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I. Introduction

On September 17, 2021 the Pima County Department of Environmental Quality (PDEQ) proposed to approve, subject to public review, a new Class II, Minor Source air quality permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) that would authorize installation and operation of a sterilization facility at 7345 E. Valencia Road, Tucson Arizona. In developing the permit, PDEQ sought input from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA is the federal agency that oversees PDEQ’s air program, but does not have a formal reviewing role in the development and approval of PDEQ’s Class II permits.

As part of the commitments made by PDEQ during this permit process, this document provides a written response to comments (RTC) to significant, permit-related comments raised at the virtual public hearing meeting and during the related public comment period.

The public comment period for the proposed permit was originally scheduled to last 30 days (by regulation). However, recognizing the potential significant public interest in the permit action and communications with local elected officials, the public comment was substantially extended to 90 days, and it was officially closed on December 17, 2021. PDEQ announced the public comment period through public notices published in the Arizona Daily Star and the Daily Territorial (in English and Spanish) and on the PDEQ website. PDEQ also distributed the Spanish and English public notices to a significant number of interested parties, including notices sent by mail, and e-mail.

A detailed breakdown of the public outreach PDEQ completed during this permit process is provided in Appendix A.

On October 6, 2021, PDEQ hosted a virtual open house via WebEx and an in-person open house on October 27, 2021 at Lauffer Middle School. This site was selected because of its location within the direct outreach area. These open houses were held, in addition to a public hearing to provide interested community members with opportunities to learn about the proposed facility, PDEQ’s air quality permitting requirements, provide verbal and written comments, and informally discuss the potential air quality impacts of the project. The public hearing was held virtually, through WebEx, on November 3, 2021. The public hearing provided community members with an opportunity to provide oral comments on the project.

II. Comments on Specific Provisions of the Draft Permit

A. Comments from EPA Referencing Specific Permit Conditions
   (Appendix B of this RTC document)

1. Comment:

   Currently, Attachment 4 of the proposed permit provides an option for ethylene oxide emissions to be monitored using CEMS to demonstrate compliance with the limits in 40 CFR part 63, subpart O. Given the proposed facility’s location near workers and residences, we strongly encourage the PDEQ to require CEMS in any final Class II air permit for the facility as the compliance demonstration method for ethylene oxide emissions. CEMS is an available technology for this industry and is already in use at, for example, Medline Industries in Waukegan, IL. Additionally, the draft permits for Sterigenics in Atlanta, GA and Baxter in Mountain Home, AR include the use of CEMS.
Additionally, ethylene oxide monitoring data for the facility should be made easily accessible to the public in a format that shows, at a minimum, current emission rates, current monthly emissions, and the 12-month rolling total of emissions.

Response:
PDEQ agrees with EPA’s concerns regarding the proposed BD facility location and its proximity to minority and low-income populations that tend to bear a disproportionate burden of environmental harm and risks in accordance with General findings from EPA’s Environmental Justice Data.

As part of our efforts to strengthen the permit to control the potential emissions from the facility, the monitoring of ethylene oxide emissions will be required on a continual basis. PDEQ supports the requirement for a Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) to be installed as an additional compliance demonstration for actual ethylene oxide emissions. Additionally, the monthly summary report of the average monitored daily and monthly Ethylene Oxide emissions with a 12-month rolling total from the facility will be made available to the public on the PDEQ BD web page - see condition 58 of the permit. PDEQ will make our existing BD webpage a direct source of information for the community about the facility and its compliance status, including information such as the EPA’s forthcoming rulemaking to update the federal standards applicable to commercial sterilization facilities.

2. Comment:
In Condition 46.b.ii.(c), the proposed permit states that the O&M plan must identify periodic measurements and parameters to be collected and monitored by the building management system verifying proper collection of fugitive ethylene oxide emissions from areas downstream of any natural draft openings and outer areas. To ensure enforceability, please confirm that the permit requires ongoing monitoring and recordkeeping of these measurements and parameters or revise the permit to include them.

Response:
The use of a CEMS increases the measurement of the emissions by at least 8000 times more than the originally proposed, providing a much more robust and statistically defensible measurement, monitoring, and accounting of the emissions within the agreed to limits. This additional measurement requirement assures the facility operates to verify EO emissions remain below the predetermined limit and safeguards the health of the community.

Furthermore, PDEQ has centered on the control of emissions from equipment leaks by stipulating BD incorporate a leak detection and repair (LDAR) work practice to identify leaking equipment so that emissions are minimized through detection and repair. A component that is subject to LDAR requirements must be monitored at specified, regular intervals to determine whether or not it is leaking. Any leaking component must then be repaired or replaced within a specified time frame. LDAR will also be addressed in the Operation and Maintenance Plan. PDEQ has also expanded the permit to require that emissions from discovered leaks from outside components as part of LDAR program must be included in the monthly facility emissions and accounted toward the 12-month rolling total facility emissions cap.

Recordkeeping of the monitoring of these operations is required by permit condition(s) 53.b.iii.g and summarized in Attachment 5 of the permit.
B. Comments from Public Referencing Specific Permit Conditions

1. Comment:
   None.

   Response:
PDEQ did not receive any additional specific permit condition related comments during the public notice period.

III. Comments That Did Not Reference Specific Permit Conditions

A. Comments from Public
   (Appendix B of this RTC document)

1. Comment:
The proposed permit changes were not sufficiently publicized.

   Response:
PCC 17.13.210 provides the requirements for public participation for Class II permits. The public participation requirements were met for this BD permit process. PDEQ is required to provide public notice by publishing a notice once each week for two consecutive weeks in two newspapers of general circulation in the county where the source is or will be located. PDEQ provided this notification in English and Spanish on September 17, 2021 and September 24, 2021 in the Arizona Daily Star and Tucson Newspaper Daily Territorial Public Notice.

   In addition, PDEQ is required to provide an opportunity for a hearing before taking final action on a new source permit issuance. This notification was also provided within the two public newspapers notices and emailed through Pima County GovDelivery system delivered to Subscribers of BOS/Admin, Environmental Quality, General County News and Health and Behavioral Health (16,515 recipients).

   Furthermore, on September 30, 2021 PDEQ emailed through Pima County GovDelivery system to Subscribers of the General Media (186 recipients).

   PDEQ is also required to mail a copy of the notice to persons who have requested in writing to be placed on the mailing list for notifications. PDEQ provided an informational mailer in English and Spanish sent to 18,679 residents and businesses that are located within a 3-mile radius of the proposed facility. Postcard included information about public comment period, virtual and in-person open house meetings (with a map to the in-person open house), public hearing, link to PDEQ website, and information on Ethylene Oxide. Mailer arrived at residents and businesses on September 30, 2021.

   A summary of the public notification process can be found in Appendix A of this document along with public notices, press releases, social media posts by PDEQ, and mailing done to the community. 
2. **Comment:**
Environmental Justice Concerns

**Response:**
PDEQ is committed to addressing environmental justice (EJ) concerns in the BD project. PDEQ has reviewed the EJ analysis in accordance with the Executive Order 12898, entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” For purposes of Executive Order 12898, PDEQ recognizes that, in the context of an environmental justice analysis, compliance with the applicable NAAQS is generally emblematic of achieving a level of public health protection that demonstrates that PDEQ’s issuance of the permit for the proposed facility will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations due to exposure to the relevant pollutants. This is because NAAQS are health-based standards, designed to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety, including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics. In this case, PDEQ also found it important to consider the short-term and long-term risks from emissions of EtO as a hazardous air pollutant. PDEQ has considered in detail environmental justice issues associated with this permit decision, and offered the public the opportunity to comment on such issues as part of the notice and comment process. As recommended by EPA, PDEQ’s initial EJ analysis dated 09-16-2021 was updated and posted on the PDEQ BD permit processing website dated 01-31-2022. This updated EJ analysis addressed the following to better inform the community and local policymakers regarding the impacts of this project:

**Demographics section:**
The EPA’s screening and demographic evaluation for potential environmental justice concerns focused on the primary populations that are geographically near the area of the facility. As noted in the permit and EJ analysis, the impacts of the project have been demonstrated to be below the applicable national emission standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for ethylene oxide commercial sterilization and fumigation operations. A “Direct Outreach Area” was identified and included direct mail targeted outreach to all residents and businesses located within this area. For the purposes of the EJ analysis, The Direct Outreach Area was selected by starting with the area that encompasses a three-mile radius from the facility. This area was selected to ensure that the outreach efforts, including a direct mail outreach, included all of the residential areas to the north, southwest and southeast of the facility. The three-mile radius was then converted to a square that was outlined utilizing major streets. This allowed for more defined boundaries than the circle radius and expanded the outreach area to include all of Littletown and Vail. The final area selected encompasses approximately 50 square miles and includes a population of 42,325. The Direct Outreach Area includes the area to the north of the proposed project to East Escalante Road, areas to the west to South Alvernon Way, areas east to South Houghton Road, a significant portion of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and to the southern tip of the University of Arizona Technology Park.

**Impact of the Project’s Emissions - Long Term and Short Term Exposure Risks**
Our current understanding of the Human Health and Environmental Risks of EtO include both short term and long term effects. Short-term inhalation exposure to high amounts of EtO can cause headache, dizziness, nausea, fatigue, respiratory irritation (such as coughing, shortness of breath, wheezing) and, in some cases, vomiting and other types of gastrointestinal distress. Long term exposure to EtO for many years
increases the risk of cancers of the white blood cells, including non-Hodgkin lymphoma, myeloma, and lymphocytic leukemia. Studies also show that long-term exposure to EtO increases the risk of breast cancer in women. People who live near facilities that release EtO to the outdoor air may be exposed to EtO, depending on how much EtO is released and how close they live to the facility. The greatest cancer risk is for people who have lived near a facility releasing EtO into the air for their entire lifetime (lifetime defined as 70 years of continuous inhalation exposure).

**BD Facility Emissions Exposure Risks**

To show compliance with environmental regulations, a computer simulation of the movement of EtO emissions through the outdoor air was evaluated for the proposed BD facility at full potential to emit (PTE). Outdoor air concentrations at six residential receptors provided maximum modeled impact risk from ethylene oxide concentrations. It was found that the EtO concentrations do not exceed 100-in-a-million for an individual if that person was exposed to that concentration continuously for a lifetime. The 100-in-a-million risk threshold level referenced is the EPA derived individual risk threshold for determining an acceptable level of risk for annual ethylene oxide exposure (0.02 μg/m³).

**Modeled Residential Risks**

Table 1 of the EJ report presents the annual average maximum predicted modeled impacts at the residential receptor locations. The highest percentage ratio of the safe level was identified at residential receptor location 1 at 19% or 19 in a million (the safe level being 100 in a million).

**Modeled Non-residential Workplaces Risks**

Table 2 of the EJ report presents the maximum predicted modeled annual concentrations of ethylene oxide at the property boundary. The percentage of the safe level, 72% or 72 in a million (the safe level being 100 in a million). This scenario is based on an offsite worker as described by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR 2016), which assumes an 8.5-hour workday, 250 days a year, for 25 years.

In addition to the conditions in the facility’s air quality permit to document the facilities EtO emissions, the facility is also subject to the reporting requirements contained in the following federal rules relating to emergency planning, and accidental releases of hazardous pollutants. Please note, the requirements below contain criteria regarding quantities of EtO stored or released that trigger the applicability of such planning and reporting rules.

- Emergency planning notification under EPCRA section 302 (40 CFR Part 355); *The threshold EtO planning quantity for this rule is 1000 lb.*
- Emergency release notification under EPCRA section 304 (40 CFR Part 355); *The threshold EtO reporting quantity for this rule is 10 lb.*
- Toxic chemical release reporting under EPCRA section 313 (40 CFR Part 372);
- Hazardous substances release notification under CERCLA sections 102-103 (40 CFR Part 302); *The threshold EtO reporting quantity for this rule is 10 lb.*
- Accidental release prevention requirements under CAA 112(r) (40 CFR Part 68); *The threshold EtO quantity for this rule is 10,000 lb.*
The reporting, planning, hazmat response, and communication activities associated with these rules, while outside the scope of the air quality permit, are vested in the facility, EPA, and/or Pima County’s Local Emergency Planning Committee LEPC. For more information on Pima County’s LEPC, please see the following website: https://webcms.pima.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=49312

3. Comment:
Several commenters made statements to indicate PDEQ to not grant the permit to BD and why would PDEQ allow a known carcinogen to be emitted into the atmosphere.

Response:
EtO is a frequently used chemical in a variety of applications. In the U.S., EtO is primarily used to make other chemicals that are used to make a range of products, including antifreeze, textiles, plastics, detergents, and adhesives. It is also used to sterilize devices that can’t be sterilized using steam or radiation, such as some medical and dental equipment. According to the Food and Drug Administration, approximately 50% of sterile medical devices are treated with EtO – about 20 billion each year. EtO is also used to sterilize some food products such as spices, certain dried herbs, dried vegetables, sesame seeds and walnuts.

The permit contains the operation of advanced air pollution controls which are installed for the purpose of reducing EtO emissions. The permit goes beyond the current federal rule regulating EtO emissions from commercial sterilizers. The permit also includes enhanced emissions monitoring and emissions reporting. EtO emissions, as documented in the permit are controlled to levels that result in a modeled maximum ambient concentration that is well within the acceptable risk range used by US EPA.

PDEQ issues air quality permits in accordance with Title 17 of the Pima County Code (PCC). This title is adopted pursuant to the authority granted by Title 49, Chapter 3, Article 1, Section 49-401, et seq., Arizona Revised Statues. Air Quality permits issued by PDEQ do not and are not required to address non-emissions related issues such as its location. Such issues are beyond the scope of the Pima County Code that prescribes PDEQ’s duties and authorities.

Permits for the construction or operation of emissions units or control equipment may be acquired under Pima County Code upon a showing that there is no violation of the Clean Air Act or applicable regulations. Except for some requirements that are developed on a health-based standard (e.g., National Ambient Air Quality Standards), this legal standard for permit issuance may not appear to directly account for risks posed to human health from a particular activity or exposure to a particular pollutant. This does not mean that the permitting process ignores these risks, only that they are accounted for, indirectly, through an evaluation of the rules and regulations that a stationary source must meet when constructing and operating new emissions units or control devices.

As of the date of issuance of the permit, the emission limits contained in the permit demonstrate adequate protection of the public health in accordance with findings published in EPA’s IRIS database and modeling submitted with the application on file with the Control Officer. The limits in the permit exceed current Federal Clean Air Act requirements for commercial sterilization facilities contained in NESHAP Subpart O.
4. **Comment:**
One commenter made statements to indicate that there should be mandatory continuous public monitoring of atmospheric concentrations along the entire fence line of the plant, with audible alarms in the case of an exceedance, both onsite and at the appropriate designated public safety monitoring facilities.

**Response:**
PDEQ supports EPA’s position on the feasibility of monitoring of Ethylene Oxide Emissions in ambient air. ‘In this circumstance, we do not believe ambient air monitoring is the best way to ensure the facility is held accountable for potential excess emissions. With ambient monitoring, it can be difficult to distinguish between pollution from the facility and pollution from other sources. When we know which pollutants are emitted from a particular source, we can use modeling to determine the impacts on the nearby community. For this reason, the use of continuous emissions monitoring systems (CEMS), which instead measure emissions at the source, is preferred.’

The permit will not be revised to require ambient monitoring; no air quality permit issued in Pima County currently requires such monitoring. Ambient monitoring can be a useful tool to evaluate ambient impacts in a community, but such data cannot be used to correlate compliance with the emissions limits in the BD permit.

Regarding potential unexpected emissions releases, the site will employ several levels of controls to minimize and mitigate the potential uncontrolled release of ETO from the process equipment. The process equipment is designed to monitor and control critical process parameters, including but not limited to; temperature, pressure, injection rate, vacuum rate, EtO concentration, and various phase specific parameters and set points. The sterilization cycle is carried out at pressures below atmospheric reducing the possibility of a large leak during the sterilization cycle. The vaporizer and process piping will be purged with nitrogen after the gas injection phase reducing the risk of ETO release for subsequent phases of the cycle. Additionally, there are gas detection systems installed in the processing areas which are interlocked with the process equipment. Any deviation from normal process parameters, loss of utilities, or activation of the gas detection system alarms, will cause the process to stop (in safe mode) until the issue is corrected and it is safe to resume operations.

A robust preventive maintenance program will be developed in alignment with manufacturer’s recommendations as well as Recommended and Generally Accepted Good Engineering Practice. This includes, but is not limited to, leak check of the drum manifold and associated equipment, leak check of the sterilizer prior to use of EtO, routine leak test of the entire sterilization process equipment, calibration of sensors, gas detectors, and critical process control equipment, safety interlock verification, and annual requalification of the sterilization process and associated utilities.

BD will implement a strict ETO drum inspection program which will ensure no leaking drums are received on site or used in the process. BD will also implement a robust Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR) program in accordance with EPA guidance, inclusive of all ETO processing equipment, including safety (emergency) relief valves.
BD will establish and train an on-site HAZMAT Team to enable timely response to emergencies and will develop a comprehensive emergency response plan and coordinate with local emergency response agencies.

5. **Comment:**
A number of commenters raise concerns on the fugitive emissions at the facility.

**Response:**
The primary controls and design of the facility have been engineered to collect and capture fugitive emissions from the facility. The estimated reduction of the fugitive emissions from operations exceeds federal standards.

Potential fugitive emissions are expected from the gas room areas, sterilization areas, and as a result of the storage of the sterilized products. As part of the application, BD will use Advanced Air Technology® dry bed chemisorption control systems to control the fugitive EO from designated work areas and to effectively collect and limit these emissions.

As part of a required Operation and Maintenance (O & M) plan, the facility is required to provide a report demonstrating collection within a total enclosure to include the parametric monitoring of the negative air conditions and door openings using the data collected by the building management system. Also, to be incorporated into the operation and maintenance plan is the requirement to document leaks from a LDAR (Leak Detection and Repair) program and any emergency room ventilations which will be accounted in facility cap below.

6. **Comment:**
A number of commenters raise concerns on the location of the facility and called upon the facility to be built further away from populated areas of Pima County.

**Response:**
Pursuant to Title 17 of the Pima County Code, the decision to locate a facility in a location in Pima County, is not within the purpose, discretion, or authority of the Control Officer.

As explained in our response to Comment 3, the Control Officer believes that the installation and operation of the facility at the current location, will be able to achieve or remain below the current applicable health based standards to safeguard the public health.

7. **Comment:**
A number of commenters raise concerns on the history of Becton Dickenson and Co compliance record in Covington GA.

**Response:**
PDEQ cannot comment on the basis of the history on Becton Dickenson and Co compliance record in Covington GA. Based on the Tucson permit information, however, the Tucson plant will have state-of-the-art air emission controls for both process emissions and fugitive emissions that will result in total emissions that are
below health risk standards for issuing an air permit. Additional information from BD indicates:

The facility design has been reviewed by two independent expert organizations (FM and Inotek) to ensure the safety of the facility. A thorough hazard analysis of the process and equipment has been completed using Hazard and Operability (HAZOP) methodology. This plant will be fitted with fugitive emissions control systems to capture and control potential fugitive emissions from process equipment and the post sterile warehouse, eliminating the potential for uncontrolled emissions from the site.

Additionally, BD is one of only 12 companies selected by the U.S. Food and Administration (FDA) Innovation Challenge on EtO. BD’s activities include: projects that focus on cycle optimization to reduce the amount of EtO used during each sterilization cycle, EtO residual reduction, evaluation of new and emerging alternate sterilization methods and evaluation and implementation of new emission control technologies. BD’s implementation of cycle optimization and new control technologies will reduce fugitive emissions by more than 95%.

8. Comment:
A commenter raises a concern on the EtO gas ‘how far out does the gas or hard particles go before it becomes safe under normal standards? Does this gas or particles fall down to the ground and is absorbed via plants into the ground and ultimately our water supply?’

Response:
The EPA’s current understanding on the human health and environmental risks of EtO is summarized on this webpage: https://www.epa.gov/hazardous-air-pollutants-ethylene-oxide/our-current-understanding-human-health-and-environmental.

With regard to ecological risks, EPA provides the following information:

- Land animals that live near facilities that release EtO to the outdoor air may be exposed to and affected by EtO. However, EtO has not been reported to bioaccumulate (increase over time) in organisms that live on land or in water.
- EtO dissolves in water, and it can move from water to the air. There is currently limited evidence that EtO is commonly found in water. Any release of EtO into water appears to be mostly from industrial sources.
- There is insufficient information on the movement of EtO in soil. There is also a lack of information on what happens to EtO in sediment. Because of its physical and chemical properties, EtO is not expected to be readily absorbed by sediment or soil.
B. Public Comments Opposing the Permit

First Name: Aidan
Last Name: Slosser
Comment: NO, Becton, Dickinson & Company should not be given an air quality permit allowing them to pollute Tucson's air willy nilly. With the effects of climate change and air pollution, there is absolutely no reason why we should pollute and harm our planet even more. According to the World Health Organization, 10 million people die each year from air pollution, and 9 in 10 people breathe hazardous air.

First Name: Carol
Last Name: Brown
Dear Pima County Environmental Quality
If at all possible, please to do not approve this permit without some mitigation measures. The toxic substance that BD proposes to emit will add to the Tucson air pollution soup. Individually, each emission may be okay, but together the total makes for bad breathing. I am an asthmatic who is highly sensitive. However, my reactive lungs may merely act as the ‘canary in the mine’ as every Tucson resident breathes this air and is affected.
Thanks for your consideration,

First Name: Jessica
Last Name: Sampson
Dear Rupesh Patel, I want to add my voice to the public outcry over the use of the highly carcinogenic gas, ethylene oxide,
As a sterilizer for medical devices.
Stop the use of ethylene oxide!

First Name: Wanda
Last Name: Bruhns
Comment: Dear Ms. Shepp, In accordance with DEQ’s public records policy, I am requesting copies of the administrative record for the Becton, Dickinson and Company Air Permit, specifically public comments received on this project through September 30, 2021. I look forward to receiving the requested information by October 4, 2021. This request is NOT for commercial use. Thank you.

First Name: Cheryl
Last Name: Virden
I have lived in Rita Ranch for 22 years and I have concerns about this air quality permit issuance. I already live very close to Air Liquide and on occasion early in the morning I can smell a sickly sweet maple syrup smell. I don’t want to smell more chemicals from a toxic gas and a highly flammable one at that. The information Pima County Air Quality sent out doesn’t tell where this plant will be located. My first question is: where will Becton, Dickinson and Company be producing or working with this gas? Next questions: what is the company’s safety record for similar endeavors? Why should we trust our health and safety to this company? I would appreciate a response from you shortly. This virtual open house will not in all likelihood, provide me with the opportunity to ask these questions. Thank you for your help,

First Name: Jessica
Last Name: Sampson
Comment: Why would Tucson want to have a known carcinogen emitted? What happened in Spain last year?
First Name  Stephen  
Last Name  Brittle  
Comment  Why can't a phone number be provided to call in? Never seen that in 30 years of AZ air permit meetings.

First Name  Vanessa  
Last Name  Gallego  
Comment  I am a resident of Pima County District 5, I work and do community engagement in District 2. I recently received my EPA 608 Certification to remove and keep refrigerants from appliances and keep them from entering the air. I am a small business owner who recycles appliances and makes sure they do not end up in the landfill. 35 years in business. As someone who advocates cycling and outdoor activities for people of color on the southside of Tucson, I am here to speak against the air permit for Becton Dickson and Co. The southside is oversaturated with industry and with emissions, and we do not need another cancer causing element Ethylene oxide to the southside. We already have seen industries come in and promise safe conditions and in this time of climate resiliency we need action and that is denying this permit for the residents, stakeholders and our future.

First Name  T. Stephen  
Last Name  Cody  
Comment  I strongly suggest that you change your policy of disabling the Q/A and chat functions on the Cisco WebEx platform for remote open house meetings because someone at PDEQ is afraid they'll receive an inappropriate comment. IMHO your fear that one of your professionals might get their feelings hurt is not sufficient grounds for removing the ability of the public to ask questions or provide comments without disturbing the main audio of the presentation. On at least three different occasions during the recent open house, an attendee asked a question or made a comment that none of the panelists was able to answer, but I knew the answer and could have submitted the answer immediately via chat without disturbing the flow of the meeting. Instead, I had to raise my hand and wait to be recognized and unmuted by the chair in order to provide the information. Because there were so few participants, nobody else had their hands raised and I was able to respond in a timely manner. I suspect that will not be the case in the future. Also, if a question is raised that none of the panelists can answer, the chair should open the floor to ask if anyone else on the call can provide the requested information.

First Name  Jessica  
Last Name  Sampson  
Comment  Hi, Natalie, I could not get into the online mtg. about the Air Permit for the Sterilization Plant. I tried for an hour and I did start 15 minutes before the scheduled mtg. time. I heard that there were others who did not get in, also. I have 2 questions for you. 1.) Who gives Becton, Dickinson & Co. a permit? 2.) Who actually ran the mtg. Thurs. evening? Thank you.

First Name  Thomas Stephen  
Last Name  Cody  
Comment  1. No amount of Ethylene Oxide (EtO) air pollution is safe. “Over a lifetime, an annual average of just .0002 micrograms per cubic meter of air — an infinitesimal amount — is associated with a one-in-a-million risk of getting cancer, according to the EPA’s 2016 calculations. That one-in-a-million standard was set by a 1990 amendment to the Clean Air Act.”2 “In 2008 the EPA increased the “upper limit of acceptability” to a risk level of 100 cancers in a million people: That’s 100 cancers in addition to the cancer risk without the contamination. Using that less protective number, the safety threshold for ethylene oxide is .02 micrograms per cubic meter of air.”2 In the public notice, Becton Dickinson states that “the impact from the proposed project will remain approximately 5 times below the safe ambient air concentration level of 2.0 x 10-2 μg/m3 prescribed by the EPA”6 In the last table of the last page of the permit application, Appendix C Information Modeling Results, BD states that its measurements of
ambient pollution at nearby residential areas is as high as .0038 μg/m³, which is indeed a ratio of .19 (which is actually 5.26 times lower than the current EPA limit). What BD fails to mention is that this planned level of lethal pollution of nearby Pima County residents is 19 times higher than the original EPA limits set in 1990 - limits that were increased in 2008 to allow 100 times as many deaths, as a political gift from the George W. Bush administration to the worst polluters. 2. There are safe alternatives to Ethylene Oxide for the sterilization of medical equipment. The American Medical Association’s ARHMM Webinar states that EtO penetrates through multiple levels of packaging. If a contaminated item is metal, autoclave and steam are usually used for sterilization. EtO can be used for everything else, especially for materials that are sensitive to temperature and pressure. EtO is often preferred because it can be used for all types of materials, but there are alternatives for every material. The FDA states that dry heat, radiation, hydrogen peroxide, ozone and flexible bag systems are established alternatives. Hydrogen peroxide vapor or plasma, peracetic acid, gamma radiation, E-beam, nitrogen dioxide, chlorine dioxide are at various stages of implementation and development for eventual use at commercial scale. There is no technical reason that EtO cannot immediately be eliminated as a sterilizing agent for medical equipment. That would require sorting, like we already do as a society for recyclable materials. 3. The EPA cannot be trusted to safeguard public health. a. “you can’t trust the EPA. You have to put pressure on the EPA and put pressure on the government because the regulatory agencies are confronted with multibillion-dollar propaganda — misinformation budgets from industry. They’re outgunned, even when the EPA is not actively corrupt as it was under Trump.”1 “The EPA’s Office of Air and Radiation was a textbook example of regulatory capture. The office, which oversees much of the oversight related to ethylene oxide, was first headed by Bill Wehrum, a corporate lawyer, who spent the bulk of his career fighting air pollution regulations. Among Wehrum’s former clients was the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, a trade group to which Huntsman Chemical, among other ethylene oxide producers, belongs. In 2019, Wehrum was replaced by Anne Idsal Austin, a Texan with close ties to the oil and gas industry who left the EPA through the revolving door to join legal and lobbying firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman.”2 b. The EPA took 35 years to establish the current EtO risk levels, multiplied the allowable risk by 100 for political reasons to benefit polluters like BD, and then failed to notify most polluted communities after EPA’s own research established that their pollution levels exceeded even the new, more relaxed standards - especially if those communities were low-income. “At a toxicology conference in Galveston, TX, in 1981, Marvin Legator, PhD, briefed the audience on emerging cancer risks from chemicals. “The biggest problem chemical we have right now is ethylene oxide,” he said.”8 In 2016 the EPA determined that “Ethylene oxide was far more dangerous than the scientists had understood before. The agency moved it from a list of chemicals that probably could cause cancer to a list of those that definitely caused cancer. The EPA also updated a key risk number for the chemical to reflect that it was 30 times more likely to cause certain cancers than scientists had once known.”8 (Sixty times more likely for children). “Two years later, in 2018, the agency used that new risk value for a periodic report that assesses health risks from releases of airborne toxins in the U.S. That report, called the National Air Toxics Assessment, or NATA, flagged 109 census tracts across the country where cancer risks were higher because of exposure to airborne toxins. Most of the risks were driven by just one chemical: ethylene oxide...“EPA is not issuing a press release,” wrote Larry Lincoln, director of the EPA’s office of external affairs for Region 4, which covers the Southeastern U.S., in an email message to state officials.”8 The “EPA inspector general released a report saying that only nine out of the 25 communities that they labeled a high priority because of their exposure to so many chemicals, only nine out of 25 of them were notified at all.1 “But a year later, the agency still hasn’t reached out to the remaining communities. The more than 150,000 people living within 2 miles of the other 16 plants have heard no official word of warning from the EPA...more than two years after the data was released, the vast majority of the people living in these toxic hot spots have not received any help from the EPA, either alerting them to the deadly problem or addressing it. And many remain unaware of the risk they face...Instead of heeding the inspector general’s advice and holding meetings in the predominantly low-income communities that were affected, the Trump EPA doubled down on its refusal to do so.”2 c. “The Environmental Protection Agency under the Trump administration invited companies to retroactively amend emissions records.”1
“270,000 pounds of the chemical ethylene oxide vanished from the public record right after the EPA determined that it was more toxic than previously known... We started looking over the TRI reports for all the big emitters of ethylene oxide. And it turns out that 12 of the facilities had retroactively revised their reports downward — in many cases, by a whole lot... All told, seven companies retroactively revised their TRI reports of ethylene oxide emissions for 12 facilities since 2018, when news broke about the additional dangers posed by the chemical. Among the companies that changed their reported ethylene oxide emissions in the EPA database is medical device manufacturer Becton Dickinson, which resubmitted its reports to the TRI for its sterilizing plants in both Covington and Madison, Georgia. Shockingly, at least some of these companies appear to have changed their records because the Trump EPA asked them to.”

“Although it was designed to provide transparency, the TRI is notoriously opaque. By law, polluting facilities are required to use “the best readily available data” but are allowed to estimate if real measurements aren’t “readily available.” The calculation process is confusing even to some industry insiders. “They use air pollution estimates, which are sometimes based on their own tests. In other cases, it’s unclear what they’re based on,” said Keri Powell, the attorney who specializes in air permits. “Even the government can’t get the underlying bases for these estimates unless they pay a huge fee to the industry group that created them.” Meanwhile, the resulting estimates are imprecise at best, according to Todd Cloud, the former air pollution consultant for industry. “Estimate is too kind a word,” said Cloud. “Some of those numbers we use, we call them WAGS. That’s short for wild-ass guesses.” It can be particularly difficult to get an accurate accounting of a chemical that’s dangerous at very low levels, as ethylene oxide is, he said. Even at its most sensitive, equipment can’t detect the gas below a certain level. The EPA doesn’t have the staff to verify the accuracy of each of the TRI reports that are prepared and submitted by industry. The agency now requires reporting for 770 chemicals, including ethylene oxide. And although the EPA can fine companies over TRI violations, it rarely does. While more than 21,000 facilities filed TRI reports in 2020, the EPA filed only five enforcement actions over TRI violations last year.”

With the revisions, those corporations eliminated their legal accountability for the pollution that magically disappeared, but the people who died because those corporations emitted a lethal gas - to increase profits - are still dead, and their families still mourn. 4. BD cannot be trusted to safeguard public health.

In October 2019, BD leaked 54 pounds of EtO in Covington, GA and didn’t report it. “The Becton, Dickinson (BD) medical sterilization facility in Covington…agreed to a temporary shutdown from October 30 to November 6. The plant reported leaking 54 pounds of ethylene oxide in September. State officials said the plant failed to properly disclose the leak.”

“The Becton, Dickinson (BD) medical sterilization facility in Covington...agreed to a temporary shutdown from October 30 to November 6. The plant reported leaking 54 pounds of ethylene oxide in September. State officials said the plant failed to properly disclose the leak.”

Among several provisions, the Order temporarily closes BD’s Covington facility for air testing, imposes fugitive emissions caps, requires mandatory reports, and imposes deadlines for installation of enhanced pollution controls at BD’s medical sterilization facilities in Covington and Madison.”

Two months later, BD was fined for off-gassing EtO pollution from their nearby warehouse, without an air quality permit. “Based on a Dec. 15 report that BD submitted to the state, which revealed 0.65 lbs. per hour in “fugitive” EtO emissions at the warehouse, the state calculated that the facility could emit 5,600 lbs. per year of the gas. Any facility that has emitted or may emit more than 4,000 lbs. per year of EtO must apply for a state permit to do so.”

BD argues that EtO levels in the larger Atlanta community are similar to those nearer their plant, but fails to mention that EtO stays in the atmosphere for 4-7 months, depending on the season’s average temperatures, offering plenty of time for their lethal gas to disperse community-wide. “...modeling done by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources in 2019 showed elevated cancer risk extends for miles beyond...a sterilizing plant in Covington, owned by Becton Dickinson. That revelation led to a drop in real estate prices in those areas and a wave of lawsuits.”

There is unacceptable nuisance, hazard and risk from transporting 225 tons of EtO and unspecified tons of medical equipment that is either contaminated with lethal organisms or off-gassing a lethal carcinogen. BD does not address the necessary emergency response plan development, training, staffing or supplies. BD must be contractually held liable to the greatest extent possible for the remediation that would be required in the case of explosion, contamination or other catastrophic injury to public health, whether accidental or intentional. a. Kolb Rd. is the only North-South route into Tucson for five miles in either direction for the thousands of residents who live South of the proposed site. Houghton Rd. to the East has been under
construction for several months, and will continue for months to be single-lane in both directions for
miles. The only route into Tucson East of Houghton is a single-lane country road four miles further East.
Any disruption of traffic on Kolb Rd. has high impact. What was once a single traffic light at Valencia
and Kolb Roads is now seven traffic lights between the proposed site and the I-10 interchange.
Transporting 225 tons of EtO and an unknown tonnage of lethal contaminated or off-gassing medical
equipment will cause an unacceptable worsening of traffic delays along that major route into town, and
uncompensated additional financial costs and wasted travel time in constant traffic delays and in detours
for maintenance and repair from the wear and tear on the road due to all of those additional transports. b.
Any vehicle transporting hundreds or thousands of pounds of carcinogenic and highly flammable EtO is a
mobile bomb, and as such is a terrorist target. So is onsite EtO storage. Unless stringent security measures
are in place, either can be detonated by a single individual, with disastrous consequences. Accidental
release of EtO during transport must also be mitigated. These security risks have not been addressed in
the proposal. c. Tons of medical supplies contaminated with Covid, MRSA or other lethal organisms will
be transported up Kolb Rd, and exposure to the surrounding residential and commercial areas, either by
accident or act or terrorism, must be mitigated. Once sterilized, these supplies will be transported down
Kolb Road and will continue to off-gas EtO for months, and therefore are additional fugitive sources of
pollution that must also be mitigated. In summary: No amount of Ethylene Oxide (EtO) air pollution is
safe5. There are safe alternatives to Ethylene Oxide for the sterilization of medical equipment. The EPA
cannot be trusted to safeguard public health. BD cannot be trusted to safeguard public health. In my
opinion, EtO is too dangerous to sterilize medical equipment, and no new EtO sterilization plants should
ever be built again. If for some reason one were to be built, it should never be located anywhere near a
residential area. If a plant is ever built in a residential area, there should be mandatory continuous public
monitoring of atmospheric concentrations along the entire fence line of the plant, with audible alarms in
the case of an exceedance, both onsite and at the appropriate designated public safety monitoring
facilities. I ask all residents of Pima County, AZ to urge the Pima County Board of Supervisors to
prevent construction of the proposed BD EtO plant in any residential area in Pima County. ----- EtO
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First Name  Rachael
Last Name  Richards
Comment  This facility should be built a lot further away from the general public. I’d like to know if our opinion will help you make a better decision and move the facility.

First Name  Damon
Last Name  Sage
Comment  Please consider denying the permit for BD to operate a plant the sends ethylene oxide into Tucson's air. If we want to live and grow in a healthy community, we cannot compromise our environment for a few additional jobs. There are better ways to increase employment in Tucson without placing the health of Tucson's residents at risk. Permitting this plant would be the epitome of short sighted planning. I have two daughters, age 11 and 8, and moved to Tucson because of its community and thoughtful planning for the future. Please don't ruin that with allowing a company to come in and spew carcinogenic pollution all over town.
Thanks for your time.

First Name  Esther
Last Name  Graves
Comment  We CANNOT believe that Pima County is actually considering allowing the construction that would emit trace amounts of a cancerous gas.
We live at Voyager Resort where there are thousands of older senior citizens that are prone to health problems.
We are vehemently apposed to this permit! Please search your conscience and don't put your community in this type of danger.
Signed, Two very concerned senior citizens!

First Name  Gail
Last Name  Kamaras
Comment  I’m a former environmental agency attorney who worked on regulations and permitting issues for many years. With regard to the cancerous emissions from this company with a less than stellar track record, my recommendation is to increase the frequency of testing and to require that the testing be done by either the county or by a testing agency paid by BD but chosen and controlled by the county. Accurate and frequent testing that is trusted by the public is the best way to protect public health.

First Name  Kathleen
Last Name  Brennanglynn
Comment  The negatives, which are many, far outweigh the minimal positives, of granting BD an air quality permit in Pima County. The deleterious effects of EtO are indisputable. WHY would lovely Pima County even consider granting this permit? Please do not.
Respectfully,
First Name  Lola  
Last Name  Wasinge  
Comment  No no no. 3 miles from my house in The Cove! No no no. Do not place revenue over public health! I am terrified and I vote.

First Name  Mark  
Last Name  Glinker  
Comment  It is profoundly reckless and shortsighted to ok a corporate project that is admitting in advance that cancer causing emissions will be released. Becton's independent consultant acknowledges the cancer risk in dozens per million and these so called benevolent corporate citizens, ironically providers to the medical industry, will gladly allow these "fugitive" emissions to drift over to the nearby military base, putting our nation's finest, in harms way. Not to mention the additional 120,000 residents in the five mile radius that will be inhaling this colorless, toxic, gunk. Regarding the draft permit limiting EtO release to no more than 709 pounds a year, BD spokesman Troy Kirkpatrick states, "the facility will likely emit less than that." "Likely" is not good enough when you are dealing with carcinogens and human life. The stated number should be an absolute cap, not a metric subject to wiggle room. For twenty months the citizens of this community have been forced to mask up, stand 6 feet apart from one another and many were forced to get vaccinated or lose their jobs. Add in the weeks long curfews and we all (albeit grudgingly,) did our part in the name of public health. To knowingly condone a polluter of this magnitude in the geographic center of the metroplex demonstrates utter disregard for those that presently live and work here.

First Name  Stephen  
Last Name  Kraynak  
Comment  I write as a Pima County resident who lives within five miles of the proposed Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) facility at 7345 V. Valencia Road. I am opposed to this BD facility being located this close to populated areas of Pima County due to the carcinogenic nature of its chemical solvents used and proximity to low flying aircraft from neighboring Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. The Pima County Department of Environmental Quality should deny issuing an air quality permit to the proposed Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) facility at 7345 V. Valencia Road. There are plenty of other possible sites much further away from populated areas of Pima County. Thank you,

First Name  Stephen  
Last Name  Terry  
Comment  Hi...I'd like to submit input for the Public Hearing on the Permitting process for the above listed party. Thanks for your time in reading and considering. I'm a Property Manager/Realtor in the area and live North and East of the proposed location. I would like to let you know that my Family is not in favor of granting the Permit. Though the economic boost from the plant would be great, the potential impact from even the very small amount of EtO gas emitted is not worth the risk. If that small amount were to lead to a cancer risk, properties in that area would be decimated and Residents could face terrible health risks. In addition to this, it's close proximity to DM AFB puts our troops at the same risk, along with the explosive nature of the plant being an issue. Lastly, with the data and lawsuits ongoing with BD in Georgia still playing out, Pima County would be good to be cautious and sit and wait to see what comes of that prior to allowing BD a Permit here. Thanks again! Best Regards,

First Name  Tammie  
Last Name  Graves  
Comment  To WHom It May Concern: We CANNOT believe that Pima County is actually considering allowing the construction of a plant that would emit trace amounts of a cancerous gas. We live at Voyager Resort where there are thousands of older senior citizens that are prone to health problems. We are vehemently opposed to this permit! Please search your conscience and don't put your
community in this type of danger. Where do you live - would you like this dangerous plant within a 5-mile radius to your home? Signed, Two very concerned senior citizens!

First Name: Elizabeth
Last Name: Falcon
Comment: Dear Ursula Nelson and to anyone else whom it may concern, Tucson has enough to deal with with the PFAS contaminating our water. Now, Becton, Dickinson and Company wants to pollute our air with cancerous gas. How much toxicity are we going to allow before people can't live here anymore? Please deny this permit. Pima County is an amazing place to live. Don't let this outside company wreck our home, or put our community, especially the neighbors of this proposed project, our service members at Davis Monthan, at risk. There are better ways to bring jobs to Tucson than this. Thank you for your consideration of this critical concern.

First Name: Joyce
Last Name: Billotte
Comment: Please do NOT approve the new BD plant! Tucson is full of human beings, including many children (who have no voice in this process). No human being wants to be subjected to chemicals that cause cancer, especially with the bad past record of BD! Thank you,

First Name: Mark
Last Name: Harkness
Comment: Pima DEQ, Unfortunately, I am not able to attend the WebEx public hearing regarding the proposed air quality permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company. I strongly oppose approval of the permit, and that is why I write to you today. I find it disheartening that this is another example of an industrial project with toxic waste that is proposed to be sited where the impacted households are disproportionately low income and minority. Despite promises of "low" emission rates, the health risk is unacceptable. If it really were safe and only bringing plentiful, good-paying jobs, then residents in the wealthy parts of the Tucson area would be competing to have it sited near them. That isn't happening, because we all know better. This is another project that harms or puts at risk the most vulnerable members of the community. That's shameful, and we need to better.

First Name: Sarah
Last Name: Hammond
Comment: Isn’t it bad enough that we have deadly chemicals leaching into our water – PFAS and more? Something that we will have to deal with for decades more to come …Why in the world would we even consider allowing an out-of-town firm to come in and spew cancer-causing chemicals into our air? Just Say No to Becton, Dickinson and Company!

First Name: Shannon
Last Name: Russell
Comments: Sent to Supervisor Sharon Bronson: Sharon, I am very concerned regarding the proposed issuance of an air quality permit to Becton, Dickinson and Co. This is a company that does not abide by the law. Please see this website https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/prog.php?parent=becton-dickinson. If you have difficulty finding the page please go to violation tracker and type in parent company of Becton Dickinson. You will find they have violations of over $156 million. There are numerous offenses of safety, healthcare, false claims, fraud, etc. This is a company that will end up poisoning the Valencia families. I plead with you to vote no. Thank you for your time,
To whom it may concern: As a home owner in Rita Ranch I’m appalled that the County EPA is considering putting a company with a track record of inability to control the release of carcinogenic material near our living areas. We utilize the bike paths, drive through the area, and live and work here. We raise families here. The idea of allowing these types of businesses to continue building potentially harmful factories near us has a feeling that someone is out of touch with its residents. The phrase “good for thee but not for me” comes to mind. I say “NO” to permitting companies to continue to pollute Rita ranch with their facilities. William Martin, Resident of Pima County in the Southeast

Hello, As a citizen of Tucson for the past seventeen years, I am adamantly opposed to the proposed medical sterilization plant, for environmental and human health reasons, and I want to know why citizens at large were informed of the public outreach process from a news site THE DAY BEFORE the public outreach process, rendering it nearly impossible for citizens to attend. I am completely onboard with economic improvements, but NOT AT THE EXPENSE of the health of Tucson citizens. We are already mired in the chemical fallout of forever chemicals in our wells near DM, we are already fighting to keep our water from being polluted by a proposed mine, and we shouldn't have to fight to keep our air clean.

To whom it may concern, I am concerned about the effects of cancer causing gases released into our community's air. Even though the permit states that only traces amount will be released, the cumulative effect could be dangerous. The health effects of these gases is not only based on the amount of gases released but also considers the duration of exposure. Traces amount in one day may seem to be insignificant but long term exposure over hours, days, years could hurt the people in the community, especially the younger ones. Prolonged exposure could also hurt our flora and fauna. Based on the CDC ethylene oxide can cause headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, breathing difficulty, drowsiness, weakness, exhaustion, eye and skin burns, and reproductive effects. Bringing companies to Pima County may help boost the economy but no economy is beneficial when its residents have to incurred in health expenses related to cancer treatment. Cancer treatments are extremely expensive, requiring patients to pay millions for treatments and surgery. This is a burden our residents cannot take. Please, We the residents of Pima County deserve to live and enjoy good health and air quality. Do not allow companies to pollute our air, especially now that we are recovering from a pandemic and are able to enjoy the great outdoors that our county has to offer. Sincerely,

How could ANY thinking person justify allowing a plant such as Becton, Dickinson & Company a permit that would emit cancer causing EtO into our Tucson air? Even if it was MINIMAL amounts that is unconscionable – and especially what if there were an accident (no matter how minimal that risk) - and a large amount was emitted that could harm a HUGE amount of our population? Even if the County is “not allowed” by Federal law to take into consideration this company’s track record of abuses in Georgia – how can they possible made the statement... “we feel like the surrounding residents and people that work in the businesses in that area will be safe if the company continues to abide by those permit conditions” is the HEIGHT of bureaucratic idiocy. “IF”??? – good grief!! IF a tragedy were to happen – what responsibility will Pima County take? You wouldn’t really expect this company – with a history of problems elsewhere – to take responsibility. YOU ARE PUTTING EVERY TUCSONAN IN
JEOPARDY. If Pima County absolutely MUST have such a dangerous company operating in its vicinity – it should only be allowed in a place FAR, FAR away from the population.

First Name Jan
Last Name Dowling
Comment Dear sir: I am writing to register my opposition to granting an air quality permit to Becton Dickinson Company. My objections are as follows: 1) Too close to Davis Monthan; possible jet crash poses great danger 2) That area has already had water quality issues with toxic PFAS in the wells 3) That area has an already at risk population. This just seems like piling on 4) Job creation/tax base not enough to mitigate potential human harm or environmental issues 5) Company already being sued by Georgia victims of carcinogenic gas leak who now have cancers 6) Does anyone know what effect our extreme summer temperatures will have on this gas? The temperatures in Georgia are very different than ours here. Please do not let jobs or tax revenue influence the decision about this toxic chemical!
Sincerely,

First Name Jonadine
Last Name Randolph
Comment If I had a vote on whether to approve the permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company, I would vote NO on allowing this permit. This seems like a very un-Tucson like thing to do. After reading about this company, I don't feel it would be a good thing for Tucson to host this facility. Based on their past history of lawsuits and gas escaping from other facilities and causing problems I feel we don't need them here. This business is not health or Tucson friendly and should not be built here. It is much too dangerous to gamble with our residents' health. PLEASE STOP THIS FROM HAPPENING. Thank you

First Name Melanie
Last Name Powis
Comment I encourage you to decline this company's request to further pollute our Tucson air. I personally already struggle with all of the pollutants in our air, and I feel that we as a community need to work on decreasing pollutants versus adding more to our Tucson air. I need to use an inhaler and a nebulizer everyday, due to chronic asthma, which I've developed since living here in Tucson from all of the dust, smoke, ozone, and other pollutants in the air. It makes life very challenging to have throat constriction, shortness of breath, dizziness, and chest tightness whenever the air quality is "moderate" or worse. I have to monitor the air quality multiple times per day to determine if it's ok for me to leave the house. I'm still affected by it even if I wear a mask, it's awful. I also become very fatigued from my reactions, and struggle to care for my 5 year old daughter. I truly worry about her playing outside here in Tucson. Our air quality is similar to Phoenix, and sometimes worse. I recently read that 1/9 kids in the Phoenix area has asthma. Pima County needs to do something to improve our air quality here to protect our kids as they grow up. Please ask this company to take it's carcinogenic dirty air business elsewhere, and let's focus on cleaning up our already dirty air. Thank you.

First Name Robert
Last Name Alper
Comment As a resident and homeowner in Pima County I urge you to reject a permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company -- a company with an acknowledged disregard for the Clean Air Act. Leaking any amount of cancerous gasses should be a non-starter for county officials, but given the comments of
Nancy Shepp as reported in an Arizona Public Media article published November 3, 2021, I am more strenuously opposed to the possibility of this company doing business here. Shepp is quoted as saying: "We do know that they have a history in other places and we're well aware of that, but unfortunately for the role of our permit writers and our permit manager, they don't have any ability to make any changes based on what's happened in other states." Shepp goes on to say: "...we feel like the surrounding residents and people that work in the businesses in that area will be safe if the company continues to abide by those permit conditions," Shepp said. Whatever bureaucratic obstacles are in place binding the hands of permit writers and managers are absurd. The company's documented abuses should be a HUGE factor in the decision making process here in Pima County. And it is simply not acceptable to base a decision on how the permit office 'feels' about the outcome should they approve the permit when there is evidence that suggests the company will not "abide" by the permit conditions "if" given the chance, as Shepp states. Source of quote: https://news.azpm.org/p/news-articles/2021/11/3/202752-pima-county-considers-permit-for-company-that-will-emit-trace-amounts-of-cancerous-gas/?fbclid=IwAR1KK-n_niA9qO1RBqtS9Ei2KTwasvAk1wl2tZ9x22JDSKq_4d-ddkdIGQ.

First Name Al
Last Name Wiruth
Comment Mr. Patel,
I may be late in submitting my comments about BD’s request for an air quality permit at 7345 E. Valencia Road – sorry.

I don’t know very much about Ethylene Oxide but my concern is that no one answered my questions how far out does the gas or hard particles go before it becomes safe under normal standards? Does this gas or particles fall down to the ground and is absorbed via plants into the ground and ultimately our water supply? The plant is at the edge of the Air Force base which currently has problems of PFAS seeping into the groundwater. The location is a very busy main thoroughfare for residents on the east side of town to bet to the military base, Raytheon, TIA , a way to get to the I-10 freeway or get to Kolb so they can go to other parts of town. Even though there are no homes for about a mile, what about the two gas stations that are at the corner of Kolb and Valencia. What about the workers health in those businesses? What about the several thousand workers at Amazon Distribution Center. The work within a short distance of the proposed BD facility. There are a lot of questions not yet answered including how to get into and exit the property. I am waiting for the City’s TDOT representative to get off leave to talk to me about that question. Thank you for taking time to read my comments.

First Name Jamie
Last Name Lawhorn
Comment To Whom it May Concern, I want to hear by state that I am fully against having Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) for a new product sterilization facility at 7345 E. Valencia Road. I live near that address (Houghton and Valencia) and I am extremely concerned about the cancerous gas that will be emitted. Regardless of quantity. There is potential for accidents, not to mention the business’ past failures to meet guidelines. My family lives here... my kids. Who is going to say what long term exposure will do. Not to mention property values with this business operating in our community. Please for the sake and safety of our community and kids do not allow permitting for this business. Thank you,

First Name Laura
Last Name Kozlowski
Comment Attn: Ursula Nelson, PDEQ’s director. Dear Ms Nelson, I am writing you regarding the proposed issuance of an air quality permit to Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) for a new product sterilization facility at 7345 E. Valencia Road. I am a Tucson native and longtime resident of Tucson's south east side and I am also a 5 year breast cancer survivor. I certainly understand the need for
companies like this and have benefited from the equipment they clean and I understand these chemicals may be the most efficient way to do it. But I urge you to take into account this company's past performance and the real possibility of accidents occurring and do not approve this permit! This puts residents and businesses at risk that is completely avoidable and unnecessary. Cancer and the suffering it brings is heartbreaking and devastating. This company could utilize the thousands of uninhabited acres available in surrounding areas well away from residents and still be profitable and provide jobs for our community. Please Ms. Nelson, I implore you! Do not grant their permit at the cost of your fellow Tucsonan's health and lives! Thank you for your consideration.

First Name Tara
Last Name Noble
Comment I am very concerned that you are considering a permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company. They have multiple lawsuits currently filed against them for various reasons relating to the carcinogenic gases emitted by their facilities, and now you want to bring this toxic, cancer causing company into our community? Tucson has turned down a number of lucrative businesses recently and this should be added to that list. This facility will bring money and jobs into the economy, but at what cost? Not only will this pollute our air, but it will pollute our water supply as well. The communities of Rita Ranch and Vail have grown to be desirable areas to raise a family and the concern for this cancerous gas emission will change that. So, in approving this will you not only potentially poison our families, but you will ruin a community we have all worked so hard to create. Please reconsider this permit, our community is doing well without it. We would rather have healthy families than more money in our economy.

First Name Jane
Last Name Kenworthy
Comment Please, please do not permit a company that produces cancer causing exhausts to build anywhere in Pima County. There are many homes and businesses in the Kolb/Valencia area. Please stop this from going through and thank you. Jane Kenworthy

First Name Judy
Last Name Sterling
Comment Do not want any business in rita ranch, which would emit any cancer causing gas. This is not acceptable in this community. Rita Ranch homeowner.

First Name Amber
Last Name Romero
Comment I am writing regarding the newest permit asking for a cite to be built next to the amazon facility in which cancerous gas will be used. This is an egregious decision as there are several communities all around this area and the use of cancerous gas in the area presents a huge problem for those living, working and attending school in the area. The communities are growing with families and children. There should be no question as to keeping them safe. The company has lawsuits from GA and pending 200 more complaints regarding the gas. Please consider the health of the Tucson residents and their families over making money. Thank you for your time and consideration.

First Name Barbi
Last Name Reuter
Comment We understand the economic impact bringing a new employer like BD has on our region and also know the importance of corporate stewardship of our environment and precious resources. BD has a well crafted plan for compliance and containment, and we believe this air quality permit should be approved expediently to allow for this important facility to be developed and provide sterilization services for a growing need in the medical device arena.
First Name  D.
Last Name  Carter
Comment  I oppose the siting of the Becton Dickson medical sterilization plant on or near the DMAFB. The carcinogenic risk of Ethylene Oxide has yet to be determined and is still being evaluated by the EPA with a growing understanding that it is not risk free. This area has already been burdened with PFAS released into local drinking water wells by the US AF, and assaulted on a daily basis by deafening training air flights & shows. It is unfair to burden one segment of the population with increased pollution risks while wealthier Foothills residents face no such health threats.

First Name  William
Last Name  Baber
Comment  Living in a different state most of my life I have heard of a lot of problems that come up from different companies. In fact I worked at a factory that leaked some chemicals into the ground that had to be removed by a company that worked with the EPA. The problem with this and other companies that had issues come up is that if a problem happens it is "Sorry" the damage is already done. Sorry doesn't help. So do I want this plant built near me NO

First Name  Christopher
Last Name  Pasquet
Comment  To whom it may concern, As a resident of Tucson for some thirty years, I cannot endorse granting a permit to Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) for releasing any amount of ethylene oxide (EtO, a known carcinogen) into the beautiful air of Tucson and Pima County. The proximity of this proposed facility would cause irreparable damage to Tucson both financially and morally. My reasoning behind this is such: releasing EtO into the air around not only the S Kolb Amazon facility but Davis Monthan Air Force Base would be doing harm to the people who work at both locations. The BD facilities emissions would be damaging the health of Amazon workers who are trying to make an honest living to support themselves, their families and their community. BD would also be damaging the health of those brave citizens who have stepped up to serve their country by joining the U.S. Air Force and their families. These brave souls are from all across this great country, is this how we as a community want to thank them for their service and sacrifice? "Join the Air Force, server your country, get cancer!" I can't imagine that the Dept of Defense would keep the base open for much longer once the cancer rates among service members skyrocket. I haven't even mentioned the loss of Raytheon that will come once the employees and contractors their start having to pay for cancer treatment for their spouses and children working and going to school in Tucson. Allowing BD this permit would not only be reprehensible but deplorable and I hope that the honorable council members considering this permit will deny it and act to keep Tucson beautiful, successful and healthy. Thank you for your time, may you and your family enjoy long, cancer free lives.

First Name  Karissa
Last Name  Rosenfield
Comment  To Whom it May Concern:

Allowing Becton, Dickinson and Company, a potentially hazardous company with a concerning history to move into Tucson's heavily growing eastside, full of new families and young children, is a horrendous choice. Please do NOT allow this. I will consider moving my family from this area if this happens. Please do the right thing. That is not an ideal area for a company like that. All the best,

First Name  Cheryl
Last Name  Purvis
Comment  This facility should NOT be permitted, due to numerous health and safety concerns involving Ethylene Oxide (EtO). Not only is EtO carcinogenic, it is also highly flammable. The planned
facility would be located close to the Davis Monthan arrival/departure path, so accidental release could spark a fire, which could become a major conflagration. And EtO will be transported over city streets, also increasing risks of accidental release, increasing cancer risk for those exposed, or causing fires and/explosions. Allowing this facility to be built would be negligent.

First Name David
Last Name Gadzo
Comment Sir/ma’am, I am writing this email to inform you I am STRONGLY opposed to the proposed BP building that would be built on the Valencia/Kolb space, just north of the Amazon warehouse. I am a resident of the La Estancia area, as well as Active Duty USAF. My children go to daycare on base, and I work on the flight line, we’ll within the radius that would be affected should a leak happens. I am not willing to trade off an economic boom in favor of a health risk for myself and especially my family. My children will be playing outside, and 99.95% IS NOT good enough. 100% needs to be prevented from going into our air. The fact that I just now heard about this, where the virtual meeting was already held is despicable. EVERY SINGLE resident should have had a delivered invite via mail within the affected range. If you approve this permit and allow them to start building, I am sure MANY, especially myself will be taking this to court and I will sue the county. Health and Safety should be your #1 priority. Emitting ANY kind of cancerous gasses is unacceptable. V/R

First Name Rose
Last Name Veneklasen
Comment Dear Mr. Patel, On Wednesday, November 3, I attended the public hearing to discuss the air quality permit (referenced above) and would like to submit some additional comments for your consideration. First, I would like to thank you for creating the space for members of the Tucson community to voice their concerns about Becton, Dickinson, and Company’s (BD) plans to open a product sterilization facility near Davis Monthan Air Force base in southeast Tucson. That said, I would like to point out that there was apparently some confusion regarding the times of the public hearing … it was advertised to begin at 5 pm and end at 7 pm. Instead, the event did not start until 5:30 pm and ended short at 6:40ish pm. I’m not sure why there were these last-minute changes, but this could have had an impact on the number of attendees. I would like to reiterate several points that were made at the public hearing, such as concerns for the vulnerable communities that surround the sterilization facility’s proposed location and the long-term effects that the release of ethylene oxide would most surely have on these impacted communities should the air quality permit for BD be approved. Just looking at this company’s track record should be enough of an eye-opener and great cause for concern. While I realize that federal law does not allow PDEQ to take the company’s history outside of AZ into account, the story I’ve copied below from TheCovington News, published on July 22, 2021, sums things up quite well. In addition, I have also copied snippets from other sources and highlighted some sections that I felt were relevant. The State of Georgia’s Attorney General filed a complaint “on behalf of Governor Brian Kemp and the Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (EPD) to temporarily stop Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) from operating its Covington medical device sterilization facility in an unlawful manner. “ They claimed that “from Sept. 15, 2019 through Sept. 22, 2019, BD violated the Georgia air quality rules when it “negligently allowed the release of 54.5 pounds of ethylene oxide into the atmosphere, which upon further investigation has been determined to have been caused by a lack of diligence and prolonged operator error rather than an equipment malfunction.” Another source reported that “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency named EtO a Level 1 carcinogen in 2016. Two years later, the EPA’s National Air Toxics Assessment identified 12 areas of the country with elevated levels of EtO emissions and associated cancer risk, including the areas of Georgia where BD and Sterigenics have EtO plants.” As for BD’s claims that they “would not operate a facility that we didn’t feel it was safe for the community, for our employees or for the people around it,” just last year, KVOA reported “that C.R. Bard, Inc. and its parent company Becton, Dickinson and Company have agreed to pay $1.15 million to Arizona in penalties. The settlement with the Arizona Attorney General’s
Office is part of a $60 million settlement with 48 states and the District of Columbia to resolve allegations that C.R. Bard deceptively marketed its transvaginal surgical mesh devices. The lawsuit filed by the Arizona Attorney General’s Office alleges that C.R. Bard engaged in unfair and deceptive practices promoting its transvaginal surgical mesh devices by misrepresenting or failing to adequately disclose serious and life-altering risks arising from the devices, such as chronic pain, scarring and shrinking of bodily tissue, painful sexual relations, and recurring infections, among other complications. Question yourself on whether you’d be comfortable having this plant in your own backyard. I respectfully implore you to please do everything in your power to reject Becton, Dickinson & Company’s request for an Air Quality Permit. Sincerely,

COVINGTON, Ga. — An Atlanta-based law firm said today it has filed more than 150 lawsuits claiming medical sterilization company BD Bard has released a chemical linked to cancer into the air surrounding its Covington plant since the late 1960s. However, BD Bard officials said in a statement the company “denies all of the allegations in the civil lawsuits and will vigorously defend these allegations in court.” The law firm, Penn Law, said in a news release today, July 22, that all 154 lawsuits involve claims against BD for cancer “caused by the release of ethylene oxide into the air in the Covington community,” the release stated. The plaintiffs are Covington residents or others who lived within a close proximity to BD Bard’s plant for number of years, the release stated. “Some of them actually worked at BD, but the claims focus on the effects of the exposure during their time as residents in the community and not as employees,” the release stated. The suits filed in Gwinnett County State Court in Lawrenceville allege that decades of ethylene oxide (EtO) emissions created a “cancer cluster” among those living or working within a five-mile radius of the Covington plant, stated a release from the firm. It said a report by the EPA, the National Air Toxics Assessment, revealed three areas in Georgia having increased cancer risk from EtO, including one in Covington and two in Cobb County where Sterigenics operates a plant, the release stated. “In the area surrounding BD Bard’s Covington facility, it is estimated that ethylene oxide causes approximately 214 cases for every 1 million people exposed. The EPA deems the pollution risk unacceptable when it surpasses 100 cases for every million people exposed to a chemical.” Disclosures of unreported releases of EtO from the BD plant in Covington and Sterigenics in Smyrna in late 2019 led to public calls for tighter regulations of such facilities. A state law approved in 2020 requires manufacturers using EtO to report any waste spills or gas releases to the Georgia Environmental Protection Division within 24 hours. The division’s director then must post the information on the agency’s website. Attorney Darren Penn of Penn Law said, “We continue to hear from victims who attribute their cancer and other medical diagnoses to ethylene oxide exposure. “We will work tirelessly to ensure the victims of this cancer-causing emission are given a chance to have their story heard and possibly protect others from similar pain and suffering. “This will not be the end of the claims filed against BD Bard,” Penn said. In reply, BD Bard said in a statement, “As part of our commitment to employees and the communities we call home, BD has been continuously employing technology to control ethylene oxide (EtO) emissions effectively at its Covington and Madison plants for more than 20 years.” It stated that, according to ambient air monitoring data collected over the last two years, average concentrations of EtO in air samples in the Covington area “are consistent with typical EtO background levels identified by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) in other parts of Georgia and by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in other parts of the United States.” “Based on extensive air monitoring data collected over the past two years, average concentrations of EtO in ambient air samples in the Covington, Georgia, area are generally lower than the concentrations observed at EPD’s background air monitoring station in south DeKalb (County), as well as in General Coffee State Park in Southeast Georgia, a five-hour drive from Atlanta.” It said Georgia residents can review actual air monitoring data for their community collected by the Georgia EPD on the agency’s website. The company stated the Covington average of 0.28 micrograms per cubic meter of air is the “average of both EPD monitoring data from areas near BD’s sterilization facility and data from a third-party engineering company performing air monitoring around BD’s Global Distribution Center in Covington, as required by EPD.” “The data also show that average EtO concentrations across the greater Atlanta area are about the same in
areas where EtO sterilization facilities operate and areas where they do not,” the company stated. BD and its predecessors have operated the facility for more than half a century, since 1967, in Newton County. It employed a total of about 1,000 at three different locations in northeast Covington in late 2020. Arizona Daily Star article, Nov 1, 2021 https://tucson.com/news/local/pima-county-considering-permit-for-facility-that-will-emit-trace-amount-of-cancerous-gas/article_c3faae2e-3811-11ec-88de-572cf2cb3662.html “You have exposure to the community since 1968, and then in the testing that gets done, clearly, it’s in violation of what’s allowed by law,” Penn said. “There are a number of folks who have been diagnosed with cancer in the community, and it’s a much higher rate of cancer in that community that you will see in any other average or normal population.” The results showed the impacted population is comprised of 49% minority communities, 30% low-income individuals and 10% of people without a high school diploma — some of the demographics PDEQ considers more “at-risk” when receiving necessary access to information. National Cancer Institute https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/causes-prevention/risk/substances/ethylene-oxide What is ethylene oxide?
At room temperature, ethylene oxide is a flammable colorless gas with a sweet odor. It is used primarily to produce other chemicals, including antifreeze. In smaller amounts, ethylene oxide is used as a pesticide and a sterilizing agent. The ability of ethylene oxide to damage DNA makes it an effective sterilizing agent but also accounts for its cancer-causing activity.
How are people exposed to ethylene oxide?
The primary routes of human exposure to ethylene oxide are inhalation and ingestion, which may occur through occupational, consumer, or environmental exposure. Because ethylene oxide is highly explosive and reactive, the equipment used for its processing generally consists of tightly closed and highly automated systems, which decreases the risk of occupational exposure. Despite these precautions, workers and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions. The general population may also be exposed through tobacco smoke and the use of products that have been sterilized with ethylene oxide, such as medical products, cosmetics, and beekeeping equipment.
Which cancers are associated with exposure to ethylene oxide?
Lymphoma and leukemia are the cancers most frequently reported to be associated with occupational exposure to ethylene oxide. Stomach and breast cancers may also be associated with ethylene oxide exposure.
How can exposures be reduced?
How can ethylene oxide harm workers? In addition to eye pain and sore throat, exposure to EtO can cause difficult breathing and blurred vision. Exposure can also cause dizziness, nausea, headache, convulsions, blisters and can result in vomiting and coughing. Both human and animal studies show that EtO is a carcinogen that may cause leukemia and other cancers. EtO is also linked to spontaneous abortion, genetic damage, nerve damage, peripheral paralysis, muscle weakness, as well as impaired thinking and memory. In liquid form, EtO can cause severe skin irritation upon prolonged or confined contact.

First Name Aimee
Last Name Kreklow
Comment Hello,
I’m writing in regards to the proposed construction of the BD facility on Valencia near Kolb road. This should not be allowed to proceed due to the risk of cancer causing emissions. The proposed site is in close proximity to residential areas were families, including those with young children, may be exposed and sustain harm. The BD company is currently facing lawsuits filed in response to increased rates of
cancer in a community which the company operates another similar facility. For the safety of our community, this facility should not be allowed to be constructed in the proposed location. Thank you,

First Name  Bob
Last Name  Lamoreux
Comment  I am in absolute opposition to this proposal for a permit and hope that our city's officials will consider the negative impacts on our community and nearby neighborhoods before they make a decision that could be detrimental to the residents and citizens they are sworn to protect.

First Name  Daniela
Last Name  Figueroa
Comment  Hi, upon further research I would strongly oppose allowing the permit to pass. Regardless of a .5% chance seen as low, it is still a likelihood of spillover and leaking that into the surrounding areas. I do not want this for myself, neighbors and loved ones. We are buying a new home and now this has the potential to impact our lives directly, is alarming that the city would even consider it. Please, I urge you all to listen to the needs and voices of your constituents. My spouse is an Air Force active duty member and looking at how closely the site is to the base, is so detrimental and disrespectful to our soldiers. That entire area is heavily military personnel and their families, we can not send the message that it’s allowable.

First Name  David
Last Name  Gadzo
Comment  I am STRONGLY opposed to the proposed BP building that would be built on the Valencia/Kolb space, just north of the Amazon warehouse. I am a resident of the La Estancia area, as well as Active Duty USAF. My children go to daycare on base, and I work on the flight line, we’ll within the radius that would be affected should a leak happens. I am not willing to trade off an economic boom in favor of a health risk for myself and especially my family. My children will be playing outside, and 99.95% IS NOT good enough. 100% needs to be prevented from going into our air. The fact that I just now heard about this, where the virtual meeting was already held is despicable. EVERY SINGLE resident should have had a delivered invite via mail within the affected range. If you approve this permit and allow them to start building, I am sure MANY, especially myself will be taking this to court and I will sue the county. Health and Safety should be your #1 priority. Emitting ANY kind of cancerous gasses is unacceptable.

First Name  Desiree
Last Name  Jones
Comment  I respectfully object the approval of this permit. My family and I recently relocated from GA to AZ, and purchased a home in La Estancia. I have two small children, 4 and 2 years old. It’s devastating to learn that a new facility will be built within a couple of miles from our home emitting cancerous gas. My children deserve to grow up in a home where they can breathe clean air! Not cancerous air! I also learned there are several civil suits against the BD facility in Covington, GA. They emitted cancerous gas into the air affecting many of the residents. Please do not bring this to our community. For the sake of my children and every child in the community of La Estancia, please deny this permit.

First Name  Lashanton
Last Name  Jones
Comment  I’ve read that the permit committee can’t take into account the things that are happening in other places. e.g. The 150 lawsuits that members of the Covington, Georgia community have filed against this company for emitting cancerous gas. This permit holds a lot of weight and responsibility for both
parties. There is no job in the world that doesn’t take into account a person’s background before allowing a person to start working. Especially if the said person potentially harmed someone. How is this company any different? There is a moral and ethical responsibility to deny this permit for this company. This could effect more people than this company helps.

First Name Mike
Last Name Longoni
Comment I do not want this facility built this close to our neighborhood. It’s too dangerous.

First Name Terese
Last Name Balsa
Comment I would like to formally oppose a permit for this company in our area. The air quality is a huge concern to me and my family. We do not want any cancerous gasses in the area of our home as we have children and ourselves who enjoy being outside especially on the wash trails. We want to breath fresh air and not poisons. Please do not approve this company in our area. It should be out far away from where people live their lives. We have a right to live without fear of breathing and being outside due to this company and their products.

First Name Bernadette
Last Name Martinez
Comment I, Bernadette Martinez a resident of a neighboring community of the proposed location of BD and Company oppose the decision to allow BD and Company Ethylene oxide Sterilization facility to build and operate at a location near residential communities that can and will cause environmental damage to surrounding residents. BD and Company Ethylene Oxide Sterilization Facility is a clear hazard and should not be permitted to operate at the proposed location. Tucsonians have a right to reside in a hazardous cancer free community. Several surrounding communities are at risk.

First Name Jerry
Last Name Juracek
Comment Are residential fire pits regulated? The smoke from our neighbor’s backyard pit is irritating several others in our neighborhood. It appears burns are restricted to three days in a 30 period. Is this true? Are there other regs? Is a permit required? Thanks

First Name Sarah
Last Name Pennington
Comment To Whom It May Concern: It would be a grievous mistake to allow the building of a cancerous gas omitting facility near residential neighborhoods. Our family is highly opposed to the projected building of Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) for a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility located in Tucson, Arizona, near the La Estancia neighborhood development. Cancer.gov states that "The ability of ethylene oxide to damage DNA makes it an effective sterilizing agent but also accounts for its cancer-causing activity" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.). There is absolutely no reason for a facility emitting cancer-causing gases to build within proximity to residential neighborhoods. The CDC states that "Exposure to ethylene oxide may cause headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, breathing difficulty, drowsiness, weakness, exhaustion, eye and skin burns, frostbite, and reproductive effects" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). We are a military family, and our family of five has three children. Our eldest has type one diabetes, celiac disease, and hypothyroidism; our middle child has asthma, and our youngest has blessedly not been diagnosed with any illnesses thus far. As parents, we feel that the development of this plant so close to our home would create new health issues or expound on pre-existing health issues our young children and other neighboring families have to live with day-to-day. Although Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) may take precautions to reduce bodily risk to workers and the community, harm is still a probable
outcome. As the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services says, "Despite these precautions, workers, and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions" (n.d.). To build near residential communities is a careless risk in the name of the almighty dollar, and the business in question should consider a far more remote location. Please consider this as my formal opposition of the B.D. development and I respectfully request the city of Tucson to stand up for the health and welfare of Tucsonian families. Thank you for time and consideration. Very Respectfully, The Pennington Family

References:

First Name: Betty
Last Name: Thom
Comment: In regards to the following company building near my home, I am not in favor of Pima county or city of Tucson permitting the construction of the facility that emits any cancerous fumes. If the plant is as safe as the company states then let them construct it near the owners of the company as we in Tucson do NOT want it here. They have been sued in Georgia and will be sued in Tucson if they continue with construction.

First Name: Clark
Last Name: Eliason
Comment: Please do not give permit to company that would be giving off harsh chemicals into the air.

First Name: Damian
Last Name: Brewer
Comment: I am against this facility and do not want anything in the vicinity that poses any level of health risk. I understand research has been done by the company but that does change my opinion that my family should be able to breathe as clean air as possible without additional add ins from companies that do not care about the well being of my family or my neighbors family.

First Name: David
Last Name: Evenchik
Comment: To Whom It May Concern: It would be a grievous mistake to allow the building of a cancerous gas omitting facility near residential neighborhoods. Our family is highly opposed to the projected building of Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) for a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility located in Tucson, Arizona, near the La Estancia neighborhood development. There is absolutely no reason for a facility emitting cancer-causing gases to build within proximity to residential neighborhoods. Although Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) may take precautions to reduce bodily risk to workers and the community, harm is still a probable outcome. As the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services says, "Despite these precautions, workers, and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions" (n.d.). To build near residential communities is a careless risk in the name of the almighty dollar, and the business in question should consider a far more remote location. Please consider this as my formal opposition of the B.D. development and I respectfully request the Pima County to stand up for the health and welfare of our families. Thank you for time and consideration. Very Respectfully,

First Name: Jennifer
Last Name: Clarke
Comment: I am against Becton, Dixon &Co. Moving into the area. There are too many schools and communities in this area to have that kind of air quality be a concern. The company can move to an area
that is not so close to these things and then if people want to develop on that land they will be advised before they move in. Please don't allow them to come into our communities.

First Name    Julia
Last Name     Martin
Comment       I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Becton, Dickinson Air Quality Permit. It was indicated that residents within a 3 mile radius should have received a postcard notification via mail. No such notice was received by my household prior to the public meetings, but I want to now express my concern. The area surrounding the proposed location is rapidly growing residentially. I am fearful that the proposed air quality permit, if granted, would hinder residential growth and resale in this area.

First Name    Luke
Last Name     Sturdevan
Comment       Please don't build the EO thing Thanks

First Name    Stephen
Last Name     Baker
Comment       This permit would drastically decrease the overall health of the local community around its surrounding buildings. While post cards may have been sent out, I do t believe the city gave home owners a proper venue to voice concerns around this project. Please allow the home owners of the La Estancia and surrounding community an opportunity to counter this permit. Thank you for your consideration.

First Name    Neil
Last Name     Damwyk
Comment       This is outrageous. I just bought my house in what was suppose to be a safe and healthy neighborhood. Now we're hearing that the air is going to be polluted with a gas that could cause cancer?! Absolutely not! Do NOT let this happen! Build that shit somewhere else where there isn't any people! If I would have known this was coming I never moved my kids here! If this thing gets approved I'm putting my house on the market the next day and transferring to a different state that isn't trying to kill off their people!

First Name    Roland
Last Name     Keitt
Comment       To Whom It May Concern: It would be a grievous mistake to allow the building of a cancerous gas omitting facility near residential neighborhoods. Our family is highly opposed to the projected building of Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) for a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility located in Tucson, Arizona, near the La Estancia neighborhood development. Cancer.gov states that "The ability of ethylene oxide to damage DNA makes it an effective sterilizing agent but also accounts for its cancer-causing activity" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.). There is absolutely no reason for a facility emitting cancer-causing gases to build within proximity to residential neighborhoods. The CDC states that "Exposure to ethylene oxide may cause headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, breathing difficulty, drowsiness, weakness, exhaustion, eye and skin burns, frostbite, and reproductive effects" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). We are a military family, and our family of five has three children. Our eldest has type one diabetes, celiac disease, and hypothyroidism; our middle child has asthma, and our youngest has blessedly not been diagnosed with any illnesses thus far. As parents, we feel that the development of this plant so close to our home would create new health issues or expound on pre-existing health issues our young children and other neighboring families have to live with day-to-day. Although Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) may take precautions to reduce bodily risk to workers and the community, harm is still a probable outcome. As the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services says, "Despite these precautions, workers, and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed
to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions" (n.d.). To build near residential communities is a careless risk in the name of the almighty dollar, and the business in question should consider a far more remote location. This facility will decrease our home values and we have mainly military families in this neighborhood. What happens when they are relocated and can't sell their home? Would you want your family/children breathing in poison? When we bought our home we would have never bought near a facility like this. Please do not approve this permit, this facility should be built in a non-residential area, Tucson has already faced the TCE water contamination where many residents got cancer. If anyone here were to fall ill there will be many lawsuits. Our whole neighborhood opposes and has begun to write to numerous political officials.

First Name Renee  
Last Name Cynecki  
Comment This company’s previous history in Georgia has shown that regardless of the claim that emissions are within safe levels, the health of the nearby communities suffered from increased cancer rates. A number of residents of the surrounding neighborhoods have already stated that they will look into options for relocating if this permit goes through. It would be more beneficial if this new facility was built in a more remote location away from the homes of families. As a resident of one of the nearby neighborhoods, I am opposed to this facility being built so close to where my children are growing up.

First Name Nicole  
Last Name Muncy  
Comment To Whom It May Concern: It would be a grievous mistake to allow the building of a cancerous gas emitting facility near residential neighborhoods. Our family is highly opposed to the projected building of Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) for a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility located in Tucson, Arizona, near the La Estancia neighborhood development. Cancer.gov states that "The ability of ethylene oxide to damage DNA makes it an effective sterilizing agent but also accounts for its cancer-causing activity" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.). There is absolutely no reason for a facility emitting cancer-causing gases to build within proximity to residential neighborhoods. The CDC states that "Exposure to ethylene oxide may cause headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, breathing difficulty, drowsiness, weakness, exhaustion, eye and skin burns, frostbite, and reproductive effects" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). We are a military family, and our family of five has three children. As parents, we feel that the development of this plant so close to our home would create new health issues or exacerbate pre-existing health issues our young children and other neighboring families have to live with day-to-day. Although Becton, Dickinson, and Company (B.D.) may take precautions to reduce bodily risk to workers and the community, harm is still a probable outcome. As the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services says, "Despite these precautions, workers, and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions" (n.d.). To build near residential communities is a careless risk in the name of the almighty dollar, and the business in question should consider a far more remote location. Please consider this as my formal opposition of the B.D. development and I respectfully request the city of Tucson to stand up for the health and welfare of Tucsonian families. Thank you for time and consideration. Very Respectfully, The Muncy Family


First Name Michael  
Last Name Wick  
Comment So in order to attend your meeting masks will be required. However in order to have a plant that will effect our members of the United States Air Force, Rita Ranch and the Vail Area we can...
just roll over and take this. It seems like a bad IDEA...move this to the middle of the desert....the area that it effects is where are homes are at our children go to school. Please take the time to reconsider location.

First Name Arron  
Last Name Thach  
Comment Understanding that the company is putting in place engineered systems to reduce the emissions of ethylene oxide, the company can not guarantee that there will be no release of the chemical. Ethylene oxide is a known to cause cancer and the risk, if slight is still to great. With a large residential community 2 miles away I am urging Pima County to decline the permit.

First Name Christopher  
Last Name Deal  
Comment To whom it may concern, The Becton Dickinson and Company (B.D.) are considering building a facility that will emit Ethylene oxide into the air of our community and others, including Davis-Monthan AFB. This facility has projected to be built near the crossroads of Valencia and Kolb. It would be a grievous mistake to allow the building of a cancerous gas emitting facility near residential neighborhoods. Our family is highly opposed to the projected building of B.D. for a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility located in Tucson, Arizona, near the La Estancia neighborhood development. Cancer.gov states that "The ability of ethylene oxide to damage DNA makes it an effective sterilizing agent but also accounts for its cancer-causing activity" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.). There is absolutely no reason for a facility emitting cancer-causing gases to build within proximity to residential neighborhoods. In addition, I feel that the community was not given proper notice of this project and the company did not put proper effort into notifying the surrounding communities. This lack of notice was underhanded and outright despicable. The CDC states that "Exposure to ethylene oxide may cause headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, breathing difficulty, drowsiness, weakness, exhaustion, eye and skin burns, frostbite, and reproductive effects" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). We are a military family, and our only son has autism and environmental allergies that requires the use of nebulizer treatments. My wife has also been diagnosed with autoimmune disease and genetic thyroid issues requiring lifelong hormone treatments. This type of facility nearby will jeopardize the health of my entire family. As parents, we feel that the development of this plant so close to our home would create new health issues or expound on pre-existing health issues my family and other neighboring families have to live with day-to-day. Although B.D. may take precautions to reduce bodily risk to workers and the community, harm is still a probable outcome. As the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services says, "Despite these precautions, workers, and people who live near industrial facilities that produce or use ethylene oxide may be exposed to ethylene oxide through uncontrolled industrial emissions" (n.d.). To build near residential communities is a careless risk in the name of the almighty dollar, and the business in question should consider a far more remote location. Please consider this as my formal opposition to the B.D. development and I respectfully request the city of Tucson, as well as the state of Arizona, to stand up for the health and welfare of Tucsonian families. Thank you for your time and consideration. Very Respectfully, Christopher Deal References: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.). Ethylene Oxide | NIOSH | CDC. CDC. Retrieved November 14, 2021, from https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/ethyleneoxide/default.html  

First Name John and Paulina  
Last Name Wilbur  
Comment We are VERY MUCH AGAINST having Becton, Dickinson and Company given a permit for a new product sterilization facility at 7345 E Valencia Road in Tucson AZ. It is unbelievable that this is even a consideration due to known facts about the dangers of EtO emissions. We already have so many
health hazards in the area (dust, air pollution, contaminants from planes, mines, and airbase, etc., it's unconscionable to consider permitting another issue, another pollutant, to be introduced to our environment. People move out here for health reasons, and "progress" is making this city unsafe. The dangers don't just stay in one area, they spread out causing unsuspecting victims health issues. Please DO NOT PERMIT Becton, Dickinson and Company!

First Name Jessica
Last Name Stewart
Comment I am requesting that this company is denied a permit to build and operate this type of business so close to residential homes where I live. There are too many risk factors and long term health issues that outweigh any benefit of approving this business the permit they requested.

First Name Keith
Last Name Watkins
Comment BD (Becton, Dickinson and Company), a leading global medical technology company, is in the process of investing $65 million to construct a state-of-the-art facility in Tucson, Arizona that will be a hub for the company’s supply chain, serving as a final-stage manufacturing and sterilization center. The new 120,000 square-foot facility is being built on approximately 32 acres at the northeast corner of Valencia and Kolb Road and is planned to be operational in mid-2022. BD plans to add approximately 40 new jobs, including engineers, scientists, quality control specialists and other skilled talent. Sun Corridor, Inc. projects that BD’s investment will have a $122 million economic impact over the next 10 years. As part of the company’s response to COVID-19 and commitment to public health, BD is investing significantly in its in-house capacity for manufacturing and sterilization. This facility will advance BD’s goals of improved overall operational efficiency, customer service levels and supply chain resilience. This transformational project will become an integral part of the U.S. medical device supply chain.

First Name Olivia
Last Name Brown
Comment Hello, I hope all is well. I am writing to express my opposition to granting a permit to BD. After I moved my entire family back to AZ from California, I had to take my AZ law test to practice in this state. I finally purchased my first home off of Valencia Road, which is near the potential location. I am employed at Banner Health, the Palo Verde Behavioral Health Hospital and Walmart here in Tucson. I moved back to help the community in which I went to college and grew up. If, despite its bad history, BD is allowed to launch on Valencia Road, I will unfortunately have to leave this state and practice pharmacy in another state that is not contaminating the air we breathe. We are all noticing an increase in cancer among our family members and friends. At the end of the day, what BD is emitting into the air is not positive for our species. We already have more than enough contaminants in our environment, our food, and our water. We don't need the air that we breathe to be contaminated. I have talked to many other pharmacists who work on Valencia Road at the largest pharmacy in town called DLH, which is a mail order pharmacy for our vets. More than 30 pharmacists are employed at this government facility. Many of them have said that, if BD launches, they will leave AZ as well, which will leave DLH short on pharmacists, and I will be adversely impacted, because I help at multiple settings. Who will suffer? The patients will suffer. We already have a major staffing shortage in this town. BD will cause many health professionals to move out of the state because of health concerns. I am concerned that not enough people in Tucson have been made aware of BD's history and the permit request. Consequently, you don't have a true representation of how the town feels about BD polluting our air. The attachment is from a pharmacist who feels that emailing comments is pointless, because money is involved, and BD will get its way regardless. I hope he is wrong. I like living in the Old Pueblo. It has been mentioned that the facility will be monitored, etc., but I know from working with many individuals that sometimes things are best left
alone. Look at our current covid situation. We can't trust people to wear a mask properly. We can’t trust that this facility will not put people at risk for health conditions that may not show up until many generations from now. Some things are done based on financial incentives, etc., which is a conflict of interest when it comes to making the best choice for individuals. Thanks for your consideration,

First Name Cristina
Last Name Anzures
Comment Mr. Patel, I had the misfortune of learning about the pending permit request by DB just this evening from a neighbor in Sycamore Park, where I live, located just South of I-10 and Kolb Rd. My husband and I are greatly concerned about this company receiving a permit to begin production and potentially emit carcinogenic gases into the air, just a short distance from our home, where our son plays outside everyday with his friends. How can such a permit even be considered without proper notice to the families in the surrounding communities?!? Prior to considering granting such a permit, you need to ask yourself, would you want a company that could pose such a risk to you and your family, as a next door neighbor? Please DENY the permit request for Becton, Dickinson and Company. Thank you.

First Name Steffi
Last Name Meyer
Comment To whom it may concern, I strongly object to the construction of the above mentioned facility being built in such close proximity to several neighborhoods, including schools, businesses and the military base. The gas being emitted is highly toxic and flammable and the EPA has identified EtO as a carcinogenic to humans which is proven to increase the risk of cancer. History has already shown that this company’s inability to contain this chemical and properly enforce its safety practices has led to cancer clusters amount those living or working within a five mile radius of the plant in Georgia as stated in several articles. Due to the expanding growth of Tucson, the intersection at Kolb and Valencia had to be expanded already and would now even have to deal with more traffic if Becton, Dickinson and Company were to build there. Furthermore, it is in such close proximity to the flight path of Davis Monthan and since EtO is highly flammable, poses a potential safety risk to the base and adjacent areas. Taking all those factors into consideration, there is no reason for this company to be built within the city limits and such close proximity to neighborhoods filled with thousands of families and schools. Choosing a location far enough away from populated areas would tremendously improve safety standards if an incident of mishap or leak were to occur and would therefore ensure the safety of people in town.
Sincerely,

First Name Joshua
Last Name Ramirez
Comment Do not let this company pollute our air and harm our kids and the elderly. Why is this next to a school in south Tucson. The residents in the Catalinas or Oro Valley wouldn’t have it. Make this company go somewhere without neighbors or schools!

First Name Marcos
Last Name Urrea
Comment Written comments are submitted in addition to verbal comments provided via Zoom at the public hearing held November 3rd, 2021. These comments are submitted on behalf of myself, Marcos J. Urrea, candidate for Arizona’s Second Congressional District, Resident of the City of Tucson who grew up approximately 1 mile from the proposed construction site, and who has family members still living in the area. I am writing to express my serious concerns regarding the proposed Ethylene Oxide (EtO) sterilization plant that has been proposed to be built at 7345 E. Valencia Road, near the intersection with S. Kolb Road. Specifically, there are three major concerns that could irrevocably impact the communities in the area that I would like to raise. Firstly, it is well documented that the chemical EtO is a carcinogenic gas
that even the county has made clear will be disbursed into communities around the plant, and multiple reports from around the country have demonstrated that exposure to this chemical increases the likelihood of cancer. Secondly, the company itself, though it has denied allegations made against its operations, continues to face lawsuits regarding its control over its emission of EtO. Most recently, a lawsuit was filed on 09 Dec 2021 (see Anthony v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.) which alleges both that the levels of EtO are in excess of the Environment Protection Agency’s (EPA) guidelines, and that these elevated levels are causing “a variety of cancers, reproductive issues, birth defects, and other life-altering health effects.” Finally, setting aside the track record that this particular company may have, what becomes clear as one begins to analyze reports of EtO plants around the country, is that the measures of the actual emissions are either undercounted or when brought to the attention of government agencies, these are unable to reverse its impacts.

In 2016, according to an article by Sharon Lerner, titled “EPA Failed to Correct Industry Misinformation About Deadly Air Pollution at Public Meetings” published in The Intercept on 13 Oct 2021, an analysis conducted by the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS), a division of the EPA, it found the the chemical Eto was actually “30 times more carcinogenic than previously thought.” This came up in a Zoom discussion whereby the EPA and the State of Texas held meetings to inform the public about the risks of EtO emitted from an Indorama plant in the region. Strikingly, the EPA representative made a comment that he was “not here tonight to debate the different risk values but rather to explain the risk based on EPA’s latest scientific assessment.” That meeting would go on to have a presentation by the company responsible for the emissions, which “contradicted several critical points the agency official had just made” including a “dismiss[al] of the agency’s science on ethylene oxide.” This brings to mind my own experience in trying to obtain more information about the risks that our community would take on with such a plant being built here. Having approached county representatives at the event held at Lauffer Middle School, when I asked about what the actual risks to our community were, the response was uniform across the board, stating that the risk was below what the EPA has considered appropriate, leaving many with doubts about what ‘appropriate’ signifies, and what members of the community are facing.

With the risks not fully understood, the next step is for one to assess the track record of the company and its interactions in the communities it already is a part of. Such an assessment will immediately call into question whether what we’ve been told in terms of the safety of the facility is actually accurate. In an article by Nicole Ludden, titled “Pima County considering permit for facility that will emit trace amount of cancerous gas” and published in the Arizona Daily Star on 01 Nov 2021,2 she makes an attempt to address the issue head on. In the article, Natalie Shepp, outreach and education senior program manager for PDEQ, states that the department does not consider the company’s previous endeavors in it’s decision, that their past “is not factored in.” This despite a 2018 report, as indicated in the article, that identified that their facility in Covington, GA “had potential total cancer risk greater than the 100-in-a-million threshold.” As noted above, the facility in Georgia is still facing lawsuits that bring into question the safety of their operations, and which have been filed as recently as last week. In various reports by CBS46-TV, the Atlanta CBS affiliate, we see that the company has not cooperated with state officials after they declined to temporarily close their Covington facility over EtO concerns, this despite the company already having been in “hot water after air tests around the plant earlier [in 2019] were shown to be extremely high.”3 The final consideration can be given to the various companies that operate facilities that handle this particular chemical. An article by Lylla Younes, Ava Kofman, Al Shaw, and Lisa Song, with assistance from Maya Miller, and Kathleen Flynn, published in ProPublica on 02 Nov 2021, titled “Poison in the Air” completed the first of its kind analysis to map “the spread of cancer-causing chemical from thousands of sources of hazardous air pollution across the country between 2014 and 2018” giving us the first window into the very real consequences of the chemicals that are emitted, including EtO. They found that “Ethylene Oxide is the biggest contributor to excess industrial cancer risk from air pollutants nationwide.”4 They also found that the majority of the residents exposed are communities of color stating: “people of color experience about 40% more cancer-causing industrial air pollution on average than tracts where the residents are mostly white.” Considering PDEQ’s numbers indicate that 49% are
minority communities in the potentially impacted area (see Daily Star article), it is a wonder that PDEQ
determined “the project will not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or
environmental effects on any population, including minority populations and low-income populations.”
Further, in the Daily Star article, Shepp indicates that “PDEQ does not know how far EtO from the
proposed plant could travel” nor “how much EtO currently exists…from other sources.” This is a problem
that is also highlighted in the ProPublica article, as “the EPA examines certain types of facilities and
equipment in isolation.” Meaning, the aggregate exposure is not calculated, and the real risk that
communities are exposed to is underreported. Finally, regulations under the Clean Air Act don’t require
EPA monitoring, and as such, the ability to be informed about the quantity of emissions can go unnoticed,
noting that “when companies report their emissions to the EPA, they’re allowed to estimate them using
flawed formulas and monitoring methods” leaving our community members at risk. For the reasons
outlined above, it is not in the best interest of this community that the proposed plans for this facility, and
the permit to allow emissions of ethylene oxide be granted. One can appreciate the necessity for medical
sterilization facilities, particularly as we head into the third year of the pandemic, but it cannot be done so
at the expense of our local communities. There is not a clear understanding of the risk within the
community, there is not a track record by the company that inspires confidence in the community’s safety,
and there are well documented reports that indicate the catastrophic impacts such emissions have had on
communities throughout the country. As such, I am opposed to the granting of the air quality permit.

of-cancerous-gas/article_c3faae2e-3811-11ec-88de-572cf2cb3662.htm
3. https://www.cbs46.com/news/time-is-up-for-bd-facility-amid-toxic-air-battle/article_e49acdf0-2605-
11ea-8f96-d311af25bd4b.html

First Name  Yolanda
Last Name  Ornelas
Comment  I have done some research and found out that this company has over 150 open lawsuits
against it currently. It was reported in several states that they have been systematically violating the
emissions limits of the highly toxic and scientifically proven carcinogenic and highly flammable limits of
ETHYLENE OXIDE (EtO) CONTAMINANT, mostly used for industrial production of chemicals like
sterilants and fumigant, set by the EPA which are already pretty lack. The EPA increased the threshold
for unsafe emissions, “moving the bar” which made emissions more comfortable for violators to stay
within its limit, rather then imposing stricter penalties or shutdowns. Still, BD&co manages to disregard
it, disregard the environment and human life, and continue to violate these limits even though it has
caused direct irreparable damage to a lot of people in parts of Illinois and Georgia where the company has
plants already. The government shut one down in Georgia, for emissions violations; they have multiple
cancer cluster cases from employees and residents living within a 5 mile radius. Is Pima County
considering that bringing jobs is good for Tucson? NOT FOR THE PRICE workers will have to pay, their
health and ultimately their life! Tucson is NOT AN INDUSTRIAL TOWN, and a plant like this will deter
winter visitors, and possibly drive away El Tour de Tucson, and other outdoor health oriented commerce
and events! A possible solution for this would be PREVENTION, AVOIDANCE, not DAMAGE
CONTROL after the fact. The city (or the county?) didn’t allow for a college campus to be built a few
years ago, a college campus! And there have been a myriad of none-threatening positive businesses that
have been proposed to be built all over Tucson and could have benefited our beautiful town and economy,
but were received with strong opposition. This plant will bring serious health consequences, life
threatening illness that will impact not only the workers but the entire beautiful city of Tucson for future
generations! For what reason? Money? No matter the location of this plant, it will be detrimental to its
location; we do not want that here. BD&C should consider making its current locations less toxic rather
than look for new cities to pollute. The company is unethical considering it’s continuance of emitting
CANCER CAUSING ETHYLENE OXIDE. This chemical company filed a lawsuit against another chemical company over a patent; it’s clear they are about the bottom line, money, while the medical lawsuits against them continue to pile up. Innocent children and communities dying of cancer does not compare with the kind of money they make as it is clear they have no regard for the suffering and pain they cause. Please do not grant the permits to BD & Co, DO NOT allow this chemical plant to come and slowly kill the children, the environment, and the livelihood of Tucson.
C. Comments Supporting the Permit

First Name  Jim
Last Name  Purcell
Comment  I hail from Broken Bow, NE where Becton Dickinson has been the major industry for the town for as long as I have been alive. I have been inside their plant, played outside as a boy, and have a host of friends who have worked for the company. I have been proud to see their purple topped vacutainers in almost every doctors office I have been to. They have been the go to receptacle for blood draws for a long time. This corporation seems to be as good as they come. I have known some of their executives. I have watched them work and play. My family ran the newspaper. So we saw the good and the bad sides of people. Becton Dickinson has been good to the town of Broken Bow in many ways. I think they will be good to Tucson as well. I would like to see the project realized.

First Name  Meibao
Last Name  Zhuang
Comment  Dear Mr. Patel: Thanks for calling me back. Appended are comments submitted on behalf of the Ethylene Oxide Sterilization Association, Inc. (EOSA). Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions. Thank you.

On behalf of its members, the Ethylene Oxide Sterilization Association, Inc. (EOSA) appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments in response to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality’s (ADEQ) Proposed Air Quality Permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD). EOSA members represent a broad spectrum of the U.S. ethylene oxide (EO) sterilization industry. EOSA is a nonprofit organization that represents EO suppliers, contract sterilizers, sterilization equipment manufacturers, medical device manufacturers, analytical equipment and systems suppliers, and laboratories. EOSA works to educate industry, regulators, and the public on the uses and benefits of EO sterilization. EOSA also works to improve safety standards, foster industry communications, and provide a forum for many subjects related to EO sterilization.

EOSA and its members believe that the safety of workers in the EO sterilization industry and of the surrounding communities is critically important. The EO sterilization industry has historically undertaken, and will continue to undertake, significant efforts to control emissions of EO utilizing the best available technologies and practices. EOSA members work diligently to provide lifesaving sterile medical devices to patients in the United States and around the world. EOSA appreciates the opportunity to comment on this proposed air quality permit to help ensure that regulatory decisions reflect the best available science and proven technologies and practices.

As indicated in the application and reiterated here, BD’s Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) standards ensure that facilities are designed and operated with the highest level of process safety and environmental controls. Sterilization is a core competency for BD, which operates more than 20 sterilization sites globally. As demonstrated in the permit application, BD will utilize the best available emission control technology and state-of-the-art control systems to monitor and control process conditions and provide for the continued safety of personnel and the community. With these controls, the facility will far exceed the requirements of the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and operate well below the recently revised U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) risk threshold set for EO.

Sterilization is critical to public health. EO sterilization is often the only proven and reliable means for sterilizing many of today’s complex medical devices containing delicate and technologically advanced materials and components. It is therefore critical that the use of EO as a sterilant not be
artificially or unreasonably constrained. The proposed BD project will add sterilization capacity that is critical for ensuring continuity of supply for various medical products while ensuring the highest level of safety and environmental control for the health and safety of workers and the community.

We hope this information is helpful. If you have any questions, please contact me.

First Name Greg
Last Name Crist
Comment The Advanced Medical Technology Association (AdvaMed) is pleased to submit comments in support of Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) as they seek to construct and operate a new medical device sterilization facility in Tucson, Arizona. AdvaMed represents more than 400 medical device manufacturers, many of whom rely on medical device sterilization facilities like the one being constructed by BD. The COVID-19 pandemic put a strain on our health care system, requiring companies like BD to quickly react to ensure hospitals and clinics had the medical equipment necessary to care for patients. A leader in health care and the sterilization of medical devices, BD is investing resources into its in-house capacity for manufacturing and sterilization in Arizona to address COVID-related needs and the broader public health, as well as strengthening the medical supply chain. With more than 20 sterilization sites around the globe, BD uses ethylene oxide (EO) in their sterilization methods and they employ the best available emission control technology and state-of-the-art control systems to protect their personnel and the communities they call home. EO is a chemical used to sterilize more than 20 billion medical devices annually, and while EO is recognized as a hazardous chemical, federal regulations on emissions, residuals, and worker safety allow for the safe and responsible use of EO to sterilize medical products. It is a key aspect of health care delivery and our industry supply chain, responsible for ensuring products like heart valves, pacemakers, surgical kits, gowns, drapes, ventilators, syringes, and catheters, among many others, are accessible to doctors and patients who need them. There is almost no aspect of health care that is not impacted by EO sterilization. Federal regulations and international guidelines require BD, and other sterilization facilities, to implement high standards, such as emissions monitoring and controls, performance testing, and mandated reporting and recording keeping, that allows them meet federal, state, and local requirements. With this Tucson-based facility, BD has installed the latest emission control technologies and utilized an original design that allows it to be one of the first in the world to meet or exceed even the most stringent environmental guidelines. The facility will operate well below the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) risk threshold, reducing fugitive EO emissions to levels that are protective of the public’s health.

First Name Peter
Last Name Stone
Comment I read Arizona Star Article with interest about proposed sterilization plant using ETO proposal on Valencia Rd. With interest. I know from working in hospitals many hospitals use small ETO sterilizers for surgical equipment. I am unsure of efficiency of capture and containment but it would seem that that must be well in place and a proven technology or doubt it would continue to be used. To me it seems if company has well established record and monitoring in place and containment practices spelled out it would seem reasonable to allow with close cooperation by independent government monitoring and careful contingency plans in place.

First Name Joe
Last Name Snell
Comment I am writing to express our support of the planned Becton, Dickinson, & Co. (BD) medical device sterilization facility in Tucson. Sun Corridor Inc. has a 73-member Board of Directors that represents the largest employers, including key healthcare organizations, across the Southern Arizona region. The SCI team has worked with the leadership and staff at BD for more than 18 months on this project. Through our first-hand experience, we have had the pleasure of working with
a group of individuals that is beyond reproach. The BD team has taken time to explain how crucial this project is to the US and global supply chain of safe, sterilized medical devices. Many of these medical devices, such as needles, syringes, and catheters are critical in the ongoing fight against the COVID-19 pandemic. BD has a strong track-record of being good corporate citizens in the communities in which they operate. Our region will benefit from the high-quality jobs and investment made by BD that will have an economic impact of $122 million over the next several years. The planned sterilization facility will meet or exceed all federal regulations. We encourage you to grant BD the permit they need to sterilize medical devices to protect public health.

First Name: stephen
Last Name: cohen
Comment: BD will be an excellent corporate citizen. As they are in the business of running sterile facilities, they are diligent in following rules intended to keep these safe. Please support this company in its expansion to Tucson!

First Name: Sandra
Last Name: Wilson
Comment: This is a Transformational project for the region! BD is a strong corporate citizen, they are eager to join our community and will play an important role in advancing public health in our community.

Comments Received Outside Public Comment Period

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Arnuard
Comment: Please do not give Becton Dickinson and Company an air quality permit. To preserve our health, thank you.

First Name: James
Last Name: Faoro
Comment: Hi, As a local resident the plan for this hazardous facility is cause for review and evidence that it will not negatively impact the local population. It would be prudent to see considerations for its affect on nearby food animals, wildlife, open water supply (CAP canal), etc a whole host of considerations. This should be a science based decision and not focused on tax base or a real estate benefit for someone connected to a gov't official, a fairly common occurrence in this state. Also, I will alert the local school districts for the impact on our children, and the largest private employer in town thru my neighbors who work there. This sort of project will act as another negative factor for new hires, retiree's and other folks looking to relocate to Tucson.

First Name: Janet
Last Name: Tuttle
Comment: I have great concern for the toxic waste—causing cancer for the population that live and work within a perimeter of this proposed facility. I am a full-time Tucson resident living at 7319 E Maritime, in the Cove next to Voyager RV resort. This proposed plant should not be located near such a populated area. Better yet, they need to find a chemical to use that is not toxic to humans. Thank you for your time.
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Summary of Outreach for Becton, Dickinson, & Company Class II Air Quality Permit
Outreach for Becton, Dickinson, & Company Class II Air Quality Permit

Objective: Inform community about proposed air quality permit for Becton, Dickinson, and Company (BD) and the associated public meetings and public comment period.

Key PDEQ Staff
Ursula Nelson – Director
Barbara Escobar – Deputy Director
Rupesh Patel – Air Quality Program Manager
Jacqueline Ronstadt – Compliance Manager
Natalie Shepp – Senior Program Manager, Public Outreach & Education
James Jones – Air Permit Engineer
Sarah Reitmeyer – Regulatory Program Manager

Key Stakeholders
Area Residents and Businesses
Tucson Area Community
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

PDEQ Receipt of Complete Application from BD for a Class II Air Quality Permit to construct and operate a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility, located at 7345 E. Valencia Road, received on April 8, 2021.

Legally Required Public Notifications

Draft Class II Air Quality Permit
- Arizona Daily Star Public Notice (English & Spanish) September 17, 2021
- Tucson Newspaper Daily Territorial Public Notice (English & Spanish) September 17, 2021
- Arizona Daily Star Public Notice (English & Spanish) September 24, 2021
- Tucson Newspaper Daily Territorial Public Notice (English & Spanish) September 24, 2021

Other Public Notifications

News Releases:
September 17, 2021: Becton, Dickinson, and Company Air Quality Permit Process Begins
- Emailed through Pima County GovDelivery system delivered to Subscribers of BOS/Admin, Environmental Quality, General County News and Health and Behavioral Health (16,515 recipients)
- September 30, 2021: Becton, Dickinson and Company Air Quality Permit Process
- Emailed through Pima County GovDelivery system to Subscribers of the General Media (186 recipients)

Informational Mailer
- Postcard with information in English and Spanish sent to 18,679 residents and businesses that are located within a 3-mile radius of the proposed facility. Postcard included information about public comment period, virtual and in-person open house meetings (with a map to the in-person open house), public hearing, link to PDEQ website, and information on Ethylene Oxide. Mailer arrived at residents and businesses on September 30.
Other Informational Materials
- Comment Sheet: English and Spanish instruction on making public comments and form to submit comments. Available at in-person open house.

Website Posts
Pima County DEQ website, www.pima.gov/deq:
- Class II Permits Page. Original application posted on April 8. Updates and additional documents posted on May 3, June 8, September 9 and 16, and October 27.
- Air Quality Permits Public Notice page. Original application posted on April 9. Updates and additional documentation posted on Aug 4, September 17 and 24, October 6, 20, and 26, and November 1 and 3.
- Home page articles posted on September 17 and 30, October 21, and November 1.
- English and Spanish public notice and on-line comment form posted on September 17.

Pima County website, www.pima.gov
- Environmental Quality Newsroom page. Articles posted on September 17 and 30, October 21, and November 1.

Social Media Posts
PDEQ Twitter (1,329 followers)
- September 17, 2021: Notification of opening of public comment period
- October 26, 2021: Notification of October 27 open house
- November 2, 2021: Notification of public hearing

Pima County Twitter (10,123 followers)
- September 17, 2021: Retweeted PDEQ post of opening of public comment period
- October 26, 2021: Retweeted PDEQ post of notification of October 27 open house
- November 2, 2021: Retweeted PDEQ post of notification of public hearing

PDEQ Facebook (783 followers)
- September 17, 2021: Notification of opening of public comment period
- October 26, 2021: Notification of October 27 open house
- November 2, 2021: Notification of public hearing

Pima County Next Door (264,690 members)
- October 26, 2021: Notification of October 27 open house

Other Notifications
- Email to stakeholders announcing public comment period and meetings including:
  - Pima County Board of Supervisors
  - County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry
  - Southwest Regional Council
  - Vail Chamber of Commerce
  - Sierra Club Tucson
  - Sonora Environmental Research Institute
  - City of Tucson Ward 4 Office
  - City of Tucson City Manager
• Davis Monthan Air Force Base
• Mesquite Ranch Neighborhood Association
• Rita Ranch Neighborhood Association
• Houghton South Neighborhood Association
• Groves Lincoln Neighborhood Association
• Stella Mann Neighborhood Association
• Mortimore Neighborhood Association
• South Harrison Neighborhood Association

Public Meetings
Spanish language interpreter for oral translation was available at all public meetings.
  • October 6, 2021: Virtual Open House viewable through WebEx
  • October 29, 2021: In-person Open House, Lauffer Middle School, 5385 E. Littletown Rd.
  • November 3, 2021: Virtual Public Hearing viewable through WebEx

Known Media Coverage
Interview:
November 3, 2021: AZPM radio

Articles Printed or Posted:
  • September 20, 2021: Signals – Becton, Dickinson and Company Air Quality Permit Process Begins
  • October 8, 2021: Pima County FYI Newsletter (10,127 subscribers) - PDEQ hosts open house and public hearing for the Becton, Dickinson & Company Air Quality Permit
  • November 1, 2021: Arizona Daily Star – Pima County considering permit for facility that will emit trace amounts of cancerous gas
  • November 1, 8, 15, 22: Steve K’s Newsletter
  • November 3, 2021: AZPM – Pima County considers permit for company that will emit trace amounts of cancerous gas.
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Public Hearing Documents
(Sarah Reitmeyer) It has now Started

Rupesh Patel - Hearing Officer:

Excellent thank you Sarah. Good Evening and thank you for taking the time to attend this hearing. Today is Wednesday, November 3rd, 2021. The time is approximately 5:30 pm. This public hearing is being conducted virtually due to the current pandemic. I’m am the Hearing Officer tonight representing Pima County Department of Environmental Quality and I will be presiding this hearing. My name is Rupesh Patel. I’m the PDEQ Air Program Manager. Other PDEQ representatives here tonight are:

- PDEQ Director Ursula Nelson
- PDEQ Deputy Director Barbara Escobar
- PDEQ Senior Program Manager for Outreach & Education, Natalie Shepp
- PDEQ Compliance Manager Jacqueline Ronstadt
- PDEQ Regulatory Program Manager, Sarah Reitmeyer
- And PDEQ Permit Engineer James Jones

At this moment, we are conducting a formal public hearing. As an air quality control district, PDEQ has jurisdiction over facilities requiring air quality permits in Pima County. The purpose of this hearing is to allow residents the opportunity to enter into the record, oral and written comments regarding the proposed air quality permit for Becton, Dickenson and Company sterilization facility in Tucson, Arizona. Now the facility is located, um proposed to be located at 7345 E Valencia Road, Tucson Arizona and will hereby be referred to as BD.
By law, a public hearing must meet certain requirements. They are:

A 30-day advance public notice must be given in two newspapers of general circulation. Notice was given on September 17, 2021 in the Arizona Daily Star and The Daily Territorial, posted on the Pima County newsroom, the PDEQ newsroom, PDEQ AQ Permit - Public Notice webpage, and on the PDEQ webpage for documents pertaining to this permit.

Secondly, the public must be given an opportunity to speak or to give written comments during the hearing. Tonight the public has the option for doing so.

And finally, a hearing must be conducted “on the record” which means that it is recorded in some way. Tonight’s hearing, meeting is being recorded.

This hearing is considered a “formal public hearing” under state law. A formal public hearing is different from a public meeting or open house. In a public meeting there is an opportunity for questions and answers between the general public and the department. That opportunity was held virtually on October 6, 2021 and in person at the Lauffer Middle School on October 27, 2021.

As for tonight, this is a formal public hearing, the representatives of the department will not be formally answering any public permit related questions. In other words, neither I nor anyone from the department will be answering any questions at this public hearing. I can only repeat or clarify what I read to you.

After the end of this 90 day public comment period (closing on December 17, 2021), PDEQ will prepare a written response to all questions and comments entered into the record regarding the proposed permit.

If you have questions about the proposed permit, please include them in your comments. All comments and questions about the permit should only address the permit and air quality regulations.
The agenda for tonight’s hearing is as follows: First, I will give a brief description about the BD facility and the proposed air quality permit. I will then begin to call speakers by their first name, to begin taking public comment. As this is a very structured proceeding, please follow these instructions for making public comment. If you wish to comment, you need to use the raised hand button on this virtual hearing. PDEQ staff are monitoring the attendees and will allow anyone who wishes to speak to have the opportunity to provide comment.

I will call individuals in the order that I see the raised hand or as they appear on the attendees list. Please say and spell your name before you give us your comment to help ensure that we transcribe it correctly in the record. I ask that comments be no more than 3 minutes long so everyone who wishes to make a comment is given the opportunity to do so. In lieu of speaking, you may also submit written comments this evening. Written comments can be sent to air.permits@pima.gov. If you wish to do so, you may make both oral and written comments tonight.

For those that have joined us tonight on their phone, you appear on my screen as a sequential caller number. Caller ID’s 3 and 6 appear on my screen at this moment. We will be unmuting each line individually and invite the caller to state their name. I will then move onto the next caller to provide comment.

So once again, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment from the public on the proposed permit for BD. By law, all the comments made here or in writing are considered by PDEQ prior to making a final decision regarding the proposed air quality permit. The department has a duty to evaluate and respond in writing to all written and verbal comments that are received. This document is known as a Response to Comments Summary. It will be available at the time the department makes a final decision regarding the permit. If you wish to be notified of the final decision made by the department, please be sure to indicate that in your formal comment.

I will now give a brief summary of the BD facility and the proposed air quality permit. For more detailed description of the facility and the proposed permit, we have posted the permit application and all of the supporting documents on our PDEQ website.
Becton, Dickenson and Company, proposes to construct and operate a new ethylene oxide sterilization facility at 7345 E. Valencia Road, Tucson. The facility will also operate three boilers and two emergency generators as ancillary equipment. Emissions of hazardous air pollutants from the proposed facility are controlled by air pollution control technology with a reduction efficiency of at least 99% and the source is considered a minor source of air pollutants. The emissions and control technology is regulated by national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants. To effectively limit the ethylene oxide emissions from the facility, PDEQ has capped the amount of ethylene oxide that can be used at the facility to 709 lb/yr. This CAP is to be demonstrated by periodic performance testing using EPA approved test methods.

BD currently plans to commence construction of the facility project following receipt of the permit approval. BD targeted construction end date is December 2022.

This marks the end of the BD facility and permit summary. We will now begin taking formal comment. I would again like to remind people that if you wish to speak, please use the raised hand function on this WebEx virtual hearing platform. I’ll begin calling on speakers to take public comment. To ease transcribing the hearing later, please speak clearly and into your microphone.

Sarah, at this time let’s take a look at the attendees list, everyone will be allowed, allotted 3 mins to provide their comment and on the attendees list in alphabetical order, I see the first person Adam Knotspike (AK). Sarah can you go ahead and unmute Adam

(AK) – No comment from me thank you.

Thank you Adam Knotspike, we will move onto the next caller. Caller in user number 3, now I do not know who this individual is but, if you can speak you name clearly, then you will be allow to provide your comment.

I’ve unmuted caller user number 3, so if you have called in with your phone, you may want to try and speak at this time, so we can see if you are the caller that is unmuted.

Hearing no voice at the moment, Sarah let’s move onto caller user number 6 please.

Ok I have unmuted caller user number 6, if you would like to pose a comment at this time or prepare a comment at this time please try to speak.
My name is Gary Nickolas, my wife Jean and I live from about 1 and a half miles from where they plan to build this plant by Monthan Davis at Valencia and Kolb. I think that this is a very very bad idea. Look what’s happening, environmental, they say a lot of things about control, but soon as these plants build up then they start look at their bottom line and they start cutting corners and I don’t trust them. What if something happens, what if we lose the base, they decide to get out of here and go somewhere else, what happens to the town then. Look at Michigan, what’s environmental doing for them people. They have ruined their whole water system, they are now taking people fresh water to their homes. Don’t let then in here. We don’t want them and we don’t need them.

This is Jean Nikolas speaking, we have cancer too. This is why we are going to open this up to our elderly that come here for the winter months. They come, this, this state, is a reward state, it not a state where there’s a lot of manufacturing going on. I think this is going to help, hurt this state, financially as far as bringing people into our state, when they come out for the winter. And the article says it talk about and what happens there. So if can happen there it can happen here. And I don’t think it good for the state, I don’t think it’s good for the people that live here. Possibly they can go out and find a desert spot way out in the desert and I don’t know what kind of people would like to work there, that would be afraid to even to work there. They have to travel so far and be in that environment. So I’m on 24/7 on oxygen now, and it’s just something I don’t think is going to be a good idea for us and the state and that’s about all we can say at this. Is there anything at this place that you need to know or say?

We thank you for your comment Jean, Gary Nickolas. Like I said the public comment period is still open until December 17.

Ok, is there anything you want us to, I can’t hear you too well, the call is, the phones are acting funny, can I give you my telephone number and if there’s anything else you want me or the public to do, we will help you.

Jean, I had spoken to Gary earlier this day today and I do have your telephone number. So please do reach out to me and I’ll be sending, addressing any questions you may have.

Ok, if I stop the call,

Thank you for your comment Jean, thank you for your comment Gary. Let’s move onto caller number 7 please Sarah. If you are on the telephone please begin speaking. WE do not have any indication of who is on the line, we do need to have the caller speak their name clearly. Hearing
none, please Sarah let’s move onto the next person, Catherine, I apologies if I pronounce your last 
name wrong, Baladoy?

(CB) Hi, No comment from me.

Thank you Catherine for your time. Moving onto the next caller, Cody.

Cody – give everyone else a chance to speak first, I did not know we were going to some kind of 
called upon order by Pima County, I thought it was volunteering and first come first served, with 
the raised hands, having said that, can I take my time later and in the program?

Absolutely, we will come back to you. The next person, I have on the list is Eric Emmert.

(EE) – No Comment at this time.

Thank you for your time Eric, moving on to Jovan Naville (JN)

JN – Hello.

Hello we can here you.

JN – No comments at this time, can I comment later?

I will come back to you Jeovana.

Moving onto Jessica Sampson (JS). Jessica you are now unmuted and provide your comment.

Oh, I’m sorry Rupesh can you hear me?

We can

Ok, So I um, like everyone else I googled BD and sterilization plants and found out a lot that they have poisoned people in Illinois, Texas and Georgia, and also they seen to have misled, people about how dangerous, the emissions were, and the EPA has set some standards, but they are even too high, now this gas is a known carcinogen, labeled by the EPA and it shouldn’t be regulated, it should be banned. And what we need at this time is for county officials, city officials, state officials to stand up, and to say we don’t want this gas emitted any place, in anyone’s backyard. This is too dangerous. People in Illinois, if you go to Facebook, people in Illinois, there’s a lot of protest groups and there because their children, there fighting pediatric cancer there, because they have lived close to sterilization plants. We don’t want that to happen here, we don’t; want that to happen anywhere, and we need people to step outside of this idea, they are doing there jobs for the county, and to move us as a people forward, by saying no, they should not get a permit, we don’t want them anyplace.

Thank you Jessica Sampson, does that conclude your comment?

(JS)-For now thank you
Thank you very much for your time, moving onto Jim Hannan.

JH – Good evening, my name is Jim Hannan, I’m a resident of the City of Tucson. I want to acknowledge the article in the Arizona Daily Star, on BD, on the new plant, it was quite helpful to me, to find out more about this company, and the process, and so I just want to acknowledge the reporter in the newspaper for that. I’m also wondering about the wisdom about putting this in, close by to neighborhoods, close by to people who live and sleep, somewhat close by, I know that, there’s we talk about that there’s a ninety nine percent capture, or recapture of the gas. But there’s a lot of damage that can done by one percent. We all know, we have seen other environmental disasters over the years, both in terms of air and water quality and so percentages are somewhat misleading. If we find, you know, some kind of nucleus of cancer in this neighborhood in the next ten to fifteen years, it will be very, of course troubling. The other thing I want to, the other thing that was also mentioned in the newspaper article was this um problem in Georgia, and I hope Pima County is in contact with the environmental folks in Georgia, trying to find out about more about how this company operates, and find out whether they are a good actor, or did they attempt to do things a kind of short sighted. Finally I’m wondering, as part of this permitting process, if BD Becton Dickenson will have to put up some kind of bond, for future liabilities, as other industries do that do basically, that will cover like I said possible contingencies in the future. So that’s all I have.

Thank you Jim Hannon, moving onto Jonadine Randolf (JR)

Jonadine Randolf, you have been unmuted, please provide your comment. Hearing none, Sarah let’s move onto the next attendee, that will be Kyle Wysack (KW), Sorry Kylie Wysack. Kyle Wysak you have been unmuted please, provide your comment. Hearing none, Sarah let’s move on to the next attendee on the list is Leah Webser (LW)

LW- Hi my name is Leah Webster, can you hear me?

Yes we can, thank you Leah, please proceed

LW- Ok, so in BD’s initial application on page 3-1, in their initial application they said that ERN released at 0.05 percent controlled emissions from the sterilization process. However in every lawsuit that they have had across the states we a looking at number that are over one 1 percent, now they have also had, 2019 they had a 8 day ENO leek due to an undisclosed exhaust duct. We are talking about volatile compounds and the estimated half life in the atmosphere of these compounds is 69 days in the summer and 149 days in the winter months. You know your talking
about schools in the neighborhood and I live in this neighborhood that’s going to be affected, we are talking about schools that have our future generation of children in this neighborhood and about Davis Monthan Air force base which is in that area. It’s over 69,000 people in the area that is going to be affected, by these. Now they also, Georgia state officials claim that BD medical device warehouses has been emitting excess EtO of their air quality permit. They have also been accused. The company has also been accused of violating the state’s racketeering influence and corruption organization laws. Which is the regal law. Because company officials know that they are associate with um BD Becton and Dickenson company miss represented the state official the amount of emissions from the plant. There’s been various law suits, you know, on their emissions and how much they are actually emitting after certain various law suites in Georgia, Becton Dickenson and Company said that the company, said that the plant would not reopen and they completely closed it down. In Pennsylvania, lawsuits, the company failed to disclose their infusion pumps, like they had software errors, alarm prioritization, thoughout all of these lawsuits they have found they have admitted excessive volumes of EtO in the air. And it’s affected so many people in the general area, of that plant. We look to you guys as officials to help protect zoning. This is on your hands. If this company come in here, everything that happens to us, is because you guys have allowed it, so we look to you for help to stop their application and stop them coming in to destroy our future, to destroy our health. Just the various cancers that this EtO, you know the human carcinogens cause, it’s not just that, it’s also neurological, irregularities in organs, there are so many things that these emissions are going to effect on people, as officials you are supposed to be protecting them against. So we look to you for the right decision and say no to allowing them to come in and effect, our airmen who support, and protect us for our children’s sake. For our sake and the families that live in these areas.....

Thank you Leah Webster your three minutes is up. I would like you to proceed with providing any written comments that you may have and the permit comment period remains open until December 17, 2021.

LW- Thank you

I would like to move on to our next attendee to allow everyone to speak before this meeting is concluded. The next person…Thank you for your time Leah. The next person on the list is Marcos Urrea, you have been unmuted please Marcos provide your comment.
Yeah, thank you very much, I think I will also go and site, so Marcos, last name Urrea. Err I grew up on the corner of Kolb and Irvington, my mom lives there still, my younger brother lives there, and three nephews ages, four to six. And I have very, very serious concerns about the track record, in terms that this company has lawsuits that seem to some problematic issues that we could be dealing with in the future. Um and I think Er, beyond that we don’t have a full understanding of any of the ramifications of the emissions and how severely they can impact those communities. The article in the daily star, in particular mentions that the community is 49 percent minorities communities, in the area 39 percent are low income individuals, and 10 percent of the people in the community are effected live, don’t have a high school diploma. So I think that it is a community that is very venerable, and we should be looking to protect our most vulnerable communities. This is the Daily Star Article dated November 1, 2021. In addition I would also cite an article by Intercept and that article is titled ‘EPA has failed to correct industry misinformation about deadly air pollution at public meetings, this is dated October 13, 2021. In which it talks about some of the issues where EPA even though the standards of EtO from EPA have been met, there are significant impacts or that other indications that even the standards that EPA has set have not been met so I think we really need to consider the potential impact on our vulnerable communities, and really reconsider, whether this is in the best interest of the people, of southeastern Tucson. I will submit further comments in writing. Thank you.

Thank you for your time Marcos. Moving onto the next attendee Nicole Ludden (NL)

Nicole you have been unmuted please provide your comment.

(NL)- Yeah, I’m just listening, thank you.

Thank you very much for your time Nicole, moving onto the next person, Olivia Brown (OB)

Just one moment Olivia, we will unmute you very shortly. (SR) She is unmuted,

- No voice heard.

Ok Sarah let go ahead and mute Olivia. Let’s move onto the next person, Rose Vaneleson. (RV)

(RV)-Oh Hi, this is Rose can you hear me?

Yes we can

I just want to add on to what Marcos and Jim spoke of earlier about the Arizona daily star and I 100 percent agree with them that we need to protect especially our vulnerable communities and speak up for them because they are likely not to come forward and speak up on their own. I’m very concern about the history of BD in Georgia and other states. You know the article points to the
history of Georgia’s red flag and to me that’s not a good indication and that we should just follow that information to help guide us in what we do. They discuss 150 plus lawsuits against BD as of June 2021. Since the late 1960’s they have caused a cancer cluster among those living and working within a five mile radius of the plant. And that’s very concerning to me. I don’t live extremely close to the plant but I do have concerns about the air quality and that’s pretty much all I wanted to say.

Thank you for your time Rose. Moving onto the next attendee we have a S Pearman.

S Pearman please provide your comment.

Hearing not Sarah let’s move onto the next attendee. Samantha Neville, you have been unmuted, please provide your comment. Hearing none Sarah, let’s move onto the next person Shaq McCoy. Shaq McCoy you have been unmuted, please provide your comment.

(SM)- I have no comment, just listening in Rupesh.

Thank you very much Shaq, moving onto the next person on the attendees list is a Teresa Olson Smith.

Good evening my name is Teresa Smith and I’m the chief of staff for vice Mayor Nicki Lee. We support PDEQ’s public process and I’m just here to listen to every one’s comments. Thank you everyone for your time and participation this evening.

Thank you very much Teresa. Let’s move onto the top of the list again. (SR) we have caller user 8 we can unmute. Hearing none, moving onto caller user #9,

Hi My name is Olivia Brown, I’m a doctor in the community, as well as a home owner and I live on Valencia, I have children and I go to the site where BD wants to launch. So as a doctor I don’t think it’s safe, I don’t want my kids breathing this air. I lived with cancer and I’m 38 years old and I’m not trying to do that again. Chemotherapy is horrible, and I moved to Tucson to help my community. So I hope you can guide me into what we have to do, to prevent BD from contaminating our air. I moved all the way from California, and why doesn’t BD launch in California? Probably not ok out there, then it should not be ok out here. And I read something in the daily star that said that somebody said we have this colorless gas I’m really horrified. And what we can do at this point is to help get the word out. We don’t have to see a threat, I mean look at Covid, and this stuff is real so I hope sir that you can guide me into the next step. The community doesn’t know, I asked my neighbors, nobody knows about BD. I know of BD because I work in the medical field and I’ve used the tools, I know BD and hopefully you can guide me into tell the
community. I asked my neighbors. I need to know their capacity, yeah it been in the newspaper. So whatever we need to do please, let me know what the next step is. And that’s it.

Olivia Brown I thank you for your time and comment.

So Sarah at this stage let’s go back to the people that asked to be introduced later in the call.

S.Cody, we have your line unmuted please provide your comment.

(SC) Yes Hi this is T Stephen Cody, calling, it’s tstephencody@gmail.com 520-664-2076. I’m giving my information because there’s very little way for any of us to contact each other or to see each other’s comments prior to the end of the comment period. So I want to make sure for the people at least on this call to contact me. If you want to get in touch with me at don’t waste Arizona. Which was cited in the article. I’m the local contact, my best friend is the head of that organization. So I’d like to secondly voice my concern about the extremely large number of people on this call who you recognize and that you’re not hearing from because of dead silence. So there’s some kind of technical issue that needs to be addressed from preventing these people from having their right to speak being violated by some kind of technical issue on your part. So going to have to address that and have another opportunity for those people to make a comment. Thirdly I want to make sure that everyone on this call knows that PDEQ has basically has their hands tied and if BD doesn’t violate any laws, they have no choice but to grant approval of the permit. It’s not a judgement call on their point, it’s not like we are trying to do what we can to change their judgement, they don’t have one. The only way to prevent this plant from being constructed is to pressure your city council to use zoning or some other method from preventing BD from ever starting construction on this site. Assuming that there is no successful effort, I think what we should all do as a group is that at a minimum, all insist that Tucson make sure that there are monitors 1000ft distance from each other around the entire perimeter contour of the fence line. That those monitors are publically viewable and that they contain a history so that at any time anyone in the public can monitor current and past emissions at the fence line of the plant because we know for sure that BD has on multiple time been caught making emissions that exceed the legal, limits without notifying as what they were required by law. So, given all that, I do have my. The Reason I ask to wait is to allow those who had not made comment yet to be able to speak. I did submit a page and a half worth of comments that are highly referenced into the public record, but of course nobody will be able to see those which is why I gave you my phone number and e-mail. I would like to in summary tho, I’ll start first until someone lets me know how much time I have left.
You have 30 seconds left Cody

Oh ok, let me read my summary paragraph which is. No amount of ethylene oxide in the air, air pollution is safe. There are safe alternative to ethylene oxide for the sterilization of medical equipment. The EPA cannot be trusted to guarantee public health and BD cannot be trusted to guarantee public health. And in my opinion EtO is too dangerous to sterilize medical equipment, and no plant should ever be built again. If for some reason one were to be built, it should be never be located to be built near a residential area. If the plant is built in a residential area, there should be mandatory continuous monitoring of the atmosphere concentrations along the entire fence line of the plant, with audible alarms in case of an exceedance both on site and at the appropriate designated public safety monitoring facilities. I ask all residents of Pima County and Tucson to urge the City of Tucson to prohibit the construction of the proposed BD EtO plant in any residential area in Pima County. Thank you

Thank you for your comment Cody. I do need to a lot some time for the remaining attendees on this list. I was asked to go back to Giovanna Neville (GN). Thank you Sarah,

(GN) Thank you, I agree with what has been said in terms of my refusal to accept that the plant be located in our community. I live in the central area of Tucson but my community that is going to be effected in the location near that I have visited, if they are effected everyone’s effected and I am very sorry that -inaudible- people that have the power to make the decisions are the companies, the corporations, that our relations -inaudible-are not really actually trying to prevent -inaudible-problems -inaudible-contamination pollution -inaudible-where they want to build a plant -inaudible- and they don’t have any facilities around them. -inaudible-.

I apologize for interrupting Giovanna, we are experiencing some technical difficulties on your call, to hear your comment clearly, at this stage I would propose that you submit your comment in writing to air.permits@pima.gov just to make sure your comment is placed onto the record. I want to thank you for your time and I want to apologize that the line doesn’t just seem to be clear for you at this stage. Let’s move on Sarah to anyone we may have missed. Sarah can you provide any guidance on who the next person could be.

(SR) I don’t believe we have missed anyone, there were some caller users that chose to be silent when their names were chosen. Since there are 21 attendees at the moment, we could go through one last time if we wanted and skip those that have already commented that we know for sure.
Ok I’m just going to run through my list one more. Let’s go ahead and unmute all the callers on 7, 8 and 9 and we can invite them to speak.

I think I can unmute them one at a time. All three of those are unmuted.

Thank you, for all those attendees calling in, I have you on my screen as unmuted, please proceed with providing your comment.

This is David Higuera, (DH) can you hear me?

David, yes we can.

I’m a resident of the City of Tucson and I also work for supervisor matt Heinz on the board of supervisors, I want to reiterate what Mr. Cody just said which is that this comes down to a zoning issue in terms of the ability for us to stop it, but also citizens and people of Pima county and Tucson we should be demanding that if this thing does get built, everything that Mr. Cody said about how air quality around it needs to be monitored and how the public needs to have access to that data in real time, holds true. If there are other ways to do medical equipment sterilization, then there should be no reason at all to be using ethylene oxide. It’s a carcinogen, it causes cancer, it kills people and this is in an area that has a lot of low income families and this is just not right so. I want to add my voice to those that are saying that this is not right and if DEQ can stop it somehow, that’s what we want. If DEQ cannot stop it we need to lobby the city council to stop it in other ways. Thank you.

Thank you for your time. Is there any other attendees on the telephone line that would like to provide comment, please speak now. Sarah I still see caller user number 7 still muted, can you unmute that line please.

Nicole Ludden – just listening.

Mr. Cody – Thank you for the additional time. I would also like to talk about, first of all the limits themselves when the law was originally acted the limit was 0.002 micro grams and that was at the, this the understanding that the EPA limit would be such that they would take action if there was a chance of 1 in 1 million of the level of life time exposure to that chemical, among getting cancer. It was changes in 2008 by the W Bush administration from 1 in 1 million to 100 in 1 million. So five time under the limit that BD keeps bragging about has a spin, is actually 19 times higher than the old limit. And that’s especially worth considering because in 2016, EPA determined that actually the risk of cancer was actually 30 times higher for adults than what was previously understood. 60 time higher for children, so that’s supposedly going to result in a change in their
risk level assessment sometime in the very near future, it might even be this year so at that point assuming that they just do the straight 30 times, even at the new more relaxed 100 cases per 1 million people instead of 1, levels, once they change the cancer causing rates of that particular chemical, it’s going to be 6 time higher than this new lax level and not 5 times lower, and that standard could change at any time, it’s already been five years. With the new administration it’s already been communicated that it will take place. So they are going have to, as soon as that those rules takes effect, that plant will have to abide by those new EPA standards and they will have to be shut down if they are exceeded, which at the current levels that they are proposing will be 6 times that new limit at the very least. The second thing I would like to do is talk about, one of the callers mentioned that the half-life of this chemical is very long, 4 to 7 months depending on the average temperature of the season, that giving plenty of time for the EtO to disperse throughout the entire community. So for BD to say, oh it’s the same several miles away in all difference part of the metro area, it’s not any high in our plant, it’s just ridiculous. Because it takes 4 to 7 months to travel around, the home town that I come from, has a German B Brown company, that’s one of the worst polluters in the county, and in that town, the entire metro area, it above the EPA limits because the citing of that one plant, near the airport.

Mr Cody, I apologize for interrupting, we do have a number of attendees that have joined us while you were speaking, I do want to provide the opportunity for other callers to speak, we ask that you provide your additional comments by writing, at air.permits@pima.gov. I thank you for your time.

(Mr Cody) - I just want to close by saying that the entire metro area is effected, don’t just focus on the people that live close to the plant this is going to affect everybody in the metro area. Thank you.

Thank you for your time Cody.

Hi, my name is Domonic, I live by Valencia, right by the location where it’s going to be put up, I have two small children, I was in the military, and I’m familiar with the pollutants and contaminants that are in the aqueducts, and now this is something that is going to be distributed into the air. At some point, I mean, you have to be anti-life, if you’re on board with this, and so my question is, what can we, other than conveying our disapproval to you, what can we do proactively to not allow this to happen, I mean do we need to sign a petition, what action can we do collectively as a group of people if we are against it to actually put a stop to this, because I don’t want any more pollutants in my area, my air and my groundwater, and at some point we are
all going to get cancer from something. Even if we cannot see it or smell it, it's doesn't mean it
doesn't exist, just like radio frequencies flowing through the air, tower, and so instead of rambling,
that's all I wanted to know. You sir the mitigator of this conversation, what can we do proactively,
other than just talk about it to, do we need to sign a petition, do we need to collectively form as
one at a certain location. Thank you.
Thank you for your time Domonic.
Next caller Giovanna
Giovanna- I agree with the last caller and Cody, and I want to express my opposition to the
building of this plant, that will have the emissions of EtO, as everybody has acknowledged, its
poison and pollutant and we have a beautiful community and all the community are affected when
part of our community is affected like Cody said. We are dealing with PFAS in the water, it's not
going away, it has not been resolved yet, and we have dealt in the past with other serious and
deadly pollutants in our water and now in our air. We need to prevent this and protect our
community for air and our environment, we know of all the cancers that these pollutants have
casted, and we want to express our opposition, I want you to listen to the people, that they don't
want this plant. We are a business friendly community, But we wanted it to be something that we
will be open for the business for the community, thank you very much.
I thank you for your time Giovana, and thank you for calling back.
Rose – I did provide comment earlier on but I just want to draw attention to one more thing, that
I was looking at OSHA fact sheet and how ethylene oxide can effect workers and I just wanted to
read this short paragraph about that just to kind a give some more information and about the
people that might work at the plant. In addition to eye pain, sore throat, EtO can cause difficult
breathing and blurred vision, exposure can also cause dizziness, nausea, headache convulsion,
blisters and can result in vomiting and coughing. Both human and animals studies show that EtO
is a carcinogen that may cause leukemia and other cancers, EtO is also linked to spontaneous
abortion, genetic damage, nerve damage, peripheral paralysis, muscle weakness as well as impair
thinking and memory. In liquid form, EtO can cause severe skin irritation upon prolonged or
confined contact. So just another thing to think about is that for not just the people that live around
there but for those that also work at the actual plant and how that can affect them. Thank you.
Thank you for your comment Rose,
I see a Steve Kozachik on the line
Steve Kozachik – I’m here to listen, I have no comment.

Leah Webster – Yes Hi, so basically I live within that radius near Wilmot and Valencia and so my family will be affected by this. I don’t understand how officials can allow EtO’s that can cause such great illnesses in our community and even affecting the schools in the area. They have misrepresented themselves on multiple occasions and there’s nothing they’ve done, you know they haven’t done the protocols that they are supposed to do, there’s nothing in the history that they have had, that has said anything, that their initial application like to justify their initial application and the percentages that they came up with. Every percentage that has been in every lawsuit in every state across the board, has stated that their initial application is false and they misrepresent themselves. And should be null and void they shouldn’t even have an application in there with the type of technicalities that they have out there. They actual in New Jersey, they have had 33 violations and paid 133 million dollars in penalties because of their emissions problems. And so my question is to the officials, how are you guys going to protect us. How are you going to protect the citizen, do we really need all these lawsuits in the future to Tucson. Because the lawsuits are across the board in various states, Tucson and the state of Arizona is going to end up with a bunch of lawsuits because of their misrepresentation, in allowing the emissions to go into the air these EtO’s that are causing all these illnesses, and so I’m pleading for your guys especially being in the neighborhood of this plant to please consider to allow their application to be approved. And that’s all.

Leah Webster I thank you for your time.

Heidi McDonald- I’m really concerned about having any plant like anywhere near where people live or even travel, especially schools, you know those people are not able to run away if something were to happen, not going to be able to be notified, and that I know there are a lot of cancer clusters around this companies other plants and I just don’t think it’s a good idea for pima county and our community at all. You know, if they wanted to do something like this they should be on property mile away from any people living in the area. And I’m also concerned that it near Davis Monthan Air Force Base that if something were to go wrong, would either place both of those can be affected then people around. So recommend not proceeding with the permit.

Heidi McDonald, I thank you for your time.

(SR)- we also have a Vanessa Gallego,
Hi Good evening my name is Vanessa Gallego, I’m a resident of Pima County and a resident of the City of Tucson. And I advocate for bicycle riding, people of color to go outside, use the outdoors, so what concerns me, when I’m advocating for my community to go outside, and the air that we breath, I’ve done my research like others on this platform have done and it is concerning that 709 lbs of this chemical to be released into our air, it concerns me where this plant is going to be located, this area of town, this area south, southwest, southeast is over representative with industry, so it concerns me that these communities continue to get impacted and again its vulnerable communities that are often already marginalized, then again these chemicals travel, so we are not just talking about this area, we talking about where else this can go. So I also share concerns with my fellow citizens, of what this means to our community, as we are trying to be more resilient, as were trying to grow families that don’t have environmental issues, we have a lot of that represented in these area of town. So I come from an equity standpoint, you know are we thinking about equity when we are thinking about these communities, and that’s a concern. So I thank you so much for this time, and this opportunity to express our real concern and fear about these chemicals being released and the long term affects it can have not only for our air, but for our environment period. Thank you.

Vanessa Gallego I thank you for your time.

Now before closing, I would like to give a final opportunity for anyone who would like to make a comment. I know the raised hand function is something we are promoting here, Sarah do we see any other raised hands.
(SR) So there are no new raised hands,
Jessica Samson – (Summarized by RP) notified PDEQ of the difficulty of calling in and the required technology of laptops to join the call.

At this stage I would like to conclude this hearing. I do wish to request all those people that wish to submit additional comments by the end of close of business by December 15, 2021. The documents for this hearing and the permit related material is presented on the PDEQ website. The department’s response to comments will be developed in the next few weeks to address any comments received. This document will be posted on the PDEQ web site. If you would like it sent to you, please send a request to air.permits@pima.gov. At this point, I will now stage, Sarah
I would like to close this hearing. We thank all those people, the attendees listed and called in today, I appreciate your interest and thank you for attending.

The hearing is closed. Today’s date is Wednesday November 3rd, 2021. The time is 6:42pm. Thank you for your time.
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Appendix C

Public Comments
November 18, 2021

Rupesh Patel  
Air Program Manager  
Pima County Department of Environmental Quality  
33 N. Stone Avenue  
Suite 700  
Tucson, AZ 85701  

Dear Rupesh Patel:

Since the 1950s, the area of Tucson south of Broadway Boulevard has been the dumping ground for environmentally hazardous industries. Because that part of the city has traditionally been populated by a large minority population, this fact probably shouldn’t be surprising. But to continue this practice by granting an air quality permit for the proposed Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD) facility on East Valencia Road is simply unacceptable.

Beginning in the 1950s with the United States Air Force and Hughes Aircraft dumping material containing TCE onto the ground around the Tucson International Airport to the later location of the American Atomics and Brush Wellman facilities south of Broadway Boulevard, this area has not been treated equitably. The problems have been compounded more recently by leaking fuel tanks at the Tom Price Service Center to the discovery of PFAS in southside water wells.

Now, BD wants to locate a facility on Valencia Road “that is expected to emit trace amounts of a cancerous gas.” According to the Arizona Daily Star article of November 2, there may not be anything that Pima County government can do to stop this from happening. I would hope that isn’t the case. But even if it is, at a minimum your department can insure that no cancerous gas is ever emitted from the facility.

If that can be done, however, I believe you still need to point out to the Pima County Board of Supervisors that the continued inequities in environmentally polluting facilities needs to stop. If these businesses and their emissions are acceptable south of Broadway, they should be permitted anywhere in unincorporated metropolitan Tucson.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Devine  
1705 E. Water Street  
Tucson, AZ 85719
Rupesh Patel  
Air Program Manager  
Pima County Department of Environmental Quality  
33 N. Stone Ave, Suite 700  
Tucson, AZ 85701

Via email

Re: Comments on Proposed Pima County Department of Environmental Quality Class II Air Quality Permit for Becton, Dickinson and Company Facility in Tucson, Arizona

Dear Rupesh Patel:

This letter is regarding the Pima County Department of Environmental Quality’s (PDEQ) proposed Class II air quality permit for the Becton, Dickinson and Company (“BD”) facility (Permit Number 6257). The proposed permit would allow BD to construct and operate a medical equipment sterilization facility that uses ethylene oxide at 7345 E. Valencia Road, Tucson, Arizona. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9 has reviewed the proposed permit package. Our comments on the proposed action are included in the attachment to this letter.

The EPA is committed to advancing environmental justice and incorporating equity considerations into all aspects of our work. This commitment includes improving our assessment and consideration of the impacts of permits on communities already overburdened by pollution. The proposed project would be located on the southeast side of Tucson, an area that contains communities that are disproportionately low-income, people of color, people with limited English proficiency, people who have not completed secondary education, and is near a Superfund site (Tucson International Airport site).

The EPA acknowledges and appreciates the work the PDEQ has already undertaken on this permitting action, including the development of an environmental justice analysis and enhanced public outreach efforts. As part of its public outreach efforts, the PDEQ provided an extended public comment period, sent public notices to 18,000 businesses and households, made the permit record available online, issued press releases to local media, held a virtual information session, held an in-person information session, and held a virtual public hearing. The PDEQ also made English-Spanish translation services available at outreach events.

Thank you again for the opportunity to work with you on this permit action to address our shared environmental priorities, advance equity and reduce potential environmental and health impacts on communities.
If you have any questions regarding the EPA’s comments, you may contact me at (415) 317-3744 or Lisa Beckham, our Arizona air permitting oversight contact, at (415) 972-3811 or beckham.lisa@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Lakin
Acting Air and Radiation Division Director

Enclosures
Cc (via email):
  Mayor Regina Romero, City of Tucson
  Supervisor Rex Scott, Pima County Board of Supervisors
  Supervisor Matt Heinz, Pima County Board of Supervisors
  Supervisor Sharon Bronson, Pima County Board of Supervisors
  Supervisor Steve Christy, Pima County Board of Supervisors
  Supervisor Adelita Grijalva, Pima County Board of Supervisors
  Jan Lesher, Acting Pima County Administrator
The EPA has reviewed the proposed Class II air quality permit package for the proposed BD facility, including the proposed permit, technical support document, and permit application materials made available by the PDEQ during the public comment period, and has the following comments and recommendations:

1. Monitoring of Ethylene Oxide Emissions
   
a. During the public participation process, the PDEQ has heard concerns from the community about community access to information confirming that the actual emissions from the facility once built will be as low as the projections from BD that form the basis for the permit limits. It has also been suggested by community members that requiring ambient monitors around the facility would help provide this assurance.

   In this circumstance, we do not believe ambient air monitoring is the best way to ensure the facility is held accountable for potential excess emissions. With ambient monitoring, it can be difficult to distinguish between pollution from the facility and pollution from other sources. When we know which pollutants are emitted from a particular source, we can use modeling to determine the impacts on the nearby community. For this reason, the use of continuous emissions monitoring systems (CEMS), which instead measure emissions at the source, is preferred.

   Currently, Attachment 4 of the proposed permit provides an option for ethylene oxide emissions to be monitored using CEMS to demonstrate compliance with the limits in 40 CFR part 63, subpart O. Given the proposed facility’s location near workers and residences, we strongly encourage the PDEQ to require CEMS in any final Class II air permit for the facility as the compliance demonstration method for ethylene oxide emissions. CEMS is an available technology for this industry and is already in use at, for example, Medline Industries in Waukegan, IL. Additionally, the draft permits for Sterigenics in Atlanta, GA and Baxter in Mountain Home, AR include the use of CEMS. Links to this information are provided below.

   - https://www2.illinois.gov/epa/topics/community-relations/sites/ethylene-oxide/Documents/medline%20industries%2019020013%20final.pdf
   - https://epd.georgia.gov/draft-sterigenics-air-quality-permit
   - https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/downloads/WebDatabases/PermitsOnline/AirDrafts/0544-AR-17.pdf

   Additionally, ethylene oxide monitoring data for the facility should be made easily accessible to the public in a format that shows, at a minimum, current emission rates, current monthly emissions, and the 12-month rolling total of emissions.

   b. In Condition 46.d, the proposed permit states that the O&M plan must identify periodic measurements and parameters to be collected and monitored by the building management system verifying proper collection of fugitive ethylene oxide emissions from areas downstream of any
natural draft openings and outer areas. To ensure enforceability, please confirm that the permit requires ongoing monitoring and recordkeeping of these measurements and parameters or revise the permit to include them.

2. **Environmental Justice Analysis**

We commend the PDEQ for preparing an environmental justice analysis (“EJ Analysis”) for its proposed permit action, and we understand that the PDEQ is aware that the communities in the southeast side of Tucson have environmental justice concerns. We recommend that the PDEQ make updates to its EJ Analysis and provide a revised analysis to the public. We believe an updated analysis will better inform the community and local policymakers regarding the impacts of this project. We recommend that the PDEQ make these updates to the EJ Analysis prior to any final permit decision:

a. NESHAP section: State that the EPA intends to update the currently applicable standards for commercial ethylene oxide sterilizers. The latest information regarding the EPA’s actions is available here: [https://www.epa.gov/hazardous-air-pollutants-ethylene-oxide/ethylene-oxide-updates](https://www.epa.gov/hazardous-air-pollutants-ethylene-oxide/ethylene-oxide-updates).

b. Demographics section:
   i. Please explain the basis for consideration of the 50 square mile area that was evaluated. We recommend using other features of EJSCREEN (beyond the Standard Report feature) to include maps of demographical and environmental indicators, such as people of color, linguistic isolation, low-income population, and Superfund site proximity for the southeast side of Tucson.
   ii. Add an analysis of the populations most likely to receive the highest impacts from the project based on the modeled impacts (e.g., 1- and 3-mile radius from the facility location).
   iii. Include the EJSCREEN reports as attachments to the EJ Analysis.
   iv. We also recommend adding additional information to evaluate environmental burdens of the local communities. This is a feature available in EJSCREEN.
   v. You may contact the EPA Region 9 Environmental Justice Coordinator, Alan Bacock, with any questions regarding EJSCREEN. He is available at (415) 947-4195 or Bacock.Alan@epa.gov.

c. Impact of the Project’s Emissions:
   i. Provide more information on the main pollutant of concern from the project, ethylene oxide, including that exposure over many years of elevated levels of ethylene oxide increases cancer risk. You can also point to health information on the EPA’s website: [https://www.epa.gov/hazardous-air-pollutants-ethylene-oxide/frequent-questions-health-information-about-ethylene-oxide](https://www.epa.gov/hazardous-air-pollutants-ethylene-oxide/frequent-questions-health-information-about-ethylene-oxide).
   ii. Provide the summary results of the residential impacts in a table.
   iii. Consider non-residential impacts to nearby workplaces that are in closer proximity than the residential areas evaluated, and which are expected to have higher maximum impacts. Identify the responsible government agencies for enforcement of workplace protections (i.e., OSHA and ADOSH). The EPA explained its approach for the consideration of non-residential impacts in the “Risk Assessment Report for the Sterigenics Facility in Willowbrook, Illinois.” See the final paragraph of Section 2.3 on page 16 of the report.
d. Additionally, it may be appropriate to address concerns raised by the community that are otherwise outside the scope of the air permit decision but that may provide relevant information regarding the regulation and impacts of the facility in the EJ analysis. This could include identification of requirements under section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act, the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Nombre</th>
<th>Mailing Address/Dirección de envío</th>
<th>E-Mail Address/Phone Number Dirección de correo electrónico/ número de teléfono</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>5979 Andrew Lula Pl. Pawell, OH 45065</td>
<td><a href="mailto:troy.kirkpatrick@bd.com">troy.kirkpatrick@bd.com</a> 614.284.1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Componfort</td>
<td>1600 N. 35th Pl Phoenix, AZ 85029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nathan.componfort@bo.com">nathan.componfort@bo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betti Quintero</td>
<td>247 W. Calle Francesa 85701</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gapitgirl@gmail.com">gapitgirl@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Brittle</td>
<td>2434 W Northview 85031</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smbBrittle@yahoo.com">smbBrittle@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Huber</td>
<td>6583 S. Avenida Santa Carolina Tucson, AZ 85710</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laramounioncapital@hotmail.com">laramounioncapital@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Gallego</td>
<td>6950 E. 22nd St Tucson AZ 85713</td>
<td>520-245-2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Neville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel T. Cumberland</td>
<td>5790 E. Camino De Azucar Tucson, AZ 85716</td>
<td><a href="mailto:noeltcumberland@gmail.com">noeltcumberland@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Stephen Cody</td>
<td>1535 E. Ninoque Zone Tucson, AZ 85756</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tspencercody@gmail.com">tspencercody@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Ludden</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nivudden@tucson.com">nivudden@tucson.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al W Ruth</td>
<td>9982 E. Paseo San Bernando Tucson 85747</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alwruth11@yahoo.com">alwruth11@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Nombre</td>
<td>Mailing Address/Dirección de envío</td>
<td>E-Mail Address/Phone Number Dirección de correo electrónico/ número de teléfono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Dutton</td>
<td>1985 E River Rd., Suite 101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.dutton@sunriverair.com">susan.dutton@sunriverair.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos J. Urrea</td>
<td>405 S E. Horley St., Tucson, AZ 85712</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mju@urreaforcongress.com">mju@urreaforcongress.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Young</td>
<td>6748 S. Burcham Ave, 85712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Angel Ruiz</td>
<td>6783 S Avenida del Abraco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cambra</td>
<td>6783 S. Avenida del Abraco</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosegammotz@gmail.com">rosegammotz@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENT SHEET

Proposed Air Quality Permit for Becton, Dickinson & Company

Open House: October 27, 2021

Public Comment Period: September 17 – December 17, 2021

Note: Any interested person may submit comments on a proposed permit during the public comment period. PDEQ will consider all comments received during the comment period in its final decision making process, and they will be included in the administrative record and available to the public. In addition, anyone who submitted a comment during the public comment period has the legal right to appeal the permit decision. To be notified of actions related to the Becton, Dickinson & Company or to appeal the permit decision, your name and address must be provided as required under state law.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY:
Date: 10-27-21 Name: Antonio Sallinas
E-mail: sallinstatement912@gmail.com Phone: (520) 781-7426
Mailing Address:

COMMENTS: My issues are, for one is as long as this company has been around, why haven’t they found or put their money into finding an alternative to ETO. Also why would this company want to build in that location when the EPA says this vapor can last up to 70 days in the summer and up to 150 days in the winter. This company needs to build somewhere where there is no or not many residential areas. This plant will harm many and many more with the upcoming developments. Our schools are close and there are many warehousing jobs that also will get affected.
COMMENT SHEET

Proposed Air Quality Permit for Becton, Dickinson & Company

Open House: October 27, 2021

Public Comment Period: September 17 – December 17, 2021

Note: Any interested person may submit comments on a proposed permit during the public comment period. PDEQ will consider all comments received during the comment period in its final decision making process, and they will be included in the administrative record and available to the public. In addition, anyone who submitted a comment during the public comment period has the legal right to appeal the permit decision. To be notified of actions related to the Becton, Dickinson & Company or to appeal the permit decision, your name and address must be provided as required under state law.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY:

Date: 10/27/2021 Name: Leah Webster
E-mail: LPARAMOUNTCAPITAL@HOTMAIL.COM Phone: 520-208-5122
Mailing Address: 16583 S., Avenida Santa Carolina
Tucson, AZ 85756

COMMENTS: In Becton & Dickinson & Co. initial application, they stated the ETO released at 0.05% emissions from sterilization process (Page 3-1). It also states on page 2-5 the two Lecoq catalytic oxidation systems will control 99.98% of these emissions; however, the charts in GA had a lower rate of ETO emissions; Covington 0.307 ETO, Cobb County 0.430 ETO, Fulton County 1.057 ETO, South Dekalb 0.401 ETO, Gcn, Coffee State Park 0.307 ETO. Their numbers of emissions do not line up with the application submitted by the VP of BD, Travis Anderson. Their submission application should be null and void. The emissions of these types of human carcinogens put more than 69,000 people in the surrounding areas at risk of various neurological disorders and irregularities, cognitive impairment, cancers, etc. ETO emissions' estimated half-life in the atmosphere during summer is 69 days and during winter up to 149 days. How can you justify your irregular numbers of uncontrolled/fugitive emissions? How do you justify more than 69,000 military, families, and children being in the proximity of such volatile emissions?
Why after various lawsuits, in Georgia, did Becton, Dickerson & co. later announce the plant's closure? BD has already misrepresented to state officials the amount of emissions from the plant in New Jersey and how blatantly violated the state's RICO law. How can they prove their numbers on the initial application in Tucson, AZ to be truthful? In one incident the company's plant had an 8x-day leak of EtO emissions due to an unclosed exhaust valve. What guarantees do we have that proper protocols will be adhered to? How can BD guarantee our children that go to school, within a 5 mile radius, will not fall victim to these volatile emissions?
COMMENTS SHEET

Proposed Air Quality Permit for Becton, Dickinson & Company

Open House: October 27, 2021

Public Comment Period: September 17 – December 17, 2021

Note: Any interested person may submit comments on a proposed permit during the public comment period. PDEQ will consider all comments received during the comment period in its final decision making process, and they will be included in the administrative record and available to the public. In addition, anyone who submitted a comment during the public comment period has the legal right to appeal the permit decision. To be notified of actions related to the Becton, Dickinson & Company or to appeal the permit decision, your name and address must be provided as required under state law.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY:

Date: 27 October 2021 Name: Noel T. Cumberland
E-mail: noelcumberland@gmail.com Phone: 520 741 4134
Mailing Address: 5790 E. Camino de Alecar
Tucson, AZ 85756

COMMENTS: My biggest concern is with the impact to traffic at Valencia and Kolb. This is a high traffic flow area and delivery of hazardous chemicals across the current designed traffic flow looks likely to result in accidents. The potential for a chemical spill resulting from an accident during delivery seems disproportionately high.

Has AZDOT been asked to study this project and propose a solution?