

Balance

The Nature of Regulation

Perhaps it was President Theodore Roosevelt who first taught Americans the importance of the federal government protecting our nation's natural resources. One hundred years after his presidency, an entire federal agency and several state and local government departments are dedicated to striking a delicate balance between development and environmental preservation. Many of these agencies' environmental regulations are designed to protect one of three major environmental elements: air, water and earth.



Environmental Protection Agency
40 CFR Part 125
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Construction of Final Regulations Addressing Cooling Water Intake Structures for New Facilities: Rule and Proposed Rule

Category	Location of Proposed Limits	Applicable Code	Subpart	Section
Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Electricity	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Agricultural operations	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Manufacturing and processing	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Power and energy	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Transportation	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Chemical and allied products	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80
Petroleum refining and related industries	Intake of cooling water, groundwater, surface water, or other water source	40 CFR 125.80	125.80	125.80

rule implementing section 316(b) for new facilities as the "Phase I rule" (this term is used to avoid confusion with other phases of the section 316(b) rulemaking that cover existing facilities). The final authority background, and basis for the Phase I rule are discussed in the **Federal Register** notice and in the record for the rule. See 68 FR 67256, December 18, 2003. EPA reviewed the final rule text and believes that the regulatory language did not correctly reflect the intent with respect to flow issues. EPA is, therefore, making certain minor changes to the regulatory text. This document does not reopen the final rule in any respect other than the changes discussed here. EPA does not solicit comment on any issues except for the three discrete ones discussed here.

structures at new facilities, EPA required measuring velocity of cooling water intake structures of least once per quarter. In monitoring velocity, facilities that employ surface intake screens are required to monitor head loss across the intake screens at the "minimum ambient source water surface elevation." EPA qualified that language in the requirement by adding a parenthetical phrase that would allow for minimum ambient source water surface elevation to be determined using the Director's best professional judgment based on available hydrological data. See 40 CFR 125.87(b). However, EPA also defined "minimum ambient source water surface elevation" at 40 CFR 125.83 to mean "the elevation of the 7Q10 flow for freshwater streams or rivers; the concentration pool level for lakes or reservoirs; or the mean low-tide water level for estuaries or oceans." EPA further defined each of these low flows in terms of a temporal and hydrological basis. See 68 FR 65326, December 18, 2003.

EPA understands that ambient source water surface elevation is a critical permit application. Accordingly, to uniform the regulatory text to EPA's intent, EPA believes that the regulatory language at 40 CFR 125.87 is outdated and that the definition of "minimum ambient source water surface elevation" is no longer needed. Therefore, today's action will only delete the definition of "minimum ambient source water surface elevation" at 40 CFR 125.83.

All of these revisions are necessary because the decision of what to require under section 316(b) of the CWA belongs to the Director. Although EPA did not intend to delegate the decision-making to another agency, the Director may obtain information from outside agency to make a decision. Therefore, today's action exceeds the requirements of 40 CFR 125.84(b)(3)(ii), 40 CFR 125.84(b)(3)(iii), and 40 CFR 125.84(b)(3)(iv) to reflect the intent that the information of another agency informs the decision of the Director.

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. This rule merely makes three minor changes to existing regulations in the December 2003 Phase I final regulations for cooling water intake structures. These minor changes will clarify the Agency's intent on velocity measuring authority to require additional design and construction

AIR

One of the ongoing programs of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is its continuing work to produce cleaner fuels for American roadway vehicles.

The EPA first mandated catalytic converters on vehicles during the 1970s to reduce harmful emissions. Over subsequent decades, catalytic converters continued to be present on vehicles, but as emissions regulations became more stringent, the effectiveness of catalytic converters was diminished by the natural presence of sulfur compounds in fuels. As the sulfur compounds passed through the catalyst in a converter, the sulfur molecules slowly “poisoned” the catalyst, steadily diminishing and ultimately eliminating their effectiveness to meet new emission standards.

In order to meet new emission requirements, the sulfur levels in fuels were a principal target of the U.S. Clean Air Act amendment in 1990. The Clean Air Act amendment triggered a two-part response from the EPA. It first mandated that the sulfur content in on-road diesel fuel be reduced to 500 parts-per-million (ppm) in the early 1990s. This program was known as the low-sulfur diesel program. The next step was to reduce the sulfur content in gasoline. The new requirement for gasoline was to reduce sulfur levels to 30 ppm in gasoline by 2004, also known as low-sulfur gasoline. A second phase for on-road diesel was implemented during the last few years, and it reduced sulfur in on-road diesel fuel from the previous standard of 500 ppm to 15 ppm (ultra-low-sulfur diesel), effective by June 1, 2006.

Those requirements led to a revamping of numerous oil refineries serving the U.S. market to meet the standards. The EPA has reported that it estimates the diesel program alone will result in more than \$70 billion of annual benefits to the environment and \$4 billion per year in reduced public health costs.

“The next major component of gasoline that the EPA wants to reduce is benzene,” explains Dave Nispel, Burns & McDonnell refining business development manager. Benzene is a known carcinogen, and most of the nation’s benzene emissions come from mobile sources.

The average national benzene content of gasoline today is about 1 percent by volume, and the EPA is requiring that a refiner’s annual nationwide average gasoline benzene content be 0.62 percent by volume by 2011. In addition, refiners must also meet an individual refinery maximum average benzene standard of 1.3 percent by volume by July 1, 2012. The EPA in early 2007 estimated that the “additional cost of producing gasoline to comply with the new benzene standard is expected to average \$0.0027 per gallon. This per-gallon cost would result from an average of \$14 million in capital investment in each refinery that adds equipment to reduce gasoline benzene levels. We estimate that the annual net social costs of this rule will be approximately \$400 million in 2030 (expressed in 2003 dollars).” However, recent work by Burns & McDonnell at seven different refineries in the United States has shown that the EPA’s original estimates for implementation and capital costs are considerably lower than current estimates.

“The next major component of gasoline that the EPA wants to reduce is benzene,” explains Dave Nispel, Burns & McDonnell refining business development manager.

WATER

Waste heat is a byproduct of many industrial facilities, and more than half of all U.S. power plants and nuclear reactors employ once-through cooling to remove that byproduct, according to the Northeast Midwest Institute. This relatively inexpensive process draws water from lakes, rivers or other water bodies, passes it through a condenser to absorb excess heat from boilers and then discharges it back into the surface water at an elevated temperature.

Who to Contact

Burns & McDonnell has a variety of experts who can help you navigate the regulations discussed in this story. Below we match the experts with the regulations and tell you how you can reach them.



For more information on regulations not seen here, and their respective contacts, please visit www.burnsmcd.com/regulations.

Air

Clean Air Act, Benzene and Sulfur Regulations

Dominic Varraveto, (816) 822-4282
dvarraveto@burnsmcd.com

Water

Clean Water Act Section 316(a)

Greg Howick, (816) 822-3845
ghowick@burnsmcd.com

Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2)

Mark Lichtwardt, (303) 721-9292
mlichtwardt@burnsmcd.com

Earth

Vapor Intrusion

Diana Marquez, (816) 822-3453
dmarquez@burnsmcd.com

Security

Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards

Tom Dean, (816) 822-3873
tdean@burnsmcd.com

Sustainability

Renewable Portfolio Standards

Jeff Greig, (816) 822-3392
jgreig@burnsmcd.com

Certification of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need

Bob Sholl, (816) 822-3154
bsholl@burnsmcd.com

U.S. Department of Defense LEED® Silver Requirement

Wendy Hageman, (816) 822-3224
whageman@burnsmcd.com

[FROM THE COVER]

However, water temperature has direct effects on the cold-blooded organisms that live in water, and the heated discharge from industrial facilities can be disruptive or even fatal to those populations, constituting thermal pollution.

The Clean Water Act regulates thermal pollution through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program by regulating industries and municipalities that discharge pollutants, including heat, directly into surface water. If an industrial facility or power plant cannot meet federal or state thermal water quality standards but it can demonstrate that its discharge will “assure the protection and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of shellfish, fish and wildlife in and on that body of water,” then it may apply for a variance from those standards under the Clean Water Act’s section 316(a). “In other words,” explains Burns & McDonnell’s Greg Howick, senior aquatic ecologist, “A 316(a) variance can be granted if a plant can show that despite exceeding thermal water quality standards, the receiving water body is still maintaining a balanced, indigenous community.”

Many industrial facilities and power plants applied for and received 316(a) variances in the 1970s, shortly after the Clean Water Act was enacted, and many others have subsequently received variances as they have been constructed. NPDES permits, which include the section 316(a) variances, are



U.S. refiners are meeting requirements for sulfur and benzene, which were targets of the Environmental Protection Agency. Burns & McDonnell is currently helping seven refineries in the United States look for ways to meet benzene regulations.

renewed every five years. While industrial facilities and power plants have always technically been required to demonstrate a continued need for section 316(a) variances in their permit reapplications, automatic renewals since the 1970s have been commonplace. However, in light of improvements in overall water quality, increases in ambient temperatures and development of new thermal water-quality standards by some states, the EPA and state regulators have recently shown renewed interest in requiring industrial facilities and power plants to re-examine their section 316(a) variances.

That leaves many facilities needing to repeat their section 316(a) variance studies for the first time in decades. This may require technically sound waste load allocations to show the maximum heat load a facility can be allowed to release into its waterway without

a variance. Or a facility may need a thermal-plume study to demonstrate the actual physical extent of the thermal-discharge plume. Finally, a facility may need biological impact field studies to demonstrate that the receiving water body is still maintaining a balanced, indigenous aquatic community.

EARTH

While there is no single, sweeping body of legislation that affects American soil and earth that is comparable to the clean air and water acts, the environmental condition of our land still has health and legal ramifications. One area of environmental concern in the earth is vapor intrusion, which is the migration of volatile chemicals from the subsurface into overlying buildings. It can be a problem when structures have been built near former industrial or commercial facilities in which chemicals were spilled, dumped on the ground or leaked from a storage tank. Large or steady contaminant flows are enough to percolate into underlying groundwater and then be broadly dispersed. (Some chemicals can also travel through soil as vapors.)

Some time later — in many cases, decades later — structures have been built above the soil or groundwater dispersion area without a developer or builder knowing that the contaminant has passed from a liquid into a vapor, or volatilized. Those vapors then migrate into overlying homes and businesses through crawlspaces, cracks or other openings in foundations. Examples of volatile organic compounds include petroleum products such as gasoline or diesel fuel that were leaked from storage tanks or were simply spilled at gas



Heated discharges can be disruptive to cold-blooded organisms that live in water. Facilities can receive a variance from water quality standards regulating the temperature of discharges through Section 316(a) of the Clean Water Act if they can show the receiving water body is maintaining a balanced, indigenous aquatic community.

stations. Other examples include industrial chemicals such as the dry cleaning solvent tetrachloroethylene (also known as perc or PCE) and trichloroethylene (also known as TCE), which is a common solvent for degreasing and washing metal parts. There are other volatile compounds as well: industrial paint strippers and residuals from defunct manufactured gas plants.

If developers and property owners suspect vapor intrusion, they should have the site investigated with soil, groundwater and soil gas (air trapped between soil particles) tests. "Vapor intrusion can be remedied easily and inexpensively," explains Diana Marquez, associate risk assessor with Burns & McDonnell. In contrast, the loss of people's health and the potential debilitating liability for a health risk is neither easy nor inexpensive. "It is in people's best interest to be aggressive in solving the problem," Marquez continues. "So, there is no benefit in delay." If site samples determine that the soil or groundwater pose a health concern, the most common solutions are sub-slab depressurization or soil vapor-extraction systems, which are much like in-home radon-removal systems. Both of those systems use extraction pipes placed in contact with subgrade materials through one or more holes cut in the building slab; a fan or blower then draws soil gas from beneath the slab and discharges it into outdoor air. "Even though there are no regulatorily enforceable standards for air quality on this topic, the goal is to get breathable air to acceptable levels that do not cause adverse health affects," says Marquez.

When these systems are needed, the party responsible for contamination — typically a public entity or corporation — usually pays for them. If liability cannot be assigned to a responsible party, there may be state funding available for orphan sites, especially in cases of former dry cleaning facilities.

Most Americans would say long after Roosevelt's time that it is important to strike the right balance between development and environment — whether in the air, water or earth.

The Rest of the Story

Security and sustainability are two important regulatory drivers in the 21st century. Below is a synopsis of some of the most important regulations deriving from them.

Security

In an effort to protect chemical and covered facilities from terrorist attacks, the Department of Homeland Security mandated the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS). Under CFATS, chemical and covered facilities must assemble classified information — a Security Vulnerability Assessment and Site Security Plan (SSP) — as well as undergo compliance audits. By combining process design and security expertise, Burns & McDonnell offers a holistic approach to vulnerability analysis and SSP development.

Sustainability

State-by-state Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) instruct electric power generators to secure a set minimum percentage of power from renewable energy resources such as wind, solar and biomass. As of June 2007, 24 states plus the District of Columbia mandate RPS ranging from 4 percent to 25 percent renewable energy by as soon as 2009 and as late as 2025. Burns & McDonnell is assisting with the development of the world's largest wind farm, covering 200,000 acres across five Texas counties. The \$10 billion Mesa Power facility will generate 4,000 megawatts of electricity starting in 2011.

In an era of increasing demand for electrical generation and transmission resources, the state-centric Certification of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need requires utility companies to present key information to regulators involving need, environmental impact, proposed mitigation measures, cost and alternatives that were considered. Bob Sholl of Burns & McDonnell's Environmental Studies & Permitting Group finds that client certification efforts are most successful when paired with strong public relations initiatives and organized document management.

The U.S. Department of Defense now requires silver Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification on all new vertical construction. The Army will implement the standard in 2008 and the Air Force in 2009. In advance support of this policy, Burns & McDonnell is taking on the challenge to LEED-certify three training facilities being designed for Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.



Safe Drinking Water

To further protect public water systems, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recently published the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2) that requires increased monitoring and removal of cryptosporidium, among other potential disease-causing microorganisms from drinking water. LT2 requires that systems using surface water or groundwater influenced by surface water be classified into one of four treatment categories based on their monitoring results. Additional treatment often requires advanced technologies such as membrane filtration or ultraviolet disinfection. Many communities are benefiting from Burns & McDonnell's advanced treatment experience, including Rapid City, S.D.; Thornton, Colo.; and Lander, Wyo.



For more information on regulations not seen here, and their respective contacts, please visit www.burnsmcd.com/regulations.