October 23, 2025

Submitted Via Ecology.gov

Anthony Bruma
Washington Department of Ecology
anthony.bruma@ecy.wa.gov

Re: Chapter 173-448 WAC – Air Quality in Overburdened Communities Rulemaking

Dear Anthony Bruma & Rulemaking Team,

This letter is submitted by Front and Centered, Duwamish River Community Coalition, Communities for a Healthy Bay, Friends of Toppenish Creek, and Earthjustice. Our organizations carry the stories and regional and statewide perspectives of frontline communities in Washington State. This comment letter is submitted in response to the Department of Ecology's ("Ecology") most recent workshop on Emission Reduction Strategies. Herein, we make two recommendations:

First, Ecology should use air quality targets that it develops for overburdened communities to set air quality standards and emissions limits that will reduce pollution in these communities. Washington's Clean Air Act and the Climate Commitment Act explicitly provide Ecology with this authority and require Ecology to use its authority to reduce emissions in overburdened communities.

Second, in considering both Ecology's obligation to identify major sources of emissions in overburdened communities, and its obligation to reduce emissions from those sources, Ecology should adopt regulations to control emissions from diesel pollution hotspots by regulating facilities that attract diesel mobile sources like mega-warehouses and ports. Washington can look to successful examples from California to reduce pollution from warehouses and ports–which are major sources of pollution in and near to port-communities.

Addressing pollution hotspots at goods movement hubs like ports and warehouses advances environmental justice. It addresses the reality that polluting activities like freight warehouses, distribution centers, and ports are often sited in communities that have historically had less political power – communities of color, immigrant communities, and poorer areas. These communities endure the health burdens of decisions made by distant

corporate logistics planners. Regulating these facilities shift the responsibility for controlling pollution back onto the polluters. They say, in effect, *if you want to operate a facility that draws hundreds of diesel trucks through a neighborhood, you must take action to mitigate the pollution and protect that neighborhood's health*.

This is entirely consistent with the **community-led principles of environmental justice** that our coalition embraces. It's also supported by Washington's statutory commitments – the Climate Commitment Act's EJ provisions, as well as the HEAL Act (Healthy Environment for All Act), which directs agencies like Ecology to reduce disparities and ensure meaningful involvement of overburdened communities in decisions (RCW 70A.02.050–060). Implementing indirect source controls would show that Ecology is listening to frontline communities who have been calling for solutions to the unchecked diesel and noise impacts of nearby ports and warehouses.

I. Ecology must set enforceable limits on air pollution to protect overburdened communities

Ecology should use its authority under RCW 70A.65.020 to set strong air quality standards in overburdened communities that reduce the exposure of these communities to harmful criteria air pollutants. In turn, Ecology should seek to achieve reductions in air pollution through strong emissions limits for stationary sources, and indirect source control to reduce emissions from the transportation sector.

A. Ecology has authority to set strong air quality standards to reduce air pollution in overburdened communities.

The Climate Commitment Act directs the Department of Ecology ("Ecology") to set health protective air quality targets for overburdened communities, and then requires Ecology to take action to meet those targets through stricter air quality standards, emission limits and enforcement orders. Ecology must identify the stationary and mobile sources that are the greatest contributors of those emissions, and then "achieve reduction targets through adoption of emission control strategies or other methods[.]" RCW 70A.65.020(2)(b)(ii), (iii). Further, Ecology has broad authority to develop air quality standards, and emissions standards and limits to protect air quality and public health. *See* RCW 70A.15.3000(1), (2). And, is specifically directed to use this authority to set "stricter air quality standards, emission standards, or emissions limitations on criteria pollutants" to reduce such pollution in overburdened communities. *See* RCW 70A.65.020(2)(b)(iv). "The air quality standards and emission standards may be for the state as a whole or may vary from area to area or source to source[.]" RCW 70A.15.3000(3). Lastly, Ecology must issue enforcement orders to ensure compliance with air quality standards, and emissions limits or standards adopted pursuant to RCW 70A.65.020. Washington's Clean Air Act requires Ecology to take swift action to protect public health through enforcement orders:

> "The department … must issue an enforceable order… to all permitted or registered sources operating in overburdened communities when … the department determines

> that criteria pollutants are not being reduced in an overburdened community and the department … adopts stricter air quality standards, emissions standards, or emissions limitations on criteria pollutants."

RCW 70A.15.1100.

Recommendation 1: Consistent with the approach proposed in Ecology's last rulemaking workshop, Ecology should identify air quality targets in overburdened communities, and make those targets enforceable by making them air quality standards. Ecology can then set emission limits for stationary sources to reduce criteria pollution, focusing on facilities that operate in identified overburdened communities.

Recommendation 2: Consistent with its authority to develop air quality standards, Ecology should develop a regulation to control hotspots of diesel pollution that concentrate at goods movement hubs, like ports and warehouses. RCW 70A.65.020 explicitly requires Ecology to address **both stationary *and mobile* sources** in achieving air quality targets for overburdened communities. These diesel pollution hotspots are a major contributor of pollution in overburdened communities of both smog forming and cancer-causing air pollutants, which Ecology should regulate.

II. Regulating Diesel Pollution at Large Warehouses & Ports

Science shows that the emission of diesel pollution from medium and heavy-duty trucks deteriorates air quality with the toxic emission of diesel particulate matter, and NOx, in and around goods movement corridors. This pollution is particularly noxious in Seattle, Vancouver, and Tacoma. Diesel pollution can cause deleterious impacts on the health of community residents who live near to ports, warehouses, highways, and designated trucking corridors, where the cumulative movement of freight in these freight distribution hubs creates diesel pollution hotspots.[1] In addition, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHG pollution in the state.[2] Reducing emissions from the transportation sector is critical to achieving the climate and health objectives of the Climate Commitment Act.

Washington has taken steps to reduce toxic diesel, but more needs to be done to protect the health of overburdened communities. By adopting the Heavy Duty Omnibus Rule and the Advanced Clean Trucks rule, Washington State has taken significant steps toward addressing pollution from medium and heavy duty vehicles, and the public health impacts of these important tailpipe emissions regulations will be felt for decades.[3] However, these regulations only apply to new vehicles, and further, Washington must take steps to upgrade needed infrastructure to support this transition to electrified freight movement. Indirect

---

[1] DRCC, Earthjustice, Front & Centered, Communities for a Healthy Bay, Friends of Toppenish Creek, *Comment Letter on Chapter 173-448 WAC – Air Quality in Overburdened Communities Rulemaking*, Mar. 19, 2025 (describing public health impacts from goods movement in overburdened communities, like South Seattle).

[2] *See* Statewide GHG Emissions Inventory, https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2414077.pdf.

[3] We understand these regulations have been subject to challenge and litigation.

source regulation can help with both these problems by encouraging facilities that attract mobile sources, like ports and mega-warehouses, to take actions that facilitate reduced mobile source emissions, like installing fast chargers for electric vehicles.

It is also important to consider the federal context, which makes state-level indirect source rules even more critical. This year, the U.S. Congress took steps to overturn EPA's waiver that allowed California to develop stricter emission standards for medium and heavy-duty trucks (NRDC Press Release). According to an analysis by the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Congressional Review Act resolution blocking updated truck standards would result in **an extra 1.6 million tons of carbon emissions and 17,700 metric tons of fine particulate (PM 2.5)** nationwide from the affected vehicles (NRDC Press Release). Given this context, it is even more important to utilize as many regulatory tools as possible that will drive vehicle innovation and electrified vehicle adoption in our state. Indirect source rules offer a way for states to help develop infrastructure and incentives to support electrifying the freight sector.

A. What tools are available to regulate facilities that create diesel pollution hotspots?

Ports, rail yards, mega-warehouses and distribution centers attract trucks, ships, and trains that transport freight because these vehicles are used in the distribution of freight. Diesel is the primary fuel used by these types of vehicles. The concentration of diesel-powered vehicles at freight distribution hubs creates **diesel pollution hotspots**.

While the federal Clean Air Act preempts Washington from developing new tail-pipe emission standards for vehicles, it explicitly allows local and state governments to regulate facilities that attract mobile sources, such as ports and warehouses, and to require those facilities to reduce pollution generated on-site by motor vehicles. The federal Clean Air Act reserves the authority for states to regulate any "facility, building, structure, installation, real property, road, or highway which attracts, or may attract, mobile sources of pollution[,]" which the Clean Air Act defines as an indirect source.[4] States may adopt a "facility-by-facility review of indirect sources of air pollution, including such measures as are necessary to assure, or assist in assuring, that a new or modified source will not attract mobile sources of pollution[.]"[5]

As EPA has explained in its proposal to incorporate the WAIRE Rule into California's State Implementation Program ("SIP"), "by defining the term 'indirect source program' in Section 110(a)(5)(D), Congress was not diminishing existing State authority under Section 116 to adopt such programs that apply to existing sources, such as existing

[4] 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(5)(C).
[5] *Id*.

warehouses, if they elect to do so."[6] This means that states have the authority to adopt such regulations pursuant to their traditional police powers.

States and local governments around the country have developed regulations to control diesel hotspots requiring them to cumulatively reduce pollutant emission from mobile sources that frequent these facilities. Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality requires applicants seeking to construct new or modify existing indirect sources ("IS") such as parking, retail, commercial, industrial, recreational, educational, and hospital facilities as well as office and government buildings of a certain size be required to obtain IS permits with construction and operation conditions that control emissions.[7] Oregon's program is similar to the California's San Joaquin Valley District Rule 9510, which has regulated NO_x and PM_{10} emissions from the construction and operation of new development projects since 2005.[8] The U.S. Virgin Islands and Washington D.C. are two other U.S. territories that have similar construction and parking lot-related ISRs.[9]

In California, a local air district adopted Rule 2305, the **Warehouse Indirect Source Rule (WAIRE)**, a groundbreaking measure to curb pollution from the goods movement industry. Rule 2305 requires large warehouses (100,000+ sq ft) to earn a certain number of points each year by implementing emission-reducing actions, or else pay a mitigation fee.[10] The purpose is to internalize the environmental cost of diesel traffic to those profiting from the warehouse, and to incentivize a switch to cleaner alternatives. Preliminary analysis of the impacts of the WAIRE rule shows that the rule resulted in increased electric truck acquisition, investments into charging infrastructure, and an increased number of electric truck visits at warehouses.[11] Southern California's example is highly relevant to Washington – we too have exploding growth in warehouse logistics (especially with e-commerce) and similar resulting diesel-related air quality challenges.

In terms of regulating mega-warehouses, the New York State Senate passed a bill that would regulate freight pollution occurring at warehouses, and the bill is now before the New York Assembly.[12] Colorado is also considering regulating diesel hotspots at transportation hubs like ports and warehouses, and is currently investigating how to structure such a

---

[6] California South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Plan Approval, 88 FR 70622.
[7] Or. Admin. R. 340-254-0030 et seq.
[8] San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule 9510, https://ww2.valleyair.org/media/cjlnn0u1/r9510-a.pdf.
[9] San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule 9510, https://ww2.valleyair.org/media/cjlnn0u1/r9510-a.pdf.
[10] S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., *WAIRE Program*, https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/compliance/waire-program.
[11] *See* Attachment A, *Pritzer Brief: Wielding the Power of ISRs: Using Indirect Source Rules to Fight Air Pollution from Mega Facilities*.
[12] NYS 2025-S1180A, https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2025/S1180/amendment/A.

program.[13] Colorado also developed an extensive analysis of its legal authority to adopt an indirect source program.[14]

More recently, California's local air district has proposed a comprehensive rule to require ports to reduce pollution from all mobile sources.[15] This proposed rule would require the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to develop plans for port-wide charging and fueling infrastructure, with the goal of reducing indirect emissions from the port to meet state and federal air quality standards.[16]

B. Mobile Sources Are A Major Contributor of Pollution in Overburdened Communities

Mobile sources are a **major contributor of pollution**, particularly mobile sources that rely on diesel, marine diesel, heavy fuel oil, or low-sulfur fuel oil for power such as medium and heavy-duty vehicles, diesel powered trains, and ships. Pollution from mobile sources adversely affects the health of communities throughout Washington State. The Environmental Health Disparities Map shows that communities impacted by mobile sources also tend to rank high in Socioeconomic Factors indicators, including People of Color and Population Living in Poverty. A closer examination of the transportation infrastructure and land use policy decisions in Tacoma demonstrates how health disparities result across the state from mobile sources and associated cumulative and health effects in communities in and near centralized pollution sites.

In Tacoma, Interstate 5, State Route 16, and the maze of freight routes to and from the Port of Tacoma run through these neighborhoods, carry heavy-duty diesel truck traffic that releases toxic exhaust. Diesel engines are a dominant source of NO_2 and fine particulates; a recent Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) air toxics study concluded that diesel particulate matter is the *single largest driver of cancer risk* in Tacoma's air.[17] This study revealed that at Tacoma's Tideflats about **65% of the area's diesel pollution came**

---

[13] RAQC, Indirect Source Rule, https://raqc.org/control-strategies/indirect-source-rule/#:~:text=Indirect%20sources%20include%20activities%20associated,attainment%20and%20maintenance%20of%20the.

[14] *See* Attachment B, Christy Law, *Indirect Source Control Authority*, https://raqc.egnyte.com/dl/Bi1QyETJZG.

[15] S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., Proposed Rule 2304, https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-2304.

[16] *Id.*

[17] Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, *Tacoma and Seattle Air Toxics Trends Technical Report*, Dec. 2023, https://www.pscleanair.gov/DocumentCenter/View/5369/2023TacomaSeattleAirToxicsReport?bidId=.

from maritime and port-related sources and 35% from on-road vehicles, underscoring the substantial impact of port trucking and shipping in Tacoma.[18]

South and East Tacoma, some of the communities identified by the Department of Ecology as overburdened, face a **cumulative pollution burden** from both **stationary industrial sources** and **mobile sources**. Ecology's own 2023 report identifies South and East Tacoma (population ~147,000) as highly impacted by fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) and cumulative air pollutant emissions. [19] These communities contain historically redlined neighborhoods with a high proportion of Black, Indigenous, and residents of color as well as the industrial zones in the Port of Tacoma and South Tacoma. Notably, life expectancy in Tacoma's South End neighborhood (68.4 years) is a full 18 years shorter than in the city's more affluent North End (86.7 years).[20]

Of the four most populous counties in the Puget Sound region, Pierce County as a whole has highest rate of deaths due to cardiovascular disease and stroke (234 per 100,000).[21] While certain areas of Tacoma see nearly double that rate (456 per 100,000), the city also experiences asthma hospitalizations at one of the highest rates in the state (30.4 per 100,000).[22,23] The prevalence of chronic diseases like asthma and cardiovascular illness in Tacoma/Pierce County reiterate that **environmental justice and public health are inextricably connected**.

Crucially, the health impacts of this cumulative pollution are **well documented and alarming**. Compared to state averages and even just to other parts of Pierce County, residents of South and East Tacoma suffer higher rates of asthma, heart disease and dramatically shorter lifespans. Although Ecology's 2023 report affirms that overburdened communities statewide have more heart disease deaths and about **2.4 years shorter life expectancy on average** than other communities, the residents of overburdened communities in Tacoma live 9-12 years shorter (68.4 and 71.1 years in different census tracts) than the

---

[18] *Id*.

[19] Wash. Dep't of Ecology, *Improving Air Quality in Overburdened Communities Highly Impacted by Air Pollution: 2023 Report*, at 171-180, https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2302115.pdf.

[20] Puget Sound Regional Council, *Life Expectancy by Census Tract (Equity Insights and Analysis)*, https://www.psrc.org/our-work/equity/equity-tracker/communities-health/life-expectancy.

[21] Puget Sound Regional Council, *Cardiovascular Disease Mortality by Census Tract (Equity Insights and Analysis)*, https://www.psrc.org/our-work/equity/equity-tracker/communities-health/cardiovascular-disease-mortality.

[22] *Id*.

[23] Wash. State Department of Health, *Washington Tracking Network (WTN) Asthma Hospitalizations: Age-Adjusted Rate*, https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wtn/WTNPortal/#!q0=886.

state average of 80.4 years.[24, 25] These health disparities in Tacoma and communities across the State are, in part, the result of policy decisions that allowed polluting activities to concentrate near marginalized neighborhoods. As our coalition emphasized in previous comments, **cumulative health impacts are a major issue of concern in overburdened communities. Mobile source pollution in particular directly harms these communities**. If regulatory agencies fail to account for cumulative impacts in permits and planning, then *systemic injustice will flourish* as polluting projects continue to **harm overburdened communities.**

i. Warehouse Pollution

Unfortunately, South Tacoma offers a case study in **procedural gaps and accountability failures** that have perpetuated pollution inequities. A recent example is the Bridge Industrial warehouse project, a massive 2.5 million-square-foot logistics center proposed in South Tacoma's residential area. Despite community outcry about the air quality impacts, the City of Tacoma issued a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance under SEPA – **approving the project without a full Environmental Impact Statement or any Health Impact Assessment.[26]** The warehouse is expected to generate thousands of additional **truck trips per day** on local streets that already endure heavy pollution.[27]

As community leaders have observed, this decision essentially told residents that **their health is "non-significant"** in the eyes of regulators. This is precisely the kind of blind spot – where indirect or off-site emissions are ignored – that has allowed toxic air to persist in overburdened areas. This example underscores an urgent need for Ecology to exercise leadership: local land use processes alone cannot sufficiently protect environmental justice communities. **Ecology must step in to fill these regulatory gaps**, ensure cumulative impacts are addressed, and prevent new projects from adding to the pollution burden in places like South Tacoma.

South Tacoma's 12,000-vehicle/day warehouse project is one illustration, but the pattern is widespread: new warehouse complexes along I-5 and I-90, and expanding marine terminals, create hotspots of pollution in overburdened communities like South Park, Georgetown, and Tacoma. These communities share a similar pattern of environmental

---

[24] Wash. Dep't of Ecology, *Improving Air Quality in Overburdened Communities Highly Impacted by Air Pollution: 2023 Report*, at 53-54, https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2302115.pdf.

[25] Puget Sound Regional Council, *Life Expectancy by Census Tract (Equity Insights and Analysis)*, https://www.psrc.org/our-work/equity/equity-tracker/communities-health/life-expectancy.

[26] Earthjustice, *What You Should Know About the Bridge Industrial South Tacoma Warehouse Project*, Oct. 6, 2023, https://earthjustice.org/feature/south-tacoma-warehouse-bridge-industrial.

[27] *Id*.

health disparities and being similarly situated where direct and indirect sources of air pollution are concentrated. It's time for Ecology to take action to mitigate this pollution to meet air quality targets and reduce health disparities in Washington.

ii. Pollution from Ports

From a health perspective, the port sector is one of the *largest contributors of criteria air pollutants* in our region. The **Port of Tacoma**, together with the broader **Northwest Seaport Alliance (NWSA)**, is a significant source of air pollution affecting Tacoma's overburdened communities. Port-related activities – including ocean-going vessels, harbor craft, cargo-handling equipment, locomotives, and trucks – produce a concentrated plume of emissions that spreads across Commencement Bay and into surrounding neighborhoods (Tacoma's Northeast Tacoma, Tideflats, Fife, South End, and beyond). Recent emissions inventory data underscores the magnitude of this impact: **in 2021, maritime and port operations in the Puget Sound region (Tacoma, Seattle, and other Puget Sound ports) emitted approximately 1.59 million metric tons of CO_2e** (greenhouse gases) into the air.[28] Of this total, pollution from on-road heavy-duty trucks that occurred on site at the terminal amounted to 238,471 tons of CO_2e emissions.[29]

According to the Puget Sound Maritime air emissions inventory, **ocean-going vessels (OGVs) are the single largest source of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulfur dioxide (SO_2) emissions** in the Puget Sound airshed, due to the large ships calling at our ports.[30] Other major port-related emitters include harbor vessels (tugs, ferries), which also produce significant diesel particulate matter. Heavy-duty **diesel trucks** moving cargo to and from port terminals and nearby warehouses likewise also are a significant source of diesel pollution.[31] In short, port activities represent the intersection of both stationary and mobile pollution sources that significantly degrade air quality in Tacoma's overburdened communities.

Mobile sources at Washington's ports include the **ocean going vessels** (OGVs) burning high-sulfur diesel or bunker fuel as they maneuver or berth; the **harbor tugs and equipment** (cranes, yard trucks, cargo handlers often running on diesel); the **railroad locomotives** hauling freight; and the endless stream of **diesel trucks** (drayage trucks) that move containers and goods in and out of port terminals and nearby warehouses.

---

[28] Puget Sound Maritime Air Forum, *Puget Sound Maritime Air Emissions Inventory Volume, 1* at ES-2 (April 2024), https://s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/nwseaportalliance.com.if-us-west-2-or/2024-06/FINAL%202021%20PSEI%20Report%20Volume%201%20(3%20April%2024)scg.pdf.
[29] *Id*., at 90.
[30] *See Id*., generally.
[31] *See Id*., generally.

Collectively, these mobile sources release large quantities of diesel exhaust, NO_x, SO_2, and fine particulate ($PM_{2.5}$). Notably, the 2021 Puget Sound Maritime emissions report found that at the NWSA terminals, the biggest contributors to emissions were **ships (especially during hoteling at berth), cargo-handling equipment, locomotives, and trucks.**[32] At NWSA facilities, OGVs were identified as the top source not only of NO_x and SO_2 but also of particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) and diesel particulate matter among all port-related sources.[33] This means that communities near the Port of Tacoma are continually exposed to **elevated levels of diesel soot and combustion byproducts**, which are known to cause cancer, respiratory illness, heart attacks, and premature death.

The impact on human health and environmental justice communities around ports is severe. For example, the South End and Eastside neighborhoods of Tacoma lie just south and west of the Port/Tideflats and are directly downwind of port emissions. These areas are part of Ecology's identified overburdened communities, and residents there experience higher asthma rates and other pollution-related health disparities. Perhaps the most striking illustration is the presence of the **Northwest Detention Center (NWDC)** – a large immigrant detention facility – *within* the Port of Tacoma industrial area. The NWDC houses several hundred to over a thousand people at any time, effectively functioning as a residential population confined 24/7 in the middle of a toxic air pollution hotspot. The Tacoma Tideflats area is so polluted that the City of Tacoma has deemed it generally **"unfit for residents"**, yet detainees (who are disproportionately people of color) are held there involuntarily. Community advocates have noted that NWDC detainees are exposed to pollutant concentrations around the clock that likely **exceed what would be considered safe for workers on an 8-hour shift**, raising serious environmental justice and human rights concerns. In short, the Port of Tacoma's pollution is not just a theoretical problem – it is causing real harm to real people, many of whom have little political power or choice in the matter.

Despite these well-known impacts, **current regulatory oversight of port pollution is patchy and insufficient**. The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulates some emissions (and has partnered on voluntary clean air programs), and the NWSA itself has a voluntary "Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy." While these efforts have yielded some progress (e.g., cleaner standards for trucks entering the port, shore power at a few berths, and phasing out older diesel equipment), they are **not enforceable or comprehensive enough** to bring port-area air quality in line with health-protective levels. For instance, many ocean-going vessels still use dirty fuels or engines without the best available controls, especially once beyond the dock.

Truck emissions, while improved from a decade ago, still add significantly to neighborhood pollution – and the **cumulative cancer risk from diesel in port-adjacent communities remains extremely high**, as PSCAA's 2022 study confirms. In Tacoma's

---

[32] *See Id.*, generally.
[33] *See Id.*, generally.

Tideflats, PSCAA found that **maritime sources (ships, harbor craft) contributed roughly 213 per million excess cancer risk from diesel, compared to 114 per million from on-road diesel – together summing to over 300 per million risk from diesel alone in that area.**[34] These are very high levels of pollution and risk, which demand action. They illustrate that **port pollution is an urgent public health crisis** that not only affects Tacoma, but other coastal communities in the State**.** This situation calls for a strategic, multi-faceted regulatory approach by Ecology.

Moreover, we call on Ecology to increase air monitoring of $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, diesel particles (e.g., measurements of Black Carbon), NO_x, and Air Toxics, to understand emission sources and to document patterns over time in emissions and concentrations. While some of those pollutants are currently monitored by Ecology, not all of them are. In too many cases, monitoring in overburdened communities is lacking. Furthermore, ecology should strengthen the connections between concentration measurements, understanding the emission sources causing the pollution, and their subsequent actions to reduce those emissions. In this way, Ecology can better connect information-gathering and action, with ongoing feedback between those two over time.

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, Front and Centered, Earthjustice, DRCC, Communities for a Healthy Bay, and Friends of Toppenish Creek respectfully request that the Department of Ecology use the air quality targets for overburdened communities that it develops through this rulemaking, to set strong air quality standards and emissions limits in the affected communities. Further, given that diesel hotspots at ports and warehouses are a major contributor of criteria air pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and highly toxic diesel particulate matter, Ecology should take action to regulate these hotspots by requiring facilities that attract diesel vehicles to reduce emissions that occur onsite.

Sincerely,

Logan Danzek
Communities for a Healthy Bay

Mia Ayala-Marshall
Duwamish River Community Coalition

Maiko Patschke
Front and Centered

---

[34] Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, *Tacoma and Seattle Air Toxics Trends Technical Report*, Dec. 2023, https://www.pscleanair.gov/DocumentCenter/View/5369/2023TacomaSeattleAirToxicsReport?bidId=.

Jean Mendoza
Friends of Toppenish Creek

Jaimini Parekh
Earthjustice