

Department of Water and Power



the City of Los Angeles

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
Mayor


Commission
LEE KANON ALPERT, *President*
EDITH RAMIREZ, *Vice President*
FORESCEE HOGAN-ROWLES
JONATHAN PARFREY
THOMAS S. SAYLES
BARBARA E. MOSCHOS, *Secretary*

S. DAVID FREEMAN
Interim General Manager

RAMAN RAJ
Chief Operating Officer

April 13, 2010

Ms. Jeanine Townsend
Clerk to the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 "I" Street, 24TH Floor
Sacramento, California 95814



Dear Ms. Townsend:

Subject: Comment Letter – Once-Through-Cooling (OTC) Policy

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Board) draft Statewide Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling (draft Policy) dated March 22, 2010, and its associated Supplemental Environmental Document (SED).

LADWP expresses appreciation for numerous improvements from the prior versions and the willingness of the State Board and its staff to meet with us to discuss the challenges with the proposed policy and its impact to LADWP's power reliability and grid stability. LADWP is also particularly appreciative of the willingness of the State Board to reach out to all of the stakeholders in a collaborative fashion to tackle this very complex issue.

Fundamentally, however, one of LADWP's key points remains the same, namely, that impacts on marine resources will vary dramatically at different power plants and that a site-specific evaluation, rather than a "one-size-fits-all" State policy, is a more practical and affordable option which, in the end, will reach the same goal - to minimize impingement (IM) and entrainment (E) impacts. LADWP supports elimination of the use of OTC where feasible and minimizing aquatic impacts in the most scientifically sound and cost-effective manner. It is critical to note that LADWP is required by City Charter to provide reliable energy to the citizens of Los Angeles in a cost-effective manner. We are therefore obligated to note that at this time, the City of Los Angeles and its rate payers, as is California and the nation, are facing the worst economic crisis in quite some time. For this reason, any regulatory program should strive to achieve the greatest benefit at the least cost. This well intended policy as currently written, with a "one size fits all" focus, will impose a multi-billion dollar burden on the Los Angeles rate payer and pose a serious threat to the reliability of LADWP's power supply. A site-specific impact evaluation and a corresponding selection of appropriate impact controls make preeminent sense. Case in point,

Water and Power Conservation ... a way of life

111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-2607 Mailing address: Box 51111, Los Angeles 90051-5700
Telephone: (213) 367-4211 Cable address: DEWAPOLA



Ms. Jeanine Townsend
Page 2
April 13, 2010

the State of New York recently released its draft OTC Policy on March 4, 2010¹ which allows for site-specific determinations and wholly disproportionate evaluations. LADWP urges the State Board to adopt this effective and affordable approach.

The current draft Policy as written is still troubling for LADWP with regards to: 1) the final compliance dates and associated suspensions being capped at a maximum of two years; 2) the role of the SACCWIS versus CAISO and LADWP; 3) the lack of a mechanism in place to close a compliance gap under Track 2; 4) the inability to be able to conduct site specific feasibility and cost evaluations for fossil fuel power plants that also must comply with AB 32; and 5) being unable to run pumps that are not on hot standby but still needed for availability when not generating power to meet reliability requirements.

LADWP provides the enclosed observations and comments (Enclosure) for your consideration and incorporates by reference all previous comments.

In closing, LADWP appreciates the opportunity to provide the enclosed comments and looks forward to reaching a mutually beneficial policy.


If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either Ms. Susan Damron of the Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Division or Ms. Katherine Rubin of the Environmental Affairs and Sustainability Program Division at (213) 367-0279 or (213) 367-0436, respectively.

Sincerely,



Aram Benyamin
Senior Assistant General Manager
Power System

Sincerely,



Mark J. Sedlacek
Director of Environmental Affairs

KR:rp

Enclosure

c: Ms. Susan Kennedy, Governor's Chief of Staff
Ms. Dorothy Rice, Executive Officer, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Mr. Charlie Hoppin, Chairman, SWRCB
Ms. Fran Spivey Weber, Vice Chairman, SWRCB
Ms. Tam Doduc, Member, SWRCB
Mr. Art Baggett, Member, SWRCB
Mr. Walt Petit, Member, SWRCB
Mr. Jonathan Bishop, Chief of Staff, SWRCB
Mr. Dominic Gregorio, Staff, SWRCB
Ms. Joanna Jensen, Staff, SWRCB
Ms. Susan Damron, LADWP
Ms. Katherine Rubin, LADWP

¹ The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC): Best Technology Available for Cooling Water Intake Structures DEC Policy dated March 4, 2010.

**Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Comments on the Revised Draft Policy dated March 22, 2010**

In order to achieve the Impingement Mortality (IM) and Entrainment (E) impact reduction goals as delineated in the State's current draft policy, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides the following observations and comments¹, for your consideration.

1. Compliance Dates and Suspension

LADWP appreciates that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) has changed the compliance dates for its Harbor and Haynes facilities and will make every effort to comply with the Scattergood date of 2020. However, the current draft policy states, as it pertains to securing permits and completing the CEQA process (page 10, item #5), that the compliance dates can only be suspended for a period not to exceed two years.

Final compliance dates may need to be suspended longer than two years if the CEQA or permitting processes are prolonged during public review. Without the possibility of such an extension, the Scattergood and Haynes facilities may be non-compliant due to a process that may not be the fault, nor under the control, of LADWP. LADWP understands that the State Board wants to ensure that each facility owner does its utmost to navigate a permitting and CEQA process that minimizes discourse and secures consensus. To that end, the draft policy incentivizes the utility to achieve compliance as soon as possible with the imposition of interim requirements until compliance is achieved. However, and despite these incentives, should permitting and CEQA obstacles preclude the ability to comply even with the two-year extension, the Policy provides no recourse..

Therefore, LADWP provides the following recommended amendments and requests the language "not to exceed two years" be stricken so that there is not a limited amount of time past the specified compliance date. Amend the Policy to read:

"...the owner or operator used best efforts to obtain the required permits, then the State Water Board shall suspend a final compliance date specified in the policy ~~for a period not to exceed two years~~. An owner or operator shall be required to update the Statewide Advisory Committee on Cooling Water Intake Structures (SACCWIS) and the State Water Board every six months on the permitting status."

¹ The following list of consultants assisted LADWP in the preparation of these comments, they are as follows: MBC, Tenera, Dave Bailey. Dave Bailey and John Steinbeck (Tenera) participated as part of the State Board's expert review panel for this draft policy.

Enclosure
4/13/2010
P2/10

2. SACCWIS vs. CAISO vs. LADWP

LADWP appreciates the addition of new language to the draft Policy intended to clarify the role of the California Independent System Operator (CAISO), and for LADWP facilities, the role of LADWP's Board of Water and Power Commissioners as it pertains to recommending the suspension or amendment of the compliance dates for reasons of ensuring reliability. However, the addition of these most recent amendments has created conflicting and confusing language throughout the draft Policy regarding the roles of the SACCWIS, the CAISO and the LADWP when it comes to the issue of reliability.

LADWP understands that CAISO (for non-LADWP facilities) will solely advise the State Board on issues of reliability with a 10-day period to lodge a disagreement provided to the CEC and CPUC. The State Board would adopt the CAISO's recommendation unless it had overriding concerns. Similarly for LADWP facilities, LADWP's Board of Water and Power Commissioners would solely advise the State Board on issues of reliability regarding its facilities with the State Board having the ability to consult with CAISO and issue overriding considerations. In contrast, the role of the SACCWIS would be advisory: ensuring state-wide agency coordination and recommending compliance date changes to the State Board for any reasons other than reliability.

In order to clarify the roles stipulated in the draft Policy, LADWP identifies the conflict areas throughout the draft Policy and provides the following changes and suggested amendments:

- ◆ Page 2, Introduction, Finding I - The draft language in Finding I needs the following sentences to be deleted and the words "CAISO and LADWP" to be inserted as follows:

~~"...of this Policy to ensure that the implementation schedule takes into account local area and grid reliability, including permitting constraints. The State Water Board recognizes... as determined by CAISO and LADWP, the energy agencies included in the SACCWIS, acting according to their individual or shared responsibilities. The State Water Board retains..."~~

- ◆ Page 3, Introduction, Finding K – The SACCWIS will assist the SWRCB in evaluating all schedules within the Los Angeles Region due to the air quality and transmission complexities; however, LADWP's generating plants are not the only OTC facilities within the Los Angeles Basin.

LADWP suggests the following words be deleted from the last sentence to read:
~~"...compliance schedules. for power plants not under the jurisdiction of the CPUC or operating within the CAISO Balancing Authority Area.~~

- ◆ Page 7, item (d) - For consistency of intent in providing the LADWP Commission authority to advise the State Board on reliability issues, the language in this item needs to be amended.

LADWP suggests the following amendments:

"...the State Board shall implement the recommendations of the CAISO or the LADWP Commission unless ..."

- ◆ Top of Page 10 relating to SACCWIS role – For consistency of intent, delete as follows:

"...the State Water Board on the implementation of this Policy ~~to ensure that the implementation schedule takes into account local area and grid reliability, including permitting constraints.~~"

- ◆ Page 10, (B)(5) – For consistency with the new language inserted on Pages 6 and 7, along with the commensurate stipulations on those pages which makes CAISO and the LADWP Commission the entities responsible for providing compliance date recommendations to the State Board based on reliability assessments, delete the following sentence:

"..if appropriate, for the State Water Board's consideration. ~~In the event that the SACCWIS energy agencies (CAISO, CPUC, and CEC) make a unanimous....Board finds that there is compelling evidence no to make the recommended modification and makes a finding of overriding considerations. In the event...~~"

- ◆ Page 11, (C)(1) – For consistency of intent relative to the roles of the SACCWIS, CAISO, and the LADWP Commission regarding decision pertaining to reliability, amend the following sentence with the noted edits:

".... If the State Water Board determines that a longer compliance schedule is necessary to maintain reliability of the electric system per SACCWIS CAISO and LADWP Commission recommendations..."

3. Annual Submittal Grid Reliability Study to the SACCWIS

Page 10, (B)(3) – The draft Policy as written requires that a grid reliability study be submitted to the Statewide Advisory Committee on Cooling Water Intake Structures (SACCWIS) by December 31 of each year. The information included in such a study is confidential and if made public would risk the security of the grid and its system. Therefore, LADWP requests that either: 1) the State Board delete this requirement; or 2) if this information is necessary for determining whether or not there is a reliability issue with regards to suspending compliance dates, that it be submitted as confidential business information and only shared with those involved in the decision making of reliability issues, (ie, in LADWP's case, the State Board and CAISO, and not the public).

4. Site Specific Evaluations for Nuclear Plants Only

Finding "L" on Page 3 of the draft Policy's Introduction identifies the decision-making implications that the requirement to comply with the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) had on the draft Policy's current amendments. Compliance with AB 32 will be required of all CO₂ emitting sources commencing with six sectors, one of which is the utility sector. For California, (or the utility sector for that matter) the success of AB 32 is not tied to a particular facility (i.e., a nuclear plant) but rather to the actions of the utility itself. Each utility must determine how it will go about achieving compliance with AB 32, including utilities that own nuclear generation. Utilities will need to meet load (including load growth) while also complying with AB 32 by instituting complementary measures (i.e., energy efficiency, renewable energy, combined heat and power) and participating in a market-based emissions cap-and-trade program. Utilities will be required to surrender emission allowances and emission offsets that match emissions from owned generation, as well as pass along the cost of purchased power (e.g., from the merchant generators) which would include any AB 32 related costs. Thus, if the nuclear OTC facilities are shut down for the installation of control technology, the utilities that own the two nuclear facilities have the same means of AB 32 compliance as do all the other OTC plants, namely, the acquisition of emission-free energy or the purchase of emission offsets and allowances for any interim back-up fossil-fuel energy generation source.

As has been noted in prior comments, LADWP has an aggressive program to acquire and integrate renewable, non-greenhouse gas emitting energy into its energy supply portfolio. The Mayor's Green LA program calls for 40 percent renewables by 2020. This effort supports LADWP's ability to comply with AB 32 and the existing fleet of natural gas-fueled power plants serves a critical role in: (1) integrating these intermittent, AB 32-compliant resources; and (2) ensuring system reliability while doing so. In addition, the repowering of this existing fleet (also requiring downtime) reduces emissions, increases energy efficiency, and promotes renewable integration – all of which aide in AB 32 compliance. As with the utilities owning the nuclear facilities, emission reduction shortfalls will require the purchase of offsets and allowances.

Thus, complying with AB 32 is a challenge which faces all of California's utilities and is not unique to the utilities that own the two nuclear facilities. Similarly, the measures to address compliance shortfalls, regardless of the reasons, are also available to all utilities. It is inappropriate, and blatantly arbitrary and capricious to allow site-specific evaluations, including evaluations of feasibility and cost, for the State's two nuclear facilities and not the state's other OTC facilities based solely on an assertion that it is needed for the State's AB 32 compliance. The addition of Finding "L" is an obvious attempt to justify the State Board's arbitrary actions. A plant's importance in warranting a site-specific evaluation should not be predicated solely on greenhouse gas reduction but on other factors such as its role in local and grid reliability, providing increased energy efficiency, and integrating renewable resources.

Enclosure
4/13/2010
P5/10

The State of New York released its draft OTC Policy on March 4, 2010² and, as with the draft California Policy, prescribes reductions in impingement and entrainment necessary to minimize adverse environmental impact. The state of New York, at the time an applicant seeks a new NPDES permit, identifies its responsibility as determining the appropriate Best Available Technology with due consideration as to feasibility and cost for that facility in accordance with their OTC Policy. LADWP believes this approach is vastly better than the one the State Board is proposing to adopt.

LADWP believes that Finding L is flawed. It should either be removed entirely or reworded to allow all plants that must address compliance with AB 32 impacts the opportunity to comply with the draft Policy on a site-specific basis, including the use of feasibility and cost considerations, not just the nuclear facilities. As mentioned above, compliance with AB 32 impacts everyone, no one is exempt.

5. Compliance Gap

The current amendments to the draft Policy on Page 10, item #4 allow the SACCWIS to make Policy amendment recommendations to the State Board for permitting and CEQA obstacles. However, the draft Policy as written does not have a mechanism to close the compliance gap should the facility have exhausted and implemented with due diligence all feasible compliance avenues and still fall short of the Track 2 standard. For example, if a utility has information (e.g., from pilot studies, engineering calculations, model runs, etc.) such that the installation and implementation of a series of reduction control technologies and operational controls will fall short of the Track 2 standard despite its best effort, the draft policy as written does not allow for any relief.

Under these circumstances, the State Board should either: (1) declare that the utility is done and in compliance; or (2) allow mitigation for the difference (the compliance gap). At the annual SACCWIS meeting, a review of each utility's progress toward compliance, including the results of any studies performed which illustrate a compliance gap could be undertaken. A determination by the SACCWIS that a compliance gap will exist if the utility were to implement the compliance mechanisms studied, and that the utility will have exhausted all feasible mechanisms, could be made by the SACCWIS with a recommendation that State Board grant relief from 100 percent compliance with the Track 2 standard. If a utility can demonstrate that it is technically infeasible to reach the reduction standard, and the SACCWIS concurs, relief should be allowed and the State Board should declare that the utility is in compliance with no further action needed.

LADWP suggests item #4 on Page 10 be amended as follows:

"The SACCWIS will report to the State Water Board with recommendations on modifications to the implementation schedule or policy itself every year starting in 2012."

² The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC): Best Technology Available for Cooling Water Intake Structures DEC Policy dated March 4, 2010 (Attachment to Enclosure).

6. Power-Generating Activities Definition

The definition of "Power-generating activities" continues to be problematic. In this definition, "critical system maintenance," only applies to Nuclear Facilities. Fossil-fueled power plants also have critical system maintenance issues that need to be addressed in order to maintain generating capacity, safety, or physical plant machinery. Critical system maintenance should not be selectively applied only to nuclear facilities, but should apply to all generating facilities equally.

One of these "critical system maintenance" activities that must be performed on a continuous basis is the control of biofouling on facility cooling systems. By not allowing the continual maintenance of these systems, cooling systems in general and condensers specifically, could become so fouled during non-power generating periods, that restarting the generating system to meet critical electrical demand would be impacted and even impossible. If condensers become fouled to the point of restricting cooling water flow, it would not be possible to restart a generator when needed in a timely fashion. In addition, the build up of biofouling organisms on cooling system surfaces could have significant impacts on the structural integrity of condenser piping or other cooling system surfaces. Rather than completely eliminating this critical maintenance activity, the policy could specify reduce flow rates for non-power generating time periods in order to maintain these systems in a state of operational readiness for reliability and availability.

LADWP proposes the following changes to the definition of Power-generating activities.

Power-generating activities – Refers to activities directly related to the generation of electrical power, including start-up and shut-down procedures, contractual obligations (hot stand-by), hot bypasses, and critical system maintenance regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Activities that are not considered directly related to the generation of electricity include (but are not limited to) dilution for in-plant wastes, and maintenance of source-and receiving water quality strictly for monitoring purposes and running pumps strictly to prevent fouling of condensers and other power plant equipment.

7. Compliance for Combined Cycle Units

If it is the intent of the SWRCB that combined cycle units only, not the facility as a whole, would be considered in compliance with both IM and E, if the through-screen intake velocity is reduced to 0.5 ft/sec or less, then section 2. A. (2)(d)(ii) needs to be amended as follows:

"(ii) For combined-cycle power-generating units* only, and not the facility as a whole, the owner or operator may be deemed in compliance with the impingement mortality and entrainment requirements by:

1. Reducing the through-screen intake velocity to a maximum of 0.5 foot per second, and
2. Complying with the immediate and interim requirements described in Sections 2.C.(1) and 2.C.(2), below, for the life of the combined-cycle power-generating units*.”

8. Monitoring for 200 Micron-Sized Organisms Must Bear a Relationship to the Need for the Monitoring

Meroplankton Sampling

LADWP is pleased to see that historic baseline sampling for ichthyoplankton and certain meroplankton (i.e., crustacean phyllosoma, crustacean megalops, and squid paralarvae), as well as confirmation sampling post control implementation, recognizes the use of 333 or 335 micron mesh sampling nets. However, the continued requirement for any additional samples to be collected with 200 micron nets is disturbing.

The Water Code Section 13267 (b)(1) states that monitoring must bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the monitoring and the benefits to be obtained. To date, the SWRCB has not stipulated the reasoning and/or the benefits to be gained from this additional sampling. Simply wanting to know what is out there in the size range between 200 and 333/335 micron is not the relationship the Water Code Section envisioned. There is no available compliance technology below 500 microns that can reduce entrainment impacts; therefore the need to monitor for 200 micron aquatic life should not be required. LADWP's 2006 entrainment data reported the following statistics for unidentifiable eggs and larvae because they were either too small or the life stage was too young to adequately determine. The requirement to monitor organisms between 200 and 333/335 will only increase the unidentifiable portions of the entrainment sample.

	Unidentifiable Eggs	Unidentifiable Larvae
• Harbor	46.7%	1.5%
• Haynes	69.5%	1%
• Scattergood	63.4%	20%

If the RWQCB were to exercise their authority as stipulated in the draft Policy and require the additional monitoring for meroplankton down to 200 microns, this would cost LADWP, at a minimum, an additional \$1.5 million dollars. LADWP questions what this additional information would provide and how this sampling relates to the goals of the Policy.

Notwithstanding LADWP's assertion that there should be no monitoring for organisms between 200 and 333/335 microns because the monitoring does not "bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the monitoring", the draft policy needs to be very clear that any additional sampling using smaller mesh, which would capture smaller organisms, is intended to be qualitative and not used for compliance, since most zooplankton could not be effectively excluded from intake structures. LADWP does not believe that sampling for organisms 200 microns in size would generate any additional useful data

and requests that any reference to do so be removed from the draft Policy. The attached revisions are provided to clarify these changes.

LADWP provides the following additions and strike out language:

- ◆ Page 5, Section 2.A.(2)(b) (ii): "...If screens are employed to reduce entrainment, compliance shall be determined based on reductions in entrainment of ichthyoplankton*, and ~~on the crustacean phyllosoma and megalops larvae, and squid paralarvae fractions of later stage invertebrate larval fractions of meroplankton*~~ that can be adequately sampled with nets having a mesh size no larger than 335 microns."
- ◆ Page 16, Section 4.B.(1): "...Prior studies that ~~may have used a mesh size of 333 or 335 microns for sampling are acceptable for compliance with the review and approval of the Regional Water Board. If the Regional Water Board determines that a new baseline entrainment study shall be performed to determine larval composition and abundance in the source water, representative of water that is being entrained, then samples must be collected using a mesh size no larger than 335 microns. Additional samples shall also be collected using a 200 micron mesh to provide a broader characterization of other meroplankton* entrained...~~ "
- ◆ Page 17, Section 4.B.(1): "(a) Entrainment impacts shall be based on sampling for all ichthyoplankton*, and invertebrate meroplankton* that can be adequately sampled with nets having a mesh size no larger than 335 microns. Individuals collected shall be identified to the lowest taxonomical level practicable. When practicable, genetic identification through molecular biological techniques may be used to assist in compliance with this requirement. Samples shall be preserved and archived such that genetic identification is possible at a later date.
- ◆ Page 17, Section 4.B.(2): "After the Track 2 controls are implemented, to confirm the level of entrainment controls, another entrainment study (with a study design to the Regional Water Board's satisfaction, with samples collected using a mesh size no larger than 335 microns, ~~and with additional samples also collected using a 200 micron mesh~~) shall be performed and reported to the Regional Water Board."

9. Entrainment Sampling

On page 16 there is a requirement to determine the source water "*based on oceanographic conditions reasonably expected after Track 2 controls are implemented.*" However, if the purpose of the required study is verifying the level of entrainment before and after Track 2 controls are implemented, then it should not be necessary to determine the source water.

LADWP suggests deleting this requirement and adding a sentence to Section 4.B.(2) that suggests if other data or information can be presented to verify that oceanographic conditions in the source water were similar for the periods the baseline study was performed, no other determination or confirmatory studies would be needed.

10. Interim Requirements for Mitigation – Habitat Production Foregone (HPF)

The latest draft Policy requires use of Habitat Production Foregone (HPF) to calculate mitigation. Many of the problems pertaining to the use of HPF have been detailed in previous comments. Specifically, it cannot be used as "...an estimate of habitat area production that is lost to all entrained species.." as defined in Section 5 (Definition of Terms), since the area associated with production cannot be specifically identified for many species and the habitat requirements for production vary among species. In some specific cases, HPF is an appropriate method for determining the area of habitat that would be required to compensate for larval losses due to entrainment. It is only appropriate when the actual adult habitat can be identified and estimated. Also, similar to the limitations with any restoration project, it will only be successful for species that are dependent on the specific habitat being restored.

It is unknown how the HPF would be applied to species whose primary habitat is the water column (e.g., northern anchovy and Pacific sardine) or sandy bottom (e.g., queenfish, white croaker, and California halibut) since it is unlikely that these habitats would be the focus of restoration efforts. In addition, the populations for most of the species in these habitats are not limited by available habitat and would not directly benefit from habitat restoration. Factors affecting water quality and food availability are much more important to these fish populations.

Finally, HPF is not an appropriate method for benefits valuation. The problems associated with the use of HPF as a valuation method are pointed out in a comment letter from PG&E to the Central Coast Regional Water Board on the use of HPF for valuing mitigation at the Diablo Canyon Power Plant³. This letter points out that the EPA and its consultant (Stratus) both rejected HPF as a valuation technique for use in resource valuation associated with 316(b) Phase II cost-benefit analyses.

LADWP suggests the following Policy amendments:

Page 8 Section 2.C.(3)(d):

The habitat production foregone* method, or a comparable alternate method approved by the Regional State Water Board Division of Water Quality, shall be used to determine the habitat and area for, ~~based on replacement of the annual~~ entrainment, for funding a mitigation project*.

11. Miscellaneous Comments

The following comments clarify and/or make language consistent throughout the draft Policy:

³ PG&E comments on Mitigation Paper, May 25, 2005 -
http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/water_issues/programs/diablo_canyon/index.shtml

- Page 5, (d)(i)(1) add OTC to: "the maximum permitted OTC discharge..."
- Page 5, (d)(i)(2) – the NPDES permits for some repowered facilities have not been fully updated in anticipation of a new statewide OTC Policy. Therefore, add the following wording:
"...identified in the current or for administratively continued permits future maximum permitted flow plant's NPDES permit..."
- Page 6, B (2) – for consistency within this section, amend as follows:
"...date may be suspended or amended under the following circumstances:"
- Page 7 B(2)(c) – Ditto previous bullet for second to the last sentence:
"...hearing in accordance with paragraph (d) to determine whether to suspend or amend the final compliance date."
- Critical system maintenance definition – remove "machinery" and replace with "infrastructure". Machinery implies something that does "work" (like a pump).

12. Additional Comments on Issues Other Than the Revised Draft:

Compliance Dates

LADWP suggests that the State Board consider setting one final date for each utility to reach compliance for all of its facilities with OTC units, and that milestones for the final CEQA document and other permits be set in either the NPDES permit or implementation plan for each facility. As mentioned in our cover letter, the City of Los Angeles is facing its worst economic crisis since the depression, for economic reasons, allowing for this type of flexibility allows for the State wide Policy's goals and compliance to be achieved. A municipal utility such as LADWP must undergo a lengthy administrative planning and budgeting process in order to undertake a repowering project or make any physical changes to the cooling water intake system(s) or placement of an alternative reduction technology. A more flexible approach would allow for the proper planning, budgeting, and permitting process to take place which is needed to ensure that resources are not spent unnecessarily.

State-wide Policy and Federal Rule

Lastly, in the revised Supplemental Environmental Document, pages 45-47, it states that the State Board is not aware of Federal EPA's schedule for the release of its new 316b Rule; LADWP contacted EPA on March 30, 2010, and was told that EPA's draft Rule is expected to be released for comment in Fall 2010 with a final Rule projected to be released by 2011/2012. LADWP suggests that the State Board delay the adoption of its policy until EPA releases its draft Rule. This would allow utilities to have some indication as to how to comply with the Federal Rule and to be certain that whatever compliance measures are suggested in the state's required implementation plan count toward compliance for both the federal Rule and state policy. At the very least, the State Board should consider extending the implementation plan due date, which is currently within six months of the adoption of the state policy, in order for dischargers to complete implementation plans that include measures that comply with both the federal and state regulations.

CP-nn / Best Technology Available (BTA) for Cooling Water Intake Structures

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

DEC Policy

Issuing Authority: Alexander B. Grannis, Commissioner

Date Issued:

Latest Date Revised: March 4, 2010

I. Summary:

This policy prescribes the reductions in impingement mortality and entrainment required to minimize the adverse environmental impact caused by industrial facilities having a cooling water intake structure (CWIS) in connection with a point source thermal discharge. Water withdrawals from surface waterbodies through a CWIS cause injury and mortality to fish and other aquatic organisms through impingement at the intake and/or entrainment through the cooling system. Through this policy, the Department establishes closed-cycle cooling or its equivalent as the performance goal for the best technology available (BTA) to minimize adverse environmental impact pursuant to Section 704.5 of 6 NYCRR, Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act, 40 C.F.R. Part 125 subpart I, 40 C.F.R. Part 125.90(b), and 40 C.F.R. Part 125 subpart N in State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permits.

II. Applicability:

This policy applies to all existing and proposed industrial facilities designed to withdraw twenty (20) million gallon per day (MGD) or more of contact or non-contact cooling water from the waters of New York State and that are subject to the requirements of Section 704.5 of 6 NYCRR. Existing and proposed industrial facilities subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR § 704.5 that are designed to use less than 20 MGD of contact or non-contact cooling water will continue to be subject to the requirements of 6 NYCRR § 704.5 and CWA § 316(b) or another subpart of 40 C.F.R. Part 125, as determined by the Department on a case-by-case, site-specific, best professional judgment (BPJ) basis.

III. Policy:

Through the general powers and duties of the Commissioner and the Department of Environmental Conservation [ECL Articles 1 and 3] to conserve and protect the natural resources of the state and to minimize adverse impact to the environment, the Commissioner hereby establishes the following performance goals to minimize adverse environmental impact from a CWIS:

1. Dry closed-cycle cooling as the performance goal for all new industrial facilities sited in the marine and coastal district (ECL § 13-0103) and along the Hudson River up to the Federal Dam in Troy;

2. Wet closed-cycle cooling as the minimum performance goal for all new industrial facilities located along all waters other than those covered by No. 1;
3. Wet closed-cycle cooling or its equivalent as the minimum performance goal for existing industrial facilities that operate a CWIS in connection with a point source thermal discharge; and
4. Wet closed-cycle cooling as the minimum performance goal for all repowered industrial facilities that operate a CWIS in connection with a point source thermal discharge.

Furthermore, for an existing industrial facility where the Department determines that wet closed-cycle cooling is not an available technology, this policy establishes a performance goal of at least 90 percent or greater reduction in both entrainment and impingement mortality from that which would be achieved by a wet closed-cycle cooling system at that facility. Any existing industrial facility meeting these performance goals will be deemed in compliance with the requirements of 6 NYCRR § 704.5 and CWA § 316(b) to implement BTA for minimizing adverse environmental impact related to the operation of cooling water intake structures.

Definitions:

Adverse environmental impact – the fish killed or injured through entrainment and impingement by the operation of cooling water intake structures. The “adverse environmental impact” that must be minimized by the BTA standard of 6 NYCRR §704.5 relates only to aquatic resources.

Available – technically feasible with costs not wholly disproportionate to the benefits.

Best Technology Available (BTA) – technology-based standard authorized under CWA Section 316(b), 40 C.F.R. Part 125, subpart I; 40 C.F.R. Part 125.90(b); and 40 C.F.R. Part 125, subpart N and 6 NYCRR Part 704.5 as the most effective technology, process or operational method for minimizing adverse environmental impact from a CWIS.

Calculation baseline – an estimate of impingement mortality and entrainment that would occur at a facility CWIS assuming that: the cooling water system has been designed as a once-through system; the opening of the cooling water intake structure is located at, and the face of the standard 3/8-inch mesh conventional traveling screen is oriented parallel to, the shoreline near the surface of the source waterbody and is operated at the full rated capacity 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. This is the baseline of adverse environmental impact to be used in estimating reductions in impingement mortality and entrainment resulting from operating a closed-cycle cooling system.

Cooling water - the water used for contact or non-contact cooling, including water used for equipment cooling, evaporative cooling tower makeup, and dilution of effluent heat content. The intended use of the cooling water is to absorb waste heat rejected from the process or processes used, or from auxiliary operations on the facility's premises [6 NYCRR § 700.1(a)(11)].

Cooling water intake structure (CWIS) - the total physical structure and any associated constructed waterways used to withdraw cooling water from waters of New York State.

The cooling water intake structure extends from the point at which water is withdrawn from the waters of the State up to, and including the intake pumps [6 NYCRR § 700.1(a)(12)].

Dry closed-cycle cooling - cooling system that uses air flow, rather than the evaporation of water, to remove heat from the power station in order to reduce or eliminate the consumptive use of surface waters.

Entrainment - the incorporation of all life stages of fish with intake water flow entering and passing through a cooling water intake structure and into a cooling water system. It is assumed that entrainment results in 100 percent mortality of the entrained organisms.

Equivalent to - providing a reduction in adverse environmental impact within a ten (10) percent margin of error of that which is attainable with the use of wet closed-cycle cooling.

Feasible - capable of being done; able to be installed and function efficiently within the operating constraints of the facility.

Impingement mortality - the death of all life stages of fish as a result of being entrapped on the outer part of a cooling water intake structure or against a screening device during periods of water withdrawal.

Industrial facilities - includes all facilities listed in CWA § 306(b)(1)(A) and all other facilities that have a cooling water intake structure in connection with a point source thermal discharge.

Minimize - reduce to the smallest amount, extent or degree reasonably possible.

Once-through cooling water system - a system designed to withdraw water from a natural or other water source, use it at the facility to support contact and/or noncontact cooling uses, and then discharge it to a waterbody without recirculation.

Repowering - the process of increasing the efficiency of older, less efficient industrial facilities through the installation of new, improved equipment. Repowering with more efficient equipment can significantly reduce non-contact cooling water requirements thereby rendering closed cycle cooling available for an existing industrial facility. Repowering includes but is not limited to the partial or complete demolition and replacement of the existing industrial facility.

Wet closed-cycle cooling - a system designed to withdraw the smallest amount of water to support contact and/or non-contact cooling uses within a facility. A closed-cycle cooling system uses between 93 and 98 percent less water than a once-through cooling system. The water is usually sent to a cooling canal, channel, pond, or tower to allow waste heat to be dissipated to the atmosphere and then is returned to the system. New source water (makeup water) is added to the system to replenish losses that have occurred due to cooling tower blow-down, drift, and evaporation.

Wholly disproportionate test - a comparison of the proportional reduction in impact (benefit) as compared to the proportional reduction in revenue (cost) of installing and operating BTA technology to mitigate adverse environmental impact. This comparison does not monetize the resource and gives presumptive weight to the value of the environmental benefits to be gained.

IV. Purpose and Background:

State regulations and federal laws mandate that industrial facilities employ BTA to minimize adverse environmental impact when proposing a new or operating an existing CWIS. The purpose of this policy is to identify the goals of the Department in implementing this standard and to ensure consistent application of those goals to industrial facilities in New York State.

Throughout New York, over 16 billion gallons of water are withdrawn from state waters through a CWIS system each day for the purpose of industrial cooling. The adverse environmental impact of these CWIS systems is staggering, resulting in over 17 billion fish of all life stages (eggs, larvae, juveniles and adults) being entrained or impinged annually. The fish can suffer from lethally high water temperatures, contact with screens, impellers or heat-exchangers, or from exposure to the chemicals used to maintain heat-exchanger cleanliness. Steam electric power plants account for the majority, though not all, of this environmental impact with some of these power plants using well over a billion gallons of water every day for cooling purposes.

Establishing Closed-Cycle Cooling or the Equivalent as the Performance Goal:

One of the most efficient and effective ways to minimize or eliminate the number of and mortality to aquatic organisms impinged and entrained during industrial cooling is to minimize or eliminate the use of once-through, non-contact cooling water from the surface waters of New York. The demonstrated technology that achieves the greatest reduction in non-contact cooling water use is closed-cycle cooling. Under the U.S. EPA CWA 316(b) Phase I Rule (40 C.F.R. Part 125, subpart I), wet closed-cycle cooling was identified as the best technology available for new facilities to minimize impingement and entrainment, and New York already requires closed-cycle cooling technology to be employed on all new facilities and for electric generating facilities being repowered. Given the effectiveness of closed-cycle cooling at reducing adverse environmental impact caused by a CWIS, and the biological importance of New York's surface waterbodies for commercial and recreational uses, particularly in the marine and coastal district, the tidal reach of the Hudson River, and the Great Lakes, this policy establishes closed-cycle cooling as the performance goal for all new, existing and repowered industrial facilities in New York.

The Establishment of a Ninety (90) Percent Reduction Minimum Threshold:

Wet closed-cycle cooling can reduce cooling water requirements by approximately 93-98 percent from that required by once-through cooling technology depending on the closed-cycle design and the amount of make-up and blow-down water

required.¹ Where the Department determines that wet closed-cycle cooling is available at an existing facility, closed-cycle cooling will be required as BTA to comply with 6 NYCRR § 704.5. However, due to site-specific conditions, wet closed-cycle cooling may not be an available mitigative technology for some existing industrial facilities in New York. For a facility where the Department determines that wet closed-cycle cooling is not available, the minimum threshold reduction that must be achieved by alternative mitigative technologies and/or operational measures is 90 percent of what would otherwise be attainable with installation of wet closed-cycle cooling at that facility. However, this policy establishes only the minimum reduction goal and the Department reserves the right, in any case, to require more stringent protective measures at a particular facility and will require the most protective technology and/or operational measures available.

Exemption from the Performance Goal

An existing electric generating facility operated at less than fifteen (15) percent of its electric generating capacity over a current 5-year averaging period may be exempt from meeting the performance goals of this policy provided that the reduction in operation results in the minimization of the impingement and entrainment of all life stages of fish in accordance with this policy.

Additional Supportive Documentation

Additional information on this policy can be found in Appendices A and B. Appendix A, *BTA Policy Technical Document*, provides background information on the aquatic impacts associated with the operation of CWIS in New York State, supportive documentation on selecting closed-cycle cooling as BTA in New York State, and anticipated impacts due to the implementation of this policy. Appendix B, *Department Procedures for the Determination of "Best Technology Available", or BTA, under 6 NYCRR Part 704.5 and Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act*, outlines the procedures Department staff use in determining BTA for an industrial facility operating a CWIS in connection with a point source thermal discharge.

V. Responsibility:

The Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources has the primary responsibility to ensure that BTA determinations are made consistent with this Policy. Additionally, the Divisions of Water and Environmental Permits will ensure that the requirements of this policy are reflected in all final SPDES permits issued to industrial facilities that operate or propose to operate a CWIS in connection with a point source thermal discharge. Specific Division responsibilities are as follows:

Division of Environmental Permits (Permits) - As the Project Manager, Permits staff will coordinate the BTA determination with the development of the SPDES

¹ Phase II Rule - 69 Fed.Reg. 41,601, footnote 44 (July 9, 2004). See also Maulbetsch and DiFilippo (2008).

permit and will provide liaison to the New York State Department of Public Service and other state and federal agencies as needed. In addition, Permits staff will assess BTA determinations with respect to compliance with Uniform Procedures Act (UPA) and State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) requirements. With respect to other land use impacts, Permits staff will seek other agency or outside expertise as needed.

Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources (DFWMR) - DFWMR staff will conduct the biological assessment for and take the lead role in developing the BTA determination with respect to aquatic resource impacts. For the SPDES permit, DFWMR staff will also assess other fish and wildlife impacts, especially within the context of ECL Articles 11, 13, 15, 24 and 25.

Division of Water (DOW) - DOW Staff will assess BTA determinations with respect to water quality impacts and incorporate the final BTA determination into the SPDES permit.

VI. Procedure:

Implementation of this Policy:

This policy will be implemented when: (i) an applicant seeks a new SPDES permit; (ii) a permittee seeks to renew an existing SPDES permit; or (iii) a SPDES permit is modified either by the Department or by the permittee, for a facility that operates a CWIS in connection with a point source thermal discharge pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 704.5; 40 CFR Part 125, subpart I and subpart N; and 40 CFR Part 125.90(b). In addition, when issuing SPDES permits for industrial facilities using a CWIS, staff are guided by the applicable SPDES regulations, including 6 NYCRR 750-1.11 "Application of Standards, Limitations and Other Requirements." These regulations require that both federal minimum requirements and State water quality requirements are met, and that other impacts are evaluated and mitigated as required by applicable law and regulations.

DFWMR staff will make final BTA determinations on a site-specific, case by case basis following the *BTA Determination Procedures* (*see* Appendix B, *BTA Determination Procedures* and *Matter of Athens Generating Co., L.P.*, Interim Decision of the Commissioner, June 2, 2000). The BTA determination made under this policy for a new SPDES permit or during the renewal or modification of existing SPDES permits is only concerned with minimizing the adverse environmental impact associated with a CWIS. Once a site-specific BTA determination is made by DFWMR staff, the Department will undertake a SEQRA review to ensure that any significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of the selected BTA are avoided, minimized, or mitigated. In situations where SEQRA does not apply (*e.g.*, Public Service Law Article VII siting cases) consideration of the significance of impacts associated with construction and operation of the selected BTA, and whether avoidance, minimization or mitigation would be appropriate, will occur according to the governing procedural statute.

Cost Considerations in Making Site Specific BTA Determinations

After selecting the best technology available for an industrial facility, the Department will consider the cost of the feasible technologies and will determine whether or not the cost of the technologies are wholly disproportionate to the environmental benefits to be gained from the technology. The Department will not undertake a formal cost-benefit analysis whereby the environmental benefits would be monetized. Such an analysis is neither desirable nor required by law. *See Entergy Corp v Riverkeeper, Inc., et al.*, 556 U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 1498 (2009). For each site-specific BTA determination, the Department will select a feasible technology whose costs are not wholly disproportionate to the environmental benefits to be gained (*see* Appendix B, *BTA Determination Procedures*).

Variances to the Policy's Performance Goal

Other than the exemption due to operating capacity noted previously, the Department will not allow facility variances from the performance goals established by this policy. Any facility that is unable to meet the performance goals established in this policy will need to repower, reduce operations, shut down, or otherwise meet the performance goals through a suite of operational measures (e.g., seasonal outages, installation of screening mechanisms, variable-speed pumps, etc.).

Additional Actions Required:

The Department is required to make a SEQRA determination prior to the implementation of this policy and has determined that the adoption of this policy will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Rather, adoption of the policy will result in greater protection for aquatic resources from the impingement mortality and entrainment impacts that result from industrial facilities using surface water for non-contact cooling. The policy will also result in the reduction of withdrawals from surface waterbodies and the reduction of thermal impacts at some facilities where the discharge of waste heat will be dissipated by the use of cooling towers.

VII. Related References:

California Environmental Resources Control Board. 2008. Scoping Document: Water quality control policy on the use of coastal and estuarine waters for power plant cooling. State Water Resources Board. March 2008. 91pp.

Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 – 1387

Clean Water Act §§ 306, 316(b)

Environmental Protection Agency. 1977. Permits Division, Office of Waste Enforcement, EPA, *Guidance for Evaluating the Adverse Impact of Cooling Water Intake Structures on the Aquatic Environment: Section 316(b)*, PL 92-500 (Draft 1977).

Entergy Corp. v Riverkeeper, Inc., et al., 556 U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 1498 (2009).

- Maulbetsch, John S., and Michael N. DiFilippo. 2008. *Performance, Cost, and Environmental Effects of Saltwater Cooling Towers*. California Energy Commission, PIER Energy-Related Environmental Research Program. CEC-500-2008-043.
- Matter of Athens Generating Co., L.P.*, Interim Decision of the Commissioner, June 2, 2000
- Matter of Dynegy Northeast Generation, Inc., on behalf of Dynegy Danskammer, LLC*, Decision of the Deputy Commissioner, May 24, 2006 [2006 WL 1488863 (N.Y.Dept.Env.Conserv.)]; *Riverkeeper, Inc. v Johnson*, 52 AD3d 1072 (3d Dept. 2008), appeal denied 11 NY3d 716 (2009).
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Regulations Addressing Cooling Water Intake Structures for New Facilities; Final Rule, 66 Fed.Reg. 65,255 (Dec. 18, 2001) (codified at 40 C.F.R. pts. 9, 122-25 [Phase I Rule].
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Phase II Existing Facilities; Final Rule, 69 Fed.Reg. 41,576 (July 9, 2004) (codified at 40 C.F.R. pts. 9, 122-25) [Phase II Rule].
- NERC (2008). Electric reliability impacts of a mandatory cooling tower rule for existing steam generating units, U.S. Department of Energy/North American Electric Reliability Corporation: 46 pp.
- Riverkeeper I: *Riverkeeper, Inc. et al. v U.S. EPA*, 358 F.3d 174 (2d Cir. 2004)
Riverkeeper II: *Riverkeeper, Inc. et al. v U.S. EPA*, 475 F.3d 83 (2d Cir. 2007).
- Stark letter (2005) 24 January 2005 letter to EPA B. Grumbles from Deputy Commissioner L. Stark.
- Tetra Tech, Inc. 2008. California's coastal power plants: alternative cooling system analysis. Final report to the California Ocean Protection Council. February 2008.
- Title 6 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York (6 NYCRR) Parts 700, 704 and 750.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Establishing Closed-cycle Cooling or the Equivalent as the Best Technology Available in New York State for Industrial Facilities

Background on the Impact to Aquatic Resources

Throughout New York State, over 17 billion gallons of water are withdrawn from state waters each day for the purposes of industrial cooling resulting in over 18 billion fish of all life stages (eggs, larvae, juveniles and adults) being entrained or impinged annually. These fish can suffer from lethally high water temperatures, contact with screens, impellers or heat-exchangers, or from exposure to the chemicals used to maintain heat-exchanger cleanliness. Steam electric power plants count for the majority, though not all, of this impact with some of these power plants using well over a billion gallons of water every day for cooling purposes (Table 1). More than 25 steam electric facilities are located in New York with almost half of them sited along the East River and the Hudson River estuary (Table 2). Other industries in New York requiring non-contact cooling water include manufacturing facilities (e.g., cement and sugar industry) and large office building facilities.

Regulatory Requirements

The Clean Water Act as amended in 1972 includes requirements for the protection of fish, shellfish and wildlife from the potential harm caused by the non-contact cooling water systems and thermal discharges of industrial facilities. One of the requirements is included in Section 316(b) and reads:

“Any standard established pursuant to section 301 or section 308 of this Act and applicable to a point source shall require that the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impacts.” See 33 U.S.C. Section 1326(b).

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Table 1: Estimated impingement mortality, entrainment and water use at major industrial facilities in New York State (MW = megawatts; MGD = million gallons per day). Impingement numbers are absolute and do not consider survival off traveling screens. Estimates are based on the most recent site-specific data collected (Date). When two dates are indicated, the first date corresponds with entrainment and the second date with impingement. Estimated entrainment for the cement plants is based on modeling; no site specific data were available.

Estimated Entrainment and Impingement at Major New York Facilities Using Once-through Cooling Water

Facility	Owner	MW	MGD	Waterbody	Entrainment	Impingement	Date
AES Cayuga	AES	308	219	Cayuga Lake	576,000	ND*	1994
AES Greenidge	AES	161	113	Saratoga Lake	ND	28,000	1977
AES Somerset	AES	675	279	Lake Ontario	141,486	12,445	2000
AES Westover	AES	146	102	Susquehanna River	3,900,000	10,200	1977
Arthur Kill	NRG Energy	842	713	Arthur Kill	1,548,314,607	4,406,742	2007
Ashtabula Generating	National Grid	1,290	1,254	East River	629,832,154	2,816,328	2007
Barrick	Black River Power	364	294	Barrick's Cove	908,259,233	176,044	2004
Black River Power	Black River Power	50	56	Black River	41,000	0	1983
Bovine 1&2	Mirant	1,139	912	Hudson River	127,000,000	30,000	1997
Brooklyn Navy Yard	Brooklyn Navy Yard	286	55	East River	38,998,201	0	1997
Danstarmer	Dynegy Northeast	491	457	Hudson River	167,019,074	144,428	2008
Dunkirk Steam Station	NRG Energy	800	579	Lake Erie	47,940,000	62,778,798	2007
East River Generating	ConEd	317	369	East River	1,342,191,677	1,500,873	2007
Fair Rockaway	National Grid	109	84	Jamaica Bay	117,667,695	6,950	2006
Fitzpatrick	Entergy	825	598	Lake Ontario	18,004,625	239,357	2007/2004
Genoa	Rochester Gas & Electric	466	490	Lake Ontario	28,616,000	35,612	2007
Glenwood	National Grid	210	179	Hempstead Harbor	177,879,210	9,962	2005
Huntley	NRG Energy	760	846	Niagara River	105,500,000	98,700,000	2007
Irish Point	Entergy	1,910	2,601	Hudson River	1,200,000,000	1,160,000	1990
Nine Mile Point 1&2	Constellation	1,757	490	Lake Ontario	86,700,000	1,081,900	1997
Northport	National Grid	1,522	939	LI Sound	8,430,808,238	127,118	2003
Oswego Steam Station	Oswego Harbor Power	1,700	1,399	Lake Ontario	12,824,104	1,246	2007
Port Jefferson	NYPA	675	622	Lake Ontario	638,749,772	37,567	2002
Reverwood	National Grid	385	399	Pl. Lfnt. Harbor	1,014,950,951	76,104	2004
Riverwood	Trans Canada	2,410	1,391	East River	189,000,000	82,303	1994
Roseboro	Dynegy Northeast	1,200	926	Hudson River	712,000,000	44,056	1997/2007
Non-steam electric							
Holcim Cement	Holcim Cement	NA*	4.6	Hudson River	403,743	ND	ND
Lafarge Cement	Lafarge Cement	NA	8.6	Hudson River	870,834	ND	ND
Empire State Plaza	OGS	NA	108	Hudson River	37,739,611	ND	2007
World Trade Center	NY/NJ Port Authority	NA	173	Hudson River	140,000,000	10,335	1993
Total		20,864	16,664		13,772,663,134	17,712,816	
Mean		602	562		611,307,698	6,900,636	
STD		637	588		1,572,249,191	22,083,594	
Minimum		50	5		41,000	0	

Notes: NA=not applicable; ND=no data available
 All estimated impingement and entrainment values are based on actual cooling water use.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Table 2: Estimated annual entrainment and impingement by waterbody caused by cooling water intake structures at 28 major steam electric facilities in New York State. "Other" waterbodies include Cayuga and Seneca Lakes and the Black River. Data are summarized from Table 1 estimates.

Waterbody	Number Power Plants	Annual Entrainment	Annual Impingement
<i>East River</i>	6	4,397,086,411	8,943,803
<i>Hudson River</i>	6	2,205,019,337	1,398,525
<i>Lake Erie</i>	1	47,940,000	62,778,786
<i>Lake Ontario</i>	5	146,286,198	1,350,560
<i>Long Island Sound</i>	3	9,623,638,399	212,784
<i>Niagara River</i>	1	105,500,000	96,700,000
<i>South Shore Long Island</i>	2	1,023,921,918	182,604
<i>Susquehanna River</i>	1	3,900,000	10,200
<i>Other</i>	3	617,000	29,000

In 1974, 6 NYCRR Part 704 became effective with section 704.5 requiring the minimization of impacts caused by cooling water intake structures (or CWIS). This regulation contains similar language to section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act and states:

"The location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures in connection with a point thermal discharge shall reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact."

In recent years, the U.S. EPA developed and promulgated three phased rules to provide formal regulations for states to address the impacts caused by cooling water intake structures (CWIS). The Phase I Rule governs all new industrial facilities that propose to withdraw two million gallons of water or more each day (MGD) with 25 percent or more of the water to be used for cooling. This rule establishes the use of wet closed-cycle cooling or the equivalent as BTA for all new industrial facilities that meet these criteria. The Phase II Rule governed large, existing power plants withdrawing 50 MGD or more. This rule has since been suspended by the EPA due to a legal decision (Riverkeeper II Decision 2007) and a revised draft rule is not anticipated to be released until sometime in 2010. The Phase III Rule regulates offshore gas and oil extraction facilities. No such facilities exist in the coastal waters of New York State.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Need for a Statewide Policy to Implement Clean Water Act Section 316(b) and 6 NYCRR Part 704.5

Since 1975, the Department of Environmental Conservation has been responsible for ensuring the requirements of CWA § 316(b) are effectively implemented in New York State through the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (or SPDES) Permit Program. However, after more than 30 years of regulating industrial facilities the adverse environmental impacts have only been reduced at a few facilities while others have not implemented technology or operational measures to minimize impingement mortality and/or entrainment. As a result of the failure of the U.S. EPA to effectively promulgate a Phase II Rule, no federal guidance or rules exist to set performance requirements for the majority of the facilities in New York State regulated under CWA § 316(b) and 6 NYCRR Part 704.5. This policy sets a performance goal for all new and existing industrial facilities throughout New York State based on the best technology available that will result in a substantial decrease in adverse environmental impacts caused by cooling water intake structures.

Definition of "Adverse Environmental Impact"

Regulations and law define the adverse environmental impact that must be minimized under CWA § 316(b) and 6 NYCRR Part 704.5 as the number of aquatic organisms entrained and impinged by cooling water intake structures (EPA 2001, Riverkeeper I Decision 2004, and Riverkeeper II Decision 2007). Industry disagrees with this definition and as recently as March 2009, has been attempting to reopen this debate before the New York State Supreme Court (Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 2, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 3, LLC v. Alexander B. Grannis).

The "Best Technology Available" or BTA Performance Goal for New York State

The Department establishes closed-cycle cooling or equivalent as the performance goal for "Best Technology Available" (BTA) to minimize the adverse environmental impacts caused by an industrial facility's operation of a cooling water intake structure (CWIS) in connection with a point source thermal discharge. Furthermore, for an existing industrial facility where the Department determines closed-cycle cooling is not available, this policy establishes a performance goal of 90 percent or greater reduction in

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

both entrainment and impingement mortality that would be achieved by installing and operating a wet closed-cycle cooling system at that facility. The designation of a performance goal requiring a 90 percent reduction of that obtainable using wet closed-cycle cooling provides the allowance for a ten percent margin of measurement error (Riverkeeper I Decision 2004). Therefore, the appropriate application of this performance goal will be for the facility owner to aim for the same reduction in adverse impacts obtainable if a closed-cycle cooling system were operated at the facility.

The reduction in impingement mortality and entrainment required will be determined on a site specific, case-by-case basis and will be calculated as follows:

1. An estimation of impingement mortality and entrainment that would occur at a facility assuming that: the cooling water system has been designed as a once-through system; the opening of the cooling water intake structure is located at, and the face of the standard 3/8-inch mesh conventional traveling screen is oriented parallel to, the shoreline near the surface of the source waterbody and is operated at the full rated capacity 24 hours a day, 365 days a year (e.g., Calculation Baseline) (Riverkeeper v. Johnson 2009, Phase II Rule) will be made;
2. An estimated reduction in impingement mortality and entrainment if the facility were to install and operate wet closed-cycle cooling will be made; and
3. If wet closed-cycle cooling is determined to be unavailable for the facility, the permittee will be required to demonstrate that by using alternative technologies and operational measures impingement mortality and entrainment will be reduced by at least 90 percent of that obtainable by step No. 2.

The reductions afforded by closed-cycle cooling will be dependent on the total reduction of cooling water withdrawal realized. For marine waters, wet closed-cycle can reduce the total amount of water from once-through cooling by 93-95 percent when make-up and blowdown flows are minimized (Maulbetsch *et al.* 2008, EPA 2004). Actual reductions in water use at a facility may be lower depending on other air and

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

water quality restrictions that would restrict the cooling water cycles of concentration which for most marine cooling towers would typically be approximately 1.5 cycles (Maulbetsch *et al.* 2008). For freshwater, the reduction is greater: 96-98 percent (EPA 2004). Therefore, the final, verifiable percent reduction in the adverse environmental impact that must be achievable at a facility where closed-cycle cooling is *not available* will range from 84-86 percent in marine waters to 86-88 percent or greater in freshwater from the calculation baseline.

Why Choose Closed-cycle Cooling Technology as "BTA"?

There are many alternative technologies, processes and operational methods to closed-cycle cooling that have been demonstrated to reduce entrainment and impingement. For some industrial facilities operating once-through cooling systems, these alternatives have been demonstrated to reduce entrainment and impingement to levels commensurate to that achievable using a closed-cycle cooling system. However, the effectiveness of these technologies, especially on reducing mortality, varies greatly depending on the facility location, the waterbody drawn from, fish species and life stages impinged and entrained, and the ability of the facility owner to maintain and operate the equipment effectively. Therefore, it is not possible to select any one of these alternative technologies or suites of technologies to install and operate on all existing industrial facilities that will consistently, effectively and efficiently minimize the adverse environmental impacts caused by CWIS.

One of the most effective and efficient methods to minimize or eliminate the number and mortality of aquatic organisms impinged and entrained during industrial cooling is to minimize or eliminate the use of once-through, non-contact cooling water from surface waters (EPA 2004, footnote 44). The demonstrated technology that achieves the greatest reduction in non-contact cooling water use is closed-cycle cooling. Under the U.S. EPA CWA 316(b) Phase I Rule (40 C.F.R. Part 125, subpart I), the EPA identified wet closed-cycle cooling as best technology available for new facilities requiring non-contact cooling. Prior to the promulgation of the Phase I Rule, New York had already required closed-cycle cooling technology to be employed on all new and repowered steam electric facilities (Athens Decision 2000).

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

There are four categories of cooling water systems in use at industrial facilities in New York to dispense of waste heat: once-through cooling, wet closed-cycle cooling, dry cooling, and hybrid closed-cycle cooling (see Table 3).

Table 3: Cooling-water system technologies currently in use in New York State. All of the example facilities using a dry closed-cycle cooling system are located in the marine district and on the Hudson river south of the Federal Dam.

Cooling Water System Type	Description of Technology	Examples
<i>Once-through cooling</i>	Water withdrawn from waterbody, passes through condensers to absorb waste heat and returned to the source waterbody. Requires the most water.	Most steam electric facilities in New York (see Table 1)
<i>Wet Closed-cycle cooling</i>	Cooling water is recycled. Requires 93-98% less water than a once-through cooling system.	Nine Mile Point Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2
<i>Dry Closed-cycle cooling</i>	Uses the air to transfer heat to the atmosphere and requires <u>little to no</u> water.	Athens Generating Station; New Poletti Station; Astoria SCS
<i>Hybrid closed-cycle cooling</i>	Combines wet and dry cooling technology to reduce vapor plumes. Water use commensurate with wet closed-cycle.	Bethlehem Energy Center

Closed-cycle systems use significantly less water than once through because these systems are designed to allow for waste heat to be transferred from the cooling water to the atmosphere (by either a reservoir or tower) so the cooling water can be recycled. With the exception of some forms of dry-cooling systems, cooling water intake structures are still required for many of these closed-cycle systems for the uptake of replacement water but the total volume of water required is between 93 and 98 percent less than that required with once-through cooling (Maulbetsch *et al.* 2008, EPA 2002). Albany Steam Station (now called Bethlehem Energy Center), located on the Hudson River was required to use a closed-cycle cooling system when this facility repowered in 2005. By doing so, the owner of Albany Steam Station was able to reduce cooling water use by more than 98 percent. This has resulted in an estimated reduction in entrainment of 98.7% and with the inclusion of wedge wire screens on the intake structure and a low intake velocity, impingement mortality has been eliminated.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Dry closed-cycle cooling can eliminate the need for any cooling water withdrawals from state waters and has been selected as the appropriate technology for a few new industrial facilities sited in New York (Table 3). However, both the U.S. EPA and the State of California found this technology is rarely available for retrofitting existing facilities due to insurmountable technical and logistical problems (EPA 2004, Havey & Blackburn 2008). In addition, both the U.S. EPA and California determined that the projected cost of retrofitting existing facilities with dry closed-cycle cooling technology could not be reasonably borne by the industry. Nevertheless, the added environmental benefits that dry closed-cycle provides over wet closed-cycle is enough for New York to identify this technology as the performance goal for new industrial facilities sited in the marine and coastal district in New York including the Hudson River up to the Federal Dam in Troy. Given that several marine and coastal fish stocks are dangerously low (e.g., winter flounder, American shad, Atlantic sturgeon, and river herring), dry closed-cycle cooling would provide the greatest environmental benefit to help New York marine and coastal fish stocks rebound. In addition, the use of dry closed-cycle cooling systems in the marine district would eliminate the potential impact salt water plumes associated with wet closed cycle-cooling systems would have on the surrounding environment. Dry closed-cycle cooling is already being used at new and repowered steam electric power facilities in the marine and coastal district (see Table 3).

California is developing a policy to establish wet closed-cycle cooling as the performance benchmark in meeting the requirements of CWA § 316(b) (CA Env. Protec. 2008, Appendix A). California's policy consists of the following two tracks:

Track 1: An existing power plant must reduce intake flow and intake velocity, at a minimum, to a level commensurate with that which can be attained by a closed-cycle cooling system; and

Track 2: If an existing power plant owner or operator demonstrates to the Water Board's satisfaction that Track 1 is not feasible, the power plant must reduce the level of adverse environmental impacts from the cooling water intake structure to a comparable level to that which would be achieved under Track 1, using operational or structural controls, or both. A reduction in environmental impacts

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

under Track 2 will achieve a "comparable level" if both impingement mortality and entrainment of all life stages of marine life are reduced to 90 percent or greater of the reduction that would be achieved under Track 1, using closed-cycle wet cooling.

The State of California has set draft compliance dates of 2018 for non-nuclear facilities and 2021 for nuclear facilities. California has also made an exception for nuclear steam generating facilities where compliance with the policy will jeopardize required health and safety regulations. In these cases, California will make BTA decisions on a site specific basis to ensure all safety requirements are met with the implementation of BTA.

Is Closed-cycle Cooling Available at All Existing Industrial Facilities in New York?

Closed-cycle cooling is required for all new industrial facilities in New York with non-contact cooling water needs. However, closed-cycle cooling may not be an available technology at many existing facilities in New York State without requiring a major reconstruction, or repowering, of the existing plant. Some of the issues that may limit the availability of closed-cycle cooling for existing facilities are as follows:

1. Lack of physical space to site or efficiently operate cooling towers;
2. Costs wholly disproportionate to benefits due to requiring reconstruction of condensers and other infrastructure to site and efficiently operate cooling towers;
3. Facility would not operate efficiently or safely with closed-cycle cooling;
4. Nuclear Regulatory Commission health and safety requirements will not be met; and
5. Tower drift, fogging, icing, and salt deposition on local neighborhoods, roads, and vegetation may have significant impacts.

Over the past several years, the Department has been making BTA determinations using performance goals based on the Phase II Rule requirements (60-90% reduction in entrainment and 80-95% reduction in impingement mortality)(Riverkeeper v. Johnson 2009, Stark 2005 letter to EPA). Since 2004, the Department has completed BTA determination for six existing industrial facilities resulting in an average estimated reduction in impingement mortality of 89 percent and entrainment by 72 percent (Table 4). Closed-cycle cooling is likely not available for these facilities for one or more of the

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

above stated reasons; therefore the Department selected the next best available technology to minimize impingement mortality and entrainment. Without retrofitting these facilities with closed-cycle cooling, four of the six facilities would likely meet the performance goal established by this policy for impingement mortality reduction but it is possible that only one facility would meet the goal for entrainment reduction with the currently selected BTA. Additional technologies and operational measures would be required.

Table 4: Estimated reductions in impingement mortality and entrainment obtainable at facilities recently implementing Department selected BTA. Closed-cycle cooling is likely not available for these facilities without repowering. It will likely be the most difficult for facilities to meet the performance goals for entrainment. Note that World Trade Center will be implementing a partial closed-loop cooling system as part of the BTA determination. The *Policy Based Reduction* ranges listed in this table include both impingement mortality and entrainment.

Facility	Type	Water Body Type	Percent Reductions:	
			Impingement Mortality	Entrainment
Arthur Kill	Steam Electric	Marine	80	70
Astoria	Steam Electric	Marine	85	60
Danskammer	Steam Electric	Freshwater	85	80
Dunkirk	Steam Electric	Freshwater	98	75
Ravenswood	Steam Electric	Marine	90	65
World Trade Center	Office Cooling	Estuarine	95	84
Average:			89	72
Policy Based Reductions - Marine Waters:			84-86	
Policy Based Reductions - Freshwater:			86-88	

Alternative Technologies, Processes and Operational Methods That Reduce Entrainment and Impingement Mortality

There are many technologies, processes and operational measures that have been demonstrated to reduce entrainment and impingement mortality (Table 5). For some industrial facilities, these alternatives have been demonstrated to reduce entrainment and impingement mortality to levels commensurate to that achievable using closed-cycle cooling. Prior to its closing in 2008, the Lovett Generating Station on the Hudson River had seasonally employed filter fabric technology (Gunderboom Marine Life Exclusion System or MLES™) resulting in a reduction in entrainment and impingement greater than 90 percent from plant operations prior to the use of this technology. Bowline Point generating station was able to reduce impingement mortality by 91 percent using an

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

exclusion barrier net (Hutchinson and Matouse 1988). However, for most facilities, a combination of physical barriers, fish return systems, and deterrent systems along with flow reductions and outages would be required to reduce entrainment and impingement mortality to 90 percent of that achievable using wet closed-cycle technology.

Table 5: Alternative technologies to closed-cycle cooling that are used in New York and have been demonstrated to reduce levels of entrainment and impingement mortality (modified from Taft and Cook 2003).

Technology Category	Technologies	Mode of Action	Where Used in New York
Physical Barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wedge wire screens - Barrier nets - Aquatic filter barriers 	Physically block fish passage (usually in combination with low water velocity)	Brooklyn Navy Yard Somerset Lovett Bowline Point Ravenswood Bethlehem Energy Center
Collection/Return Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conventional Traveling Screens - Ristroph Traveling Screens - Fine Mesh Traveling Screens - Fish pumps 	Actively or passively collect fish for transport through a return system	Arthur Kill Black River Danskammer Oswego Steam E.F. Barrett Far Rockaway Indian Point Ravenswood Somerset Dunkirk Huntley Port Jefferson Roseton
Diversion Systems	Angled screens	Divert fish to a return system or safe area	Oswego Steam
Flow Reduction	Variable Speed Drive Pumps	Closely match cooling water use to heat load	Danskammer Arthur Kill Astoria
Behavioral Deterrent Technologies	Acoustic systems	Alter or take advantage of natural behavior patterns to repel or attract fish	James A. Fitzpatrick Danskammer

Anticipated BTA Policy Compliance Costs to Industry

To estimate the compliance cost industry would have to bear with the implementation of this policy, some assumptions had to be made and several sources of public information and data were relied upon. Since the cost of retrofitting and operating a wet closed-cycle cooling system on a facility is directly related to the amount of cooling water used and the heat load that is required to be dissipated, the steam electric generating industry would bear the greatest cost to comply with this policy.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Though other manufacturing facilities would also be required to comply with the policy, the overall cost would be significantly less than that for the steam electric industry. In fact, the U.S. EPA found that for new manufacturing facilities, the total annualized compliance costs to install and operate wet closed-cycle cooling were below 0.5 percent of gross annual revenues for several industries (e.g., pulp & paper, chemicals, petroleum, steel and aluminum) (EPA 2005). In the same document, the EPA estimated compliance costs to the steam electric industry would be much higher, at greater than five percent gross annual revenues for some facilities but still determined that the industry as a whole could bear this cost. The U.S. EPA had previously rejected dry closed-cycle cooling as the performance benchmark in the Phase I Rule, which applies to all new industrial facilities, with cost estimates exceeding ten percent of gross revenues for many proposed facilities. The U.S. EPA considers costs greater than 10 percent of gross revenue could be a barrier for new facilities to enter the industry (EPA 2001). However, in New York, new steam electric facilities have recently been constructed that utilize dry closed-cycle cooling technology clearly demonstrating that this technology is in fact economically achievable.

Compliance costs listed in Table 6 were only generated for the existing steam electric generating facilities in New York with the assumption that wet closed-cycle cooling is available for all existing plants. Given the large amount of revenue information available for the steam electric generating industry, it is possible to estimate the overall cost of compliance the implementation of this policy will have. Revenue was estimated by calculating the average net energy production (in MWh) for each facility for the period from 2002 to 2007 from the *NYISO Load and Capacity Data "Gold Books" (2003-2008)* and multiply that number by the average zonal price per MWh reported for 2007. This revenue was then projected for 20 years which is the approximate functional life of wet cooling towers before major maintenance and reconstruction is required (Havey and Blackburn 2008).

The cost to construct and operate cooling towers at each facility was estimated using the relationship between costs and cooling water use in gallons per minute (gpm) reported by Maulbetsch (2005). In order to determine a current cost per gpm, the median

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

cost of \$555 per gpm was calculated using the costing data provided in Havey and Blackburn (2008) for 11 steam electric facilities in California. Annual cooling tower operation and maintenance costs were estimated using the relational factor to capital cost of 1.6 percent reported by Maulbetsch (2005). By applying these cost factors to existing New York steam electric facilities, it is estimated that the compliance cost for the steam electric industry over 20 years would be over \$8.5 billion (Table 6). This would be approximately 6.7 percent of the gross annual revenues for the industry for this time period. If Oswego Power were not included in the estimation, the overall cost of compliance would fall to 6.2 percent of revenue. At present, Oswego Steam operates at less than three percent capacity.

For steam electric facilities where wet closed-cycle is not feasible, the costs of alternative technologies are generally much less costly than cooling towers for most facilities in New York State (Table 7). EPA estimated that for 99 percent of the firms across the country that own large power plants, compliance costs for implementing these other technologies under the Phase II Rule would be less than three percent of revenues (EPA 2004). However, some facilities will likely not meet the performance goals set by this policy by utilizing alternative feasible technologies and would likely be required to reduce cooling water use further by reducing electric generating capacity. This could significantly reduce revenue for these facilities.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Table 6: Estimated compliance costs for the steam electric industry in New York State. Note that Oswego Steam Station operated on average less than 3.0% of capacity. Parasitic and efficiency losses are not included.

Facility Name	Capital Costs	Operation & Maintenance Costs (20 years)	Total Costs	20-year Revenue	Cost - Revenue Ratio
Indian Point	\$1,079,651,875	\$345,424,800	\$1,424,976,675	\$24,169,629,280	3.9
Astoria Generating	\$540,431,250	\$172,938,000	\$713,369,250	\$6,232,600,000	11.4
Oswego Steam Station	\$539,929,335	\$172,518,887	\$711,638,518	\$5,357,257,252	135.6
Ravenswood	\$538,076,042	\$171,544,333	\$707,620,375	\$7,796,676,244	9.1
Northport	\$461,224,956	\$115,733,367	\$577,002,225	\$15,362,523,680	3.1
Roseton	\$356,807,188	\$114,178,300	\$470,985,488	\$3,183,683,722	14.8
Bowline 1&2	\$361,653,950	\$112,497,297	\$474,091,225	\$1,914,251,673	32.6
Huntley	\$325,904,479	\$104,289,433	\$430,193,913	\$2,409,262,820	17.9
Artis KII	\$274,956,250	\$87,988,000	\$362,944,250	\$1,355,009,080	18.6
Fitzpatrick	\$240,153,125	\$78,849,000	\$317,002,125	\$8,038,232,251	3.9
Palam	\$239,017,088	\$78,072,567	\$316,289,653	\$3,562,207,865	8.6
Dunkirk	\$222,971,250	\$71,350,800	\$294,322,050	\$3,573,800,000	8.2
Oran	\$198,933,942	\$68,655,933	\$267,589,875	\$1,812,269,079	5.3
Nine Mile Point	\$188,723,125	\$60,391,400	\$249,114,525	\$18,490,063,300	1.6
Dunkirk II	\$179,324,271	\$60,223,787	\$239,798,038	\$3,460,148,917	6.7
Port Jefferson	\$153,704,167	\$48,185,333	\$202,889,500	\$3,162,734,117	6.4
EF Barrett	\$119,447,398	\$36,303,777	\$149,750,563	\$2,895,381,700	5.2
AES Somerset	\$107,346,250	\$34,350,800	\$141,697,050	\$5,792,311,378	2.4
AES Cayuga (Mitsun)	\$94,473,250	\$27,010,000	\$121,416,250	\$2,967,921,468	4.1
Glenwood	\$66,939,167	\$21,420,633	\$88,359,700	\$952,476,512	9.3
Roseton	\$66,285,000	\$15,431,200	\$81,716,200	\$1,453,886,013	4.4
AES Greenidge	\$43,552,083	\$13,936,667	\$57,488,750	\$1,048,558,645	5.5
AES Westport (Goodley)	\$39,288,642	\$12,562,733	\$51,821,275	\$676,518,148	5.8
Far Rockaway	\$32,182,282	\$10,296,333	\$42,480,625	\$559,636,320	7.8
Essex River	\$122,477,663	\$39,098,867	\$161,573,750	\$1,126,998,000	14.3
Black River Power	\$21,197,917	\$6,783,333	\$27,981,250	\$497,823,667	5.6
Brooklyn Navy Yard	\$21,197,917	\$6,783,333	\$27,981,250	\$2,635,019,685	1.0
Total Compliance Costs:	\$6,476,437,604	\$2,072,460,633	\$8,548,897,638	\$126,686,872,946	6.7

Table 7: Estimated costs of installing alternative technologies at existing steam electric facilities in New York State.

Estimated Costs*	Ristroph Screens	Wedge wire	Variable Speed Pumps	Fish Deterrent Systems	Barrier Nets
<i>Average</i>	\$9,920,476	\$20,019,002	\$39,306,075	\$2,248,500	\$5,173,333
<i>Maximum</i>	\$18,689,000	\$65,000,000	\$55,657,000	\$3,050,000	\$8,000,000
<i>Minimum</i>	\$3,746,000	\$3,892,000	\$16,400,000	\$1,447,000	\$3,539,000

*All estimates include construction and 20-year operation and maintenance expenses. All cost estimates are based on data provided to New York State for 12 steam electric facilities.

Cost Considerations in Implementing the Performance Goals of this Policy

Cost-Benefit Analysis

The U.S. Supreme Court (2009) determined that it is up to the discretion of the U.S. EPA, or the U.S. EPA's designee, to determine how costs will be considered when establishing requirements to minimize the adverse environmental impacts caused by CWIS. The Court decided that the need for, and the rigor of a cost-benefit analysis were rightly left to the U.S. EPA's discretion when they established the performance standards

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

in the Phase II Rule (Entergy v. Riverkeeper, Inc. 2009 Decision). The Supreme Court decision reverses the 2007 U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit decision which ruled that the U.S. EPA was prohibited from making cost-benefit analyses under CWA § 316(b) (Riverkeeper II-2007 Decision).

Prior to the 2007 decision of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, the Department had been making BTA determinations in New York for individual facilities on a site-specific, case by case basis (Athens Decision 2000). For each site-specific BTA determination, the Department selected a feasible technology whose costs were not wholly disproportionate to the environmental benefits expected to be gained. (Athens Decision 2000).

Wholly Disproportionate Test

The Department contends that the only relevant environmental benefit to be considered in any CWA §316(b)/6 NYCRR §704.5 BTA analysis is the reduction in impingement mortality and entrainment of fish and shellfish, afforded by the minimization alternative (Stark letter 2005, Athens Decision 2000). The selection of the BTA is a technology forcing decision but the Department will select technologies that are not *wholly disproportionate to the environmental benefits* (Stark letter 2005, Athens Decision 2000). In the 2000 Athens Interim Decision the Commissioner stated ".....a lone finding that costs outweigh environmental benefits to be gained is insufficient; instead, a finding must be made that the costs are "wholly disproportionate" to the environmental benefits to be gained. This more rigorous standard gives presumptive weight to the value of the environmental benefits and places the burden on a permit applicant to demonstrate that the relative costs are unreasonable." The Department will continue to use the wholly disproportionate test when determining BTA on a site-specific basis.

Costs Reasonably Borne by the Industry

The estimated compliance cost for the performance goals stated in this policy for existing facilities in New York State is 6.7 percent of revenue with 11 facilities falling below six percent (Table 6). Unfortunately, no specific threshold is available for the electric generation industry for determining an absolute threshold for cost reasonably

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

borne, but based on several EPA documents, a range around such a threshold can be estimated. In establishing the Phase I Rule, the EPA rejected dry cooling citing that the annualized compliance costs would be "... greater than 4 percent of revenues for all of 83 projected electric generators within the scope of the rule. For 12 generators, costs would exceed 10% of revenues. EPA has determined that higher capital and operating costs associated with dry cooling may pose barrier to entry for some new sources in certain circumstances. (In general, barrier to entry means that it is too costly for a new facility to enter into the marketplace)." (EPA 2001). The EPA decided that industry on the whole could not bear the cost of dry closed-cycle technology.

The EPA (2006) also stated that small entities (not electric generating facilities) with annualized compliance costs that equal or exceed three percent of revenue *might* experience a significant financial impact. Thus, costs less than three percent can be assumed to be generally achievable. Costs that exceed three percent of revenue may still be economically achievable but achievability would depend on the specific industry in question since operating margins and profit margins vary by industry. The EPA (Putnam *et al.* 1982) estimated that a cost of greater than six percent of revenue *might* not be economically achievable for the perfumes and cosmetics industry.

The EPA ultimately settled on wet closed-cycle cooling to set the performance requirements under the Phase I Rule after finding that the compliance costs for new electric generators ranges between 0.07 and 5.24 percent of annual gross revenue. Under the Phase II Rule, the EPA concluded that the costs of technologies, other than closed-cycle cooling, to minimize impingement and entrainment could be borne by the industry since compliance costs for implementing these other technologies would be less than three percent of revenues for 99 percent of the existing steam electric facilities (EPA 2004).

While this information provides some insight into the financial condition of the electric generation industry, the upper threshold is still unclear. However, the "magic number" of what could be reasonably borne by a specific industry most likely falls between three and ten percent.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Energy Capacity and Reliability Issues

Retrofitting wet closed-cycle cooling towers onto existing steam electric facilities originally designed for once-through cooling will have an impact on the existing energy capacity and reliability in New York State (DOE 2008). Reliability can be affected by the long durations of plant shutdown required for the switch over. Total capacity of the electrical system will be reduced by parasitic losses that include the energy required to run the fans and pumps associated with the cooling towers and the loss of capacity due to losses in efficiency. For some facilities, these efficiency losses can be mitigated by increasing thermal input to generate more electricity. However, this will not be available for all facilities especially pressure water nuclear reactors and some combined cycle facilities (Havey and Blackburn 2008). For these facilities, additional energy will be required to be imported to make up for these losses which if not wind or hydro generated, will likely be generated by coal or natural gas facilities. Considering that the coal and natural gas steam facilities would also be required to make up the lost capacity to comply with this policy, additional capacity will need to be added to the grid.

Approximately 80 percent of New York State's electric generating capacity consists of nuclear, natural gas, coal, and oil fueled generating facilities (NYISO 2008). The remaining 20 percent is shared by hydro, wind, solar, solid waste, and biomass generators. The North American Electric Reliability Corporation estimates that the total energy generation capacity in the United States would be reduced by 4.3 percent with the retrofitting of existing steam electric facilities with closed-cycle cooling (DOE 2008). New energy production would be required to offset these losses and based on the total energy generated in New York State in 2007 (NYISO 2008), this would come to approximately 4,813 GWh of electricity required or the equivalent of a new 550 MW steam turbine unit operating at full-generating capacity.

Additional Impacts of this Policy to Natural Resources

In making a BTA determination, the only adverse environmental impact that will be taken into consideration is the reduction in impingement mortality and entrainment of fish afforded by the minimization alternative (Athens 2000). After the BTA determination is made, the Department will make a SEQRA determination on the facility

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

specific SPDES permit prior to issuance (Indian Point Interim Decision 2008). Implementing this policy at a facility may have an impact on the following natural resources (note that this is not an exhaustive list):

1. Air resources caused by the operation of cooling towers with both an increase in air borne pollutants (i.e., carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, mercury) due to additional power generation required to offset power losses associated with the operation of cooling towers and the localized effect of cooling tower drift;
2. The potential of localized fogging, icing and salt deposition caused by cooling tower water vapor plumes;
3. Visual impacts of cooling towers on the local communities and open spaces;
4. Local impacts caused by the physical construction of towers and potential loss of protected wetlands and other wildlife habitat and open space; and
5. Local noise ordinances caused by the operation of mechanical draft towers.

Literature Cited:

- Athens Decision 2000: *Matter of Athens Generating Co., L.P.*, Interim Decision of the Commissioner, June 2, 2000.
- California Envrtl. Protec. Agency, Water Resources Control Board. 2008. *Scoping Document: Water quality control policy on the use of coastal and estuarine waters for power plant cooling*. March 2008. 91pp.
- Clean Water Act. 33 U.S.C. Sections 1251 – 1387
- Clean Water Act Sections 306, 316(b)
- DOE 2008. Electricity Reliability Impacts of a Mandatory Cooling Tower Rule of Existing Steam Generating Units. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. October 2008.
- DOE 2007. Electric Power Annual 2007, Revised Data, January 2009. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.
(http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/epa/epaxlfile8_1.xls)
- Entergy v. Riverkeeper, Inc. 2009 Decision. 556 U.S. Supreme Court. ____ (2009)
- Environmental Protection Agency (2001). *Phase I—New Facilities Economic Analysis of the Final Regulations*. EPA-821-R-01-035.
- EPA 2001. Environmental Protection Agency; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Regulations Addressing Cooling Water Intake Structures for New Facilities; Final Rule; 18 December 2001; 66 Fed. Reg. 65256
- EPA 2002. Phase II Existing Facility Technical Development Document. EPA-821-R-02-003.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

- EPA 2004. Environmental Protection Agency; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Final Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Phase II Existing Facilities; Final Rule, 69 Fed. Reg. 41576 (7/9/2004)
- EPA 2005. Environmental Protection Agency. Preliminary Economic Profile: Steam Electric Detailed Study; August 2005. 821-B-05-006.
- EPA 2006: Environmental Protection Agency; Economic and Benefits Analysis for the Final Section 316(b) Phase III Existing Facilities Rule ; June 1, 2006; Section D1-2.3 ; Page D1-10
- Hutchinson Jr., J. B. and J. A. Matouse (1988). Evaluation of a barrier net used to mitigate fish impingement at a Hudson River Power Plant Intake. Science, Law, and Hudson River power plants: a case study in environmental impact assessment. L. W. Barnthouse, R. J. Klauda, D. S. Vaughan and R. L. Kendall. Bethesda, MD, American Fisheries Society Monograph 4: 280-285.
- Havey and Blackburn (2008). California's coastal power plants: alternative cooling system analysis. Final report to the California Ocean Protection Council. February 2008.
- Indian Point Interim Decision 2008: In the Matter of Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 2, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 3, LLC, Interim Decision of the Commissioner, August 13, 2008.
- Kennecott v. U. S. Envtl. Protect. Agency*, C.A. 4, 1985. Westlaw 780 F.2d 445.
- Maulbetsch, John S., and Michael N. DiFilippo. 2008. *Performance, Cost, and Environmental Effects of Saltwater Cooling Towers*. California Energy Commission, PIER Energy-Related Environmental Research Program. CEC-500-2008-043.
- Maulbetsch (2003). An Overview of Fish Protection Technologies and Cooling Water Intake Structures (CWISs). In A Symposium on Cooling Water Intake Technologies to Protect Aquatic Organisms. May 6-7, 2003. Arlington VA. EPA 625-C-05-002. p. 112-125.
- NERC (2008). Electric reliability impacts of a mandatory cooling tower rule for existing steam generating units, U.S. Department of Energy/North American Electric Reliability Corporation: 46 pp.
- NYISO (2003). *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2003.
- NYISO (2004) *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2004.
- NYISO (2005) *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2005.
- NYISO (2006) *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2006.
- NYISO (2007) *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2007.
- NYISO (2008) *Load and Capacity Data "Gold Book"*. April 2008.

Appendix A: BTA Policy Technical Document

Riverkeeper I Decision 2004: *Riverkeeper, Inc. et al. v. U. S. Env'tl. Protect. Agency*, (2nd Cir. 3 February 2004).

Riverkeeper II Decision 2007: *Riverkeeper, Inc. et al. v. U. S. Env'tl. Protect. Agency*, (2nd Cir. 25 January 2007).

Riverkeeper v. Johnson, NYSDEC, 2009. Matter of Dynegy Northeast Generation, Inc., on behalf of Dynegy Danskammer, LLC, Decision of the Deputy Commissioner, May 24, 2006 [2006 WL 1488863 (N.Y.Dept.Env.Conserv.)]; *Riverkeeper, Inc. v Johnson*, 52 AD3d 1072 (3d Dept. 2008), appeal denied 11 NY3d 716 (2009).

Taft, N. and T. Cook (2003). An Overview of Fish Protection Technologies and Cooling Water Intake Structures (CWISs). In A Symposium on Cooling Water Intake Technologies to Protect Aquatic Organisms. May 6-7, 2003. Arlington VA. EPA 625-C-05-002. p. 8-23.

Title 6 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations (6 NYCRR) Parts 704 and 750.

Phase I Rule. Federal Register Vol. 66, No. 243. Rules and Regulations. December 18, 2001.


Phase II Rule. Federal Register Vol. 69, No. 131. Rules and Regulations. July 9, 2004.

Putnam, Hayes & Bartlett, Inc. (1982) Workbook for Determining Economic Achievability for National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permits. Final Report to U.S. EPA. August 1982.

Stark, L. (2005). 4 January 2005 letter to Mr. Benjamin H. Grumbles of the U.S. EPA.

Appendix B: Department Procedures for Determining "Best Technology Available"

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources
Bureau of Habitat, 5th Floor
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-4756
Phone (518) 402-8924 • Fax: (518) 402-8925
Website: www.dec.ny.gov



Alexander B. Grannis
Commissioner

---- DRAFT ----

**Department Procedures for the Determination of "Best Technology Available", or BTA,
Under 6 NYCRR Part 704.5 and Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act**

Consistent with our responsibilities under 6 NYCRR Part 704.5, other SPDES regulations, appropriate case law and Commissioners' decisions (see References), and the federal Clean Water Act, staff of the Steam Electric Unit should use the following procedure when making "Best Technology Available" (BTA) determinations at power plants and other facilities having cooling water intake structures (CWIS). The purpose of the BTA determination is to identify the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact from the cooling water intake structure. Prior to following the procedures in this document, staff will determine whether the facility's CWIS is causing or may result in an adverse environmental impact. The adverse environmental impact being assessed is the mortality of fish caused by impingement and entrainment. This assessment will be made by reviewing the results of previous impingement mortality and entrainment studies conducted at the facility and/or by requiring the applicant or facility owner to conduct additional biological studies.

Step 1

Staff, in conjunction with the applicant or facility owner, will develop an array of potential alternatives for minimizing adverse environmental impact that are considered *feasible* with respect to the physical properties of the site and the specifications of the proposed or existing cooling water intake structure (location, design, construction and capacity). *Feasible* means "capable of being done" and does not involve consideration of cost. Staff will require the applicant or facility owner to provide an analysis of these alternatives that evaluates both the effectiveness at protecting aquatic resources and the cost of implementation. Staff may require the applicant or facility owner to evaluate alternatives not endorsed by the applicant or facility owner but that staff believe are feasible. Finally, the applicant or facility owner will be required to propose an alternative or array of alternatives that they believe will achieve BTA.

Step 2

Next, staff will consider the standards for aquatic resource protection contained in Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act. For *new* facilities regulated by the 40 CFR Part 125 - Subpart I (Phase I Rule), any feasible alternatives or combination of feasible alternatives from Step 1 that do not provide aquatic resource protection at least equivalent to the protection afforded by closed-cycle cooling will be eliminated from further consideration as BTA. For *existing* power plants regulated by 316(b) of the Clean Water Act, any feasible alternatives or combination of feasible alternatives from Step 1 that do not provide a 90 percent or greater reduction in both entrainment and impingement mortality from that which would be achieved by a wet closed-cycle cooling system will be eliminated from further consideration as BTA.

Step 3

For each of the mitigation alternatives remaining after conducting Step 2, staff will consider the extent to which adverse environmental impacts are minimized. *Minimize* means reduce to the smallest amount, extent or degree reasonably possible. *Adverse environmental impact* means impact resulting in any injury or mortality of aquatic organisms caused by impingement and/or entrainment. Staff will then determine whether minimizing adverse environmental impact is wholly disproportionate to the resulting aquatic resource benefit¹ (i.e., increase in the level of aquatic resource protection) using cost information provided by the applicant or facility owner, and other publicly-available information, as appropriate. Staff will not perform a formal cost-benefit analysis; however, they will use a quantitative approach when making this determination. The analysis will not be done on the basis of absolute value (the cost of the mitigation alternative compared to the value of the aquatic resource benefit) because there is no generally agreed upon methodology for placing a dollar value on environmental benefits. Instead, staff will compare relative changes in cost when assessing the effectiveness of the different mitigation alternatives. Cost and benefits will be aggregated over the expected life of the facility. If the applicant or facility owner does not provide information on the expected life of the facility and no other information is available, staff will use 20 years as a default time frame.

Cost.— Cost will be assessed using the proportional cost of the mitigation alternative when compared to either total cost or total revenues. Proportional cost for an **existing** facility will be expressed as the ratio of the cost of the mitigation alternative (construction plus operation and maintenance) to the projected

¹ See discussion regarding *Matter of Athens Generating Co., L.P.*, Interim Decision of the Commissioner, June 2, 2000 *Matter of Mirant Bowline, LLC*, Decision of the Commissioner, March 19, 2002, page 14-26.

revenues for that facility. Proportional cost for new facilities will be expressed as the ratio of the cost of the mitigation alternative (construction plus operation and maintenance) to either the total cost for the proposed facility (capital plus operation and maintenance), or the projected revenues for the proposed facility. These costs will be aggregated over the life of the facility and calculated as shown below.

$$\text{Proportional cost (C)} = \frac{\text{Cost of mitigative technology}}{\text{Total cost (or revenues)}}$$

Benefit.— As with cost, staff will assess the proportional aquatic resource benefit (or effectiveness) of the mitigation alternative. Effectiveness will be measured as the proportional change in the number of vulnerable aquatic organisms estimated to be protected by the mitigation alternative compared to the number at risk. Vulnerable organisms are those which would be killed by impingement or entrainment if the plant used a once-through cooling system without any additional mitigation². Aquatic resource benefits will be aggregated over the life of the facility and calculated as shown below.

$$\text{Proportional benefit (B)} = \frac{\text{Number of organisms protected with mitigative technology}}{\text{Number of organisms at risk of impingement/entrainment mortality}}$$

The results of the cost effectiveness comparison will be expressed as a narrative: "An increase in facility expenditures of [C x 100] percent would yield a [B x 100] percent increase in aquatic resource protection."

This process provides a way to develop a cost - benefit comparison to determine whether the cost is wholly disproportionate. Staff will use statutes, case law, Commissioner's decisions, guidance documents³, and professional judgment to determine whether the cost

² compared with baseline impingement and entrainment when the facility is operating at full flow and full capacity - See Matter of Dynegy Northeast Generation, Inc., on behalf of Dynegy Danskammer, LLC, Decision of the Deputy Commissioner, May 24, 2006 [2006 WL 1488863 (N.Y. Dept. Env. Conserv.)]; Riverkeeper, Inc. v Johnson, 52 AD3d 1072 (3d Dept. 2008), appeal denied 11 NY3d 716 (2009).

³ See Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS), 1.2.1, Section I.B.2.b which references USEPA 1982.

of the mitigation alternative is wholly disproportionate to the aquatic resource benefits (i.e., increase in the level of aquatic resource protection).

Any of the feasible alternatives from Step 3 with cost determined to be wholly disproportionate to the benefits provided will be eliminated from consideration as BTA.

Step 4

Of the alternatives remaining after Step 3, staff will identify as the most protective alternative the one that most effectively minimizes adverse environmental impacts. Staff then will use professional judgment in making a site-specific determination of: a) whether the level of mitigation provided by the most protective alternative is reasonable and necessary for minimizing adverse environmental impacts at the facility, b) whether the alternative or array of alternatives proposed by the applicant or facility owner will achieve BTA, and c) whether one or more of the other remaining alternatives can achieve an approximately equivalent level of mitigation as the most protective alternative.

Step 5

As a final step in the process, staff will identify the preferred alternative and develop a narrative explanation of the reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting other feasible alternatives. This narrative should form the basis of the analysis of alternatives presented in the Biological Fact Sheet for the SPDES permit for the facility.

References:

New York

Letter to Environmental Energy Alliance of New York Director John G. Holsapple from DEC Executive Deputy Commissioner Denise M. Sheehan, dated January 31, 2005.

Matter of Dynegy Northeast Generation, Inc., on behalf of Dynegy Danskammer, LLC Decision of the Deputy Commissioner, May 24, 2006 [2006 WL 1488863 (N.Y. Dept. Env. Conserv.)]; Riverkeeper, Inc. v Johnson, 52 AD3d 1072 (3d Dept. 2008), appeal denied 11 NY3d 716 (2009).

Matter of Athens Generating Co., L.P., Interim Decision of the Commissioner, June 2, 2000 Matter of Mirant Bowline, LLC, Decision of the Commissioner, March 19, 2002.

Title 6 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations (6 NYCRR) Parts 700, 704 and 750.

Federal

Entergy Corp. v. Riverkeeper, Inc., et al., 556 U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 1498 (2009).

EPA 2001. Environmental Protection Agency; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System: Regulations Addressing Cooling Water Intake Structures for New Facilities; Final Rule; 66 Fed. Reg. 65256 (12/18/2001).

In re Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, 1976 WL 25235, (E.P.A.G.C.).

Riverkeeper, Inc. v. U.S. Envtl. Protect. Agency, 358 F.3d 174, 189-92 (2nd Cir. 3 February 2004).

Riverkeeper, Inc. v. U.S. Envtl. Protect. Agency, (2nd Cir. 25 January 2007).

Seacoast Anti-Pollution League v. Costle, 597 F.2d 306 (1st Cir. 1979).

Guidance Documents

Commissioner Policy-nn. Best Technology Available (BTA) for Cooling Water Intake Structures. (Draft 2010).

USEPA. 1982. Work book for determining economic achievability for national pollution discharge elimination system permits. Prepared by Putnam, Hayes, and Bartlett, Inc. (August 1982).

USEPA. Permits Division, Office of Waste Enforcement, EPA, Guidance for Evaluating the Adverse Impact of Cooling Water Intake Structures on the Aquatic Environment: Section 316(b) PL 92-500. (Draft 1977).