


L.U.S.T.LINE



A Report On Federal & State Programs To Control Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

THE TROUBLE WITH TRUCK STOPS

(and Other High-Throughput Fueling Facilities)



By Marcel Moreau

The other day I spotted a tractor-trailer rig with a message on the side that caught my eye. It said, "You need it? It's in here." This message has often been stated another way, "America's needs move by truck." For better or for worse, these statements are no exaggeration. When was the last time you saw a Wal-Mart SuperCenter or a Home Depot or a Target or any other stadium-sized store located near a railroad track or a ship docking facility? The fact is that America's trucking industry is a cornerstone of our economy and our culture.

And all those trucks bringing all those goods within convenient reach of all our homes, guzzle oceans of diesel fuel that is dispensed at a relatively small number of fueling facilities. In 2004, U.S. vehicles consumed 37.3 billion gallons of diesel fuel. According to the National Association of Truckstop Operators (NATSO) website, three-quarters of this diesel fuel is pumped through facilities owned by their members. The average volume of fuel pumped at a typical large-scale NATSO facility is a million gallons per month. A throughput of a million gallons a month means that on average a facility pumps better than 33,000 gallons a day, or about 1,400 gallons an hour, or about 23 gallons each minute of every day.

The leak detection implications of these massive truck stop throughputs were the topic of a workshop presented by Steve Purpora of Purpora Engineering, LLC at this year's National Tanks Conference in San Antonio. Steve's dad, Bill, essentially founded the tank and piping testing industry in the U.S. back in the early 1970s and became the undisputed master of his trade. Steve began his career in UST testing at the tender age of eight and is passionate about leak detection. "Everybody can see that there's a huge potential for problems at truck stops," says Steve, "but because there are no simple answers, most

■ *continued on page 2*

Inside

- 4 Continual Reconciliation Applications for Active Fueling Facilities
- 6 Florida's Leak Autopsy Study
- 8 Impact of Ethanol on Natural Attenuation of BTEX and MtBE
- 12 Results of NEIWPC's 2006 Survey of State Tank Programs
- 16 Two Years After the Energy Policy Act
- 17 Field Notes - PEI/RP600
- 18 FAQs from the NWGLDE-CITLDSs
- 19 STI-Labeled UST Warranty to be Reduced to 10 Years
- 20 Energy Policy Act Update

■ Trouble with Truck Stops from page 1

everyone is content to be whistling Dixie and crossing their fingers. I can tell you from personal knowledge that this strategy is not working.”

The problem is that this kind of very-high-volume-virtually-non-stop throughput leaves little time for leak detection. And because flowing fuel equals cash flow, there is little desire to interrupt fuel dispensing to allow leak detection to occur. And the fact is that traditional leak-detection methods are woefully inadequate to do their job in these high-throughput systems. Let's look at available leak-detection methods to find out why.

Leak-Detection Methods in a High-Throughput Environment

■ Inventory

A new facility less than 10 years old might still be able to use inventory control plus tightness testing every 5 years for leak detection. But with a million gallons of throughput, a vari-

ance of 10,000 gallons “passes” the federal standard of 1 percent of throughput plus 130 gallons. Clearly, though it may be legal, inventory control is not going to be protective of the environment at this level of throughput.

■ Automatic Tank Gauging (ATG)

Truck-stop tanks are never shut down at night and most are manifolded together, so ATGs that conduct periodic tests don't qualify as a leak-detection method. ATGs that conduct “continuous” testing still require quiet intervals when there is no pumping activity in order to gather the data required to conclude that a tank is tight or leaking. At throughputs of more than just a few hundred thousand gallons per month, however, these types of tank gauges typically do not have enough quiet time to do their leak-detection job. While ATGs can definitely help improve the quality of inventory data, at high-volume sites, they can serve no acceptable leak-detection function.

■ Statistical Inventory Reconciliation (SIR)

Traditional SIR methods rely on about 30 data points gathered on a daily basis to determine whether a leak is present. The SIR evaluation protocol does not put a throughput limit on the applicability of a SIR method as the continuous ATG protocol does. It would be foolish to conclude from this, however, that a SIR method can be used at a facility no matter how high the throughput. I do not see how a SIR method can reliably detect a 150-gallon loss in a million gallons of sales (that's 0.015 percent of the sales volume) using only 30 data points.

There is a more recently developed “real-time” SIR that can automatically gather thousands of data points by taking “snapshots” of the fueling activity at a site. One vendor of this approach has been certified for throughputs of up to 2.7 million gallons. This approach has promise, especially because it offers facility owners a means of keeping much tighter control over their fuel inventories and thus offers business advantages as well as leak detection.

SIR methods alone will not do the complete job of piping leak detection at a truck-stop facility. Truck

stops typically have satellite fuel dispensers that allow tanks on both sides of a truck to be fueled simultaneously in a single sales transaction. Satellite dispensers are typically connected to the master dispenser via a relatively short length of underground piping. Inventory-based methods of leak detection do not see any leakage that may occur after the fuel has passed through the metering mechanism in the master dispenser. Thus, no inventory or SIR-based method of leak detection can be used for leak detection on satellite-dispenser piping.

■ Secondary Containment

Secondary containment with interstitial monitoring is one of the few methods of leak detection whose efficacy is not affected by throughput and could realistically be expected to meet regulatory requirements for monthly leak detection. However, many existing truck stops do not have secondary containment. Replacing existing storage systems is a costly proposition, and not just because of the huge storage capacity and the extensive piping network required for the new system. The cost of interrupting the fueling operations in terms of lost profit as well as the loss of customers to competing facilities during the construction of the new storage system is likely to dwarf the cost of the storage system itself.

■ Soil-Vapor Monitoring

Diesel fuel is not nearly as volatile as gasoline, so soil-vapor monitoring is not a particularly sensitive method for detecting diesel-fuel leaks. Because fuel storage and dispensing systems at truck stops are spread out over a large area, it would also require a multitude of sampling points to achieve effective leak detection. Existing contamination at many sites could also pose problems in detecting new releases.

■ Groundwater Monitoring

The biggest restriction on groundwater monitoring is that it is only acceptable where the groundwater is less than 20 feet from the ground surface. Because of its questionable effectiveness in detecting releases and the difficulties encountered in distinguishing new leaks from old, groundwater monitoring is hardly anybody's favorite method of leak detection. Like soil-vapor monitoring,



L.U.S.T.Line

Ellen Frye, *Editor*
Ricki Pappo, *Layout*

Marcel Moreau, *Technical Adviser*

Patricia Ellis, Ph.D., *Technical Adviser*

Ronald Poltak, *NEIWPCC Executive Director*

Lynn DePont, *EPA Project Officer*

LUSTLine is a product of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC). It is produced through a cooperative agreement (#T-830380-01) between NEIWPCC and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

LUSTLine is issued as a communication service for the Subtitle I RCRA Hazardous & Solid Waste Amendments rule promulgation process.

LUSTLine is produced to promote information exchange on UST/LUST issues. The opinions and information stated herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of NEIWPCC.

This publication may be copied.
Please give credit to NEIWPCC.

NEIWPCC was established by an Act of Congress in 1947 and remains the oldest agency in the Northeast United States concerned with coordination of the multimedia environmental activities of the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

NEIWPCC
116 John Street
Lowell, MA 01852-1124
Telephone: (978) 323-7929
Fax: (978) 323-7919
lustline@neiwppc.org



LUSTLine is printed on Recycled Paper

effectively monitoring an entire truck-stop fueling facility would also require an extensive network of wells.

■ Tightness Testing

Few facilities use inventory control plus tightness testing as a method of tank leak detection today. Tightness testing primarily plays a role in the annual testing plus line-leak-detection option for pressurized-piping leak detection. The biggest obstacle here is cost—not the cost of the actual tightness test but the cost of business lost during the time required to set up and conduct the test.

Few truck-stop designers had the foresight to design a facility so that a portion of the dispensers could be shut down while the rest continued to operate. “Truck-stop designers apparently never heard that saying about ‘putting all your eggs in one basket,’” says Steve Purpora. “So when something breaks down, the whole system is down and there’s a huge rush to get pumping again. Checking for leaks to be sure the work has been done right is not even a consideration.”

This philosophy places great pressure on the piping and distribution system to operate non-stop, because taking the time for maintenance, minor repairs (even of small leaks), and testing is unacceptably expensive due to the lost income from the interruption of sales.

Consequently, if tightness testing is done, facility operators want the testing to be conducted at night and they want it done fast to minimize costs and inconvenience to customers. While this is all very understandable, it puts substantial pressure on tightness testers to be quick rather than accurate. “And,” adds Steve Purpora, “tired testers working in the dark around tired truckers driving enormous rigs is hardly the ideal situation from a safety perspective.”

■ Line-Leak Detectors

Perhaps the biggest deficiency associated with truck-stop leak detection is the lack of line-leak detection on the pressurized piping. Remember that the regulatory definition of line-leak detector is “a device that can detect a leak rate of 3 gallons per hour at a pressure of 10 psi within one hour.” All line-leak detectors, whether mechanical or electronic, require that

the pump be cycled either from off to on (mechanical LLDs) or on to off (electronic LLDs) in order to conduct a test. At a facility where the pumps remain on for many hours at a time (at many facilities the pumps may not shut down for days at a time) the line-leak-detection requirement is not met because the pumps do not shut down on an hourly basis. If a sizable leak were to develop in a truck-stop piping system, it could very likely not be detected by a line-leak detector until many hours had passed.

Truck stops stretch the limits of LLDs in other regards as well. The volume of the extensive, large-diameter piping runs may easily exceed the volume-limit restrictions on the line-leak detector as determined by the third-party evaluation. In addition, if the lengthy piping runs are sloped uniformly towards the tanks, the tanks may end up buried many feet below grade. For mechanical LLDs, this could create a scenario where the static head pressure produced by the product in the pipe would be sufficient to prevent the LLD from ever “tripping” and detecting a leak. (See *LUSTline* #29, “Of Blabbermouths & Tattletales – The Life & Times of Line Leak Detectors” for a more detailed discussion of this issue.)

While in some jurisdictions, double-walled piping with continuously monitored sensors in tank-top and dispenser sumps might be acceptable as line-leak detectors, this is not a position that I am particularly fond of. But given existing technology and the realities of truck-stop operations, this may well be the best that can be done to meet line-leak-detection requirements.

■ 0.2 Gallon per Hour Monthly Testing

Single-walled piping systems are increasingly using the automated 0.2 gph leak-detection capability of most electronic LLDs to meet the monthly piping leak-detection requirements. These tests require the temperature of the product in the piping to be stable in order for the test to be accurate, so most devices conducting this type of testing require a 30-minute or so period of no dispensing before they can run the test. Thirty-minute quiet periods are virtually nonexistent at truck stops, and so electronic LLDs cannot be relied upon to meet leak-

detection requirements by conducting monthly 0.2-gph tests.

The Bottom Line

Because of their extraordinary throughputs and extensive piping systems, truck stops present time-based and physics-based challenges to effective leak detection. While secondary containment with interstitial monitoring may be the most-likely-to-succeed method of leak detection, few regulatory agencies have the clout to force existing single-walled facilities to upgrade to secondary containment.

While it is true that the federal Energy Policy Act may by default impose secondary containment on most of the nation’s new storage systems, this is a double-edged sword. The increased replacement cost of new storage systems means that owners will keep their existing single-walled storage systems in service as long as possible. And because most state regulations have no mandatory retirement age for storage systems, “as long as possible” means until the storage system can be proven to be leaking. Coupled with the ineffectiveness of leak detection in detecting leaks, this is not a comforting prospect.

Real-time inventory analysis could provide leak detection relief for many facilities with throughputs less than 2.7 million gallons a month, while providing fuel-management benefits like verifying delivery volumes and checking the calibration of meters. Real-time inventory analysis may provide the least objectionable pathway for single-walled storage systems to achieve compliance with monthly leak-detection requirements. Keep in mind, however, that leak detection for satellite piping would still need to be addressed. Line-leak-detection requirements remain problematic under any leak-detection scenario that I can think of.

In the meantime, Steve Purpora is promoting a campaign of awareness and incremental improvement. “People need to know that just because the rest rooms at a high-volume facility are clean doesn’t mean that everything below ground is hunky-dory. Regulators need to pay more attention to truck stops and not be intimidated by their size or

■ continued on page 4

■ Trouble with Truck Stops

from page 3

their complexity. Truck-stop operators need to be made aware of their responsibilities and have their feet held to the fire. At a minimum," continues Steve, "a detailed annual inspection, in daylight, should be conducted and fines assessed just like for any other noncompliant facility."

Our High-Throughput Challenge

The continuing increase in our nation's fuel consumption (we used 2 billion more gallons of diesel fuel in 2004 than 2003, and 2.5 billion more gallons of gasoline), together with the dramatic reduction in the number of fuel-storage systems since the onset of the federal tank rules has produced a substantial increase in the throughput volume of the "typical" storage system. As this trend of increasing throughput continues, the leak-detection methods formulated for the storage systems of the 1980s will be stretched to their effective limits at an increasing number of sites. While leak-detection issues associated with high throughput are most obvious at truck stops, they are present in a growing number of today's convenience stores as well.

So my crystal ball is as fuzzy as ever, but I see in its misty depths a growing need for "next-generation" leak-detection methods like real-time SIR and pressure-/vacuum-based interstitial monitoring, as is now required for new facilities in California, to meet the leak-detection challenges of today's (and tomorrow's) high-throughput fueling facilities. ■

NOTE: Curt Johnson chaired a session at the National Tank Conference in San Antonio entitled "Leak Detection — The Next Generation" that provided much interesting information on the state-of-the-art of leak detection. For a copy of the slides presented during this session of the conference, go to: <http://www.neiwpcc.org/tanks07/presentations/LeakDetectionSession-All-Handouts.pdf>

Marcel Moreau is a nationally recognized petroleum storage tank specialist, whose column "Tank-nically Speaking" is a regular feature of LUSTLine. He can be reached at marcel.moreau@juno.com

Continual Reconciliation Applications for Active Fueling Facilities

by William P. Jones

While the population of regulated USTs has dropped dramatically since storage tank rules were first published in 1988, there has been a major trend in the retail petroleum industry toward the development of high-throughput fueling facilities. Hypermarket fueling stations with customers at each dispenser, convenience stores active at all hours of the day, and travel centers with delivery transports lined up to make their drops are now a common sight. The fueling public is drawn to these facilities because of their competitive fuel prices. The business model that supports these complex operations relies upon moving large amounts of fuel products on thin margins.

Naturally, operation of these high-tempo sites imposes wear and tear on fueling equipment. From a leak-detection standpoint, the concern is whether product containment has been compromised in the face of all this activity. (See "The Trouble with Truck Stops..." page 1.) From a business perspective, costly fuel-inventory losses can take place at active sites because of problems with meters drifting out of calibration or improper blending ratios, theft at the dispenser or upon delivery, or the effects of temperature fluctuations.

Many companies with high-volume sites have realized that the best way to manage their complex operations is to rely upon precise measurements of fuel inventory. Warren Rogers Associates (WRA) has worked with operators of such sites to develop a Continual Reconciliation System to enable them to manage their leak-detection requirements and all of the complex transactions and fueling equipment at high-throughput facilities where problems with fuel-inventory shrinkage are endemic.

The Continual Reconciliation System


As shown in Figure 1, the Continual Reconciliation System uses a processor ("OSP") installed at each facility to acquire data from automatic tank gauges, dispenser controllers, and other related systems. The OSP records data for each dispenser and compiles refined inventory data at the conclusion of every sales transaction by querying the tank gauge for product height and temperature measurements. The OSP develops a complete and ongoing record of fluid flows, transfer, and storage occurring on-site.¹

Because the Continual Reconciliation System develops precise inventory measurements, it is capable of computing delivery volumes and meter calibration. Further, the system adjusts for the expansion and contraction of product due to temperature change on an ongoing basis. The system also identifies leakage as a continuous loss of product, as opposed to episodic delivery shortfalls, theft, or excess product dispensed due to meter miscalibration.

Given that the Continual Reconciliation System works while the UST system is active, its leak-detection applications function differently than conventional automatic-tank-gauge and line-leak detector monitoring. Typically, volumetric monitoring of tanks and associated lines has taken place when the tank systems are dormant, an infrequent occurrence at high-volume sites. The Continual Reconciliation System instead relies on data from both the static and dynamic operations of the tank so that ongoing monitoring of the tank system can occur.

Because the Continual Reconciliation System tracks product from the point of delivery to the dispenser meter, leaks from almost every component of the storage system can be detected. We have found that leaks originating in the tank shell or buried

1. U.S. and foreign patents apply.



Dispenser theft at a truck-stop facility, for example, is not a trivial event, since the losses of each individual event could be greatly in excess of 100 gallons of product. The Continual Reconciliation System can calculate on an ongoing basis the actual amount of product delivered to a tank system as well as identify theft events by date, time, and amount.

Marrying Business and Environmental Concerns

Continual reconciliation has an important role for volumetric leak-detection monitoring in high-throughput UST systems. It is a way to motivate tank owner/operators to pay attention to leak detection.

pipng runs are much less common today than leaks in flexible connectors, line-leak-detector components, and dispenser components such as impact valves, unions, and meters. Though common, many of these types of leaks are often missed by traditional methods of leak detection.

As a result of its ability to use all of the available data from a tank system, the Continual Reconciliation System is certified as an automatic tank gauge system method for monthly monitoring of tanks and associated lines for complex manifolded tank systems up to 100,000 gallons in capacity and nearly 3 million gallons in monthly throughput.

What about Non-Leak Losses?

The same data the system collects for leak detection purposes can also be used to quickly pinpoint and quantify non-leak losses. Operational problems such as miscalibrated meters, short deliveries, and theft at the pump occur with far greater frequency than leakage, and their costly effects can mount up quickly at a high-throughput site.

For example, an active dispensing position for diesel fuel could be checked for calibration by weights and measures standards and be found to be operating within the acceptable range. However, this same

dispenser at an active travel center can be dispensing in excess of 300,000 gallons monthly and during that time could be giving away 650 gallons of product worth nearly \$2,000.00 despite the fact that it's operating in conformance with required tolerances.

The Continual Reconciliation System is able to identify such meter-drift effects because measurements are being recorded at the end of every transaction and set of overlapping transactions. Therefore the contribution of each individual meter to inventory variations can be identified. Instances of both meter give-away and holdbacks can then be identified to the owner/operator so that they can be corrected. Further, because the duration of transactions is also recorded, dispenser flow rates can be determined to identify clogged filters or problems with flow limiters.

Theft is also common at the point of delivery or at the dispenser, particularly in this era of volatile fuel pricing. While delivery shortfalls may be apparent to the operator of a low-throughput site, they are difficult to identify at a very active facility taking more than one delivery a day. Similarly, dispensers can be jiggered at remote fueling positions of high-throughput sites, resulting in unauthorized fueling transactions.

As a result of the reconciliation system's ability to identify specific reasons for loss of product—be it piping or dispenser or theft or meter drift—a report of leakage becomes more visible and understandable to the businessperson who owns or operates that site. Leak detection is enfolded into everyday business practices. If a situation develops at a high-throughput site, the operator can quickly direct his/her attention to the problem at hand rather than undertake a protracted "hit-or-miss" investigation that could allow a leak to persist. It is a win-win solution for both the businessperson and the environment.

Currently the Continual Reconciliation System is in use at over 400 active travel centers nationwide as well as at high-volume convenience stores and truck terminals. To find out more about this leak-detection option, go to www.warrenrogersassociates.com or consult the National Work Group on Leak Detection Evaluation's website at www.nwglde.org and look under the methods listed for Continuous In-Tank Leak Detection Systems. ■

Bill Jones is Executive Vice President of Warren Rogers Associates, Inc. He can be reached at wjones@warrenrogersassociates.com or 800.972.7472.

FAQs from the NWGLDE

... All you ever wanted to know about leak detection, but were afraid to ask.

What Is CITLDS Leak Detection All About?

In this issue of FAQs from the National Work Group on Leak Detection Evaluations (NWGLDE), we follow-up on a FAQ from LUST-Line #50 (August 2005). At that time we discussed protocols used for evaluating CITLDS without explaining what CITLDS leak detection is all about. We now present the rest of the story. (Please note: the views expressed in this column represent those of the work group and not necessarily those of any implementing agency.)

Q. What exactly is a CITLDS?

A. CITLDS stands for "Continuous In-Tank Leak-Detection System." It is a volumetric leak-detection method that does not require an extended shut-down period in order to conduct a leak test. The system gathers pieces of data from all designated input devices during tank "quiet time" and then performs the leak-test calculations when enough data have been recorded. The term continuous, in this situation, implies that data are collected on a regular basis and when available. Most CITLDS methods employ the use of an Automatic Tank Gauge ("ATG") to gather product-level data and some use additional information from input devices such as the dispenser totalizers and point-of-sale records.

CITLDS are well suited to facilities that are open 24/7, as long as the volume of product sold from the storage system does not exceed the throughput limit of the CITLDS method. There must be sufficient data collected in order to perform the leak-test calculations. For example, if there is not enough "quiet time," then not enough data will have been collected to complete a test. If enough suitable data have not been collected during the month to perform a leak test, the tank system must be shut down and a "static" test performed.

Q. Why are there two separate line entries in the "List" index for Continuous In-Tank Leak Detection Systems?

A. Currently there are two types of CITLDS methods on the NWGLDE List. These types are referred to as CITLDS "Continuous Automatic Tank Gauging" and CITLDS "Continual Reconciliation." The primary distinction between these two is that the ATG systems use only product-level data to conduct a test and are most similar to standard, or static, ATGs that test only the tank. Reconciliation systems use both product-level data and sales data to see if the volume of fuel dispensed from the tank, as measured from ATG readings, is equal to the volume of fuel measured by the meter in the dispenser.

"Continuous Automatic Tank Gauging" systems use an ATG probe to collect data during tank "quiet time." An algorithm then combines data from a number of such periods until there is enough evidence to make a determination about the leak status of the tank. Because these systems typically monitor only the liquid level in the tank, they test only the tank, not the piping. This type of system functions

like an ATG, except that it does not require the tank to be taken out of service for a set period of time whenever a test is conducted. Instead, it uses data from shorter, stable time periods and combines the results to estimate a leak rate. If sufficient good-quality data has not been obtained over the month, the system may be programmed to default to a static or shut-down ATG test which requires the tank to be out of service for a few hours.

"Continual Reconciliation" systems combine continuous product-level and temperature monitoring from the tank with data from dispensing meters. Data from delivery and point-of-sale records may also be included. Because of multiple-device data input, the system is capable of detecting leaks or unexplained losses of product from the tank, pressurized lines, or even dispensers. In addition, it can combine data from times when the tank is static (no dispensing activity) as well as when the tank is active to monitor the system for a leak. (For a more in-depth discussion of "Continual Reconciliation," refer to "Continual Reconciliation Applications for Active Fueling Facilities" on page 4 of this issue of LUSTLine.

All CITLDS methods are volumetric and designed to operate continuously or nearly continuously in order to collect the necessary data for the determination of a quantitative leak rate. They may use different combinations of data and inputs but they share the same characteristic of monitoring tank and/or other data continuously for days, weeks, or months, and then providing leak-detection capabilities and leak status on demand once the initial data requirements are met. ■

About the NWGLDE

The NWGLDE is an independent work group comprising 10 members, including 9 state and 1 U.S. EPA member. This column provides answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs) the NWGLDE receives from regulators and people in the industry on leak detection. If you have questions for the group, please contact them at questions@nwglde.org.

NWGLDE's Mission:

- Review leak-detection system evaluations to determine if each evaluation was performed in accordance with an acceptable leak-detection test method protocol and ensure that the leak-detection system meets USEPA and/or other applicable regulatory performance standards.
- Review only draft and final leak-detection test method protocols submitted to the work group by a peer review committee to ensure they meet equivalency standards stated in the USEPA standard test procedures.
- Make the results of such reviews available to interested parties.