

Revision to 7 DE Admin Code 1124 Sections 26 (Stage I) and 36 (Stage II)

2019-05-08 Review Committee Meeting

Committee Meeting Summary

1. List of attendants (Attachment 1: Signed up sheet)

Tom Ruszin,	Royal Farms,	truszin@royalfarms.com
Glenn D'Antuono,	Speedway LLC,	gdantuono@speedway.com
Richard Negrete,	GPM Investments,	rnegrete@gpminvestments.com
John Oiko,	PMG,	Joiko@PetroMG.com
Bill Logue,	Tanknology	wlogue@tanknology.com
Kirk McCauley,	WMDA/CAR,	kmccauley@wmda.net
Paul Hyfschmidt,	Service Energy,	paul@serviceenergy.com
Sandy Carl,	Crompco,	Sandra.Carl@crompco.com
Josh Worth,	Wawa,	joshua.m.worth@wawa.com
Mark Devey,	UST Services,	mdevey@ustservicescorp.com
Steve Stookey,	Southern MD Oil,	SStookey@twgi.net
Mark Baker,	Baker Petroleum,	Mark@wilsonbaker.com
Frank Gao,	DAQ-DNREC,	Frank.Gao@delaware.gov
Jim Coverdale,	DAQ-DNREC,	James.Coverdale@delaware.gov
Valerie Gray,	DAQ-DNREC,	Valerie.Gray@delaware.gov
Pete Rollo,	TMS-DNREC,	Peter.Rollo@delaware.gov
Eileen Butler,	TMS-DNREC,	Eileen.Butler@delaware.gov
Michael Moyer,	TMS-DNREC,	Michael.Moyer@delaware.gov

2. DAQ presentation

- DAQ staff provided an overview of the background, the current regulations and the challenges that would need to be addressed. (Attachment 2: DAQ presentation)
- Two major issues were discussed:
 - How to solve the Stage II-ORVR incompatibility problem, and
 - How to ensure gas stations' USTs to remain vapor-tight.

3. Discussions and results

In summary, agreements were reached on the following:

- 1) Decommissioning Stage II should be the solution for DE to solve the "incompatibility" problem.
- 2) Decommissioning should follow PEI procedures and TMS' check list.
- 3) CPM should be kept as one of two testing options in the new revision.
- 4) Stage I EVR should be a solution for the UST vapor-tight issue. However, industry representatives asked for flexibility of installation timing, and in particular, suggested:

- a. The industry should be allowed to install Stage I EVR at decommissioning or on a later date;
- b. The later date could be 5-6 years after promulgation of the new revision, and DAQ could set up that deadline.

Other issues discussed included:

- 1) ECO nozzles and impermeable hoses currently required in some other OTR states (e.g., NJ). DAQ stated that it would not consider requiring these parts in the new revision, due to the limited environmental benefit derived from them, and high initial and maintenance cost associated with them.
- 2) The possibility of component interchange between EVR systems under different CARB Executive Orders.
 - a. Industry representatives stated that other OTR states (MA, RI and NJ) permitted interchange of components under different CARB orders. The industry representatives suggested that DE follow the same approach.
 - b. DAQ informed the committee that it was aware of the situation in OTR and agreed to continue to research this approach.

4. Action items

- DAQ will provide the committee a summary of this meeting by May 15.
- DAQ will research the EVR component interchange approach, and seek information from other OTR states as well as from CARB.
- DAQ requests the committee members send additional comments and information on EVR component interchange, and further suggestions if any on decommission compliance schedule by May 29 via email to:
DNREC_1124_Regulations@Delaware.gov

5. Next step

- The second committee meeting is scheduled on June 12 from 10 am to 12 noon, at State Street Commons (100 W. Water Str.), Dover.