

**WEST VIRGINIA
SECRETARY OF STATE
BETTY IRELAND
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DIVISION**

Form #3

Do Not Mark In This Box

FILED

2007 JUL 26 PM 12:51

OFFICE WEST VIRGINIA
SECRETARY OF STATE

**NOTICE OF AGENCY APPROVAL OF A PROPOSED RULE
AND
FILING WITH THE LEGISLATIVE RULE-MAKING REVIEW COMMITTEE**

AGENCY: Waste Management
Department of Environmental Protection TITLE NUMBER: 33

CITE AUTHORITY: W. Va. Code 22-17-6

AMENDMENT TO AN EXISTING RULE: YES NO

IF YES, SERIES NUMBER OF RULE BEING AMENDED: 30

TITLE OF RULE BEING AMENDED: Underground Storage Tanks

IF NO, SERIES NUMBER OF RULE BEING PROPOSED: _____

TITLE OF RULE BEING PROPOSED: _____

THE ABOVE PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE RULE HAVING GONE TO A PUBLIC HEARING OR A PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD IS HEREBY APPROVED BY THE PROMULGATING AGENCY FOR FILING WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE LEGISLATIVE RULE-MAKING REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR THEIR REVIEW.


Authorized Signature

- e. Date you filed in State Register the agency approved proposed Legislative Rule following public hearing: (be exact)

July 27, 2007

- f. Name, title, address and phone/fax/e-mail numbers of agency person(s) to receive all *written correspondence* regarding this rule: (Please type)

Michael Zeto, Chief Inspector

601 57th St SE

Charleston, WV 25304

phone - (304) 926-0470 fax (304) 926-0488 MZETO@wv.dep.org

- g. **IF DIFFERENT FROM ITEM 'f',** please give Name, title, address and phone number(s) of agency person(s) who wrote and/or has responsibility for the contents of this rule: (Please type)

same as above

3. If the statute under which you promulgated the submitted rules requires certain findings and determinations to be made as a condition precedent to their promulgation:

- a. Give the date upon which you filed in the State Register a notice of the time and place of a hearing for the taking of evidence and a general description of the issues to be decided.

N/A

b. Date of hearing or comment period:

c. On what date did you file in the State Register the findings and determinations required together with the reasons therefor?

d. Attach findings and determinations and reasons:

Attached

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

BRIEFING DOCUMENT

Rule Title: Underground Storage Tanks

A. AUTHORITY: W. Va. Code §22-17-6

B. SUMMARY OF RULE: This legislative rule establishes regulations to govern the construction, installation, upgrading, use, maintenance, testing, and closure of underground storage tanks in this State.

C. STATEMENT OF CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH REQUIRE RULE: There are several new provisions to reflect the 2005 Federal Energy Act, including: secondary containment requirements for new or replaced tanks or piping; secondary containment requirements for new or replaced fuel dispenser systems; tank eligibility for delivery, deposit or acceptance – enables agency to prevent deposit or delivery to a tank that is not in compliance; and training requirements for individuals who operate, maintain or are responsible to address emergencies from spills or releases from underground storage tank systems.

D. FEDERAL COUNTERPART REGULATIONS - INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE/DETERMINATION OF STRINGENCY:

There is no federal counterpart regulation, thus no determination of stringency is required.

E. CONSTITUTIONAL TAKINGS DETERMINATION:

In accordance with §22-1A-1 and 3(c), the Secretary has determined that this rule will not result in taking of private property within the meaning of the Constitutions of West Virginia and the United States of America.

F. CONSULTATION WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ADVISORY COUNCIL:

At its meetings on May 21, 2007, and May 30, 2007, the Environmental Protection Advisory Council discussed this rule. (See attached minutes for Council's discussion.)

West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Monday – May 21, 2007

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

601 57th Street, SE, Charleston, WV

West Virginia Room – 3rd Floor

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council Members:

Rick Roberts
Karen Price
Bill Raney
Lisa Dooley
Larry Harris
Jackie Hallinan

DEP:

Randy Huffman, Deputy Cabinet Secretary/Director – Division of Mining & Reclamation
Karen G. Watson, Assistant General Counsel
Ken Ellison, Director - Division of Land Restoration
Lisa McClung, Director – Division of Water and Waste Management
John Benedict, Director – Division of Air Quality
Lewis Halstead, DMR
Ken Politan, DMR
Charlie Sturey, DMR
Jessica Greathouse, Chief Communication Officer – WVDEP – Public Information Office
James Martin, Chief, Office of Oil & Gas
Carroll Cather, DWWM
Pam Nixon, Advocate
David L. Vande Linde, Blasting
Jim Mason, DAQ
Mike Zeto, DWWM – EE
Matt Sweeney, DWWM

VISITORS:

Ann Bradley, Spilman Thomas & Battle
Charlie Burd, IOGA
Don Garvin, WVEC
Dave Yaussy, Robinson & McElwee

Randy Huffman, Deputy Cabinet Secretary - West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Karen Price stated that the Council did not have enough time to review the rules, therefore was requesting to have another meeting to discuss further and the remaining of the Council agreed. The Council will meet May 30, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. – WVDEP – 601 57th Street, SE – Charleston, WV 25304 – West Virginia Room (3001).

Deputy Cabinet Secretary Huffman apologized for the short time period regarding the rules getting out to Council. Randy Huffman then introduced Karen Watson, Assistant General Counsel to discuss with the Council the DEP bills that had passed in the 2007 Regular Legislative Session:

- SB 337 – Establishing New Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program
Approved by Governor – April 4, 2007
- SB 425 – Relating to Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund
Approved by Governor – April 4, 2007
- SB 465 – Establishing Dam Safety Rehabilitation Revolving Fund
Approved by Governor – March 27, 2007
- SB 490 – Relating to Underground Storage Tank Insurance Fund
Approved by Governor – April 3, 2007
- SB 524 – Requiring Proof of Lawful Disposal of Solid Waste
Approved by Governor – March 28, 2007
- SB 588 – Removing Tax Expiration Date on Manufacturing or Production of Synthetic Fuel From Coal
Approved by Governor – April 4, 2007

Karen Watson then gave a brief summary of each proposed rule for the 2008 legislative session:

Air Quality

45CSR6 – Control of Air Pollution from Combustion of Refuse

SUMMARY

Proposed Rule 6 is now a basic open burning/ incinerator rule. Revised scope includes ‘statutory air pollution,’ addition of new language for posted operating instructions and open burning or incineration of animal or poultry carcasses during a declared state of emergency. Except for temporary Air Curtain Incinerators for land clearing debris (DOH jobs) and incineration of animal or poultry remains, most Air Curtain Incinerators will now be exempted under Rule 6 and placed under Rule 18.

COMMENT

Mr. Harris: Why does it allow low-level radioactive waste?

DEP Response: To allow crematories to dispose of bodies with chemo drugs. Does not allow high-level radioactive compounds related to research.

Council wanted to know if the agency would accept comments in writing after the meeting (e-mail in comments)

DEP Response: Yes

45CSR8 – Ambient Air Quality Standards

SUMMARY

NAAQS rules 45CSR8, 45CSR9 & 45CSR12 have been combined for the 2008 legislative session. Rule 8 is now the complete NAAQS incorporation by reference rule, and 45CSR9 & 45CSR12 will be repealed and replaced. Revisions to SO₂ & PM NAAQS include correction of SO₂ annual primary standard from 0.003 to 0.030 ppm, addition of annual and 24-hour PM_{2.5} standards, and addition of measurement methods for PM_{2.5}. Revisions to CO & Ozone NAAQS include revocation of one-hour ozone standard except for Berkeley & Jefferson counties, identification of one-hour ozone maintenance areas, and addition of 8-hour primary and secondary ozone standards. Revisions to NO₂ and Lead NAAQS include addition of primary and secondary standards for lead, and addition of measurement methods for lead. Revisions also include general language updates, improved citing and consistency.

COMMENT

Mr. Harris: Are we sure we are protecting the public's health? We should not be lowering standards so that our energy being transmitted to other states doesn't pollute our air. Are we aware of EPA's Science Advisory Panel?

DEP Response: CAIR aims to lower emissions at power plants. Utility controls are helping us meet targets earlier. EPA's regional approach has generally been successful and we are seeing tremendous benefits. The agency is aware of the EPA's panel, and EPA is considering more stringent regulations but has not done so yet.

45CSR16 – Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources

SUMMARY

Revisions to rule incorporate annual incorporation by reference updates and exclusions.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR18 – Control of Air Pollution from Combustion of Solid Waste

SUMMARY

CISWI Rule 18 combines and incorporates by reference all current federal Section 111/129 combustion regulation into one rule. Old Rule 24 will be repealed and replaced. New exemption section is consistent with revised Rules 6, 25 and 34. Revisions also include revised scope, extensive federal counterpart language updates, improved citing and consistency.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR25 – Control of Air Pollution from Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage and Disposal Facilities

SUMMARY

Revisions to the proposed rule include general annual incorporation by reference and revisions required to maintain consistency with the DWWM's rule 33CSR20 and federal counterpart regulation. Addition of direct incorporation by reference of new provisions published in the Federal Register. Language for pathological waste incinerators is revised for clarity.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR34 – Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants

SUMMARY

Rule 34 now combines all NESHAP regulations previously adopted under both Rules 15 & 34. Old Rule 15 will be repealed and replaced. Revisions to Rule 34 incorporate annual NESHAP updates under Parts 61 & 63. Some Part 63 standards affecting non-major sources of hazardous air pollutants are being excluded from incorporation by reference: Oil and Natural Gas; Polyvinyl Chloride and Copolymers; Primary Copper Smelting; Secondary Copper Smelting; and Primary Nonferrous Metals.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR39 – Control of Annual Nitrogen Oxides Emissions

SUMMARY

Annual CAIR NO_x Rule - Incorporates revisions to 40 CFR Part 96.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR40 - Control of Ozone Season Nitrogen Oxides Emissions

SUMMARY

Ozone Season CAIR NO_x Rule - Incorporates revisions 40 CFR to Part 96.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR41 – Control of Annual Sulfur Dioxide Emissions

SUMMARY

Annual CAIR SO₂ Rule - Incorporates revisions to 40 CFR Part 96.

COMMENT

No questions.

45CSR42 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Program

SUMMARY

The Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program Rule is authorized by SB337 passed in the 2007 legislative session. The rule establishes a program which requires the reporting and inventory of greenhouse gas emissions by stationary sources which emit more than a *de minimis* amount; inventories greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources, and accounts for reductions, capture and sequestration; provides for: a periodic compilation of a greenhouse gas inventory; a determination whether WV is a net sink or emitter; development of a registry for voluntary reductions; and a determination whether greenhouse gas can be developed as an asset for economic development.

COMMENT

Mr. Raney: Is the exclusion still there for coal preparation activities?

DEP Response: Yes, section 3.2. (45CSR42)

Mr. Raney: How do we quantify sequestration?

DEP Response: Don't think we will get down to stationary source level. Agency will look at area

sources and biogenic activities. Once we get information, we will compile in an inventory.

Division of Water and Waste Management

33CSR9 – Standards for Beneficial use of Filtrate from Water Treatment Plants

SUMMARY

This legislative rule establishes a mechanism and requirements for the permitting, siting, bonding, and use of water treatment plant sludge from water treatment plants that has beneficial properties. This rule applies to the beneficial use of water treatment plant sludge and to any person who seeks approval from the Secretary to beneficially use such sludge within the state. This rule is intended to enhance the resource recovery and recycling goals of article fifteen of chapter twenty-two of the West Virginia Code and to encourage the beneficial use of water treatment plant filtrate. Section 22-15-23 of the West Virginia Code and this rule, and not the provisions of W. Va. Code § 22-15-10 or 33 CSR 1, shall govern the beneficial use of water treatment plant sludge. This rule does not apply to sewage sludge, products derived from sewage sludge, sludges regulated under 33 CSR 8, or materials regulated as hazardous waste under W. Va. Code §§22-18-1, et seq.

COMMENT

Lisa Dooley: Public notice of permits – who bears the cost – there has to be a more efficient way of getting notices out than Class I legal ads. This is a suggestion for the future.

DEP Response: Applicant bears cost – DEP is trying other methods of getting the information out – but not everyone has access to e-mail.

400 people on DEP's mailing list to receive permits by e-mail and we have between 30-40 who receive permits by US mail.

33CSR20 – Hazardous Waste Management System

SUMMARY

This amendment will adopt by reference approximately two years of changes to federal regulations by adopting the federal regulations in effect as of June 1, 2007 consisting of changes that correct errors in previously enacted Dye and Pigment rule and Manifest rule, allow more hazardous waste, allow greater flexibility in SW-846 testing and monitoring, allow more mercury containing devices to be managed as universal waste, streamline permitting process through a standardized permit, allow additional headworks and de minimus waste exemptions, reference Clean Air Act standards for hazardous waste combustors, allow a series of paperwork burden reductions for hazardous waste management facilities, corrects errors in 40 CFR (federal regulations) and excludes cathode ray tubes from the definition of solid waste under certain conditions. Language corrections, updated references and a change as the result of an EPA comment regarding annual groundwater monitoring at corrective action sites are also included in the amended rule. The rule amendment is not projected to require additional operating expenses above current levels as the amendments are generally de-regulatory in nature.

COMMENT

No questions.

33CSR30 – Underground Storage Tanks

SUMMARY

There are several new provisions to reflect the 2005 Federal Energy Act, including: secondary containment requirements for new or replaced tanks or piping; secondary containment requirements for new or replaced fuel dispenser systems; tank eligibility for delivery, deposit or acceptance – enables agency to prevent deposit or delivery to a tank that is not in compliance; and training requirements for individuals who operate, maintain or are responsible to address emergencies from spills or releases from underground storage tank systems.

COMMENT

No questions.

47CSR2 – Requirements Governing Water Quality Standards

SUMMARY

The proposed revisions reflect updates identified during the federally-mandated triennial review of the Water Quality Standards rule. These include proposed additions to the trout water list, new criteria for nutrients, revisions to criteria in Appendix E and a use redesignation in the Guyandotte River Basin.

COMMENT

Mr. Raney: Would like to have the trout water list stay within the agency and be able to discuss the science on a case-by-base basis before the EQB, not the Legislature.

DEP Response: The DEP believes the scientific basis for the proposed trout streams is clear and does not need to be litigated before the EQB.

Mr. Harris: Commented on the changes in Appendix E and asked whether the formula change for copper and cadmium resulted in a more or less stringent standard.

DEP Response: The changes in Appendix E are recommended by EPA, updating MCL's, etc. The revised hardness formulas represent EPA's latest science.

47CSR10 – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

SUMMARY

The proposed revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Rule reflect updates/additions made to the various federal regulations that govern the NPDES program. The proposed changes also include specific language in section 14 of the rule relating to the Pretreatment Program to ensure that the rule is consistent with the most recent federal pretreatment regulations in 40 CFR Part 403.

COMMENT

No questions.

47CSR34 – Dam Safety

SUMMARY

The proposed revisions establish requirements governing the disbursement and use of moneys in the Dam Safety Rehabilitation Revolving Fund, authorized by SB 465 in the 2007 legislative session.

COMMENT

Ms. Hallinan: Any progress being made in reducing the number of deficient dams?

DEP Response: Not very much. The fund initiative is badly needed.

60CSR5 – Antidegradation Implementation Procedures

SUMMARY

Antidegradation is a requirement of the federal Clean Water Act intended to preserve the existing quality of the State's waters and to prevent and/or minimize future degradation. The rule was first adopted in 2001 and establishes four levels, or tiers, of protection for state waters, Tiers 1, 2, 2.5 and 3. Each tier provides a graduated level of protection used during the NPDES permit issuance process. The proposed revisions to the rule carry forward the agency's antidegradation implementation efforts, and move the Tier 2.5 streams that had been on the "presumptive" list in Appendix C to a final proposed list in Appendix A. The agency is proposing a total of 156 streams be included on the list. The list of 156 waters is comprised of the 37 waters that did not receive objections in the formal objection period, those waters that contain reproducing trout and are 100% on public land, those waters listed as high quality on public land based on their high biological scores, and Loop Creek.

COMMENT

Mr. Harris: Suggested we file with 309 streams instead of 156 streams because Legislature will further reduce.

Mr. Raney: Suggested we start with 39.

Mr. Harris: Asked about section 2.11 in the definitions regarding “trading” and if it includes cross-pollutant trading.

DEP Response: The definitions were unchanged from the ones the EQB first adopted in 2001. The agency does not think it allows cross-pollutant trading.

Division of Mining and Reclamation

38CSR2 – Surface Mining Reclamation Rule

SUMMARY

§38-2-3.2.g. Notice of Technical Completeness is new language and is to provide the public an opportunity to review the application once technical review is completed. §38-2-5.4.e.1 is removing language that is contrary to returning the natural drainway to its original pattern, profile, and dimensions once drainage control structure is removed. The changes in §38-2-5.6 clarify what operations may be exempt from conducting a “Surface Water Runoff Analysis”, monitoring requirements and removes phase-in compliance schedule that expired on June 19, 2006. Changes to §38-2-6 removes duplication of rules for Blasting and after this change, all the requirements for blasting will be contained in Surface Mining Blasting Rule, Title 199 Series 1. New §38-2-11.8 titled “Bond Credit for Reclamation of Bond Forfeiture Site under a No Cost Reclamation Contract” encourages qualified operators to undertake reclamation of bond forfeiture sites for the purpose of eliminating hazards to human health and safety, abating pollution of surface and ground waters and the contribution of sediment to adjacent areas, and restoring land to beneficial uses. Changes in §38-2-14.15.c.2 and 14.15.d.3 are clarifying contemporaneous reclamation rules on excess spoil disposal. The changes in 14.15.e remove a phase-in compliance schedule that expired in 2004. The changes in §38-2-23 are being made to make the mining rule consistent with the proposed changes in the State’s NPDES Mining Rules.

COMMENT

No questions.

47CSR5A – Individual State Certification of Activities Requiring a Federal Permit

SUMMARY

The proposed amendments to this rule are being made to adopt into rule requirements that have been applied through past practices for coal related activities requiring mitigation and issuance of a 401 State Certification of a 404 Permit. Ratios for monetary compensation for temporary impacts are detailed. Monetary compensation for permanent impacts to wetlands from coal related activities are made the same as non-coal related. Additional economic and stream measurement information is being requested to be added to the 401 application.

COMMENT

Mr. Harris: How do we determine the “ordinary high water mark” under section 4.2.f.4 and how is it determined on a small stream?

DEP Response: The US Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for determining “waters of the U.S.” under the rule.

Mr. Harris: What are the differences between coal and non-coal impacts and how are they determined?

DEP Response: Rule has to be consistent with statute.

47CSR30 – WV/NPDES Rules for Coal Mining Facilities

SUMMARY

The proposed amendments to this rule are being made to allow general clean-up of sections referencing outdated names of agencies and references to the EQB governing rule making. This rule addresses the Secretary as being the person as head of all actions. References to the “Director” are changed to “Secretary” to eliminate the need to distinguish between the Director of Mining and Reclamation and the Director of Water and Waste Management when issuing a coal related WV/NPDES permit. This rule adds provision for storm-water coverage for certain minimal activities without the requirement for modification through application to the permit. This rule also provides for an advanced approval of transfer of a WV/NPDES Permit to coincide with the advanced approval of the corresponding Article 3 Permit. This rule clarifies provisions related to coal remining operations and provides a remining water quality standard variance for any parameter of concern.

COMMENT

No questions.

199CSR1 - Surface Mining Blasting Rule

SUMMARY

The proposed amendments change the following sections: 2.27. Adds the definition of “other structure” (structures built by the permittee); 2.38 Clarifies definition of “surface mine operation”; 3.2.C. Plan for blasting should include seismic monitoring when within 1000 ft of a structure, and performance specifications for blasting seismographs; 3.4. Areas of blasting that will be regulated for shaft and slope development; 3.6.c.3. Requiring field practice guidelines for blasting seismographs; 3.7a Request for alternate limits must have written consent of the owner; 3.9. Minimum qualifications and continuing education requirements for surveyor; 4.1.b. Allows the agency to consider blasting experience of applicants that was gained prior to the last three years; 4.5.d. Requires applicants who have been suspended or revoked in other states to show cause as to why should be issued a certification; 4.9.a.2 process for issuing a temporary suspension to a blaster and appeal rights; 4.13 Clarifies blasters responsibility of training the blasting crew; 5.2.a.3&4 Clarifies

the investigations process on a claim of blasting damage; 6.1 Requiring that any arbitrators that are removed from the list must be done with cause; and 7.3 Detonators and initiation systems are not considered for calculation of fees.

COMMENT

No questions.

Office of Oil and Gas

35CSR3 – Coalbed Methane Wells Rule

SUMMARY

The WVDEP, Office of Oil and Gas is proposing to revise existing rule 35CSR3. Series 3 is a legislative rule in place to enforce the provisions in WV Code §22-21-1 et seq., Coalbed Methane Wells and Units, commonly referred to as the Coalbed Methane Act. The revisions will: Address the establishment of special field rules to promote the orderly development of coalbed methane fields; Protect the correlative rights of all owners located within the geographic area for which special field rules are established; Provide a process by which the Review Board may hold a hearing on an application for special field rules and issue such rules; Insert language (Section 17) which was inadvertently deleted from the rule during the 2006 legislative session. This language existed in the rule prior to the revisions in 2006.

COMMENT

Is this the same rule that went through last year?

DEP Response: Yes, except for two sections that had changes:

16.2.e – advertisement “15 days”

16.1.6.1 – “FOIA” issue that came out of the LRMRC.

Mr. Raney: Is this the product of the stakeholders group?

DEP Response: Yes.

Ms. Hallinan: What is a field rule?

DEP Response: Special spacing procedure for coalbed methane wells. It deals with pooling and royalty issues.

Division of Land Restoration

33CSR10 – Recycling Assistance Grant Program

SUMMARY

This rule sets out guidelines and procedures for providing assistance grants to local governments and other interested parties for the purpose of planning, initiating, expanding, or upgrading recycling programs, provide related public education programs, and assist in recycling market procurement efforts.

COMMENT

No questions.

60CSR3 – Voluntary Remediation and Redevelopment Rule

SUMMARY

This legislative rule establishes the eligibility, procedures, standards and legal documents required for voluntary and brownfield cleanups and updates risk protocol standards, including updates to the deminimis table. It also includes changes to the land use covenant section to incorporate the components of the Uniform Covenant Act.

COMMENT

Ms. Dooley: Are there grant dollars for brownfields?

DEP Response: Yes

The next scheduled Advisory Council Meeting will be on May 30, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Huffman asked the Council members to notify the DEP of which rules they want to discuss so the right agency person can be at the meeting. He also asked them to submit comments prior to the meeting if possible.

West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday – May 30, 2007

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

601 57th Street, SE, Charleston, WV

West Virginia Room – 3rd Floor

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Council Members:

Rick Roberts
Karen Price
Bill Raney
Larry Harris - Teleconference
Jackie Hallinan

DEP:

Randy Huffman, Deputy Cabinet Secretary/Director –Division of Mining & Reclamation
Karen G. Watson, Assistant General Counsel
Lisa McClung, Director – Division of Water and Waste Management
John Benedict, Director – Division of Air Quality
Jessica Greathouse, Chief Communication Officer – WVDEP – Public Information Office
Pam Nixon, Advocate
Jim Mason, DAQ
Mike Zeto, DWWM – EE
John Morgan, DWWM
Scott Mandirola, DWWM
Greg Adolfson, PIO

VISITORS:

Dave Yaussy
Brittany Carns
Joe Gollehon
Gregory Hoyer
Jeff Mauzy
Amy Christy

Randy Huffman, Deputy Cabinet Secretary - West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Advisory Council Member Larry Harris joined the meeting via teleconference. Deputy Cabinet Secretary Huffman then turned the meeting over to Karen Watson, Assistant General Counsel for the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection. Karen informed the Council that the agency had received comments from several Council members and those comments would be appended to the minutes. (see attached) She explained the agency

had representatives from each of the programs to answer questions for the rules identified in those comments. She also explained the agency had made several changes in the rules as a result of those comments.

Air Quality

45CSR6 – Control of Air Pollution from Combustion of Refuse

SUMMARY

Proposed Rule 6 is now a basic open burning/ incinerator rule. Revised scope includes ‘statutory air pollution,’ addition of new language for posted operating instructions and open burning or incineration of animal or poultry carcasses during a declared state of emergency. Except for temporary Air Curtain Incinerators for land clearing debris (DOH jobs) and incineration of animal or poultry remains, most Air Curtain Incinerators will now be exempted under Rule 6 and placed under Rule 18.

COMMENT

Larry Harris: Had raised the issue of “low-level radioactive waste” in the last meeting.

DEP Response: DEP has removed the chemotherapeutic waste and low-level radioactive waste provisions from the proposed rule. The proposed rule does not in any way affect current medical waste incineration rules now on the books.

45CSR8 – Ambient Air Quality Standards

SUMMARY

NAAQS rules 45CSR8, 45CSR9 & 45CSR12 have been combined for the 2008 legislative session. Rule 8 is now the complete NAAQS incorporation by reference rule, and 45CSR9 & 45CSR12 will be repealed and replaced. Revisions to SO₂ & PM NAAQS include correction of SO₂ annual primary standard from 0.003 to 0.030 ppm, addition of annual and 24-hour PM_{2.5} standards, and addition of measurement methods for PM_{2.5}. Revisions to CO & Ozone NAAQS include revocation of one-hour ozone standard except for Berkeley & Jefferson counties, identification of one-hour ozone maintenance areas, and addition of 8-hour primary and secondary ozone standards. Revisions to NO₂ and Lead NAAQS include addition of primary and secondary standards for lead, and addition of measurement methods for lead. Revisions also include general language updates, improved citing and consistency.

COMMENT

Karen Price: Section 4.2.c – PM_{2.5} Maximum 24-Hour Average Concentration. The level for the 24-hour primary and secondary standard states 35 ug/m³. This should be 65 ug/m³, pursuant to 40 CFR 50.7.

DEP Response: On October 17, 2006, the federal NAAQS regulation changed from 65 to 35.

Larry Harris: Restated his concern that the standards may not be stringent enough to protect public health. He also restated his question about the antidegradation language struck from the rule.

DEP Response: DEP cannot lower the NAAQS standards below that of federal levels unless the provisions for the stringency test in §22-1-3a are fully met. 45CSR14, in its entirety, has wholly replaced the intent of the relic anti-degradation language struck in proposed Rule 8.

45CSR39 – Control of Annual Nitrogen Oxides Emissions

45CSR40 - Control of Ozone Season Nitrogen Oxides Emissions

Ozone Season CAIR NOx Rule - Incorporates revisions 40 CFR to Part 96.

Annual CAIR NOx Rule - Incorporates revisions to 40 CFR Part 96.

45CSR41 – Control of Annual Sulfur Dioxide Emissions

Annual CAIR SO₂ Rule - Incorporates revisions to 40 CFR Part 96.

COMMENT

Karen Price: Asked why the opt-in language was deleted from each of these rules.

DEP Response: has removed the opt-in provisions in the three CAIR rules so that West Virginia can say that CAIR equals NOx RACT for EGUs under the PM2.5 implementation rule.

45CSR42 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Program

SUMMARY

The Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program Rule is authorized by SB337 passed in the 2007 legislative session. The rule establishes a program which requires the reporting and inventory of greenhouse gas emissions by stationary sources which emit more than a *de minimis* amount; inventories greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources, and accounts for reductions, capture and sequestration; provides for: a periodic compilation of a greenhouse gas inventory; a determination whether WV is a net sink or emitter; development of a registry for voluntary reductions; and a determination whether greenhouse gas can be developed as an asset for economic development.

COMMENT

Karen Price and Larry Harris: Both asked about the definitions of “anthropogenic” and “biogenic” in the rule and asked for examples of each.

DEP Response: An example of an anthropogenic source is the coal extraction process and an example of a biogenic source is the erosion of soil exposing a coal seam. The agency does not plan

to ask sources to report biogenic activities. In order to receive credit a source must report all of its emissions.

Karen Price: Can the reporting requirement in section 4.1 be made consistent with the emissions inventory requirements.

DEP Response: The date in the rule is March 31st and is the same as the emissions inventory date.

Karen Price: Does not believe fees should be required for greenhouse gas reporting.

DEP Response: The agency will consider the issue.

Karen Price: The last sentence in section 5.3 allowing the Secretary to request information is not authorized by statute.

DEP Response: It is authorized by the statute.

Karen Price: There should be a reasonable protocol for reporting emissions.

DEP Response: DAQ purposely wrote the rule in a manner flexible to the Secretary, as greenhouse gas reduction quantification protocols are still being developed at this time.

Karen Price: Is WV going to sign on to the climate registry or are we going to have our own?

DEP Response: In order to trade, we have to be consistent with other programs, but we do not want to be more specific in the rule.

Bill Raney: The exemption in section 3.2 includes language referring to sources covered by chapter 22-3 as well as sources required to report emissions. We are concerned this may take the exemption in the statute away.

DEP Response: While the agency did not want to require mining extraction to report emissions, thermal dryers associated with coal prep plants often have huge emissions of greenhouse gases. That is the reason the statute and rule only exempt sources permitted under chapter 22-3.

Division of Water and Waste Management

33CSR9 – Standards for Beneficial use of Filtrate from Water Treatment Plants

SUMMARY

This legislative rule establishes a mechanism and requirements for the permitting, siting, bonding, and use of water treatment plant sludge from water treatment plants that has beneficial properties. This rule applies to the beneficial use of water treatment plant sludge and to any person who seeks approval from the Secretary to beneficially use such sludge within the state. This rule is intended to enhance the resource recovery and recycling goals of article fifteen of chapter twenty-two of the West Virginia Code and to encourage the beneficial use of water treatment plant filtrate. Section 22-

15-23 of the West Virginia Code and this rule, and not the provisions of W. Va. Code § 22-15-10 or 33 CSR 1, shall govern the beneficial use of water treatment plant sludge. This rule does not apply to sewage sludge, products derived from sewage sludge, sludges regulated under 33 CSR 8, or materials regulated as hazardous waste under W. Va. Code §§22-18-1, et seq.

COMMENT

Larry Harris: DEP made changes to this rule during the Interims process last year, and the rule now requires a permit for both short-term and long-term applications. This is a good change. However, we feel that most of the information required in Section 7.3. Permit Application Requirements for long-term permits should also be required for short-term permits.

DEP Response: The requirements of section 7.3 were intended to be directed toward facilities that proposed to land apply filtrate as the beneficial use. It was intended to be applicable to both, if land application was the proposed method of reuse. Section 7.3 will be revised to more clearly reflect the applicability of the requirement for both long-term and short-term, if land application is the proposed beneficial reuse.

Rick Roberts and Larry Harris: Regarding the environmental effects of disposal of sludge are the values in Table 1 of the rule sufficient?

DEP Response: The Table 1 values are the same as the sewage sludge levels in DEP's other rules, and the agency believes they are supported by sound science.

Rick Roberts and Larry Harris: Mr. Harris expressed concern with the distinction between "beneficial reuse" and "disposal." Mr. Roberts believes that his concern is satisfied by the language in section 3.1.b.1.

Rick Roberts: The rule should include general permits as proposed.

Larry Harris: Only individual permits should be allowed under the rule.

DEP Response: There will be public notice in the general permit process.

33CSR30 – Underground Storage Tanks

SUMMARY

There are several new provisions to reflect the 2005 Federal Energy Act, including: secondary containment requirements for new or replaced tanks or piping; secondary containment requirements for new or replaced fuel dispenser systems; tank eligibility for delivery, deposit or acceptance – enables agency to prevent deposit or delivery to a tank that is not in compliance; and training requirements for individuals who operate, maintain or are responsible to address emergencies from spills or releases from underground storage tank systems.

COMMENT

Karen Price: Section 6.1. states "...including any person who accepts a delivery order, accepts payment, delivers or deposits product into an underground storage tank.....". The portion that states "...accepts payment..." should be removed from this section because those individuals within a company who accept payment or make payments most often do not know anything about the underground storage tank (UST), the operation of the UST, or the current regulatory status of the UST.

DEP Response: This language will give the agency a better handle on transporters and middle-men involved in the process.

Karen Price: Section 7.3.a.1. states "....the methodology for verifying attendance, the date, time and location of the course, the name of the offering organization, the credentials of the instructors, and a certification that the technology or methods.....".

1. The portion that states "..the date, time and location of the course,...." should be deleted. For large companies with many UST installations and locations there can be numerous individuals that need to be trained. Training will most likely occur on multiple dates, times, and locations that may not always be known until just prior to the training event. When new employees are hired training might occur on short notice and for one individual. The burden of having to report the dates, time and locations would hinder and slow down the training process and restrict a company's ability to comply.

2. The portion that states "...the credentials of the instructors..." should be removed. Credentials will vary from instructor to instructor new instructors might be utilized, and a company might not know which instructors will be used at the various training sessions until just prior to the training session. In addition, the course content is the main issue of concern and should be the main focus in obtaining State approval of a training program.

DEP Response: Regarding dates, times and location of the training the agency will not require the information prior to the training. As far as the credentials of the instructor the agency needs this information as part of its curriculum review, in this case before the training.

Karen Price: Section 7.3.a.2 - This section states that a nonrefundable application fee of \$280 must be submitted with the application. Larger companies may have one training program, but administer the training on multiple dates, times and locations. Having to submit an application for approval of the training program each time the program is administered would be cost prohibitive, burdensome, and would hinder the training process.

DEP Response: The agency agrees and believes the rule only requires a one-time fee.

Rick Roberts: Regarding the \$5.00 per ton fee, how does a source measure the tonnage? Perhaps the agency should consider using a cubic-yard approach.

DEP Response: The agency will consider.

47CSR2 – Requirements Governing Water Quality Standards

SUMMARY

The proposed revisions reflect updates identified during the federally-mandated triennial review of the Water Quality Standards rule. These include proposed additions to the trout water list, new criteria for nutrients, revisions to criteria in Appendix E and a use redesignation in the Guyandotte River Basin.

COMMENT

Larry Harris: Does the use removal in section 7.2.d follow the federal Clean Water Act requirements?

DEP Response: Yes, the agency followed all the requirements, federal and state, and required extensive information from the company. The agency also conducted two public meetings.

Bill Raney: Mr. Raney repeated his concern with the listing of trout waters in the rule and the fact that the list has to be approved by the Legislature. Karen Price agreed with this comment. Jackie Hallinan and Larry Harris did not agree with this comment.

Karen Price: Questioned the need for Appendix D, because the Category C use applies to all state waters.

DEP Response: Agency will consider.

Karen Price: Will the agency consider not making use removals go through the legislative process.

DEP Response: The agency decided not to include any language pertaining to this issue at this point in time, but will be subjecting this issue to the public participation process in the coming months.

60CSR5 – Antidegradation Implementation Procedures

SUMMARY

Antidegradation is a requirement of the federal Clean Water Act intended to preserve the existing quality of the State's waters and to prevent and/or minimize future degradation. The rule was first adopted in 2001 and establishes four levels, or tiers, of protection for state waters, Tiers 1, 2, 2.5 and 3. Each tier provides a graduated level of protection used during the NPDES permit issuance process. The proposed revisions to the rule carry forward the agency's antidegradation implementation efforts, and move the Tier 2.5 streams that had been on the "presumptive" list in Appendix C to a final proposed list in Appendix A. The agency is proposing a total of 156 streams be included on the list. The list of 156 waters is comprised of the 37 waters that did not receive objections in the formal objection period, those waters that contain reproducing trout and are 100% on public land, those waters listed as high quality on public land based on their high biological scores, and Loop Creek.

COMMENT

Larry Harris: Scientific criteria should be used to add or delete streams from the Tier 2.5 list.

Rick Roberts: Can the SRF program give priority to facilities impacted by the Tier 2.5 list?

DEP Response: Agency will take this under advisement.

Larry Harris: Is the nomination process adequate?

DEP Response: The agency believes the process is generally adequate and workable. If, however a large number of streams are nominated at one time, the individual notification requirements may be difficult and costly.

At this point in the meeting, Bill Raney submitted written comments regarding several mining rules. (see attached)

60CSR8 - Environmental Excellence Program

Greg Adolfson summarized the rule revisions. He said the changes would provide more flexibility for the agency to approve or disapprove of incentives in the program, as well as other flexibilities.

SUMMARY

Changes are being proposed to the Environmental Excellence Program Rule (60CSR8) to better align with and follow the momentum of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's National Environmental Performance Track Program. Additionally, the primary purpose for the changes is to give more flexibility to the Department of Environmental Protection Cabinet Secretary in areas such as: Eligibility Criteria for Participation (section 4); Environmental Performance Record (section 5); Environmental Management System (section 6); Public Participation (section 8); Incentives (section 9); Procedures for Application (section 10); and Annual Performance Report (section 14). Language, such as "may include, but will not be limited to, the following," has been added to allow for this flexibility.

COMMENT

Rick Roberts: Why is section 6.2 completely deleted?

DEP Response: The section is not completely deleted, just the 1996 standards. This will allow the agency to use the most current standards.

Bill Raney: How many companies are participating in the program?

DEP Response: There are two in the National Program, Toyota and Dow.

Jackie Hallinan: The program is a good idea.

Meeting was adjourned by Deputy Cabinet Secretary Randy Huffman.

Council meeting - 5/30/07
Comments
Submitted
by Bill Raney

Bill...

Here are some preliminary comments provided by the Environmental-Technical Committee on the rules that will be reviewed by the Advisory Council:

Water Quality Standards Rule (47CSR2)

Only concern relates to the Trout Stream List:

Inclusion of a stream in the codified list contained in the rule forever locks in unrealistic WQS on that stream regardless of existing and/or future water quality. The lower standards are very problematic for the coal industry by targeting iron and aluminum.

WVCA believes the list is immaterial to protection of the existing use if it is indeed a trout stream.

WV DEP, in the NPDES permitting process, will apply appropriate trout stream effluent limitations if the agency believes a stream to have a trout population regardless of whether or not it is on the codified list contained in the water quality standards rule or not. The only difference is that in the permitting process, the applicant has the opportunity to present data and sampling to refute the agency's assertion that a stream is a trout stream, and has a right of appeal if they continue to disagree with agency's assignment of trout stream limits. The ability to dispute the trout stream designation is very important, especially since some of the data supporting the current initiative to expand the codified list is decades old.

If a trout stream is included on the codified list approved by the legislature, the only option for removing that designation is to once again pursue a legislative fix. Under those circumstances, it is easier to just challenge the entire expansion of the trout stream list.

The massive expansion of the trout stream list as currently proposed is much more restrictive than the standards found in surrounding states, where the regulatory agencies have developed different levels and categories of trout streams. West Virginia continues to treat all trout streams the same as though they were native, naturally-reproducing, cold water streams that deserve the highest levels of protection. This is simply not true, as many streams in West Virginia are stocked trout streams where the existing, in-stream water quality is lower than the established effluent guidelines for native trout streams.

Mining & Reclamation Rule (38 CSR 2)

Main concern relates to 14.15 c.2, regarding contemporaneous reclamation and valley fills:

This revision will penalize operators that are constructing "bottom-up" valley fills, the agency's preferred method of fill construction by unnecessarily restricting when such fill can be counted as "reclaimed" under the state's contemporaneous reclamation rules. These rules already vastly exceed the federal requirements and those of any other surrounding state, and this change will only make them worse.

Additionally, this proposed revision was deleted during the Legislative session in 2007.

401 Water Quality Certification Rule (47 CSR 5A)

The changes to this rule are totally un-necessary, and add further detail and complication to a state mitigation rule when the Legislature has specifically instructed the agency to better align its mitigation program with that of the Corps of Engineers. Several years ago, the Legislature passed a bill directing WV DEP to provide state mitigation credit for Corps mitigation. While this has occurred, we feel the revisions to this rule will drive the two programs further apart. Additionally, we know of no state statutory revision that necessitates these changes...the state mitigation program has functioned for years without this level of detail, and we question why it's needed now.

Further, we are concerned that the rule seeks to change definitions that should only be revised in the statute with Legislative approval. For example, the revisions jettison the long-used references to stream types and insert reference to ordinary high water mark. This appears to be an effort to expand the definition of "waters of the state" to all cover every erosional feature, regardless of whether or not it actually functions as a stream.



West Virginia Coal Association

PO Box 3923, Charleston, WV 25339 ■ (304) 342-4153 ■ Fax 342-7651 ■ www.wvcoal.com

July 18, 2006

Mr. Charles Sturey
West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Mining & Reclamation
601 57th Street SE
Charleston, WV 25304

Re: Comments on Proposed Revisions to 47 CSR 5A

Dear Mr. Sturey:

Pursuant to the notice filed with the Secretary of State on June 15, 2006, the West Virginia Coal Association (WVCA) offers the following comments and observations regarding the agency's proposed revisions to 47 CSR 5A, "Rules for Individual State Certification of Activities Requiring a Federal Permit".

WVCA is a non-profit state trade association representing the interests of the West Virginia coal industry on policy and regulatory issues before various state and federal agencies that regulate coal extraction, processing, transportation and consumption. WVCA's primary goal is to enhance the viability of West Virginia's coal industry by supporting efficient and environmentally responsible coal extraction and processing through reasonable, equitable and achievable state and federal policy and regulation. WVCA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection's (WVDEP) proposed revisions to the state's Clean Water Act ("CWA") Section 401 certification rule.

General Comments

WVCA is very concerned about the WVDEP's proposal to add detail to its § 401 mitigation program, particularly at this time. The WVDEP has not articulated any problems with implementation of its existing mitigation program pursuant to this rule, and the WVCA sees no benefit to adding further detail and complexity now. Even more importantly, the WVCA understands the history of the WVDEP's § 401 mitigation program, and believes that the very basis for its development years ago no longer exists. The WVDEP's program has been fully replaced by the federal mitigation program which has developed into a comprehensive program and is the subject of new joint United States Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") and the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") rules to update and conform their collective mitigation goals and requirements. The state's mitigation requirements, at least as they relate to mitigation for activities permitted by a CWA § 404 permit, have become obsolete and duplicative.

History of State § 401 Mitigation Requirements.

The state's mitigation program as maintained by the WVDEP and implemented through the § 401 rules is not a required component of the federal § 404 permitting program. The § 401 certification program is intended to insure that

issuance of a federal permit does not result in a violation of state water quality standards:

CWA section 401 provides that states certify that federal activities or activities requiring federal approvals relative to CWA section 404 would not violate applicable effluent limitations, or other limitations, or other water quality requirements.¹

Instead, the state has independently required mitigation as a condition of § 401 certification. Implementation of the state's mitigation program and requirements dates from a time when the Corps imposed no federal mitigation requirement on mining operations authorized by the § 404 General Permit for coal mining operations, Nationwide Permit 21("NWP 21"):

[NWP] 21. Activities associated with surface coal mining activities provided they are authorized by the Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining (OSM) or by states with approved programs under Title V of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 and provided the permittee notifies the District Engineer in accordance with the "Notification" general condition. **The notification must include an OSM or state-approved mitigation plan (emphasis added).**²

Based on the requirements of the NWP 21, a state mitigation plan was required for a mining-related § 404 permit (usually a NWP 21) to be issued by the Corps:

Prior to reissuance of NWP 21 in January 2002, the COE [Corps] considered mitigation adequate with the inclusion of an OSM or state-approved SMCRA onsite mitigation plan in the permit application.³

¹ Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Corps, EPA et al. 2005. page II.C-42.

² Final Notice of Issuance, Reissuance, and Modification of Nationwide Permits. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Dec. 13, 1996. 61 Fed. Reg. 241.

³ Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Corps, EPA et al. 2005. Page II.C-52

West Virginia implemented this program through the § 401 certification program which imposed monetary or in-lieu fee requirements on coal mining related § 404 permits.

In 2002, the Corps revised and reissued NWP 21 adding a condition that the Corps' District Engineer require federal mitigation, reviewed and approved by the Corps in accordance with its joint mitigation rules and regulations maintained with the EPA.⁴ The revised and reissued NWP 21 allowed the Corps to consider state mitigation when determining federal mitigation, but removed the automatic acceptance of state-required mitigation as sufficient for § 404 authorization. From this point on, the state mitigation requirements as maintained in the § 401 certification process became duplicative because the Corps was requiring federal mitigation plans as part of the § 404 permitting process.

Federal Mitigation Requirements are Comprehensive.

Coal mining-related § 404 permitting and mitigation has evolved since the Corps's reissuance of NWP 21 in 2002. Most mining projects are now permitted using the Corps' Individual Permit process and mitigation plans are now developed based on the Corps's and EPA's combined preference for on-site, in-kind mitigation to restore the impacted aquatic resource.

As you know, coal mining operations are typically subject to the federal CWA § 404 program and the state § 401 certification program because of

⁴ Final Notice of Issuance, Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jan. 15, 2002. 67 Fed. Reg. 10

activities undertaken in jurisdictional waters. The steeply-sloped terrain of West Virginia is permeated by small ephemeral and intermittent streams that serve to drain natural runoff into larger perennial stream systems. Any development in these areas--coal mining or otherwise--will result in some form of impact to small streams. Unlike many other activities subject to § 404 permitting and § 401 certification, mining activities are mostly temporary in nature, with the reclamation process providing a unique opportunity for reconstruction of impacted stream segments.⁵ The Corps has recognized this opportunity for on-site, in-kind replacement/restoration of impacted aquatic resources and issued guidance encouraging this type of mitigation:

This guidance acknowledges the uniqueness of regional and site-specific conditions, recognizes that features constructed in accordance with the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act may contribute to overall mitigation plans, and identifies several appropriate ways to accomplish appropriate mitigation projects.

Surface mining operations can result in the creation of intermittent and and/or perennial streams depending on the on-site hydrologic conditions and the chosen method of dealing with groundwater and/or runoff. Applicants are encouraged to optimize these opportunities for on-site mitigation.

...Corps staff, Office of Surface Mining staff, and the mining operator should coordinate to explore options for incorporating...features required by SMCRA into compensatory mitigation plans. If successfully implemented, channels and other features will help maintain and potentially improve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of waters of the United States.⁶

⁵ See pages ____ of attachment "A", comments filed by WVCA concerning the draft federal mitigation rule.

⁶ "Mitigation for Impacts to Aquatic Resources from Surface Coal Mining." U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. May 7, 2004

In addition to the Corps's above-cited guidance for mining, on-site, in-kind mitigation remains the preferred means of performing mitigation for other authorized impacts to aquatic resources:

In the interest of achieving functional replacement, in-kind compensation of aquatic resources will often be appropriate.⁷

Mitigation should be required, when practicable, in areas adjacent or contiguous to the discharge site. On-site mitigation generally compensates for locally important functions, e.g., local flood control functions or unusual wildlife habitat.⁸

Compensatory mitigation should generally be "in-kind" and occur as close to the site of the adverse impact as practicable in order to minimize losses to the local aquatic ecosystem.⁹

To satisfy the Corps's preference (enunciated in previously-cited Regulatory Guidance Letters issued by the Corps) for in-kind mitigation, or a functional replacement of the impacted resources, a Functional Assessment Protocol, referred to as the "Central Appalachian Protocol", has been used for several years now by the Huntington District to assist in assessing and assigning mitigation requirements for mining-related projects.¹⁰

Unfortunately, the WVDEP has to date largely ignored the mitigation guidance and requirements developed and imposed by the Corps, as well as the functional assessment protocol. The WVDEP has continued to implement its duplicative § 401 mitigation requirements, and typically requires mitigation above

⁷ Regulatory Guidance Letter No 01-1. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, October 31, 2001.

⁸ Regulatory Guidance Letter No 02-2. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, December 24, 2002.

⁹ Compensatory Mitigation Guidelines- Huntington District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington, WV District. January 30, 2004.

¹⁰ See attached power point presentation---Central Appalachian Protocol.

and beyond that which is required by the Corps despite the mandate of W. Va.

Code § 22-11-7a(a)(2)(C):

The Director shall provide credit for any mitigation that is a required component of the permit issued by the United States Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to 33 U.S.C. § 1344 to the extent that it satisfies required mitigation pursuant to this section.

Because a comprehensive federal mitigation program is being implemented, the WVDEP's failure to provide credit for such mitigation *as mandated* is a serious concern to the WVCA. To the extent a state program is relevant at all, perhaps to address the limited circumstances where the state's definition of "waters of the state" is broader than the CWA definition of "waters of the United States," it should be narrowly tailored to address that need. The WVCA cannot support proposed revisions that are not so narrowly tailored.

WVCA urges WVDEP to postpone pursuit of these proposed revisions at this time and to more fully consider the need for its separate mitigation program in light of (1) the federal mitigation now required as part of a § 404 permit, (2) the possibility of creating inconsistencies with the draft federal Corps and EPA rule for mitigation, (3) the deletion of NWP 21 conditions relating to state mitigation, and (4) the mandate of W. Va. Code § 22-11-7a(a)(2)(C) to rely on and give credit for federally mandated mitigation to satisfy any state mitigation needs.

Specific Comments

Page 4 4.2.f.2.A. Economic Information about the coal mining operations, including, without limitation, the estimated number of jobs created, the estimated proportion of employees who will be residents of West Virginia, the estimated annual payroll, the

estimated annual coal production (if applicable), the estimated life of the operation, the estimated severance tax for the operation, the estimated annual property tax, and such other economic information as may be requested by the agency.

WVCA questions why this level of information is needed for the § 401 certification process. Similar information is provided to the Corps under the § 404 permitting program and to the state through the Community Impact Statement.

The justification for requiring duplicative information as part of the § 401 certification process is lacking. Further, we are puzzled as to why this information is required only for mining operations. Sections 404 and 401 of the CWA apply to all manner of filling activities, not just coal mining operations. If this information is needed by the WVDEP to properly implement the § 401 certification process, then it should be required for all dredge and fill activities. If it is not, then it should be removed from the proposed revisions. Without further explanation and justification, the WVCA does not support this proposed revision.

4.2.f.4. A Delineation of the Stream to be Impacted. The length, width and depth of the stream segment impacted shall be measured. Width and depth measurements shall be made at one hundred (100) foot intervals. The stream delineation shall indicate the ephemeral and intermittent/perennial segments to be impacted. The stream shall be measured from the farthest downstream disturbance, excluding stream crossings associated with haul roads for surface mining operations, upstream to the beginning of an ~~intermittent stream, as defined in 46 CSR 1-2.9 and/or 38 CSR 2-2.71.~~ the ordinary high water mark. The applicant shall provide a table listing the station number with the corresponding acreage, including the drainage area from the toe of the pond and the toe of the fill.

As proposed, this revision appears to extend the reach of the state's jurisdiction and expand the WVDEP's mitigation requirements under the § 401 certification program. While this change may be motivated by a desire to more closely align the state's mitigation requirements with those of the Corps, the

WVDEP's first and most needed step in that direction is compliance with W. Va. Code § 22-11-7a(a)(2)(C). Until the WVDEP revises its mitigation rules and policies to accept Corps-required mitigation, this proposed change will serve only to increase the amount of in-lieu fee mitigation provided to the state, with no resulting environmental benefit. Further, the proposed change appears to be counter to the authorizing statute which bears no mention of the "ordinary high water mark." The WVCA does not support this proposed revision.

6.2.b.1. Compensatory mitigation shall be required for all permanent and temporary stream impacts resulting from coal related activities in watersheds greater than or equal to two hundred and fifty (250) acres and/or when the activity results in a stream loss or impact exceeding one half (1/2) acre of stream. The drainage area and 1/2 acre assessments shall be measured starting from the toe of the most downstream permanent or temporary impact (excluding stream crossings) in which the activity occurs.

WVCA believes that this proposed revision extends the authority of the state beyond the authorizing, underlying statute:

1) If the applicant's surface coal mining operation will not impact waters of the state designated as national resource waters and streams where trout naturally reproduce and will not impact wetlands of the state in a manner inconsistent with all applicable state or federal standards as the case may be, as required by the federal Clean Water Act, and if the watershed above the toe of the farthest downstream permanent structure authorized pursuant to the United States Army Corps of Engineers permits issued in accordance with 33 U.S.C. §1344 and 33 C.F.R. Parts 323 or 330 is less than two hundred fifty acres, then the director may issue a water quality certification pursuant to the requirements of this section. If the watershed above the toe of the farthest downstream permanent structure impacted is equal to or greater than two hundred fifty acres, the director shall require that mitigation be undertaken. Additionally, the director may require mitigation for temporary impacts to waters of the state as specified in subdivision (2) of this subsection.

(2) If the watershed above the toe of the farthest downstream permanent structure authorized pursuant to the United States Army Corps of Engineers permits issued in accordance with 33 U.S.C. §1344 and 33 C.F.R. Parts 323 or 330 is greater than or equal to two hundred fifty acres and all other necessary requirements are met consistent with this section, the director shall further condition a water quality certification on a requirement that the applicant mitigate the expected water quality impacts under the following conditions...

The above-cited statute contains no reference to "1/2 acre" of stream. Apparently, the agency is attempting to further extend its jurisdiction or merely implementing past policies that existed with respect to coal and non-coal mitigation. Since the statute contains no reference to 1/2 acre of stream, WVCA suggests the agency delete this proposed revision. If the agency truly believes that this change is necessary, it should seek a legislative revision to 22-11-7(a) and only then seek to modify the rule.

~~6.2.d.1. Permanent impacts for coal related monetary mitigation will be assessed at \$200,000 per acre of impacts in watersheds greater than or equal to two hundred and fifty (250) acres from the toe of the farthest downstream permanent structure, and/or exceeds a 1/2 acre of loss or impact of stream. Monetary compensation for stream impacts resulting from coal related activities shall be assessed as follows:~~

6.2.d.1.A Permanent impacts for coal related monetary mitigation will be assessed at \$200,000 per acre of impacts

6.2.d.1.B Temporary coal related stream impacts resulting from structures (excluding stream crossings) that will be removed prior to final bond release will be assessed at \$20,000 per acre of stream impact per each five-year period of impact and/or prorated for each year the impact occurs.

6.2.d.1.C Temporary coal related stream impacts resulting from stream crossings (i.e. culverting) and stream relocations where the stream impact is greater than or equal to two hundred one (201) lineal feet, but less than or equal to four hundred (400) lineal feet and is in place for five years or more, shall be assessed at \$20,000 per acre for the first five (5) year period and prorated for each additional year the impact shall occur. A temporary stream impact resulting in more than four hundred (400) linear feet shall be monetary compensated at a rate of \$20,000 per acre per each five (5) year term and/or prorated for

each year the impact occurs.

As noted in our general comments, the state § 401 certification program has functioned for several years without the level of minutia and detail presented here, and there appears to be no justification for adding these new provisions to the rule at this time. In addition, because § 404 permit mitigation plans cover both permanent and temporary impacts, there is no need for the duplicative state provision for monetary mitigation. As explained in our general comments, the Corps and EPA have continuously stressed a desire for on-site, in-kind mitigation. Using the "Central Appalachian Protocol", coal mining operations have been providing on-site, in-kind mitigation through the reclamation and stream reconstruction process. These projects have been embraced by the Corps and EPA through mining-specific regulatory guidance.

WVCA questions the need for these revisions, and urges WVDEP to re-evaluate the need for this provisions in light of the federal mitigation now required as part of a § 404 permit and the mandate of W. Va. Code § 22-11-7a(a)(2)(C) to rely on and give credit for federally mandated mitigation to satisfy any state mitigation needs.

6.2.d.1.D Permanent wetland impacts for coal related monetary mitigation will be assessed at the rate \$30,000 per acre of wetland replaced based on the ratios in section 6.2.c.


Again, as noted in our general comments, the state § 401 certification program has functioned for several years without the level of minutia and detail presented here, and there appears to be no justification for adding these new provisions to the rule at this time. In addition, § 404 permit mitigation plans cover

both permanent and temporary impacts to all impacted aquatic resources, including wetlands, and there is no need for the duplicative state provision for monetary mitigation for wetland impacts.

To the extent WVDEP nevertheless chooses to pursue this proposed revision, it has no justification for the \$30,000 replacement value proposed. In addition, by proposing this specific amount, the WVDEP has excluded any opportunity to determine a monetary mitigation amount for wetlands on a case-by-case basis, which could be either higher or lower than \$30,000 per acre.

In-lieu fee payment for wetlands impacts is a desirable option to have, but we question whether the agency will ultimately determine that wetland replacement as already specified in the rule is sufficient. The WVCA cannot support this proposed revision without additional justification and explanation, and again urges the WVDEP to re-evaluate the need for this provisions in light of the federal mitigation now required as part of a § 404 permit and the mandate of W. Va. Code § 22-11-7a(a)(2)(C) to rely on and give credit for federally mandated mitigation to satisfy any state mitigation needs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Bostic", written over a large, loopy scribble.

Jason Bostic, Vice President
Regulatory & Technical Affairs



West Virginia Coal Association

PO Box 3923, Charleston, WV 25339 ■ (304) 342-4153 ■ Fax 342-7651 ■ www.wvcoal.com

Ms. Gloria Shaffer
West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Water and Waste Management
Water Quality Standards Program
601 57th Street SE
Charleston, WV 25304

Via Electronic Mail: Gjshaffer@wvdep.org

Re: Comments on 2007 Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards

Dear Ms. Shaffer:

Pursuant to the September 22, 2005 announcement by the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WV DEP), the West Virginia Coal Association (WVCA) offers the following comments and observations regarding the agency's first triennial review of water quality standards.

WVCA is a non-profit state coal trade association representing the interests of the West Virginia coal industry on policy and regulation issues before various state and federal agencies that regulate coal extraction, processing, transportation and consumption. WVCA's producing members account for 80 percent of the Mountain State's underground and surface coal production. WVCA also represents associate members that supply an array of services to the mining industry in West Virginia. WVCA's primary goal is to enhance the viability of the West Virginia coal industry by supporting efficient and environmentally

criteria. EPA is currently in the process of revising the nationally-recommended selenium criteria.⁶ Because of the flawed nature of the current selenium criteria and its inappropriate application to flowing waters in West Virginia, WVCA is supportive of this federal initiative. However, we caution WV DEP to fully analyze the appropriateness of applying any federally-revised standard in West Virginia. Available information seems to indicate that a state-specific selenium standard for West Virginia may be warranted, as fish populations appear to be healthy and diverse in streams with identified selenium concentrations.⁷ The pressing nature of selenium also warrants that WV DEP investigate a state-specific criteria for West Virginia since the federal revisions remains pending. The agency has recently completed draft TMDL documents that impose selenium allocations based on the existing water quality criteria, and will continue to develop and implement selenium TMDLs, adding urgency to this important issue.

Trout Streams

In the EQB's last triennial review, it proposed adding some 400 streams to the list of Trout Waters contained in the water quality standards rule. The EQB allowed only a 30-day comment period on this major expansion of the Trout Waters list. The EQB proposal was based only on the recommendations of the

⁶ See Attachment "F", October 29, 1999 Federal Register Notice published by EPA regarding revision of the selenium criteria and Attachment "G", December 17, 2004 Federal Register Notice announcing draft criteria and requesting public comments.

⁷ See Attachment "H", relevant pages from comments filed by the National Mining Association and WVCA regarding the programmatic Mountaintop Mining/ Valley Fill Environmental Impact Statement and *Fish Communities and Their Responses to Environmental Factors in the Kanawha River Basin, West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina*. U.S. Geological Survey, 2001.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, with no accompanying data or information on whether or not the streams actually meet the requirements to be classified as trout waters. Based on the lack of information regarding the current status of the proposed trout waters and the limited opportunity for comment provided, the West Virginia Legislature rejected the revision.

The permitting ramifications of classifying streams as trout waters can be significant, as different water quality standards (uniformly more stringent) apply to trout streams. Incorrectly classifying a water as a trout stream can have serious economic impacts for property owners and NPDES dischargers along that streams and should not be taken lightly by WV DEP. Before the agency undertakes any effort as part of its 2007 triennial review to list any additional streams as trout waters, WV DEP should conduct scientific investigations of water quality and fish populations in order to ascertain if a water body meets the criteria required of a trout stream. The agency should also hold hearings in the communities where such streams are located to take comment from the persons most familiar with the conditions of these streams.

We appreciate the agency's consideration of these comments)

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason D. Bostic", written over a horizontal line. The signature is somewhat stylized and overlaps the line.

Jason D. Bostic
West Virginia Coal Association



West Virginia Coal Association

PO Box 3923, Charleston, WV 25339 ■ (304) 342-4153 ■ Fax 342-7651 ■ www.wvcoal.com

July 17, 2006

Mr. Charles Sturey
West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Mining & Reclamation
601 57th Street SE
Charleston, WV 25304

Re: Comments on Proposed Revisions to 38 CSR 2

Dear Mr. Sturey:

Pursuant to the notice filed with the Secretary of State on June 15, 2006, the West Virginia Coal Association (WVCA) offers the following comments and observations regarding the agency's proposed revisions to 38 CSR 2, the state's Mining and Reclamation rules.

WVCA is a non-profit state coal trade association representing the interests of the West Virginia coal industry on policy and regulation issues before various state and federal agencies that regulate coal extraction, processing, transportation and consumption. WVCA's membership accounts for over 80 percent of the Mountain State's underground and surface coal production. WVCA's primary goal is to enhance the viability of the West Virginia coal industry by supporting efficient and environmentally responsible coal extraction and processing through reasonable, equitable and achievable state and federal policy and regulation.

WVCA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the West Virginia

Department of Environmental Protection (WV DEP) regarding the proposed revisions to the state's mining and reclamation rule.

Specific Comments

3.2.g. Notice of Technical Completeness. After the Secretary deems a Surface Mine Application technically complete, the Secretary shall cause the applicant to advertise stating such. The notice shall state that the application has been deemed technically complete by the Secretary and include a fifteen (15) day public review period. Provided, however, Notice of Technical Completeness may not be necessary if the application was technically complete prior to the end of the comment period of the original advertisement and a decision is made within ninety (90) day of the end of the comment period or informal conference.

WVCA believes this revision is unnecessary. Existing state rules provide the agency with authority to require re-advertisement:

3.2.e. Re-advertisement. After a Surface Mine Application (SMA) has been advertised once a week for four successive weeks, and is determined by the Secretary to have had a limited number of minor changes that do not significantly affect the health, safety or welfare of the public and which do not significantly affect the method of operation, the reclamation plan, and/or the original advertisement, he may require one (1) additional advertisement to be published with a ten (10) day public comment period.

As the above-cited provision reveals, the agency has the authority to require the additional advertisement that appears to be the goal of the proposed revision. The language of 38 CSR 2.3.e restricts the applicability of the provision to "a limited number of minor changes that do not significantly affect the health, safety or welfare of the public and which do not significantly affect the method of operation, the reclamation plan, and/or the original advertisement...." for changes that are substantive WV DEP has always required re-advertisement. Additionally,

the proposed revisions exceed the corresponding federal requirements maintained by the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) at 30 CFR 773.6. Because the agency has already has the authority to require re-advertisement, WVCA suggests that WV DEP delete the proposed revision.

14.15.c.2. Areas within the confines of excess spoil disposal fills which are under construction provided the fill is being constructed in the "conventional" method, i.e., completed from the toe up, or those fills which are being constructed progressively in lifts from the toe up or are being progressively completed from the toe up by constructing benches and appropriate drainage control structures (ditches, flumes, channels, etc.) from the toe up as soon as the ~~area is available to do so~~; first two lifts are in and are seeded and certified;

WVCA is extremely concerned about this proposed revision and believes that it will unnecessarily restrict operating flexibility and thereby discourage the construction of "bottom-up" valley fills. WVCA strongly suggests the agency delete this proposed revision. This entire section of rules already exceeds the corresponding federal requirements of OSM, but members of WVCA negotiated the rules in good faith to remedy an agency-perceived problem with valley fill construction. These rules have been scrutinized and approved by the West Virginia Legislature and OSM. WVCA is concerned as to why the agency believes this change is necessary, and would be willing to discuss other possible remedies to the situation.

Respectfully Submitted,


Jason D. Bostic, Vice-President
Regulatory & Technical Affairs

Surface Mining 38 CSR2 (Agreement)
401 Certification 47 CSRSA 45CSR42
TRADU LISTING

2.5
"Biogenic Sources"
include
COAL

TITLE 45

LEGISLATIVE RULE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY

SERIES 42
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY PROGRAM

3.2 turned on
exemption info
on inclusion
5.3 "shall provide
information?"

§45-42-1. General.

1.1 Scope. -- This rule establishes a greenhouse gas emissions inventory program in West Virginia which:

1.1.a. Requires the reporting and inventory of greenhouse gas emissions by stationary sources which emit more than a *de minimis* amount of greenhouse gases on an annual basis;

1.1.b Inventories greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources, and accounts for reductions and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions;

1.1.c. Provides for a periodic compilation of a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and a determination whether West Virginia is a net sink or emitter of greenhouse gases;

1.1.d. Provides for development of a registry to record voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions; and

1.1.e. Provides for a determination whether the reduction and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions can be developed as an asset for economic development.

1.2 Authority -- W Va. Code §22-5-19

1.3. Filing Date --

1.4. Effective Date. -- June 1, 2008.

§45-42-2. Definitions.

2.1. "Air pollutants" means solids, liquids, or gases which, if discharged into the air, may result in statutory air pollution

2.2. "Air pollution" or "statutory air pollution" means and is limited to the discharge into the air by the act of man substances (liquid, solid, gaseous, organic or inorganic) in a locality, manner and amount as to be injurious to human health or welfare, animal or plant life, or property, or which would interfere with the enjoyment of life or property.

2.3. "Anthropogenic" means a direct result of human activities or the result of natural processes that have been influenced by human activities.

2.4 "Area source" means, for purposes of this rule, a collection of similar sources of air pollutants within a geographic area. Area sources collectively represent individual sources that are small and numerous, and that typically have not been inventoried as a stationary or mobile source.

2.5. "Biogenic" means a naturally occurring biological source or process that is not significantly affected by human actions or activity.

Biogenic
Sources
include
COAL

2.6. "Capture" means the collection of greenhouse gas emissions from a stationary source.

2.7. "De minimis" means emissions from a stationary source that are equal to or less than ten thousand tons per year for carbon dioxide, four hundred seventy-six tons per year for methane, thirty-two and six tenths tons per year for nitrous oxide, eight hundred fifty-five thousandths tons per year for hydrofluorocarbons, one and nine hundredths tons per year for perfluorocarbons and forty-two hundredths tons per year for sulfur hexafluoride.

2.8. "Emission" means the release, escape or discharge of regulated air pollutants or greenhouse gases into the air.

2.9. "Greenhouse gas" means the gaseous compounds: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆).

2.10. "Mobile source" means a variety of onroad and nonroad vehicles, engines, locomotives, marine vessels, airplanes and other equipment that generate air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, and that move or can be moved from place to place.

2.11. "Regulated air pollutant" means, for purposes of this rule, any air pollutant regulated under rules promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to W.Va. Code §22-5-4.

2.12. "Reservoir" means a geological site where a greenhouse gas is securely stored.

2.13. "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection or such other person to whom the Secretary has delegated authority or duties pursuant to W.Va. Code §§22-1-6 or 22-1-8.

2.14. "Sequestration" means the physical process by which emissions of a greenhouse gas are directly captured for storage

in a reservoir, or the biologic process by which a greenhouse gas is indirectly removed from the atmosphere for storage in a sink.

2.15. "Sink" means any process, activity or mechanism which removes a greenhouse gas from the atmosphere. Forests are considered sinks because they remove carbon dioxide through photosynthesis.

2.16. "Source" means, for purposes of this rule, any process or activity which releases a greenhouse gas into the air.

2.17. "Stationary source" means any building, structure, facility, installation, stationary process or process equipment which emits or may emit any regulated air pollutant or greenhouse gas.

2.18. "Ton" means a short ton, or 2000 pounds.

2.19. Other words and phrases used in this rule, unless otherwise indicated, shall have the meaning ascribed to them in W.Va. Code §22-5-1 et seq.

§45-42-3. Applicability.

3.1. Any stationary source that emits one or more greenhouse gases on an annual basis greater than the *de minimis* amounts listed in the table below, and reports emissions of regulated air pollutants pursuant to the emissions inventory requirements of the Secretary under rule or W.Va. Code §22-5-4(a)(14), shall be an affected source required to report emissions of all greenhouse gases to the Secretary under section 4:

Greenhouse Gas Compound	tons/year
carbon dioxide	10,000
methane	476
nitrous oxide	32.6

Any facility, etc.

45CSR42

hydrofluorocarbons	0.855
perfluorocarbons	1.09

sulfur hexafluoride	0.42
---------------------	------

Prep plants under title IV

only stationary sources

3.2. Stationary sources which are regulated by the Secretary under W.Va. Code §22-3-1 et seq. and do not report emissions of regulated air pollutants pursuant to the emissions inventory requirements under W.Va. Code §22-5-4(a)(14) are not required to, but may voluntarily report their greenhouse gas emissions under section 4.

§45-42-4. Reporting Requirements.

4.1. By March 31, 2009, and March 31 of each year thereafter, affected sources shall report to the Secretary the quantity of all greenhouse gases emitted in the previous calendar year.

4.2. Affected sources shall only be required to report annual quantities of anthropogenic non-mobile source greenhouse gas emissions at the source, and shall not be required to report biogenic emissions of greenhouse gases.

4.3. The Secretary shall determine the form and format of the information reported by affected sources under subsection 4.1 to ensure that the information is consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international greenhouse gas emissions programs.

4.4. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 4.3, to satisfy the greenhouse gas emission reporting requirements under this section, affected sources may submit greenhouse gas emissions inventory information from documented greenhouse gas inventories such as those provided to the Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Leaders Program, Chicago Climate Exchange Registry, the International Organization for Standardization and the SF₆

Emissions Reduction Partnership for Electric Power Systems. Greenhouse gas emissions inventory information from other widely recognized and verified greenhouse gas emissions inventory programs may be submitted by affected sources under this subsection, but shall be subject to approval by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis.

4.5. Reports of greenhouse gas emissions submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be signed by a responsible official and shall include the following certification statement: "I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the data transmitted to the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection is true, accurate, and complete, based upon information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry."

§45-42-5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory.

5.1. The Secretary shall periodically compile an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions to:

5.1.a. Characterize the relative contributions of greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources in West Virginia; and

5.1.b. Determine the extent to which greenhouse gas emissions are offset by the rate of sequestration, and whether West Virginia is a net sink or emitter of greenhouse gases

5.2. The greenhouse gas emissions inventory shall include the emissions from stationary sources reported under section 4, and other relevant information regarding significant emissions, reductions, and sequestration of greenhouse gases from stationary, area, mobile

entire Sorban Area / underground Area is a AREA SOURCE

and biogenic sources requested by the Secretary under subsections 5.3 and 5.4.

5.3. To inventory greenhouse gas emissions reductions, the Secretary shall consult with the citizenry and other entities such as industry trade groups that have information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and sequestration. Upon request of the Secretary, such entities shall provide relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions; capture and sequestration.

5.4. The Department of Agriculture, the Division of Forestry, Marshall University, West Virginia University, West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, and the Department of Transportation shall enter into interagency agreements with the Secretary and at the Secretary's request provide:

5.4.a. Relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions from area, mobile and biogenic sources;

5.4.b. Relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions and sequestration; and

5.4.c. Any assistance the Secretary may request during the development of the greenhouse gas emissions inventory.

5.5. The Secretary shall determine the form and format of the information submitted by the entities under subsections 5.3 and 5.4 to ensure that the information is consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international greenhouse gas emissions programs.

§45-42-6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Registry Program.

6.1. The Secretary shall develop a registry for the recordation of voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

6.2. The greenhouse gas emissions registry program shall be as consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international programs designed to monitor, quantify and register reductions in greenhouse gas emissions with respect to:

6.2.a. Development of criteria, based on a set of standardized emissions accounting, reporting and verification protocols, to determine baseline emissions and quantification of voluntary reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases;

6.2.b. Public recognition of such voluntary emissions reductions;

6.2.c. Consideration of voluntary greenhouse gas emission reductions when determining baselines and reduction requirements under future federal greenhouse gas emission reduction programs; and

6.2.d. The ability of sources to participate in future greenhouse gas emission trading programs.

§45-42-7. Economic Development Potential.

7.1. Using information obtained, gathered or developed under this rule, the Secretary will determine whether the reduction and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions can be developed as an asset for economic development in West Virginia.

§45-42-8. Inconsistency Between Rules.

8.1. In the event of any inconsistency between this rule and any other rule of the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, the inconsistency shall be resolved by the determination of the Secretary and the determination shall be based upon the application of the more stringent provision, term, condition, method or rule.



P Premium Content | Register | Log In | Help

Biogenic

Search

Dictionary Thesaurus Encyclopedia All Reference The Web

ADVERTISEMENT

13 results for: *Biogenic*

Displaying 1 best match. [Browse all 13 results below](#)

View results from: [Dictionary](#) | [Thesaurus](#) | [Encyclopedia](#) | [All Reference](#) | [the Web](#)

Biogenic substance

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia - Cite This Source

A **biogenic substance** is a substance produced by life processes. It may be either constituents, or secretions, of plants or animals.

Examples

Coal and oil are examples of constituents which have undergone changes over geologic time periods.

Chalk, and limestone are examples of secretions (marine animal shells) which are of geologic age.

Cotton and wood is are biogenic constituents of contemporary origin.

Pearls, silk and ambergis are examples of secretions of contemporary origin.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia © 2001-2006 Wikipedia contributors (Disclaimer)

This article is licensed under the GNU Free Documentation License.

Last updated on Tuesday January 02, 2007 at 08:21:59 PST (GMT -0800)

[View this article at Wikipedia.org](#) - [Edit this article at Wikipedia.org](#) - [Donate to the Wikimedia Foundation](#)

[13 More from Wikipedia »](#)

All 13 results for: *Biogenic*

[13 from Wikipedia](#)

Free download! Get instant dictionary, thesaurus, and encyclopedia access with our Firefox [browser tools](#).

ADVERTISEMENT

Indicates premium content, which is available only to subscribers.

[About Reference.com](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#) | [Link to Us](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Copyright © 2007, Lexico Publishing Group, LLC. All rights reserved.

From: "Charles Harris" <charris@hsc.wvu.edu>
To: <jhallinan@hallinanlaw.com>, <rick@lcpd.com>, <braney@wvcoal.com>, <PWHITE@wvdep.org>, <karen@wvma.com>, <wvml@wvml.org>
Date: 5/24/2007 7:54:40 PM
Subject: Re: May 30, 2007 Meeting

Trish: I received some last minute comments on 33CSR8 that I would like to submit:

§33-9-2. Definitions -- Section 2.5 defines "Beneficial Use" as "the use of a non-hazardous material for a specific beneficial purpose where it is done in a manner that protects groundwater and surface water quality, soil quality, air quality, human health, and the environment." We are concerned that it has not been adequately demonstrated that this filtrate is non-hazardous, and point to the current "inter-sex" fish issue in the Potomac River drainage which illustrates that there are unanswered questions concerning unmonitored pollutants in sludge from both water and waste treatment facilities

§33-9-2. Definitions - Section 2.5 defines beneficial uses as including "use as a fertilizer substitute, soil amendment, cover material, fill material, mulch or horticultural product, or other purpose approved by the Secretary." However, Section 33-9-3, in sub-Section 3.1 b.1 requires that "The use proposed is a reuse, and not a disposal." We suggest that the use of this filtrate as fill material is actually simply a disposal and not a "reuse." We believe this material should not be used as fill material. This would also require a change to Section 33-9-5, sub-Section 5.2.

§33-9-5. Standards for Beneficial Use of Filtrate - sub-Section 5.3 states, "The Secretary may approve the use of filtrate as fill material within fifty (50) feet of surface water upon submission of information sufficient to show that the fill material will have no significant impact on the quality of runoff reaching the surface water." Even the U.S. Forest Service has adopted stronger stream buffers for sediment runoff. DEP should develop stronger stream buffers for this rule, and there should be no discretion.

§33-9-7. -- DEP made changes to this rule during the Interims process last year, and the rule now requires a permit for both short-term and long-term applications. This is a good change. However, we feel that most of the information required in Section 7.3. Permit Application Requirements for long-term permits should also be required for short-term permits

§33-9-8. Draft Permits and Public Comment. Section 8.2 a. provides for a 30-day public comment period for long-term permits, but only a 15-day public comment period for short-term permits. We oppose the shortened public notice provisions for short-term permits. The 30-day comment period should apply in both instances.

§ 33-9-11. General permits. We oppose the development of a General Permit to cover the provisions of this rule. Specific individual permits are necessary to inform potentially affected parties of the application of this material.

Appendix A -- Frequency of Monitoring. The Legislative Rule-Making Review Committee last session accepted an amendment proposed by industry that reduced monitoring tests to once a year. While we would prefer even more frequent monitoring than proposed in this rule, we hope DEP will strongly oppose any attempts to reduce the monitoring provisions provided in this rule.

Charles L. Harris
Professor of Biochemistry
West Virginia University
School of Medicine
304-293-7749

>>> "Patricia White" <PWHITE@wvdep.org> 05/21/07 4:21 PM >>>

Please be advised of the following meeting:

Comments on DEP Rules for 2007

Communicated by Larry Harris, Public Advisory Council Member

I would like to commend the staff of the DEP for the hard work and expertise used in preparing and reviewing the rules with Council. As promised, I include below some of the technical and other issues raised during the May 21 meeting of the Council, omitting some questions that were answered at the meeting. Members of the environmental community who reviewed the rules raised some of the questions.

Some of the issues mentioned below are related to the act of valley fills and determining compensation for this process. I have pointed out my view to Council previously that the permitting of valley fills is essentially allowing the destruction of upper tributaries of watersheds. As such the process should be outlawed, in my view.

47CSR2 Water Quality

We learned that the B2 list is essentially the same as submitted previously and includes the definition of trout waters cited on page 2 of the rule.

Page 11: Why is the temperature regulation on Stony River being removed?

47CSR2 (7.2.d.9) — The removal of variances, etc. on the Blackwater seems to be a strength, but why do these rivers remain "reserved" on the list? Why not just remove them?

47CSR2 (7.2.d.34.1): Adds language for site-specific applicability of water use categories and water quality criteria: "Pats Branch from its confluence with the Guyandotte River to a point 1000 feet upstream shall not have Water Use Category A and Category D1 designation."

* Is this a use removal? Yes was the answer.

* If so, did this go through the appropriate public process and use attainability analysis to justify a use removal. Did the use and attainability

analysis follow the federal Clean Water Act provision. (i.e. how was this decision justified)? Not sure this was fully answered.

47CSR2 (Appendix E):

Are the changes in concentrations for cadmium, copper, and others in Appendix E consistent with EPA changes/recommendations? Some of the changes in hardness calculations are in response to comments from our groups last year asking DEP to be consistent--so this is good.

47CSR5A

47 CSR 5A (State Certification)

*****47CSR5A (4.2.f.4):** seems to be weakening the system for determining stream miles (delineation). DEP inserts the language: "The stream shall be measured from the farthest downstream disturbance, excluding stream crossings associated with haul roads for surface mining operations, upstream to the beginning of the ordinary high water mark."

This will result in fewer stream miles being "delineated" as actual stream miles, it seems. Why would you move upstream (where there are fewer inputs) to find a high water mark? Thus, it also seems fewer miles of headwaters will be mitigated for impacts.

47CSR5A (6.2.b): Typo--"loses" should be "losses"

47CSR5A (6.2.d.1): Is there a discrepancy between how monetary compensation for coal versus non-coal impacts is assessed? It may be worth determining that coal is not getting a break, in comparison to non-coal.

For example--why is it lineal miles for coal and acreage for non-coal? If they are going to assess from the high water mark--as discussed above--will this not result in fewer stream miles and thus fewer miles to mitigate/compensate? Also, there is no assessment for non-coal related temporary impacts--why?

60 CSR5 Antidegradation

I made the suggestion that the list of Tier 2.5 streams (156 in the current rule) should be returned to the same number as began the legislative session, which is 309 streams. A scientific process that included expertise

from the WVDNR, which manages trout waters, arrived at the list of 309 streams. The list now submitted with the bill was reduced by the political process. Politics should not determine which streams merit protection from pollution; science should.

Other issues:

2.11 Explanation of the addition of this trading section is needed. Is this similar to EPA rules and consistent with the Clean Water Act?

3.9 Which advisory committee is this phrase referring to:

5.5b is removed. Why?

Is the procedure for nomination and addition of streams to the tier 2.5 list adequate?

Comments from Adam Webster (WVRC)

60CSR5 (2.11) : It's good that DEP provides "upstream controls" and mentions "for the same parameter" in the first sentence of the "trading" definition. Overall, the definition is good, but it is important to remember that the intent of the definition is not to allow cross-pollutant trading. With this in mind, the second sentence—"More than one parameter of concern may be traded on a given stream"—needs to be worded more restrictively (i.e. despite what the first sentence says, the second sentence could be interpreted as if cross-pollutant trading is allowed).

*** 60CSR5 (5.2) : Removes (strikes) the language: "Water segments that support the minimum fishable/swimmable uses and have assimilative capacity remaining for some parameters shall generally be afforded Tier 2 protection".

Does this suggest the default is Tier 1 (if data does not suggest otherwise)? If so, why?

60CSR5 (5.6.c) : The deletion is a response to lawsuit. However, the new 5.6.c suggests they cannot assess assimilative capacity when dealing with pH,

DO, temperature, and fecal coliform. We feel that they can assess these parameters and should not treat them separately.

45CSR42 Greenhouse Gases

The fact that the DEP is beginning to deal with the process of greenhouse gases that lead to global warming is commendable. Some questions on the rule were raised by Dr. Kotcon:

The greenhouse gases emissions inventory rule (45-42-1) needs to be strengthened considerably. The sections on emissions inventory (section 5, pages 3-4) is so vague as to be meaningless, especially as it deals with sequestration for area sources and sinks. I do not see how any meaningful data can be generated with this language. How would the carbon sequestration be estimated? Has there been studies estimating the biogenic incorporation of CO₂ per acre of woodland, for example? The rule appears to be a vague in how it would be implemented.

Air Quality and Emission Rules (see below)

45CSR8 Ambient Air Quality Standards

Don Garvin pointed out that the the antidegradation language was removed from this rule, and it was explained that the agency feels these provisions are now covered in 45-CSR-14("Prevention of Significant Deterioration.") However, the language that was stricken does not appear in 45-CSR-14, and the stricken language is the ONLY statement in the rules of West Virginia's antidegradation policy for air quality. The environmental community still believes the stricken language should be restored.

Here is what should be reinstated:

§45-8-2. Anti-Degradation Policy.

2.1. Pursuant to the best interests of the State of West Virginia, it is the objective of the Secretary to obtain and maintain the cleanest air possible, consistent with the best available technology.

2.2. Where the present ambient air is of better quality than the established standards, the Secretary will develop long-range plans to protect the difference between the present quality and the established standards. The plans will be based upon the best available forecasts of probable land and air uses in these areas of high air quality.

2.3. The air quality of these areas will not be lowered unless it has been clearly demonstrated to the Secretary that such a change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not result in statutory air pollution. This will require that any industrial, public, or private project or development which could constitute a new source of air pollutants, within an area of such high air quality, provide the best practicable control available under existing technology as part of the initial project or development.

45CSR41 Control of Annual SO₂ emissions

45CSR6 Control of Air Pollution from Refuse Combustion

45CSR39 Nitrogen Oxides

I raised the general concern whether the standards for air quality were consistent with the EPA guidelines or not. Further, were any recognized health authorities consulted when these levels were determined? I also raised the issue that West Virginia is increasing supplying electricity to the population east of our mountains. New transmission lines are proposed that are to be connected with coal burning power plants. Billy Jack Gregg, Consumer Advocate for the WV PSC has pointed out that the states receiving our generated power will not permit generation plants in their region. They are concerned about air pollution and its various effects. But they need power, so they turn to West Virginia. This helps the coal industry and generation plants, but puts the health of West Virginians in jeopardy. I feel that our air quality and emission limits should be even more stringent than the EPA calls for in order to protect our citizens. This should be particularly true for power plants that export electricity.

Dr. Kotcon has raised the following issues:

45-CSR-8 Ambient Air Quality Standards

The standards for PM_{2.5} and Ozone are not adequately protective. I recommend that the standards be lowered from 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 13 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in section 4.2.b., and from 0.08 ppm to 0.07 ppm in section 4.4.b.

The air standards (45-8-1) retains the standards for PM_{2.5} and ozone
>that the EPA Clean Air Scientific Advisory Council has already
>determined to be inadequate. Keeping these old standards will kill
>dozens or hundreds of West Virginians each year.

>The rule on refuse combustion (45-6-1) attempts to revise the
>definition of low-level radioactive waste and revives the
>Below-Regulatory_Concern (BRC) issue from some years ago. It also
>creates a large number of exemptions for "temporary" pollution
>sources. I am not yet sure if this re-opens old battles over
>medical waste incineration, but this was a really hot issue a few
>years back.

Comment submitted
by Karen Price at
Council
meeting
5/30/07

Questions/Comments on DEP's 2007 Proposed Rules

- **45 CSR 8 Ambient Air Quality Standards**

Section 4.2.c – PM_{2.5} Maximum 24-Hour Average Concentration. The level for the 24-hour primary and secondary standard states 35 ug/m³. This should be 65 ug/m³, pursuant to 40 CFR 50.7.

- **45 CSR 39, 45 CSR 40, 45 CSR 41**

The opt-in unit language is deleted from each of these rules. What is the purpose for the deletion of these provisions?

- **33 CSR 30, Underground Storage Tank Rules**

Section 6.1. states "...including any person who accepts a delivery order, accepts payment, delivers or deposits product into an underground storage tank.....". The portion that states "...accepts payment..." should be removed from this section because those individuals within a company who accept payment or make payments most often do not know anything about the underground storage tank (UST), the operation of the UST, or the current regulatory status of the UST

Section 7.3 a.1. states "...the methodology for verifying attendance, the date, time and location of the course, the name of the offering organization, the credentials of the instructors, and a certification that the technology or methods....."

1. The portion that states "...the date, time and location of the course,...." should be deleted. For large companies with many UST installations and locations there can be numerous individuals that need to be trained. Training will most likely occur on multiple dates, times, and locations that may not always be known until just prior to the training event. When new employees are hired training might

occur on short notice and for one individual. The burden of having to report the dates, time and locations would hinder and slow down the training process and restrict a company's ability to comply.

2. The portion that states "...the credentials of the instructors..." should be removed. Credentials will vary from instructor to instructor new instructors might be utilized, and a company might not know which instructors will be used at the various training sessions until just prior to the training session. In addition, the course content is the main issue of concern and should be the main focus in obtaining State approval of a training program.

Section 7.3 a.2 - This section states that a nonrefundable application fee of \$280 must be submitted with the application. Larger companies may have one training program, but administer the training on multiple dates, times and locations. Having to submit an application for approval of the training program each time the program is administered would be cost prohibitive, burdensome, and would hinder the training process. The State should clarify or make provision for a company to submit one application for the training program that will be administered to all company UST facilities. This will make the \$280 application fee reasonable and the application process less burdensome.

INDUSTRY'S REVISIONS

45CSR42

**TITLE 45
LEGISLATIVE RULE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY**

**SERIES 42
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY PROGRAM**

§45-42-1.General.

1.1 Scope -- This rule establishes a greenhouse gas emissions inventory program in West Virginia which:

1.1.a. Requires the reporting and inventory of greenhouse gas emissions by stationary sources which emit more than a *de minimis* amount of greenhouse gases on an annual basis;

1.1.b Inventories greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources, and accounts for reductions and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions;

1.1.c. Provides for a periodic compilation of a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and a determination whether West Virginia is a net sink or emitter of greenhouse gases;

1.1 d. Provides for development of a registry to record voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions; and

1.1 e Provides for a determination whether the reduction and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions can be developed as an asset for economic development.

1.2 Authority -- W Va Code §22-5-19.

1.3. Filing Date --

1.4. Effective Date -- June 1, 2008.

§45-42-2. Definitions.

2.1. "Air pollutants" means solids, liquids, or gases which, if discharged into the air, may result in statutory air pollution

2.2. "Air pollution" or "statutory air pollution" means and is limited to the discharge into the air by the act of man substances (liquid, solid, gaseous, organic or inorganic) in a locality, manner and amount as to be injurious to human health or welfare, animal or plant life, or property, or which would interfere with the enjoyment of life or property.

2.3. "Anthropogenic" means a direct result of human activities or the result of natural processes that have been influenced significantly by human activities.

2.4. "Area source" means, for purposes of this rule, a collection of similar sources of air pollutants within a geographic area. Area sources collectively represent individual sources that are small and numerous, and that typically have not been inventoried as a stationary or mobile source.

2.5. "Biogenic" means a naturally occurring biological source or process that is not significantly affected by human actions or activity.

2.6. "Capture" means the collection of greenhouse gas emissions from a stationary source

2.7. "*De minimis*" means emissions from a stationary source that are equal to or less than ten thousand tons per year for carbon dioxide, four hundred seventy-six tons per year for methane, thirty-two and six tenths tons per year for nitrous oxide, eight hundred fifty-five thousandths tons per year for hydrofluorocarbons, one and nine hundredths tons per year for perfluorocarbons and forty-two hundredths tons per year for sulfur hexafluoride.

2.8. "Emission" means the release, escape or discharge of regulated air pollutants or greenhouse gases into the air.

2.9. "Greenhouse gas" means the gaseous compounds: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)

2.10. "Mobile source" means a variety of onroad and nonroad vehicles, engines, locomotives, marine vessels, airplanes and other equipment that generate air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, and that move or can be moved from place to place.

2.11. "Regulated air pollutant" means, for purposes of this rule, any air pollutant regulated under rules promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to W.Va. Code §22-5-4

2.12. "Reservoir" means a geological site where a greenhouse gas is securely stored.

2.13. "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection or such other person to whom the Secretary has delegated authority or duties pursuant to W.Va. Code §§22-1-6 or 22-1-8

2.14. "Sequestration" means the physical process by which emissions of a greenhouse gas are directly captured for storage

in a reservoir, or the biologic process by which a greenhouse gas is indirectly removed from the atmosphere for storage in a sink

2.15. "Sink" means any process, activity or mechanism which removes a greenhouse gas from the atmosphere. Forests are considered sinks because they remove carbon dioxide through photosynthesis.

2.16. "Source" means, for purposes of this rule, any process or activity which releases a greenhouse gas into the air.

2.17. "Stationary source" means any building, structure, facility, installation, stationary process or process equipment which emits or may emit any regulated air pollutant or greenhouse gas.

2.18. "Ton" means a short ton, or 2000 pounds.

2.19. Other words and phrases used in this rule, unless otherwise indicated, shall have the meaning ascribed to them in W.Va. Code §22-5-1 et seq

§45-42-3. Applicability.

3.1. Any stationary source that emits one or more greenhouse gases on an annual basis greater than the *de minimis* amounts listed in the table below, excluding biogenic emissions, and reports emissions of regulated air pollutants pursuant to the emissions inventory requirements of the Secretary under rule or W.Va. Code §22-5-4(a)(14), shall be an affected source required to report emissions of all greenhouse gases emitted above de minimis amounts to the Secretary under section 4:

Greenhouse Gas Compound	tons/year
carbon dioxide	10,000
methane	476

nitrous oxide	32.6
perfluorocarbons	1.09
sulfur hexafluoride	0.42

3.2. Stationary sources which are regulated by the Secretary under W Va. Code §22-3-1 et seq. and do not report emissions of regulated air pollutants pursuant to the emissions inventory requirements under W.Va. Code §22-5-4(a)(14) are not required to, but may voluntarily report their greenhouse gas emissions under section 4.

§45-42-4.Reporting Requirements.

4.1. ~~By March 31, 2009, and March 31 of each year thereafter, affected~~ Affected sources shall report to the Secretary the quantity of all greenhouse gases emitted above de minimis amounts in the previous calendar year at the same time such sources are to report emissions of regulated air pollutants pursuant to the emissions inventory requirements of the Secretary under rule or W.Va. Code §22-5-4(a)(14).

4.2. Affected sources shall only be required to report annual quantities of anthropogenic non-mobile source greenhouse gas emissions directly at the source, and shall not be required to report biogenic or mobile emissions of greenhouse gases, or indirect emissions of greenhouse gases, such as emissions occurring offsite from energy consumption.

4.3. The Secretary shall determine the form and format of the information reported by affected sources under subsection 4.1 to ensure that the information is consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international greenhouse gas emissions programs

4.4 Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 4.3, to satisfy the greenhouse gas

hydrofluorocarbons	0.855
--------------------	-------

emission reporting requirements under this section, affected sources may submit greenhouse gas emissions inventory information from documented greenhouse gas inventories such as those provided to the Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Leaders Program, Chicago Climate Exchange Registry, the International Organization for Standardization and the SF₆ Emissions Reduction Partnership for Electric Power Systems. Greenhouse gas emissions inventory information from other widely recognized and verified greenhouse gas emissions inventory programs may be submitted by affected sources under this subsection, but shall be subject to approval by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis

4.5. Reports of greenhouse gas emissions submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be signed by a responsible official and shall include the following certification statement: "I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the data transmitted to the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection is true, accurate, and complete, based upon information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry."

4.6. Greenhouse gases reported under this section are not subject to fees under 45 CSR 30, unless the greenhouse gases are otherwise regulated by the Secretary.

§45-42-5.Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory.

5.1. The Secretary shall periodically compile an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions to:

5.1.a. Characterize the relative contributions of greenhouse gas emissions from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources in West Virginia; and

5.1 b. Determine the extent to which greenhouse gas emissions are offset by the rate of sequestration, and whether West Virginia is a net sink or emitter of greenhouse gases.

5.2 The greenhouse gas emissions inventory shall include the emissions from stationary sources reported under section 4, and other relevant information regarding significant emissions, reductions, and sequestration of greenhouse gases from stationary, area, mobile and biogenic sources requested by the Secretary under subsections 5.3 and 5.4.

5.3. To inventory greenhouse gas emissions reductions, the Secretary shall consult with the citizenry and other entities such as industry trade groups that have information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and sequestration. ~~Upon request of the Secretary, such entities shall provide relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions, capture and sequestration.~~

5.4 The Department of Agriculture, the Division of Forestry, Marshall University, West Virginia University, West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, and the Department of Transportation shall enter into interagency agreements with the Secretary and at the Secretary's request provide:

5.4.a Relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions from area, mobile and biogenic sources;

5.4.b. Relevant information relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions and sequestration; and

5.4.c. Any assistance the Secretary may request during the development of the greenhouse gas emissions inventory.

5.5. The Secretary shall determine the form and format of the information submitted by the entities under subsections 5.3 and 5.4 to ensure

that the information is consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international greenhouse gas emissions programs.

§45-42-6.Greenhouse Gas Emissions Registry Program.

6.1. The Secretary shall develop a registry for the recordation of voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

6.2. The greenhouse gas emissions registry program shall be as consistent as possible with developing regional, national, or international programs designed to monitor, quantify and register reductions in greenhouse gas emissions with respect to:

6.2.a Development of criteria, based on a set of standardized emissions accounting, reporting and verification protocols, to determine baseline emissions and quantification of voluntary reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases;

6.2.b Public recognition of such voluntary emissions reductions;

6.2.c Consideration of voluntary greenhouse gas emission reductions when determining baselines and reduction requirements under future federal greenhouse gas emission reduction programs; and

6.2.d The ability of sources to participate in future greenhouse gas emission trading programs.

§45-42-7.Economic Development Potential.

7.1 Using information obtained, gathered or developed under this rule, the Secretary will determine whether the reduction and sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions can be developed as an asset for net economic development or will result in a deterrent to net economic development in West Virginia.

45CSR42

§45-42-8. Inconsistency Between Rules.

8.1. In the event of any inconsistency between this rule and any other rule of the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, the inconsistency shall be resolved by the determination of the Secretary and the determination shall be based upon the application of the more stringent provision, term, condition, method or rule

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karen Price
FROM: David L. Yaussy
DATE: May 29, 2007
SUBJECT: DEP Advisory Council Rules

A. Rules for Individual State Certification of Activities Requiring a Federal Permit.
Title 47, Series 5A.

No comment.

B. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program.
Title 47, Series 10.

We would urge the DEP to update the rule. It still contains references to the Chief, rather than the Director (See, for example, Sections 5.13.d.1, 6.2 and 9.1.a.)

Has the DEP updated this rule to reflect changes in the Code of Federal Regulations that were made since it was last comprehensively updated?

C. Antidegradation Implementation Procedures.
Title 60, Series 5.

We agree that the State should do away with Section 6.2. There is no need for an initial presumptive listing procedure at this point. As for the 156 (I counted 157, but I may have miscounted) streams in Appendix A, we will disagree with all those listed except the 39 to which no objections were ever lodged.

D. Requirements Governing Water Quality Standards.

Title 57, Series 2.

There are a couple of minor errors – Section 2.2 has a “then” that should be “than” and Section 6.1 is missing text

We remain disappointed that the State continues to interpret its water quality standards to apply all uses in all streams at all times. Section 6.1 clearly provides that B and C are the only default, or universal, uses

Memorandum
May 29, 2007
Page 2

Appendix D should be eliminated. Category C, Water Contact Recreation, is a default use, and listing all streams with that use assigned to them suggests that there are streams that do not have that designation.

Appendix A. The DEP is listing a huge number of trout streams with no justification for their listing. If streams meet the requirements of trout waters, they qualify as such; if they do not, there is no reason to list them. Unless the DEP can document that each stream has year round, multi-age populations, they should not be listed.

DLY:shb

**Summary of Industry's Suggested Changes and Comments on
45 CSR 42, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Program**

- Section 2.3. The definition of “anthropogenic” should be revised to state that it is the “result of natural processes that have been influenced significantly by human activities”. Adding the term “significantly” makes the definition consistent with the definition of “biogenic” which means a “naturally occurring biological source or process that is not significantly affected by human actions or activity.”
- Section 3.1. Applicability. This section should be revised to clarify that only individual greenhouse gases emitted above the *de minimis* amounts are required to be reported. Otherwise, affected sources that trigger any of the *de minimis* amounts could be required to report emissions of all of the greenhouse gases even if they are below the *de minimis* amounts. We do not believe that this is DEP’s intent. Also, this section should be revised to clarify that the *de minimis* amounts do not include biogenic emissions.
- Section 4.1. Reporting Requirements. This section should be revised to require reporting of greenhouse gases at the same time the air emissions inventory reporting is required. Sources should not be required to report their emissions at two different times. This section should also be clarified so that only greenhouse gases emitted above the *de minimis* amounts are required to be reported.
- Section 4.2 should be revised so that “mobile” emissions of greenhouse gases are not required to be reported. This section should also be revised to clarify that only direct emissions and not indirect greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., emissions occurring offsite from electricity consumption) are required to be reported. The references in section 4.3 to programs like Climate Leaders could lead sources to include indirect and direct emissions in their reporting. This would lead to double counting of electric generation greenhouse gas emissions and to higher source emissions compared to the *de minimis* amounts.
- Section 4.6 should be added so that sources will not be subject to fees for reporting greenhouse gas emissions, as the purpose of such reporting is to create an inventory, not to generate fees.
- Section 5.3. This section should be revised to delete the requirement that certain entities, including trade associations, must provide relevant information on greenhouse gas emissions, reductions, capture and sequestration to the Secretary upon request. This requirement is not found in the statute and could be interpreted to require such entities to report reductions, which is also not required under the statute.

- Section 7.1 Economic Development Potential This section should be revised to require the DEP to also determine whether reduction and sequestration will result in a deterrent to net economic development – not just whether it will be an asset.
- Additional questions/issues:
 - A reasonable protocol for reporting greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources should be developed. Affected sources should not be required to report emissions from individual units within a stationary source if such emissions are insignificant. Affected stationary sources should have the option to report all of its greenhouse gas emissions in the aggregate.
 - Over 30 states have signed on to “The Climate Registry”. Does West Virginia intend on signing on? The rule indicates that West Virginia will have its own registry independent of “The Climate Registry”. Does DEP intend to rely upon any greenhouse gas registry programs, such as the Chicago Climate Exchange Registry, in developing the registry program?

APPENDIX B

FISCAL NOTE FOR PROPOSED RULES

Rule Title: Underground Storage Tanks (33 CSR 30)

Type of Rule: Legislative Interpretive Procedural

Agency: West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

Address: 601 57th Street S. E.
Charleston, WV 25304

Phone Number: (304) 926-0470 Email: mzeto@wvdep.org

Fiscal Note Summary

Summarize in a clear and concise manner what impact this measure will have on costs and revenues of state government.

The agency will incur costs associated with new provisions for training requirements for individuals who are responsible to operate, maintain and respond to emergency releases from underground storage tank systems. Full implementation is August 8, 2012 (FY 2013).

Fiscal Note Detail

Show over-all effect in Item 1 and 2 and, in Item 3, give an explanation of Breakdown by fiscal year, including long-range effect.

FISCAL YEAR			
Effect of Proposal	Current Increase/Decrease (use "--")	Next Increase/Decrease (use "--")	Fiscal Year (Upon Full Implementation)
1. Estimated Total Cost	0.00	0.00	8,400.00
Personal Services			6,048.00
Current Expenses			2,352.00
Repairs & Alterations			
Assets			
Other			
2. Estimated Total Revenues	0.00	0.00	8,400.00

Rule Title: _____

Rule Title: Underground Storage Tanks (33 CSR 30)

3. **Explanation of above estimates (including long-range effect):**
Please include any increase or decrease in fees in your estimated total revenues.

This estimate in increase of fees is based on the agency's review of 30 curriculums to meet the training requirements set forth in this proposed rule. This is based on an eight (8) hour review at \$35.00 per hour to address salary, benefits, and administrative costs for a total fee of \$280.00.

MEMORANDUM

Please identify any areas of vagueness, technical defects, reasons the proposed rule would not have a fiscal impact, and/or any special issues not captured elsewhere on this form.

The proposed rule addresses requirements imposed on states by the Federal Energy Act of 2005, which included secondary containment for new or replaced tanks or piping and fuel dispenser systems. The proposed rule also requests training for individuals who operate, maintain or are responsible to address emergencies from spills or releases from underground storage tank systems. The proposed rule also enables the agency to prevent deposit or delivery to a tank that is not in compliance.

Date: May 7, 2007

Signature of Agency Head or Authorized Representative

2007 JUL 26 PM 12: 52

TITLE 33
LEGISLATIVE RULES
~~DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION~~ VIRGINIA
~~OFFICE DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT~~ SECRETARY OF STATE

SERIES 30
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS

§33-30-1. General.

1.1. Scope. -- This legislative rule establishes regulations to govern the construction, installation, upgrading, use, maintenance, testing, and closure of underground storage tanks in this State.

1.2. Authority. -- W. Va. Code §22-17-6.

1.3. Filing Date. --

1.4. Effective Date. --

§33-30-2. Adoption of Federal Regulations.

2.1. Incorporation by Reference. -- The ~~director~~ secretary hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the provisions contained in 40 C.F.R. Part 280 as published in the Code of Federal Regulations on ~~May 1, 2000~~ May 1, 2007, with the following modifications:

2.1.a. The definition of "implementing agency" that appears in 40 C.F.R. §280.12 shall be deleted and replaced by "implementing agency means the West Virginia ~~division~~ department of environmental protection."

2.1.b. The provisions contained in 40 C.F.R. §280.20(e) shall be deleted and replaced by section 3 of this rule.

2.1.c. The provisions contained in 40 C.F.R. §280.22 shall be deleted and replaced by section 4 of this rule.

2.1.d. The phrase "section 9005 of Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended" that appears in 40 C.F.R. §280.34 shall be deleted and replaced by the phrase "W. Va. Code §22-17-13".

2.1.e. The provisions contained in 40 C.F.R. §280.34(a)(1) shall be deleted and replaced by "(1) notification in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this rule".

2.1.f. The provisions contained in appendices II and III of 40 C.F.R. Part 280 shall be deleted.

§33-30.3. Certification Requirements for Individuals Who Install, Repair, Retrofit, Upgrade, Perform Change-in-Service, Close, or Tightness Test Underground Storage Tank Systems or Install, Repair, Upgrade, or Test Corrosion Protection on Underground Storage Tank Systems.

3.1. Application of Requirements. -- The requirements of this section apply to individuals engaged in underground storage tank system installation, repair, retrofitting, upgrading, change-in-service, closure, tightness testing, or corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade or testing.

3.2. Certified Individual Required. -- No individual shall conduct an underground storage tank system installation, repair, retrofit, upgrade, change-in-service, closure, conduct a tightness test, or a corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade or test unless an individual present at the underground storage tank system site and exercising responsible supervisory control over the installation, repair, retrofit, upgrade, change-in-service, closure, tightness test, or corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade or test is currently certified by the ~~director~~ secretary in accordance with this section. The underground storage tank system owner and operator must ensure that the individual supervising the installation, repair, retrofitting, upgrade, change-in-service, closure, tightness testing and/or corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade or testing is certified by the ~~director~~ secretary in the applicable class for the activity performed. The certified individual is required to ensure that the underground storage tank system installation, repair, retrofit, upgrade, change-in-service, closure, tightness testing and/or corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade or testing is conducted in accordance with all applicable rules, regulations, and policies established by the ~~director~~ secretary.

3.2.a. An individual who holds a current certificate issued by the ~~director~~ secretary shall be present at all times during:

3.2.a.1. The installation process involving the preparation of the excavation immediately prior to receiving backfill and the tank, the setting of the tank and the piping (including placement of any anchoring devices), backfilling to the level of the tank, strapping, anytime during the installation in which piping components are connected, installation of corrosion protection either galvanic or impressed current when anodes are installed, electrical connections are made to the tank and anodes, and when the system is energized, all testing of the underground storage tank and piping performed during the installation, completion of the backfill and filling of the excavation, and installation of release detection devices within the excavation zone;

3.2.a.2. The repair, retrofitting or upgrading process involving the excavation of existing tanks and/or piping, the actual performance of repairs to the tank and/or piping, anytime during the process when components of the piping are connected, anytime during repair or upgrade of corrosion protection either galvanic or impressed current when anodes are installed, electrical connections are made to the tank and anodes, and when the system is energized, anytime during the repair process when the tank and/or associated piping are tested and at anytime during the process when equipment is connected to the tank and/or piping;

3.2.a.3. The tightness testing of tanks and/or piping;

3.2.a.4. The change-in-service or closure process involving the process of vapor removal, purging, inerting, cleaning and all subsurface sample collection events; and

3.2.a.5. The testing of a corrosion protection system either galvanic or impressed current.

3.3. Certification Categories. -- The underground storage tank system certificates issued by the ~~director~~ secretary will address the following categories:

3.3.a. A class A certificate will allow the individual certified to install, repair, retrofit or upgrade an underground storage tank system;

3.3.b. A class B certificate will allow the individual certified to perform a change-in-service or close an underground storage tank system;

3.3.c. A class C certificate will allow the individual certified to perform tank and/or piping tightness testing and to perform minor repairs and to disconnect and reconnect piping and equipment to an underground storage tank system as is necessary to perform the tightness test;

3.3.d. A class D certificate will allow the individual certified to install, repair, test or upgrade corrosion protection systems either galvanic or impressed current on an underground storage tank system; and

3.3.e. A class E certificate will allow the individual certified to conduct routine tests, system maintenance, and routine inspections on corrosion protection systems either galvanic or impressed current on an underground storage tank system.

3.4. Certification Requirements. -- An individual applying for a class A, class B, class C, class D and/or class E certificate must file a written application on a form supplied by the ~~director~~ secretary showing the ~~director~~ secretary that he or she meets the following requirements:

3.4.a. The applicant must be an individual. Businesses or corporations may not be certified;

3.4.b. The applicant need not be a resident of West Virginia;

3.4.c. The applicant shall demonstrate ethical practice. The demonstration shall consist of providing to the ~~director~~ secretary written statements from two (2) personal references and two (2) business references attesting to the applicant's ethical practices. In addition, the ~~director~~ secretary may conduct a police check and checks with other certification or licensing boards with which the applicant is registered to determine the nature of violations of federal, state or local laws and regulations relating to the applicant's performance in an ethical and competent manner. The ~~director~~ secretary may deny the applicant's certification based upon the documentary evidence obtained pursuant to this subdivision;

3.4.d. The applicant for class A, B, or C must demonstrate active participation in a minimum of ten (10) regulated underground storage tank system installations, repairs, retrofits, upgrades, performances of a change-in-service, closures, and/or tightness testing conducted after December 22, 1988, as is applicable to the class A, B and/or C certificate. An applicant who is a registered professional civil or mechanical engineer duly licensed by the State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers of West Virginia may substitute this license for the required experience for class A or class B;

3.4.d.1. Applicants shall provide the ~~director~~ secretary a listing of the work performed, site locations, and the names of the companies or employers for whom the work was performed;

3.4.d.2. Applicants for class C certification must submit proof of a current certification by the manufacturer of each tank and/or piping tightness test method that they will be using and must assure by a signed written statement filed with the ~~director~~ secretary that they will follow the current test protocol established by the manufacturer and policies established by the ~~director~~ secretary;

3.4.e. Applicants for class D must submit proof of a current certification level as at a minimum a corrosion technician by the National Association of Corrosion Engineers or an equivalent certification from another organization and must assure by a signed written statement that they will follow the West Virginia public service commission rule as adopted by reference Title 49, Parts 191-193 and Part 195 of the Pipeline Safety regulations regarding corrosion protection;

3.4.e.1. The applicant must prove that certification by an organization other than the National Association of Corrosion Engineers is equivalent to the National Association of Corrosion Engineers by submitting copies of the course of study for review;

3.4.f. Applicants for class E must submit proof of a current certification level as at a minimum a corrosion tester by the National Association of Corrosion Engineers or an equivalent certification from another organization and must assure by a signed written statement that they will follow the West Virginia public service commission rule as adopted by reference Title 49, Parts 191-193 and Part 195 of the Pipeline Safety regulations regarding corrosion protection;

3.4.f.1. The applicant must prove that certification by an organization other than the National Association of Corrosion Engineers is equivalent to the National Association of Corrosion Engineers by submitting copies of the course of study for review;

3.4.g. No applicant for class A, B, or C shall be issued a certificate unless he or she has successfully passed a written examination administered by the ~~director~~ secretary;

3.4.g.1. Examinations administered to applicants for certification shall be written, multiple choice examinations. The ~~director~~ secretary shall derive the questions used in the examination from standards, instructions, industry recommended practices and state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to underground storage tank system installation, repair, retrofitting, upgrading, change-in-service, closure, and tightness testing. The ~~director~~ secretary can make available to applicants alternative testing procedures;

3.4.g.2. The ~~director~~ secretary or persons designated by the ~~director~~ secretary shall conduct written examinations at such times and locations within the state as the ~~director~~ secretary may consider necessary;

3.4.g.3. Applicants for certification must correctly answer not less than 80 percent of the questions in a category of certification to qualify for that category of certification; and

3.4.g.4. No applicant may take an examination more than three (3) times within a twelve (12) month period. Applications are considered current for a period of one (1) year from the date they are received by the ~~director~~ secretary. After one (1) year, a new application must be filed and the examination fee paid;

3.4.h. At the time of the examination the applicant for class A, B, or C shall remit a nonrefundable \$75 fee by check or money order. This fee shall be deposited in the Underground Storage Tank Administrative Fund. A fee of \$35 shall be assessed for each retesting within the same year; and

3.4.i. Applicants for class D or E shall submit a nonrefundable application fee of \$75 by check or money order. This fee shall be deposited in the Underground Storage Tank Administrative Fund.

3.5. Certificate Expiration and Renewal. -- All certificates and certificate renewals expire December 31 of every second year. Applications for certificate renewal and payment of a nonrefundable renewal fee of \$50 must be submitted to the ~~director~~ secretary by November 1 of the year in which the certificate expires. An individual whose certificate has expired prior to his or her submission of an application for renewal is considered a new applicant for certification.

3.5.a. An individual may renew his or her certificate for another two (2) year period by:

3.5.a.1. Paying the renewal fee; and

3.5.a.2. Submitting on a form supplied by the ~~director~~ secretary a certificate renewal application demonstrating that he or she has completed sixteen (16) hours of ~~director~~ secretary approved continuing education training courses for each class and has participated in at least one (1) job applicable to the class of certification within the prior certification period:

3.5.a.2.A. The continuing education training course must be relevant to the subject area of installation, repair, retrofitting, upgrading, corrosion protection, change-in-service, closure, tightness testing or the regulation of underground storage tank systems as it relates to the category of certification and offer instruction on the most current generally acceptable technology or methods for these subjects; and

3.5.a.2.B. Applications for approval of specific training programs shall be submitted by the training provider to the ~~director~~ secretary in writing. The submissions shall contain a complete course outline, training material, sample certificates, the methodology for verifying attendance, the date, time and location of the course, the name of the offering organization, the credentials of the instructors, and a certification that the technology or methods that will be presented in the training program will satisfy state and federal laws governing underground storage tank system installation, repair, retrofitting, upgrading, corrosion protection, change-in-service, closure, or tightness testing; or

3.5.a.3. Submitting on a form supplied by the ~~director~~ secretary a certificate renewal application, demonstrating that he or she has participated in at least one (1) job applicable to the class of certification within the prior certification period and successfully passing the written examination described in sub-division 3.4.g. of this rule. At the time of the examination, the applicant applying for renewal must remit a nonrefundable \$50 fee by check or money order; and

3.5.b. Individuals certified in class C must submit a copy of their current certification by the manufacturer of each test method that they are and will be using. Individuals certified in class D or class E must submit a copy of their current certification by the National Association of Corrosion Engineers or another previously approved equivalent organization.

3.6. Identification Card. -- Upon issuance of the certification the ~~director~~ secretary shall issue an identification card to the successful applicant that shows the individual's name, social security number, certificate issuance date, certificate expiration date, certification number and the class of certification.

3.6.a. An individual who holds a current certificate shall present his or her identification card upon request by a representative of the ~~director~~ secretary or the owner or operator of the underground storage tank system for which an installation, repair, retrofit, upgrade, change-in-service, closure, tightness test or corrosion protection installation, repair, upgrade, or test is to be conducted.

3.7. Denial or Revocation of Certification. -- Should an applicant be denied issuance or renewal of certification or should the individual's certificate be revoked, the reason or reasons for the denial or revocation shall be set forth in writing to the individual by the ~~director~~ secretary.

3.7.a. Possible reasons for denial of issuance of certification, renewal of certification or revocation of certification may include, but are not limited to, failure to achieve a passing score on the written examination described in sub-division 3.4.g. of this rule, failure to submit required documentation, failure to follow the tank and/or piping tightness testing manufacturer's protocol and/or policies established by the ~~director~~ secretary, failure to follow West Virginia public service commission rules as adopted by reference Title 49, Parts 191 - 193 and Part 195 of the Pipeline Safety regulations regarding corrosion protection and/or policies established by the ~~director~~ secretary, previous revocation of certification held by the applicant, evidence of fraud or deceit with respect to the certification application, failure to present the identification card upon request of a

~~director's~~ secretary's representative, violations of the laws or rules of West Virginia, for ethical considerations enumerated in sub-division 3.4.c. of this rule, and/or any other cause that, in the opinion of the ~~director~~ secretary, constitutes adequate grounds for denial or revocation of a certificate.

3.7.b. An individual who has been denied issuance or renewal of certification or who has had a certificate revoked may appeal the action to the Environmental Quality Board pursuant to the provisions of WV Code §22-17-18.

3.8. Enforcement Action. -- Any individual who violates the provision of section 3 of this rule is subject to enforcement action under WV Code §22-17-1 et seq.

§33-30-4. Notification Requirements.

4.1. Notification. -- Except as provided in sub-division 4.1.a., 4.1.b., or 4.1.c. of this rule, the owner or operator of an underground storage tank system that was in the ground prior to May 1, 1990, must submit a notice of the existence of such tank system to the ~~director~~ secretary by completing the form prescribed by the ~~director~~ secretary.

4.1.a. The owner or operator of an underground storage tank system that was in the ground prior to May 1, 1990, is exempt from the notification requirements of subsection 4.1 of this rule if notice was previously given to the ~~director~~ secretary in accordance with the provisions of the federal Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 on the form published in the federal register on November 8, 1985 (50 F.R. 46602), unless such notice was given pursuant to section 103[©] of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

4.1.b. The owner or operator of an underground storage tank system that was removed from the ground on or before May 8, 1986, is exempt from the notification requirements of subsection 4.1 of this rule.

4.1.c. The owner or operator of an underground storage tank that was installed before December 22, 1988, need only complete sections I through X of the form prescribed in appendix I of this rule. Tank systems installed on or after December 22, 1988, must comply with the provisions of subsection 4.2 of this rule.

4.2. Notification of Compliance. -- All owners and operators of underground storage tank systems installed on or after December 22, 1988, must provide the ~~director~~ secretary, in addition to the provisions of sub-division 4.1.c. of this rule, notification of compliance with the following requirements:

4.2.a. For underground storage tank systems installed on or after December 22, 1988, and before January 1, 1995, installation of tanks and piping as certified under section XI of the form prescribed by the ~~director~~ secretary, excluding item B (installer certified or licensed by the implementing agency) under section 1 (installation) of part XI (certification of compliance).

4.2.b. For underground storage tank systems installed on or after January 1, 1995, installation of tanks and piping by an individual certified by the ~~director~~ secretary in accordance with section 3 of this rule.

4.2.c. Cathodic protection of steel tanks and piping in accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. §§280.20(a) and 280.20(b).

4.2.d. Spill and overfill prevention equipment in accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. §280.20[©].

4.2.e. Financial responsibility in accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. Part 280 Subpart H.

4.2.f. Release detection in accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. §§280.41 and 280.42.

4.3. Notification of Installation or Upgrade. -- All owners and operators of underground storage tank systems to be installed or upgraded must notify the ~~director~~ secretary in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to beginning the installation or upgrade. The thirty (30) day time period may be waived when such action is in response to a release from an existing UST system on the site.

4.4. Certification of Installation. -- All owners and operators of UST systems must ensure that:

4.4.a. When the system was installed on or after December 22, 1988, and before January 1, 1995, the installer certifies, in the notification form, that the methods used to install the tanks and piping comply with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. §280.20(d); and

4.4.b. When the system was installed on or after January 1, 1995, the installation of tanks and piping was performed by an individual certified by the ~~director~~ secretary in accordance with section 3 of this rule. The installer must certify in the notification form that the methods used to install the tanks and piping comply with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. 280.20(a) through (d).

4.5. Notification Requirements. -- An owner or operator who is required to submit notices under section 4 of this rule may provide notice for several tanks by using one notification form, but an owner of tanks located at more than one place of operation must file a separate notification form for each separate place of operation.

4.6. Notification to Purchaser. -- After June 10, 1988, any person who sells a tank intended to be used as an underground storage tank must notify the purchaser of the tank of the owner's notification obligations under section 4 of this rule. The following notice may be used to comply with the requirement:

"NOTICE: Owners of certain underground storage tanks in West Virginia are required by law to notify the ~~director~~ secretary of the ~~division~~ department of environmental protection of the existence of their tanks. Notifications for tanks brought into use after May 8, 1986, must be made within thirty (30) days. Consult the ~~division's~~ department's Underground Storage Tank Rule (33 C.S.R. 30) to determine if you must provide this notification."

4.6.a. After June 14, 1993, any person who sells an existing tank intended to be used as an underground storage tank must notify the ~~director~~ secretary in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to the transfer of ownership.

4.7. Notification of Change in Status. -- Except as provided in sub-division 4.6.a. of this rule, the owner or operator must report changes in the status of any underground storage tank system by completing the form prescribed by the ~~director~~ secretary and then submitting that form to the ~~director~~ secretary by December 31 of the year in which the change of status occurred.

4.7.a. A new owner of an underground storage tank must provide notification of the transfer of ownership of that tank by completing the form prescribed by the ~~director~~ secretary along with proof of financial responsibility in accordance with the provisions of 40 C.F.R. Part 280 Subpart H and must submit this information to the ~~director~~ secretary within thirty (30) days of the transfer.

§33-30-5. Secondary Containment Requirements, Release Prevention, and Release Detection .

5.1 Secondary Containment Requirements for New or Replaced Underground Tanks or Piping. – Each new or replaced tank or piping connected to any such new or replaced tank, including tanks or piping used for emergency power generation, must be secondarily contained and monitored for leaks.

5.1.a. The secondary containment shall apply only to the specific underground storage tank and piping being replaced and not to other underground storage tanks and connected pipes comprising such system.

5.1.b. The interstitial space shall be monitored in compliance with 40 C.F.R. §280.43(g).

5.1.c. The secondary containment system must be designed, constructed, and installed to:

5.1.c.1. Contain regulated substances released from the tank and piping system until they are detected and removed;

5.1.c.2. Prevent the release of regulated substances to the environment at any time during the operational life of the tank and piping system; and

5.1.c.3. Be checked for evidence of a release at least every 30 days.

5.1.d. The requirements of this subsection do not apply to suction piping that meets the requirements of 40 C.F.R. §280.41(b)(2)(I) or to piping that manifolds two or more tanks together.

5.2 Secondary Containment Requirements for New or Replaced Motor Fuel Dispenser Systems. – New or replaced motor fuel dispensers must have under-dispenser containment.

5.2.a. The motor fuel dispenser system shall include the equipment necessary to connect the system to the underground storage tank system such as check valves, shear valves, unburied risers or flexible connectors, or other transitional components that are beneath the dispenser and connect the dispenser to the underground piping.

5.2.b. The secondary containment must:

5.2.b.1. Be liquid-tight on its sides, bottom, and at any penetration;

5.2.b.2. Be compatible with the substance conveyed by the piping;

5.2.b.3. Allow for visual inspection and access to the components in the containment system and/or be monitored; and

5.2.b.4. Be liquid-tightness tested every three years.

5.3. Application of Secondary Containment Requirements. – These requirements do not apply to repairs meant to restore an underground storage tank, piping, or dispenser to operating condition.

~~§33-30-5. Carriers.~~ §33-30-6. Delivery Prohibition.

~~5.1.~~ 6.1. Proof of Compliance. -- Carriers (private, common, or for-hire) of regulated substances including any person who accepts a delivery order, accepts payment, delivers or deposits product into an underground storage tank shall not deliver regulated substances into an underground storage tank unless the division department has certified that the underground storage tank owner or operator is in compliance with the

requirements of: the Underground Storage Tank Fee Assessments (33 C.S.R. 31), notification requirements (33 C.S.R. 30 §4); and capitalization fee requirements (33 C.S.R. 32 §5) and the owner or operator presents proof of this certification along with proof of financial responsibility in compliance with 40 C.F.R. Part 280 Subpart H to the carrier.

6.2. Tank Eligibility for Delivery, Deposit, or Acceptance. – Carriers shall not deliver or deposit into an underground storage tank and an underground storage tank owner or operator shall not accept or allow delivery or deposit to an underground storage tank that the department has identified as ineligible to receive product. An underground storage tank is eligible under this subsection when in compliance with all of the following:

6.2.a. Required spill prevention equipment is installed and properly operated and maintained;

6.2.b. Required overfill protection equipment is installed and properly operated and maintained;

6.2.c. Required leak detection equipment is installed and properly operated and maintained;

6.2.d. Required corrosion protection equipment including a buried metal flexible connector is installed and properly operated and maintained; and

6.2.e. Required financial responsibility is maintained.

6.3. Notification of Ineligibility – The department shall notify the owner or operator in writing that an underground storage tank is ineligible to accept deposit or delivery and may affix a tag, notice, or locking device to the underground storage tank until compliance with the requirements under subsection 6.2 is achieved.

6.3.a. The department may choose to classify an underground storage tank as ineligible to receive product but then authorize delivery in an emergency situation.

5.2. 6.4. Enforcement. -- Any carrier, owner, or operator who violates the provision of subsection 5.1 6.1., 6.2., or 6.3. of this rule is subject to enforcement action under WV Code §22-17-1 et seq.

§33-30-7. Training Requirements for Individuals Who Operate, Maintain, or Are Responsible for Addressing Emergencies Presented by Spills or Releases from an Underground Storage Tank System.

7.1. Applicability of Requirements. – The requirements of this section apply to:

7.1.a. Individuals who have primary responsibility for on-site operation and maintenance of underground storage tank systems;

7.1.b. Individuals who have daily on-site responsibility for the operation and maintenance of underground storage tank systems; and

7.1.c. Daily on-site employees who have primary responsibility for addressing emergencies presented by a spill or release from an underground storage tank system.

7.2. Effective Date of Training Requirements.

7.2.a. Beginning August 8, 2012, those individuals who meet the requirements of subsection 7.1.a. or 7.1.b. must have received the required training within thirty days after assuming operation and maintenance responsibilities at the underground storage tank system;

7.2.b. Beginning August 8, 2012, those individuals who meet the requirements of subsection 7.1.c. must have received the required training before assuming responsibility for responding to emergencies;

7.2.c. Beginning August 8, 2012, those individuals who meet the requirements of subsection 7.1.a., 7.1.b., or 7.1.c. shall repeat the required training if their underground storage tank systems are determined by the department to be out of compliance.

7.3. Approval of Required Training.

7.3.a. Training for individuals who meet the requirements of subsection 7.1.a., 7.1.b., or 7.1.c. must receive prior approval by the department.

7.3.a.1. Applications for approval of specific training programs shall be submitted by the training provider to the secretary in writing. The submissions shall contain a complete course outline, training material, sample certificates, the methodology for verifying attendance, the date, time and location of the course, the name of the offering organization, the credentials of the instructors, and a certification that the technology or methods that will be presented in the training program will satisfy state and federal laws; and

7.3.a.2. Applicants for approval of training programs shall submit a nonrefundable application fee of \$280 by check or money order. This fee shall be deposited in the Underground Storage Tank Administrative Fund.

7.3.b. The approved training may include in-class, on-line, or hands-on training.

7.3.c. The approved training must include an evaluation designed to measure all aspects of the individual's knowledge and skills to be competent to operate underground storage tank systems.

7.4. Proof of Required Training.

7.4.a. The training provider must provide the individual and the department with a certificate of training documenting the level of training received.

7.4.b. Individuals who meet the requirements of subsection 7.1.a., 7.1.b., or 7.1.c. shall demonstrate that they have received the required training by providing a copy of the training certificate to the department upon request.

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF MINING AND RECLAMATION

IN THE MATTER OF:

PROPOSED RULE 33CSR30

Underground Storage Tanks

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had or testimony of adduced pursuant to the West Virginia Rules of Civil Procedure in the above-entitled action, on the 11th day of July, 2007, commencing at 6:36 p.m. and concluding at 6:44 p.m., at the office of the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, 601 57th Street, S.E., Charleston, Kanawha County, West Virginia, pursuant to notice to all interested parties.

BEFORE: DIANA HAID, Public Information Office

ORIGINAL

NANCY MCNEALY
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
Post Office Box 13415
Charleston, West Virginia 25360-0415
(304) 988-2873 FAX (304) 988-1419

APPEARANCES: GIL SATTLER, Environmental Enforcement
PAM NIXON, Environmental Advocate
MIKE ZETO, Environmental Enforcement
PAUL GEBHARD, Verizon WV

I N D E X

Reporter's Certificate.....Page 11

1 MS. HAID: Good evening. My name is
2 Diana Haid, and I work with the Public Information Office.
3 Welcome to the DEP and the public hearing to discuss the
4 2008 Proposed Legislative Rule No. 33CSR30, Underground
5 Storage Tanks.

6 Please make sure that you have signed in
7 and indicated if you are going to make a comment. Comments
8 shall be limited to the proposed revisions to the rule.
9 Copies of the rules are available from the Secretary of
10 State's Office or from the DEP webpage at
11 [www.WVDEP.org/2008 Rules](http://www.WVDEP.org/2008_Rules).

12 We are here this evening to listen to
13 comments and questions and include them in the official
14 record. Written comments must be submitted to the West
15 Virginia Department of Environmental Protection Public
16 Information Office at 601 57th Street, S.E., Charleston,
17 West Virginia, 25304. Comments may also be e-mailed to
18 Comments@WVDEP.org.

19 The meeting is being recorded, and the
20 comment period will end at the conclusion of the hearing.
21 Right now I'd like to introduce Gil Sattler to come and
22 give a summary of the rule.

23 MS. SATTLER: This legislative rule establishes
24 regulations to govern the construction, installation,

1 upgrading, use, maintenance, testing, enclosure of
2 underground storage tanks in this state. Comments or
3 questions?

4 MS. HAID: We have a comment from Paul
5 Gebhard with Verizon.

6 MR. GEBHARD: Correct.

7 MS. HAID: Okay, go ahead.

8 MR. GEBHARD: Gil, I'd like to refer to 33-30-
9 5.2, which is page 8 on my copy. Secondary Containment
10 Requirements for New or Replaced Motor Fuel Dispenser
11 Systems, New or Replaced Motor Fuel Dispensers. My
12 question is very simple. Will this pertain to existing
13 underground storage tanks?

14 MS. SATTLER: Only if they replace that part of
15 the system.

16 MR. GEBHARD: Okay.

17 MS. SATTLER: If they take the piping out and
18 the new piping will have to meet.

19 MR. GEBHARD: Meet that requirement?

20 MS. SATTLER: Right.

21 MR. GEBHARD: And that would be effective in
22 2012?

23 MS. SATTLER: No. This would be -- become
24 effective when the regs become effective and so amendments

1 --

2 MR. GEBHARD: So if it was --

3 MS. SATTLER: So it would be --

4 MR. GEBHARD: July of --

5 MS. SATTLER: Yes, when it goes to the
6 Legislature for this year, then it would be this summer.

7 MR. GEBHARD: So it would be July of '08 then?

8 MS. SATTLER: It's the training requirements is
9 not until 2012.

10 MR. GEBHARD: All right. I had another
11 question and it is regarding the training which is 33-30-7
12 or dash seven. It's a very basic question and I understand
13 in Section 7.1 Applicability of these Requirements. My
14 question is more of a question from a practical standpoint.

15 Verizon operates a facility that is what I
16 call an unattended facility; that is, we have a dispenser
17 island and tanks there, but from a practical standpoint,
18 it's a self-dispensing facility and when I go through the
19 requirements, it talks about primary responsibility for on-
20 site operations, daily on-site responsibility, primary
21 responsibility for addressing emergencies. I'm trying to
22 understand how the agency would look at a site like that in
23 terms of how we would potentially select the person or
24 persons to address this?

1 MS. SATTLER: Yes, it's possible that one
2 person would be all of three of these.

3 MR. GEBHARD: Could be three?

4 MS. SATTLER: Yes.

5 MR. GEBHARD: Here's my question. I have the
6 responsibility for emergency response, but it talks about
7 daily on-site. So the context of this is such that you're
8 looking for someone who is actually going to be there. Is
9 that correct?

10 MS. SATTLER: Well, it's going to be whoever is
11 responsible. You've got someone who is responsible for
12 checking that site, right, even though they're not there
13 all the time.

14 MR. GEBHARD: Correct.

15 MS. SATTLER: So it would be that person.

16 MR. GEBHARD: So --

17 MS. SATTLER: It's not saying that somebody has
18 to be there every minute. It's just saying somebody is
19 responsible for it.

20 MR. GEBHARD: Okay, and that is part of my
21 question. So your understanding would be that it doesn't
22 have to be a full-time --

23 MS. SATTLER: Right.

24 MR. GEBHARD: -- on-site person. It has to be

1 someone that is responsible for the operation?

2 MS. SATTLER: Right.

3 MR. GEBHARD: Who would have the responsibility
4 of these different functions?

5 MS. SATTLER: Right.

6 MR. GEBHARD: Okay. And then based on that
7 individual, the training would be a requirement, which has
8 to be met by August 8th, 2012?

9 MS. SATTLER: Right.

10 MR. GEBHARD: Does the agency, do they
11 contemplate providing this training?

12 MS. SATTLER: No, not at this point, no.

13 MR. GEBHARD: Will they provide guidance for
14 what this training should encompass?

15 MS. SATTLER: Yeah, what we have -- see, we
16 don't have the final guidance document from EPA on this.

17 MR. GEBHARD: Okay.

18 MS. SATTLER: So once they come out with it,
19 then these always could be amended to take that in.

20 MR. GEBHARD: Okay.

21 MS. SATTLER: Right now it's just the draft
22 that's out there.

23 MR. GEBHARD: All right.

24 MS. SATTLER: And this is what this is written

1 from. So these could be changed some before it actually
2 becomes effective.

3 MR. GEBHARD: Okay.

4 MS. SATTLER: And there should be more
5 direction on it, what we should do.

6 MR. GEBHARD: Do you contemplate that change
7 before it goes to the Legislature next year?

8 MS. SATTLER: No.

9 MR. GEBHARD: So you're speaking in terms of
10 after -- if this was passed by the Legislature, then you'd
11 go back for additional revisions to this?

12 MS. SATTLER: Yeah, we could. Not this year
13 but later years before 2012.

14 MR. GEBHARD: Okay. So I want to be clear.
15 The agency itself will not conduct the training, but it's
16 my understanding that the agency will provide guidance as
17 to what that training will encompass?

18 MS. SATTLER: Yeah. Well, just within the EPA
19 guidance there will be guidance right there and we'll just
20 be adopting that basically.

21 MR. GEBHARD: Will that training have to be
22 conducted by someone who's certified or licensed?

23 MS. SATTLER: They don't have to be, but the
24 training program itself has to be approved. So you would

1 have a basic training program that gets approved by us and
2 then you have your trainer that goes out and does it. You
3 don't have to get him approved every time they're going to
4 go out. If they went to Logan one day, that's just the
5 same class being taught in several places.

6 MR. GEBHARD: Right.

7 MS. SATTLER: So this isn't individual
8 applications for every time you're going to do it.

9 MR. GEBHARD: Okay.

10 MS. SATTLER: So you just have the approval for
11 all of them and then they go -- the person will take care
12 of it. There's going to be internet training, so somebody
13 -- when it's approved, somebody could go on the internet.
14 PEI has already got some training out there for people.
15 So, you know, there's going to be a lot of different --
16 hopefully, be a lot of different options they can --

17 MR. GEBHARD: Okay, that's -- you've answered
18 my questions. Thank you.

19 MS. HAID: Thank you, Gil. Thank you, Mr.
20 Gebhard. We have no more comments or questions so that
21 will be the conclusion of our hearing.

(WHEREUPON, the hearing was closed.)

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF MINING AND RECLAMATION


STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF KANAWHA, to wit:

I, **NANCY MCNEALY**, Certified Verbatim Reporter and Commissioner of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is, to the best of my skill and ability, a true and accurate transcript of all the proceedings as set forth in the caption hereof.

Given under my hand this 11th day of July, 2007.

My commission expires November 26, 2010.




Certified Verbatim Reporter

From: <Cassidy.Joanne@epamail.epa.gov>
To: <mzeto@wvdep.org>, <tfisher@wvdep.org>, <gsattler@wvdep.org>
Date: 7/23/2007 9:24:36 AM
Subject: Comments on Draft Regulations

EPA appreciates the opportunity to comment on WVDEP's draft regulations for the delivery prohibition, secondary containment and operator training provisions of the Energy Act:

Delivery Prohibition

If WV intends to hold carriers responsible for delivering to an ineligible tank, then it needs to include a mechanism to inform the carriers that a tank is ineligible. Section 6.3 should be revised to explicitly include affixing a tag, notice, or locking device to the underground storage tank until compliance with the requirements is achieved. This provides notice to the owner and operator and the deliverer that the tank is ineligible. In Section 6.3, we suggest that the word "may" be deleted or replaced with the word "shall". Currently, WV does not have the authority to seek a civil penalty from a deliverer right away. It appears that a change in the WV Code would be necessary for this.

The following items are missing from the draft regulations and could be established through Agency policy:

Timeframes for classifying a tank as ineligible for delivery--the regulations list the violations that trigger ineligibility but they do not specify whether delivery is prohibited immediately, within 7 days, etc.

Process for reclassifying an ineligible tank as eligible once the violations have been addressed, e.g. the owner or operator would submit a letter to the department saying that the tank is now in compliance with all the requirements, and then the department would issue a new letter of eligibility after an inspection and verification of compliance.

Secondary Containment

WVDEP should clarify when a repair becomes a replacement for piping. WV should clarify that new piping connected to a new dispenser at an existing facility would require secondary containment. Does WVDEP have comparable enforcement authorities for secondary containment requirements as for current UST requirements?

Operator Training

Section 7.2.c. does not limit those that need to repeat the required training to those that have management responsibilities for tanks that are out of compliance. WV's draft regulations appear to impose the retraining requirement on all, which is a bit broader than the federal requirement. WV may want to add language about management responsibilities to this provision (section 7.2.c.) to make it clearer.

If you have any questions regarding EPA's comments, please contact me.
Thanks.

Joanne Cassidy
US EPA Region III
Phone: 215/814-3381
Fax: 215/814-3163
E-mail: cassidy.joanne@epa.gov

CC: <Burgos.Hilda@epamail.epa.gov>, <Roberts.Timothy-P@epamail.epa.gov>, <Pizarro.Luis@epamail.epa.gov>, <lacono.David@epamail.epa.gov>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS – 33SCR30

DEP notes that U.S. EPA's comments were received after the close of the official public comment period. Generally speaking, the State Administrative Procedures Act at W.Va. Code Chapter 29A-3-5 prohibits the agency from considering comments filed after the comment period and characterizes such comments as "ex parte." However, due to the fact that the U.S. EPA is in the unique position of having authority to approve or disapprove the State's program, the DEP believes EPA's comments should be treated differently from other interested parties and its comments considered before the DEP files its rules with the Secretary of State and the Legislative Rulemaking Review Committee.

COMMENTS: EPA REGION 3, Joanne Cassidy

COMMENT A: *Delivery Prohibition*

RESPONSE A. The rule is written to provide the department options on what type of notification mechanism it will attach to the underground storage tank. Any necessary enforcement action against a deliverer will be implemented in the same manner as carrier rule violations have been dealt with since 1991.

COMMENT B. *The following items are missing from the draft regulations and could be established through Agency policy. –*

RESPONSE B. The department already plans to implement the specifics of the delivery prohibition through department policy.

COMMENT C. *Secondary Containment*

RESPONSE C. The department plans to have a written policy on when a repair becomes a replacement for piping. The rule specifies that new piping must have secondary containment therefore to specifically say that new piping connected to a new dispenser requires secondary containment would be redundant.

COMMENT D *Operator Training*

RESPONSE D. As of this date, EPA has not submitted final guidance on the requirements for operator training. This section of the rule is not required to be fulfilled until August 8, 2012. Prior to that date the final guidance from EPA should be available and amendments to this rule may be necessary.