements, and when you say forces of evil and blackmail, some folks might interpret that as a slur. So let me just caution you to be a little judicious in your language.

Are there any other questions?

MS. BORG: Well, to follow up --

MS. MADDEN: Did you have a followup?

MS. BORG: Yes.

MS. MADDEN: Okay.

MS. BORG: If you believe that those arms of the government that are to protect you -- EPA and DEQ -have failed and/or not giving as much weight to citizens as they are to others because the system is set to give such a buffer and advantage to the persons that you say are causing the problem, then what is left to you?

MR. TRITICO: Prayer. Really, that's the only thing we have left is that the Creator will somehow intervene. And I think He does from time to time. have to tell our good loved ones goodbye. We just have to hope we'll see them again.

But every now and then, He will help us when

it's something really critical. A couple of the members of our little environmental group were run over by hazardous waste trucks. No witnesses. Now, one who was a little more radical than me died. One who is an angel has been given back to us. That is, to me, what the Creator does.

When He sees a righteous person, He looks at them as an individual and He helps them. I don't think He says as righteous this system that we are in, and I don't think He's going to help the system. He's going to help individuals. To me, that's all we have left here.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. Are there other questions?

Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: Just a quick question about the other governor's task force you mentioned. When was it formed, when was it dissolved, what was its mission?

MR. TRITICO: Well, it was formed after the 1987 fishing advisories went up, which were done very reluctantly by the state, thanks mainly to the heroic efforts of a lady named Dr. Joyce Mathison. And Martha Madden -- I don't know if you're kin --

MS. MADDEN: No relation.

MR. TRITICO: -- she was the secretary of DEQ and she had the guts to say, Yes. The scientist, Dr.

Mathison, has convinced me that we need to put up some signs. Those two ladies managed to get some signs put up.

Well, then some more uproar started about, This is bad for tourism. This is bad for economic development. So eventually, a task force was formed probably, I'd say around maybe 1990. I'm not sure of the date, and it went on for about seven or eight years.

And during that time, things happened, like we would get to go to the task force, and at the end of the meeting we would get to ask questions. And the task force members would say, Okay, well, we don't know the answers to that. We'll call in somebody.

So NOAA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, was called in, and they and the U.S.

Geological Survey and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service -
those three agencies have done as well as they could under

the restrictions that they have on them. But they

gathered information.

They didn't do a whole lot of interpretation.

They just said, We went out and we measured this. Here's what we see. And then some of us out here in the citizenry said, Well, wait a minute. If you found this, the literature says that about this. Doesn't that mean we have this problem?

And then the task force would talk about it,

and it went on I guess for about seven or eight years, and it was making some progress. Things were happening. The industries were having to sit down and negotiate with NOAA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Natural Resource Trustees -- they were having to negotiate.

But when they broke off the negotiations and the task force was cancelled, that's when EPA, NOAA, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said, Well, we're just going to have to, you know, go in and use Superfund money to finish the investigation. We may have to declare it a Superfund site. Then here comes this new task force.

MS. BORG: Do you feel there was a pretty good dialogue though between the community and the industries and --

MR. TRITICO: No. I think there was not.

Every time we tried to bring up in the old task force
things like a policy of prudence, they would laugh, and
their people on the task force would keep it from even
coming to a vote. We were asking that the old task force
would adopt the concept and encourage, through
resolutions, that DEQ and EPA and everybody else would
have a policy of prudence so that if there were data gaps
or if there was a dispute among experts about what was the
meaning of a certain piece of information, and a decision
had to be made, that the decision-maker would always make

the decision in the direction that most protected the public or the ecosystem.

Well, they wouldn't -- they couldn't -- they never would vote on adopting the concept of a policy of prudence. The thought that caution must not be compromised -- nobody would touch that. So eventually, the task force -- that task force was cancelled, I think partly because we were trying to at least get them to talk about why will you not adopt a policy of prudence.

There was an attempt at dialogue. We were not the ones who failed to communicate. We tried, and we were considered, I guess, non-judicious at times. We got frustrated.

MS. BORG: Were there ever any attempts to sit across the table; I mean, be it the task force or any other body -- the mayor's office or -- I mean, you know, police jury or --

MR. TRITICO: We made many, many police jury meetings. We made many different trips to Baton Rouge.

Now, one thing we did sit across the table, Mr. McMurray assisted in that. We asked that the U.S. Geological Survey do some tests to determine whether or not many of the pits that are alongside the river were tidally interconnected to the river, which we had seen at Willow Springs, that the pits are interconnected with the

aquifers and surface waters, and when the waters go up and down it's a pump, so the stuff gets dragged out into the -- so we wanted the USGS to do a project like that.

Industry jumped in and said, Wait a minute, wait a minute. We have to have some control here. We will put up some of the money to save the taxpayers some money, but we also are going to have some control here. But Mr. McMurray facilitated that, and there was some research done.

It never got to the phase where they were going to check on the tidal interconnections. But that's the kind of thing that happens. When we do attempt to work with the industries, things go wrong. Another good example of what happened on a dialogue there -- it was an Earth Day thing.

Paul Ringo, who's now the head of LEAN, was head of CLEAN. And he had an idea of challenging the industries to just get them to talk. And Olin accepted the challenge and we did -- we had a meeting with them.

And we said, There's a rookery of roseate spoonbill birds. They migrate all the way from the southern hemisphere and they land in your hazardous wastepond, which used to be a beautiful swamp. They're dying and so is their habitat, and they won't move across the river. Can you please restore that rookery?

And Olin said, Yes. Yes, we will. And we were really happy. However, a state agent for DEQ said, No, Olin, you're going to have to start your whole hazardous waste permit application for that pond all over again, which is going to cost you about six years. You sure you want to restore that rookery?

And so, of course, the company couldn't -- I mean, it didn't make good sense for them to start all over and do six years and not get their permit, and we understood that. And we tried to figure out, Now, why did that guy squelch a bird restoration project? And then we remembered somebody had gone in his office and saw a thing where CLEAN had given him a Dirty Pelican award -- this bureaucrat -- because of something he had done or said in a meeting here in Lake Charles.

And he had this thing up on the wall and said,
Here's what happens when you try to help the citizens.

And then when he got a chance, he shot down the bird
restoration project. So that's the kind of thing where
you have to -- I mean, when you do try everything and some
of them backfire like that, then you're -- many people
just drop out. They say, Well, it's a hopeless cause.

But yes, we have tried to talk to them. As individuals, I'm able to communicate with some of the technical people. They know a lot of things, and some of

them are really almost heartbroken that they don't have within their company the final say-so.

I have seen company people pleading that their name, because it appears on a piece of paper, that we do not condemn them, because it's their job and they have to do what they are told to do. They're under intense pressure.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. We'll have time for about one more question, and then we're going to take a little break and set up some microphones that we can hear better. I know you'll appreciate that.

Ms. Seicshnaydre.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: Yes. I just wanted to ask. You said that at some point, science intervenes and assists you. Are there additional data gathering or other sorts of sampling that you -- your group has identified that you would like to do or you think would be informative or helpful in any way that you have not done or that you perhaps don't have resources to do?

MR. TRITICO: Well, I would like to see the blood testing extended. ATSDR came in to Mossville and checked people in Mossville and said, Yes, they are contaminated. They have not yet got to Bayou d'Inde or Willow Springs or the rest of the parish.

EPA has indicated that it is going to help the

group CLEAN do some air sampling. That's a positive sign.
We would like to have more air sampling. I saw on the
news something about industry is going to pay for it.
When industry pays for it, they control it.

so I didn't celebrate last night when I saw that news story. But I would like to see more real fact-gathering and less political rhetoric, because we can go through this every -- one time I said something. A guy running a hearing, a DEQ hearing, said, It's a new ballgame, Mike. Give us a break, you know. Why don't you just let us do our thing? Two or three years from now things are going to be a lot better.

I said, Yes, I hear this. It's a new ball'game. Every two or three years you've got a new agency or a new name, but it's the same shortstop. It's the same third baseman. It's the same people, and it's going to be the same ballgame.

So that's why I think that the gathering of facts is critical. It does help.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Tritico.

That was very informative.

We are going to take I guess about a ten-minute break and set up microphones so that everyone can hear a little bit better. Please don't go away.

MR. TRITICO: Okay. I did want to mention that

we have turned in a report. Herbert Rigmaden of Willow 1 Springs and Mabel -- I mean, Pam Tines -- we've turned in 2 a report that is Willow Springs specific, and Ms. Robinson 3 has it. Okay. 4 MS. MADDEN: Good. Thank you so much. 5 MR. TRITICO: Thank you. 6 7 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.) MS. MADDEN: We're going to go ahead and get 8 started again. We appreciate your patience while we got 9 10 the microphones set up so that everybody can hear. Can you hear me? Hello? 11 VOICE: Yes. 12 13 MS. MADDEN: Okay. We appreciate your patience in letting us set up the room a little bit more 14 conveniently for everyone, and we're also working on the 15 temperature and I think it's beginning to get better in 16 17 here. It's a little bit cooler than it was. All right. Our next speaker is Mr. Damu Smith from 18 Greenpeace USA. 19 Mr. Smith, would you please give us your 20 21 occupation. 22 My name is Damu Smith, and I work MR. SMITH: 23 on the staff of the Greenpeace USA toxins campaign. 24 I first of all want to thank the members of the

Louisiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on

25

Civil Rights for convening these hearings this morning, and particularly for convening these hearings here in the Lake Charles metropolitan area; an area saturated with polluting facilities of all kinds.

In the past I have also worked in Louisiana on behalf of the Southern Organizing Committee for Economic and Social Justice. Since 1991, I have worked extensively with communities throughout the state of Louisiana, providing various forms of assistance to help communities organize to rid their neighborhoods of toxic and radioactive hazards or threats.

My organization is usually invited by groups to come and assist them after they conclude that government agencies and industry will not, which, unfortunately, is most often the case in this state. Most of the communities we work with are populated by black people and poor working class whites.

The majority population of nearly all the communities I have worked with are African-American. This fact is not a matter of choice. It is merely a reflection of the circumstances which exist in this state. It remains a fact that black people in Louisiana live in the principal host communities for polluting facilities of all kinds throughout this state.

Our experience in Louisiana has often placed us

in the epicenter of some of the nation's and this state's most hotly contested, well-publicized and controversial environmental justice battles. The fight over agricultural street landfill in New Orleans. NARCO Louisiana and the battle with Shell and Motiva. Convent and the effort to keep SHINTECH out of that community.

Forest Grove and Center Springs and our successful struggle with the community there to stop the LAS uranium enrichment plant. And now here in Mossville, a community surrounded by Condea Vista, Conoco, PPG, and other facilities.

I mentioned this, Madame Chairwoman, because I want to make the point that I have first-hand knowledge of the kinds of experiences black and poor people have in Louisiana in their interaction with state and federal agencies and industries. So I'm speaking today out of experience.

Louisiana is a place where people of all races, of all races, suffer from economic and environmental policies that have ruined the state's economy, severely damaged the environment, and fundamentally undermined the health, safety, and quality of life of residents here.

Louisiana is so bad off that several national media outlets and newspapers have done stories or are working on stories about what goes on here. Louisiana

indeed is a national disgrace. Most of Louisiana's waterways are polluted and require advisories to people to not use them or if they fish in them.

The state ranks number one in per capita toxic releases to air, water and land. Louisiana is among the top five most impoverished states in the nation. The income gap between black and white in Louisiana is one of the widest in the nation. Louisiana also has one of the worst public school systems. In short, Louisiana is in bad shape.

As you know, the fundamental issues involved in civil rights law and enforcement are equal protection, equal justice under the law, fair and equitable treatment, and equal access and opportunity for all citizens. In the area of environmental protection, relevant civil rights laws such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, existing environmental laws, statutes and regulations, and fundamental constitutional precepts should be applied by government agencies to ensure equal environmental protection for all.

Our Constitution is very clear. No state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. In Louisiana, this is simply not the case. In community after community, we see how permitting decisions by the Louisiana Department of

Environmental Quality, with the acquiescence of EPA Region VI over the years, that part of the EPA responsible for watchdogging the environmental policies of the state, have led to black communities and poor communities being disproportionately overburdened by life-threatening noxious facilities, often located only a few yards or feet from homes or residential areas.

while the government agencies today and tomorrow will chronicle their record of reducing emissions, they cannot claim that the racially discriminatory siting policies in the state have fundamentally been altered. Beyond new testing initiatives, we have seen a continuation of the same old policies which have caused the problem, which you documented in 1993 to continue.

In Louisiana, therefore, equal protection for black and other communities of color simply does not exist. Unequal protection, in fact, is the norm and not the exception in this state. Even when environmental statutes are complied with, siting decisions which leave black communities saddled with more polluting facilities than white communities, which means that pollution is increased in communities of color, is a violation of the equal protection clause and relevant civil rights law.

If Title VI was enforced in accordance with

ř.

traditional civil rights jurisprudence, we could perhaps provide some measure of relief to black and poor communities in Louisiana. And I just want to say to members of this committee, speaking out of the experience that I've talked about, what does unequal protection in the state of Louisiana mean?

It means that black communities living next to these facilities are having to deal with more of the explosions from nearby facilities, more of the accidental releases, more of the transportation accidents. Trucks are falling over, rail lines accidents and emissions from chemicals that they carry.

Barge explosions along the Mississippi River, sometimes when people are worshipping in their churches on Sunday afternoon. People can no longer fish in the rivers and streams. People can no longer baptize in the Mississippi River and other places where they use to baptize.

People can no longer grow food in their gardens or pick figs from fig trees because of the contamination. People cannot sit out on their porches for long periods of time. Our children with asthma and other respiratory problems cannot -- or miss many days from school and experience frequent visits to the hospitals because of all of the pollution coming out of these facilities.

Therefore, not only do the state and federal environmental regulatory agencies have an obligation to enforce environmental protection laws, they must also ensure that under our relevant civil rights law that environmental protection is meted out equally.

And as I mentioned through these examples, when black and poor communities in Louisiana and elsewhere are exposed to more life-threatening pollution than other segments of the population, this means that black people are at more risk for serious illnesses, shorter lifespans, higher death rates, frequent hospital visits, more rates of cancer, and at greater risk to injury from industrial accidents near their homes and schools from nearby facilities.

The point I am trying to make to all of you today is that we have a very serious problem in this state in terms of equal protection being enforced here. I just want to mention very quickly some specific examples of how, as you mentioned, Ms. Richardson, justice delayed is justice denied.

And I want to talk just a little bit about what has happened here in Mossville, Louisiana, over the past few months. And I first want to introduce my remarks on Mossville by saying I want to acknowledge and affirm that as a direct result of the wonderful work that people in

the Lake Charles area have been doing on behalf of their communities, with support from groups like Greenpeace and Earthjustice and Deep South Center and others, there have been some significant positive things that have occurred, and I acknowledge those things.

But those positive things have been undermined by the politics that have often surrounded the decision-makers -- decision-making processes in this situation.

Last year when it was announced by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry that their test results showed that dioxin was three times the national average in the blood of Mossville residents, the governor announced with great fanfare that a task force would be convened to come up with solutions to the problem.

And shortly thereafter, the Louisiana

Department of Environmental Quality, the Louisiana

Department of Health and Hospitals, EPA Region VI, and

ATSDR announced a formation of the Mossville Public Health

Response Work Group. Now, that work group was announced

and begun with implementation, in our view, without

adequate community involvement in the planning.

The subgroups of this work group had already been proposed by ATSDR. Those work groups that were proposed focused on health services for residents, pollution reduction -- I'm sorry. The agencies introduced

their work groups which had a number of subgroups. Since then the agencies have unofficially abandoned the work group process, after understandings and agreements were reached in November 1999 between the government agencies and residents of the Mossville community to add work groups recommended by the group Mossville Environmental Action Now.

Those work groups focus on health services for residents, pollution reduction and permitting issues, reduction of industrial accidents, and environmental justice. After promises and agreements to reestablish these work groups by ATSDR officials, these work groups have failed to materialize.

One of the things that has occurred is that the message has been put out that Mossville Environmental Action Now asked ATSDR and the federal agencies to cancel the work groups. That is not true. And I want to submit for the record this morning, Ms. Madden, this document which presents a chronology with documentation of the chronology of the events that have occurred here in Mossville with letters, memos, e-mails and correspondence.

What is not included in that is this memorandum from Dr. Tommy Torres from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry dated January 19, 2000, in which he records the minutes of discussions that have taken place

1.8

between state and federal agencies and the community.

And in this document it documents the understandings that have been reached about the formation of the work groups. I then have another document dated 18th of February, 2000, which is an e-mail from Dr. Reuben Warren in the Office of Urban Affairs, and I just want to read you a part of that e-mail to make the point that I'm about to make.

Environmental Justice Working Group meeting on Saturday from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. February 26, 2000, in Mossville, Louisiana. The scheduled meeting for Friday evening, February 25, will not occur. Drs. Crawford, Tommy Torres and I will represent the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and we will discuss the environmental justice issues associated with ATSDR activities and other matters that may facilitate health improvements possibly associated with the environment.

And what I want to inform this committee of is that shortly after this memo was sent, the persons mentioned in this memo who were scheduled to appear in the Mossville community did not come, because they were ordered not to come from people high up in ATSDR.

So when we talk about how the communities are being treated in Louisiana, this represents one example of

...

how the agencies, because of politics, refuse to deal with the community often with respect.

And so the final thing that I want to mention about this is that we go on to chronicle in an eight-page letter, which I am also submitting to you today for the record, because there's no time to read it, in which we document point by point the systematic way in which the agencies, through their actions or inaction, have not gotten the work group process that was announced and promised to move forward.

And we have concluded that the reason why this occur is because of something -- we're speculating now -- but we receive from an anonymous person an envelope stamped Baton Rouge on it through the postal system a document from one of the meetings that the agencies had in Baton Rouge in which this document, if it is an authentic document, said that the Louisiana agencies did not like the environmental justice label.

Madame Chairwoman, environmental justice is now a recognized concept in America. And when we have our Louisiana agencies, if this document is true, speaking in that fashion, it points to the mindset that is already in this state, and it points to the fact that the Louisiana agencies perhaps are having too much influence over our federal agencies who we believe want to try to do the

right thing in this community but somehow are being stymied by the attitude and the behavior of the Louisiana agencies.

Thank you very much, and I thank you for this opportunity.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

We have time for just two or three questions. We have time for just two or three questions.

Oh, and I'd like to note that William Quigley has joined us from New Orleans. Glad to have you.

Any questions?

DR. FORD: Yes.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Dr. Ford.

DR. FORD: Mr. Smith, though you pointed out many instances of failure on the part of agencies to bring remedies to the problems in this area, you did indicate that there have been successes. Would you care to share some of those with us? And in the same vein, if you could, speak to any additional strategies that you think are important, including this work group approach that has seemingly failed so far.

MR. SMITH: Well, the agencies are doing something which I think is quite unprecedented. They are conducting testing in the area to document the dioxin problem and sources of other contamination. They have

22.

announced a program -- it's in the papers this morning -- working with DEQ to do a program of testing on dioxin over the next year and other testing over the next three years.

They have been convening the Calcasieu Parish initiative meetings on a quarterly basis. That's a good thing. They are paying a lot of attention to Calcasieu Parish. And so we -- what's good is good. You acknowledge that.

But here's the problem. Those good things continue to be undermined and delayed and shortcircuited because of the politics that has been injected into the situation. So, for example, it was a good thing that the agencies announced a formation of the work groups. It is a good thing to have work groups; one of the best things that could have ever happened.

But guess what. The work groups have not been implemented, all because an organization in the community that has been helping to lead the struggle there said. We want to amend those work groups. We have other ideas.

And then the agencies took three -- almost three months after Mossville Environmental Action Now sent their letter of July 6 criticizing the work group process and offering other recommendations, the agencies took until September 10 to respond to their letter. So again, justice delayed, justice denied.

And your other question?

DR. FORD: Well, the other part of my question was: Are there some additional strategies you would suggest --

MR. SMITH: Yes.

DR. FORD: -- that would move us in the right direction?

MR. SMITH: Yes. We have to keep in mind that places like Lake Charles, Louisiana, and the industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans represent what we call extraordinary polluting regions. I mean, there's pollution in many areas of the United States, but we have a concentration of industries like you have here in Lake Charles and other parts of Louisiana -- these present special problems.

What we need are special initiatives that go beyond just testing. That -- it's mentioned in the paper of last night that the Louisiana industries are going to be contributing, I think, \$1.5 million to assist with the testing.

Okay. That testing is fine. But what we need is a substantial reduction of the emissions in this area beyond any reductions that have already incurred. We are happy that EPA Region VI, for example, has begun to do some important work in the area of enforcement. Good

things.

We want that to continue. We will continue to press them to continue that in that area. So stepped-up enforcement measures and creative innovative efforts by industry that don't require a government mandate to substantially reduce emissions in the area will go a long way.

But the ultimate solution to this problem here is not a reduction of emissions. We need a phase-out of the kind of industrial processes that are present in this area. As long as we have industries polluting the kind of -- producing the kind of hazardous emissions that we have here, we're going to have this problem.

We need a just transition to clean production, clean technologies. One of the things that Greenpeace is recommending specifically is that the state or the governor, working with other stakeholders here in the state, ought to convene what we would call a statewide commission on a just transition, a clean production, and the precautionary principle.

And we add the precautionary principle in there because when you have a situation like what we have here in this state, and particularly in this community, where we know that there are high levels of dioxin in people's blood, where ethylene dichloride contamination has been

detected in significantly high levels in the air, you must take precautionary measures to protect the health, welfare, and safety of the residents and the communities in which they reside.

You don't wait to have final scientific proof that Chemical X is causing disease. Why? You know that what is coming out is possibly or probably causing a problem. You therefore take action to prevent the problem and to minimize the risk to the people concerned.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. Are there any other questions? All right. We have time for one more. Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: I was just a little curious, with a public relations background, you know, I recognize that Greenpeace does a lot of public relations efforts in the focus. But what kind of balance do you have with research and statistical data? Do you -- does Greenpeace -- have a portion to do that, a mechanism, or do you collect data from other sources?

You know, you made a comment about the areas saturated with all kinds of polluting activities. But I'm just wondering, you know, what kind of documentations do you have to back up some of this?

MR. SMITH: Well, Greenpeace does engage in independent investigation and research. And of course we

=

rely both on government data, but we also rely on work that we do ourselves. We took action on our own to test tars and heavy Ns and sludge waste from some of the vinyl facilities in this area, and we produced a report that outlines the fact that significant levels of dioxin contamination were found on the premises of a number of the plants here in this area, in Texas, and in other parts of Louisiana.

So yes, indeed, we do that. In fact, we did our own critique of ATSDR's dioxin report, and we have here, which I am submitting for the record, a one-page review of that exposure and investigation and our recommendation for what ought to be done. That includes a graph and chart here.

So yes, indeed, we do do independent research, and this is why -- and to state this very quickly -- we want to participate with the community in what we're recommending to be a scientific, technical, and legal meeting with all of the agencies so that we can review the various testing that is currently under way, so that we can have a third-party process of review for what the agencies are doing.

This would help to empower the community. This will also help to build trust within the community about what ATSDR is doing. And our scientist, Pat Kostner in

our laboratory in England, we are prepared to do whatever to assist with this process.

MS. RICHARDSON: Can I get a quick one?

MS. MADDEN: I think we have time for one quick question.

MS. RICHARDSON: And I try to respect time, but something came to mind with Ms. Parks' last question. A scientifically recognized field of research is anecdotal data. There have to be certain patterns, certain amounts and what-not. Is Greenpeace engaged in any kind of anecdotal data collection that might assist in your efforts?

MR. SMITH: Are you talking specifically about the communities here in -- the situation here in Louisiana?

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, particularly here.

MR. SMITH: No, we're not. But we are going to continue to respond to the testing that the agencies are doing, as we -- by the way, this is a one-page document, but we have produced a report about this thick which, again, critiques the dioxin study and provides recommendations.

So we will continue to work with the communities to do whatever they need, including anecdotal -- collection of anecdotal data as necessary to

help document the situation here -- the problem here. 1 Thank you. 2 MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. 3 MR. SMITH: Thank you very much. 4 MS. MADDEN: We appreciate your being with us. 5 MR. SMITH: Who do I give the documents to? 6 MS. MADDEN: Yes. If you would, give those to 7 one of our staff members, Ms. Robinson. Thank you. 8 All right. Our next presenter is Jerry 9 Clifford Regional Administrator for the U.S. Environmental 10 Protection Agency, Region VI. 11 12 MR. CLIFFORD: Good morning. MS. MADDEN: Good morning, Mr. Clifford. For 13 the record, would you please state your name and your 14 15 occupation. MR. CLIFFORD: Good morning. My name is Jerry 16 Clifford. I've not been promoted to the Regional 17 Administrator of the EPA Region VI, unless there's 18 something you know that I don't. I'm the Deputy Regional 19 Administrator. 20 VOICE: So noted. 21 MR. CLIFFORD: I'm the -- again, my name is 22 23 Jerry Clifford. I'm the Deputy Regional Administrator for EPA's Region VI office in Dallas, Texas. 24 25 Good morning, Chairperson Madden, and

distinguished members of the Louisiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I thank you all for the opportunity to testify before you today and discuss with you what our efforts have been in the Lake Charles/Calcasieu area.

I'm happy to be here to discuss EPA's efforts and activities, mostly of late, in the Lake Charles and Calcasieu area of Louisiana. I've submitted a full copy of my statement for the record, although I've taken the liberty to embellish some on my prepared remarks.

The mission of the Environmental Protection

Agency is to safeguard and protect the natural

environment: the air, the land and the water. One of the

single most important concerns emanating from a

contaminated environment is its potential to adversely

affect human health.

As reiterated in the agency's 1997 strategic plan, our mission is to ensure that all Americans are protected from significant risks to human health in the environment where they live, where they learn, and where they work.

That federal laws protecting human health in the environment are enforced fairly and effectively. That all parts of society -- communities, individuals, businesses, state and local governments and tribal

governments -- have access to accurate and reliable
information sufficient to effectively participate in
managing their human health and environmental risks in

their communities.

And that environmental protection contributes to making all our communities and ecosystems diverse, sustainable and economically productive. The EPA Region VI office in Dallas is responsible for managing and overseeing environmental programs in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and New Mexico.

The demographic makeup of the region is even more diverse, with representation by a variety of races and ethnic groups, including 65 federally-recognized Native American tribes, and a very broad spectrum of income levels. The region has a major role in responsibility for addressing the environmental and public health concerns facing each and every one of these communities.

Most of the environmental statutes administered by EPA are under provisions whereby states may obtain approval to administer their own state programs consistent with federal rules and regulations. In general, state programs must meet minimum federal requirements.

They may be more stringent that federal programs and may be broader in scope than our federal



programs. In Louisiana, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality is authorized to administer state programs, including permitting and enforcement, under the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

A brief description of our role in the implementation of each of these statutes is included in my prepared remarks, and so in the interest of time I'll not go through those if the committee would allow.

I do want to touch on the broader enforcement arena, because I know that's of particular concern to this committee. In response to a petition by the Louisiana Environmental Action Network, and based on EPA's independent oversight authority, we conducted a comprehensive multimedia review of the LDEQ enforcement program in October 1997.

EPA issued a report of its program review in July 1998. I could make that report available should the Commission want it. Our report outlined that the enforcement program at the Department of Environmental Quality, where it has many strengths, also had a number of serious deficiencies that we identified in that review.

The final report contained 36 recommendations for improvement. The Region VI office, our office in Dallas, continues to work with LDEQ in implementing an

action plan that they developed immediately following the report. And we have continued to put extra emphasis on our own internal enforcement efforts in Louisiana since that time.

We work closely with the state to develop, among other things, a penalty policy; a policy by which when an industry is found in noncompliance, at the federal level of EPA we have a penalty policy that helps us make sure that we are consistently assessing penalties across all our programs, across all 50 states.

And we have been working with LDEQ. They have now developed a penalty policy that's consistent with the EPA's national policy and are in the process of applying that policy to their current enforcement actions. In addition, joint inspections are routinely conducted in the core programs, and we work with the state to share the lead on the followup of those enforcement actions.

Parish, it began roughly in earnest back in 1990 with a site inspection under our Superfund program of the Gulf States Utility site on North Ryan Street. The site inspection was completed in September and revealed contaminants attributable to the North Ryan Street facility; that those contaminants were being released into the estuary.

The site was proposed for the national priorities list in 1995, and since that time we have worked with the responsible party, both through our own efforts under removal of authorities to clean up a portion of that site; and now through their actions to clean up the remainder of that site. That site is well into the cleanup phase at this time.

In addition, through that investigation we found significant contamination in the broader Calcasieu Estuary, which is about -- I can't remember now -- 13 square miles, I believe, roughly. We have -- I don't have with me today, but if the Commission would like -- we have maps that show where this contamination is in the estuary to give you a sense.

We had some information on a Powerpoint. It doesn't appear that the room is conducive to showing that to y'all.

MS. MADDEN: If you would get that to us we'd appreciate it.

MR. CLIFFORD: But we could certainly get it to you. We are in the first phase -- we've completed the first phase of the sediment sampling and through that effort have identified significant hot spots as a result of that sampling, and we're looking at, in terms of the magnitude of that particular site, the investigation is

going to cost the federal government on the order of \$6 million, just to investigate this particular problem.

It's so pervasive.

We're going to spend roughly of that 1.5 million just to do the analytical work to determine what contaminants are in the sediments and on what level they're in the sediment before we even begin to identify what potential cleanup alternatives are before us.

In May and December '97 at meetings of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee in Wisconsin and in Durham, North Carolina, Calcasieu Parish citizens testified at both those committee hearings, and in their testimony relayed some of the concerns that you will hear during the course of your hearings over the next two days.

As a result of those two hearings, our enforcement division stepped up its enforcement activity in Lake Charles, Louisiana. In January '98 representatives visited the parish and met with several citizens to individually discuss what their current concerns were from an enforcement perspective.

Following a 1998 meeting in Oakland,

California, one which I attended, we set up a separate

meeting to hear about the concerns from the individuals

from this area who attended that Oakland EJAC meeting.

And in the process of that conversation, I myself learned about the significant concerns facing the citizens of this area.

As a result of that effort, we pulled together a team of people inside the regional office who are all working on different aspects: water pollution efforts, Superfund efforts, air pollution efforts, enforcement efforts in Lake Charles, and pulled a team together for the first time where everybody in our office who were working on aspects of the contamination problem in this area were working together for the first time from a community-based perspective. Very different than how we typically manage our work at EPA.

In addition, I agreed to meet -- at the Oakland meeting I agreed to come down and meet with the community to hear firsthand what the concerns are from people who were unable to make the Oakland meeting. And as a result of that meeting and at their request, I committed to work with the State Department of Environmental Quality to meet at least four times over the course of a year to come down to this community and meet to hear what their concerns are and begin a process of making sure that our efforts across our immediate programs were addressing the most significant public health and environmental concerns of the citizens of Lake Charles, Louisiana.

On the -- just some initial results from the enforcement perspective, if I might add, for the period from 1998 to the present, if we compare that period to the two-year period from 1995 to 1997, EPA's enforcement actions in Calcasieu Parish have increased 130 percent from an administrative penalty order perspective.

referrals -- those cases which are more significant than -- in other words, they are significant enough that we need to bring in the Department of Justice to help us on the enforcement front -- they have increased roughly five times from that which we were typically referring on an annual basis to the Department of Justice from our enforcement actions in this area.

In response to citizen concerns regarding the drinking water quality in Mossville, EPA sampled the Mossville drinking water system in 1998 for volatile organic compounds and in 1999 for dioxin. We found no compounds detected in the drinking water system above the drinking water maximum contaminant levels for any compound tested.

In addition, we conducted the first ever in our region what we call a comprehensive performance evaluation of the municipal public water system. Although -- and we did that in conjunction with the Louisiana Department of

4 5

• 6

Health and Hospitals -- the system was found to be in compliance with all Safe Drinking Water Act requirements.

What we did find is some performance limiting factors that, although they weren't violations of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the operator agreed to step forward and address those issues. And to my knowledge today, those issues have been addressed.

In 1998, citizens of this area brought to our attention -- certainly was brought to my attention for the first time -- that there were citizens in this community who had their blood tested that showed elevated levels of dioxin. At that point, we had requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to come in and help us determine whether this was a past problem, a current problem, or something that could be addressed either through health -- through their side of the federal responsibilities, or through environmental protection from our side of our responsibilities.

I know Dr. Abraham from ATSDR is on your agenda to speak tomorrow, as is Dr. Jimmy Guidry from Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals. So I'll not mention more about what was found there, but just mention that we are working closely in conjunction with ATSDR and the State of Louisiana to develop a plan to figure out where that dioxin is coming from and what we can do to stop the

exposure, if there's any ongoing exposure to dioxin levels in this area.

Also in the Lake Charles area it was actually -- I noticed it was in the newspaper today as a result of our meeting last night -- we have worked with the state and industry to expand an air toxics monitoring network in the Lake Charles area.

My understanding is we will have now five very capable air quality monitors monitoring dioxin, among other things; very comprehensive monitoring to help us determine at what levels ambient air toxics are occurring in the Lake Charles area.

Because of expenses, we're only going to be -because of the expense for dioxin analytical work, we'll
do that analysis for one year and the rest of the analysis
will take place over a three-year period.

We have also worked with citizens in this area to help fund what is called or termed a bucket brigade. And this is a program whereby citizens, in their own time, learn to take air quality samples. And when they smell something in their backyard or in their home that is foreign to them that they're able to open up a canister or a bag, collect an air sample, and we analyze it to determine what it is they're actually being exposed to.

It's not a perfect method. In other words, it

m-m-12-5

.1

doesn't tell us whether a grab sample, there's been a violation of an ambient air quality standard. It doesn't tell us whether there's an exposure level over a length of time that warrants significant acute concerns.

But it does help us understand what types of emissions and exposure is occurring to citizens in this area. On the broader effort side within our region, we are working on an issue that we call episodic releases, and it's an issue that was brought to us by a longtime devoted environmentalist in this area. Her name is Wilma Subra, but she raised an issue at a national meeting that I co-chair called the Petroleum Common Sense Initiative about accidental releases.

These are releases -- typically, when a facility shuts down or starts up, our permitting allows some additional increase in emissions during those periods. Oftentimes those emissions are flared, and you'll hear a lot about flaring from your testimony over the next two days.

We heard about it. We didn't have a good handle on exactly what the magnitude of these emissions were, so we did an analysis inside our region among our facilities, and we identified the top ten to 15 facilities in our region who were reporting -- they do have to report -- these accidental releases and the emissions that

are coming from these releases, and we found that the top eleven facilities were emitting over a five-year period 50 percent of the emissions from all facilities in our region during that period.

So we took the initiative to bring those facilities in. We have learned a lot from that process. We created an interagency team with DEQ, the State of Texas, and industry to work with us to find the root cause of what these problems were and to help develop strategies to cut back on these emissions.

As importantly, it helped increase, I believe, at least the facilities that are represented in this group, their awareness of the concerns of citizens about flaring; the concerns about the size the flares, the duration of the flares, what they are smelling as a result of the flaring, the additional light that's caused. Much of this flaring that occurs at night creates a light problem for citizens that are living right next to these facilities.

It also creates a tremendous noise problem. You have to be living right next to these facilities. That increased awareness has, in my view, helped them at the facilities focus more on controlling flaring and trying to find out what is causing it and how they can reduce the amount of flaring at these facilities.

We are hopeful that this effort with these facilities can be transferred to other facilities, not just in our region but nationwide, to help address this particular problem, and especially in communities where citizens live this close to facilities.

We have created an Office of Environmental

Justice in our region. That office has been in place for about a year now. We have five staff of that office. The head of that office is with me here today, Warren Arthur.

Sitting next to me is one of our employees who works in that office, and their responsibility is to be the voice of the community in our regional office, because the community can't be in our regional office every day.

It's to reach out to the community, to listen, to understand what their concerns are in all five states, not just Louisiana, and not just in Lake Charles, but to help them understand what the issues are and for them to help our program employees understand what the issues are and to help facilitate how we can address those concerns at the local level.

Our regional administrator -- this group reports directly to me, so the level of interest within our regional office is very high with respect to this team. In addition, our regional administrator, Greg Cook, is very supportive of our efforts to address environmental

justice issues, and he and I both find the time in our travels throughout our state to sit down with communities periodically to listen to what their concerns are and then bring those concerns back into the regional office.

Thank you for bearing with me. Let me just close. I know I've probably taken more than my time.

I believe that we have significantly stepped up our responsiveness to environmental issues in the State of Louisiana and, in particular, in Calcasieu Parish and Lake Charles. I believe that the progress we have made is due in large part to three actions.

First, and I think foremost, it's due to the diligence and action on the part of the citizens to continue to force these issues before the attention of regulatory agencies. Had they not spoken out at the National Environmental Justice Advisory committee, we would not have known the types of problems that these communities are facing across all our immediate programs.

Sure, we would have known there's a water issue in the estuary. Some folks in our office would have known that. Sure, we would have known that we have a continuing enforcement challenge, and our enforcement division folks would know that.

But had it not been for the community raising these issues to our attention at the national level, I

really don't think we would have quickly come to understand the holistic nature of all the types of pollution and emissions that the community faces in areas like this, in Lake Charles.

Second, action on the part of the State

Department of Environmental Quality. They have a large

staff. There is no way that the Environmental Protection

Agency in our region, spread across five states, would be

able to accomplish as much as I think we've accomplished

over the last few years without their working with us,

especially on this air toxics issue, especially on the

episodic release issue, and especially on the enforcement

front.

You will hear from state employees, but I believe they will tell you and my information shows that their enforcement actions and activity has stepped up significantly in the Lake Charles area, as well as ours.

And lastly, I believe it's a commitment on the part of the entire agency, and that's to increase the level of diversity within the agency. Over the last -- well, since this administration, last seven plus years, there's been a fairly significant increase in the number of minority employees who are now employed at the Environmental Protection Agency.

And I really believe that if we are going to

address the issues of our communities that our workforce needs to be reflective of the community out there that we're helping to address. Issues in those communities that we are helping to address.

Each assistant administration at EPA, each regional office, was asked to reach out to their minority employees to hear what their concerns are and understand what their issues are and develop plans to address them. That process is no different than the process we have used to listen to the concerns of communities like Lake Charles and to work with them to develop actions that we can take to address those issues.

This increased emphasis internally on the value of a diverse workforce, the focus on environmental justice at the national level, the focus on Title VI complaints and getting finally our guidance out on how to address Title VI complaints so that we can begin to address Title VI complaints, combined, I think move us towards a greater awareness of what the issues are, a greater understanding of how we can tackle those issues, and therefore, and most importantly, responsive action.

But just as we must continue to be diligent on diversity internally, we need and must continue to be diligent and unwavering in addressing the public health and environmental concerns of minority communities and low

1.

income communities everywhere. Our work is clearly far from done, and we cannot sit back on our meager laurels at this point.

Thank you.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Clifford.

We are running a little bit behind schedule, but I'd like to take a couple of questions. Anyone on the state advisory committee with a question? Let me go to Dr. Wright first.

DR. WRIGHT: Mr. Clifford, we heard a lot today about how Louisiana politics seems to affect remedies that are attempted to be put in place for some of the environmental policies -- for some of the environmental problems that communities are having, and I just would like to ask if it has been your experience, without being specific, if Louisiana politics, just generally speaking -- we're not asking for names -- has had any impact on the work that you do?

MR. CLIFFORD: I know there is much concern about that potential. At the federal level, I can honestly say I have not felt any pressure on the part of the governor's office, on the part of industry in this state, to do anything different than what we have set out to do in Louisiana, Lake Charles.

I cannot comment, though, on what influence if

б

any is being applied at the state or local level. But at the federal level, I have not experienced any impact from a political nature on activities that we've undertaken or planned undertaking.

MS. BOURG: Mr. Clifford, I have a couple of questions to ask you. It seems, just looking at the toxic release inventory air releases ranked by facility over some years, that there's a fairly steady increase in bad stuff. It's going in the wrong direction, it seems like.

And I guess my question would be if you're relying so heavily on the state programs, you know, it seems to put an enormous burden on the citizens to deal with those local politics when in fact the national EPA is supposed to be there so that they don't have to have that undue burden.

And my question more specifically would then be: Has the EPA ever pulled the agency authority from a state program. And if it never has, would you consider it, and what might be the precipitating incidents or behaviors that would cause it to be so?

MR. CLIFFORD: I don't know specifically. My understanding is we have pulled a program or two from a state agency. But it is not the agency's inclination to do that for a couple of key reasons. One is we don't have the resources to run these programs is one key one.

I am not aware of any incidents in our region, and I've been in our region for four years, but even historically in our region, I'm not aware of any program that this region has pulled away from a state.

Now, the circumstances that would arise to that occasion. I am familiar with a situation in the Northeast where a state agency's resources were cut so drastically by the legislature that the regional office determine that they -- there was no way they could implement one or two of their programs, and they initiated the process to withdraw those programs as a result of the cut in resources.

The state legislature responded, put those resources back in there, and the agency never followed through with its proposal to withdraw the program. The kinds of things that would lead a region to go to that type of a drastic measure is not complying with the federal requirements and not agreeing to develop a plan where we found they were not complying with federal requirements, not agreeing to implement a plan of action to bring them back into compliance with those federal laws and regulations.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. I think Dr. Ford has a question.

DR. FORD: Mr. Clifford, my question is

somewhat similar. You described a great deal of action on the part of Region VI in this area. And my question is:

How typical is it that a regional office would become so seemingly involved in enforcement, technical assistant, analytical assessment of a region within a state where programs have been delegated?

MR. CLIFFORD: Dr. Ford, it's very unusual. In fact, I'm not aware of a locality or a community that we have done something similar in our region. This is, from our perspective, sort of like a pilot investment. We clearly don't have the resources to do this in multiple communities across our region.

And there are other communities in our region who cry out for this type of attention. Our hope is that by investing heavily up front and trying to bring facilities into compliance, trying to work with the state so that with us, we are bringing facilities into compliance, to get some of the issues that are before the community addressed and behind us, we can move on to some of those other communities.

But we don't have the resources to do this elsewhere. This is the first time we've attempted to do something this comprehensive and focus in one local area.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you. We have time for one more question. I'm going to ask Mr. Quigley. Okay. We

` 5

have one more speaker before lunch, so if you could make it kind of brief.

Mr. Quigley.

MR. QUIGLEY: Two real informational questions.

You said your efforts -- you're doing five times more than
you used to do in one specific area. What area was that
again?

MR. CLIFFORD: That was with respect to referring enforcement actions to the Department of Justice.

MR. QUIGLEY: And what does that translate into? How many was it before; how many is it now?

MR. CLIFFORD: Typically, we would only do in an area like this probably one a year. So we've stepped that up to, like, five a year and a lot -- it takes quite a while to develop a case from its initial inspection, and so we have a lot of casework yet to come, based on our stepped-up inspection efforts in this area.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. And the final question is:
You indicated that you haven't received any pressure from
the governor or the legislature or the chamber of commerce
to slow down, but sounds like you're getting a lot of
suggestions from citizens that you ought to -- that there
ought to be more done. Does that indicate sort of a
future course of action that might suggested?

MR. CLIFFORD: Well, I don't consider community 1 focus and pressure political pressure. 2 MR. OUIGLEY: Well, I -- but my question, I 3 guess, is if the people want you to move faster and the 4 politicians are happy with the way you are right now, 5 doesn't that suggest that maybe there could be more done? 6 MR. CLIFFORD: I think the suggestion that 7 there could be more done is very well taken. I agree more 8 could be done. 9 MS. MADDEN: We don't have really have time --10 into something very -- to get into something --11 DR. RICHARDSON: No. I have all these things 12 running around in my head, and this will be very brief. 13 MS. MADDEN: Go ahead. 14 DR. RICHARDSON: Commendations on the 15 establishment of the entity that addresses environmental 16 justice, which is a much more genteel time -- turn than 17 the one it replaced -- environmental racism. So if 18 anybody's concerned with the environmental justice, then I 19 have a concern with them. 20 But I'd like to know something about the 21 22 staffing. That tells us to what extent you're dedicated to carrying out the principles of environmental justice; 23 the staffing pattern, the workload, that kind of thing? 24 MR\_ CLIFFORD: Well, this is our first year. 25

1 the office is Olivia Balandran, and she's here with us 2 today. Warren works with Olivia. We have five 3 individuals that in my view are highly competent 4 individuals. 5 DR. RICHARDSON: That's five professional 6 7 staff? MR. CLIFFORD: Yes. Five professional staff. 8 DR. RICHARDSON: Plus support staff? 9 MR. CLIFFORD: And support staff -- they have 10 to scramble for it. 11 DR. RICHARDSON: So that's the next thing you 12 need to address. 13 MR. CLIFFORD: We share support staff actually, 14 but five professional staff, very -- a quite varied level 15 of experience on the part of those staff, but two of them 16 are Hispanic speaking, and we have a large Hispanic 17 population in our region that we need to address as well. 18 And so -- but to get to your other question, 19 Ms. Richardson, is they're highly overworked. They are 20 highly overworked. 21 DR. RICHARDSON: But yet it has choices as many 22 as our regional staff, so somebody has a commitment. 23 Thank you. 24 MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much.

25

We have, as I mentioned, five individuals. The head of

All right. We're going to take two more questions, even though we are running a little bit behind time. This is so interesting. I'm going to ask Dr. Ford and then Ms. Bourg.

MR. CLIFFORD: Chairperson, is that going down?

I just want to follow up. The staff -- we have five

staff. We also have a representative at each of our

divisions. So we have an environmental justice work group

that cuts across the entire organization that supports

them, so we have people in each division that are focused,

in addition to the five on the -- in the office, and

together they're working quite collaboratively across all

these issues in the region. Thank you.

DR. FORD: Mr. Clifford, I just wanted to follow up to the earlier question. You pointed out that in October '97 EPA Region VI conducted a review of DEQ -- LDEQ's enforcement activities and outcomes. Is there any connection between the findings of deficiency and your concentration here in the Lake Charles area, or they are totally unrelated in terms of those deficiencies and what you brought to the table in this community to address environment issues?

MR. CLIFFORD: No, sir. I don't believe there is a direct connection. I think we began to step up our enforcement activities as a result of the two earlier

£ - - - - - -

NEJAC meetings in Wisconsin and North Carolina. And Sam Coleman, our enforcement division director, initiated the process of stepping up our enforcement acts.

Concurrent with that we were petitioned by LEAN to review the enforcement program. And so there wasn't -- we didn't find anything to my knowledge, and I can double-check, but to my knowledge, I don't believe we found anything with respect to our review of the enforcement program that said more things were not getting done in the Lake Charles area than in other parts of the state. If that was your question.

DR. FORD: That speaks basically to it.

MS. BOURG: Well, I have a two-part question, since I'm allowed one question. I'll just call it a technical question with two parts. Can I get away with it?

I understand that loading docks do not have to report high emissions; that only manufacturing facilities report them on the toxic release inventory. And yet, surely it would seem that those incidents that would have occurred or might occur at loading docks could affect communities that live nearby. That would be Part 1.

Part 2 of that question is you mentioned that the drinking water, where you tested it, did not show the dioxin or did not show the things that you were testing

for. Is it not true that the drinking water level comes from one <u>level</u>, and that above that level, perhaps not below it where the aquifer is, but above that level where you tested, might in fact be contamination that is seeping ever so slowly and in fact be something of a time bomb just waiting to get there, which then would be an enormous thing to clean up if the entire aquifer were affected.

MR. CLIFFORD: With respect to TRI -- I figured if I stayed up here long enough you'd ask me a question I couldn't answer, but let me take a shot at it. Our toxic release inventory program is a nonregulatory program. It is simply a reporting program. So there's no authority under the law that allows us or enables us to establish regulations to direct states or facilities to reduce their TRI emissions. It is simply a voluntary reporting measure.

Now, as a result of that voluntary program, however, in many parts of the country and at many facilities, there is a definite decrease in emissions because facilities don't necessarily want to be reported as the largest emitter of pollution in any particular area. So it's a voluntary program.

So getting back to the loading docks. Yes, emissions from loading docks do contribute to overall emissions in a particular community. But even if they

were added to the TRI inventory, there would be no guarantee that those emissions would actually go down, because the authority to require that does not exist.

Now, with respect to -- on the second question, -- I'm sorry?

MS. BOURG: It was the aquifer and where you tested for the drinking water and what might be a time bomb waiting to go off.

MR. CLIFFORD: We have -- we actually did two things. A lot of the residents in the Mossville area at one time used private drinking water wells also instead of the public water supply. So in response to concerns about those, we did a search to see if anybody was continuing to use a private well for drinking water.

And I'm pretty sure we found that there were no residents using their private well for drinking water. We did send out a survey and asked, because we don't know where all those private wells are and how they're being used, but we did send out a survey and ask people to tell us if, one, if they were, and two, if they thought that for some reason -- smell, odor, past disposal practices in the area -- they were concerned about the drinking water -- their well, to tell us and we would go inspect it.

I can't remember how many homes we actually

went out and inspected as a result of the survey, however.

\_\_(Pause.)

MR. CLIFFORD: Okay. Warren tells me that's an ongoing effort as we speak.

There are somewhere in the order of 200 industrial facilities in this area. Some of them are regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and they are treatment, storage or disposal facilities. Seven of those fall into that category.

I think at all seven of those facilities, if
I'm not mistaken, there is ground water contamination, the
result of spills, leaks, et cetera, et cetera, in and
around those facilities. Each of those facilities -- and
so that your concern is well taken, Ms. Bourg, that that
contamination can find its way into what is called the
Chicot Aquifer, which is a sole source aquifer drinking
water supply for much of this part of Louisiana. Very
sensitive.

And so we are concerned about that, so we are working with the state to ensure that the contamination that has been released from these seven facilities is being captured by some sort of groundwater treatment system. And to my knowledge, each of those systems are in place and of late, we have actually worked with DEQ to expand some of the groundwater extraction activities at at

renna

1 least one or two of them.

\_MS. MADDEN: One quick question from Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: It's a quick question.

MS. MADDEN: Okay.

MS. PARKS: Clarification. Ms. Bourg mentioned something about heavy increase in bad stuff. Is that in fact what we're looking at, or are we looking at a lot of these problems having been caused by past practices? Can you kind of clarify that?

MR. CLIFFORD: I think the real heart of the issue is twofold. If I live in an area where for years I had been exposed to lots of emissions -- we all know cancer doesn't -- you don't get exposed to something today and develop cancer tomorrow morning. Our bodies react over a long period of time to exposure to hazardous constituents.

And so one concern is that people have been exposed over long periods of time to different types of chemicals. And we won't know at what levels, because before TRI, we didn't measure that. And so there's no way of knowing what body burden residents who live in an area like this have today already built up in their system which are causing or could be causing or contributing to bad health or their children's bad health, for that matter. That's one part.

--

The second part is we now know, based on the toxics release inventory, how much is being emitted in communities like this. The national regs -- EPA's regs -- if I could take air pollution, for example -- we've done what I think is a very good job of finding out for any one particular facility how much they should control their emissions.

But for the National Ambient Air Quality
Standards, which include things like ozone, sulphur
dioxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, we don't have
ambient standards for air toxics. So the soup of
chemicals that residents breathe in an area where there
are -- that is heavily industrialized, we don't yet have a
standard that says, In an area like this there can't be
more than X amount of emissions across all the facilities.
Our science has not gotten us to that point yet.

And so that cumulative impact, both historical accumulation and current cumulative impact of emissions from multiple facilities on an individual, I think, is the heart of the problem that we're trying to address.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Clifford. We appreciate your patience with all these questions.

We have one more presented before we take a lunch break. And we are running a little bit behind schedule, so we'll cut back our lunch\_break a little bit.

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our next presenter is Monique Harden, who is with the Earthjustice Legal Defense. Are you here, Ms. Harden?

Would you please state your name and occupation. for the record.

MS. HARDEN: My name is Monique -- is this the -- yes, this works.

My name is Monique Harden. I'm an attorney and community liaison director in the New Orleans office of Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund. Earthjustice is a nonprofit public interest environmental law firm, and we've been working with community groups in the southern states for the last ten years.

Just gather my notes here. First of all, I'd just -- good morning to you all, and I really want to commend you all on focusing this meeting and holding this meeting in Calcasieu Parish, which has, in my estimation, has been long neglected as a toxic hotspot in this state.

I want to first begin by kind of going over what's been going on since the last committee report in 1993 and kind of catch us up to what's particularly going on here in Calcasieu Parish with the Mossville community. And let me first begin by saying that I'm intimately involved and very committed to working with residents here in the parish and in other parishes in Louisiana, as well

14.

as Mississippi and Texas and Alabama and Georgia, where we have cases\_either under development or in litigation.

And from that -- from those experiences, I think, I can provide you with a lot of information on where things have come to play since the 1993 report, which was extremely important to our work and still used in our work. First of all, one of the cases brought that was focused in the 1993 report involved a community in northern Louisiana.

They named themselves Citizens Against Nuclear Trash. Ms. Rupert Richardson was very much involved with supporting that community group which had a nine-year-long struggle to stop a uranium enrichment facility from locating right between their two historical African-American communities. It would have located on the road that would connect these two communities right outside of Shreveport, Louisiana.

Like I said, this was a nine-year-long struggle against an international consortium of nuclear energy producers that had the support of our Senator J. Bennett Johnson, among other Louisiana politicians, to open up this plant.

At Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund we represented that community group in challenging the licensing of that uranium enrichment plant. One of the

.5

challenges we brought was solely on environmental justice under the National Environmental Policy Act.

And our charge was, The licensing of this facility should be denied under the National Environmental Policy Act because the negative impacts that would be borne by these two African-American communities haven't been considered by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff.

We also found that in the site selection process used by Louisiana Energy Services, there was evidence of racial -- or racism in how they began narrowing their criteria of where they were going to locate and finding these two isolated rural African-American communities as their choice selection.

In May 1997 the Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board denied licensing to the Louisiana Energy Services
solely on environmental justice grounds, finding that,
yes, the negative impacts that would burden these AfricanAmerican communities were not considered and therefore, it
was violative of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Secondly, they also found that there was -that the evidence we were able to present of racism in the
site selection process was also another grounds for
denying the license and also warranted further
investigation. Louisiana Energy Services --

2.2

MS. MADDEN: Ms. Harden, would you speak right into the mic? I think some people can't hear you.

MS. HARDEN: I'm sorry. Louisiana Energy
Services appealed that May 1997 environmental justice
decision which brought in April 1998 the full Nuclear
Regulatory Commission denying the license and upholding
the environmental justice grounds for the denial.

This was a precedent on two grounds. First, this was the only nuclear license that had ever been denied by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, so in all of its years as a regulatory body, it's never once denied a license, which says a lot about how we regulate hazardous facilities in this country.

Secondly it was a precedent because they did deny this license on environmental justice grounds, finding that the negative impacts that would be borne by these African-American communities had not been considered by the staff. There was no attempt to try to mitigate those impacts or avoid them.

So on behalf of Citizens Against Nuclear Trash,

I'd like to thank this committee for raising awareness

about this environmental justice case in the 1993 report

and also leave you with this important fact about the LES

case, which was that this was the first federal government

agency ever making an environmental justice decision,

first of all; and secondly, it brought us one more environmental statute that could be used to ensure and protect on environmental justice.

And I think that's important for this reason:
because what we hear from so many of our environmental
regulators is that environmental justice is something that
they can't do much more than meet on. They can't
regulate, they can't govern it, they can't protect it,
they can't ensure it, but they can hold a meeting to talk
about it, but not really bring that into action.

And the LES case shows that, no, environmental justice can render a decision that blocks a hazardous facility from coming into and harming African-American communities.

Another case I was involved in was the Shintech case, and many of them have heard about it and received some background documents on it. I'm sorry?

MS. MADDEN: Talk right into the microphone.

MS. HARDEN: Okay. Have to put my lips right on it. Okay.

And at that time, I was working with Greenpeace organization, and I was able to develop legal theories and draft a petition that led to the EPA blocking this -- the state-issued air permits and co-writing that with the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic.

The main points of the legal challenge was to echo the demand of the community group in St. James

Parish, who were saying, Enough is enough. We have 17

million pounds of toxic pollution. We don't need another 600,000 pounds of pollution that would be proposed by the Shintech plant.

And what that meant was going through the Clean Air Act and finding those provisions that could be used to support that demand. For example, there's a provision in the Clean Air Act that calls for public participation process that's meaningful. If you don't have that with a facility like Shintech, you don't get your permit. So that was definitely a provision that we used in this petition, among many others.

But all in all, what the petition worked and I think achieved pretty successfully was marrying those provisions of the Clean Air Act to environmental justice concerns for the first time in a way that was articulate and convincing and compelling for a denial of the permit.

Some experiences and lessons I've learned from this is that once we filed the challenge, this petition, DEQ repeatedly said, continuously said, that this permit that they issued to Shintech was valid under the law and met all the regulatory permitting and was something that they would not -- that EPA could not block.

And what they -- and so by saying that, they were saying that, This is really -- what you're really saying is that you want environmental justice, which is something we -- that's outside of our purview or something that's outside of our authority.

And we were saying just the opposite. No.

Environmental justice is within your purview. It's within your authority, because it basically ties down to the fact that for some people, based on their race and their income levels, their environments are not equally protected.

But most disturbing -- I mean, with DEQ, given its track record and reputation in the state, that wasn't alarming -- the fact that they were trying to support this permit that they issued to Shintech. But what was most disturbing to me for the first time in dealing with these kinds of issues was having to respond to attempts by EPA Region VI to get us to withdraw our legal petition.

They clearly didn't want to make a decision, even though they recognized that there was an environmental justice issue that was very compelling in this case and that there were areas where the permit failed to meet with legal and regulatory standards.

The agency delayed and postponed its decision for months, and finally in September 1997, it did issue a decision that did block the state-issued permits for

failure to comply with emission standards in the Clean Air Act. And—the way we argued it was is that the failure of these permits to comply with existing environmental laws and regulations would mean that -- would -- knew that the facility would be that much more hazardous and that much more destructive and polluting in this community, and therefore is an environmental justice concern; not a technical concern.

But the decision by EPA is certainly one that in the process of reaching that decision, it's certainly one that showed, to me anyway, that this agency is under a great deal of political pressure. They didn't want to make a decision on Shintech, even though -- and instead wanted to try to figure out a way in which the community could accept Shintech for some pie in the sky bargaining with other existing pollution that wouldn't have any guarantees on assuring.

But this was the process that was involved in Shintech and it was a very eye-opening experience. Here in Calcasieu Parish, I believe the political pressure is even much more glaring, because one of the things we come across, one of the obstacles we find, is the question of, Prove to us that a community is harmed by this pollution.

And the question is really -- another way to . look at it is -- was that the questions really begging is,

Show us more dead bodies before we take action. Show us more children with cancer, show us more women with endometriosis problems before we take action, which is certainly not the way a public health or environmental agency should be approaching these kinds of issues.

But in the case of Mossville, we have that. We have people who are suffering from toxic pollution, and it's proven, it's incontrovertible, but what kind of response do we get. Do we get the immediate action that seems to be promised once you meet that hurdle, that burden of showing that, yes, my health is being affected by the toxins in my environment.

No. What we get instead has been a very frustrating process of trying to force agencies to just do their jobs. Nothing more than that. We have a federal public health agency, a state public health agency, the DEQ and the EPA, all coming together and saying, This is our charge. We're going to work on this. We see this is a crisis. We're going to step in and we're going to take care of this problem.

And as soon as the community begins to get involved and say, Well, we would like to work with you on this and we have some ideas on what this should look like, because, you know, we are, after all, experts on how we're suffering here -- the doors were shut on them.

1.8

And beyond that, we began hearing rumors about what -- that the community was telling the ATSDR to go away, which was never, ever said, and I still hear that to this day. And I don't know where that rumor began, but I can tell you in my involvement meetings with ATSDR officials, EPA, and community people, the statement coming from the community has always been clear and concise: We need you here, we want you here, but we want you to do more.

The programs that you come up with with this work group doesn't go far enough. Why? Because it's only based -- it's only focused on data gathering and research. We need action. We want work groups or a process that takes care of the health problems in our community.

We want work groups or a process that takes care of and reduces the accidents in our communities and the excessive pollution here. But instead, what they were being handed down and actually what was being handed to them was just more research and data gathering.

The community of Mossville is surrounded by 17 industrial facilities. Many of them are known sources of dioxin. You didn't hear in the comments that came before me any discussion about how those facilities would be inspected or scrutinized for their dioxin proliferation in this community. You didn't hear that. And I think that

comes from political pressure.

In the Mossville community, you have PPG
Industries, Condea Vista, and Conoco, which are some of
the leading polluters in this area and in this state, I
should mention, that just with air pollution alone, when
you combine the facilities that are all located within two
miles of the Mossville community, they constitute over
one-fifth of the total air pollution in the State of
Louisiana, and this is what surrounds this AfricanAmerican community.

There's much more data and statistics that I can share with you in our report that a coalition of groups, including Mossville Environmental Action Now and others, Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund, Communities for a Better Environment, put together called Breathing Ploys and the Toxic Costs of Industries in Louisiana, and I have -- in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana -- and I have a copy for the committee I can submit to you.

The bottom line problem here is that no one wants to do the hard work. It's tough. It's tough, because the reason why EPA is here in Calcasieu Parish is because they should be here. This is not a freebie that they're throwing out to the community. It's because the issues here really warrant extra attention, because things are really at a very, I think, critical and serious state

· 6

for the health and the environment for the people who live in this state.

One of the things, for example, with the dioxin issue: Federal agencies and state agencies have known that dioxin has been a problem in this community for the last 13 years. There have been fish advisories issued and posted here in Calcasieu Parish advising people against fish consumption because of dioxin contamination.

Thirteen years ago.

EPA and DEQ had a duty 20 years ago to set limits on how much pollution goes into our waters. They didn't do it. Right now they're in litigation on that; on that failure to implement that, to enforce that law, the Clean Water Act. In fact, they're actually in court to appeal a federal court decision that says, Yes, EPA, you do have this duty. You must set limits on polluted waters here in the State of Louisiana. That, of course, was missing from the address before mine.

So if you want to talk about cumulative pollution impacts, we're probably not there scientifically on the air, because of just the patterns and the wind patterns and that sort of thing. But we are there for water, and we also have a law, and it's not being followed. It's not being enforced.

But we get research, we get monitoring data,

and where does it go? We now have research monitoring data that people are in fact contaminated with dioxin.

One gentleman here in the Mossville community is bedridden, and he was one of the individuals tested. He's being taken care of by his elderly father.

This is a real life and death situation these industries have put this community into. And it may be asking too much for community residents to think of EPA, because DEQ has already demonstrated which side it's going to stay on. But it might be too much to ask EPA to step in and do something, but under the law, they have to.

And the lack of resources or those sort of things can't be used as excuses. We got to figure out ways around it. Instead, what we get is obstruction and very frustrating actions and responses taken by EPA when asked to take more action, to get more involved here.

The Mossville dioxin situation -- Damu Smith has submitted a chronology documents the resistance by our federal and state agencies very well in handling and coming to grips with how they're going to treat the community with respect and get action on solving the health problems and environmental woes in this community.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you very much.

Do we have questions? Mr. Quigley.

MR. QUIGLEY: Could you just explain the role

of race in this? Are we talking environmental -- I mean, our charge is specifically civil rights. Why is this important for this committee?

MS. MADDEN: The question was, Would you

MS. HARDEN: Sure. For -- and Mossville is 100 percent African-American community. Like many communities around Louisiana, it was founded shortly after the Civil War by blacks freed from slavery. These communities have very long histories. You can go to their old churches and you can, you know, see the photographs and the documents that go back -- the cemeteries that go back to the 1800s.

So it's in communities like Mossville where we had these industries, these petrochemical complexes, these oil refineries, right outside of the doors of where residents have been living for generations. This committee should be very interested and concerned about what's going on at Mossville, because it's the first case that we have where we can no longer hide behind or cover the issue with a fig leaf of, We're not quite sure what the health impacts or consequences are from this kind of a situation. We know.

And the gentleman I was just talking about -he's suffering. The impacts of living with toxic vinyl
production facilities and refineries right outside his

\_MS. MADDEN: Thank you.

3

Are there other questions? No other questions?

4

All right. I can't believe that.

5

We are now going to take a lunch break, and

6

we'll come back here at 1:30, and I'm going to ask Dr.

7

Ford to preside over that afternoon session.

8

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the hearing was

9

adjourned, to reconvene this same day, Tuesday, September

10

12, 2000, at 1:30 p.m.)

11

, 79 Y. W.

12:40 p.m.

MS. MADDEN: I'd like to call to your attention that we're asking Dr. Robert Ford to preside over this afternoon session.

I'm Roberta Madden. I'm chair of the State

Advisory Committee, but I'm just going to sit in and ask

questions this time.

DR. FORD: -- some of you who may have missed the very opening statement by Chairman Madden. I'm going to just read a portion of her opening statement that reflects on our ground rules. Important that we keep those in mind.

We want to remind everyone who presents that in fact there is some precautions about statements that could defame or otherwise be considered to be inflammatory. We hope to keep on schedule so that people who are making presentations, we would ask that you stay within the time .

limits that have been made known to you.

The time allotted for each presentation must be strictly adhered to for that purpose. We will include presentations by each participant, followed by questions from committee members. To accommodate persons who have not been invited but wish to make statements, we have scheduled open periods on our agenda during the evening

sessions today at 8:15 and tomorrow at eight o'clock p.m.

\_\_Anyone wishing to make a statement during that period should contact a staff member for scheduling.

Written statements may be submitted to committee members or staff here today or by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The address is Gateway Tower II, 400 State Avenue, Suite 908, Kansas City, Kansas, 66101-2406.

The record of this meeting will be open -- that is, will be closed on October 13, 2000. With that reminder, I would like to deviate a bit from our agenda and give a two-minute opportunity to a citizen who is here and cannot stay much longer.

Ms. Peggy Franklin from Willow Springs will make a two-minute statement.

MS. FRANKLIN: I'd like to thank this commission for coming to Calcasieu Parish. I really appreciate it. My name is -- pardon?

DR. FORD: Pick up the one on the table.

MS. FRANKLIN: Oh. My name is Peggy Franklin.

I live at 2512 North Claybourne, Sulphur, Louisiana. I
have been an environmental activist since 1982 when a
train carrying toxic waste derailed in Livingston,
Louisiana, and the toxic residue was shipped to the Willow
Springs community in southwest Louisiana.

Until the train derailment, I had been

satisfied living in a sheltered world, surrounded by my family. However, the train derailment would change my life and my view of the other world. When the national news media carried the story of the derailment, I was astounded to learn that the waste was coming to my community.

I got on the phone and I talked to state and area public officials, and they advised me to get in touch with a group of wacko environmentalists, which consisted of Mike Tritico, Lynn Knapp, Herbert Rigmaden, Mabel Jones, Ruth Shephard, and Ruth Dohon and Sam Keys.

To my surprise, the group of wackos consisted of men and women, black and white, working for the same end result: the closure of a hazardous waste landfill and injection well located in a rural African-American community called Willow Springs.

When I began this long journey in 1982, there was no grant money. I used grocery money, gasoline; I wore out an automobile. There was no infighting, no power trips, and no racial division. We were an unbeatable team, and the landfill was closed in the 1980s. We could not have won the battle divided.

What I have observed of the last five years is alarming. Both white and black activists are fighting for power and grant money. I think the division is harmful to

everyone and in the end, no one wins. It is exactly what our opponents want.

What can this commission do? I think you can work as a mediator to get the different groups in the State of Louisiana to refocus their energy so that issues become a top priority and not personalities.

Thank you very much for this time.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Ms. Franklin, for your statement.

Are there questions from committee members?

Then we shall proceed. Mr. Edgar J. Mouton,

president of the Mossville Environmental Action Now,

Incorporated, was next scheduled. Is he present?

Then we'll go on to Lois Malvo, North Lake Charles Environmental Action Now, Incorporated.

Pick up the microphone and talk directly into it, Ms. Malvo.

MS. MALVO: Yes, sir.

Hello, everyone, and I'm so happy to see that you all are here to help us in our dilemma of chemical warfare. I thank God for you all being here. I thank God for everyone that is here today to help us in this fight for justice.

I live in the North Lake Charles community, which is a community consisted of different communities;

you know, a number of communities within the district of North Lake Charles. And my name is Lois Booker Malvo. My occupation is private duty nurse. I was born, raised and lived most of my life in the Fisherville area of the North Lake Charles community.

As long as I can remember, there has always been hazardous waste in the North Lake Charles Fisherville community. There were a pump dump site, cement company, and the trains that would sit on the tracks day and night, seven days of the week. They are on the tracks as I speak. Nothing has changed.

When I was a child, we would jump the train tracks to get to the school. The school was named after my family, the Washington family. My family owned 80 acres of the land. They donated the land for the school. Many lost their lives jumping the trains, crawling under the trains.

In 1983, 11,700 gallons of perchlorethylene was spilled in the neighborhood on both sides of the track, because at that time, they had a class action lawsuit, and both sides of the track were included into this class action lawsuit.

Now, today as I speak to you, there's another class action lawsuit, and they only taking part of the people in this class action lawsuit. I think that is very

2,1

all the law.

unfair. And then, too, I don't really care about class action suits because it was a lot of abuse done to us.

In 1983 the lawyers got all the money. The people got nothing. They got their rights, their health rights and all their rights taken from them. I was one of those people. That is why I sit before you today, because I want to do something to make a difference. But change must come.

To go on, it was called -- the train

derailment in 1983 was caused from a faulty valve leaving

out of the PPG plant. We were told that there were no

reason to be alarmed. The chemicals would be cleaned

up -- would be cleaned up.

But anyway, the chemical was to be cleaned up, and we didn't have to be alarmed because, you know, it was a -- the chemical had a long-term health effect. This is what we were told. And we believed whatever the law told us, because we -- at that time, most of us were poor people. We didn't know the law, and I still don't know

I lost my paper. But I'll go on and just talk.

And so we believed in whatever we were told about this chemical, and so we went on with our lives and tried to do the best we could, you know, to survive. And we waited 15 long years passed, and I saw people out

drilling and testing the land, and I wanted to know what was going on.

Here come to find out that we were lied to in 1983. The perchlorethylene -- a lot of it was still present in our community. They disrespected us highly. They had no consideration for us at all. We have these trains that are parked there, like I say, 24/7.

There is chemicals of all type in the area. We don't live -- it's an example of a chemical plant to me, because the chemicals are in -- only difference the chemicals are in tank cars. But it's almost the same as living near a chemical plant.

We don't know -- we don't have anyone to come and tell us when chemicals are being emitted in our community. We could be sleeping at night and maybe there's a train derailment. We don't know. Lot of times we had numerous train derailments. Lot of times -- lot of us knew about it only on TV or by someone telling us in the neighborhood that they had one last night or whatever. No regards for us at all.

We have homes that are deteriorating. Our -the homes are not being developed. Instead, homes are
being torn down. I feel as though the City of Lake
Charles has abandoned us. We have crime excelling in a
depressed area, and we are. You can get nothing but

corruption and crime excels.

we have projects sitting on toxic sites. We are fighting now about a 56-unit duplex that's about to be built. All they trying, all they can to build a complex on toxic site, a school as well. We have lot of health problems. No one has come and did a health survey or did blood sampling in our community.

It is just like we're living in a third world country. Where is the American dream? Where is liberty and justice for all? You know, we don't have any -- where I live at, I always hear on TV that we are in a all-time high economically in the United States of America. But we're not part of that American dream.

And I ask you today to please help us in our community, in all the communities that are here and that are not here. Please help us in this dilemma. We need all the help we can get. I feel as though the government can do more than what they are doing, but some reason they find it to not to do the right thing here in the State of Louisiana.

And we also have schools, elementary schools, a matter of fact, little children that are less than yards away from this chemical dilemma here with the trains on the tracks, 24 hours, seven days a week. That brings a fear in my heart, because I see all the time where there

is train derailments going on, and I don't know when there may be a\_disastrous one that lives will be taken.

Across these train tracks, over these train tracks, we have bridges that are carrying 18-wheelers, cars and everything else, and I often have a fear of what if one time one of these -- it'd be a major accident, and one fall on one of these trains maybe while they moving.

'My God, what a disaster that would be. That's a fear to me.

The people in the area, like I say, are very sick. They have cancer of all kind. You name it, they got it. The long-term effect is here for us of health problems. And we also have no economic development at all. We have no means and ways of our money coming back to us where we can be a sufficient people.

Like everyone else or those that have part of the American dream, we want it, too. We are considered American citizens. We desire the good life like everyone else, the livelihood. And God knows we deserve it as well. This is America. Would you please help us to balance the scale of justice?

We would like to -- for justice to prevail for us as well. I'm not here to attack anyone, but those who are responsible for the problems of the toxic in our area. We pleading -- I am pleading to you, find God somewhere in

\_-

your heart to realize that we are human beings. We deserve a good life as well.

I don't want any more pacifier. This is all that I have been getting is a pacifier. My community has been getting a pacifier. No more pacifier for us. You will hear my cry until the day I die, until justice prevail for us. And all I can say is that I am so glad to see you all here.

Once again, I say please find it in your heart to please remember that we need all the help we can get.

We also have the chemical, I was told -- there's 20 -- there is 21 tested wells in our area. I was told that two years ago, the perchlorethylene is not too far from the Chicot Aquifer. That is our city water system.

Everyone in the City of Lake Charles and everyone everywhere else should be concerned about this, because this can cause a lot of death, a lot of health problems. And we just need help very badly.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Ms. Malvo.

MS. MALVO: Thank you all.

DR. FORD: Questions? Okay.

MR. MORRIS: Ms. Malvo, my question to you is: You said the law let you down. Could you define that for me and tell me how did they let you down?

MS. MALVO: Well, I have gone and some others

1.8

in my community has gone before Legislature to plead to please help us with the problem of the trains on the tracks. And we have gone to the city as well. Our problem is still there all these years. It has never -- no one has never really cared to me, because the problems is still there. They let us down.

They didn't even -- lot of -- you know,

Legislature did come to our community and stuck a pacifier

in my mouth and just said to me that, Well, we would love

to know more about the chemical problems. And that's all.

They never did try to get back in touch with us or

anything.

HUD -- we called many times to New Orleans.

HUD is now fixing to help us maybe with housing and other programs that we never knew that was available to us, because like I say, our city abandoned us. They knew that they could help us but they turned they backs on us.

We have lost so many young people. I mean, our young people have no hope. They have killed each other.

Most of our young black men are incarcerated, because when you have an area that's just at a disadvantage, you're not going to have anything. There's no hope.

Women raising their little kids alone. And they have rules about housing that it seems to me as though they got it -- the qualifications only available to

the women. The men can't -- the homes are -- the family unit is being divided. And it's just causing more and more corruption, I say, because when I was a child coming up, I had my mama and daddy present, you know. They worked hard seven days a week, but they were there.

It's not like that today. Many young women raising children alone. They got to work some time two jobs; some work three. It's hard. So that's why I feel like the government has failed. The law has failed.

MR. MORRIS: As a followup question to that, if I might, you said that in your statement that the housing authority was building units or in the process of building units on a dump site?

MS. MALVO: And also built public housing on a dump site.

MR. MORRIS: Has there been any environmental studies related to the toxicity of the dump sites and that it is okay to build houses there? Or is that something that just happened and went by the wayside, and somebody overlooked that.

MS. MALVO: I don't think it was overlooked. They knew that that was a dump site.

DR. FORD: I saw Bill Quigley's hand's next up. Bill, you have a question?

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: As a followup to that, I

just want to get a better understanding of where the construction is, the HUD -- I assume it's public housing being constructed. You said 56 units. Have they already begun construction?

MS. MALVO: Well, I see a site where they're getting ready to -- they're clearing the land, and I hope to God that's not what they're doing. I hope to God. I'm going to find out.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: Have you asked HUD whether they have done any studies, and have you asked them to respond to your complaint?

MS. MALVO: HUD said that they were going to look into the matter, and we're trying to get something done about that to -- you know, to stop it.

And I want to add that as I look around in my community and I'm now -- my eyes are open to what pollution is all about, and I'm finding more and more pollution as I go.

MR. QUIGLEY: Ms. Malvo, were you here this morning when Mr. Clifford was here?

MS. MALVO: Yes, sir. I was here.

MR. QUIGLEY: He painted us a picture of -that Environmental Protection Agency is doing a awful lot
better job than they used to be doing. Is that your
experience?

· 13

MS. MALVO: Well, I feel like more can be done for our area. I mean, we were told that they would be more chemical -- more monitoring wells added into our community, but -- and that's been quite awhile, and there's -- they haven't come back to say anything. I mean, I call. Sometimes I call, but I got tired of calling, because I go to the meetings and I voice my problems.

Everyone very much aware of me and my -- and the problem. I don't feel like I need to keep calling and making long distance phone calls. My phone call -- my phone bill right now is \$400. I'm a poor person. But I thank God anyway, because guess what. He's taking care of me. My phone is still on.

MR. QUIGLEY: What about change. What about positive change. Has there been any positive change in this circumstance, this situation?

MS. MALVO: No, sir. I'm honestly telling you no, sir. The things that we -- we need a lot of things implemented in our community, like blood sampling which has never taken place. We need more health surveys. We need our young children, our little kids be educated about toxic. We need a lot of help, knowledge.

MR. MORRIS: I hate to be a mic hog, but I got -- while I have it, can I ask just one question?

DR. FORD: Well, if only --

MS. BOURG: Yes, sure.

MR. MORRIS: And I'm a novice at this. I'm new at this, so I don't know. But explain to me if you have injection -- if you have well testing and air quality monitoring devices, what happens if -- with the results of those monitoring -- with the results from those devices? And if the devices register extremely high levels of toxicity in the ground or in the air, do you know what happens? Is there a process to shut stuff down until it clears up, or is it just to collect the data or the information?

MS. MALVO: They -- from what my knowledge is, data is being collected and that's about it. Data is being collected, and that's it.

DR. FORD: Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: Thank you for your statements to the committee. I work with a community development corporation, and some time back we were asked by a community to help them get housing. And the funds that they wanted were from Housing and Urban Development -- HUD.

And I seem to remember very clearly a site assessment on environment; that you could not put a site assessment or put any HUD funds within one-half mile, I

\_\_\_

believe -- it's some such amount of space like that,
distance like that -- within one-half mile of any known
toxic or environmental impact area.

And so I guess that whole community was pretty much off-limits for the investment of any HUD dollars. So I guess my question would be: Are you familiar with any environmental site assessment requirements or regulations about placement of HUD dollars or investment of HUD dollars in an area where there's some environmental impact. Has anyone given you that information?

MS. MALVO: No, ma'am. I have not been given that information by no one.

MS. BOURG: Have there been any City of Lake Charles Parish dollars -- you said, They have abandoned us.

MS. MALVO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOURG: And that there's no investment in the area. It would seem that if that's the case that in fact you can't put HUD dollars where there is environmental impact that you're going to get a double whammy.

MS. MALVO: Well, we --

MS. BOURG: Not only do you maybe have pollution there, but you may be precluded if in fact they live up to their regulations for the placement of

time at PPG and, you know, voiced my concerns. But then

25

\<del>-</del>

all they do is just hear what I got to say and no action is taking place.

MS. PARKS: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Yes. Ms. Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. Ms. Malvo, would you identify the industries that you think have had an adverse impact on your community?

MS. MALVO: Well, I can tell you, ma'am, every last one if you ask me, because all industry -- they are, like I said, our community is a storage area of chemicals that's coming out all the plants. And they are constantly adding train tracks. As the plant expands, the train tracks expand. The tank cars multiply.

And we have -- I don't know when it's going to be, but I believe they going to be almost in people yards, because like I say, the homes and the schools are within yards from the tank cars and the railroad.

MS. MADDEN: Have you made any complaints to these specific industries, directly to the industries?

MS. MALVO: I have, but if I could get to go and talk with them to let them know that we, in our community, would like for them to come and be accountable for the action of these trains -- tank cars, and be, you know, if we could come together and communicate one on one with the community.

Not a class action lawsuit, because that's pure abuse. We-have been through it numerous times. And we're still left in the same situation. Worser, because each time they take more and more and more from us. Our health and everything else is not even being noticed or cared about.

DR. FORD: More questions from the committee?

If not, thank you, Ms. Malvo.

MS. MALVO: God bless. God bless all.

DR. FORD: Thank you.

Our next presenter is Mr. Edgar Mouton. He's president of the Mossville Environmental Action Now.

Mr. Mouton --

MR. MOUTON: Yes, sir.

DR. FORD: -- I'm going to ask you to hold the microphone fairly close to your mouth. And if you'll start by giving us your name and your affiliation; your organization you're associated with for the record.

MR. MOUTON: Okay. All right. My name is

Edgar Mouton, Jr., and I'm the president of the Mossville

Action -- Environment Action Now, Incorporation, group.

And I would like to thank the staff for being here and

allowing me to say whatever -- what I feels and what has

been said already from the other peoples.

I was born and raised in Mossville, and I lived

to see a lot of changes. Matter fact, I retired from one of the local chemical plants, and I know a lot of problems that we're having come from the plant. But our agencies doesn't believe that it do.

We -- like I say, I was here when the plants were first beginning; when they was first being built.

And the problem that we having now that we didn't have back in those days, so the plant's got to have a mental effect or health effect on our community as we speak.

And I would also like to say in the process -- something wrong here.

MS. BOURG: It's okay. It's okay.

MR. MOUTON: Okay. Okay. So through all of that, the support that we felt that we should have had have gotten from our government agency has been very, very, very, very lax. It seems to be every time they come to Mossville, I called it a bees' gathering, because that's all it is; just complaining or who going to do this and who going to do that.

And the peoples in the community have really, really have got tired of the meeting and nothing has being done. We -- myself, I've only been involved into this environmental group about two years, and out of the two years, we have written numerous of letters to our government agency for help to come give us some help or

give us some pointers or what we can or what needs to -we know what needs to be done, but what we know and want
to be done, they don't want to do it.

And that seemed to have been the problem all the way. For instance, last night I got a call from Mr.

Tom Unchane [phonetic] that he wanted to have a meeting with the group in Mossville and the other leaders. So it was not supposed to be nobody there but eight peoples.

Myself is one of the eight people.

And when I got to the building last night, I wind up with 40 or 50 people. So I asked this question:
Where are these peoples coming from? There was a cap board. There was industry, and coming into the community, which we was not prepared for, didn't want them there because we wasn't prepared for them. But they came.

So this morning Mr. Chang -- Tai Chang, called me. He said, Mr. Mouton, what -- I'm not responsible for what happened at the meeting last night. Well, I say, who is? To me, it was embarrassing. It was embarrassing to me, embarrassing to my community because we, like I say, we was not prepared for them and we didn't have no idea that they was coming.

And the thing about it, nobody knows who invited them. But the peoples that he called was myself, Ms. Pat Hardman, Ms. Deborah Ramirez, Mr. Charlie

ż

Alherton, and a couple more people. But yet and still, all of these people shows up, and I want to know why.

Nobody can tell me why they was there.

putting up with the agency ever since I've been involved in and through this environmental stuff. And this meeting that we have been trying to have a technical and legal meeting with the agency for at least a year. And that meeting has never come about.

They always -- there's some technicality.

There's some reason or another why this meeting will never take place. But yet today we still wants to have that meeting. And the sooner we have that meeting, hopefully that we can start moving forward with something definitely that we feel that our community can feel that something is going to be done.

It's been a lot of, lot of, lot of jaw-jacking, and they come to ask us what do we want or what can we do. It's not what we can do. What we want you all to do. They put it in our hands as though that we have power to do whatever is necessary to be done.

We have asked for work groups. They brought they own in. We wasn't satisfied with them, so we didn't want them. So we put our own work group into action, and ever since then, we been having problem. That work group

has not started yet, and we is still looking forward for the work group.

And I tell you something else that we have put up with, like I said, last two years is they tell us one thing and then do just the opposite. Now, since we went to Atlanta to the NEJAC meeting, now, they had supposed to have got in touch with us with a work program. They did not.

But all of a sudden, the first part of this week, we gets a call from our government agency wants to meet with us. Why? Because we are having this meeting here today. That's why they wanted to get in touch with us. But all before that, no, they didn't want to get in touch with us, because they didn't have nothing to offer. And they still don't, but these things that they are doing today is just made-up, junked-up program that once y'all leave, that's going to be the end of it.

And until they put some reinforcement into the existing laws that make industry clean up their stacks and make industry clean up their ground and make industry do some kind of medical help for my community. And they can do it if they be forced to do it.

But seems as though politics, I feel strongly, that stays in the way, because as Mr. Smith and Ms.

Monique said earlier, we cannot get any help from our

state and local government; none whatsoever. We have tried to get our police jurors involved into our program to give us some type of assistance. They won't touch us. They won't return a call, they won't return a letter or anything of the kind.

But some of the things that has been done, a lot of it is work that we have did on our own. We've contacted various peoples across the country for support, and we have gotten that support. But it's not from our home state elected officials that we feel that could be a lot of help to us.

So that's one of the reasons why we believe and truly that our local government is our -- part of our stumbling block. And we has peoples in the community that is sick and needs help. It's no if and and about it.

There's a gentleman -- somebody mentioned it earlier -- he's 52 years old today, but he started out working in the industry ten years ago, and today he cannot get out of bed. He is bedridden. He has to be waited on hands and feet. He can't do nothing for his self.

But nobody -- nobody wanted to take the initiative. He's one of the peoples that was tested of the -- I know y'all heard about the 28 peoples that was tested in Mossville. He's one of those 28. And -- but and there is other peoples that has a very high level of

dioxin in his system. Nobody not doing anything for them.

\_\_They are not concerned about -- if they would be concerned about them since last year, they would be done worked out some kind of program to help them or consult them or some kind of medical help. And most of the -- lot of our peoples that lives in Mossville and elder peoples. They are my age and older that's been there all their life. They hasn't been -- ever been anywhere else.

And then there was has younger peoples there that wants to be relocated. But the elder people do not want to hear of anything of that nature. But the folks that wants to be relocated, we would like to see them be relocated, even at the industry expense. That's where we would like to see the expense come from for the folks that like to be relocated.

And not only that, myself, I have a health problem. I has a bleeding kidney. Been bleeding for the last three, four years, but I know I wasn't born that way, and it didn't happen while I was working, but it happened.

And I'm sure y'all may not have heard of the Princes. That entire family -- entire family -- is -- they have -- the girls have endometriosis. The mother has cancer. The father has a kidney problem and he have developed cancer. And his son, he got kidney problems.

But -- and that's only some of the problem that is out there in that area.

We even had the -- our state health peoples

came down and did a health survey, and they're supposed to

got back with us in three months. We haven't heard

anything. We haven't heard anything. And see, this is

the kind of stuff that we put up with daily.

whenever they do decide to meet with us, it just bitch, bitch, bitch, bitch. That's all the meetings is about. I know myself I be so frustrated when I come out of one of them meeting, it feel like I been working all day.

And -- but yet and still, they try to dress it up. We going to do this, Mr. Mouton. We going to do this, Mr. Mouton. We going to do that. But once they walk out that door, that's the end of that until somebody with some strength can do something -- make them do something, then they're ready to meet with you.

But otherwise than that, they has all kind of stall tactics that they do, and that is a regular, regular thing. And I really don't feel that the two years -- two years and something that I been involved in this thing -- I don't feel like we has accomplished a thing. But -- nothing but promises. Nothing but promises.

DR. FORD: Mr. Mouton, why don't we have some

questions from members of the committee, and you can continue to give us more information.

MR. MOUTON: Okay.

DR. FORD: Let's start with Dr. Wright.

DR. WRIGHT: Yes. Mr. Mouton, could you give me -- I have two questions. Could you give me just a little bit more information on the meeting that you were supposed to have with EPA Region VI. Who called it and what did they say the topic of discussion was going to be?

MR. MOUTON: Last night?

DR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. MOUTON: Mr. Tom Unchane called me first and he said, Mr. Mouton, I'm going to be meeting with the police jury Monday. Could we meet with the head peoples in Mossville of your various organizations; of myself, Ms. Hartman, and we have the awareness group and we has -- oh, Helping Hands group.

We're -- actually, we got about five groups in the area. And these are the peoples that was supposed to meet -- excuse me -- with Mr. Tom Unchane last night.

These are only those peoples. Nobody else. And when I -- well, they had it at my church, so I opened the church up at five o'clock because I was asked to be there a little early by Mr. Arthur. He thought he would get in earlier enough, but he didn't.

But in that process -- well, people didn't really start coming till about a quarter to 6:00 and the meeting is supposed to start at six o'clock. So after that, all these other peoples, I'm saying to myself, where in the world is these peoples coming from? So we wound up with about 40, 50 peoples there last night.

DR. WRIGHT: Did you have a meeting last night?

MR. MOUTON: Well, we had a discussion with

what -- one of the gentlemans that works with industry

about air monitoring, well, he came to me and said, Well,

Mr. Mouton, why not let's go and get started because Mr.

Tom Unchane -- don't look like he's going to get there.

He going to be late, and whenever the government peoples

come, well, we ought to just let them take over.

So I said, Okay, since you know about this air monitoring. So -- and so he did after we started out, so the government man came in and then he immediately took over. But the point is that I'm making is what they did to us last night is the way they do to us all the time.

We -- they will not allow us to organize a meeting that we feel that we should be in control of. If they're not in control, they do not want to come to our community.

DR. WRIGHT: This is a followup; sort of a related question which has to do with the working groups.

1 to your requests --\_MR. MOUTON: No. 2 DR. WRIGHT: -- for additional modified work 3 groups? 4 MR. MOUTON: No. 5 DR. WRIGHT: And the work groups that they were 6 trying to put in place have not been put in place? 7 MR. MOUTON: No. 8 DR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 9 VOICE: May I add something to that? 10 MR. MOUTON: In the process of that, the work 11 group, which I see that what they are trying to do now --12 they are intending on putting their work groups in, 13 regardless whether we want them or not. But they do them 14 as the individual, as their thing, and then they want to 15 16 invite the .community to attend these work groups. So they're still trying to put in their work 17 group, but the way that they want to do it is going around 18 the community. 19 DR. FORD: Ms. Bourg has a question. 20 MS. BOURG: Thank you, Mr. Mouton, for your 21 statements. You mentioned at the meeting that there were 22 people present who were from the Cap Board and industry. 23 MR. MOUTON: Yes, ma'am. 24

MS. BOURG: Is that the community action agency

program board? What's the Cap?

\_MR. MOUTON: That's a board that industry has established with different peoples from the various community to form this board. And what they do, they -- the -- those community peoples relate to industry what they feel is going on into the -- in the various neighborhoods.

Now, what they do in the process of after they give them this information, I don't know. I've never been a Cap board member, so I do know that they meet every three months, I think, every quarter or something to that point.

DR. FORD: My assumption is that these are the community advisory panels, they're called, as part of CMA's responsible care?

MS. BOURG: Oh, thank you.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

DR. FORD: There's a question. Roberta Madden, please.

MS. MADDEN: Just a quick one, Mr. Mouton.

Could you specifically identify the industries that you had problems with by name; and have you made complaints to those industries, and if so, what was the response?

MR. MOUTON: Condea Vista and Conoco and PPG, which is the one that we have always have filed complaints

1	on, because they are one of the biggest polluters out
2	there
3	DR. FORD: Ms. Richardson has a question.
4	MS. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Mouton.
5	MR. MOUTON: Good afternoon, Ms. Richardson.
6	MS. RICHARDSON: What do we say down this way,
7	Long time no see? Well, listen, I really would not have
8	had a question except when Ms. Bourg raised her question
9	about the regular community action I don't know what
10	you call it now but those agencies?
11	MR. MOUTON: Yes.
12	MS. RICHARDSON: Does one still exist in this
13	area?
14	MR. MOUTON: Yes. Conoco has one
15	VOICE: Community action agencies.
16	MS. RICHARDSON: No, sir. They used to call it
17	Gulf Assistance Program when I was here that kind of
18	thing. A community action agency. Is there such a thing
19	now in the community to
20	MR. MOUTON: The police jury is our control
21	governing body in our area.
22	MS. RICHARDSON: Well, then a followup to that,
23	Dr. Ford?
24	DR. FORD: Yes.
25	MS. RICHARDSON: Are they involved at all in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the efforts of your organization in the Mossville community?

MR. MOUTON: No, ma'am. We cannot -- anything with environmental, we cannot get no response, no help, or no support. Now, I wrote to my congressman, Congressman Breaux. I got two response from him. Always if I can be any help to you, let me know, if.

Now, I -- we have wrote letters to the entire policy jury board for some type of support or help. We has never got a response from that body. For some reason, and any other environmental group here, because I will have -- we have talked about this -- why the policy jury do not give them environmental group no kind of support in this area.

So that make us -- lead us to believe that some reason, they do not want to get involved in these community environmental group. And which I feel that they should and they could. I'll tell you what. I've been pretty active in my community for quite a number of years, since I was 17. And in my community, there are approximately about 160 dirt pits, and I fought them tooth and nail for years and years and years not to dig those dirt pits in my community.

And not only -- and they had the audacity to do it -- haul that dirt out of there 24 hours around the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

clock, disturbing the neighborhood. You know what they call it? The case of our progress. But it's not a one of them suckers on that board would allow that kind of business to be in their neighborhood.

But that is what we put up with in our community. They do what they want or when they want, and they don't feel that we should have no say-so about anything.

MS. RICHARDSON: Sir, had you considered -there's always a way to get on an agenda of a public body. Has your organization considered forcing it into the public as opposed to writing them letters, which they ignore. Had you considered following procedures for getting on an agenda and therefore letting some sunshine onto your concern?

MR. MOUTON: Not indirectly, no. No. I have talked to my police jury one on one, and they has been advised not to by his president, which is -- I mean, which is the governing body. Now, why I still don't know, and I would like to really know why.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir.

DR. FORD: Now, we have to be careful with our language. Suckers is not a very good term.

MR. MOUTON: Okay. Excuse me.

DR. FORD: Other questions?

Mr. Mouton, thank you for your comments.

MR. MOUTON: You're welcome.

DR. FORD: Is Ms. Elizabeth Teel in the audience? Ms. Teel, the supervising attorney for the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic.

Before we start the presentation, could we have you introduce yourselves?

MS.. TEEL: Good afternoon. My name is
Elizabeth Teel. I'm supervising attorney with the Tulane
Environmental Law Clinic. The clinic is a nonprofit
public interest clinic that provides representation to
individuals and community groups, including minority
communities that are concerned about environmental
situations in their community.

The clinic also provides legal training to third-year law students. I'm going to have one of those students here with me today that I'd like to introduce to the commissioners -- Elizabeth Alderman.

We have filed four Title VI complaints on behalf of minority groups in Louisiana over the years.

And I wanted to take our time to point out more of a broad picture of the situation in Louisiana today as the residents and the members of Greenpeace and Earthjustice have well represented or presenting well to you the situation here in western Louisiana.

I want to show a two-minute videotape taken by the residents of Oakville, Louisiana. We filed a Title complaint on their behalf with EPA Office of Civil Rights regarding an enforcement problem there. DEQ, despite a history of numerous violations at this facility over a more than ten-year period, has refused to take any enforcement action against this facility.

And I just want to show you this quickly, and as you can see, this landfill is immediately next to this minority community. It's 100 percent African-American, and when you see the seagulls, also know that there are rats and flies and roaches that are attracted to the landfill as well.

I did not realize until -- I think I'm too far away -- I didn't realize until yesterday -- thank you. I didn't realize yesterday that no one from Oakville was going to be here to speak to you. So just wanted to take a minute to show you this.

(Whereupon, the videotape was played.)

MS. TEEL: The footage that you just saw was taken in 1996. Actually, absolutely nothing has changed in that community. You can go down there today and see the same situation. We are currently still awaiting EPA action on their Title VI complaint, and we have a state court lawsuit, based upon this situation. That footage

was shot from the Oakville community.

\_I was perusing the '93 report and looking at the testimony of another representative from the Environmental Clinic in 1992, Professor Bob Kuen [phonetic]. And frankly, I would just reintroduce all of the testimony from 1992, because nothing has changed since you all were last here, hearing about this situation, at least with regards to most of those communities that you analyzed at that time.

I'm going to turn the floor over to Ms.

Alderman right now to show a brief Powerpoint

presentation. We chose to focus on one community that

y'all looked at back in 1993 -- the community of Alsen,

where the community not only has not improved since y'all

were here, but has actually gotten worse since you last

sat down to hear this testimony.

MS. ALDERMAN: I thank you for having us up this afternoon. We had a map of the industrial corridor next to the presentation. The red flag is where the Alsen community is located. It is a nonincorporated, predominantly African-American community in northeastern Baton Rouge at the mouth of the industrial corridor.

(Whereupon, slides were shown.)

MS. ALDERMAN: The title of the presentation today is Environmental Justice in Louisiana. The air's

1.

not the only thing that's stagnant. I'd just like to reiterate that we feel as though we not just dealing with air pollution problems here. We're dealing with federal and local government agencies that are remaining stale on these issues. They're not addressing them, and they're not taking action.

I'm sure you're all familiar with the EPA's

Office of Environmental Justice. Definition,

environmental justice. Three key points here are: that

environmental justice brings in race, color, and income or

poverty. It also brings in disproportionate impact as it

affects those groups.

This is not just a concept as we've discussed throughout most of the morning. Issues have been addressed in laws and regulations. For instance, the Code of Federal Regulations states -- prohibits any recipient of federal assistance from U.S. EPA from using discriminatory or seemingly discriminatory criteria when administrating, permitting, implementing, and foreseeing or locating a program or activity.

The U.S. Supreme Court has also held that that discriminatory criteria does not to be determined on intent. It can be a discriminatory effect or impact, and that's 15 years of jurisprudence, so if it simply has the impact of discriminating, then a Title VI investigation is

1 appropriate.

\_U.S. EPA has promised documents to guide investigations, allegations in environmental justice.

This year they are accepting final comments on a guidance documents for permits alone. However, they have not addressed the issue of enforcement or intimidation by local DEQ officials, and they have not set dates to provide such documents for Louisiana.

And as I stated, despite these efforts,
environmental justice has not adequately been addressed in
Louisiana. Minority and low-income communities are
continually disproportionately affected. EPA has not
adequately addressed environmental justice concerns in
Louisiana.

We see in a department environmental quality has facilitated environmental injustice in its own state. Furthermore, the governor of Louisiana has adamantly denied the issue of environmental injustice even exists in his state.

These next few slides just provide some statistics on African-American populations in the state, specifically focusing on eastern Baton Rouge and the Alsen community. And as you can see, the United States is 12.8 percent African-American. Louisiana is 32.4 percent.

East Baton Rouge is 38 percent. Within eastern

Baton Rouge the small unincorporated community of Alsen is 99 percent African. African-American. The location of African-American populations in Louisiana, 48 percent of the African-Americans in Louisiana live within the industrial corridor, which is this darkened area on the map next to the screen.

Thirty-four percent live within a three-mile zone, which is right outside that heavy line. As a comparison point, less than 10 percent of the white population in Louisiana resides in the industrial corridor. So we're talking about a high percentage of one particular racial group living in a heavy industrialized area.

The average toxic air emissions per person for a year in the United States is about eleven pounds. For Louisiana it's about 18, and for the industrial corridor parishes it's about 26. However, people living in the Alsen region -- they're exposed to over 642 pounds of air toxic emissions per person per year.

Furthermore, 12 of the -- 12 regulated airemitting -- toxic air-emitting facilities are located
within the same zip code as Alsen. There are actually 65
regulated facilities with the same zip code. Those other
include Superfund sites and landfills.

The average toxic air emissions per square mile

for the United States is 412. For Louisiana it's about 1,800. For the industrial corridor, about 3,200. For East Baton Rouge Parish, we're looking at 18,000 pounds

per square mile per year.

Some of the practical implications of this:

East Baton Rouge ranks in the top 20 percent of 2,120 of the worst counties in the United States for toxic air releases. East Baton Rouge ranks fifth in Louisiana.

Some of the first ones are Ascension Parish and St. James Parish, which are also right alone the industrial corridor.

In eastern Baton Rouge, about 380,105 people face a cancer risk 100 times the goal set by the Clean Air Act. We feel this is unacceptable.

Poverty and unemployment play an important part in the environmental injustice issue in Louisiana.

Industry, especially new industry, like to state that they're going to bring new jobs to economically depressed communities.

However, most people in low income minority communities do not possess the educational requirements or technical training to compete for these jobs. The staff director of the Louisiana Board of Commerce and Industry admits that very few of the jobs created by new industry -- this was stated during the Shintech

controversy -- will go to local residents, due to lack of technical training. Industries tend to bring in their own people.

Myth 2: New industry claims that they're going to bring economic benefits to low income communities. The reality is Louisiana corporate tax exemption structure for industry costs local residents billions of dollars. For instance, in 1995 an industrial corridor parish school system lost over \$4 million due to the industrial property tax.

Money offered to low income communities by industry for support under the guise as aid for economic development is generally written off by industry as a charitable donation. That money's not going to the people.

The average poverty levels of the populations -- U.S., about 13.2 percent. Louisiana is well above the national average with 18.6 percent.

Eastern Baton Rouge is along the same lines, Louisiana. However, if you look in the community of Alsen, the poverty level is about 33 percent.

Unemployment for the areas. The national average is 4.2 percent with Louisiana ranking slightly higher at over 5.1 percent. East Baton Rouge is lower. There are several considerations to take into play there,

in the paris

in the parish. However, when you look at African-

Americans in eastern Baton Rouge, 7.3 percent of that population is underemployed.

considering there are several white affluent neighborhoods

So how has U.S. EPA addressed or failed to address the environmental justice issues in Louisiana? First of all, they have taken no action on 28 Title VI complaints, six of which are pending in Louisiana, including one filed for the Alsen community which I have just handed out to each of you.

They have graciously responded they have received these complaints, but no action and no response has been given. They haven't been timely in providing guidance for investigations of Title VI complaints. A determining document, which is in its final stages, may not even be out before the end of the year.

Furthermore, there are no documents coming out for intimidation allegations or environmental justice as far as investigations into other Title VI complaints. DEQ is our state agency responsible for environmental protection in Louisiana. Louisiana Attorney General Richard Ieyoub has stated that environmental protection is all about justice.

It's about the right and ability of people to be able to participate in a meaningful way in decisions



which affect their health, their neighborhoods, the character of their communities, and the scenic, historic, and aesthetic aspects of the environment.

And an essential element in environmental justice is the right to counsel, legal representation, and the right of the poor and minorities to have access to the courts and regulatory agencies. This is the duty of our state agency in order to be the agency in control of environmental protection.

However, DEQ has facilitated environmental injustice. By permitting in minority and low income communities, they failed to adequately enforce environmental laws and regulations and they've engage in intimidation practices to quiet citizens from speaking out about environmental concerns in their communities.

DEQ continues to issue new permits or reissue permits in minority or low income communities. In a three-month period of July 1, 1999, from September 30, 1999, DEQ issued or reissued 17 permits in eastern Baton Rouge alone.

DEQ's own report noticed the Kearney report.

It was an audit they had a title party make on their -- on how they were doing within enforcement issues stated that,

Citizens are not adequately being involved, were being made to feel important or part of the permitting decisions

in the regions. This is coming right out of the DEQ themselves.

DEQ has failed to take adequate enforcement measures against state polluters in minority and low income communities. The 1998 U.S. EPA report that we heard about earlier stated that DEQ is not collecting penalties to deter noncompliance in a significant number of enforcement actions.

And furthermore, the DEQ is not identifying violations appropriately and is not following up on all violations. The Kearney report states -- this is the DEQ's own report -- Many enforcement activities do not tie directly to improvements in the environment.

A question here is what do they tie directly to if they're not to the improvement of the environment? And to make matters worse, the DEQ has recently had a rule enacted that allows polluters to pay for environmental projects rather than pay a cash fine for violating the law.

So we're looking at industries that are continually violating laws in these areas and now they can get away with it by promising to plant a few trees somewhere. It's not helping the situation.

DEQ has engaged in intimidation practices to quiet those members of minority and low income communities

who oppose their actions. On May 11, 1998, the DEQ official is officially asked to excuse himself from a community meeting in which she was uninvited for engaging in destructive and abusive behavior, calling attendees of the meeting ignorant and idiots.

Minority community was compelled to file a motion to recuse DEQ officials from proceedings involving Shintech after documenting over 58 instances where DEQ members and affiliates engaged in seemingly biased and prejudicial actions. Again, DEQ is not listening to the communities they say they're there to protect.

The final statement of the Kearney report states, The DEQ is generally reactive rather than proactive in protecting and enhancing the environment. That, to me, is an obvious example that DEQ is not addressing the issues up front. They're waiting for these communities to be impacted before they're even attempting to take action.

We also have a governor who denies
environmental injustice exists in this state. When asked
if poor and black residents enjoyed a right to legal
counsel to bring environmental justice claims, he replied,
Let them use their own money; not Tulane's. He was
referring to the legal representation provided by Tulane
Environmental Law Clinic.

In stating this, he was failing to consider the poverty levels and unemployment rates that I have just shown you. Furthermore, under the ABA model rules for the legal profession, legal representation should not ever denied to people who are unable to afford legal services.

And as an aside, Governor Foster is attending law school now, so maybe he will be up on these rules soon.

The governor on environmental justice has also said that environmental justice is the world turned upside down. When you take the issue of environmental racism and never bring industry into an area that's economically depressed, here he has failed to consider again that Louisiana has over 340 industries that are regulated state polluters, and that 10 percent of those facilities are in East Baton Rouge.

I don't believe that Alsen is in need of further pollution. So as a conclusionary note, I would just like to state that since the 1990 report by the commission, Louisiana continues to be a state that is disproportionately impacted by pollution, especially among its minority and low income communities.

The federal EPA, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and the governor have not addressed environmental justice in Louisiana. And until such time

as these issues are addressed, environmental injustice will continue harming its minority communities.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Ms. Alderman.

Questions from the committee?

Had you completed?

MS. TEEL: I just wanted to say one brief thing in closing. As I think you're aware, the Environmental Clinic did file a Title VI petition on behalf of the minority community in Convent, Louisiana, regarding the Shintech matter, and there was obviously a lot of controversy and as a one of the results, in addition to stopping Shintech from locating there, was that the government and industry pressured the Louisiana Supreme Court to amend the student practice rule.

I don't want to make this about what was going on with the Clinic, but I do want to note that again, compared to the situation in 1992 when you heard testimony, today it is much harder for us to provide free legal representation to these very minority communities that are in more need rather than less as compared to the last time you sat here and heard testimony.

DR. FORD: Again, thank you.

MS. BOURG: I have a question.

DR. FORD: Okay. Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: Well, thank you for your testimony.

Can we get a copy of that Powerpoint?

MS. ALDERMAN: I have given them one.

MS. TEEL: You've got one.

MS. BOURG: Anger at real or perceived injustice takes many forms. We have seen it, I think, in previous testimony exhaust people and bring them nearly to tears. In your case, perhaps it's taking a different expression. I'd like to explore a little bit your statement that because of the rule in the state, now industries can basically pollute and plant a few trees.

And I'm a little confused, because I read in the paper -- I guess it was this morning or recently -- that there's \$1.5 million that the industry is putting forward to put monitoring equipment out in over three years.

And I guess my question is: I'm confused, because what is it that we want them to do if they've done something wrong? Do we not want them to step to the plate and take part in putting some money forward to do it; and yet when they do that, are we then to look at the . industries as totally suspect, though there may be history and a reason for you to do that.

And so I ask this in all honesty. What is it that you want?

MS. TEEL: Well, a fundamental principle of



environmental regulation is that when a company violates environmental laws that they should not profit from that violation. In Louisiana, companiés in fact do profit for breaking environmental laws.

The report referred to by Mr. Clifford with Region VI goes into -- it's polite, but it nonetheless identifies what our concern was. We filed that petition on behalf of LEAN. In Louisiana, the state agency does not ensure that when you bust a company for breaking the law that they pay for it, because obviously, if you still realize a profit from breaking the law, it's common sense profit motive for a company to continue to break the law.

So EPA proved what we already knew to be a fact; that companies were in fact not being punished and penalized and, I mean, they weren't being punished at all. They should be penalized largely to make it painful for a company to break the laws and illegally dump pollution onto minority communities or any community, for that matter.

The tree planting that Ms. Alderman referred to is a program known as BEP -- Beneficial Environmental Project, and that's DEQ's attempt to -- it loosely follows EPA's program known as the SEP, S-E-P, which says that, Well, maybe we shouldn't just make them pay a huge fine. Maybe we can let them do a side project to improve that

very community that they polluted in some small way.

\_EPA has gone on record, and we will be happy to submit it into the record for you to look at, that DEQ's BEP program does not comply with the federal program, because they don't even require that that side project be done in the community that was harmed by the pollution.

They're allowing them to do projects halfway across the state. I'm sorry -- I could go on for days, but am I answering your questions?

MS. BOURG: It's very helpful.

MS. TEEL: Okay.

DR. FORD: Thank you.

MS. BOURG: Like -- well, I --

DR. FORD: Want to follow up?

MS. BOURG: -- I did ask, So what is it precisely you would want them to do?

MS. TEEL: We want DEQ to punish them, punish severely, companies that have been identified as breaking the law. Just like you and I can't go down the road 90 miles an hour and not expect to get a very expensive ticket out of it, we expect the same punishment of large corporations or small who illegally dump pollution into these communities; particularly, for your purposes, minority communities.

And I'm sorry I didn't bring it here today, and

we could flash it before you, but appreciate that DEQ's enforcement, at least up until 1997, was at historic lows. Ten-year lows. In a study that we did, and I'll submit it to you, they were issuing the lowest amount of penalties, the lowest number of penalties.

They were collecting the least amount of penalties. Any way you crunch DEQ's own record, enforcement's at a historic low. And now they come along with this new program to allow them to do side projects and not pay fines.

MS. BOURG: What's the penalty matrix that we seem to have heard all about this morning from EPA?

MS. TEEL: It's not complicated. It's just you add up how much money did they realize from breaking the law, and you make sure at a minimum that it costs them more than they would have saved by breaking the law. It's real simple.

MS. BOURG: So is that in place?

MS. TEEL: 'Ideally, way more.

MS. BOURG: So is that in place?

MS. TEEL: According to that EPA study that Mr. Clifford referred to and that we referenced here, no.

DR. FORD: Roberta.

MS. MADDEN: Yes. You mentioned in the aftermath of the Shintech dispute that the governor had

attempted to shut down or virtually shut down your operations. There was also some action by the Supreme Court. Would you bring us up to date on exactly where all that stands?

MS. TEEL: That is still in litigation and it's going to be argued before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Federal Fifth Circuit, in November I believe is the date. Because it's still in litigation I really don't want to talk about it extensively, but I think you're all aware of the underlying situation.

DR. FORD: Okay. Yes.

MS. PARKS: Ms. Teel, I understand that there's been major restructuring and reorganization in DEQ. Are you familiar with that? Do you see any positives coming from that?

MS. TEEL: I'm all too familiar with that, and there are no positives coming from it; only negatives.

Now when you pick up the phone and try to reach somebody, you get transferred six times instead of three times. And they've admitted to me every time I make a phone call that the restructuring of DEQ has had no effect except to create more confusion rather than less.

DR. FORD: Okay. Ms. Richardson has a question.

MS. RICHARDSON: Firstly, by way of commentary,

mean.

MS. TEEL: -- EPA in the study they did in '98 found that they -- and I'm practically quoting here, I've said this so many times -- are not collecting the financial or economic benefit of the failure to comply. They're not punishing them at all.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Now maybe I can get to a question. Every time I think I'm intelligent, something else throws me. I know that it's a complicated procedure to change any kind of governmental regulations and that kind of thing, but has anyone initiated to your knowledge a change in the procedure or strengthening of the penalty clause and not plant ten trees ten miles away. Has anything been done, to your knowledge, legally to start the process of strengthening those regulations?

MS. TEEL: You heard from Mr. Clifford with Region VI that they are trying to have more oversight.

And I'm sure y'all picked up, not to be on Mr. Clifford, but I'm you all caught, and I appreciated the question from Mr. Quigley. You've gone up five times. What does that mean in numbers?

They only had one enforcement referral two
years ago and this year they have five. Is that better?
Well, yeah, I guess it is, but five, in the scheme of
things, that's nothing. You're hearing from these people
and the statistics prove that we have an enormous out-of-

6.

control state agency here.

\_\_It's going to take a lot more than five referrals over a two-year period for anything to -- of significance to be done in this state. And we have been petitioning EPA, and we will continue to petition EPA, to yank these delegations, because the record is establishing, has already established, that the state agency either is unable or unwilling to protect minority communities.

MS. RICHARDSON: Followup, sir?

DR. FORD: Sure.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. In light of having petitioned them, is that the first step to getting a public review of the regulations or change to the regulations?

MS. TEEL: I'm not sure what regulations you're referring to.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Under whatever hearing or statement that they made as to how the BEQ would operate. Since in effect it's doing nothing, how do you remedy that through the rule-making process in government?

MS. TEEL: Right. The procedure is to petition EPA to withdraw the delegation of the program. When you do that, EPA has a mandate, as in -- they're required by law to investigate the reasons that you've listed in your

. 7

2:3

petition for withdrawal.

\_I do not believe there's any public participation in that process. That would be a tremendous improvement to that process. We like to think we do a great job and if for those communities that we have filed the petitions on behalf of, we try to pull information together.

But I know that you know from sitting in these hearings that the best evidence comes from the people that are living in it.

MS. RICHARDSON: That answers me. Thank you.

DR. FORD: Pass it to Ms.Seicshnaydre. She's next.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: Hi. I just wanted to ask you how many cases the Clinic, if any, has had to turn down as a result of the practice rule?

MS. TEEL: We don't have an official count. I can tell you that we have definitely had to turn down several individuals and groups who contacted us, because they were either unable or unwilling to meet the very strict income requirements that we have -- now have under the student practice rule.

I think the bigger impact has been that with all the press that went into what happened and the governor, you know, saying, Shut them down, and then what



1.2 1.3

happened with the amendments to the rule is that people aren't calling us now. They think that we can't help them, and it's had this terrible stifling effect on the groups that we normally would represent.

And I cannot resist taking the opportunity to add to that that we are very much open for business.

They've made it harder for us, but there is no way they're going to stop us from doing everything we can to help minority groups and any group that has an environmental problem.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: Just a quick followup to the discussion about EPA monitoring DEQ. Is -- who polices EPA, and is there something other than petitioning them that -- is there any other recourse? I know in other sort of federal agencies, there are sometimes remedies available when the federal agency is not adequately doing its jobs in a civil rights context. Is there any kind of remedy available against EPA?

MS. TEEL: There are two things that we can do, one of which we did do. As you heard from Ms. Harden with Earthjustice, we co-wrote a petition on behalf of the Convent folks in Shintech. It was pursuant to the air permits. We filed an environmental justice complaints under those permits.

It went first to Region VI who -- I think she

mentioned but I just want to highlight -- found no technical problems with the Shintech permits, found no environmental justice problem with the Shintech permits, and we then went over their head to the Office of Civil Rights in EPA headquarters in D.C.

when headquarters in D.C. looked at the exact same permits that Region VI had, pardon the expression, rubber-stamped, they found more than 50 technical violations in those permits, and they found there was environmental justice issue.

We have never gotten any relief out of Region VI on environmental justice. Only by going over their heads to headquarters have we gotten any -- well, in the one instance, got an investigation.

The other thing that can be done is to sue the federal government directly. That hasn't been done yet.

That is a possibility, and I'll leave it at that.

DR. FORD: Any other committee questions? If not, we thank you very much for your input.

MS. TEEL: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Our next pair of presenters are John Koeferl and Jamal Morelli. I may have murdered your names, but that's close.

These gentlemen are with the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, Ninth Ward, New Orleans.

For our Recorder, as you get started again if 1 you would repeat your name and your association. 2 MR. KOEFERL: My name is John Koeferl --3 DR. FORD: You need to pick up the mic. Yes. MR. KOEFERL: -- John Koeferl, and this is --5 MS. DASHIELL: My name is Pam Dashiell. 6 7 also with the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association and Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal. 8 MR. MORELLI: I'm Jamal Morelli. I am a member 9 of the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association on the board of 10 directors and a member of Citizens Against the -- can't 11 hear me? 12 DR. FORD: They want you to talk louder. 13 MR. MORELLI: I'm Jamal Morelli. I'm a member 14 of the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association on the board of 15 I'm also a member of the Citizens Against the 16 directors. Widening of the Industrial Canal. 17 18 THE REPORTER: What is Pam's last name? MR. KOEFERL: D-A-S-H-I-E-L-L. 19 This is about the Corps' project of widening 20 and deepening the locks in the channel in the industrial 21 22 canal. It's -- you all have the sheets called Remarks. This is what I'm going to talk from, and you can follow 23 along. I'm going to skip rapidly so that we get to the 24

meat of it.

The basics of the project -- it's a huge project, \$641 million, to build a new lock in an old canal. The canal goes through our neighborhood. It's going to take 12 years to do it. They haven't really started it.

It's a largely African-American neighborhood surrounding the canal. The exact figures on demographics are on page 4 and 5 of the larger handout. The district as a whole is 88.5 percent African-American, and the median income is \$12,583. So it's one of the poorest neighborhoods in New Orleans.

And now the canal -- the locks is scheduled to go even closer to a neighborhood that is 99 percent

African-American. It's been moved during the course of years of study. The neighborhood has consistently opposed this project. For years the Corps has selected a mitigation committee, which has been using closed meetings to go through a menu of things to compensate the community, which we feel don't really address the adverse impacts of the canal.

This canal was built on the grave of the

Ursuline Convent, which was destroyed when the river

was -- the levee was rolled back in 1905 and freed up all

that long arpent of land, you know, from the river towards

the lake. And so we lost many blocks of our neighborhood

at that time and people were put out, so it's been around a long time.

There are people still living whose families were put out on the street to build this canal in the first place, so the argument that has been used that, We're just enlarging a canal that has always been there. It has always been a question of racism and of putting this canal in a poor place.

And now, our main objection to it is that it's not safe or appropriate to have a canal which carries all these tremendous agricultural chemicals and hydro -- and petrochemicals that are too safe to travel -- I mean, too unsafe to travel by road or rail to come through our neighborhood.

There are 50,000 people live right around our neighborhood, and the Corps has refused to study the river and canal safety, despite a strong recommendation in 1993 which has been repeated many times by the National Transportation Safety Board. And if you don't have that document in that larger folder, we'll see that you get it.

The Corps' study on toxic substances in the canal is very inadequate. We're trying to clean up the lake in New Orleans, and we feel there are many things in here that need to be addressed before the government puts millions and millions of dollars into cleaning up the lake

if we're just going to be dumping more toxic substances 1 in, you know. And it particularly affects our 2 neighborhood.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also have a decreased ability to evacuate during this project. And after the project, it's no better. We'll be further isolated from the rest of the city. We lose historic canal structures that have been there for 80 years and have finally gained the kind of patina of acceptability. A little moss has grown on them. We began to accept their being there as part of link with New Orleans.

And they're going to come in here with another structure that's good only for 50 years, and then they're going to be doing something even larger scale. So this is really disruptive. We're only a mile and a half from the French Quarter in New Orleans.

This is a poor community that really needs to be able to invest in their past in fixing up the structures that are already there and making the downtown part of New Orleans a beautiful and productive thing. instead, we have the Corps coming in who doesn't plan with anybody. Just comes in and dumps this plan right on us.

This plan is opposed by the New Orleans City Council because it's considered to be unsafe, and the Corps is not addressing that. Also, there's going to be

construction for 12 years, pile driving for six and a half years, tremendous declines in property values, decline in new and existing businesses, and a lot of traffic congestion which will get even worse -- will get no better after the project.

Also, barge traffic has been decreasing since
1988 and brings into question the whole economic
justification for this project. The justification for the
project was when this lock was economically justified by
obsolescence of the existing lock or by increased traffic.

For years, the Corps has been saying there's greatly increased traffic. We project even more. Lock is beyond capacity. We need a new lock. Well, we found out that that isn't true; that lock figures are actually declining.

This is a submission I made last year to you. Can you hear me? I'm sorry.

DR. FORD: We can hear you but I'm not sure the people in the back can.

MR. KOEFERL: Can you hear? Thank you. Thank you for saying that.

We found out that from the Corps' own Website that their projections were based on inaccurate figures. Their own figures show that traffic through the canal has gone from a high of 27,128 tons in 1988 down to 1999,

19,698 tons. It's just every year dropping by a million tons coming through the canal. They no longer can say, There's increased traffic. We need the lock.

So the Corps of Engineers misled Congress by failing to disclose this. They knew it at the very time they made these projections. There've been some articles recently in the Washington Post about the move by the Corps of Engineers to grow the organization. Perhaps you've heard of those. We can give you -- we have a handout we can give you that shows that.

In fact, there was an article in Sunday's
Washington Post which talks about the Corps controversial
projects. The first project -- five most controversial
projects in the country -- the first one on the list, New
Orleans industrial canal lock replacement controversial
project. And controversial because the figures don't back
it up. Be happy to give you a copy of this also.

We had a little car trouble on our way down, so our plans to make you copies were kind of gone by the by, and we apologize for that.

DR. FORD: You do plan to share the 15 minutes with your two colleagues. Right?

MR. KOEFERL: Pam.

MS. DASHIELL: There are many objections to this project, but one of the most important, I think, is

the institutional racism. Hopefully, completely uninformed—- I'm not saying that the people who actually implemented the project were aware of it, but last year Tulane University Environmental Law Clinic did a study for us.

And it shows unequivocally a pattern of the -this project being moved from a relatively middle class,
relatively affluent, relatively rural area to a less
middle class, poorer, darker area to the Holy Cross
neighborhood, which is a part of the Lower Ninth Ward,
which is a mixed area, 75 percent African-American, 25
percent white, and our median income may be 14- or 15,000,
as opposed to the 12,000 in the Lower Ninth Ward, to an
area that's 99 percent African-American with the lowest
median income in the city.

I mean, it's there in black and white. This is the largest project of its kind ever put on within an urban area -- ever. There are 30,000 people right at the project. The danger to the community from construction activity, from the project during construction, from what will happen after construction when there's increased barge traffic, when there's deep draft shipping which is a big part of this project.

Deep draft ships going through New Orleans neighborhoods -- we are below the levees, okay. I mean,

we are below sea level. We're talking these supersized ships cutting right through our communities. I mean, it's something that those of who live by the river and the canal have nightmares about even now.

A few years ago one of those ships ran into Riverwalk. Okay. I mean, in barges -- a barge a few years ago ran into one of the bridges that they are talking about replacing as a result of this project. So, I mean, there are safety issues.

There are the issues of the toxins that may be in the soil that line the banks of the canal or in the canal itself. This has been an industrialized area for 75 years and -- I mean, God only knows what is in there. The testing that's been done so far was not adequate.

If this -- a project like this would never have happened in a neighborhood with a higher income or a higher proportion of white people. It just wouldn't have happened. And again, opposition to the project has been concerted over the last 40 years, wave upon wave of people.

I mean, many of the people who we started working with against this have since died. I mean, this is three generations of people, and the Corps has always known about the opposition. The Port has always known about the opposition.

John didn't mention the Port of New Orleans, but they're the project sponsor. And their constituents stand to make billions. Now, there's nothing wrong with business. Nobody is opposed to economic development. We all need economic development.

But the vast, the vast majority of the money will benefit only the maritime industries. Only the maritime industries. Yes, there is a piddling amount for what they're calling mitigation for the community. It's \$35 million.

That \$35 million, for those of you who are familiar with New Orleans, must -- well, covers the area from the St. Bernard Parish line all the way to Elysian Fields Avenue. Now, I'm not sure about the exact mileage, but that's -- it's a long way. And there are about 40,000 people, and that's over -- the Corps estimates 12 years.

If they estimate 12 years, you know that it's going to be 20. They estimate the cost -- the total cost for the project at 641 million. If they estimate it at 641 million, who knows what the final cost will be. So there is a problem with that.

Another problem that has arisen is that whenever you have money, sums of money, mentioned or dangled in front of a poor community, okay, you have people who get excited at the prospect; not necessarily

for their own personal benefit, although of course there's that, too \_ I mean, we all are -- you know, we're humans.

But, I mean, people look at it for the benefit of the community, too, and don't think about the consequences and don't think about whether that amount of money is going to make a difference. Many of our institutions, because of the primacy of the maritime industry in New Orleans, many institutions, I mean, are for this project.

They tell us, Well, you know, it's for the good of the nation. It's for the good of the nation. It's for the good of the community. Even institutions which have -- I mean, which have worked valiantly for us -- I mean, for the African-American community in New Orleans and elsewhere, and I've got to say, Dr. Wright, I don't understand what's -- I mean, what's happened with this.

Even the Deep South Center for Environmental
Justice has become, I believe, a part of this. I mean,
you know, I don't the particulars. I know what I read in
the paper, and I know what I read in the Port's press
release.

DR. WRIGHT: You don't know the particulars.

MS. DASHIELL: Okay. No, I don't. That's exactly what I said. I don't, but apparently, they have

them. Okay. I also wanted to talk about the mitigation

25

12.

committee that the Corps has put together. These -- I
mean, for the most part, these are fine people. There are
24; 12 members, 12 alternates. They are people who grew
up in the community over the years. Okay. Work very hard
for the community.

But again, people get stars in their eyes when they hear about money. They either were self-selected or selected by the Corps. Our neighborhood association sent two people who would not go -- who did not disrupt who -- I mean, who went to deal with the project, okay. They were kicked off.

They have brooked no opposition to this.

They're the Army. They'll do what they have to do to get to their point. And again, nothing against the people who are on the mitigation committee except that they are being misled and they have stars in their eyes.

MR. KOEFERL: I would like to say that I think, rather than having good planning on this project, what the Corps has done is they made a decision themselves and then they announced that decision, and for 40 years they've been defending this decision against the Port moving somewhere else, against all kinds of things. They've been defending this decision that was made in their own cocoon.

And the way they've been defending it is by public relations. They've been saying that they've had a

broadbased community involvement process, even though they haven't. —They've constantly saying that, just like they say the old lock is obsolete; even though their own figures show that it can be fixed up for another 50 years for \$16 million, not 541 million, okay, 16.

So they use public relations, okay, to just hammer away at points which really are not true. The lock really isn't obsolete. It -- the traffic isn't too much for it. The wait is not too long, and there has not been a broadbased community process. It's not true.

And we have found that the courts, I mean, and other agencies, I think, have an understanding. You know, if we complain, like, to the EPA, which we have -- you have a letter that we wrote to the EPA -- the EPA gets in touch with the Corps and says, Is this true?

And the Corps says, This is -- of course not.

And the EPA writes, Well, we've checked it out. The Corps has done everything they should, and that's it. Well, we need your help. We have been just snowballed on this the whole way.

Every time we've written, we've gotten this response. People have deferred to the Corps. Even the newspaper in town defers to the Corps, and they talk about our neighborhood as just having fear about the project, implying if we knew more, we would really love it, you

know.

2.5

\_\_Or that we're activists rather than community leaders. If we were in the Lakeview section of New Orleans, they would be calling us Mr. and Ms., you know, and president of this, president of that. Because of where we're from, they call us activists, even though we represent large organizations.

So we're done. Please. Thank you.

DR. FORD: Why don't we do some questions, and Mr. Morelli can get into this, too. I'm looking to my left and my right. Okay. Mr. Quigley.

MS. WRIGHT: I think I need to respond, Bob, before -- shouldn't I respond before you --

DR. FORD: Mr. Quigley, would you give Dr. Wright an opportunity to respond first?

MR. QUIGLEY: Sure.

DR. FORD: Very good.

MS. WRIGHT: Okay. Since my name came up, I find it necessary to defend myself. It was kind of side comment, but it needs to be responded to.

Yes, we were the first Environmental Justice Center ever in this country, first to be established at HBCU, and yes, we work with communities across the country. We have also been in the business of training young people between the ages of 18 and 25 in hazardous

waste. Worker training, as it's called. For five years we've been\_working with the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, training people who live in environmentally-impacted communities in hazardous waste so that they can get jobs to clean up their own community.

We were asked by the Corps to try to put together a training program for the Lower Ninth Ward, which we did, based on our record. But also in that process, our community outreach coordinator approached every community leader in the Lower Ninth Ward, including your community, when -- \

MS. DASHIELL: He did not. [indiscernible]

DR. WRIGHT: -- well, let me say this. He did

approach and was basically told by the gentleman right

here that he was against the project, and so understanding
that, your community organization did not send a letter of
support for the project, but at least seven communities

did.

And I'm saying this because it is -- there is some controversy, but what we're doing has nothing to do with the expansion of the lock. We're doing a training program, and all of the community groups that we talk with -- and we have letters of support from them -- are for the mitigation plan and for the training.

Now, it's fine to have controversy and my

understanding is -- and I will call names -- Mr. Kojo
Livingston-told me that he spoke, and I did hear that you
called our office and was very angry, asking to speak to
me about this particular project.

But we're training people, so however you feel about the lock, we stick by our decision to train people from the Lower Ninth Ward in this particular field. This is what we do. It's one of the many things that we do, including research and other kinds of things.

But all that we do, the one area where we think we have really made a difference is in training young people so that they are working; young people who have never worked before. And so I stand by -- I stand by that, and I still say that in our investigation of this particular situation, we found a larger percentage of people -- as you say, the people on the mitigation committee, whatever that was -- in support of the project than against it.

I'm telling you what we found. You don't believe it, but this is we found. We also heard --

MS. DASHIELL: I'd like to know which organization that you talked with --

DR. FORD: This is -- we make statements, not argumentative.

DR. WRIGHT: Can I finish my point, and then

I'm going to end, because at some point every agency or organization has to take on self-determination. Just as you have decided to be self-determined in your position against the lock, there are groups who decided on the mitigation plan.

We made a decision that we wanted to be involved in the training of people in the Lower Ninth Ward. We have moved forward in that direction, and we have no intentions of turning around. How you proceed in your pursuit against the lock is a perfectly legitimate position to have. I would never say that you shouldn't.

At the same time, I believe we also have the right to self-determination in going forward with our training, which is part of our mission.

MR. KOEFERL: Dr. Wright, may I respond to that?

DR. FORD: Now, let me say something before
we -- this is not intended to be a debate. We are here to
hear your concerns, and we diverted for a moment to give
some opportunity for response. I think we've heard
enough --

MS. DASHIELL: We appreciate that.

DR. FORD: All right. I appreciate your understanding of that. So if we could, I'd like to proceed with questions. Is that okay with you?

15 ·

MR. KOEFERL: Was that -- could I just -- well, okay. I think there's a point of clarification that might be made about this.

DR. FORD: I defer to my committee. Would we permit one minute of followup?

VOICE: Let's take a minute.

MR. KOEFERL: Well, I just wanted to say that we -- Congressman Lindy Boggs was -- realized that this project was being steered towards us politically back in 1990, and she authored a resolution that went in the Waterways Bill of 1991 that insisted that if and when this project was ever -- the locks were ever declared obsolete and there was too much traffic for them that -- and it was going to come to New Orleans, that the people in the neighborhood would have to be involved in the building of that lock.

And that's where the Corps' initiative comes from to train people, because they're fulfilling the congressional resolution of 1991. Thank you.

DR. FORD: Appreciate that information.

Mr. Quigley had a question.

MR. QUIGLEY: One of the things that we hear all day long is that nobody's listening, or that we're speaking and we go to meetings, but nobody pays attention; whether it's the federal government or the state

government or the local government.

\_\_And what -- you know, this is the Advisory

Commission to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and

when we met in the early '90s, we talked about the concept

of environmental racism and environmental justice and

helped put that on the agenda, which a lot of other people

did a lot of work on that as well.

But how do we move it forward? From your experience -- I mean, you all have been fighting this thing for a long time -- what -- how can the voice of the people who live in the neighborhoods that are being affected, how can we help advise the federal government and the state government how to better listen to what people are saying?

Do you have some ideas of things that you would hope might have worked, or do you see that the citizens ought to have an absolute bar? If they don't get the agreement of the people in the neighborhood, then the state and local government shouldn't be able to take action?

MR. MORELLI: As it had been explained -- and so many things end up off the record because -- you've got neighborhood working groups; you know how this works.

Everything is not going to be extensively documented and videotaped any more than maybe even this is.

But it was said by the district engineer, If you don't want the project, it's not coming. And that's the days when there was this wave of concern and anxiety, and there were a lot more people to kind of meet it as it was coming.

Now, there's only so much dissonance a human being can sustain before they just kind of back away from it. I can't tell you how many people finally were just like, Just let the thing come through. Just let us get on with our lives.

Now, there isn't really a voice to be heard at this point, because there's not enough facts being disseminated about it, you know. Okay. So the wave of opinion, as far as I can tell, doesn't exist except in media waves that have been created by the Corps.

You have voices of dissension. We're very, very scattered. The only people who truly know how mismanaged and misled and completely misguided, the community-based mitigation committee is, and then there's subsequent interactions with their communities, are the people on the inside. The people who have read the plan of action. The people who have managed to wade through nine volumes of an evaluation report which was supposed to have been implicitly understood before there was a partnering agreement between the communities and the

Corps.

---And as an aside, this was the condition of every person who got on those working committees that they were supposed to understand nine -- I guarantee you it would take all of us four lifetimes to get -- and at least some kind of, like, nine degrees to understand what's in that.

But all of these people from neighborhood working groups signed away on this. And they are the ones disseminating the information. In a nutshell, there isn't a voice.

MS. DASHIELL: Jamil, I'm sorry. I've got to differ with you on that.

MR. MORELLI: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. DASHIELL: There is a voice for the people in the community. Now, again, the Corps' definition of that project area is from the St. Bernard Parish line to Elysian Fields. The area that's going to be most affected is the Lower Ninth Ward area, which is below the industrial canal. Okay. This is the area that's going to be --

VOICE: Talk more into the mic. Nobody can hear you.

MS. DASHIELL: I'm sorry. Okay. This is the area that is going to be further cut off from the city.

We are cut off from the city already. There are many neighborhood groups. There are many people. Again, the sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters of people who were in this fight in 1960.

And so for that voice to be heard, I would say that a hearing in New Orleans -- I mean, it was very difficult. We're all working people here. It was very difficult for us to get here. It's very difficult for the people in our community, many of whom are elderly or have small children, to come and be heard during working hours.

I would say forums and hearings like this at times accessible to the people. But there is a voice

DR. FORD: Ms. Bourg has a question.

MS. BOURG: Thank you for traveling all this way and for caring about your community and sharing the information with us.

I have a question that's a bit of a historical question. In the 1970s it appears that the Army Corps of Engineers actually selected Violet, Louisiana. Am I to assume that Violet, Louisiana, is perhaps more white, more affluent; and if so, who can remember on what basis St. Bernard Parish opposed such a wonderful lucrative project?

MR. MORELLI: Well, one thing that happened is -- you know, this project is all part of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet. We call it the Mister Go.

And it was a disaster. It's destroyed the estuaries and, you know, it's this manmade channel 75 miles out into the Gulf.

MS. BOURG: Excuse me, but my question was: On what basis historically did St. Bernard oppose it?

MR. MORELLI: Okay. They didn't like the MRGO.
Okay. They didn't like what was happening. They didn't
like their fisheries destroyed, so there was a real
resentment towards the Corps of Engineers about this.
They also didn't want their parish cut in half as they
felt a canal through there would cut them off from the
rest of their parish like we are cut off from New Orleans
where we are.

And they got together and really -- they made an environmental argument. It -- in fact, it's one of the only environmental arguments that Bob Livingston ever made was that it should not be in St. Bernard Parish. Now, Violet wasn't much less black or more white than --

VOICES: It's more black but it's not richer.

MR. MORELLI: Well, we have the figures right here on page 5, I think, of that document. We have the figures in Violet.

So they picked ten sites in 1988. They were straw sites. They just went through and just kind of crossed them off. One site -- I think it was in Muh-ro

[phonetic] or the Saxonholm site -- they crossed off because it might impede the progress of a roadway in St. Bernard Parish. I-510 coming through there. Okay. So they left that alone.

And then they finally Xed them all off and we were left. That's what happened. And you know, it took one day for the residents of English Turn, an affluent subdivision on the other side of the river, to stop I-510 bridge. And it's taken us 40 years.

Did I answer your question?

MS. BOURG: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: Thank you for your presentation.

I'd like to touch on the economic impact of these
challenges on, you know, goods being moved, as I
understand it, from ports in Florida, Mobile, through New
Orleans across the south. I feel like there's a serious
economic impact, given, as you mentioned, the Gulf Outlet
that I think runs from Breton Island to Shell Beach.

And I'm wondering what -- how that plays into this, and if traffic is moving through this area, what is the economic impact. Has that been discussed? Is that something maybe I need to ask the Corps about? But also, you know, are there any alternatives that have been looked at. Are we looking at stopping that navigability in this

-

24 .

area because it's so old and rusted out and, you know,

I've heard-stories. And is that why the traffic is less.

Is there another place, another way to get around? I kind of just throw that out, food for thought, and what are your thoughts?

MR. KOEFERL: Well, the traffic is less, I think, because the commodities that have been going through the canal are no longer going through, like coal. Some of the plants that used to burn low sulphur coal -- I mean, high sulphur coal can no longer do that, and that's what was coming through our locks to those plants.

Also, natural gas is being used much more than oil now, and oil used to pass through. Now natural gas is being piped through, so the canal isn't being used for that. Okay. Now, the MRGO, where ships come into the tidewater area through the canal, has only been having maybe one and a half ships a day coming through there at the cost to taxpayers of 16- or \$17,000.

And it was shut down by nature; by Hurricane George, I think it was, three years ago, and it initiated a change in the project. You know, this project is called the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet New Locks and Connecting Channel.

Suddenly, the Corps was calling it the Industrial Canal -- I mean, the Inner Harbor Navigation

Locks, because they're closing down this 40-year-old project which has closed down itself. The port is moving to the river, and they still want this project to go on.

And there's some reasons, but we believe the cost benefit that was originally set up is no longer valid.

MS. PARKS: By the Corps' own estimate, and I'm sure -- I mean, they will -- they may correct this if it's wrong at this point -- but up to the last year they indicated \$100 million benefit, okay, to the nation. Now, I mean, that's not a lot.

The benefits -- the main benefits that they've been projecting -- they commissioned a study last year by Dr. Tim Ryan, who's famous in New Orleans for his optimism, and they projected lots of jobs -- lots of jobs. Lots of secondary benefits. Again, the man is very optimistic, and we just don't believe that.

DR. FORD: Since it's on that end, Beverly has a question. Then Farella.

DR. WRIGHT: My question is brief on -- I just wanted to know the representatives of the Holy Cross community who were kicked off of the mitigation committee.

Can you tell me who kicked you off and why?

MR. MORELLI: Okay. At the March 30 meeting, we were told that we would have to sign a partnering

agreement. It was myself and Mary Patsy Story. We had submitted an amended partnering agreement that we were willing to sign, because in good faith that's what we were there to do was to mitigate.

One of these requests was that we wanted a map of contaminated sediment in relation to our homes. This had been requested as far back as March 16, and we were told we could get anything that we needed like this to help us assist our decisions on how we would do the mitigation spending.

This wasn't forthcoming, so I saw that as a way of exciting ill will in the Holy Cross Neighborhood

Association. We were supposed to sign a partnering agreement without having a map of where this sediment was in relation to our homes.

I think it's a very easy thing to do if you've written an environmental impact statement. It wasn't forthcoming. We refused to sign this partnering agreement. At the end of the meeting, Mary Patsy Story asked Gerald Dicharry what the status was. He said, You're off this committee.

DR. WRIGHT: Who is Mary Patsy Story?

MR. MORELLI: She was the other representative for the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association. She's also on the board of directors for Holy Cross Neighborhood

Association.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes. I just have one very brief question. In light of the information that we have gathered at this point, this project was pretty much a done deal. And I would like to know whether it's a done deal or not.

DR. FORD: Ms. Robinson has the last question.

How can this be compromised? In the presence of this industrial lock expansion, what would be a good compromise on this? What are some of the mitigating things that you feel are appropriate to resolve this problem?

MR. MORELLE: There are 25 other projects in Louisiana right now that the Corps of Engineers could be working on. There's Beek [phonetic] Restoration Project in St. Bernard. There's a study there that can be done. There are countless things besides a highly controversial, highly wasteful boondoggle which has been criticized for years.

Think about how many things can get passed through easily with sufficient statistics. Why hasn't it? Why are people still so suspicious? I would say that, you know, we can look through the lists of other Corps projects that could be authorized and get those going in D.C. and deauthorize and forget this one.

,

:

Also with me today, I'd like to introduce Michael Stout, who is with me. He is not part of the

Army Corps of Engineers in New Orleans.

23

24

25

presentation but is here to provide some assistance if we need it.

Again, thank you for inviting me to attend your hearing today. We appreciate the opportunity to provide the Corps' perspective on environmental justice in civil rights issues relative to the IHNC lock replacement project.

We have been requested to address several aspects of the project, and I'll address five of them that we have been requested to respond to. First is the Corps' jurisdiction and responsibilities over the industrial canal or the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal.

Excuse me. I use industrial canal and Inner
Harbor Canal synonymous. They're the same thing, so if I
happen to say that in my presentation, it means the same
canal.

We own and operate the present industrial canal lock that provides a navigable connection between the Mississippi River and several navigation channels. These channels include the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, and the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal.

The GIWW and the MRGO are federal navigation channels that we maintain. The Inner Harbor Navigation Canal is a non-federal waterway, owned and maintained by

the Port of New Orleans. The existing lock was placed into service in 1921, and while it's performed well for nearly 80 years, it is now obsolete and replacement with a more efficient lock is warranted.

The existing lock is just too small to accommodate modern maritime traffic and average delays to the navigation industry is eleven hours but can be as much as 24 to 36 hours on many occasions.

The IHNC lock replacement project involves construction of a new lock, flowed in -- a new flowed in lock in the existing canal just north of the present lock location with no residential relocations or significant interruptions of maritime or vehicular traffic.

And I'd like to point out here that a lot of times it's been referred to that we are widening the industrial canal. We are not widening the canal. The canal -- all the work that's going to be done for this project is within the existing flood protection that exists along the canal.

The locks itself will be widened to a wider width and will be lengthened to provide a more efficient navigation outlet through the canal, but the canal itself will not be widened.

The next aspect is the status of the project.

This project was originally authorized in the River and

Harbor Act of 1956, and it was reauthorized by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, which also established the cost-sharing for the project.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 provided authorization for the community impact mitigation plan. In the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill, Congress approved the project as a construction new start and provided \$3.8 million to initiate construction and to initiate implementation of the community impact mitigation plan.

In fiscal year 2000, we have completed a pile testing contract which included noise and vibration monitoring of the neighboring areas. We began implementation of the community impact mitigation plan, and we've continued engineering and design for the remaining features of the project.

Now, implementation of this community impact mitigation plan is a high priority as the project gets under way. We awarded a contract in September of last year to a team of consultants headed by GCR and Associates to establish a community-based committee and execute a partnering agreement with this committee to develop the procedures and priorities for implementation of this mitigation plan.

This is a multi-year contract that will

continue to involve the public in the implementation of this plan during the construction period. The team has set up the committee, executed a partnering agreement, and began the regular meetings in early March 2000.

A needs assessment and a proposed mitigation plan for the first three years of construction was completed in July of this year. We are presently developing strategies for implementation of those recommendations.

In keeping with our commitment to implement mitigation, even before construction of the project begins we awarded last month the first mitigation contract to Xavier University for initial job training effort to prepare people in the affected communities for work on the project. Additional mitigation measures will be implement beginning in fiscal year 2001.

And I might mention that the mitigation committee here has approved this job training as the initial pilot program for part of the mitigation effort.

We have been negotiating with the Port of New Orleans in the value of the real estate that they own that will be used for the project, and they own all the real estate along both sides of the existing canal within the flood protection. There's no additional rights-of-way or real estate required outside the flood protection works

along the canal, and they -- the Port owns it.

been satisfied with our initial offer, and we have prepared a supplement to our evaluation report recommending a possible change in the cost-sharing requirements for the project, and we are awaiting a decision by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works in Washington to continue construction of the project.

We have three contracts ready for award. Two of them are demolition of the Galvez Street wharf and demolition of some businesses along the east side of the canal and construction of a short piece of levee and flood wall along the west side of the canal from St. Claude Avenue to the Mississippi River. We hope to get those awarded starting in January of 2001.

Next aspect I'll talk about is our efforts to address safety and environmental risks. During the public review of the draft evaluation report and the environmental impact statement in early 1998, concerns about the effects of the project on maritime safety were raised.

In a letter dated 14 May 1998 addressed to the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, the National .

Transportation Safety Board stated that they had

previously recommended that the U.S. Coast Guard conduct a comprehensive risk assessment that considers all activities within the Port of New Orleans, including traffic in the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal.

A followup letter from the National

Transportation Safety Board dated September 4 and

addressed to the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic clarified

that while they had recommended that a comprehensive risk

assessment for the Port of New Orleans was needed, they

did not require that this assessment be completed prior to

issuance of the final EIS for the project.

In order to address these safety concerns expressed by the local community and the National Transportation Safety Board, and operational safety plan is now under preparation by the New Orleans District.

This plan addresses safety issues associated with operation of the lock throughout the construction period and after completion of the project.

This plan addresses operational procedures for navigation use of the project, potential public health and safety impacts of the project, and emergency response planning. From this analysis, appropriate safety measures and response planning measures are being developed.

A review draft of the plan is nearly complete, and this report should be shared with the interested

parties upon completion in the next couple of months. I want to point out that we truly believe that this new replacement lock will improve the efficiency of the lock and canal than the existing situation, thereby we believe will reduce the risk of navigation accidents because we'll have a wider lock, wider bridges, and therefore, the barges will be able to go through the canal at a much more efficient operation.

The fourth aspect is our efforts to ensure meaningful participation by the residents in the affected area. Probably no public project in New Orleans history has been subject to more intensive and sincere public involvement efforts than this project.

Numerous meetings with the community interests have resulted in dramatic redesign of the project to greatly lessen its impact on the adjacent communities. A few examples include that we have now developed a plan that will require no relocation of homes by the project.

We have the -- one of the initial plans that was being proposed was to build the lock adjacent to the existing lock. That would have relocated 200 homes and 800 to 1,000 people with that particular plan. That was the first plan that we went to the local people with back in the early 1990s to start talking to them about.

We heard how much -- how bad that plan was, and

so we went back to the drawing board and developed another plan that would not relocate any homes in the area but still be able to construct it in a larger lock -- excuse me; a larger lock could be constructed.

Also we have included a \$17 million temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue that will provide uninterrupted flow of vehicular traffic during construction, thus minimizing traffic congestion during the construction period.

The Claiborne Avenue bridge is another bridge that will be replaced, and it will require closure of this vital traffic artery for only about two weeks. We're not going to replace the whole bridge. We're just going to replace the steel superstructure of the bridge.

As I said, the new lock will be built offsite and floated in to reduce noise and disruption, and innovative pile driving techniques will be employed to reduce noise impacts.

Now, we made these significant modifications which are estimated to cost about 60- to \$70 million.

We've added 60- or \$70 million to the project cost as a result of listening to the communities because they had continuous problems with the plan that we were proposing.

To address the impacts that could not be completely eliminated, we developed a community impact

mitigation plan to be implemented as an authorized feature of the project. Now estimated to cost \$35 million, this plan was developed through a broadbased community participation process.

The plan includes direct and indirect measures to address impacts related to noise, transportation, cultural resources, aesthetics, employment, community and regional growth, and community cohesion. The authorized community impact mitigation plan is further evidence of the Corps' listening to the affected communities.

The actual components of the plan, our commitments to the continuing public input and our implementation of the plan, along with the construction features of the project, are a direct response to real community input.

The next paragraph on my prepared statement I'm just going to summarize here by saying that we are committed to continue this community involvement process throughout the construction period. Our contractor that I said that we have hired is going to continue this process of holding meetings with this committee, and they will continue to provide us input throughout the construction of the project.

From the beginning of this process, the committee has demonstrated its desire to share the results

of its working meetings with the general public prior to any final recommendations. In fact, the minutes of the CBMC, or the community-based mitigation meetings, are transcribed almost verbatim and posted on the committee's website within approximately one week of their meetings.

In addition, the committee hosted an extremely successful public information workshop on June 20, 2000, to inform the public of their preliminary recommendations and receive public comments prior to issuing this initial needs assessment and first three-year mitigation plan report.

Recently, the committee has now decided to hold open public meetings four times a year to provide a forum where everyone's concerns can be addressed. In our view, the volunteer members of this community-based mitigation committee have done an outstanding job in representing their communities, and we are extremely appreciative of the time and energy they have devoted to this community involvement process.

We look forward to the continuing work of the committee as we implement the mitigation features of the project. The last aspect that we were asked to address is the compliance with NEPA and the Executive Order 12898 in regards to environmental justice.

We are fully complied with NEPA and the

Executive Order entitled Federal Actions to Address

Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and LowIncome Populations. This statement is supported by the facts I will describe.

On May 4, 1999, the Holy Cross Neighborhood
Association, representing one of the neighborhoods along
the industrial canal, filed a complaint with the National
Environmental Justice Advisory Council, NEJAC, of the U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency alleging possible
environmental justice violations with regard to the plan
formulation and site selection for this project.

The petition stated that the Corps did not properly address the impacts of this project on the predominantly low-income and minority populations in the area around the existing canal. Their contentions are grounded as they state in the requirements of NEPA and the Executive Order 12898.

By letter dated August 12, 1999, and this letter is attached to your packet, the EPA responded that the Corps, and I quote, "Has appropriately and responsibly completed the decision-making process established by the National Environmental Policy Act."

In addition, the EPA concluded that, and again I quote, "The final environmental impact statement fully addresses environmental justice issues and evaluates them

in the alternative and impact analysis sections of the statement.

The EPA also cited the development of the community impact mitigation plan as demonstration of the Corps' responsiveness to environmental justice concerns. In another separate letter to Senator John Breaux dated December 21, 1999, the EPA again responded to Holy Cross Neighborhood Association's complaint and discussed the community impact mitigation plan in more detail.

I quote from that letter: "According to the final EIS, the construction associated with the lock and bridge replacement project will require no relocation of residents. While it is virtually impossible to eliminate all the impacts of construction, it is possible to mitigate the effects on the community and its resources.

"The community impact mitigation plan included in the selected project plan and documented in a final EIS is an admirable departure from the traditional Corps of Engineers' environmental analysis and mitigation planning."

The final part of this is on January 20, 2000, the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, ACORN, filed a motion in federal court for a temporary restraining order to halt our test pile contract, because they contended that we had not complied with the Executive

Order Number 12898 and that we had not received a permit from the Department of Transportation as required by the National Transportation Act of Section 4(f).

After a hearing on the facts of the case, the Court, on April 20, 2000, granted the Corps' motion for summary judgment, dismissing the suit and all of plaintiffs' allegations.

In summary, the Corps addressed environmental justice issues and complied with National Environmental Policy Act in its preparation of the EIS for the Inner Harbor Navigational Lock Replacement Project. The Environmental Protection Agency, in response to a National Environmental Justice Advisory Council inquiry, found that the Corps complied with all applicable NEPA and Executive Order 12898 requirements, and a federal district court found no cause of action under an Executive Order 12898 violation claim.

Again, I want to thank you for the opportunity to make this statement before the commission today. I wanted to -- one other thing before I open it up for questions -- I wanted to respond about the Violet site. I know one of the questions that --

The one -- the main reason that the Violet site was not chosen was because it was going to destroy 10,000 acres of wetlands in the area and all, and that was the

main environmental reason why that site was not chosen.

Thanks again for appearing before you today.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Mr. Dicharry. I'm sure we have questions?

VOICE: Oh, you'll look to the right, will you?

DR. FORD: Ms. Richardson.

MS. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon, sir.

MR. DICHARRY: How you doing.

MS. RICHARDSON: And thank you for appearing.

By way of backdrop, in civil rights law we try to look at

not only the carrying out of the law itself, the letter of

the law, but likewise the spirit of the law. You have

outlined, I think, very nicely things that have met the

letter of the law.

I do see some things where you're projecting further input and what-not as being reflective of trying to follow the spirit of the law. But one thing that caught my eye that I did not understand in light of all, firstly, with the Corps having its responsibilities that it has carried out for time immemorial -- the protection of rights of citizens as well as doing the physical things as engineers that you do.

It concerned me very much that -- put my readers on -- that when you were written -- when you received a letter from Tulane Environmental Clinic asking

Ų,

about whether or not you do a comprehensive risk assessment for the Port of New Orleans, could that not be done? Was indeed that not needed prior to initiation of the process?

I think the letter answered that EPA did not require that this assessment be completed prior to issuance of the final EIS for the project. And my question is relative to that concern. In light of the spirit of the law, in light that I've heard somebody say this or something related there to it's been around for 40 years or something, in following those wishes and needs of the people, the common person on the street, in trying to be very sure that the rights of all are protected, what was -- what is the haste in not conducting that comprehensive risk assessment prior to any further movement?

MR. DICHARRY: That is part of this operational safety plan that we are presently preparing right now, and it -- the operational safety plan does involve a risk assessment of the cargoes that, you know, will be going through the canal.

And I might mention that these -- the cargoes that will be going through the canal are the same cargoes that go through the canal. It's -- there'll be more of them, but again, it will be more -- be able to be going

DR. FORD: We're on the right for a moment.

Mr. Morris...

MR. MORRIS: I too want to thank you for a well-prepared statement. I have a question concerning community involvement, and I heard a group of persons just prior to you getting up had a problem with some things that you're doing, and you said that you held a meeting or you hold meetings, and that there is a free flow of information.

And I noticed that on -- I believe it was June 20 of this year, 2000, that you held an informational meeting, and that informational meeting was to inform the public of their preliminary recommendations and receive public comment.

Was there an evaluation after the meeting of how well that meeting was attended and what was the outcome of that, and what was the community's sentiment based on that? And when you finish with that, then I have another question about some other things.

MR. DICHARRY: Well, the June 20 meeting was held by the community-based mitigation committee. They're the ones that ran the meeting. The Corps was -- didn't run the meeting. We were there to answer questions and all.

They -- the committee members were there. They

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

coordinated with the community people that attended. was well attended by a number of community people. They discussed the preliminary mitigation recommendations that the committee had come up with prior to that date and discussed them with the community and asked the community to provide comments concerning those particular mitigation measures.

And then once they evaluated that input from that meeting, the committee then made their final recommendations for the first three years of construction.

MR. MORRIS: Okay. Also, you stated that after your community meetings and the input that you get, you post that on your Website. How many hits are you getting to that Website?

MR. DICHARRY: It's not a Corps Website. actually a Website maintained by the contractor who is the, you know, facilitator for the community-based mitigation committee. It's -- I'm not sure. I can't answer that question, to tell you the truth, right now.

The minutes also, Mike has reminded me that the minutes of all the meetings are also posted in one of the local libraries in the affected communities, so anyone can go and see the minutes of the meetings and all.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Okay. Ms. Bourg has a question.

MS. BOURG: You mentioned that that's the same cargo will go through after the project that's going through the project now. So if that be the case, then why would you need the project, except, of course, that you said it would go through more efficiently.

So to go through more efficiently, I would assume that the carriers of the ships would be larger.

And if in fact they're larger, they're carrying more stuff. And if they're carrying more stuff, it might be an increased risk to the people should there be some incident.

So how do you address the residents' concern about this increased risk?

MR. DICHARRY: What I meant when I said the same cargo, I said the same type of cargo, I should have said. And rather than -- it's going to be a lot more cargo. There's no doubt about it. Once the newer lock is there, even though we have been criticized about our projections for economic, you know, futures, there will be additional tonnage going through that canal.

And the risk assessment that I was talking about is taking that into consideration -- the additional amount of cargo that will be transported through this lock when it's completed and all.

MS. BOURG: Then I must have misunderstood your

previous comment. Perhaps I did misunderstand it; that there was no increased or significantly increased risk.

Yet I'm hearing the residents say they are very concerned about larger ships, which means if there was a mishap, it is certainly a larger risk. How will you mitigate that and their concern?

MR. DICHARRY: Well, I guess I should say that based on a preliminary assessment we might -- we think that there's not any significant increase in risk. There is going to be some increase in risk, but -- and we are looking at that in our risk assessment.

So I guess I should qualify that by saying that based on very limited knowledge right now, we don't think there's going to be any increase in risk because the bridges now are very narrow, okay, and the lock is very narrow, okay.

And so when you have a narrow opening, a narrow corridor, it's more risky for the barges and ships and all to go through there. With wider bridge openings and wider lock, that's what I'm saying is we think that it's going to be less risky.

MS. BOURG: So if there were a mishap with this larger amount of stuff that might dangerous at any given time, do you have a disaster plan, a relief plan? And are the residents that might be impacted by this mishap

satisfied, or do you believe that you will be able to do certain things to satisfy them. If so, what might that be?

MR. DICHARRY: As part of this operational safety plan, we are developing response plans. And once we've finalized this draft report, we will then give it out to the committee, to the community, and get responses from the community on these response plans that we have developed in case there was any accident during the project -- during the operation of the project.

DR. FORD: Ms. Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Yes. The previous speakers complained that they had been excluded from the mitigation committee. What's your side of the story?

MR. DICHARRY: Well, unfortunately, that issue has been brought to federal court. The American Civil Liberties Union has filed a suit in federal court concerning that issue about openness of the committee and how the committee was formed and those kinds of issues, and it's still pending in court, so I cannot discuss any -- give you any of my opinions today.

MS. MADDEN: If I could ask a followup question. There was a firm mentioned, I think, in your letter that facilitated the creation of the mitigation group. Is that a PR firm or what kind of company is that?

MR. DICHARRY: No. It's a firm that has done typical, similar type work in developing community involvement programs. In fact, they were involved in developing a community program for the building of the second grid of New Orleans Bridge in New Orleans, and so they've had some experience in developing community input, getting out into the neighborhoods, getting -- extracting the right information from these neighborhoods and all.

MS. MADDEN: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Was there another question? Mr. Quigley.

MR. QUIGLEY: Mr. Dicharry, in the handout from the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, they said -- they had mentioned you by name to say that you assured neighborhood groups and a neighborhood working group that the project would not take place if the community did not want it. Is that a misunderstanding, or what is the story on that?

MR. DICHARRY: When I may have said that, it was responding to -- referring to that previous plan that was going to relocate 200 homes. And I have never said that with this particular plan that we are proposing now. But I might mention, I'm a civil engineer senior project manager here in New Orleans, and I don't speak necessarily for the Corps of Engineers.

MR. QUIGLEY: Can you tell us why the City

Council of New Orleans -- they say in here that the City

Council of New Orleans is on record opposing this project.

Is that correct?

MR. DICHARRY: I think, if I remember correctly, their opposition was qualified by saying until all studies are completed, you know, they would not support the project, if I -- and I may be -- I think I'm paraphrasing it. Something similar to that that I -- it wasn't just, We're opposed to the project. There was some qualifying language about, Until additional studies are done and communities involved in the process and those kinds of things.

MR. QUIGLEY: And is it your position then that when those studies are done, you're going to make that available to the City Council of New Orleans?

MR. DICHARRY: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: Those are the studies you were talking about earlier?

MR. DICHARRY: Well, they have been given all the studies to date that we have finalized. And this operational plan study, we will give that to the City Council also for their review.

MR. QUIGLEY: And the main push for this is the maritime industry. Is that correct -- to try to improve

Is the

Neighborhood Association's participation in the project.

25

Who's made the final decision that ultimately removed Holy Cross-from—the mitigation committee process? Or could you give me more information on that?

MR. DICHARRY: Unfortunately, that's part of that lawsuit, Dr. Wright, and I can't -- I've been advised by my lawyers not to speak specifics about that.

DR. FORD: Okay. Even though we said --Thank you very much for your comments.

MR. DICHARRY: Thank you.

DR. FORD: Appreciate it.

We do have enough time, since this is a very patient group, to have one more presented before we stop for dinner. I'd like to call to the podium Ms. Tia Williams -- Tia Edwards, Director of Public Affairs for the Louisiana Chemical Association.

MS. EDWARDS: Before I begin, my name is Tia Edwards. I am the public affairs director for Louisiana Chemical Association.

I will also be joined by Edward Flynn, who is the director of health and safety with Louisiana Chemical Association as well. He's passing out some information to you. Our remarks are in the folders that you will receive in addition to some general information about the Louisiana Chemical Association and our member companies.

Louisiana Chemical Association is a trade

association representing chemical manufacturers in the State of Louisiana. LCA represents 74 member companies with over 100 manufacturing sites across Louisiana, and we employ over 33,000 men and women.

These companies basically manufacture the building blocks of our lives. Modern --

DR. FORD: You have to talk directly into it.

MS. EDWARDS: Right directly into it. Okay.

All right. Close. Okay.

As I indicated, LCA member companies basically manufacturer the building blocks of our modern lives, from antibiotics to zippers.

In 1992, we welcomed the opportunity to join in partnership with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the Louisiana Advisory Committee to discuss environmental justice-related issues and the impact of the environment on health and overall quality of life of our citizens here in Louisiana.

Over the past eight years we have, as LCA member companies, aggressively sought to do our part to create a healthy environment for all Louisiana citizens. We view our responsibility to Louisiana's environment very seriously, and we welcome the opportunity to continue to dialogue and to partner with our neighbors and our regulators and others in business and industry to develop

viable solutions for cleaner, healthier, and a safer
Louisiana.

Over the last decade, LCA has taken a very good and hard look at the way we conduct business, and a lot has been learned. We recognize our environmental responsibility to make sure our facilities are operated safely and healthy.

We recognize our economic responsibility, and most importantly, we also recognize our social responsibility to listen and respond to the needs and concerns of our communities.

LCA member companies contribute significantly and positively to our local communities and to the state as a whole. But our significant contributions to the economy, education, workforce, and the community in general have not been enough to change the negative perceptions of our industry by the average Louisiana citizen, and particularly those of color, minorities, and poor citizens.

We recognize that many of our neighbors are still challenged by inadequacies; inadequate housing, education, health care, and access to community resources. And environmental justice concerns grew from these social ills and these challenges that continue to plague black, minority, and poor communities.

LCA member companies recognize that we have a role -- a role as good corporate citizens and neighbors to support and, in some cases, to take the lead in developing efforts that will begin to eradicate many of these challenges faced by our communities.

So what have we done in the last eight years to respond to EJ concerns? LCA member companies have made significant progress and accomplishments by focusing on efforts and initiatives that have helped to empower black, minority, and poor citizens in our communities near our facilities.

But before we did one thing, before we created one program, before we donated one dollar, we did something, and that was we listened. We listened to our near neighbors by talking to them in their homes, in their churches, in their schools, civic organization meetings, and places of work.

And we learned that, number one, listening is a pretty good thing and that it's been something that we really have not been doing a very good job at. And the number two thing that we learned is that our neighbors value our participation and they value our input.

But something that we also learned from this, and that was it's not just enough to listen. Dialogue is good, but action is better. We learned that in order to

begin to respond to what we heard, we needed a better system.

Thus, our Community Advisory Panels, or CAPs, as we call them, were born. Today over 25 CAPs are active in making a difference throughout industrial parishes in Louisiana. As advisory groups, these panels are made up of community members and representatives of local plants and act as a bridge between the plants and the surrounding community on matters of concern to the community and of common interest.

The CAPs meet regularly and members establish the meeting agenda. Topics range from economics, environment, education; hiring practices, and health concerns as well as transportation issues.

One good example of a CAP that has been operating for over ten years is Dow Chemical's plant in Plaquemine, Louisiana. They just celebrated their tenyear anniversary this year. By listening in our CAPs, through participation in numerous neighborhood outreach programs, we've gained a better understanding of community and environmental justice concerns and challenges.

We have learned that we have a role -- a very important role -- to help to provide viable solutions to these challenges. Our neighbors have spoken. We have listened, and we have responded.

So what did our neighbors tell us? Our neighbors told us, first of all, that they want us to operate safe, clean facilities while protecting the environment. LCA member companies are environmentally conscious and are committed to continued reduction of overall air, land, and water emissions.

Give you a good tangible example of that.

Shell Norco Chemical plant, as a part of their

comprehensive good neighbor initiative, is committed to

reducing their toxic release inventory, TRI, as we call

it, their emissions by over 30 percent in the next three

years.

As also a part of this initiative, Shell has committed to enhance operational performance such that the number of episodic releases, such as flaring, for example, will be reduced by 50 percent over this three-year period as well.

In fact, industrywide, LCA member companies have spent billions on environmental equipment and systems. And although production continues to rise, LCA member companies consistently have reduced emissions to air, land, and water.

Since 1987 overall emissions have been reduced by 80 percent. Our companies are committed to raising the environmental bar and go far beyond what is required by

our regulators. Emission reduction and excellent environmental performance are not the only areas where we've made substantial progress.

Through responsible caring initiatives that have helped to increase communication with our neighbors, the environmental community and state and federal regulators, we learned that it is our environmental responsibility, again, to keep our doors open and to initiate dialogue with our community in order to gather, maintain a cleaner and healthier environment.

At this moment I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Ed Flynn, who will go into a little bit more detail about our responsible care and safety initiatives with our member companies.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you, Tia.

Good afternoon. My name is Edward Flynn. I'm the director of health and safety affairs for the Louisiana Chemical Association.

As Tia mentioned, LCA's 74 companies employ almost 33,000 Louisiana men and women. Every day and night these people use their training, their education, and their experience to safely manufacture chemicals that are essential for products that are both lifesaving and life-enhancing.

All these people dedicate themselves to the

responsible use of chemistry to benefit industries'
ultimate customer, the general public, including every
single person in this room. What goes on at local
chemical plants results in the things we all take for
granted; the ordinary, familiar, everyday useful and
desirable consumer products that we all want or need:
antibiotics, soaps and detergents, medicines,
pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, computer and sports equipment,
agricultural fertilizers, seat belts, sunscreen,
antifreeze -- the list goes on and on.

Everyday products we all buy at local grocery, hardware, drug, hobby, auto, and other retail stores all get started at LCA member companies plants. In the manufacture of these products, no one wants an accident. Nobody wants to see anyone hurt. No one wants to damage the environment.

Chemical industry employees want the same things as everyone else: good health, a clean environment, a safe workplace, a decent place to live. Let me very clear. Chemical plants are run by people, not by machinery. And every LCA member company feels a deep societal and economic investment in the safety and wellbeing of these people, their families, and their communities.

This afternoon I wish to speak briefly about

several voluntary chemical industry safety environmental and community initiates that are alive and well here in Louisiana. These programs are in place because chemical manufacturers understand and recognize that their license to operate in any community is a privilege and not a right.

In 1988 a new way of doing business was unveiled. That new way of doing business was their chemical industries' and is the chemical industries' responsible care program. What is responsible care?

Well, it is now a voluntary ten-year-old effort that seeks to continuously improve the safety, environmental, and health performance of the chemical industry, and to do so in line with public concerns and expectations. In essence, it's a public commitment.

Now, responsible care came about because of the chemical industry's poor image during the mid to late 1980s. The root cause of this negative view was the industry's insufficient and at times inappropriate response to legitimate public concerns about the health, safety, and environmental impacts of its operations and products.

Senior managers realized that the industry was not meeting public expectations. And because our industry's survival depends on both improved performance

10-

and community support, responsible care was intentionally designed as a major long-term and ambitious set of initiatives that goes beyond regulatory requirements and focuses on continuous improvement in all aspects of chemical manufacturing.

The basic ingredients of responsible care are six codes of management practices. They are the key to defining and implementing the initiative, and I want to take a moment and highlight those six.

There's Community Awareness and Emergency
Response, or the CARE Code, which fosters community rightto-know, dialogue with near neighbors, and emergency
preparedness.

The Distribution Code looks to reduce risks to communities and the environment from the transportation, storage and handling of chemicals.

Pollution Prevention commits the industry to ongoing efforts to protect the environment by generating less waste and reducing emissions to air, land and water.

Process Safety is designed to prevent accidents. This code is based on the idea that facilities will be safe if they are engineered, operated and maintained properly and inspected regularly.

The fifth code is Employee Health and Safety, which is designed to protect and promote the safety and

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

health of people working at and visiting chemical plants.

-The last of the codes is the Product Stewardship code, which is intended to make health, safety, and environmental protection a critical part of designing, manufacturing, marketing, distributing, using, recycling, and disposing of company products.

An important element of responsible care is the direct inclusion of the public through programs, as Tia mentioned, like Community Advisory Panels. In addition, a company's commitment to responsible care must be total and it now must be checked through an independent and thirdparty process known as a Management Systems Verification, or MSV.

An MSV team is composed of members of the public, other representatives of industry, and a facilitator. The team looks to evaluate and report on a company's commitment to responsible care and make recommendations where or when a company needs to improve or enhance an aspect of their operations.

Here in southwest Louisiana, both PPG Industries and Condea Vista are responsible care member companies, and both, I believe, have gone through Management System Verifications.

Additionally, many other LCA companies, in addition to the two mentioned by name, subscribe to the

.9

responsible care ethic, and every LCA company works to manufacture, package, and distribute their products in the safest and most environmentally responsible manner.

A second proactive chemical industry initiative I'd like to mention is the TRANS CARE program. The acronym stands for Transportation Community Awareness and Emergency Response. What is TRANS CARE?

TRANS CARE is a voluntary community outreach program intended to address public concerns and reduce risks around the transportation of hazardous materials.

TRANS CARE creates partnerships between chemical manufacturers, distributors and transporters with local communities and local emergency management planning and response groups.

TRANS CARE is alive and well in Louisiana.

There are many participants, including Grace Davidson,

PPG, Montell, Georgia Gulf, Condea Vista, Lyondell, and

many others located along the Mississippi River.

Also participating in TRANS CARE are the Louisiana state police, parish local emergency planning committees, mutual lay groups, and other business and industry organizations and companies.

TRANS CARE is especially oriented to communities that may not host an industrial facility but could be located along a transportation corridor through

L

which chemicals are shipped.

The last program I'd like to bring to the committee's attention is LCA's S.A.F.E. program. S.A.F.E stands for Serious About Fostering Excellence. The S.A.F.E. program has three goals. Number one, to reflect every LCA member's commitments to continuous improvements in health, safety, and environmental performance.

Two, to measure, track, and drive member performance using several existing key indicators or metrics. And three, to provide recognition opportunities for excellence by those LCA members who are achieving extraordinary results beyond regulatory requirements in safety, environmental performance, and community involvement.

Like the TRANS CARE program, the S.A.F.E.

program was not in place when this committee last visited

Louisiana in 1992. S.A.F.E. was launched in 1998 as a

voluntary effort open to every LCA member company. Public

domain information, the kind that plants must submit to

federal and state regulatory authorities, is used to

measure safety and environmental performance.

Community involvement is also a key component of the S.A.F.E. program. The 1999 information is being evaluated right now, but let me just mention a couple of things from the 1998 program. In the areas of employee or

contractor safety, EquiStar, Condea Vista, CertainTeed, Montell USA, Louisiana Pigment, PPG, Grace Davidson are all Calcasieu Parish plants recognized for their accomplishments to promote, achieve, and sustain safe workplaces.

In the areas of environmental performance,

CertainTeed; Grace Davidson, Condea Vista, PPG, Montell

USA in Lyondell, local plants here in southwest Louisiana

recognized for their efforts to prevent or minimize any

negative impact that their operations have on the

environment or the community.

And perhaps the most important category,
community involvement, Grace Davidson, Condea, Lyondell,
Montell, PPG, West Lake, and 31 other LCA members located
in communities such as Burnside, LaPlace, Convent,
Geismar, Donaldsonville, St. Gabriel, Norco, Baton Rouge,
Hahnville, Addis, Luling, Garyville, and Plaquemine were
recognized for major efforts to make their communities
better, safer, nicer places to live, work, and enjoy.

As I said earlier, every LCA member company is committed to the communities in which they have the privilege to operate. All LCA members are equally committed to operational safety, environmental responsibility, and continuous performance improvements in both these areas.

That concludes my formal remarks.

\_\_ DR. FORD: Okay. Does that conclude your remarks, too?

MS. EDWARDS: Well, I had a few more things to say, but --

DR. FORD: Okay. Continue.

MS. EDWARDS: I talked at the beginning of my statement about our environmental as well as economic and social responsibility. I will touch briefly, in the interest of time, on our economic as well as our social responsibility.

It's no secret that LCA member companies and the chemical industry in Louisiana is a major catalyst for the state's economic viability. And it's absolutely essential to its future. As we mentioned, over 33,000 men and women work directly for our chemical industry, but -- and that pays about 1.5 billion annually in salaries and wages.

In fact, for every job within the chemical industry, another seven are generated in the state, and this basically is going to translate to about 250,000 jobs for Louisianians.

Not only are our LCA member companies committed to economic stability and growth but we're also committed to hiring and spending locally. And an example of that

would be our Dow Chemical -- again, in Plaquemine -- that spends 65.7 million in equipment and supplies purchased from businesses right there in their neighboring parishes.

Another example of that is Exxon Mobil that utilizes the service of Wallace Printing, which is an African-American-owned printer in the North Baton Rouge community to develop and to actually publish and print their community newsletter that's distributed quarterly.

So our member companies have a commitment not only to the state economic viability but also their local parishes and communities.

Touching on our social responsibility,
workforce and education initiatives are very important to
us. We realize that the economic impact on our local
economy is significant, but it doesn't mean anything
unless people are working and unless they have an
opportunity to be employed.

We began, through listening, heard our communities' concern about education, and LCA shares that concern and has made enormous strides in this area. LCA member companies support a number of programs and initiatives that encourage the development of future workforce.

From scholarship programs, hands-on science programs, our nationally-recognized Chem Friends and Chem

Pals programs, inroads, back to school programs with 100 black-men — we believe that the only way to make substantial progress in our educational system is to work together to create partnerships of educators, parents and others, and we have pledged to do just that.

One particular initiative that you'll find in your folder is our higher education program which encourages and provides resources to teachers as well as to students, information about the skills needed to work within our industry, which in average pay over \$50,000 a year.

We found that many of our young people need some connections to real world in terms of what they learn in the classroom, and higher education -- higher, meaning H-I-R-E, is how we spell it -- connects classroom experiences to real life and real work jobs.

It doesn't stop here. The number of teacher institutes like the ones at Condea Vista and PPG, along with training seminars and workshops that help to extend teachers' knowledge of our industry, that allow them to transfer this into their classrooms.

As we begin the 21st century and the age of high tech and information, our member companies are also concerned that the quality of the Louisiana workforce is not going to be where we need it to be in terms of living

l

.2

in this fast-paced high tech society.

an obligation. We have a responsibility to educate our workforce for the future. But again, through our listening, we learned that in our neighborhoods where our facilities are, many of those people do not have the skills to work within our facilities, and we listened and learned that we needed to provide opportunities to provide those skills and the training necessary.

So thus was born our PTEC program, our Process
Technology Program, where we actually, through a two-year
associate degree program and partnership with the
community and with the community college system and the
governor's office, have developed a proactive training and
skills program to develop process technicians for the
future.

We're looking at from the next five to ten

years a shortage of 5,000, and we want to hire locally

right in our community. So the PTEC has allowed us to be

able to go into communities and to train young people with

the skills required to work within our industry.

Residents in our communities tell us that they want to work, and we are committed, and the chemical industry is committed to providing them the skills that are necessary.

Because Louisiana and our parishes and our communities are our homes, too, we live there, too, LCA member companies and employees contribute countless hours and invest millions of dollars in programs and projects, from Adopt-A-School programs to the Audubon Zoo.

We're serious about supporting our communities, and our partnerships help to continue to foster dialogue between industry and the community residents, and we feel that they are hallmarks to our success.

One real good example of that, and I will end here, is the Shell Norco Good Neighbor Initiative. For years, the community and the Shell plant, there existed a lack of communication, and lack of understanding, and a lack of trust.

Now, Norco and Diamond, with the connection with Shell Chemical, is a good example of a community that has changed for the better since the last time the committee was here.

Through a multi-year, multi-dollar Good
Neighbor initiative, Shell Norco plans to invest millions
of dollars for projects designed to improve the Norco and
Diamond community.

This resulted from significant community dialogue and many hours of working together. A \$1 million trust fund to help to finance community projects, such as

community beautification, youth leadership training, scholarships\_and job skills trainings for community residents will be developed.

So where do we go from here? Where can our communities turn for help, support and resources to address their concerns. We feel that our communities need look any further than our plants themselves that are in our neighborhoods, because we're their neighbors, too.

We welcome the opportunity to talk, to listen, and above all, to respond.

Thank you.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Ms. Edwards and Mr. Flynn.

Questions? Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: I have three questions if I might ask them.

DR. FORD: It's late. You can ask three.

MS. BOURG: First, I think you're to be commended for the investment in Louisiana's communities and for the educational pieces and the safety pieces. I am, however, concerned in that in Calcasieu Parish, the PPG and the Condea Vista are members of the Louisiana Chemical Association.

They are both been in Responsible CARE program.

As a matter of fact, one of them has received a Safe

Recognition. And yet, if you look at the meat and potatoes of the toxic releases, in 1997 as compared to 1998, the toxic releases by PPG in all three categories --fugitive air releases in pounds, stack air releases in pounds, and total air releases in pounds -- have all increased significantly from '97 to '98.

And if you were to look at Condea Vista, in two of those categories, they increased. And so the educational pieces and the investments are important, but the citizens are still concerned about the life quality and the undue burdensome impact on communities that are protected classes that we are looking at.

So how do you explain that, can you do anything about, and secondly -- the second question is: Do you have these discussions with the Calcasieu CAPs so that they know about the increase in these toxic release reports, and are they okay about that with you?

And then thirdly, and the last question I have, in 1993 you stated to the committee in testimony -- the Louisiana Chemical Association stated that, We will continue to support a well-funded DEQ and strong environmental enforcement.

So my question would be: What has been done by the Louisiana Chemical Association to push for the increased funding and a stronger DEQ and -- as you stated

14 .

in '93 and as you gave testimony before the Commission and the committee?

MR. FLYNN: Let me try and address some of the questions. With regard to the TRI numbers, I think one thing that needs to be kept in mind is the realization that the TRI program began in 1987, and that when you look at emissions since the inception of the program in 1987 that there has been a significant and dramatic and extensive and largely consistent overall reduction in emissions, not just in Calcasieu Parish, but throughout the Louisiana Chemical industry.

Now, it's difficult to make -- it's unfortunately difficult to make apples to apples, if you will, comparisons in reductions, because the federal EPA has continued to expand the TRI over years by adding additional chemicals and continuing to add additional reporting requirements on not just manufacturers but now on other industries.

So we need to keep that in mind. When you look at a short-term situation, as you indicated, from 1997 to 1998, I think that there may be perhaps an increase in the emissions. But when you look at the overall reduction from 1987, the beginning of the program, that's where you hopefully get a more accurate and more -- a larger perspective of the kinds of emissions, reductions, and

right.

pollution prevention and waste minimization efforts that the industry has been committed to.

The other thing to keep in mind with regard to TRI; in addition to the addition of new chemicals that are continued to add is that production among many LCA member companies is up, and that can contribute at times to increased environmental emissions.

But I think what Responsible CARE provides is certainly a mechanism and a framework through the Pollution Prevention Code, for sure, that commits the industry, individual member companies, every member of the CMA or now the American Chemistry Council, to ongoing, long-term waste minimization and pollution prevention activities.

And that looks at both air emissions, water discharges and others, so there may an increase in one sector in a particular period, but the point I'm trying to make is that overall, there's certainly significant reductions that have taken place throughout the industry here in Calcasieu Parish and elsewhere.

With regard to the second part of your question which -- I'm trying to think now --

MS. EDWARDS: The CAPs.

MR. FLYNN: Oh, the CAPs. The CAPs. That's

MS. BOURG: It was the discussions you're having with the CAPs and are they informed about these increases in Calcasieu from these companies, and how do you handle those discussions.

MR. FLYNN: The Community Advisory Panels are -- I've had the privilege to speak to two Community Advisory Panels in the ten years that I've been with the LCA. And the CAPs operate as an autonomous organization, and they basically set the agenda. They decide what kinds of information they want to know about it, be it regarding transportation issues or employment issues, or if there is an incident with respect to operational activities or TRI -- each one of the CAPs that -- the 25 or 28 CAPs that operate in the state are autonomous bodies.

They're all facilitated, but essentially, the plants respond to what the members of the public and the folks who are active on the CAPs choose to hear. And if they want to know about TRI issues, well, then they're going to say, We want to know about it, and then the plants bring in the people who can provide the information and the answer.

So while I can't speak with specificity with regard to Calcasieu Parish Community Advisory Panels, I can speak to the fact that CAPs decide what they want to know about, and then the plants do what they can, bend

over backwards, literally, to make sure that they provide the CAPs with what they want.

For example, I spoke just recently, in the last month or so, to a CAP down in St. John the Baptist Parish that is sponsored by Nalco Chemical, Stockhausen, and Marathon Oil. And I got a call a week before the CAP meeting saying that there was something that they wanted to be informed about. And I made it my point to be there and to talk to the CAP. So that's about the CAPs.

With regard to the LCA testimony in 1992 before the Commission regarding a stronger DEQ enforcement, that is -- let me see if my colleague would like to answer that question. I'm not sure. I just -- I'm --

VOICE: Well, you're doing fine.

MR. FLYNN: Well, I'm trying to look to specific examples where in fact LCA has made progress in that area, and I apologize to the members of the committee for not being able to provide you with specific information.

If there's opportunity, however, to get an answer to the committee, we would certainly be happy to do that.

MS. BOURG: Thank you. And I appreciate your earnestness in answering that. It was clear in the testimony that you had supported increased funding and

increased enforcement of the DEQ in '93. Thank you very much.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you. I apologize for not having an answer here, but we will commit to providing an answer to the committee to that question.

DR. FORD: Thank you. I'm looking to the right. Oh.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir. You're getting good.

Thank you. I'm glad my colleague opened the traditional environmental area, because while you both really are dressed for success and you're very, very articulate, you were telling me more than I wanted to know about some facets of your operation without addressing what today was about.

Nevertheless, now that that door is opened,
we're going to go to this broadened definition then of
environment, like if you make more money you can therefore
have maybe a home where you can avoid these emissions.

And let's just call environment whatever has now been put
on the table.

I think my favorite TV show is The Practice, and the judge says, There are things you cannot address unless one of the lawyers opens it up. Then the other one has a right to walk in and talk about it.

\_

I want to talk about contracts and jobs and what-not, and you may not have come with these data but you can address it at least in a generic way.

Contractual, entrepreneurial opportunities were mentioned by way of Wallace Printing, which is certainly a very fine

Would either of you have information about the percentage then of the company's contracts that are going to minority and female-owned businesses?

business by any color or anything.

While you think about that one, and we may as well look at the whole employment picture, and while I know the numbers of employees at plants are good, because I grew in this community; then moved to Baton Rouge.

Nobody knows more about plants as far as numbers than I do.

But I'm curious as to your member associations and what levels, say, what percentage managers have you? And then what happens at the next level and the next level? In most American firms, it's kind of like at the bottom we have the janitors and the laborers, you know. That's big.

And then the further up you go, you've reached this point where the percentage is almost immeasurable. So would you kindly tell me something about your member companies as far as their contract percentages are

concerned; and not just percentages of persons, but percentages of the companies' contracts that they give out. And then please tell me likewise about employees.

MS. EDWARDS: As you indicated, I do not have the figures. I wasn't prepared to answer that in terms with the figures here --

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, ma'am. But you opened it.

MS. EDWARDS: -- that would give you that information. But we'll be more than happy to provide that information and collect that data and give it to you.

I guess the way that I can respond to that, just in being a Baton Rouge citizen, growing up in Baton Rouge, and also being a product of my grandfather working at what was Standard Oil, now Exxon. And back -- he was a laborer. He was a common-folk laborer, and he worked very hard.

And I look now at the industry and look at the job opportunities that are available for the laborers, which are very few because of the change in technology and where we're moving with the 21st century.

We have not done a very good job at making sure that there were people who looked like me that were at the table and in positions that had decision-making. But I think now the opportunity for us, and what we have done is

taken the opportunity to look at the past, look at the inadequacies that exist, and begin to develop opportunities through programs and training and skills development through education that will allow more of those who look like me and look like you to be able to be in positions that will be able to be skilled into the 21st century into those jobs.

So yes, you are correct, and we know that, and we -- again, that's a part of our listening process. And now it's our responsibility to respond to that. And our member companies are committed to doing that, and we are working right now.

For example, with our PTEC program that I told you about, and you can look in more detail with our remarks, about how we are going and making a concerted effort to make sure that our neighborhood residents are aware of opportunities; that no longer are there opportunities just for the laborers.

These are opportunities for more education and more highly technical and skilled. And to be able to do those jobs, we have to provide that training in those programs. And PTEC is a very good example of that.

But I will get that data for you in reference to contracts and to our minority hiring practices.

MS. RICHARDSON: Mind you, not practices.

Numbers or percentages or whatever, because everybody is under a mandate from the world, you know, to have a policy or a statement that says, You're going to do right by everybody. But some finite data, please..

MS. EDWARDS: Yes.

MS. RICHARDSON: And corollary to that, maybe we should ask about programs in the communities that are most affected by the emissions, the whatever disparate things are happened in certain communities.

And finally, it is said that when John Adams left for the Constitutional Convention, his wife yelled out, John, don't forget the women. He forgot the women. We didn't get a vote till a hundred years later. Don't forget the data on women as a protected class as well.

Thank you.

MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: Because you mentioned in your paper two things that I'm very familiar with, the back to school program that Dow did and North Baton Rouge Neighborhoods United, and I know that both plant managers were intimately involved in both of those operations -- that's why those operations are successful.

In Calcasieu Parish, based on what we know about the community involvement, because we heard that testimony this morning, how intimately involved are the

people at the very top to getting the community involved into the process of community restoration where it should be; for instance, like in North -- with North Baton Rouge Neighborhoods United.

MS. EDWARDS: Well, specifically, what member companies I can speak to you from what I know in terms of what feedback I get from our member companies. PPG, for example, I know that they are actively -- actively involved as well as Condea Vista in community programs.

I personally, where plant managers have requested our assisted with their teacher institute, for example, providing teachers an opportunity to be able to extend their level of knowledge where the plant managers themselves have been a part of the sessions with the teachers and have invited me to come in and talk about initiatives and opportunities for teachers to extend their knowledge.

So that's just one tangible example. I'm sure that when you -- when our representatives from PPG and Condea Vista are here this evening, they can give you specifics.

But you're correct. When the plant manager and when the commitment is there from the top, it flows through, and everyone understands that commitment, and the programs work. The Exxon Mobil is a very good example of

how it works.

And our efforts and our commitment is to begin to get more of our plants to follow suit, such as Dow, as well as Exxon Mobil. So I can continue to say we have -- we've done a lot. And as I said, one thing that we've done that we haven't been doing very good on, and that is listening.

We've learned that we had to do that. We've learned that we have a responsibility, and that responsibility is to be good corporate citizens. And the best way to do that is to listen and dialogue, and most of all, to respond.

MR. FLYNN: Let me just add a couple of comments to that because I think the whole nature of the title plant manager has changed dramatically over the years. We think that years ago it was probably enough to be a chemical engineer and an operational kind of individual and run the plant and to things safely and lawfully, and that was enough.

And while those components of the job certainly continue to this day, the typical LCA plant manager is an individual -- could be a male or a female; might be African-American or it might be white, but at this point the person has got those kinds of social skills and abilities to spend time away from the plant.

Normally, the person who's running the plant is the Number 2 person. The plant manager, the senior site manager, spends so much time away from the plant in terms of community activities and outside the fence line types of programs, be they educational or other community, that it's really the Number 2 individual at the plant who basically takes care of operational safety.

And the site manager, generally he or she has got other global responsibilities for their corporation, but also spends just countless numbers of hours in terms of community activities, be they United Way or the YMCA or YWCA types of programs, are on the boards of directors and community libraries or educational foundations or blood banks or Red Cros's -- I mean, the list goes on and on and on.

And we can cite specific examples of plants up and down the river as well as here in Lake Charles the kinds of activities that those plant managers are involved in. And they do that not because it's -- they don't have anything else to do, but because it -- I think it represents and it's reflective of the corporate and, I would daresay, industry commitment, recognizing that it takes a lot more than just running a plant to be able to maintain operations in communities today.

DR. FORD: Dr. Wright.

DR. WRIGHT: I'm not sure that I have question, but I have a couple of comments, and they may be seen as questions as well.

But I found it really interesting when you gave your explanation for why the numbers for Condea Vista and the other plant had not gone down, and I just wonder if you think that a person who lives fence line with Condea Vista would be at all interested in the fact that the numbers overall for the parish or Calcasieu Parish had gone down, but where they live, it was still increasing.

And I'm making that statement because oftentimes in the work that I do, I meet the public relations people who are all very, very nice people, who do very nice things in the community -- they work with Adopt A School, they give barbeques and all these kinds of things, they get to know the people by first name -- and then they're always so shocked when they go to a meeting and these same people attack them.

And I believe it's because they're missing the point. It has nothing to do with the relation -- personal relationship that you build. It has to do with the reduction in emissions, and sometimes relocation where people want out of the area where they live, or they want improved conditions.

And so I oftentimes see the public relations

2,3

person as the canary, because the public relations people come, they can talk about all the good things but they can't answer any of the hard questions. And the people who need to be here to answer those questions are not, and then we're facing the really nice people that we really like, that we've gotten to know through the different programs and so on.

But that does not change the quality of life or the state of affairs for the people who are presenting their case or their problem. And I'm trying -- I try so hard to try to, you know, to get over this. I want to be nice to nice people, and I'd really rather be nasty to people who can really be -- who have some control or power or who can answer our questions.

But it always ends up this way, and I see you two as very nice people, but Condea Vista and the neighborhoods that we're talking about have some conflicts here, and you know, then you have give me this explanation of why their numbers aren't down.

I guess what I'm saying to you is that that means nothing to the people who are affected by Condea

Vista or the people who are sick or the people with dioxin in their blood. The truth of the matter is that when I listen to you, I almost feel that Louisiana is just this really great place, and the Louisiana Chemical Association

is just this wonderful, wonderful organization.

But I also recognize the severe fights that we've had with particular companies. There's some companies who are excellent companies. But there are others within your organization who are not. They're really terrible companies.

And so I'm not comforted when I see Condea

Vista listed in all of these programs. It's not

comforting at all to me. And I know I'm rambling, but I

just kind of needed to get this, you know, off of my chest

with the public relations kind of presentations that we

get, a lot of really, really nice people.

The other question that I have, and it's not -may be a statement as well, is that the State of Louisiana
has as much oil as Texas and more natural gas, but we are
a very poor state as opposed to what's going on in Texas.

And so if the Louisiana Chemical Association is putting so much money into our state and we should be so grateful, then why the hell -- oh, excuse me -- then why are we so poor?

And I believe that there are a lot of things going on in the way when you talk about DEQ, looking for a stronger DEQ and more funding for DEQ, I get concerned because I wonder how much funding of DEQ is Louisiana Chemical Association providing that may have something to

do with the lack of enforcement, because then if you support a particular agency, then they have to be more responsive to you than they are to me or citizens.

I'm not really asking for a response. It's not really a question. It's just some things that I'm thinking about as you're talking, and this is not an attack to you two as individuals. And it's not an attack to any specific company, except maybe Condea Vista.

But these are things that we think about, you know. To be honest, I would like to see the state move in a direction away from these chemical manufacturing plants, because there is an inverse relationship between poverty and economic development with polluting industries.

And so while you're here, we're glad you're here for what you are contributing. But in terms of our future and economic development, you've been here 40, 50 years and we're still poor, so why should we think that your continuation will mean economic prosperity?

I'm not for any company that's here to leave, but certainly not looking for more to come. And it seems that we are targeted to get just more of what we've gotten. That for us reads more poverty, since this is where we are.

And I'm going to stop here.

DR. FORD: Contrary to popular belief, that was

3 .

not a speech.

Ms. Robinson has a question.

This is the last question, because it is time for dinner.

MS. ROBINSON: What I hear here amongst the committee members, and what I hear what you said versus the questions that they have asked and your ability to answer many of these questions is that there is a gap between your perception of the situation and the people that live in and around these communities and the general public.

And so the question becomes, you have some wonderful programs, but how effective are they? How are you implementing them? And then the next question is if everything is rosy and peachy-creamy, why are we here today, seven years later?

DR. FORD: I assume you want to respond to that.

MR. FLYNN: Yes. Thank you.

MS. EDWARDS: Yes. Then I want to.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you for the question. If I can just make a couple of comments.

I'm not sure that I would agree with your statement that we -- with -- that there's a gap in our perception. But I will admit and acknowledge a certain

.

\_

level of frustration on my part individually, because I was here in 1992.

years, and I was at Pleasant Hall on the campus of LSU in Baton Rouge when the Advisory Committee first visited Louisiana. And I can tell you that I have talked with people in some of the communities that I mentioned in my comments earlier, and I have listened to and heard and felt the frustration that people who are long-term residents in some of those communities have expressed with regard to a lack of understanding or information about plants that they have grown up nearby.

And at the same time, I have talked to the kinds of community relations and site management people at the plants who very genuinely speak to unprecedented levels of effort, sweat equity, roll-up-your-sleeves kind of effort, to make themselves more available and open and transparent and make information available to people in communities and near neighbors and residents.

And there is a -- it's like two ships passing in the night. The plants are working to try and make information available about themselves, and certainly people in the communities want to know information about the plants, so I agree with you.

And I agree with people who have spoken about

the need for better efforts, bottom line kinds of efforts, to promote constructive harmony between the plants and the communities. There are good faith efforts by -- on the part of the plants, and there are certainly desires on the part of people in the community to want information and answers to legitimate questions.

Somehow, it's not working good enough. And all I can say is that Responsible CAER is one system in place that provides a framework for an ongoing, committed effort to genuinely address public concerns. It is an effort that will never end, because people have the right to know as much as they can about plants that operate in their communities.

MS. EDWARDS: And if I could just add just to that, I -- what we have given you and what we thought we had given you today are some tangible examples of things that we have done since 1992 or '93. Some of the improvements. Some of the accomplishments.

And to show you that there are committed efforts out there to be able to develop the kinds of accomplishments that we all can feel good about. This will only happen if we continue to work together.

And, you know, I can speak. Ed says he was here ten years ago. This -- I've been at Louisiana

Chemical Association a little over a year. My background

. 8

is not the chemical industry. My background is education and nonprofit and higher ed.

So I have a totally different perspective coming in and looking at something very fresh, different, and new. And in every area that I have seen with nonprofit, with higher ed, the only way that changes come about and the only way improvements can happen is if we all continue to work together.

We need to know what you want. We need to know what it is that we need to do to respond. We have given you some examples, some tangible examples of what we have done based on dialogue and based on recommendations. But we need to know what we need to do to be able to be what it is that is enough.

MS. BOURG: I'd like to respond to that, and that is in addition to the Responsible CAER program with your members and the S.A.F.E. program with your members, perhaps you might consider something that you might call the SMCR program -- Stop the Pollution, Monitor the Impact, Clean it up, and Make Restitution.

DR. FORD: I'd like to thank the two of you for your comments to the committee.

We will reconvene here at 6:30 p.m. That's a little earlier than our schedules say, but that's because we are leaving a little late. And we'll start with

Richard Metcalf from the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas

Association.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the hearing was

recessed, to reconvene this same day, Tuesday, September

12, 2000, at 6:30 p.m.)

6:50 p.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Metcalf.

MS. RICHARDSON: -- presider for this, the last segment of today's marathon.

Some of you have had the privilege of drifting in and out. The committee has been here all day, so I feel sure they are going to cooperate with you in helping me to move this meeting along.

At this time, we will go into our -- what is this -- second session. All of that today was just one session? Okay, if you say so.

Our next presenter is Richard Metcalf. He's from the Environmental Affairs Department of Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

We are asking presenters, for the sake of helping us to get back on schedule, if you would be kind enough to summarize your presentation, your full presentation will be entered into the record, and then let's see how much more questions and answers bring out.

Now, if that process leaves something to be desired, you may feel free in your summary to point out anything else that is pertinent that we may have overlooked.

Okay. Good evening, and thank you, Mr.

MR. METCALF: Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the Commission, and members of the public, my name is Richard Metcalf. I am the health, safety and environmental affairs coordinator for the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.

MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry, sir. They say they're not hearing you in the back. Speak directly into it as you're doing now.

MR. METCALF: I'm trying to speak directly.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Go.

MR. METCALF: Louisiana Mid-Continent is a trade association which represents individuals and companies who together produce, transport, refine and market about 90 percent of the crude oil and natural gas in Louisiana and from the areas just offshore of Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico.

We represent 15 of the 19 refineries in the state, including the two major refineries here in Lake Charles -- the Citgo and Conoco refineries. Mid-Continent has represented the oil and gas industry in Louisiana since 1925.

Mike Lyons was supposed to give the presentation here tonight and Mike could not make it. He testified before this Commission in 1992 and would like

for me to express his regrets for not being able to be here tonight.

In the interest of time, our remarks tonight focus on the relationship of the refining industry in Louisiana to the communities in which they operate. As you requested, I will try to focus on how that relationship has changed over the past eight years since your last hearing.

In addition, Commission staff asked that we express our thoughts on the second draft of EPA's environmental justice guidance document. In this regard, we feel that EPA has addressed many of our concerns with Draft 1 of the environmental justice guidance document.

Draft 2 has more clarity and better definition of the process required for formally addressing environmental justice claims. The guidance also suggests activities that affected agencies and permit applicants can undertake to minimize the likelihood of EJ complaints in the future.

Louisiana refineries have already initiated many of these recommendations either individually or through the support of agency rule-makings to improve the permitting process. We still have concerns with some areas of the guidance where a lack of clarity is still an issue, but overall, the document is much improved, and we

commend EPA for the improvements.

With respect to the refining community relations over the last decade, we'll briefly discuss three areas in the time allowed. These are community outreach and community involvement, continuing efforts to reduce emissions and provide a safer environment, and commitment to education and training in the diversity in the workplace.

With respect to the first area, all of our member refineries in the state are involved in major community outreach efforts designed to better communicate with their neighbors. We want to listen to community concerns and to better inform residents of the facility's activities and plans.

Each of our refinery members has community action panels or similar community dialogue programs. The effort to better understand community concerns and communicate with our immediate neighbors has been significantly increased since 1992.

In addition to this dialogues, there's a serious effort to involve community members early in the permit process. When we plan plant modifications, we want the community to understand what those modifications will involve over time.

As the community surrounding our facilities has

changed and communities' expectations have changed, we have changed as well. We are committed to improving this dialogue.

MS. RICHARDSON: Sir, I'm sorry to say people are still signalling that they cannot hear. I don't know if there's a volume problem on the microphone.

MR. METCALF: It starts to go in but then it fades out.

MS. RICHARDSON: It fades out. Just as loudly as you can, and we apologize. That was about it.

MR. METCALF: Once again, we have a lot of examples and in the interest of time, many of these examples are identical to examples given by the Louisiana Chemical Association, and we will just answer those in the record.

As we testified in 1992, it is our strong belief that each community is unique and each of these facilities needs to engage in a dialogue that seeks better understanding of the uniqueness and work towards addressing the special needs of their neighbors.

We have always been committed to the overall community in which we operate. We generally are one of the major taxpayers in the parishes in which we operate, and this translates into better funded school systems, transportation systems, sewage and drainage systems in our

1 communities.

As indicated earlier, each of our refineries is involved in a wide variety of community projects. Other, you know, -- and we will go through -- I won't go through some of the United Way and those types of things, in the interest of time.

Many have undertaken beautification projects to improve the overall community. One refinery has a regular safety fair and a health fair for the neighboring communities such that they can improve their personal safety and health as they operate around the house and things around their house. There's also -- one has a minority leadership program designed especially for the community.

Let me move on to emissions, because that seems to be something that you want to hear about. In our effort to improve our relationships with our neighborhood communities is -- one of the major things we've done has been to reduce emissions.

Refineries have been significantly reducing emissions in Louisiana for decades through the use of improving technology. The best example I can give you is this. Hydrocarbons, or volatile organic compounds, as they're known to environmental people, historically represent the largest single source of air emissions from

1 a refinery.

These VOC emissions also include most of the few air toxics we're allowed to -- permitted to release. Since 1970, we have reduced VOC emissions from refineries by approximately 90 percent. In fact, the total of all VOC emissions from Louisiana refineries in 1996 is less than one-half of what the emissions from a single refinery was in 1970.

The commitment to reduce emissions is a continuing commitment. Since 1993 benzene air emissions from refineries have dropped 44 percent. MTBE emissions to the air are down by 47 percent. Xylene emissions are down 30 percent.

These are three main either carcinogens or suspected carcinogens we have from our refinery operations. All or part -- all of these are part of the overall hydrocarbon reductions achieved by Louisiana refineries.

As a result of efforts like these, Louisiana refineries have been recognized for environmental leadership and voluntary reduction efforts by both the DEQ and EPA. As we continue to reduce emissions, it's also important to remember that we have done so while significantly increasing capacity.

In order to remain competitive in the world

marketplace, we must become more efficient and more versatile. While we have reduced hydrocarbon emissions by 90 percent since 1970, we have doubled distillation capacity from 1.3 million barrels a day to 2.7 billion barrels a day.

Along with our commitment to reduce emissions is a related commitment to safety. Refinery operations remain among the safest workplaces in the manufacturing sector. The rate of job-related injuries and illnesses in U.S. refining in recent years has been four times lower than the overall rate among U.S. manufacturing facilities and has been declining at a significantly greater rate than the overall manufacturing sector.

Louisiana safety statistics from our Department of Labor indicate that performance of Louisiana refineries is even better than the national average. While we feel our overall environmental safety achievement in recent years is noteworthy, we are committed to doing even better.

We do have occasional emergency releases or odors which we are continually attempting to minimize. We have had some historical issues which we are dealing with today and learning from. These are issues which we want to address in a responsible way and which we do not want to repeat.

/

We are committed to continuous environmental and safety improvement. Our ability to reduce emissions and become more efficient is directly related to changes in our refinery employment practices. We want to hire from the local community and we want our workforce to represent the diversity of our local neighborhoods.

As refineries have modernized, the refinery workforce has changed and educational requirements for employment have become more rigorous. This is a direct result of the technological improvements in the refining industry.

For example, Louisiana refineries today utilize computer technology wherever possible. More and more refinery jobs today require significantly more than a high school education. Undoubtedly, educational and training requirements will continue to rise as refineries become more and more efficient.

Education is key to the future employment opportunities, and we are committed to enhancing education and training opportunities in our local communities. With respect to diversity in the workplace and educational training opportunities in local communities, each of our member refineries is and has long been committed to actively recruiting and hiring members of minority communities.

To this end, our refinery members have increased minority employment over the last decade. The Conoco refinery, who you'll hear from later, for example, has increased minority employment by 22 percent since 1993.

For the facilities we represent and have employment data, virtually all have increased minority hiring. Minority training and employment is another area which we have a longstanding and continued commitment.

Education is of utmost importance in every community in which we operate. In each of our facilities, there's a serious commitment to education in local communities. You heard a lot of programs undertaken by the Chemical Association members. Our members undertake similar programs or are in the same identical programs where we share co-located facilities.

As the world around us change, we must change, too. All of Louisiana refineries in Louisiana were initially constructed between 1909 and 1980. In virtually every case, the refinery was constructed in a rural setting with very few neighbors.

While this continues to be the case for some refinery locations, in others communities and neighborhoods develop near refinery operations. There was a time when many, and perhaps most of those in these

neighborhoods, worked in the refinery.

That was a time when there was no interstate highways and intricate transportation systems, as there are today. You lived where you worked. As improvement in transportation has made it possible to live almost anywhere and continue to work in local refinery, neighborhoods changed over time.

In addition to the change in neighboring communities, overall community expectations also changed. We are expected to reduce or eliminate emissions wherever practicable. We expect ourselves to be the safest workplace practicable.

In order to remain competitive, we must change and be more efficient. Sometimes we are required to make changes for benefit of national goals, which may increase local emissions but significantly reduce emissions on a national level. The new gasoline sulphur requirement is an example of that.

These are the challenges we face today. They are vastly different than the challenges we faced in 1909, 1942, or 1948, when many of the refineries were built. We are just committed to meeting today's challenges as we've been in meeting those of yesterday.

Meeting today's challenges will require better dialogue and understanding, new innovative programs,

better education and training, and continued emissions reductions. We have demonstrated our desire to change and better meet the challenges of today, and we're committed to continuous improvement in each of these areas in the future.

Thank you very much for letting me read this statement.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: Thank you for your testimony. I noticed that on the second page of your testimony, you use the Conoco refinery and Conoco Company as an example of the community outreach in working with CAPs. Their fire safety, the promoting the fire safety for children, Special Olympics, boys and girls villages, and the statement on the page right before that that there's a better effort to understand community concerns.

And I note that on the 1998 toxic release inventory air releases for Calcasieu Parish, Conoco has increased its releases and fugitive air releases in pounds and also in total air releases in 1998 over 1997.

I notice also that in the West Lake ambient air monitor data, the benzene ambient air standard would be 3.76 parts per billion, and yet in 1995 it was 11.11 and in '96 it was 65.63, and in '98 it was 6.58, so that there's a history of exceeding the acceptable standard.

Aside from the fact that in '94, since this committee met, Conoco had a very terrible explosion in '94 next to the Mossville community. And I think -- it doesn't seem that it's going in the right direction.

Could you address that?

MR. METCALF: Yes. I'll answer the questions that I can.

First of all, when it comes to calculating TRI emissions, fugitive emissions are the greatest source of emissions from any --

MS. RICHARDSON: Not loud enough.

MR. METCALF: I can only scream in it.

MS. BOURG: Try turning it up.

MR. METCALF: But it fades out. I'm sorry.

But fugitive emissions are the greatest source of emissions from a refinery. These are based on -- every time you have a valve, much like you have a valve on your sink at home, there's a gasket associated with that. EPA gives us factors to use to calculate the amount of emissions that come from those types of components, and those factors get refined every year and are changed.

And so some of the variations from year to year may come -- and quite often do come -- from new, revised, more up-to-date factors provided to the industry through either industry studies or EPA studies or studies done in

1 conjunction with the two.

leak detection program, where they go out on a quarterly or semiannual basis and actually sample the stems of each of these valves, and there's hundreds of thousands of components, even millions of components, in some refineries for these leaks to keep these emissions as small as possible.

so that may be one of the reasons for why there may be a variation in fugitive emissions. I believe your second question was on benzene emissions. Once again, benzene is a very common compound; probably the most common of the toxic compounds in fuels.

You know, there is benzene in your gasoline.

And the monitor that is out there in the field -- you said
the West Lake monitor -- there are several potential
sources, some of which may be the refinery, some of which
may be transportation on the roads that go by.

I would have to look at the individual numbers, but emissions from cars emit benzene. Gasoline in cars have benzene in it. And so there's lots of sources of benzene in the environment, both from transportation sources and industrial sources, and that is one of the things I think the new network that they're putting out more monitors in this area will help pin down where are

the sources of those emissions.

almost assure you they will take steps to further reduce those emissions.

MS. BOURG: Do you feel that a response to the community concerns that we've heard, which were really around, as they put them, sort of life and death and health and quality of life, do you feel that there needs to be a response to those concerns perhaps more than the promotion of the programs around Special Olympics.

Those are all important programs. My question would be: I'm not sure how that addresses the concerns around the data that the community brought forward.

MR. METCALF: And I will tell you this. When we were here in 1993, we were just in the beginnings of community outreach. The Chemical Association was way ahead of the refining industry. We have noticed that our definition of community has changed.

It used to be the whole Baton Rouge community, the whole Lake Charles community. As the world has become more global, our true community has become more focused to those people next to us, and this is one of the things we have really learned in the last year or two is community is not that overall civic community -- the City of Lake Charles. It is really that group that's next to the

plant.

I think this forum today is very good, because I'm starting to hear that clear message that it's emissions and these things versus United Way and kind of the big global things that we have always been active in and continue to be active in.

And so that's one of the messages we will take and relay to our member companies.

MS. BOURG: Thank you.

MR. METCALF: You had asked the question earlier about DEQ funding. I will -- you know, if you want me to, I'll address that.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, yes. By all means, go ahead and do that.

MR. METCALF: Okay. DEQ funding --historically, probably if you go back probably into the 1980s when DEQ was formed, it had been part of the Department of Natural Resources. DEQ was funded essentially in groups of thirds.

One-third from Louisiana general fund money -your taxes, my taxes; one-third from EPA, and one-third

•

from the regulated community, be that either industry or the public municipalities, the wastewater treatment plants, et cetera.

That radically changed in the early '90s.

Around 1990 -- and forgive me if the year is not right -but around 1990, DEQ was receiving \$14.5 million of
general fund money. That was about 25 percent to 30
percent of their budget.

Due to budget crisis and stuff and the wisdom of our legislature, they decided, You'll go to a totally fee-based agency. You will get no more general fund money. So in the early '90s, DEQ lost \$14 million of general fund money.

It is now funded entirely by EPA money that they get for their grants or fees on the regulated community, and most of those fees are on the industrial community. Right now the split is about 75 percent industry or regulated community, 25 percent EPA money.

The overall budget has grown to about \$100 million, give or take small, you know, round numbers.

That is up from about \$500 million around 1990. Staffing has gone up almost two to two and a half times there for about 1,000 employees.

When the general fund money was taken away from DEQ, DEQ came to Mid-Continent and LCA at the same time,

the Chemical Association, said, You need this agency. We need to exist. We need to increase your fees.

We stepped up to the table, agreed to a funding package to replace that \$14.5 million. A couple of years ago, Dale Givins came to us and said, We've got to do these TMDLs -- these water quality standards. We need more employees; roughly 30 more employees, roughly about \$12 million more, if I remember my figures right.

We went to our members and said, This is a good thing. The agency needs the money. We accepted the fee increases on ourselves. I think every time we have been asked by the agency for money to help with programs -- and we think the money is being well spent -- we stepped up to the table. So did the Chemical Association.

MS. BOURG: I believe in industry paying their fair share. Does that sort of strike you that 75 percent of the regulatory agency's budget comes from the industries they regulate? Is that sort of like the fox guarding the henhouse kind of thing?

MR. METCALF: I can understand the fox guarding the henhouse analogy. We don't like it. We would have always argued the third, third, third split as it existed several years ago or some more balance. That is the way to fund the agency -- to have some money that comes from the taxpayers to pay for their agency.

Unfortunately, that's not the position of the state legislature. It has not been the position of those people who draw up the budget, and so we can have two options. One, an under funded agency, and -- or one that is funded as much as we can from however we can get the money.

We as an industry have decided to give them as much money as we can to keep them running. We would rather see the current split than an underfunded agency.

MS. RICHARDSON: Does that complete your line of questioning or our line of questioning?

MS. BOURG: Thank you.

MS. RICHARDSON: Ms. Parks.

MS. PARKS: Yes. I just have a question about flaring. I was pleased to see a few days ago in Baton Rouge on the news an announcement that -- I think it was Exxon; I'm not sure -- that they would be flaring, and I wondered: Is this a new guideline? Is this voluntary? Is this usually done? I couldn't remember having seen it before.

MR. METCALF: Well, flaring is something that has come about because of environmental regulations. I mean, prior to the 1970s, those hydrocarbons that are being burned in, you know, flare were being emitted directly to the atmosphere. I mean, they were affecting

the communities next to them.

- Flares were put to, one, reduce the hydrocarbon emissions. Burn them, convert them to less toxic or less -- pollutants of less concern and take away that environmental impact, and also to do it in a way that was safely, both for the refiners and for us.

One thing we have heard from our neighbors is the flares make noise. We don't understand what the flares do, why they exist. One thing that has been a trend or starting to be a trend of our members is if we are shutting down a facility, we know it's planned, we know it may be there for an extended period of time, is to make public service announcements and try to get the word out why something is happening.

Quite often these flares, especially if they last for long periods of time, are because we're doing maintenance on facilities. There's not a problem. We shut down a compressor or something to do some work voluntarily to keep things running.

But the communication of that, you know, what's happening and why it's happening, is fairly new the last few years. I think it's something you'll see more of.

MS. PARKS: Thank you.

DR. FORD: You're looking to the right.

MS. RICHARDSON: The chair is very cognizant of

-25

that, having critiqued the previous chair.

DR. FORD: Thank you, Madame Chairman.

Mr. Metcalf, one of the greatest frustrations that I'm experiencing in particularly talking to citizens is the fact that environmental justice almost is always a reactive phenomenon.

You mentioned desulphurization. This is, I believe, a good opportunity for the industry to be proactive, because at this point in time, the regulations relative to meeting these lower sulphur gasoline requirements have not yet been implemented.

Is it possible, is it likely, and is it good to think that citizens could get involved very early in the process of protecting communities as you begin to do whatever those technical improvements and enhancements you'll be doing in the 17 refineries around Louisiana?

MR. METCALF: That's a very good point. In fact, you're probably a month too early. Our refineries right now are in the process of pretty much finalizing their facility designs and what the impacts will be, what the overall reductions, because there will be reductions in the communities from your automobiles.

Essentially, we're transferring what comes out of your tailpipe will now -- only a small portion of that will come out of the refinery, so there'll be about a 95

tailpipes. Only 5 percent of that will come out of the individual refineries making the gasoline.

But as we get in our facility designs finished

percent reduction of the sulphur that comes out of

and our permits started, we've already been meeting with EPA, with DEQ, and some of the refineries are already starting to meet with their people. And we're discussing this issue -- how do you roll it out, what do you tell them -- I would say in about a month to a month and a half, we will be meeting with EPA Region VI with some of the community leaders, with the refineries in the region -- Texas, Louisiana -- to start the dialogue of how do you roll out and explain this process.

So right now a lot of work is going on behind the scenes. I think you're right; it is an excellent opportunity for us to explain what's happening, because there will be a slight increase at the refineries to offset a much bigger decrease that comes out of the cars nationwide and should overall, you know, improve air quality.

DR. FORD: I just want to point out that even though you may have a 95 reduction across the nation, most of that small 5 percent now will be focused on those communities next door to refineries.

MR. METCALF: We agree with that. We

understand that concern. We -- like I said, we are 1 spending as much time in meetings discussing the public 2 education aspects of this as we are the technical 3 compliance with the rule. And I'm in charge of 4 coordinating that for Mid-Continent. 5 MS. RICHARDSON: Further questions, Committee? 6 Thank you so very much, Mr. Metcalf. 7 MR. METCALF: Thank you very much. 8 MS. RICHARDSON: This brings us up to dinner on 9 the agenda. But dedicated servants that we are, we're 10 11 going to skip that and go right on to our next presentation. 12 (Off the record.) 13 14 MS. RICHARDSON: Geoffrey Reeder and Steve 15 Levine. MS. ECHEVARRIA: Suzanne Echevarria. 16 17 MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. MR. METCALF: I'm Geoffrey Reeder. 18 19 Levine is not present. MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. And again, we're going 20 to ask, particularly in light of our technological 21 22 difficulties, if you would hit the high points of your 23 presentation. Then as the committee asks questions, we 24 will try to bring out more information from you.

If that fails, then we will ask you in your

25

closure to bring out any points that may have been omitted. And we're just struggling with this. I'm trying so hard to do what's the least harm, I guess, in the course of our dissertations here.

Please proceed.

MR. REEDER: All right. Thank you very much.

MS. RICHARDSON: And each of you state your name now officially for the record, and somebody may want to spell hers.

MR. REEDER: My name is Geoffrey Reeder. I'm the manager of environmental mediation for the Union Pacific Railroad. My first name is spelled

G-E-O-F-F-R-E-Y. Last name is Reeder, R-E-E-D-E-R.

This is Suzanne Echevarria. She's also from the Union Pacific Railroad. Her first name is spelled S-U-Z-A-N-N-E, and her last name is E-C-H-E-V-A-R-R-I-A. Is that correct? I get an extra point for that:

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, you do get some credit there.

MR. REEDER: She's new to the railroad. I've only learned her name since November.

I'd like to start off to summarize my presentation and talk about the history of the Union Pacific Railroad in the Lake Charles area.

The Union Pacific modern day railroad is a conglomeration of many railroads in the past. In 1883, the Louisiana & Western Railroad built their tracks into the Lake Charles area. In 1885, the Lake Charles & Northern Railroad built a junction and they connected with the Louisiana & Western at our yard which is located about two miles west of where we are today.

The yard and the tracks have not changed in the last 115 years. The locations have not changed.

MS. RICHARDSON: Please pardon me, Geoffrey.

To show you what good hosts we are, we're going to give

you the mic that works and I'll try to work with the one
that's a little malfunctioning. How's that for

accommodations?

MR. REEDER: All right.

MS. ECHEVARRIA: Good deal.

MS. RICHARDSON: The chair could take credit, but it really wasn't her idea.

(Pause.)

MR. REEDER: All right. In 1885, the Lake
Charles & Northern Railroad built a junction with the
Louisiana & Western and they joined, built the yard for
interchange purposes at the location where our yard is
today. It's just north of Railroad Avenue underneath the
Shaddick [phonetic] Street Overpass.

In 1927, the Louisiana & Western and the Lake Charles & Northern Railroads were merged into the Texas & New Orleans. Later on that railroad was merged into the Southern Pacific, and in 1996 the Southern Pacific was merged into the Union Pacific Railroad.

Prior to 1996 the Union Pacific, the company
that I work for, had a minor presence in Lake Charles.

After that time we've had a major presence in Lake Charles
with our track that runs through here east and west and
serves most of the industries on the west side of town.

In 1983 the Southern Pacific Railroad was moving a car of tetrachloroethylene for an industry, and they had a leak in that car. Subsequently, they lost the whole load. They lost about 11,700 gallons of that product.

They responded immediately, collected the free liquid, excavated the soil in the area, and immediately put in some monitoring wells to monitor the contamination as well as try to recover the chemical that had gone into the groundwater.

And they worked on that problem until 1996 -- or actually, 1997. After the merger I was assigned that project, and we've taken over since then. Since that time we've worked to improve the recovery system that's out there. We've also had many meetings with the people who

live in the area.

We've had meetings with the city councilmen who represent that area. We've even done a door-to-door presence to ask those people if they have water wells, ask them -- let them know what's going on with the project out there so they'll have some idea of what we're doing when we come into the area.

Now, we've worked closely with the DEQ and also the EPA since that time. Now, you might ask why do railroads carry these dangerous chemicals if they're such a problem? And the simple answer is: Like many truck lines, the railroads are a common carrier.

If someone offers us a shipment of materials, whether it's hazardous or non-hazardous, and it's packaged according to the federal regulations, we have no choice but to move that from origin to destination.

You might say, How long does it take? The federal regulations require shipments of regulated hazardous materials have to move within 48 hours, not including Saturdays and Sundays and holidays. Most of the shipments that come through this yard move within 12 to 24 hours.

So even though you might go over the overpass and see railroad cars in that yard day in and day out, they're not the same cars. They're cars that are in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

transportation. The Union Pacific Railroad is a transportation company, much like the post office or UPS, Federal Express.

We don't make any money by storing materials. We make money by moving them from Point A to Point B, and that's what we try to do. The only time that a car might be delayed is if a plant can't take an empty car coming in -- their tracks are full or when we pull a car out we put it on the first available train to move it out. move those things along.

I'd like to say that we have a good working relationship with the regulatory agencies that are in this area. I'd like to think we have a good working relationship with most of the citizens in this area. In this meeting tonight, I recognize several people. I think they recognize me on a first-name basis.

I would hope that we've kept them informed of the environmental activities that are taking place in their neighborhood as well as the railroad activities that are taking place in their neighborhood.

And at this point I'd like to open it up for any questions that you might have.

MS. RICHARDSON: Committee?

DR. FORD: To start it out -- I don't think I need a microphone. Can you hear me?

1.8

There's something called the Federal Railroad

Administration State Safety Participation Program. Are

you familiar with it?

MR. REEDER: I'm familiar with the Federal Railroad Administration, but I'm not familiar with the state safety participation that you mentioned.

DR. FORD: Okay. As I appreciate it, there are number of states that run so-called safety participation programs. It turns out Louisiana is not one of those states. And I was wondering -- I assume that the FRA itself has inspectors who assure the public that railroad systems are in good shape and are capable of carrying the loads that are in fact moved across them.

I'd be curious to know why Louisiana -- and I understand most states do have such a system, where state inspectors carry out functions similar to federal inspectors. Is there anyone that you can identify who could tell us why Louisiana might not be a participating state?

MR. REEDER: -I can't answer for the State of Louisiana. The Louisiana State Police respond to hazardous material incidents, whether they're on the rail or on the road or pipeline incidents. Perhaps someone in the Louisiana State Police could answer that question for you. I don't know.

DR. FORD: Do you feel that's needed? The Federal Agency itself, FRA, does it have enough inspectors to assure the citizens of this state that the rail systems are safe for carrying the kinds of -- in fact, let me back up a little bit.

As I understand it, some more than 40 percent of hazardous materials that are transported in this country actually go through places like Baton Rouge and New Orleans. In fact, if that's the case, doesn't it stand to reason that there should be even more secure rail systems in those areas?

And if in fact that's the case, inspection would certainly be a part of that. I'm just trying to understand what is the current inspection system? If it's federal, is it adequate -- if it's federal only?

MR. REEDER: Again, it -- I see on the agenda there's a representation from the Federal Railroad Administration be here tomorrow. I would broach that question to them, but as a citizen I would agree. I would have more inspectors where the heaviest concentration of traffic is.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, we're moving right along. Did you want to make a closure; did we miss anything?

MR. REEDER: I don't think so, unless you have any questions for me.

د ک

addressing the Executive Order of the President around environmental justice issues and around communities that have historically distributed themselves around the rail communities, the rail lines.

MR. REEDER: In this community, I've met with everyone in this city from the City Councilmen down to the individual residents who live next door to that railroad yard. We went to those people's houses one on one with representatives from the Department of Environmental Quality, with representatives from their city council, and representatives from the railroad and from our environmental consultant.

We spent several days going house to house.

Not in a group meeting -- one on one -- to ask those people any questions, to answer their concerns, as well as having public meetings with the DEQ, as well as with the EPA who have those.

And I think to this day we've addressed those concerns in a satisfactory manner. If there's any outstanding issues, I'm not aware of them.

DR. FORD: I have another question.

MS. RICHARDSON: One minute, Dr. Ford.

MS. BOURG: I yield to Dr. Ford.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir.

DR. FORD: For the education of people here and

for me, what are the major chemicals that your transport system moves\_across this state; by name and -- generally, the first five or six in terms of volume and their relative toxicity.

MR. REEDER: I can't tell you, because chemicals that we move through Lake Charles are probably not the same chemicals that we move through Houston or Baton Rouge simply because the plants that make those chemicals are located here.

So, for example, if there was a plant here that made chlorine, you would have an extremely high concentration of chlorine cars here, whereas in Baton Rouge it may be a high concentration of ammonia cars, if they made the product over there.

Once they get out on the rail, they're pretty evenly distributed. However, as I said earlier, we're required to transport any chemical, any product, that's properly packaged and offered for transportation.

DR. FORD: Let's take Lake Charles. What are the five most common chemicals you transport?

MR. REEDER: I don't know from memory. I don't know. I could provide you that list of what comes through here, but I don't know them from memory.

DR. FORD: Who are the major companies for whom you transport chemicals?

MR. REEDER: In the Lake Charles area?

25

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

Lake Charles yard, which is near Railroad Avenue and Cherry Street. That product was made by PPG Industries. The only other spill I know of was an anhydrous ammonia spill. It was a vapor released to the air, and I don't recall who made that product. That was at about 1989, I think.

We've had some diesel spills, but they were in our yard over off Highway 14. Other than that, I can't recall any other spills that we've had in this area since we've been keeping records.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Along those same lines, do you have some outstanding, pending litigation involving leaks and spills that --

MR. REEDER: Yes, we do.

MS. ROBINSON: -- that's still pending?

MR. REEDER: Yes, we do.

MS. ROBINSON: Does it involve communities in Lake Charles?

MR. REEDER: Yes, it does.

MS. RICHARDSON: One minute. And because it's in litigation, I'm sure that's all you choose to say.

Before we go any further, you will follow up on answering Dr. Ford's question, because it's of concern to

jurisdiction, to order an evacuation or to write an 1 evacuation plan. That's the responsibility of the local 2 public safety agencies. 3 If there were to be a chemical release, we 4 would notify the police, the fire -- Louisiana State 5 Police, and it's up to those folks to make a decision as 6 to whether or not evacuation is necessary; and if so, what 7 routes those folks should take to evacuate. 8 MS. BOURG: So your role basically is to 9 report, notify? 10 11 MR. REEDER: And respond to the incident and repair the problem. 12 MS. BOURG: What about prevention so that they 13 don't occur in the first place? 14 MR. REEDER: That's correct. 15 MS. ECHEVARRIA: Prevention and mediation, 16 notification, reporting. 17 MR. REEDER: Prevention, preparedness, response 18 recovery -- the four R's that we use. 19 20 MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you. And thanks to both of you for your succinctness 21 and finite answers when you could provide them, and you'll 22 23 provide the others as soon as possible. 24 MR. REEDER: Thank you. 25 MS. RICHARDSON: Thanks so much.

We're moving right along. Is Milton Neal 1 available? --2 Please come forward. Would you state into the 3 record your name and position, and is this a co-presenter . 4 5 or a go-fer? MR. NEAL: No, he's just a hander-outer, I 6 7 think. Madame Chairperson, I would like if possible to 8 hand those out for the record, and I will reduce my talk 9 in the essence of time if it's okay. 10 MS. RICHARDSON: And we would so appreciate 11 12 that. MR. NEAL: Madame Chairperson, my name is 13 Milton Neal, and I'm works director, environmental health 14 and safety assurance at PPG Industries, Lake Charles 15 Complex. I have served in this position at PPG for the 16 last four years. 17 PPG Industries appreciates this opportunity to 18 address the Louisiana Advisory Committee of the U.S. 19 20 Commission on Civil Rights. As a brief background information, let me 21 mention that PPG Lake Charles Complex represents PPG's 22 largest investment in the company's nearly 100 23 manufacturing sites worldwide. 24

Incidentally, the complex was originally

25

constructed by the U.S. Government at the end of World War II as a defense production facility designed to produce magnesium. PPG acquired the approximately 650-acre site in 1947, and thousands of PPG people have lived, worked and raised their families in southwest Louisiana during that time.

We produce building block chemicals for the manufacture of literally thousands of everyday modern conveniences expected and demanded by consumers all over the world. Our products are made right here in Calcasieu Parish by hard-working women and men to make life safer and better for all of us.

These beneficial consumer products are produced because of PPG's science, technology and research efforts. We're constantly improving our processes which allows us to be more environmentally friendly in the manufacture of these products.

PPG Industries applies uniformly high standards worldwide and in Lake Charles for safeguarding the environment and ensuring safety and health for our employees, their families, and facility neighbors.

Meeting legal requirements is merely the baseline for acceptable environmental health and safety performance at PPG.

However, it's important to note that state and

federal government regulators, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency use conservative assumptions in developing their rules and permits.

These estimates have a great deal of safety already built in and are considered protective of human health and the environment. Nonetheless, our pursuit of excellence and continuous improvement means aiming higher, applying sound management systems, and effectively implementing voluntary programs like the chemical industry's Responsible CAER initiative.

You've heard a little about Responsible CAER and other industry environmental improvements during the LCA testimony this afternoon. For PPG, we spell out our commitment in PPG's global code of ethics and environmental health and safety policy which recognizes strong environmental health and safety performance as a vital corporate priority.

Without question, fulfilling the environmental health and safety components for our corporate citizenship responsibilities is good business. PPG's employees live as well as work in facility communities such as those in southwest Louisiana.

As such, we're committed to the improved stewardship of the local environment and the health and

safety of our employees and the general public. All of us, as members of the community, expect to breathe clean air, drink clean water, and be safe and healthy, whether on the job or away from the workplace.

As I mentioned earlier, state and federal laws and regulations govern our regulation -- our operations, and these numerous rules and regulations have encouraged many improvements during the last decade. Since 1990, PPG has invested more than \$300 million to upgrade and improve the Lake Charles Complex's environmental systems and operations.

Improvements like these have also resulted in a steady decline in emissions at the Lake Charles Complex. Since EPA first began collecting toxic release inventory data in 1987, Lake Charles Complex has reduced emissions by more than 80 percent. That's real progress, and is a testament to improved technology and the hard work and dedication of all our employees.

approach to safety. We have top-notch engineers and constructors design, site, and build our plants. Well-trained and experienced operators and skilled mechanics operate and maintain our plants, and a fully equipped and well-trained on-site emergency response organization is available around the clock should an emergency arise.

In addition, PPG employees continue to be leaders and active members of several community groups and organizations and share the common goal of developing and promoting accident prevention, awareness, and emergency planning.

PPG is a founding member of both the Calcasieu Parish local emergency planning commission and the local community awareness and emergency response organization. We recognize that dialogue with the community is one of the steps in earning the trust of our neighbors and finding solutions to issues of concern.

As one of several ways we try to promote community dialogue, PPG actively supports and participates in two Community Advisory Panels in our area. We will work closely with the Community Advisory Panel to PPG and also participate in a multi-facility CAP known as the I-10 CAP.

On a monthly basis, company managers meet with a cross-section of the community to discuss all aspects of our operation. We have learned a lot from these panels and consider them to be a valuable source of community input.

. Additionally, PPG recognizes a social responsibility to the community and strives to be among the leaders in community service. PPG involvement in the

community is demonstrated by the numerous company organizations and resources that reach out to the community.

A few are those are listed here on the outline.

One of those, of course, is the United Way fund drive.

Certainly, we have our PPG friends, PPG Plus One, a

voluntary group of minority employees who organized the

group a couple years ago to improve outreach focus in the

minority community in our area.

And just recently, we made a three-year funding commitment to the Calcasieu Community Clinic. That's a health clinic to benefit the working poor and is housed in the nursing school at McNeese State University.

Like many areas around our state and nation, education continues to be a primary issue of concern to many citizens. PPG is very interested in educational improvement, and we've made education a primary focus in our community outreach efforts.

We have four partners in education schools within Calcasieu Parish whom we support and contribute to McNeese State University, our regional state university. In addition, PPG conducts two sessions of the popular teacher summer institute to help area teachers better understand what's required to safely operate and maintain a large chemical complex.

This experience serves to increase the educators' knowledge of our operations and helps them to understand the skills required to be successful in this industry. Armed with that knowledge, we believe that educators can better prepare and teach students who aspire to make our industry a career objective.

With assistance from the Wildlife Habitat

Committee, we've created NatureLab, known by many as the

classroom in the woods program. NatureLab is an outdoor

pavilion built and equipped by PPG to provide an

environment for local schools to conduct nature studies

and instill in participating students an appreciation for

nature and respect for the environment.

Incidentally, NatureLab was a recipient project for the 1999 Governor's Environmental Leadership award.

Finally, PPG's impact is also strongly felt in the local economy. PPG's Lake Charles Complex contributes more than 279 million to the economy of southwest Louisiana during 1999. And for those who saw the paper this morning, PPG -- is evidence of PPG's confidence in this area, and PPG Starts High-Power Job, indicating that we are working with energy in a joint venture to develop a 425 megawatt co-gen facility.

Finally, PPG's impact is strongly felt in the local economy. PPG's Lake Charles Complex again

contributed 279 million to the economy in 1999, the single largest economic contributor with the purchase from 735 area suppliers within a 50-mile radius of the city.

Also during and adding to the economic impact were payroll for approximately 1,500 employees as well as contract and temporary personnel, utility and transportation costs, environmental control of equipment and operations, state and local taxes that we pay.

PPG's hiring and promotion practices are done without regard to race, religion, sex, or national origin, and a diverse workforce within PPG fairly well reflects a general cross-section of the local community. For instance, recent workforce statistics indicate the minority population within the five-parish area to be approximately 23.4 percent.

percent. In addition, minorities and females are represented within all job groups, including supervisors, foremen, engineers, technicians, trade crafts, production workers, office clerical, and laborers.

Madame Chairperson, again I want to thank you for the opportunity to address this committee. I hope I've conveyed the fact that PPG takes its responsibilities seriously, and we're constantly aware that we operate with the permission of our community.

At this time, I'll be happy to try to answer any questions that members of the committee might have.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir.

Lorna -- I'm sorry; Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: Thank you. I had a couple of questions; actually, I have three right now. Is there a buffer zone around PPG?

MR. NEAL: PPG is located in an area that is bounded by the Calcasieu River ship channel to our east and to our south. We -- and to the north of our plant, there is some light industrial neighbors. Directly to the west, we're bounded by I-210 and an undeveloped area, which is also owned by PPG.

The only near neighbors that we have is the Maplewood section of Sulphur, and those persons are possibly a mile away from our plant.

MS. BOURG: On February 28, 1999, I understand that there was some chemicals released because a 12-inch expansion joint ruptured, and that approximately a little under 1,500 pounds of ethylene was released in a little short of nine -- of 1,000 pounds of EDC was released.

And what efforts did you make to alert the citizens when that occurred and at what time were they alerted on that?

MR. NEAL: As soon as we recognized that there

was a problem, a call went into our night superintendent, who initiated a call to the state police, the local emergency planning commission, the National Response Center.

The local -- the state police that was notified was the state police in Baton Rouge. The local state police did not get that notification for another approximately 20 minutes. The notification occurred within 20 minutes to the other agencies, but it was about a 40, 45-minute time span before the local state police was notified.

MS. BOURG: Has PPG done anything to put something in place so that that would not repeated? And I don't just mean the ruptured joint, but I mean the notification of the citizens of imminent danger, if there were to be an imminent danger case?

MR. NEAL: One of the things that we did do is we do what's known as a root cause analysis any time that we have an incident occur. The intent is to do a decision tree analysis of what happened and what actually caused the situation to occur.

It's a very labor-intensive process, but it does get to the root of the problem. And it also identifies a number of other conditions along the way that needs to be dealt with, and one of the things that was

dealt with here was we have an emergency response manual and we have an emergency response program that's online as well as hardcopy documents in our supervisors' office.

There were changes that were made to our emergency response program to ensure, complete with checklists, that as soon as we knew about those incidents that those calls were made immediately.

MS. BOURG: And how were the citizens involved in planning for their notification for any future incidents? Is there a community thing that you set up?

MR. NEAL: One of the things that we do is we review all of these environmental incidents monthly with our local CAP, our Community Advisory Panel to PPG. They get all the spill or release notification data that's sent in to the state.

we send copies of those to all of our CAP members. Not only do we conduct the root cause analysis, but we also review all those issues with our CAP members. The CAP members give us their input and, quite frankly, their comments with respect to how things should be handled and dealt with, and we integrate that information into our planning and our decision-making process.

MS. BOURG: Thank you. I had one more question at this time. I notice that in your company's 1999 environment health and safety report, which is very nicely

done --

MR. NEAL: Thank you.

MS. BOURG: -- you have a Chicot containment system. And I guess I have kind of a basic question, and that is: Is the Chicot Aquifer in danger if there's contamination? Can you address that system and the danger to the Chicot Aquifer?

MR. NEAL: Yes. Basically, what we have here is we have contamination that is migrating vertically. This is a result of environmental technology that existed back in the '60s and '70s, where you used clay-line lagoons as a means of containing and treating waste material.

And one of the things that happened is those lagoons leaked, and that migrated vertically. When we proceeded with our RCRA facilities investigation, we discovered that there was some contamination, and we proceeded with trying to define the scope of the contamination and discovered that it had in fact gotten into the Chicot.

You need to understand that the Chicot Aquifer is permeable sands, and the recharge is quite a few miles north of here. The flow rate within that aquifer is very low. It's probably literally in inches per year. But one of the things that we did as soon as we discovered that

was a problem was we put in a pump and treat system to contain or to draw the water back onsite and to contain the contaminants that were there.

And we continue to pump that -- those wells, and we continue to create a zone of containment within our plant boundaries, and that's what we're referring to there is an explanation to the public; that, you know, there's contamination there. We're working to correct that problem, and the way that we're doing it is through pump and treat system.

It's been peer-reviewed by a number of people and they agree that this is the best type technology for what exists on our site.

MS. RICHARDSON: Further questions, Committee?
Oh, plenty. We'll start with Ms. Madden.

MS. MADDEN: Okay. A couple of questions.

After a decision is made to locate or expand in a certain area, would you please describe the permitting process that takes place?

MR. NEAL: You need to understand that the property that we own -- our plant site -- generally, our expansions are -- take place within the existing plant site or the existing complex.

But it's a process where -- and often it involves the type product that we're producing, what we

would anticipate the operating conditions would be, and it sometimes involves modeling. It involves discussions and dialogue with the permitting agencies.

It also involves discussions and dialogue with the community. If we make an application for a permit, today in many cases there's a requirement that there be a public meeting and that discussion occur.

So typically, the things that we look at is we look at dialogue with the agencies; that is, the LDEQ, the permitting agency. We look at the engineering required to properly design and predict what that operation would be. Then we discuss that application with the public, and then we make application.

I don't know if I answered your question or not.

MS. MADDEN: Yes. In fact, you answered the second one, too.

MS. RICHARDSON: Dr. Wright.

DR. WRIGHT: I have just one question. Good evening.

MR. NEAL: Thank you.

DR. WRIGHT: And first of all, because I'm a sociologist I'm always interested in statistics, and you have listed in terms of your employment 23.4 percent minority workforce population. What percentage of that

minority population is African-American. Do you know? 1 MR. NEAL: I think I may have that for you. 2 (Perusing documents.) 20.5 percent. 3 DR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 4 MS. RICHARDSON: There's a question from Ms. 5 Roberts -- Robinson. 6 MS. ROBINSON: Good evening, Mr. Neal. 7 MR. NEAL: Good morning, Ms. Robinson. 8 MS. ROBINSON: Good to see you again. 9 MR. NEAL: How are you? 10 MS. ROBINSON: Fine. I have one question. 11 Unfortunately -- well, my first question is this. Are you 12 familiar with the Mossville and the Fisherville area which 13 is the North Lake Charles area? 14 MR. NEAL: Yes, I am. 15 MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Unfortunately, there are 16 persistent complaints from that community regarding PPG 17 out of all of the industries that are in and around those 18 communities. Could you give us an idea of why those 19 complaints surface from those communities versus maybe 20 Maplewood community or some other area that's close by? 21 And after answering that question, could you 22 tell me a little bit about what is the nature and extent 23 of your relationship with those communities and that kind 24 25 of thing?

MR. NEAL: Okay. Ms. Robinson, we met in August 1999 and conducted a plant tour in our plant with members of the Mossville community. Unfortunately, there wasn't many of those people that showed up at our plant. But the complaints that were lodged at that particular meeting was concerns with regard to our plant incinerators, our waste incinerators.

We explained to them in great detail that the incinerators that we have on site meet MACT, which stands for maximum achievable control technology with respect to dioxin emissions, and that seemed to be their biggest concern.

I don't know what other concerns that they voiced. A Ms. Malvo was also in attendance at that meeting, and she voiced a concern about railroad cars being stored within their local area. I explained to her that it was a situation where, as the railroad had indicated, we can't make any money by not moving our rail cars.

We have empty rail cars that the railroad brings in. We load them, and we turn them over to the railroad, and the railroad then will take them and store them in an area to make up a train, but it usually moves within 12 hours, and then they go to an interchange point where they're broken apart and then put back together

again.

And she had asked me to do what I could to correct that problem, and I had explained her during that meeting that there was, you know, little I could do because I didn't understand the railroad other than to say that typically, we keep in very close touch with them to make sure that our cars continue to move, because we have what's known as a just-in-time delivery system for our customers, and it's important that our cars move.

Those are the only concerns that were voiced to me, and we've attempted to address those by explaining to them what we do in the community.

MS. RICHARDSON: The chair has been quiet about as long as she could.

In light of the observation that was just made by you, sir, about not having good participation in a meeting that you called for those residents, have you given any consideration to some non-traditional means of outreach, if indeed a letter went and a small percentage showed up.

Different communities have different mores, and I think it would behoove all of us to try different ways of reaching people. Are there any alternative -- well, firstly, what kind of outreach and informational mechanism did you use and how might you improve upon that in order

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to reach more members of the affected communities?

MR. NEAL: Okay. Well, again, we held on December 8, '99, a public meeting in the West Lake community primarily for the people in West Lake and Mossville. And Ms. Dagmar D'Argene with the Mossville community asked a number of questions which, frankly, I wasn't able to answer at the time.

And we followed up with a response letter to her with a carbon copy letter of that going to Mr. Edgar Mouton. We have conducted block walks within the communities, and as you say, we've tried to put together documents that explain to the community what we do and how we go about doing those:

And we try to be very candid within those documents such that our credibility remains high.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Maybe you would like to consider following up with the few who did participate in order to ask them about means of reaching a broader spectrum of people. But I do hope that you will continue those efforts.

Ms. Bourg.

MR. NEAL: Thank you, Ms. Chair.

MS. BOURG: Mr. Neal, I notice that on page 11 in the report, in the environmental report, that between 1997 and 1998 the number of pounds of chemicals released

in the environment through releases or spills little more than doubled, and yet the environmental spending by PPG, Lake Charles, was decreased by about \$10 million.

And yet your testimony talks about increased commitment to environment. Could you address that discrepancy?

MR. NEAL: Okay. The spills and releases that are there -- the difference between the 14.8 and the 30,000?

MS. BOURG: Yes.

MR. NEAL: What you typically have is within those spills and releases, as was indicated earlier, those are what's known as fugitive emission releases, and also they count for our incinerator devices. We have shut down systems on our incinerators, and if they shut down just for a second, even though they go to a secondary control system, those are counted as a spill or a release.

So basically, what you're looking at right here is you're looking at a maintenance issue relative to reporting all or one of the incinerators.

MS. BOURG: So my question would still stand.

MR. NEAL: And what is -- I'm sorry. Maybe I missed that.

MS. BOURG: So if in fact for whatever reason the releases were nearly doubled, yet you decreased by a

little over \$10 million your commitment to environmental improvements ---

MR. NEAL: That's actual spending. Those are not commitments. What we typically do is we set our engineering programs in place, and we plan for that couple of years ahead and do all the engineering, and then we spend it.

The dollars that you're talking about has to do with maintenance and on-stream factors, and we keep our own stream factors for our incinerators very high. And that has no reflection -- the 37 versus a 14 unit has no reflection on the numbers below.

MS. BOURG: It appears, though, from the documents and the numbers that I have that the fugitive air releases and the stack air releases, as well as the total air releases in poundage for 1998 surpassed that of 1997.

MR. NEAL: Well, if you're looking at air in particular, there was a reporting change there in air in that we started including painting and the paint solvents and everything that's in our paint, as an example, during that period, and that increased the number.

MS. RICHARDSON: Dr. Ford, on the chair's right.

DR. FORD: I assume that PPG, like other

chemical companies, do risk management planning. Is there a mechanism by which you make the community aware of your worst-case scenarios as well as your emergency plans for evacuation in the case of need for such action?

MR. NEAL: Yes. We did that, as a matter of fact, in October of '99. We had a public meeting -- what we called the industry roll-out of our RMP plan. There was also a document, and I don't have -- yes, I have -- I may have that with me.

Yes. We have our risk management information document that was handed out to everyone and is made available to the public. This is a copy of that document, and it outlines what needs to be done as a part of the risk management plan for sheltering place all the way to notifications.

DR. FORD: For the committee's information, could you describe generally your worst-case scenario?

MR. NEAL: Our worst-case scenario was the sudden catastrophic release of all the contents of our largest chlorine storage tank, liquid chlorine. And according to the government's guidelines, there were no mitigating circumstances.

The contents had to be released suddenly. The total contents had to vaporize immediately, and the environmental conditions had to be such that the cloud

would proceed in a manner where it would, under the worst atmospheric conditions, and would probably create the absolute worst-case scenario.

There was no mitigations, and it had to extend to what was known as the ERPG 2. That's the Emergency Response Planning Guideline 2, and 2 is that level of exposure such that a person could be exposed to that chemical for up to one hour without any kind of long-term health effects or debilitating effects such that that person could not seek shelter or get out of it.

We modeled that according to EPA's models, and it indicated that that three part per million concentration under worst-case conditions would be -- would extend 25 miles from our plant. That, of course, is contained within this document.

In reality, as you know, the worst-case conditions are very extreme, and chlorine -- there's just enough heat available to cause liquid chlorine to vaporize immediately. We also have containment, and we also have emergency response procedures for covering us with foam and pumping the liquid out such that even if that were to occur, and it's not likely, since our storage tanks are carbon steel and they're seven-eighths of an inch think and they're designed for 500 psi pressure. But that was our worst-case scenario.

1	MS. RICHARDSON: Further questions?
2	. We thank you so much, Mr. Neal.
3	MR. NEAL: Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Madame
4	Chair.
5	MS. RICHARDSON: We are now the chair is
6	ready to recognize Mr. Glackin. Am I pronouncing you
7	correctly?
8	MR. GLACKIN: I have an overhead that I wanted
9	to put up.
10	MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir. And again, we're
11	asking in the interest of time conservation if you would
12	summarize as much as you can and let us bring out other
13	things.
14	I don't know what the chair's excuse is now;
15	it's not morning, but her voice is trying to mess up.
16	And then other facts will come out through the
17	question and answer process. Thank you.
18	Gentlemen and lady, will you introduce
19	yourselves into the record with the correct spelling of
20	your last names, and then proceed as expeditiously as you
21	can, please.
22	MR. GLACKIN: Let me introduce then as you
23	mentioned the people, if you will, that I have to assist
24	me with this program.
25	My name is Mike Glackin. I am the human

resources manager for Condea Vista Company at Lake Charles 1 here and West Lake. 2 I have with me Mike Kerlegon -- you want me to 3 spell these or --4 MS. RICHARDSON: That's up to the Reporter. I 5 think she'd like that. 6 MR. GLACKIN: Mike Kerlegon, K-E-R-L-E-G-O-N. 7 Mike is the manager of order fulfillment with Condea Vista 8 Company. I have with me Ms. Monica Welch, who is a 9 teacher at Western Heights Elementary School, and I have 10 with me Ms. Betty Gasaway, G-A-S-A-W-A-Y, who is the 11 program director for the Recreational District Number 1, 12 serving residents of Mossville and West Lake. 13 VOICE: What is Ms. Betty Gasaway's position 14 15 again, please? MR. GLACKIN: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear. 16 VOICE: Betty Gasaway -- what's her position; 17 her title? 18 MR. GLACKIN: Did I give your title correctly? 19 Director. She is the director, program director for 20 Recreation District 1. Okay? 21 22 Also, let me make a correction on myself. I was listed as being from Houston, Texas, and I've lived 23 here in Sulphur for 20 years. 24

MS. RICHARDSON: That qualifies you.

MR. GLACKIN: Thank you.

As you're aware, Ms. Farella, we had already provided answers to many of your questions in writing.

Additionally, however, you had asked us to speak and present information about our efforts to support and/or address environmental justice and non-discrimination.

At Condea Vista, we understand that the issue of environmental justice is more than just air, land and water concern. Environmental justice considers a company's total impact on neighboring communities. That impact ranges from emissions reduction efforts to local hiring and community efforts.

And based on this understanding, Condea Vista has addressed environmental justice a number of ways. We have supported and participated in one of the first environmental justice advisory panels in the nation, which was sponsored by the DEQ in 1994.

. While this panel no longer meets, Condea Vista, as well as many advisory members of that group, have separated into other advisory panels locally in the community, which helps, certainly, with keeping the dialogue between industry and ourselves.

With regards to hiring, it is Condea Vista's policy, which I have here -- this is our policy which notes that we do provide equal employment opportunity to

all persons without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, physical or mental disability, or veteran status.

This policy applies to recruitment, training, promotion, transfers, rates of pay -- all those conditions of employment. One way we help to ensure equal employment opportunity is by using the local Louisiana employment office.

This identifies qualified applicants for us, particularly for operations and craft testing, which is where we do most of our hiring. We believe that this office provides for the best resource for minority applicants available for work in our local communities.

Of our 454 employees that we have at Condea Vista currently, over 60 percent of these employees reside within five-mile perimeter of our facility. With regard to siting, I think the best way to discuss the proximity of our communities for you is to provide an aerial photo, which we try to provide here.

Can you move it up just a little bit, Mike? Thank you.

What we've outlined is in black outlines the Condea Vista complex and areas that we -- properties that we own. To our south you can see is the Conoco complex.

Thank you, Mike, if you'll help me point those

-

areas.

region -- that's the West Lake community. To our west, we have immediately outlined in white is the Georgia Gulf Corporation. And then the yellow outlining is partially starting into our neighbors which go beyond that stretch, and that is Mossville.

The reason that I have the area marked out in yellow is this is an area, as many of you are aware, that was a part of a community effort to buy homes in those particular subdivisions of Mossville as a result of litigation that we had.

The yellow section on the northeast side and West Lake is another area, but that was not due to litigation, that we are also purchasing homes. Even with these property purchases that have been conducted, we recognize that we must keep the lines of communication open with our neighbors, and we must work to minimize our impact.

Some of the things that we've done to address neighbor concerns have been identified and initially suggested, actually, by our Community Advisory Panels. Of those things, we have a 12 to 15-foot earthen berm around our facility to address noise, light, and aesthetics.

We have installed a muffler on our flare tip to \_

reduce noise. We've changed traffic patterns for construction so that to help with the traffic around our facility. We operate a 24-hour call line. In providing tours, newsletters, we block-walk, we have employees that actually walk the blocks of our neighbors to help with the line of communications.

I'd also like to share we're committed to reducing emissions in our environment. One example of that commitment is evidenced by our tracking of EPA targeted emissions through what is known as the toxic release inventory.

Since 1987, Condea Vista has reduced these emissions to air, land and water by over 80 percent. Most importantly, we believe that the quality of life issues identified by local people as environmental justice concerns are best addressed by being involved in our communities.

That's why Condea Vista places such strong emphasis on outreach and suggests that these efforts and contributions and other donations. As you can see, we put in over \$150,000 annually in these programs -- programs towards United Way, nature conservancy, West Lake bird sanctuary, the YMC black achievers, et cetera, et cetera. Many programs that we are involved with.

Our three main areas of emphasis are employee

14.

volunteerism, Partners in Education, and our nearneighborhood outreach. We brought you some examples. I
thought it might be easier if we had some local people to
help me present this to you, and therefore, I'm asking
them to just share a minute or two with you.

The first presenter is Mike Kerlegon. Mike, as I mentioned, is our manager of order fulfillment at Condea Vista. He's very involved with our volunteerism program, and Mike is also the person who's responsible for the transportation at our facility,

MR. KERLEGON: Thank you. Madame Chairman, committee members, I'm very pleased to come before you tonight to give an update on our community volunteerism program, our Condea Vista volunteer program.

It was -- our program is -- it's a volunteer program is -- we have 450 local people working at Condea Vista, and we care about the area we live in. We're also involved in the community in a number of ways. Our volunteer program provides a mechanism for us to work within our community to enhance the quality of life by working with different groups and improving things.

Today we've got over 110 employees involved in our program. We've got various groups that -- Mike showed a slide where it talked about the financial contributions that we made to the different committees -- to the

different organizations.

We also provide volunteer hours, because we also recognize that financial contributions are just part of the program. We do need to volunteer hours to make it go as well. Some of the programs that we've done at Condea Vista -- we've got the -- just some of the activities up there, we track the volunteer hours, the -- and I'll talk about some of them a little bit more in detail.

But the Chemistry Expo is one of the things that we did last year. What we got about 700 different sixth-graders from the parish that came in and we did a program to try to enlighten them with the chemistry, and trying to encourage them in that endeavor to seek careers that way.

We also do the Dusk-to-Dawn Cancer Relay.

There are some things that are not on there; for example,
this past weekend we had 30 people involved in the Shiver

Me Timbers volunteer program, helping out in building that
park.

We've also got 40 people registered this week for the Inland Waterways Cleanup, so we're very active in the organization in the community activity. Some of our other activities, like the Christmas in April project, benefit our near neighbors; the cities -- communities of



Mossville and West Lake.

The Christmas in April Foundation is a nonprofit group that identifies homeowners with needs that might -- that they might not be able to take care of themselves. And what we do is we let them select the home, and the only stipulation that we add is that it's a near -- it's in Mossville or the West Lake community.

And what we're doing there is we refurbish the home. I mean, we do -- we've done things like we have got in and re-roofed the home. We've done plumbing. We've done electrical work. When we walk away from that home, what we wind up having is a home that is more secure, more weather-resistant, and it's a safer place for our neighbors to live.

Personally, I've also been involved in a organization called the Southern Youth -- Southern Regional Youth Institute, and our big project there once a year is we put on a camp for at-risk youth; for young men and young women.

It's about a week-long activity, and we -- what we're working on, the idea is to work with the youth to improve their self-esteem, to work with them to accept personal responsibility. It's a week-long activity. We take them away from the boom boxes. We take them away from their

parents, and it's very refreshing or encouraging, if you will, to look at the growth that we see in our kids over that one-week activity.

You'd be surprised that in a week you can see a kid who didn't want to be part of that activity, all of a sudden he doesn't want to leave. And then you can watch the growth in those same kids, because a lot of our kids come back to us.

We have a -- we target a youth aged nine to 14, and by the time when you get them in at the beginning and you can watch the growth, some of those young men and young women that are very -- when they first get there, they're very active.

And by the time that they're nearing the end of the camp experience, those are the same ones that are taking the other youth underneath their wings and working with them and mentoring them. That just keeps us going -- at least, keeps me going. So I --

MS. RICHARDSON: The chair had better interrupt to be clear with Mr. Glackin. If you want all of these people to say something, it's going to have to move a little faster. I've hoped that since you've asked people to come and testify, they would all have an opportunity.

So maybe if you could sum up, we do understand your outreach and community activities; not program by

program, but the overall concept of what you are trying to do, particularly for your neighbors. So if you would like to wrap up, I think Mr. Glackin needs to recognize other members of his presenting panel.

MR. GLACKIN: Well, I'll -- thank you.

MS. RICHARDSON: That's a good point right there to stop? Thank you.

MR. GLACKIN: Yes. We thought you may be interested in some of the specific programs and most people don't hear all these programs wind out specifically and what they really do. These are some excellent programs; they really are.

Thank you, Mike.

My next speaker is Ms. Monica Welch. She is a teacher at Westwood Elementary School, Western -- I'm sorry, Western Heights Elementary School. This is the school that is nearest to our facility.

MS. WELCH: And I want to thank you for allowing me to address you this evening.

As Mike has told you, I'm a teacher at Western Heights --

MS. RICHARDSON: Hold it just a little closer. It's not as sensitive.

MS. WELCH: -- I'm a teacher at Western Heights
Elementary School, and I'm also a resident of the West

Lake area. And I've had the privilege of working with numerous employees from Condea Vista over the course of the past couple of years through our Partners in Education program.

Condea Vista is the only company in Louisiana to have been awarded the Partners in Excellence award in the State of Louisiana, and they've gotten this award twice. As one of the teachers who nominated him, I can tell you that the company and the employees definitely are deserving of that award.

We have a good level of employee involvement and management support. Condea Vista recently sold the area that was in charge of working with Western Heights Elementary, but in turn the company kept Western Heights Elementary as their partner even though they had a lower number of employees to service the school.

Some of the programs that they do in our school are the honor and band roll breakfast for the students, where they come in and honor our high achievers. They also have tutoring in the school. They have shadow day and touring of the facility.

We also focus on activities that directly benefit the students. One of the best things about the partnership is the open dialogue that we have with the employees and the plant management. We occasionally have

.24

plant employees come to the school to speak to our students about the flare, because it's in their area that they live in, and also about the chemicals and the products that are made from all these chemicals at the plant.

One of the other things that Condea Vista has done is an open house in their plant, where they invite the entire community to come in, and they tour and they give demonstrations of what they do on a daily basis. Our partnership is one of the best in the state, because we work together.

Condea Vista is clearly reaching out into our community, and I'm glad that I've been a part of that.

Thank you.

MR. GLACKIN: Thank you very much, Monica.

Next speaker is Ms. Betty Gasaway, as I had introduced as the program director for Recreation District 1 serving Mossville and West Lake. She'll give you a rundown about our near neighbor outreach efforts.

MS. GASAWAY: Thank you, Mike.

Madame Chairman, committee. At Recreation

District 1, we have a good working relationship with the industry. Our strongest supporters are Conoco, Lyondell, PPG, and of course Condea Vista.

While these companies are the main tax for

Recreation District 1, they also go beyond the support by providing additional funding, donated items, and volunteers. My relationship with Condea Vista began in 1994 when I assumed the position of program director.

The Mossville-West Lake after-school tutorial program in 1995 to present, they were very instrumental in implementing by giving us a \$10,000 grant, and they worked along with us, as well as Calcasieu Parish school board, to help us get this implemented.

Our Kids Against Tobacco program they also support annually. Our annual fun day and our yearly athletic banquet has been supported by Condea Vista as well. Recreation District 1 looks forward for and to a continuous friendly working relationship with this industry, as well as Condea Vista.

And thank you.

MR. GLACKIN: Thank you very much.

That concludes our speakers. We appreciate you inviting us to speak, and we'd certainly take an invite in the future if you want to continue, because this is a good forum, we believe, for helping in terms of communicating with our neighbors.

I'll take questions.

MS. RICHARDSON: Don't go anywhere. We may have some things we want to ask of you.

MR. GLACKIN: Yes. I'll stay right here. 1 MS. RICHARDSON: To the right, to the left. 2 Ms. Bourg. 3 MS. BOURG: Actually, I have five questions if . 4 you'll bear with me. The last question is perhaps most 5 difficult. 6 I want to ask Ms. Gasaway if you would rather 7 see the dollars of the company spent on recreation for the 8 children or clean air for the children? 9 MS. GASAWAY: I'm not here to answer anything 10 about clean air. I was only asked to give information on 11 what they have done for our recreation district. 12 MS. BOURG: Thank you. I appreciate your 13 position. 14 MR. GLACKIN: I would appreciate it probably 15 if -- I was really the main speaker here that I don't know 16 that my guests have come in preparation of answering 17 18 anything. MS. BOURG: Then I'll address the rest of these 19 20 to you. MR. GLACKIN: Thank you. 21 MS. BOURG: The president of your company in 22 the 1999 report states that we must "operate with respect 23 for and to safeguard our environment, and we must 24 communicate well with our stakeholders. Substandard 25

performance in any of these areas diminishes the success of our company."

So my question to you is about the accidental releases in upset conditions. From March to August '99, there were 422 pounds of sulfuric acid released by accident, 250 pounds of EDC, 22 pounds of vinyl chloride -- it goes on and on and on with about ten or 15 incidents.

What was the level of communication to the residents in Mossville and the working community of West Lake on those incidents from March through August '99?

Could you -- thank you.

MR. GLACKIN: I understand your question. I am not real sure, to tell you the truth, exactly what was done at those particular incidences. I can say as far as you mentioned they were accidental, that every industry does their best to not have any accidents, obviously:

Our accident record at our plant is very, very good. We have improved to an extremely good percentage there, but --

MS. BOURG: All right. Next question to you is: Looking at the five-year incident and accident report, in January 24, 1995, there was -- Mossville community had to shelter in place for 20 minutes, and there was a release of almost 1,800 pounds of hydrogen

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chloride, almost 4,300 pounds, 4,260 pounds of vinyl chloride, 6,510 pounds of ethylene dichloride.

On March 10 there was a short in the electrical control for air compressors that led to the failure of the electrical supply of units cooling water supply pumps. resulted in release of 6,500 pounds of vinyl chloride, 52,000 pounds of ethylene dichloride -- and it goes on.

And the community was asked to shelter in place for 50 minutes. And the list goes on -- 21,000 pounds of this and that. How were you communicating -- the record is rather startling -- how were you communicating with the residents in those communities?

MR. GLACKIN: We, as most of the industry, belong to what they call CAER, which is Community Awareness and Emergency Response. That is a very well put together, I believe, group which discusses how to handle shelter in place with the four steps, et cetera, and communicates very well.

We, as we've explained already, I believe, we've got a number of outreach methods that we use. We walk blocks at times when we need to to talk to our near neighbors. But we use this pretty extensively, and from my understanding, it works very well.

MS. BOURG: Looking at the TRI -- the toxic release inventory -- air release for Calcasieu Parish in

1998, it seems that your 1998 releases overall, and also in the stack for air releases, were higher in 1998 than 1997. How does that jive with your president's statement in the report, sir?

MR. GLACKIN: Well, the president's statement that I believe I made was since 1987, we have reduced emissions in that report by over 80 percent since that time period. I cannot explain the little particular years that you have given me.

Let me also, if you will, and maybe also for your timing, I have Mike assisting me with these questions, and we will -- we are taking these down. We'll certainly -- I'm obviously not technically involved in a lot of these things to give you the answers you want. We would certainly like to supply those.

MS. RICHARDSON: That would be very satisfactory. Yes.

Dr. Wright.

DR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon.

MR. GLACKIN: Good afternoon.

DR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry you weren't here for my last statement about the canaries. You're a human resource manager. All I'm saying -- I said I'm sorry you weren't here earlier when I made some statements about canaries in the mine that are sent to us.



As a human resource manager, you're not exactly the person who can answer a lot of the technical questions that we have. So I'm going to ask some questions that aren't very technical, but I think I really need an explanation.

When you talk -- you showed us the map, and you talked about purchasing homes. I wanted -- first of all, why are you purchasing homes, and are you buying them for resale?

MR. GLACKIN: The reason that we purchased homes in the home purchase area on the Mossville side, the west side of the complex, was the result of a settlement agreement.

DR. WRIGHT: So you say purchase homes. It just sounds like, I'm going out looking for a new house. I think there was a little more serious --

MR. GLACKIN: No. There was litigation involved, and there was a settlement agreement made on purchase of certain subdivisions which I outlined. That agreement was basically made in terms of -- by their legal assistants that represented the people, and I can say that the judge did say that our decision was fair.

DR. WRIGHT: Okay. All right. My other question is really to the school teacher. Are you here in Mossville, or I thought they said Houston, Texas?

MS. RICHARDSON: Pardon me, Dr. Wright, please.

I think Mr. Glackin has stated that these people came
solely to make this presentation about good corporate
citizenship, but they came not prepared to answer any
questions.

DR. WRIGHT: But the question that I'm going to ask is about her program. It's not a question for him.

I'm just going to ask about the program.

MS. RICHARDSON: I'll ask him.

MR. GLACKIN: If she wishes to answer, I'll certainly oblige.

MS. WELCH: I can try.

DR. WRIGHT: Okay. I just wanted -- I was really interested -- you talked about the program, and I wanted to ask, first of all, do you talk to the children at all about health risks as it relates to certain chemicals, about emergency responses if your school is near one of the sites, and about shelter in place as well.

If it's coming from the chemical company, these are some of the responses that children in schools near -- and also for you, if you work there -- is there anything going on in the schools to make kids aware of health risks and how to be careful and emergency response and shelter in place?

I'm just wondering if these kinds of things are

also being taught for children in schools that are at risk.

MS. WELCH: And to answer your question, we annually talk about the shelter in place procedures. We go over it. We have the students -- you know, being a teacher in fourth grade whereas the science teacher, and that's when I'd have people from the plant come out and speak to my class about what they do at the plant; what do they make, you know, why is it important for us to not just have the --

You know, we have to have the plant there, because it showed the kids what they give back to us as far as the -- what do the chemicals -- what products do the chemicals go into. And we go over -- for the past three years I've had a sociologist from McNeese come out, and he would give -- you know, at the beginning of the year and the end of the year, kind of like a little quiz to the kids on if they knew the procedures of the shelter in place.

And during the year, we would annually go over it, along with all the TV ads they have and, you know, the community itself -- KPLC, you know, gives incentives and they ask them to -- I forget; they have like a contest in the area on the shelter in place.

DR. WRIGHT: I just wanted to share with you

that at our Center in New Orleans, we've developed an environmental justice curriculum for K through sixth grade that I think just might give them more balanced view of what's going on than maybe you would get just from people coming from the plant.

I have another question, and that is have you observed any irregular or increased rates of illness, like asthma or sickness, children missing school due to illness at your school, since it's in this area, I guess more so that what you would expect?

MS. WELCH: I'm in -- I've been teaching for ten years now, and at the beginning of my career I taught in Cameron Parish near the coast, and I can compare that where I am now, and I don't really see a higher significance of children.

You know, I've had occasional asthma. Right now I don't have any in my class that have any asthma this year. I really couldn't say that I see a higher percentage in the school I'm at now as compared to the schools I've been at in the past.

DR. WRIGHT: And I have one final question, if you don't mind. When -- then this is to Mr. Glackin, and I'm still not sure that you're the right person to answer this question, but in looking at where your plant is and how it has expanded, if you had to offer suggestions to

the Environmental Protection Agency, for example, about how to situate plants that produce dangerous chemicals the way that your plant does, in relationship to where you should allow people to live, what would be the what you would consider as safe distance for people to live, work and -- well, live and play -- from your plant being as vital as you say it is but also dangerous, as we know it to be?

MR. GLACKIN: You're right. I may not be the correct person to try to answer that question, and that's almost more of a personal question no matter who you ask it to. I might add that personally, I live five miles from the plant and I work there every day. I do not have any fears whatsoever of working in this industry.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

Ms. Bourg.

MS. BOURG: In the report -- your annual report goes on to say; "An industry example of Condea Vista's product stewardship is participating in a national effort to develop and communicate to the public the toxicity information of a large number of chemicals." It's -- and then you relate it to the chemical right-to-know initiative that you support.

On June 5, 1999, there was an incident in which 21,400 pounds of hydrogen chloride gas was released, and

540 pounds of vinyl chloride was released. Are you 1 familiar with the carcinogenic or developing fetus 2 implications on either of those compounds, and were any of 3 those right-to-know informations given to either West Lake 4 or Mossville communities, sir? 5 MR. GLACKIN: I'm -- we'll have to take that 6 question and answer. I'm not technical enough to answer 7 8 that. I'm sorry. MS. RICHARDSON: And thank you so very much. 9 MR. GLACKIN: Thank you. 10 MS. RICHARDSON: Do you have a copy of the 11 12 statement that you'd like to leave? Give it to the Sir? 13 Reporter. MR. GLACKIN: The overheads -- do you want 14 15 those? MS. RICHARDSON: We would like a copy of those, 16 certainly. Thanks again. 17 And we're going to move now to Bill Easter, 18 19 general manager of Conoco Gulf Coast business unit in Lake 20 Charles. Mr. Easter. 21 22 MR. EASTER: Good evening. 23 MS. RICHARDSON: Welcome, sir. MR. EASTER: Thank you. Madame Chairman and 24

Committee, I'd like to ask two of my colleagues to join

me. I'll be doing the presenting, but I've asked them to join me to help with questions. They can help address any technical issues you might have.

I might introduce them. This gentleman is

Robert Loveless, who is the director of safety at our

refinery here locally. And this gentleman to my left is

Reed Marton, M-A-R-T-O-N, who is our manager of

environmental affairs for the business unit, so he looks

after the refinery as well as our operations throughout

the region.

MS. RICHARDSON: Please proceed, sir. Oh, I'm sorry. Would you repeat them, please, and the titles.

MR. EASTER: Yes. The first one is Robert Loveless, L-O-V-E-L-E-S-S, and he is the director of safety at the Lake Charles refinery. The other gentleman is Reed Marton, M-A-R-T-O-N, manager of environmental affairs, business unit.

We also have a series of slides that we would like to utilize; some pictures, some words. In answers to time, we will try to race through these pretty quickly. Some of the issues, other speakers have talked about.

But first of all, we'd like to begin by saying thank you for inviting us to come and speak with you this evening and also, obviously, for your time.

My name is Bill Easter. I'm the general

1.5

manager of the Conoco's Gulf Coast business unit, which is refining, marketing, transportation in a ten-state area.

Most of our assets are located here in Lake Charles, including the refinery, transportation assets, et cetera.

We also operate marketing facilities.

I've personally lived in Calcasieu Parish for two years now. During these hearings, you've heard already from representatives from a wide variety of special interest groups, industries and businesses from the community, and I know all have made a concerted effort to convey their respective priorities and concerns around environmental justice, and I'm sure that those coming tomorrow will do the same.

Tonight I'd like to focus my comments on the role Conoco sees for itself as a multinational corporation and as a member of this community for nearly 60 years now.

At Conoco, our activities are guided by four basic core values. Those include safety, environmental stewardship, valuing all people, and then maintaining high ethical standards. These core values are woven into our culture. They're fundamental to our vision of being recognized around the world as a truly great company.

This next -- well, if we think about Conoco employees around the world, we actively seek to live these core values every day. And again, this is especially true

΄3

here in Calcasieu Parish, where we have over 1,200 employees and hundreds of honored retirees.

Our core values are also fundamental to Conoco's notion of sustainability. And by that, I mean providing cost-effective energy to fuel global growth while protecting the environment and contributing to the quality of life in the communities where we operate.

Sustainable development is one of those phrases that seems to have parachuted into our vocabulary almost overnight without being very well understood, and certainly without having a common meaning among us. At Conoco, we interpret this term, sustainable development, to mean development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

And I would insert a comment here that obviously, we're on a journey to define that better and understand it and make sure that that is truly the way we operate as a company.

I think what makes this concept of sustainability so important is the clear evidence that each successive generation is placing a heavier and heavier burden on the environment. Planet Earth is getting smaller by the year.

Fifty years ago, the world population was 2-1/2

2.2

million people. Today it's risen to 6 billion. I'm sorry; it was 2-1/2 billion. Today it's risen to 6 billion, and the projection is by the middle of the next century we're going to be at 10 billion, which is just phenomenal growth.

At the same time, society's expectations are growing. Each generation expects to enjoy a better standard of living than the one before and as a consequence, industrial development and energy consumption are growing tremendously, and man's impact on the planet becomes more and more far-reaching.

The underlying question is how on earth do we resolve the paradox of meeting the needs and aspirations of an ever-increasing global population without placing an ever-increasing and ultimately catastrophic burden on the planet or its inhabitants?

What makes this concept of sustainable development both challenging and stimulating is the fact that interests that are usually seen as being at odds with one another are instead seen as interdependent. The platform of sustainability stands on three equally important pillars.

The first is economic growth -- no particular order here -- the first is economic growth. Another one is environmental protection, and the third one is social

.15

progress. To succeed, sustainable development requires commitment, cooperation, and creativity by all of us.

For the sake of our discussion this evening,

I'd like to concentrate for the most part on two of the

three pillars: environmental protection and social

progress. First, I'd like to talk about our value for the environment.

Conoco's concern for environmental protection is manifest in our core value of environmental stewardship. And our environmental creed is represented here -- conducting business with respect and care for the environment where we operate.

For many years, Conoco has been recognized as an industry leader in environmental care with a reputation for innovation and successful operations in environmentally sensitive areas. I'm proud to say that I could say many examples on a global basis of this commitment.

But for the sake of brevity, I'll focus just on a couple of local examples. This particular slide is an aerial photo of the Lake Charles refinery located in West Lake. At our refinery, increased operating reliability and flare reduction program has contributed to a 40 percent reduction in volatile organic compounding emissions and 20 percent reduction in sulphur dioxide over

the last two years.

And I might stop here. The flare, in case anybody is not familiar with it, is essentially a safety device that takes away or consumes safely by burning any hydrocarbons that may be free in the system, if you will. The VOCs are recovered and used in the refinery as fuel gas. The SO<sub>2</sub> is processed and recycled as sulphur for use in fertilizers and other products.

In addition to reducing emissions, our flare reduction program has greatly reduced a tangible, a very real concern for our near neighborhoods; namely, seeing the flare and wondering what it was about. But at the same time, it's also increased operator discipline and pride in the quality of our operation.

I go to the next slide. Here's another example of a Conoco corporate decision that has dramatically improved the integrity of our operations here in Lake Charles. Conoco's decision to become the first petroleum company to voluntarily commit to build only double-hulled tankers was made in 1990, years prior to U.S. legislation, and now mandates that all tankers visiting U.S. ports have double hulls by the year 2015.

So we were 25 years ahead of that deadline when we made the decision. Since launching an initial double-hull tanker in '92, Conoco's fleet has grown to seven

4.

vessels, and in the wake of that historic commitment, the benefits to that decision have-proved to be substantial.

This next picture demonstrates exactly what I mean. On Halloween 1997, the Guardian, one of our ships loaded with more then 500,000 barrels of crude oil, was struck by a barge flotilla at the Port of Lake Charles. Rip of 400 square foot -- rip 400 square foot of steel from most loaded oil tankers, and you've got an environmental nightmare.

But the double-hull construction, not a single drop of the Guardian's shipment escaped into the Calcasieu River. Before I leave the area of environmental stewardship, I must point out the extensive level of work that Conoco is doing in concert with the EPA and the Louisiana DEQ to address environmental legacy issues associated with Bayou Verdine -- with the Bayou Verdine area of the Calcasieu Estuary.

We're proud to be a leader in addressing this important issue. A sizable part of Bayou Verdine is located within the boundaries of our refinery property.

Work is progressing well in identifying the extent of the environmental impact of our operations from years before EPA was even formed.

And we are working hand-in-hand with the state and federal agencies to develop an effective remediation

effort. We are approximately -- I think you all know that EPA is leading an investigation here. We are actually doing the investigation work on Bayou Verdine on our own.

We're some six to eight months ahead of the EPA effort, and it was something that we chose to do voluntarily on our own.

I'd like to turn now to social responsibility and our commitment to the community. This is an area of involvement that I like to refer to as the giving of time, treasure and talent. Conoco has been a strong philanthropic contributor within the community from the first day the company began operating here; again, almost 60 years ago.

In '99 our total support to civic, community, charitable, and educational causes totalled more than \$600,000. That included \$300,000 to the United Way alone, and we served as a Pacesetter company there. But again, our -- or I should add that our involvement really extends to more than dollars.

It really has to do with people respecting and helping other people. There's a series of slides, and let's run through these real quickly. You'll see things like turkey donations, things we do around, beach cleanups. If we jump really to the Partner in Ed, that's the one that I take a lot of personal pride in.

In the K through 12 educational area, Conoco is involved with two partner schools, both high schools, West Lake High and then Lake Charles Boston. We're also a partner through one of our joint venture companies in College Oaks Elementary.

And again, we're involved in terms of providing tutors and speakers. We've had a pilot program for tutoring math. This next slide will show that we've also been involved with sponsoring teachers to participate in the annual meeting of the National Science Teachers Association.

Trying to get through this quickly, Madame.

The next one we're just tickled pink about, and that's the fact that earlier this year, Conoco was recognized for its effort in the PIE area. The Louisiana Department of Education honored Conoco with two of the state's five annual Distinguished Partner in Education awards, one at West Lake High and the other at College Oaks, so you might call that a two-for.

In terms of funding for higher education, we're actively involved there. There's a scholarship program involving -- or for the benefit of Mossville eligible students at McNeese. We have -- we're involved with Southern.

We recently granted the first ever \$25,000

Circle of Excellence scholarship award here locally to a young woman from Lake Charles Boston. That degree will fund her for four years. It also carries with it a commitment for summer employment at our plant, and of course we're very hopeful that she'll come to work for us once she finishes her studies. Outstanding student.

We're also involved with the petroleum technology program at McNeese, and then we have several employees that serve on the engineering board at McNeese as well. Let's see. Let's go to the next one.

This particular picture highlights the fact -or really, the mix of two new classes of operators that
have come on at our refinery this year. Again, we're
relying, like all other industrial sites are, to take our
pool of candidates from petroleum technology programs. In
this case, both from McNeese and Lamar.

Real quickly, the next one -- this is an interesting one. It highlights the Conoco Safety House. This is a fire safety house, and we literally -- it's a trailer that we literally pull around the area during a one-month period each year. Our employee volunteers train more than 7,000 elementary school children in safe ways to exit a burning house, and this program's been going on for a number of years.

Let's jump two forward. Next one. Next one

after that. Special Olympics. We're a major sponsor for Special Olympics in southwest Louisiana. It has a very special place in our heart, and in fact, Conoco's heart around the country.

Our employees are involved in helping set up the day before the event, escorting the athletes into the stadium, and working with them throughout the day. Let's go to the next one. Let's see -- Christmas in April you've heard about. An original participant, long-standing sponsor. Let's go to the next one.

Like to talk just a minute about Citizen

Advisory Panels. Stewardship of two of these panels, or

Conoco's involved in two of these panels; one specifically

for our operations. The other is a joint CAP for I-10

industries.

You'll see in your packet a reference to the Website, and we would invite you to view that at your convenience. There's also a brochure in the packet that talks about our CAPs.

I would also like to talk about Conoco's START program is an example of our corporate support in the community, but in this case, with a clear business focus.

START is a special purpose credit program designed to assist qualified minority and/or women in becoming Conoco branded marketers.

The program addresses the number one challenge sited by potentially qualified\_individuals, and that's financing. Just eleven days ago, the Wallace family of nearby Beaumont broke ground on their new Conoco retail facility.

And we're also working with local jobbers to identify -- try to identify potential candidates here in southwest Louisiana.

MS. RICHARDSON: Mr. Easter, please pardon me. Would you wrap up in order that we might have time to ask some questions in particular areas of interest that we might have.

MR. EASTER: Okay. I will. Just one last section, Madame Chairman, and really, I was at the end.

Before I close, I'd like to take a minute and focus on the third pillar, which is economic performance. Fundamentally, we believe it's impossible for a company to support sustainable commitments to environmental stewardship and social responsibility if it's not able to demonstrate strong financial performance.

Accordingly, we're continually seeking to enhance our operations in ways that sustain and/or improve our position in an increasingly competitive global environment or marketplace. This often requires modifications or additions to our facilities.

While not always popular, such changes are critical to the economic future of Conoco and, in fact, the community. Our commitment in that regard is to engage the community early on and make sure that the environmental impacts are mitigated.

I'd like to stop there. We are certainly open to try to answer any questions that you all have. Thank you.

MS. RICHARDSON: And thank you, sir.

Are there questions from the committee members?

Yes. Ms. Seicshnaydre. Oh, well. This is the hardest part of this job. It doesn't reach? Please proceed.

MS. SEICSHNAYDRE: You mentioned some partnerships with DEQ as well as EPA. We heard some testimony earlier today about some unfortunate examples of regulators actually impugning industry efforts to address environmental concerns as opposed to facilitating them.

I'm wondering if you have had any experiences where regulators may have impeded efforts. And otherwise, can you comment on suggestions you might make for how regulators could better facilitate efforts on your behalf.

MR. EASTER: The estuary is probably an excellent example. And it's -- there's both positive and negatives in our experience. When I -- to say that we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a partnership with DEQ and EPA may be a bit of an overstatement.

We do have an extremely good working relationship, I believe, with DEQ, who obviously is charged with regulating our industry, so it is -- that's the context of it. But it's a positive working relationship.

We have been able to craft a program that seems to work. They've encouraged us to be aggressive, if you will, in addressing the issues and have tried to be supportive. And that support has been demonstrated in a number of ways; the most significant is probably their attempt to help us work with the EPA.

Obviously, as we embarked on this voluntary program, what we were interested in getting was some sort of, you would hope, approval, but at least a positive sign from the regulatory agency that we were heading down the right path, but we were not about to step off the cliff.

The DEQ was responsive. The EPA was much less I think the EPA had more of a tendency to want to rely on the bureaucratic process and their process of approaching things with almost a Superfund mentality. So it put us in a position where we had to charge on.

And what we've done as a result is place a lot of emphasis on creating a talking relationship with the

EPA and trying to engage them in dialogue. And so it functions reasonably well at a lower level. As you try to carry it up the line, it's -- there's a very high fog factor. You don't know exactly what it's going to look like.

But we're making progress. You've probably heard something about the estuary task force that exists today. I think that is a very positive thing that the politicians in the area, both at a local, state and federal level, helped bring about.

So we've got community members, we've got politicians, we've got industry members, as well as representatives of the regulatory bodies that are there in sort of an advisory capacity. But it provides a forum to talk about it, and quite frankly, to put heat on doing what's really called for, and that's finding a solution.

Let's not get hung in the bureaucracy and all the other issues that surround this. Let's move toward a resolution. So there's some issues. I would hope that what we're doing here is a bit groundbreaking and could be a model for somewhere else. That's a personal ambition of mine.

DR. FORD: Very briefly. Your presentation is extremely impressive and your literature is impressive.

My question is: Is it your perception that the community

perceives you in that light? I mean, for someone who knows little about your company, just listening to you tonight, looking through your material, I would come to the conclusion that this a great company with a great image.

Is -- do you perceive that the Lake Charles community sees Conoco in that light; and if by some reason they don't, do you have any notions about how they could be more impressed?

MR. EASTER: Well, you know, I would love to tell you that they see us that way, but my basic guess would be, the answer is no. I think some do. I think some see us as being more progressive and moving in the right direction. But, you know, the proverbial saying, the proof is in the pudding. People want to see more.

Some of the things that we've done really over the last couple of years have been to be more visible, more involved in the community. So we have people here tonight that not only participate in CAPs, but also attend meetings from -- of CLEAN and MEAN.

They're -- you know, our people are known, and I would like to think that we've reached a point where they accept the fact that we're going to show up and that they can contact us if they have issues.

So I describe this as a journey. I mean, one

MS. BOURG: I, like Dr. Ford, believe that your

of the things -- I mean, I -- you know, maybe I'm going on too long here, but I was out of the country for six years. Whole different environment. I came back to Lake Charles, right in the middle of really a hotbed of environmental and legal and all other issues.

And, you know, I think we're all in a bit of a struggle. We're all on a journey. I think that folks like us are typically viewed as engineers. We like numbers. We don't -- you know, we don't feel comfortable talking to the public. We haven't always put forth adequate effort to get out and talk to people and listen to what their issues were and explain what was going on.

So I think we're starting that, and I'm proud to say that my company is being aggressive about that.

I'm not going to pass judgment on what other people are doing. I just know that we're after that. I don't think that's a transition or journey that gets completed overnight. We just have to keep working, and we'll see where we go.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well, sir, you mentioned that at least your people know that you will show up. Who was the philosopher who said, Ninety percent of life was just showing up. So at least you've made a step forward.

Other questions? Ms. Bourg.

presentation as well as the materials from the company are impressive and certainly bold to have environmental stewardship as one of the three core values of your company, so I congratulate you on that.

MR. EASTER: Thank you.

MS. BOURG: I do have some specific questions about communities that are here around in this area. What is it exactly that Conoco is releasing into the estuary?

MR. EASTER: Well, we're not releasing anything today. The estuary issue is a legacy issue, I call it.

Certainly, we are operating according to all regulations on air and water releases today. The estuary is not about water. It is really about sediment issues.

I was surprised to find, for instance, that it wasn't until 1975 that a lot of the chemicals that are actually manufactured in this area came under regulation by the EPA. So if you think about this industrial complex we have here -- I mean, it dates back 40 to 50 years.

Technologies were introduced. People operated under a standard at the time, but things were released into the environment. So that now has become a sediment issue, and that's what's being addressed. So it ranges from PHAs to zinc to questions about EDC. I mean, there's -- anything that's been produced here, I think, is fair game for investigation.

1	MS. BOURG: TCDD, dioxin would be in there
2	also?
3	MR. EASTER: Conceivably, yes.
· 4	MS. BOURG: I noticed that the toxic release
5	inventories for air in Calcasieu Parish for Conoco for the
6	fugitive air releases increased from '97 to '98, and thus
7	your total air releases increased over that year period
8	from '97 to '98. Can you address that?
9	MR. EASTER: Can you address that? I've got
10	some data on benzene. I don't know that it addresses the
11	broad issue.
12	MR. MARTON: Yes. Directionally, our VOC
13	reporting
14	MS. RICHARDSON: You have to hold it real
15	close. It's not sensitive.
16	MR. MARTON: Okay. I'm sorry. Directionally,
17	our VOC reporting of volatile organic compounds or
18	hydrocarbon emissions that we report through TRI are
19	MS. RICHARDSON: Sir, you're still not
20	projecting. I'm sorry, but I see the question
21	MR. MARTON: They are closely related to
22	MS. RICHARDSON: That's fine.
23	MR. MARTON: They are closely related.
24	Hydrocarbon emissions are closely related to our day-to-
25	day operation. The movement of oil through our refinery

through tankage, through our lines, and the fugitive emissions are -- they are a calculated emission of hydrocarbons based on throughput largely.

And so as numbers increase, they do reflect generally an increase in our production activity. And we've been quite successful in increasing our ability to keep our process units operating soundly and continuously. And one of the effects of that would be an increase in hydrocarbon emissions, or VOC emissions.

MS. BOURG: Can you appreciate how the communities might find that, though they may be happy for your production level going up, they may be concerned about the TRI, the air release numbers going up, too. Can you appreciate that?

MR. MARTON: Absolutely. And that's why we have very aggressive leak detection and repair program.

Our performance on that program versus the expectations in the regulations are well below the standards that are set. We generally operate at about a half percent leak rate, which compares to a general federal standard of around -- you know, trying to maintain operation within a 2 to 4 percent leak rate.

And so we are generally well below that. The way we try to address our emissions is through very aggressive management of our operating units. We're

.1

\_

obviously disappointed every time there's an upset condition that takes place.

We can provide reasons for that, but we can't provide excuses for that. It happens, and we try to learn from every one of those incidents.

MS. BOURG: Thank you. The Conoco refinery in '97, for example, released through the fugitive medium, I guess, 3,600 pounds of benzene and through the stack, 4,700 pounds. Benzene is a human cancer-causing agent. It can -- it's a toxic thing, surely, and we can go on with three or four or five or six of these other releases that are contained in the '97 and '98 air releases in the West Lake area.

And if you look at the health effects of those, you can see why people might be kind of concerned about that. So how specifically is Conoco addressing those concerns, I mean, other than the educational programs and the goodwill things you're doing in the community?

I think I'm hearing over and over earlier today, they want the meat-and-potatoes knowledge of how you're going to protect their communities of African-Americans and hard-working families by the reduction of things that they consider making them sick or that surely, by most scientists' standards, are not too good to be having in the air?

MR. MARTON: In the same way that we're concerned about protecting our employees, we are concerned with protecting the communities around us. The way we address that is through a hard focus, and a much improved focus over the years, on mechanical integrity.

If we can keep the equipment running,

performing well, doing its job properly, keeping our

pollution control equipment in operation at all times,

that is our best protection from emissions. And as

emissions increase, we are tracking those emissions

increases and searching constantly for any technological

upgrades we can make to our equipment, operational changes

we can make to try to drive reduction.

And that's generally an everyday part of our activity. That's what we're accountable for looking after. But mechanical integrity is extremely important to both the business success as well as the environmental protection.

MS. BOURG: So help me out here. As the economy gets better or as Conoco increases its production, is it likely that the community should look forward to more of these releases in the years to come because the production amount went up?

MR. EASTER: No. No. I'd say the answer to that is no. I'd like to go back to the -- to air

emissions, and I'm looking at some data contrasting benzene emissions in 1993 versus 1998. In '93, we released almost 32,000 pounds. In '98, it was 9,400 pounds. So a very substantial reduction.

I mentioned in my comments the flare reduction program. Reed has talked about leakage, if you will, being in the range of half a percent. I want to be very clear that when we talk leakage here, we're talking vapor that subsequently gets consumed in the flare, so it's not -- you know, it's not just roaming around. It's being destroyed.

But that was a program that we really put in place in '98, and I think we've seen tremendous -- I know we've seen tremendous benefits from it in '99. So those are things that we've been doing all the while we've been increasing the reliability and uptime at the plant.

MS. RICHARDSON: Does that complete questioning from the committee?

DR. FORD: One final question.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, I invited that, didn't I. Dr. Ford.

DR. FORD: I'm intrigued by your sustainable development initiative. I just heard you talk about production increases. As you increase production, it means we are also increasing the depletion of fossil

1 | energy resources.

How is it that you can guarantee a future for generations to come if in fact you aren't investing heavily in other forms of energy outside of your current fossil energy systems? It seems to be a contradiction in terms of long-term sustainability when oil companies are not investing in solar energy and other forms of renewable energy. How would you respond to that?

MR. EASTER: Well, I mean, that is the underlying issue, and I used the term journey before, and I think we're very much on a journey. And what I would see us doing as a world is continuing to rely on fossil fuels for quite some time in the future.

Now, I believe that that dependence will decline and that we will offset that decline with other forms of energy; whether that's solar -- some of the things that we're doing as a company involve, say, converting natural gas into diesel as a use of a cleaner hydrocarbon that is plentiful in some isolated locations.

By converting it into, say, diesel you can then can transport it more readily to markets where it's needed. We're continuing to look at other technologies.

I mean, I clearly believe that we'll move to hydrogen and fuel cells and solar energy and those kinds of things, and it's a function of each company's appetite or ability to

I know

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, you have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROY: I'm going to try to be brief as I can. I'd like to also say I want to thank God for letting us all be here today, and I've heard some testimony, and I can say this. I have testified to many committee boards on a national, state and local level --

MS. RICHARDSON: One minute, Mr. Roy.

Ladies and gentlemen, please be in order. is too important to all of us and especially to our factfinding.

And as long as I've interrupted, Mr. Roy, we are not going to ask questions as a committee. If there is something not clear; you will hear back from us for clarification.

MR. ROY: Okay.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir.

MR. ROY: Thank you, ma'am.

I would also like to say I'd like to commend this committee board, because like I said earlier, I have testified to many committee boards on a national, state and local level. This is one of the first committee boards that I've seen have the interest of the people.

Seem like we really gone into the right direction with a committee board like y'all. I want to applaud y'all for that. And I was here all day.

certainly heard some of the testimony from other people, which ACORN is writing a [indiscernible] that they were true testimonial, and we can appreciate them.

I'm going to go only half of my presentation, because I'm going to leave the rest of the presentation with you for the record, for y'all records.

Railroads were inoffensive neighbors when they first put down their tracks in the communities of this state. However, since the 1950s, railroads have become [indiscernible] on wheels, storehouses of hazardous materials.

The railroad companies have also grown in size and expanded from the numbers of tracks they have at their switching yards, which are located in African-American communities in New Orleans as well as Lake Charles, Louisiana.

In both New Orleans and Lake Charles, low- and moderate-income communities of African-American have waged campaigns to remove the switching yards from their communities because of the ongoing proximity to toxins.

The explosions and leaks of cars carrying hazardous materials, as well as the poor record of maintenance and storage by the railroads -- during 1984 World's Fair, there was a hue and a cry to move the dangerous railroads' activity away from the French Quarters and all of

historics.

The Norfolk Southern Railroad then moved it from the smaller neighborhoods of the Caucasian French Quarters to their anonymous and distantly residential Afro-American neighborhood, dividing the 8th Ward and 9th Ward of New Orleans.

At this same Norfolk Southern Railroad switching yard, a toxin-laden tank car exploded and burned for days. The New Orleans Fire Department wasn't trained nor had the proper equipment to handle the fire. And after three days, firefighters from Houston were brought in to contain the fire.

The public was told the chemical was safe and there was no danger from the burning butadiene. It was also discovered later that the car had been leaking for days. There have been other fires since then in the same switching yards, and the railroad company has defined it's 24-hour parking limitation as though it does not exist.

The general public has no information concerning the chemicals which come through daily and nightly on the trains nor about what is leaking or burning at any given time. ACORN members in the City of New Orleans remain very convinced about the widening of the industrial canal that separates the 9th Ward neighborhoods.

You have -- we have been fighting this expansion preject for a period of years. However, the only --

MS. RICHARDSON: Mr. Roy.

MR. ROY: -- is determined --

MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry, sir. We have a strict three-minute limitation, so if you will give a closing statement, please leave the entire statement for our record. Our work is not starting here. The staff is going to gather, and we're going to review all of this, and if we have further concerns or need further information, we shall be in touch with you.

MR. ROY: Okay. Well, in closing, like I said earlier, we appreciate your committee. We certainly have, testified in many communities -- I mean, different -- many communities' board, and all we asking that we hoping that we can bring about positive changes for the poor people that has suffered and been abused by big industry, big fat cats that have been given the ten-year tax exemption, big tax giveaways, and all the other good thing that been happening to them as our people's suffering their abuse.

We certainly wish that this committee can bring back to the people that can bring about the changes, because we will be out there lobbying. We lobbied on the national, state and local level, finding all these

people -- try to bring about these changes.

we certainly appreciate y'all, and we need all of the help that we can get. Working together, we can bring about some of these changes. But if we all come together now -- this is late for us, but we have to think about our children, their children's children's children.

We can make a difference if we stick together and work together, but we have to do it now, because right now, time is winding down. And I think it's time. ACORN says that it's time for industry to pay their fair share.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. ROBINSON: I would like to emphasize as staff that we want to get everyone here that signed up this evening to present, so please share and summarize your statement very succinctly and as quickly as possible so we can get that information and we can close for this evening.

If you have a written statement, submit it to the record. But three minutes is the allocation. Thank you.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Roy.

Deborah Ramirez.

MS. RAMIREZ: I had a tape to show, but I don't think I could do it in three minutes, but if I have to sacrifice, I'd rather for you all to see the tape, because

1	He is now deceased, and one community are a conditioned
2	card
3	MS. RICHARDSON: Ma'am, what is the length of
4	the tape?
5	MS. RAMIREZ: I had to shorten it and get
-6	straight to the point on it so that we since I knew we
7	were going to be limited for time
8	MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. Please do.
9	MS. RAMIREZ: I've been through this many, many
10	times, and one of these days everybody's going to stop and
11	listen when everything's going haywire.
12	DR. FORD: Since technology works slowly, would
13	you care if someone else goes now and you get that
14 .	together?
15	MS. RAMIREZ: I'll just do my little speech
16	then
17	VOICE: Here it is.
18	(Whereupon, a videotape was played.)
19	MS. RAMIREZ: Allen was 54 years old. Sunrise
20	on him was April 9, 1946, and sunset was September 1,
21	2000. And until you all really get it together and
22	understand people have something to say you have to
23	give us the opportunity to speak more than three minutes,
24	because I did have a lot to say.
25	We_stayed_here and we hung out all day long

.10

trying to get that say, but maybe next time, maybe when it hit y'all's doorstep, then you give us the opportunity and the time that we need to explain.

Discrimination went on everywhere in that community. It went on with the people in the community as far as the community as a whole, because they never told us when they first spilled this EDC in the ground and had all those air emissions, they never told us anything.

They never came knocking on our doors, and it just surprise me and amaze me and industry ought to be ashamed of they self. Come in here and telling all those bold stories about what you do for community, and you don't do nothing. It's too late.

Understand it's too late. And every time you go to sleep, remember this picture. Remember Allen Ryan's picture, because I promised him to tell his story. And I will tell it. If not today, tomorrow. If not tomorrow, two years. If not two years, ten. But don't forget.

Employees have died, too, and the money that they pay you is not worth your life. Wake up, people.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you so much.

MS. RAMIREZ: \$7 million dollars for two men, \$7 million because they was digging in it, smelled it on our side; [indiscernible], and one ran up to the other and helped -- and this is what they got; now just 7 million,

-MS. RICHARD: Yes.

2

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay, I thought -- some people

3

choose to be Richard now, you know.

4

than English, so if I don't pronounce my words too

5 6

clearly, it's because I am bilingual.

7

My name is Teresa Richard, and I move here to

MS. RICHARD: Hello. I speak better French

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lake Charles. I am going to give you a scenario what is happening to our community. I went to the community last night to try to get the people to come and participate, and all of them said, We're beating a dead horse. Nobody is listening.

So one lady look at that white book that y'all give out and she -- let me ask this, if I may. Why is there no one from Lake Charles on the panel here? And why did it take seven years to come to this state, and we still feel left out of the equation, and I'm not being rude to no one, because we do have major problems here.

But I don't think it's fair for an organization to target a certain plant or industry or anybody and call them name, because it makes a reflection on all of us, and that I disapprove of. I think we should be able to sit and compromise with each other of what is happening in our community.

But everyone that spoke here today, they forgot

one thing: North Lake Charles. It's as though we are blind part of the parish. People get grant money. It goes to certain part of the parish. None never come to North Lake Charles.

And I feel EPA, when they collect fines, some of that money should come to North Lake Charles. We are very poor. We want health study on those children and our elderly. They are the most vulnerable in our community. And most of all, I disagree with EPA.

I have never seen that man come to Lake

Charles. Very much that man from the railroad. But there

still is a major problem with that railroad. They will

not answer about the spill. They're at fault, too, and I

know they're in litigation.

But we as a community -- we'd like to be heard.

And that's all we ask is to give us this opportunity, and

I think our people has learned -- and I'm not saying this
to be biased; I hate the government because of what HUD
has done into our community.

They have turned it back on us. We have to go all the way to Washington, D.C. to get some help. That New Orleans office, they just pass the buck on. They sweep it on the road. It shouldn't take 15 or 16 years to get a answer from them.

Those are our federal tax dollar. We poor, but

16.

when I buy a loaf of bread I pay tax just like the next fellow. And we hope that y'all would come more often and to our community, because you in the good part of North Lake Charles -- this side.

come toward the other side. Then you going to ask, Well, where have these people been? What happened to this community? We look like if -- when they bombed part of England and these other places. Abandoned houses, all our young mens in the prison or they dead. We have no help here in North Lake Charles, and it is nothing to be ashamed about.

Nobody cares. And we are very poor, but one thing about us -- we poor with money but we are very rich in spirit and one thing, we have wisdom.

Thank you.

MS. ROBINSON: In response to Ms. Richard's question, why is there no one represented from Lake Charles is that we take in a lot of factors in our decisions when committee members are appointed. They are appointed by the Commissioners in Washington, D.C.

And we look at a lot of factors. Location is a factor, but we also look at political affiliation. We look at gender, a person's involvement in the community and their knowledge of civil rights. So there's a lot of factors involved in that.

how in the world a bunch of what you call certified --

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's the best I'm going to call them, because they are not qualified -- to come in here and tell y'all about our position.

We are qualified to sit before y'all and give y'all our destination of our concern, because y'all seen that picture up there. That's one of the most considering and accepting story that this problem that we confronted today with, that's what it is all about.

We are putting -- they are putting lives, human lives, against industry, you see. And we can't afford going along with that. We just cannot do it, you see. And I wanted to be here to hear that. I ain't seen none of this Union Pacific guy sit before you all and tell y'all one of the biggest lies [indiscernible] be back down to 1,800. Well, I imagine he did, was talking about -- he knew what he was talking about, but he was talking about Union Pacific. He was not talking --

MS. ROBINSON: Mr. Bellamy, we cannot defame and use personal, identifiable names of persons. Out of respect and courtesy to the committee and to that person, please refrain from using names and making defame statements about that person.

MR. BELLAMY: I understand that, but I'm going to say this and I'm going to quit, because I feel like we are being dis-privileged. We are being discriminating

against. We can't talk about it without all this biting us. Who in the world can we talk about?

I'm sorry. I'm going to conclude.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. ROBINSON: I wish to make a brief statement. I don't want to take up your time, because we do want to listen to you. We have been working on this project for over eight months. We have been going out into the community interviewing community persons, representatives of all stakeholders in this situation.

And I would beg to differ with you that we have not given your perspective, based on other people that are knowledgeable about it. We could be here for two years talking individually about our personal concerns.

We're trying to get a summation of the situation, and this committee has done a lot of hard work to get this far. We try -- we [indiscernible] various environmental groups that represent your interests to speak this morning and provide a perspective on your situation, and we also have provided an opportunity for an open session.

So please respect what we've -- what we are trying to do; what we have done in the past.

MS. RICHARDSON: Patricia G-O-T-T-E, Gotte. Please, ma'am.

MS. GOTTE: Madame Chairman and other representatives, this is representing, not meaning any specifics, but I'm in the middle of all the industries, really. Concerning one of them that's really right close to us that nobody has ever brought attention to until I start hollering and other people around in our community, even on the west side and south side and even some of them around in Moss Bluff, and I'm in West Lake, and I live right there by this plant.

They provided -- when we moved there, the house was already built and stuff, which is over 20 years. It ran on natural gas, and the only chemicals we ever smelled was the chemical to clean the natural gas.

Eight years ago in 1992, they built the other parts of the plant, which now runs on coal, coke, limestone ash, stuff, so now we get all this flying particulars all around. They've cleaned out, down Johnstine [phonetic], their trees, this plant.

So now we get smells from the other plants, which are like about a mile and a half from us, and they are the ones that y'all are talking about -- these three plants. And yes, they do have other people that complains constantly.

We have noise pollution, which nobody seems they can even try to control. They put us down to a

police jury, which that's no help. EPA, you know, we've contacted them several times. I've called them in Baton Rouge, New Orleans, wherever. I've called DEQ. We've called them even around here and just kind of got pacified through them, you know, and taken samples one time.

Telling us it's pollen. Well, I know pollen's not black.

Needless to say, we get this ash from this plant all the time. We get it from their ash piles. We get it from their stacks. One of them is so close to us I can count maybe probably 20 trees through us, especially when I go to my neighbor's yard right in the front. It's that close.

Which when they started this plant, supposed to all further west from us, but it's not. It's right there on top of us. Needless to say, they tell us, you know, Oh, it's not -- doesn't test conclusive, but we can't say it's not coming from us.

But yet, we watching it fall right out the air, right onto us. I call it microscopic snow, just covers us. Sometimes it's in large blotches. We been fighting it for eight years when they opened the plant, and I can count -- know the years, because my grandson's birthday.

We've gotten large blotches. It's messing everything up around our house -- rusting, people can't breathe, can't live in their houses right next to it

because they have some laws further and further. They can't live there.

The noise is so tremendous. The ash is so tremendous right there in the areas, and I'm right in the middle of all of it, so we get it from their stacks. We get it from their ash piles -- either way. El Nino, when we had it, we just was covered with it for two years straight through El Nino, nonstop and stuff.

And we put new hurricane fence up after freeze.

Not six months later they've got rust spots all over it.

We put these awnings you get to cover your automobiles and stuff, less than six months you got rust spots all over it. So what else is it doing to our healths?

It's contaminating my ground, for I notice my grandson plays in the dirt, and I've given him baths, and Moore's not brown from the dirt. It's black. They play on their slide, their gym set and stuff. Their feet comes out totally black, I mean, or their clothes, you know, whatever.

So it's a constant and ongoing, and this is just up -- for one plant that has never been brought up that needs to be looked into. They were supposed to be doing stuff, but we're still not getting any results for the nonstopping of the ash or anything of the noise.

We've been told, like from DEQ, Go to police

jury. Police jury says, We can't help you with that. 1 can't help you with that. It's a constant roar. Nonstop 2 roaring 24 hours a day, sometimes louder, and it used 3 to --4 VOICE: What plant is that exactly? You 5 6' never --MS. GOTTE: Well, it's. --7 VOICE: You can name the --8 9 MS. RICHARDSON: No. We were not talking about companies. We didn't want to impugn individuals. 10 MS. BOURG: Company's okay. 11 MS. GOTTE: This is a energy plant, which is 12 electricity, which we know we have to have electricity. 13 MS. BOURG: What's the name of it? 14 MS. GOTTE: Dynergy. 15 MS. BOURG: Dynergy? Thank you. 16 MS. GOTTE: Yes, ma'am. We know -- and if I 17 could say this, I been lied to, not mentioning no names or 18 anything, several times, even from them, knowing that they 19 were supposed to build another plant and had permits, they 20 21 told me no. 22 Well, I have a book. We're affiliated with

this company back home, and this book states that there was another plant built near Lake Charles. Where's near Lake Charles? Of course -- West Lake. It's called --

23

24

25

We will receive Mr. Lee Sherman, Ms. Pat Hartman, and following Ms. Hartman, Mr. Harold Areno.

For those persons who signed up, Margie

Garland, Valerie Montgomery, and Charles Atherton, you

will have to be a part of the open session, if you wish

to, on tomorrow evening.

COL. SHERMAN: I am Lieutenant Colonel Lee A. Sherman. I'm retired military, retired from the Army 33 years and been fighting this environmental thing here now for close to 20 -- over 20 years.

I just thank the Good Lord that I was privileged to be born into a society where we can some distinguished people as this panel here and give the opportunity to speak, seeing as a lot of people I've seen throughout the world did not have that right.

I want to go back to early this morning. I promised myself I'd keep my mouth shut. I wouldn't say nothing when I come up here today, but holy mackerel, when you hear the things I've heard, you've just got to open your mouth.

Let me say one thing about the rail history.

We heard a very eloquent story about the rail history, but what they forgot to tell you was -- was North Lake

Charles, Fisherville, was a two-hour ride to downtown Lake

Charles.

When they built that station out here where they hook the cars together, it was outside of Lake Charles by two miles. Now, a real easy way to solve that problem. Darn it, move it out that way five more and shut this sucker down -- no, this thing down, because you have a contaminated area that degradating the clay, and it's going to continue to have their annual train wreck.

Now, let me say a little something about chemicals in the body, and I have been fighting with DEQ on this, which I get no response. The chemicals in the body we're talking about, EDC, tri-ethane, per-chlor, tri-chlor, a BCL -- you name it, it's there.

The chemicals in the body, including dioxin, degradates the immune system and, lo and behold, if all of a sudden you get something like mononucleosis and then you get hypoglycemia, then you get chronic fatigue syndrome, then you get a heart bypass operation, then you have two; which, by the way, I've had two.

DR. FORD: One minute. One minute.

COL. SHERMAN: One whole minute? You're a nice guy.

In the meantime, let me say this about the chemicals. Here just recently on Channel 7, they had a extensive report about family violence, and the violence in the United States was 5 percent, and the violence in

2.

Louisiana was 12 percent.

The violence in Calcasieu Parish is 25 percent.

The family violence, and it comes from the chemicals

that's in the air. Now, before he shushes me up, let me

tell you, the man's come in here from PPG and spoke about

his big vessel.

Granted, he opened a door. He opened a big one, because last Christmas on the 23rd or 22nd, somewhere along in there, of December, an airplane lost power directly over that unit and glided 1,200 yards out there at exactly --

DR. FORD: Ten seconds to sum up.

COL. SHERMAN: -- 15 or 1,200 -- you're a nice guy -- 1,200 foot. If that airplane had crashed on that unit, we would have had people dead all the way from the Gulf clean up to Singer. In the meantime --

DR. FORD: Your time. I'm sorry,

COL. SHERMAN: -- he just hollered time. And I could talk for hours because I work with -- and hey, some of these people on here in this panel have said some pretty strong stuff, and especially Dr. Beverly.

God bless you, one and all.

MS. RICHARDSON: Ms. Pat Hartman.

MS. ROBINSON: State your name again, please.

MS. HARTMAN: Allerine Pat Hartman.

I just want to share just a few things. They put it out in the paper. They lie. They say just a few pounds of this stuff was released. From 1993 to 1994, they released 19 million to 48 millions of pounds --

MS. ROBINSON: Who is they?

MS. RICHARDSON: Use the microphone, Ms. Hartman, please.

MS. HARTMAN: Okay. They released 19 million to 48 million pounds of EDC leaked.

MS. ROBINSON: Who is they?

MS. HARTMAN: Condea Vista and Conoco. This was in the paper on Sunday. I didn't know it was that much. All we asking for is help. They came down and tested our people but never came back and gave our people any help. We got one dead. Here's this man's son here.

I called the people and asked him, Go to the hospital. Send somebody over there. Help this fellow because he's dying. What are they going to do for us? That's all I'm asking. When are they coming into Mossville and stop lying and come and do something for us? Relocate us. Give us compensation and give us

medical. That's all we asking for, because they know they lying.

Thank y'all very much.

MS. RICHARDSON: Harold Areno. Is that

correct, sir?

MR. ARENO: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you. Please come up.

MR. ARENO: I kind of agree with her. I kind of wish it would happen in my neighborhood thataway.

But my name is Harold Areno. I am 65 years -- MS. RICHARDSON: Use the mic.

MR. ARENO: My name is Harold Areno, and I am 65 years old, and I've lived on Bayou d'Inde all my life.

I've seen it when it was good and I've seen it when it was destroyed.

I seen industry come in and kill everything se had; everything from the trees to the fish to, you name it, and destroyed our land, destroyed our lives, caused us to have cancer. And, well, what else can I name that they didn't do.

But anyway, Conoco also has got a coke plant in the Bayou d'Inde area. They load them ships down there, and clouds of dust covers your houses and all along on Bayou d'Inde. I'm a little bit further than right in there, but all of the people -- I try to get them to come to a meeting, but you can't get them out of their houses.

But anyway, they cover them up with that black stuff, and when they put CertainTeed in, I helped build the plant, and they told me when we built it that it was a

cancer-causer, and I didn't know if it was true or not.

I said, If there's anything to it I would be one of the first to know it, because I live within a mile of the plant. Well, within 20 years after that, six out of eight of us on that 40 has died -- I mean, has had cancer. Some has already passed on, but I'm one that had it that, thank God, I'm still here.

But I guess that's what got me up and started talking. But the wrongdoing has been done to us in Bayou d'Inde, but seemingly nobody ever hears it when we holler. So that's the reason I came up here and kindly presented it to y'all, and I got my testimony kind of here.

I had a lot to mention about the health, the business. My dad had a boat rental, but they put him out of business. And we used to farm, and they couldn't even raise cows or anything because it killed the cows from poison.

But anyway, let me finish and -- because y'all want to get out of here, and I got a little paper here

I'll leave with y'all, and --

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir. I think it's more we have to get out of here.

To those who had signed up and were not recognized, during the open session tomorrow you will be the first ones to testify. We're not sure where it's

going to fall, because things have clearly not fallen 1 today as we had expected. 2 So it's hard to project a time. I'm so sorry. 3 My apologies. 4 We start at 8:45, and if there is anyone who 5 cannot return, please give a statement to the Court 6 7 Reporter. Does the real chair need to say anything at 8 this point? 9 MS. MADDEN: No. We'll see you in the morning. 10 MS. RICHARDSON: We'll see you, and we hope as 11 many as possible at 8:45 in the morning, and thank you 12 kindly. Thank you for all your indulgence. 13 (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the hearing was 14 concluded.) 15

## CERTIFICATE

2

3 IN RE:

Louisiana Advisory Committee to

the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

4

5

- |

DATE:

LOCATION:

Lake Charles, Louisiana

6

September 12, 2000

7

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages,

8

numbers 1 through 409, inclusive, are the true, accurate,

9

and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording

10

made by electronic recording.

9/27/2000 (Transcriber) (Date)