

Hello,

My name is Vanessa Mascaro and I'm a North Kingstown resident and a parent. I'm here in support of S 3224, which is exactly why I'm asking you to fix it. I am asking you to do something very simple: remove the sunset clause.

Because right now, this bill does not stop harm. It schedules it.

Let's talk about what's actually being proposed. This is not a "green" facility. This is not harmless innovation. This is a facility that would heat sewage sludge and waste at extreme temperatures and release dozens of pollutants into the air — not one, not a few, dozens. The applicant's own filings and the state's technical review show that 46 toxic air contaminants could be emitted, 25 of them exceed minimum thresholds requiring modeling, and emissions include hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, VOCs, heavy metals, and carcinogens like benzene and formaldehyde. And that's just what they expect.

Now here's where it gets worse. QSS Biosolids, LLC claimed high pollution control efficiency, but when it came time to prove it, they couldn't. They could not measure it, and they could not verify it. So what happened? The requirement was effectively dropped, and the emissions are now treated as uncontrolled. Let me say that again: a facility that cannot demonstrate its pollution controls is being allowed to move forward based on assumptions.

So when you hear "it meets standards," understand what that actually means. It means the standards were adjusted to match what they could show — not what is actually safe.

I also want to address the testimony submitted by QSS Biosolids, LLC, because it contains inconsistencies that this body should not ignore. In their testimony, they reference a \$225 million private investment, yet their own project documentation identifies an anticipated construction cost of \$150 million for the biosolids biochar facility. That is a significant difference, and it raises questions about how this project is being represented. Additionally, their testimony emphasizes that the Quonset vote occurred in public session, which is not what has been contested. The concern has always been that the substantive discussion and decision-making occurred in executive session, outside of public view. This type of selective framing is exactly what we are dealing with when it comes to this company, and it underscores why allowing this project to move forward based on their claims is not just risky, it is irresponsible.

And this is where your decision matters. Because passing this bill with a sunset clause says, "we recognize this is dangerous... but only temporarily." That is not a safeguard. That is a delay tactic.

You are being asked to make a choice tonight: either this type of facility is appropriate next to schools, homes, families, and a sole source aquifer, or it is not. And if it is not, then there is no justification for allowing it in 2027. None.

Because here's the reality: if this facility is built and something goes wrong, you cannot undo that exposure. You cannot un-breathe that air, you cannot un-contaminate water, and you cannot go back and say, "we should have been more cautious."

So I'm going to be very direct. If you vote for this bill without removing the sunset clause, you are not preventing harm, you are accepting it, just on a delayed timeline.

So I am asking you: be honest about what this is. If it's unsafe today, it's unsafe in two years. Make the prohibition permanent, remove the sunset clause, and stand behind the decision you already know is the right one.

Thank you.

Vanessa Mascaro

North Kingstown, RI