Environmental-Community-Labor Process Safety Promising Practice

Best practices examples; safer and more secure chemicals and processes

SUMMARY

Many facilities have replaced large amounts of extremely hazardous substances with options that do not pose the danger of a major chemical release. This submission provides examples. Please see attachments.

DESCRIPTION

Some facilities that formerly filed Risk Management Plans (RMP) with the Environmental Protection Agency no longer do so because they have removed extremely hazardous substances. In surveys, some cite information they learned through the process of complying with the RMP program as a motivating factor in making the changes. These facilities are located across the USA.

Attached is a list of more than 550 example water and wastewater treatment facilities that have removed gaseous chlorine or other toxic gasses from their disinfection practices. These are understood to be sample facilities; many others have made such changes. Many drinking water facilities switch to sodium hypochlorite, often generated on-site. Some wastewater facilities make the same change, while others switch to ultra-violet light disinfection. Wastewater facilities that remove gaseous chlorine typically remove anhydrous sulfur dioxide gas as well. Leading bleach manufacturers have also removed catastrophic chemical hazards by going to a process that does not accumulate bulk amounts of chlorine gas at any point, including transportation. These bleach manufacturers include: Odyssey Manufacturing (Tampa, Fla.); BleachTech (Seville, Ohio and Petersburg, Va.); Kuehne Chemical (Delaware City, Del.); FSTI (Greenville, Texas); Buckman's (Pottstown, Pa.); Allied New Technologies, (Fort Pierce, Fla.); and KIK (Denver, Colo.). Also attached are some twenty types of industries in which some facilities have removed extremely hazardous substances, based on prior surveys. Avoiding the presence of chemical hazards through the use of alternate processes is a fundamental safety and security practice.

Facilities that make such changes not only remove dangers of a catastrophic chemical release, but also avoid many types of costs and burdens. These savings and avoided costs include: safety devices and personal protective equipment; inspections, certifications, permits, and fees; higher risk-group insurance and potential liabilities; specialized emergency response teams, training, and planning; compliance with chemical related fire codes; chemical purchases; chemical thefts; physical security measures; worker and community notification; background checks; and regulatory compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Local, State, Tribal, and Federal programs should systematically generate solutions in safer and more secure practices. These programs include in particular EPA's RMP program, OSHA's Process Safety Management, and DHS Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards. Facilities covered by these programs should demonstrate knowledge of available and relevant alternatives and submit information on the costs as well as savings and avoided costs of the alternatives and routinely submit this information as part of plans and assessments.

Best Practice Definition: The EO Working Group defines Best Practices as being voluntary and are intended to complement existing chemical safety and security regulations and requirements. Application of EO Best Practices will enable facility owners and operators to enhance their safety and security planning and their implementation of measures to protect facility assets, employees, first responders, and the community surrounding the chemical facility.

REFERENCES

- <u>Chemical Security 101: What You Don't Have Can't Leak, or Be Blown Up by Terrorists, Center for</u> <u>American Progress, November 2008.</u>
- <u>Preventing Toxic Terrorism: How Some Chemical Facilities Are Removing Danger to American</u> <u>Communities, Center for American Progress, April 2006.</u>
- <u>Safer Chemicals Create a More Secure America, Center for American Progress, January 2012.</u>
- Water Utilities That Have Converted From Extremely Hazardous Substances, Center for American Progress, 2010.
- <u>Who's in Danger? Race, Poverty, and Chemical Disasters, Environmental Justice and Health Alliance for</u> <u>Chemical Policy Reform, May 2014.</u>

SEARCHABILITY

For greater document search capabilities, please check up to 5 selections from the listed tags below:

- Accident Investigation/Safety Case
- ALARP (as-low-asreasonably-practicable)
- Ammonium Nitrate
- ✓ Assessment
- ✓ Attenuation
- □ CAMEO and other IT Tools
- □ Certification
- Checklist
- Class/Course/Computer
 Based Training (CBT)
- Diversion
- Elimination
- First Responder preparedness
- prepareuness

- Human Factors
- Industry Stewardship Programs
- ✓ Inherently safer technology (IST)/Safer Alternatives
- 🗹 ISD
- □ Injury and Illness
- ✓ Multi-disciplinary
- Outliners
- Precursors
- Prevention through design (PTD)
- Process Safety Indicators/ metrics
- Reactives
- Release

- ☑ Risk Management Plan
- Sabotage
- □ Screening threshold quantity
- ✓ Security
- □ Shelter-in-Place
- □ Simplification
- Siting
- Standard Operating Procedures
- ☑ Substitution
- □ Terminology/taxonomy
- 🗹 Theft
- □ Third-party
- □ Tier II Reports
- □ Training/Instruction Manual

DISCLAIMER

Any best practices, lessons learned, or other views or opinions presented in this forum are solely those of the author, and publication herein does not constitute or imply their endorsement or recommendation by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of Labor (DOL), or any other department or agency of the United States Government. In addition, the publication of a best practice in this forum does not constitute advice as to the legality of such practice in a relevant jurisdiction. The publication of any material purported to be a best practice is at the sole discretion of the departments and agencies operating this website. For advice as to whether a best practice is appropriate in a particular circumstance, you should consult with a subject matter expert and/or legal counsel familiar with your situation.

The use of this forum to identify any specific commercial products, processes, services, trade names, trademarks, or manufacturers does not constitute or imply their endorsement or recommendation by DHS, EPA, DOL, or any other department or agency of the United States Government.

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

Authority: 44 U.S.C. § 3101 authorizes the collection of this information.

Purpose: DHS will use this information to associate document submissions with the appropriate individual when posted to the Chemical Facility Safety and Security Lessons Learned Information Sharing (LLIS).gov webpage and to contact individuals with questions regarding their submission, when necessary.

Routine Use: This information may be disclosed as generally permitted under 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b) of the Privacy Act of 1974. This includes using the information, as necessary and authorized by the routine uses published in the DHS/ALL-004 - General Information Technology Access Account Records System (GITAARS) November 27, 2012, 77 FR 70792.

Disclosure: Furnishing this information is voluntary; however failure to provide the information requested may prevent DHS from attributing your submission to you on the Chemical Facility Safety and Security LLIS.gov webpage.