

# Chapter 4: Efficacy of Cooling Water Intake Structure Technologies

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data compiled by the Agency on the performance of the range of technologies currently used to minimize impingement and entrainment (I&E) at power plants nationwide.

### 1.0 DATA COLLECTION OVERVIEW

To support the section 316(b) rule for existing facilities, the Agency compiled data on the performance of the range of technologies currently used to minimize impingement and entrainment (I&E) at power plants nationwide. The goal of this data collection and analysis effort was to determine whether specific technologies could be shown to provide a consistent level of proven performance. The information compiled was used to compare specific regulatory options and their associated costs and benefits, as well as provide stakeholders with a comprehensive summary of previous studies designed to assess the efficacy of the various technologies. It provided the supporting information for the rule and alternative regulatory options considered during the development process and final action by the Administrator.

Throughout this chapter, *baseline technology performance* refers to the performance of conventional, wide-mesh traveling screens that are not intended to prevent impingement and/or entrainment. The term *alternative technologies* generally refer to those technologies, other than closed-cycle recirculating cooling systems, that can be used to minimize impingement and/or entrainment. Overall, the Agency has found that performance and applicability vary to some degree based on site-specific and seasonal conditions. The Agency has also determined, however, that alternative technologies can be used effectively on a widespread basis if properly designed, operated, and maintained.

### 1.1 SCOPE OF DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS

The Agency has compiled readily available information on the nationwide performance of I&E-reduction technologies. This information has been obtained through the following:

- Literature searches and associated collection of relevant documents on facility-specific performance.
- Contacts with governmental (e.g., TVA) and non-governmental entities (e.g., EPRI) that have undertaken national or regional data collection efforts/performance studies.
- Meetings with and visits to the offices of EPA regional and state agency staff as well as site visits to operating power plants.

It is important to recognize that the Agency did not use a systematic approach to data collection; that is, the Agency did not obtain all the facility performance data available nor did it obtain the same amount and detail of information for every facility. The Agency is not aware of such an evaluation ever being performed nationally. The most recent national data compilation was conducted by EPRI in 2000; see *Fish Protection at Cooling Water Intakes, Status Report*. The findings of that report are cited extensively in the following subsections. EPRI's analysis, however, was primarily a literature collection and review effort and was not intended to be an exhaustive compilation and analysis of all available data. Through this evaluation, EPA worked to build on the EPRI review by reviewing primary study documents cited by EPRI as well as through the collection and reviewing of additional data.

### 1.2 TECHNOLOGY DATABASE

In an effort to document and further assess the performance of various technologies and operational measures designed to minimize the impacts of cooling water withdrawals, EPA compiled a database of documents to allow analyses of the efficacy

of a specific technology or suite of technologies. The data collected and entered into this database came from materials ranging from brief journal articles to the more intensive analyses found in historical section 316(b) demonstration reports and technology evaluations. In preparing this database, EPA assembled as much documentation as possible within the available timeframe to support future Agency decisions. It should be noted that the data may be of varying quality. EPA did not validate all database entries. However, EPA did evaluate the general quality and thoroughness of the study. Information entered into the database includes some notation of the limitations the individual studies might have for use in further analyses (e.g., no biological data or conclusions).

EPA's intent in assembling this information was fourfold. First, the Agency sought to develop a categorized database containing a comprehensive collection of available literature regarding technology performance. The database is intended to allow, to the extent possible, a rigorous compilation of data supporting the determination that the proposed performance standards are considered best technology available. Second, EPA used the data to demonstrate that the technologies chosen as compliance technologies for costing purposes are reasonable and can meet the performance standards. Third, the availability of a user-friendly database will allow EPA, state permit writers, and the public to more easily evaluate potential compliance options and facility compliance with performance standards. Fourth, EPA attempted to evaluate the technology efficacy data against objective criteria to assess the general quality and thoroughness of each study. This evaluation might assist in further analysis of conclusions made using the data.

Basic information from each document was recorded in the database (e.g., type of technology evaluated, facility at which it was tested). In addition to basic document information, the database contains two types of information: (1) general facility information and (2) detailed study information.

For those documents that refer to a specific facility (or facilities), basic technical information was included to enable EPA to classify facilities according to general categories. EPA collected locational data (e.g., waterbody type, name, state), as well as basic cooling water intake structure configuration information. Each technology evaluated in the study is also recorded, along with specific details regarding its design and operation. Major categories of technologies include modified traveling screens, wedgewire screens, fine-mesh screens, velocity caps, barrier nets, and behavioral barriers. (Data identifying the technologies present at a facility, as well as the configuration of the intake structure, refer to the configuration when the study was conducted and do not necessarily reflect the present facility configuration.)

Information on the type of study, along with any study results, is recorded in the second part of the database. EPA identifies whether the study evaluates the technology with respect to impingement mortality reduction (or avoidance), entrainment survival, or entrainment exclusion (or avoidance). Some studies address more than one area of concern, and that is noted. EPA records basic biological data used to evaluate the technology, if such data are provided. These data include target or commercially/recreationally valuable species, species type, life history stage, size, sample size, and raw numbers of impinged and/or entrained organisms. Finally, EPA records any overall conclusions reached by the study, usually presented as a percentage reduction or increase, depending on the area of focus. Including this information for each document allows EPA and others to readily locate and compare documents addressing similar technologies. Each document is reviewed according to five areas of data quality where possible: (1) applicability and utility, (2) soundness, (3) clarity and completeness, (4) uncertainty and variability, and (5) evaluation and review. Because the compiled literature comes from many different sources and was developed under widely varying standards, EPA reviewed all documents in the database against all five criteria.

To date, EPA has collected 153 documents for inclusion in the database. The Agency did not exclude from the database any document that addressed technology performance in relation to impingement and entrainment, regardless of the overall quality of the data.

### 1.3 DATA LIMITATIONS

Because EPA did not undertake a systematic data collection effort with consistent data collection procedures, there is significant variability in the information available from different data sources. This variability leads to the following data limitations:

- Some facility data include all the major species and associated life stages present at an individual facility, whereas others include only data for selected species and/or life stages. The identification of important species can be a valid method for determining the overall effectiveness of a technology if the criteria used for selection are valid. In some studies, target species are identified but no reason for their selection is given.

- Many of the data were collected in the 1970s and early 1980s when existing facilities were required to complete their initial 316(b) demonstrations. In addition, the focus of these studies was not the effectiveness of a particular technology but rather the overall performance of a facility in terms of rates of impingement and entrainment.
- Some facility data includes only initial survival results, whereas other facilities have 48- to 96-hour survival data. These longer-term survival data are relevant because some technologies can exhibit significant latent mortality after initial survival.
- Analytical methods and collection procedures, including quality assurance/quality control protocols, are not always present or discussed in summary documentation. Where possible, EPA has reviewed study methods and parameters to determine qualifications, if any, that must be applied to the final results.
- Some data come from laboratory and pilot-scale testing rather than full-scale evaluations. Laboratory studies offer unique opportunities to control and alter the various inputs to the study but might not be able to mimic the real-world variables that could be present at an actual site. Although EPA recognizes the value of laboratory studies and does not discount their results, *in situ* evaluations remain the preferred method for gauging the effectiveness of a technology.
- Survival rates calculated in individual studies can vary as to their true meaning. In some instances, the survival rate for a given species (initial or latent) has been corrected to account for the mortality rate observed in a control group. Other studies explicitly note that no control groups have been used. These data are important because overall mortality, especially for younger and more fragile species, can be adversely affected by the collection and observation process—factors that would not affect mortality under unobserved conditions.

EPA recognizes that the practicality or effectiveness of alternative technologies might not be uniform under all conditions. The chemical and physical nature of the waterbody, facility intake requirements, climatic conditions, and biology of the area all affect feasibility and performance. Despite the above limitations, however, EPA has concluded that significant general performance expectations can be inferred for the range of technologies and that one or more technologies (or groups of technologies) can provide significant impingement and/or entrainment protection at most sites. In addition, in EPA's view many of the technologies have the potential for even greater applicability and higher performance when facilities optimize their use.

The remainder of this chapter is organized by groups of technologies. A brief description of conventional, once-through traveling screens is provided for comparison purposes. Fact sheets describing each technology, available performance data, and design requirements and limitations are provided in Attachment A. It is important to note that this chapter does not provide descriptions of all potential cooling water intake structure (CWIS) technologies. (ASCE 1982 generally provides such an all-inclusive discussion.) Instead, EPA has focused on those technologies that have shown significant promise at the laboratory, pilot-scale, or full-scale levels in consistently minimizing impingement and/or entrainment. In addition, this chapter does not identify every facility where alternative technologies have been used but rather only those where some measure of performance in comparison to conventional screens has been made. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of how the location of intakes (as well as the timing of water withdrawals) can also be used to limit potential impingement and/or entrainment effects. Habitat restoration projects are an additional means to comply with this rule. Such projects, however, have not had widespread application at existing facilities. Because the nature, feasibility, and likely effectiveness of such projects would be highly site-specific, EPA has not attempted to quantify their expected performance level in this document.

#### 1.4 CONVENTIONAL TRAVELING SCREENS

For impingement control technologies, performance is compared to conventional (unmodified) traveling screens, the baseline technology. These screens are the most commonly used intake technology at older existing facilities, and their operational performance is well established. In general, these technologies are designed to prevent debris from entering the cooling water system, not to minimize I&E. The most common intake designs include front-end trash racks (usually consisting of fixed bars) to prevent large debris from entering the system. The traveling screens are equipped with screen panels mounted on an endless belt that rotates through the water vertically. Most conventional screens have 3/8-inch mesh that prevents smaller debris from clogging the condenser tubes. The screen wash is typically high-pressure (80 to 120 pounds per square inch [psi]). Screens are rotated and washed intermittently, and fish that are impinged often die because they are trapped on the stationary screens for extended periods. The high-pressure wash also frequently kills fish, or they are re-impinged on the

screens. Approximately 89 percent of all existing facilities within the scope of this rule use conventional traveling screens.

## 1.5 CLOSED-CYCLE WET COOLING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

Although flow reduction serves the purpose of reducing both impingement and entrainment, flow reduction requirements function foremost as a reliable entrainment reduction technology. Throughout this chapter, EPA compares the performance of entrainment-reducing technologies to that of recirculating wet cooling towers. To evaluate the feasibility of regulatory options with flow reduction requirements and to allow comparison of costs and benefits of alternatives, EPA determined the likely range in flow reductions between wet, closed-cycle cooling systems and once through systems. In closed-cycle systems, certain chemicals will concentrate as they continue to be recirculated through the tower. Excess buildup of such chemicals, especially total dissolved solids, affects the tower's performance. Therefore, some water (blowdown) must be discharged and make-up water added periodically to the system. An additional question that EPA has considered is the feasibility of constructing salt-water make-up cooling towers. For the development of the New Facility 316(b) rule, EPA contacted Marley Cooling Tower (Marley), which is one of the largest cooling tower manufacturers in the world. Marley provided a list of facilities (Marley 2001) that have installed cooling towers that use marine or otherwise high total dissolved solids/brackish make-up water. It is important to recognize the facilities listed represent only a selected group of facilities for which Marley has constructed cooling towers worldwide.

## 2.0 ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

### 2.1 MODIFIED TRAVELING SCREENS AND FISH HANDLING AND RETURN SYSTEMS

#### *Technology Overview*

Conventional traveling screens can be modified so that fish impinged on the screens can be removed with minimal stress and mortality. Ristroph screens have water-filled lifting buckets that collect the impinged organisms and transport them to a fish return system. The buckets are designed such that they will hold approximately 2 inches of water once they have cleared the surface of the water during the normal rotation of the traveling screens. The fish bucket holds the fish in water until the screen rises to a point at which the fish are spilled onto a bypass, trough, or other protected area (Mussalli, Taft, and Hoffman 1978). Fish baskets are another modification of a conventional traveling screen and may be used in conjunction with fish buckets. Fish baskets are separate framed screen panels attached to vertical traveling screens. An essential feature of modified traveling screens is continuous operation during periods when fish are being impinged. Conventional traveling screens typically operate intermittently. (EPRI 2000, 1989; Fritz 1980). Removed fish are typically returned to the source waterbody by sluiceway or pipeline. ASCE (1982) provides guidance on the design and operation of fish return systems.

#### *Technology Performance*

A wide range of facilities nationwide have used modified screens and fish handling and return systems to minimize impingement mortality. Although many factors influence the overall performance of a given technology, modified screens with a fish return capability have been deployed with success under varying waterbody conditions. In recent years, some researchers, primarily Fletcher (1996), have evaluated the factors that affect the success of these systems and described how they can be optimized for specific applications. Fletcher cited the following as key design factors:

- Shaping fish buckets or baskets to minimize hydrodynamic turbulence within the bucket or basket.
- Using smooth-woven screen mesh to minimize fish descaling.
- Using fish rails to keep fish from escaping the buckets or baskets.
- Performing fish removal prior to high-pressure washing for debris removal.
- Optimizing the location of spray systems to provide a more gentle fish transfer to sloughs.
- Ensuring proper sizing and design of return troughs, sluiceways, and pipes to minimize harm.

#### 2.1.1 EXAMPLE STUDIES

##### ***Salem Generating Station***

Salem Generating Station, on the Delaware Bay estuary in New Jersey, converted 6 of its 12 conventional traveling screen assemblies to a modified design that incorporated improved fish buckets constructed of a lighter composite material (which

improved screen rotation efficiency), smooth-woven mesh material, an improved spray wash system (both low- and high-pressure), and flap seals to improve the delivery of impinged fish from the fish buckets to the fish return trough.

The initial study period consisted of 19 separate collection events during mid-summer 1996. The configuration of the facility at the time of the study (half of the screens had been modified) allowed for a direct comparison of the effectiveness of the modified and unmodified screens on impingement mortality rates. The limited sampling timeframe enabled the analysis of only the species present in numbers sufficient to support any statistical conclusions. 1,082 juvenile weakfish were collected from the unmodified screens while 1,559 were collected from the modified structure. Analysts held each sample group separately for 48 hours to assess overall mortality due to impingement on the screens. Results showed that use of the modified screens had increased overall survival by as much as 20 percent over the use of the unmodified screens. Approximately 58 percent of the weakfish impinged on the unmodified screens survived, whereas the new screens had a survival rate approaching 80 percent. Both rates were based on 48-hour survival and not adjusted for the mortality of control samples.

Water temperature and fish length are two independent factors cited in the study as affecting overall survival. Researchers noted that survival rates decreased somewhat as the water temperature increased, possibly as a result of lower levels of dissolved oxygen. Survival rates decreased to a low of 56 percent for the modified screens when the water temperature reached its maximum of 80°F. At the same temperature, the survival rate on the unmodified screens were 35 percent. Differences in survival rates were also attributable to the size of the fish impinged. In general, small fish (< 50 mm) fared better on both the modified and unmodified screens than large fish (> 50 mm). The survival rates of the two size categories did not differ significantly for the modified screens (85 percent survival for small, 82 percent for large), although a more pronounced difference was evident on the unmodified screens (74 percent survival for small, 58 percent for large).

Salem Generating Station conducted a second series of impingement sampling from 1997 to 1998. By that time all screen assemblies had been modified to include fish buckets and a fish return system as described above. Additional modifications to the system sought to enhance the chances of survival of fish impinged against the screens. One modification altered the fish return slide to reduce the stress on fish being delivered to the collection pool. Flap seals were improved to better seal gaps between the fish return and debris trough, thus preventing debris from affecting returning fish. Researchers used a smaller mesh screen in the collection pools during the 1997-1998 sampling events than had been used during the 1995 studies. The study notes that the larger mesh used in 1995 might have enabled smaller fish to escape the collection pool. Since smaller fish typically have a higher mortality rate due to physical stress than larger fish, the actual mortality rates may have been greater than those found in the 1995 study.

The second impingement survival study analyzed samples collected from October through December 1997 and April through September 1998. Samples were collected twice per week and analyzed for survival at 24- and 48-hour intervals. Six principal species were identified as constituting the majority of the impinged fish during the sampling periods: weakfish, white perch, bay anchovy, Atlantic croaker, spot, and *Alosa* spp. Fish were sorted by species and size, classified by their condition, and placed in holding tanks.

For most species, survival rates varied noticeably depending on the season. For white perch, survival was above 90 percent throughout the sample period (as high as 98 percent in December). Survival rates for weakfish varied from a low of 18 percent in July to a high of 88 percent in September. Although the number of weakfish collected in September was approximately one-fifth of the number collected in July, a possible explanation for the variation in survival rates is the modifications to the collection system described above, which were implemented during the study period. Similarly, bay anchovy fared worst during the warmer months, dropping to a 20 percent survival rate in July while achieving a 72 percent rate during November. Rates for Atlantic croaker varied from 58 percent in April to 98 percent in November. Spot were collected in only one month (November) and had a survival rate of 93 percent. The survival rate for the *Alosa* spp. (alewife, blueback herring, and American shad) remained relatively consistent, ranging from 82 percent in April to 78 percent in November.

For all species in the study, with the exception of weakfish, survival rates improved markedly with the use of the modified screen system when compared to data from 1978-1982, when the unmodified system was still in use.

### ***Mystic Station***

Mystic Station, on the Mystic River in Massachusetts, converted one of its two conventional traveling screen assemblies to a modified system incorporating fish collection buckets and a return system in 1981 to enable a side-by-side comparison of impingement survival. Fish buckets were attached to each of the screen panels. Low-pressure spray (10 psi) nozzles were installed to remove fish from the buckets and into the collection trough. The screen system was modified to include a two-

speed motor with a four-speed transmission to enable various rotation speeds for the traveling screens.

The goal of the study was to determine the optimal screen rotation speed and rotation interval that could achieve the greatest survival rate without affecting the screen performance. The study analyzes 2-, 4- and 8-hour rotation intervals as well as continuous rotation. Samples were collected from October 7, 1980 to April 27, 1981. Fish collected from the screens were sorted several times per week, classified, and placed into holding tanks for 96 hours to observe latent mortality.

Results from the study indicated that impingement of the various species was highly seasonal in nature. Data from Unit 7 during the sample period indicate that in terms of both biomass and raw numbers, the majority of fish are present in the vicinity, and thus susceptible to impingement, during the fall and early winter. Almost 50 percent of the *Alosa* spp. were collected during one week in November, while 75 percent of the smelt were collected in a 5-week period in late fall. Likewise, nearly 60 percent of the winter flounder were collected in January. These data suggest that optimal rotation speeds and intervals, whatever they might be, might not be necessary throughout the year.

Continuous rotation of the screens, regardless of speed, resulted in a virtual elimination of impingement mortality for winter flounder. For all other species, survival generally increased with screen speed and rotation interval, with the best 96-hour survival rate (50 percent) occurring at a continuous rotation at 15 ft/sec. The overall survival rate is affected by the high latent mortality of *Alosa* spp. in the sample. The study speculates that the overall survival rates would be markedly higher under actual (unobserved) operating conditions, given the high initial survival for large *Alosa* spp. Fragile species such as *Alosa* can be adversely affected by the stresses of collection and monitoring and might exhibit an abnormally higher mortality rate as a result.

### ***Indian Point Unit 2***

Indian Point is located on the eastern shore of the Hudson River in New York. In 1985, the facility modified the intake for Unit 2 to include a fish lifting trough fitted to the face of the screen panels. Two low-pressure (10 psi) spray nozzles removed collected fish into a separate fish return sluiceway. A high-pressure spray flushed other debris into a debris trough. The new screen also incorporated a variable speed transmission, enabling the rotation of the screen panels at speeds of up to 20 ft/min. For the study period, screens were continuously rotated at a speed of 10 ft/min.

The sampling period lasted from August 15, 1985 to December 7, 1985. Fish were collected from both the fish trough and the debris trough, though survival rates are presented for the fish collected from the fish trough only. The number of fish collected from the debris trough was approximately 45 percent of the total collected from the fish trough; the survival rate of these fish is unknown. Control groups were not used to monitor the mortality associated with natural environmental factors such as salinity, temperature, and dissolved oxygen. Collected fish were held in observation tanks for 96 hours to determine a latent survival rate.

White perch composed the majority (71 percent) of the overall sample population. Survival rates ranged from 63 percent in November to 90 percent in August. It should be noted that during the month with the greatest abundance (December), the survival rate was 67 percent. This generally represents the overall survival rate for this species because 75 percent of white perch collected during the sample period were collected during December. Weakfish were the next most abundant species, with an overall survival rate of 94 percent. A statistically significant number of weakfish were collected only during the month of August. Atlantic tomcod and blueback herring were reported to have survival rates of 73 percent and 65 percent, respectively. Additional species present in small numbers had widely varying survival rates, from a low of 27 percent for alewife to a high of over 95 percent for bluegill and hogchoker.

A facility-wide performance level is not presented for Indian Point, but a general inference can be obtained from the survival rates of the predominant species. A concern is raised, however, by the exclusion of fish collected from the debris trough. Their significant number might affect the overall mortality of each species. Because the fish in the debris trough have been subjected to high-pressure spray washes as well as any large debris removed from the screens, mortality rates for these fish are likely to be higher, thereby reducing the overall effectiveness of the technology as deployed. The experiences of other facilities suggest that modifications to the system might be able to increase the efficiency of moving impinged fish to the fish trough. In general, species survival appeared greater during late summer than in early winter. Samples were collected during one 5-month period. It is not known from the study how the technology would perform in other seasons.

### ***Roseton Generating Station***

Roseton Generating Station is located on the eastern shore of the Hudson River in New York. In 1990, the facility replaced two of eight conventional traveling screens with dual-flow screens that included water-retaining fish buckets, a low-pressure (10 psi) spray system, smooth-woven mesh screen panels, and a separate fish return trough. The dual-flow screens were also

equipped with variable speed motors to achieve faster rotational speeds. For the study period, screens were continuously rotated at a speed of 10.2 ft/minute.

Impingement samples were collected during two periods in 1990: May 9 to August 30 and September 30 to November 29. A total of 529 paired samples were collected for the first period and 246 paired samples for the second period. Initial mortality was recorded at the Roseton facility. Collected samples were not held on site but rather transported to the fish laboratory at Danskammer Point, where they were observed for latent mortality. Latent mortality observations were made at 48- and 96-hour intervals. A control study using a mark-recapture method was conducted simultaneously to measure the influence, if any, that water quality factors and collection and handling procedures might have had on overall mortality rates. Based on the results of this study, the post-impingement survival rates did not need to be adjusted for a deviation from the control mortality.

Blueback herring, bay anchovy, American shad, and alewife composed the majority of the sample population in both sampling periods. Latent survival rates ranged from 0 percent to 6 percent during the summer and were somewhat worse during the fall. The other two predominant species, white perch and striped bass, fared better, having survival rates as high as 53 percent. Other species that composed less than 2 percent of the sample population survived at considerably higher rates (98 percent for hogchoker).

It is unclear why the more fragile species (alewife, blueback herring, American shad, and bay anchovy) had such high mortality rates. The study notes that debris had been collecting in the fish return trough and was disrupting the flow of water and fish to the collection tanks. Water flow was increased through the trough to prevent accumulation of debris. No information is presented to indicate the effect of this modification. Also noted is the effect of temperature on initial survival. An overall initial survival rate of 90 percent was achieved when the ambient water temperature was 54°F. Survival rates decreased markedly as water temperature increased, and the lowest initial survival rate (6 percent) was recorded at the highest temperature.

#### ***Surry Power Station***

Surry Power Station is located on the James River in Virginia. Each of the two units has 3/8-inch mesh Ristroph screens with a fish return trough. A combined spray system removes impinged organisms and debris from the screens. Spray nozzle pressures range from 15 to 20 psi. During the first several months of testing, the system was modified to improve fish transfer to the sluiceway and increase the likelihood of post-impingement survival. A flap seal was added to prevent fish from falling between the screen and return trough during screen washing. Water volume in the return trough was increased to facilitate the transfer of fish to the river, and a velocity-reduction system was added to the trough to reduce the speed of water and fish entering the sample collecting pools.

Samples were collected daily during a 6-month period from May to November 1975. Initial mortality was observed and recorded after a 15-minute period during which the water and fish in the collection pools were allowed to settle. The average survival rate for the 58 different species collected was 93 percent, although how this average was calculated was not noted. Bay anchovy and the *Alosa* spp. constituted the majority of the sample population and generally had the lowest initial survival rates at 83 percent. The study does not indicate whether control samples were used and whether mortality rates were adjusted accordingly. A noticeable deficiency of the study is the lack of latent mortality analysis. Consideration of latent mortality, which could be high for the fragile species typically impinged at Surry Power Station, might significantly reduce the overall impingement survival rate.

#### ***Arthur Kill Station***

The Arthur Kill Station is located on the Arthur Kill estuary in New York. To fulfill the terms of a consent order, Consolidated Edison modified two of the station's dual-flow intake screens to include smooth mesh panels, fish-retention buckets, flap seals to prevent fish from falling between screen panels, a low-pressure spray wash system (10 psi), and a separate fish return sluiceway. One of the modified screens had mesh of 1/8-inch by 1/2-inch while the other had 1/4-inch by 1/2-inch while the six unmodified screens all had 1/8-inch by 1/8-inch mesh. Screens were continuously rotated at 20 ft/min during the sampling events.

The sampling period lasted from September 1991 to September 1992. Weekly samples were collected simultaneously from all screens, with the exception of 2 weeks when the facility was shut down. Each screen sample was held separately in a collection tank where initial mortality was observed. A 24-hour survival rate was calculated based on the percentage of fish alive after 24 hours versus the total number collected. Because a control study was not performed, final survival rates have not been adjusted for any water quality or collection factors. The study did not evaluate latent survival beyond the 24-hour period.

Atlantic herring, blueback herring and bay anchovy typically composed the majority (> 90 percent) of impinged species during the course of the study period. Bay anchovy alone accounted for more than 72 percent of the sample population. Overall performance numbers for the modified screens are greatly influenced by the survival rates for these three species. In general, the unmodified screens demonstrated a substantially lower impingement survival rate when compared to the modified screens. The average 24-hour survival for fish impinged on the unmodified screens was 15 percent. Fish impinged on the larger mesh (1/4") and smaller mesh (1/8") modified screens had survival average 24-hour survival rates of 92 percent and 79 percent, respectively. Most species with low survival rates on the unmodified screens showed a marked improvement on the modified screens. Bay anchovy showed a 24-hour survival rate increase from 1 percent on the unmodified screens to 50 percent on the modified screens.

The study period at the Arthur Kill station offered a unique opportunity to conduct a side-by-side evaluation of modified and unmodified intake structures. The results for 24-hour post-impingement survival clearly show a marked improvement for all species that had fared poorly on the conventional screens. The study notes that lower survival rates for fragile species such as Atlantic herring might have been adversely affected by the collection tanks and protocols. Larger holding tanks appeared to improve the survival of these species, suggesting that the reported survival rates may underrepresent the rate that would be achieved under normal (unobserved) conditions, though by how much is unclear.

#### ***Dunkirk Steam Station***

Dunkirk Steam Station is located on the southern shore of Lake Erie in New York. In 1998 a modified dual-flow traveling screen system was installed on Unit 1 for an impingement mortality reduction study. The new system incorporated an improved fish bucket design to minimize turbulence caused by flow through the screen face, as well as a nose cone on the upstream wall of the screen assembly. The nose cone was installed to reduce the flow and velocity variations that had been observed across the screen face.

Samples were collected during the winter months of 1998/1999 and evaluated for 24-hour survival. Four species (emerald shiner, juvenile gizzard shad, rainbow smelt, and spottail shiner) compose nearly 95 percent of the sample population during this period. All species exhibited high 24-hour survival rates; rainbow smelt fared worst at 83 percent. The other three species had survival rates of better than 94 percent. Other species were collected during the sampling period but were not present in numbers significant enough to warrant a statistical analysis.

The results presented above represent one season of impingement sampling. Species not in abundance during cooler months might be affected differently by the intake structure. Sampling continued beyond the winter months, but EPA has not yet been reviewed by EPA.

#### ***Kintigh Station***

Kintigh Station is located on the southern shore of Lake Ontario in New York. The facility operates an offshore intake in the lake with traveling screens and a fiberglass fish return trough. Fish are removed from the screens and deposited in the return trough by a low-pressure spray wash (10 psi). It is noted that the facility also operates with an offshore velocity cap. This does not directly affect the survival rate of fish impinged against the screen but might alter the distribution of species subject to impingement on the screen.

Samples were collected seasonally and held for observation at multiple intervals up to 96 hours. Most species exhibited a high variability in their rate of survival depending on the season. Rainbow smelt had a 96-hour survival rate of 95 percent in the spring and a 22 percent rate in the fall. (The rate was 1.5 percent in summer but the number of samples was small.) Alewife composed the largest number among the species in the sample population. Survival rates were generally poor (0 percent to 19 percent) for spring and summer sampling before the system was modified 1989. After the screen assembly had been modified to minimize stress associated with removal from the screen and return to the waterbody, alewife survival rates increased to 45 percent. Survival rates were not adjusted for possible influence from handling and observation stresses because no control study was performed.

#### ***Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant***

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant is located on the eastern shore of the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland. The facility used to have conventional traveling screens on its intake screen assemblies. Screens were rotated for 10 minutes every hour or when triggered by a set pressure differential across the screen surface. A spray wash system removed impinged fish and debris into a discharge trough. The original screens have since been converted to a dual-flow design. The data discussed in the 1975-1981 study period are related to the older conventional screen systems.

Sampling periods were determined to account for the varying conditions that might exist due to tides and time of day.

Impingement and survival rates were estimated monthly based on the number and weights of the individual species in the sample collection. No control studies accompanied the impingement survival evaluation although total impingement data and estimated mortalities were provided for comparative purposes. Latent survival rates were not evaluated for this study; only initial survival was included.

Five species typically constituted over 90 percent of the sample population in the study years. Spot, Atlantic menhaden, Atlantic silverside, bay anchovy, and hogchoker had composite initial survival rates of 84, 52, 54, 68 and 99 percent, respectively. Other species generally had survival rates greater than 75 percent, but these data are less significant to the facility-wide survival rate given their low percentage of the overall sample population (< 8 percent). Overall, the facility showed an initial survival rate of 73 percent for all species.

It is notable that the volume of impingement data collected by Calvert Cliffs NPP (over 21 years) has enabled the facility to anticipate possible large impingement events by monitoring fluctuations in the thermal and salinity stratification of the surrounding portion of the Chesapeake Bay. When possible, operational changes during these periods (typically mid to late summer) might allow the facility to reduce cooling water intake volume, thereby reducing the potential for impingement losses. The facility has also studied ways to maintain adequate dissolved oxygen levels in the intake canal to assist fish viability and better enable post-impingement survival and escape.

### ***Huntley Steam Station***

Huntley Steam Station is located on the Niagara River in New York. The facility recently replaced four older conventional traveling screens with modified Ristroph screens on Units 67 and 68. The modified screens are fitted with smoothly woven coarse mesh panels on a rotating belt. A fish collection basket is attached to the screen face of each screen panel. Bucket contents are removed by low-pressure spray nozzles into a fish return trough. High-pressure sprays remove remaining fish and debris into a separate debris trough. The study does not contain the rotation interval of the screen or the screen speed at the time of the study.

Samples were collected over five nights in January 1999 from the modified-screen fish return troughs. All collected fish were sorted according to initial mortality. Four targeted species (rainbow smelt, emerald shiner, gizzard shad, and alewife) were sorted according to species and size and held to evaluate 24-hour survival rates. Together, the target species accounted for less than 50 percent of all fish impinged on the screens. (An additional 6,364 fish were not held for latent survival evaluation.) Of the target species, rainbow smelt and emerald shiners composed the greatest percentage with 57 and 37 percent, respectively.

Overall, the 24-hour survival rate for rainbow smelt was 84 percent; some variation was evident for juveniles (74 percent) and adults (94 percent). Emerald shiner were present in the same general life stage and had a 24-hour survival rate of 98 percent. Gizzard shad, both juvenile and adult, fared poorly, with an overall survival of 5 percent for juveniles and 0 percent for adults. Alewife were not present in large numbers ( $n = 30$ ) and had an overall survival rate of 0 percent.

The study notes the low survival rates for alewife and gizzard shad and posits the low water temperature as the principal factor. At the Huntley facility, both species are near the northern extreme of their natural ranges and are more susceptible to stresses associated with extremes in water conditions. The water temperatures at the time of collection were among the coldest of the year. Laboratory evaluations conducted on these species at the same temperatures showed high degrees of impairment that would likely adversely affect post-impingement survival. A control evaluation was performed to determine whether mortality rates from the screens would need to be adjusted for waterbody or collection and handling factors. No discrepancies were observed, and therefore no corrections were made to the final results. Also of note in the study is the inclusion of a spray wash collection efficiency evaluation. The spray wash and fish return system were evaluated to determine the proportion of impinged fish that were removed from the buckets and deposited in the fish trough instead of the debris trough. All species had suitable removal efficiencies.

### 2.1.2 SUMMARY

Studies conducted at steam electric power generating facilities over the past three decades have built a sizable record demonstrating the performance potential for modified traveling screens that include some form of fish return. Comprehensive studies, such as those cited above, have shown that modified screens can achieve an increase in the post-impingement survival of aquatic organisms that come under the influence of cooling water intake structures. Hardier species, as might be expected, have exhibited survival rates as high as 100 percent. More fragile species, which are typically smaller and more numerous in the source waterbody, understandably have lower survival rates. Data indicates, however, that with fine tuning,

modified screen systems can increase survival rates for even the most susceptible species and bring them closer to the performance standards established under the final rule.

## 2.2 CYLINDRICAL WEDGEWIRE SCREENS

### *Technology Overview*

Wedgewire screens are designed to reduce entrainment and impingement by physical exclusion and by exploitation of hydrodynamics and the natural flushing action of currents present in the source waterbody. Physical exclusion occurs when the mesh size of the screen is smaller than the organisms susceptible to entrainment. Screen mesh sizes range from 0.5 to 10 mm, with the most common slot sizes in the 1.0 to 2.0 mm range. Hydrodynamic exclusion results from maintenance of a low through-slot velocity, which, because of the screen's cylindrical configuration, is quickly dissipated. This allows organisms to escape the flow field (Weisberd et al. 1984). The name of these screens arises from the triangular or wedge-shaped cross section of the wire that makes up the screen. The screen is composed of wedgewire loops welded at the apex of their triangular cross section to supporting axial rods presenting the base of the cross section to the incoming flow (Pagano et al. 1977). Wedgewire screens are also referred to as profile screens, Johnson screens, or “vee wire”.

General understanding of the efficacy of cylindrical wedgewire screens holds that in order to achieve the optimal reduction in impingement and entrainment, certain conditions must be met. First, the slot size must be small enough to physically prevent the entrainment of the organisms identified as warranting protection. Larger slot sizes might be feasible in areas where eggs, larvae, and some classes of juveniles are not present in significant numbers. Second, a low through-slot velocity must be maintained to minimize the hydraulic zone of influence surrounding the screen assembly. A general rule of thumb holds that a lower through-slot velocity, when combined with other optimal factors, will achieve significant reductions in entrainment and impingement. Third, a sufficient ambient current must be present in the source waterbody to aid organisms in bypassing the structure and to remove other debris from the screen face. A constant current also aids the automated cleaning systems that are now common to cylindrical wedgewire screen assemblies.

### 2.2.1 EXAMPLE STUDIES

#### ***Laboratory Evaluation (EPRI 2003)***

EPRI recently published (May 2003) the results of a laboratory evaluation of wedgewire screens under controlled conditions in the Alden Research Laboratory Fish Testing Facility. A principal aim of the study was to identify the important factors that influence the relative rates of impingement and entrainment associated with wedgewire screens. The study evaluated characteristics such as slot size, through-slot velocity, and the velocity of ambient currents that could best carry organisms and debris past the screen. When each of the characteristics was optimized, wedgewire screen use became increasingly effective as an impingement reduction technology; in certain circumstances it could be used to reduce the entrainment of eggs and larvae. EPRI notes that large reductions in impingement and entrainment might occur even when all characteristics are not optimized. Localized conditions unique to a particular facility, which were not represented in laboratory testing, might also enable successful deployment. The study cautions that the available data are not sufficient to determine the biological and engineering factors that would need to be optimized, and in what manner, for future applications of wedgewire screens.

Slot sizes of 0.5, 1.0, and 2.0 mm were each evaluated at two different through-slot velocities (0.15 and 0.30 m/s) and three different channel velocities (0.08, 0.15, and 0.30 m/s) to determine the impingement and entrainment rates of fish eggs and larvae. Screen porosities increase from 24.7 percent for the 0.5 mm screens to 56.8 percent for 2.0 mm screens. The study evaluated eight species (striped bass, winter flounder, yellow perch, rainbow smelt, common carp, white sucker, alewife, and bluegill) because of their presence in a variety of waterbody types and their history of entrainment and impingement at many facilities. Larvae were studied for all species except alewife, while eggs were studied for striped bass, white sucker, and alewife. (Surrogate, or artificial, eggs of a similar size and buoyancy substituted for live striped bass eggs.)

Individual tests followed a rigorous protocol to count and label all fish eggs and larvae prior to their introduction into the testing facility. Approach and through-screen velocities in the flume were verified, and the collection nets used to recapture organisms that bypassed the structure or were entrained were cleaned and secured. Fish and eggs were released at a point upstream of the wedgewire screen selected to deliver the organisms at the centerline of the screens, which maximized the exposure of the eggs and larvae to the influence of the screen. The number of entrained organisms was estimated by counting all eggs and larvae captured on the entrainment collection net. Impinged organisms were counted by way of a plexiglass window and video camera setup.

In addition to the evaluations conducted with biological samples, Alden Laboratories developed a Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) model to evaluate the hydrodynamic characteristics associated with wedgewire screens. The CFD model analyzed the effects of approach velocity and through-screen velocities on the velocity distributions around the screen assemblies. Using the data gathered from the CFD evaluation, engineers were able to approximate the “zone of influence” around the wedgewire screen assembly under different flow conditions and estimate any influence on flow patterns exerted by multiple screen assemblies located in close proximity to each other.

The results of both the biological evaluation and the CFD model evaluation support many of the conclusions reached by other wedgewire screen studies, as well as in situ anecdotal evidence. In general, the lower impingement rates were achieved with larger slot sizes (1.0 to 2.0 mm), lower through-screen velocities, and higher channel velocities. Similarly, the lowest entrainment rates were seen with low through-screen velocities and higher channel velocities, although the lowest entrainment rates were achieved with smaller slot sizes (0.5 mm). Overall impingement reductions reached as high as 100 percent under optimal conditions, and entrainment reductions approached 90 percent. It should be noted that the highest reductions for impingement and entrainment were not achieved under the same conditions. Results from the biological evaluation generally agree with the predictions from the CFD model: the higher channel velocities, when coupled with lower through-screen velocities, would result in the highest rate of protection for the target organisms.

### ***JH Campbell***

JH Campbell is located on Lake Michigan in Michigan, with the intake for Unit 3 located approximately 1,000 meters from shore at a depth of 10.7 meters. The cylindrical intake structure has 9.5-mm mesh wedgewire screens and withdraws approximately 400 MGD. Raw impingement data are not available, and EPA is not aware of a comprehensive study evaluating the impingement reduction associated with the wedgewire screen system. Comparative analyses using the impingement rates at the two other intake structures (on shore intakes with conventional traveling screens) have shown that impingement of emerald shiner, gizzard shad, smelt, yellow perch, and alewife associated with the wedgewire screen intake has been effectively reduced to insignificant levels. Maintenance issues have not been shown to be problematic at JH Campbell because of the far offshore location in deep water and the periodic manual cleaning using water jets to reduce biofouling. Entrainment has not been shown to be of concern at the intake structure because of the low abundance of entrainable organisms in the immediate vicinity of the wedgewire screens.

### ***Eddystone Generating Station***

Eddystone Generating Station is located on the tidal portion of the Delaware River in Pennsylvania. Units 1 and 2 were retrofitted to include wide-mesh wedgewire screens and currently withdraw approximately 500 MGD from the Delaware River. Pre-deployment data showed that over 3 million fish were impinged on the unmodified intake structures during a single 20-month period. An automatic air burst system has been installed to prevent biofouling and debris clogging from affecting the performance of the screens. EPA has not been able to obtain biological data for the Eddystone wedgewire screens but EPRI indicates that fish impingement has been eliminated.

## **2.2.2 OTHER FACILITIES**

Other plants with lower intake flows have installed wedgewire screens, but there are limited biological performance data for these facilities. The Logan Generating Station in New Jersey withdraws 19 MGD from the Delaware River through a 1-mm wedgewire screen. Entrainment data show 90 percent less entrainment of larvae and eggs than conventional screens. No impingement data are available. Unit 1 at the Cope Generating Station in South Carolina is a closed-cycle unit that withdraws about 6 MGD through a 2-mm wedgewire screen; however, no biological data are available. Performance data are also unavailable for the Jeffrey Energy Center, which withdraws about 56 MGD through a 10-mm screen from the Kansas River in Kansas. The system at the Jeffrey Plant has operated since 1982 with no operational difficulties. Finally, the American Electric Power Corporation has installed wedgewire screens at the Big Sandy (2 MGD) and Mountaineer (22 MGD) facilities, which withdraw water from the Big Sandy and Ohio rivers, respectively. Again, no biological test data are available for these facilities.

Wedgewire screens have been considered or tested for several other large facilities. In situ testing of 1- and 2-mm wedgewire screens was performed in the St. John River for the Seminole Generating Station Units 1 and 2 in Florida in the late 1970s. This testing showed virtually no impingement and 99 and 62 percent reductions in larvae entrainment for the 1-mm and 2-mm screens, respectively, over conventional screen (9.5-mm) systems. In 1982 and 1983 the State of Maryland conducted testing 1-, 2-, and 3-mm wedgewire screens at the Chalk Point Generating Station, which withdraws water from the Patuxent River in Maryland. The 1-mm wedgewire screens were found to reduce entrainment by 80 percent. No impingement data were available. Some biofouling and clogging were observed during the tests. In the late 1970s, Delmarva Power and Light

conducted laboratory testing of fine-mesh wedgewire screens for the proposed 1,540 MW Summit Power Plant. This testing showed that entrainment of fish eggs (including striped bass eggs) could effectively be prevented with slot widths of 1 mm or less, while impingement mortality was expected to be less than 5 percent. Actual field testing in the brackish water of the proposed intake canal required the screens to be removed and cleaned as often as once every 3 weeks.

#### *Applicability to Large-Capacity Facilities*

EPA believes that cylindrical wedgewire screens can be successfully employed by large intake facilities under certain circumstances. Although many of the current installations of this technology have been at smaller-capacity facilities, EPA does not believe that the increased capacity demand of a large intake facility, in and of itself, is a barrier to deployment of this technology. Large water withdrawals can be accommodated by multiple screen assemblies in the source waterbody. The limiting factor for a larger facility may be the availability of sufficient accessible space near the facility itself because additional screen assemblies obviously consume more space on the waterbody floor and might interfere with navigation or other uses of the waterbody. Consideration of the impacts in terms of space and placement must be evaluated before selecting wedgewire screens for deployment.

#### *Applicability in High-Debris Waterbodies*

As with any intake structure, the presence of large debris poses a risk of damage to the structure if not properly managed. Cylindrical wedgewire screens, because of their need to be submerged in the water current away from shore, might be more susceptible to debris interaction than other onshore technologies. Vendor engineers indicated that large debris has been a concern at several of their existing installations, but the risk associated with it has been effectively minimized by selecting the optimal site and constructing debris diversion structures. Significant damage to a wedgewire screen is most likely to occur from fast-moving submerged debris. Because wedgewire screens do not need to be sited in the area with the fastest current, a less damage-prone area closer to shore or in a cove or constructed embayment can be selected, provided it maintains a minimum ambient current around the screen assembly. If placement in the main channel is unavoidable, deflecting structures can be employed to prevent free-floating debris from contacting the screen assembly. Typical installations of cylindrical wedgewire place them roughly parallel to the direction of the current, exposing only the upstream nose to direct impacts with debris traveling downstream. EPA has noted several installations where debris-deflecting nose cones have been installed to effectively eliminate the damage risk associated with large debris.

Apart from the damage that large debris can cause, smaller debris, such as household trash or organic matter, can build up on the screen surface, altering the through-slot velocity of the screen face and increasing the risk of entrainment and/or impingement of target organisms. Again, selection of the optimal location in the waterbody might be able to reduce the collection of debris on the structure. Ideally, cylindrical wedgewire is located away from areas with high submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and out of known debris channels. Proper placement alone may achieve the desired effect, although technological solutions also exist to physically remove small debris and silt. Automated air-burst systems can be built into the screen assembly and set to deliver a short burst of air from inside and below the structure. Debris is removed from the screen face by the air burst and carried downstream and away from the influence of the intake structure. Improvements to the air burst system have eliminated the timed cleaning cycle and replaced it with one tied to a pressure differential monitoring system.

#### *Applicability in High Navigation Waterbodies*

Wedgewire screens are more likely to be placed closer to navigation channels than other onshore technologies, thereby increasing the possibility of damage to the structure itself or to a passing commercial ship or recreational boat. Because cylindrical wedgewire screens need to be submerged at all times during operation, they are typically installed closer to the waterbody floor than the surface. In a waterbody of sufficient depth, direct contact with recreational watercraft or small commercial vessels is unlikely. EPA notes that other submerged structures (e.g., pipes, transmission lines) operate in many different waterbodies and are properly delineated with acceptable navigational markers to prevent accidents associated with trawling, dropping anchor, and similar activities. Such precautions would likely be taken for a submerged wedgewire screen as well.

### 2.2.3 SUMMARY

Cylindrical wedgewire screens have been effectively used to mitigate impingement and, under certain conditions, entrainment impacts at many different types of facilities over the past three decades. Although not yet widely used at steam electric power plants, the limited data for Eddystone and Campbell indicate that wide mesh screens, in particular, can be used to minimize impingement. Successful use of the wedgewire screens at Eddystone, as well as at Logan in the Delaware River (high debris flows), suggests that the screens can have widespread applicability. This is especially true for facilities that have relatively

low intake flow requirements (closed-cycle systems). Nevertheless, the lack of more representative full-scale plant data makes it impossible to conclusively say that wedgewire screens can be used in all environmental conditions. For example, there are no full-scale data available specifically for marine environments where biofouling and clogging are significant concerns. Technological advances have been made to address such concerns. Automated cleaning systems can now be built into screen assemblies to reduce the disruptions debris buildup can cause. Likewise, vendors have been experimenting with different screen materials and coatings to reduce the on-screen growth of vegetation and other organisms (zebra mussels).

Fine-mesh wedgewire screens (0.5 - 1 mm) also have the *potential* for use to control both impingement and entrainment. EPA is not aware of the installation of any fine-mesh wedgewire screens at any power plants with high intake flows (> 100 MGD). However, such screens have been used at some power plants with lower intake flow requirements (25 to 50 MGD), which would be comparable to a very large power plant with a closed-cycle cooling system. With the exception of Logan, EPA has not identified any full-scale performance data for these systems. They could be even more susceptible to clogging than wide-mesh wedgewire screens (especially in marine environments). It is unclear whether clogging would simply necessitate more intensive maintenance or preclude their day-to-day use at many sites. Their successful application at Logan and Cope and the historical test data from Florida, Maryland, and Delaware at least suggest promise for addressing both fish impingement and entrainment of eggs and larvae. However, based on the fine-mesh screen experience at Big Bend Units 3 and 4, it is clear that frequent maintenance would be required. Therefore, relatively deep water sufficient to accommodate the large number of screen units would preferably be close to shore (readily accessible). Manual cleaning needs might be reduced or eliminated through use of an automated flushing (e.g., microburst) system.

## 2.3 FINE-MESH SCREENS

### *Technology Overview*

Fine-mesh screens are typically mounted on conventional traveling screens and are used to exclude eggs, larvae, and juvenile forms of fish from intakes. These screens rely on gentle impingement of organisms on the screen surface. Successful use of fine-mesh screens is contingent on the application of satisfactory handling and return systems to allow the safe return of impinged organisms to the aquatic environment (Pagano et al. 1977; Sharma 1978). Fine-mesh screens generally include those with mesh sizes of 5 mm or less.

### *Technology Performance*

Similar to fine-mesh wedgewire screens, fine-mesh traveling screens with fish return systems show promise for control of both impingement and entrainment. However, they have not been installed, maintained, and optimized at many facilities.

### 2.3.1 EXAMPLE FACILITIES

#### ***Big Bend***

The most significant example of long-term use of fine-mesh screens has been at the Big Bend Power Plant in the Tampa Bay area. The facility has an intake canal with 0.5-mm mesh Ristroph screens that are used seasonally on the intakes for Units 3 and 4. During the mid-1980s when the screens were initially installed, their efficiency in reducing I&E mortality was highly variable. The operator, Florida Power & Light (FPL) evaluated different approach velocities and screen rotational speeds. In addition, FPL recognized that frequent maintenance (manual cleaning) was necessary to avoid biofouling. By 1988, system performance had improved greatly. The system's efficiency in screening fish eggs (primarily drums and bay anchovy) exceeded 95 percent, with 80 percent latent survival for drum and 93 percent for bay anchovy. For larvae (primarily drums, bay anchovies, blennies, and gobies), screening efficiency was 86 percent, with 65 percent latent survival for drums and 66 percent for bay anchovy. (Note that latent survival in control samples was also approximately 60 percent). Although more recent data are generally not available, the screens continue to operate successfully at Big Bend in an estuarine environment with proper maintenance.

### 2.3.2 OTHER FACILITIES

Although egg and larvae entrainment performance data are not available, fine-mesh (0.5-mm) Passavant screens (single entry/double exit) have been used successfully in a marine environment at the Barney Davis Station in Corpus Christi, Texas. Impingement data for this facility show an overall 86 percent initial survival rate for bay anchovy, menhaden, Atlantic croaker, killfish, spot, silverside, and shrimp.

Additional full-scale performance data for fine-mesh screens at large power stations are generally not available. However, some data are available from limited use or study at several sites and from laboratory and pilot-scale tests. Seasonal use of fine mesh on two of four screens at the Brunswick Power Plant in North Carolina has shown 84 percent reduction in entrainment compared to the conventional screen systems. Similar results were obtained during pilot testing of 1-mm screens at the Chalk Point Generating Station in Maryland. At the Kintigh Generating Station in New Jersey, pilot testing indicated that 1-mm screens provided 2 to 35 times the reduction in entrainment over conventional 9.5-mm screens. Finally, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) pilot-scale studies performed in the 1970s showed reductions in striped bass larvae entrainment of up to 99 percent for a 0.5-mm screen and 75 and 70 percent for 0.97-mm and 1.3-mm screens, respectively. A full-scale test by TVA at the John Sevier Plant showed less than half as many larvae entrained with a 0.5-mm screen than with 1- and 2-mm screens combined.

### 2.3.3 SUMMARY

Despite the lack of full-scale data, the experiences at Big Bend (as well as Brunswick) show that fine-mesh screens can reduce entrainment by 80 percent or more. This reduction is contingent on optimized operation and intensive maintenance to avoid biofouling and clogging, especially in marine environments. It might also be appropriate to use removable fine mesh that is installed only during periods of egg and larval abundance, thereby reducing the potential for clogging and wear and tear on the systems.

## 2.4 FISH NET BARRIERS

### *Technology Overview*

Fish net barriers are wide-mesh nets that are placed in front of the entrance to intake structures. The size of the mesh needed is a function of the species present at a particular site and varies from 4 mm to 32 mm (EPRI 2000). The mesh must be sized to prevent fish from passing through the net, which could cause them to be gilled. Relatively low velocities are maintained because the area through which the water can flow is usually large. Fish net barriers have been used at numerous facilities and lend themselves to intakes where the seasonal migration of fish and other organisms requires fish diversion facilities at only specific times of the year.

### *Technology Performance*

Barrier nets can provide a high degree of impingement reduction by preventing large fish from entering the vicinity of the intake structure. Because of typically wide openings, they do not reduce entrainment of eggs and larvae. A number of barrier net systems have been used or studied at large power plants.

### 2.4.1 EXAMPLE STUDIES

#### ***JP Pulliam Station***

The JP Pulliam Station is located on the Fox River in Wisconsin. Two separate nets with 6-mm mesh are deployed on opposite sides of a steel grid supporting structure. The operation of a dual net system facilitates the cleaning and maintenance of the nets without affecting the overall performance of the system. Under normal operations, nets are rotated at least two times per week to facilitate cleaning and repair. The nets are typically deployed when the ambient temperature of the intake canal exceeds 37°F. This usually occurs between April 1 and December 1.

Studies undertaken during the first 2 years after deployment showed an overall net deterrence rate of 36 percent for targeted species (noted as commercially or recreationally important, or forage species). Improvements to the system in subsequent years consisted of a new bulkhead to ensure a better seal along the vertical edge of the net and additional riprap along the base of the net to maintain the integrity of the seal along the bottom of the net. The improvements resulted in a deterrence rate of 98 percent for some species; no species performed at less than 85 percent. The overall effectiveness for game species was better than 90 percent while forage species were deterred at a rate of 97 percent or better.

#### ***JR Whiting Plant***

The JR Whiting Plant is located on Maumee Bay of Lake Erie in Michigan. A 3/8-inch mesh barrier net was deployed in 1980 as part of a best technology available determination by the Michigan Water Resources Commission. Estimates of impingement reductions were based on counts of fish impinged on the traveling screens inside the barrier net. Counts in years after the deployment were compared to data from the year immediately prior to the installation of the net when over 17

million fish were impinged. Four years after deployment, annual impingement totals had fallen by 98 percent.

### ***Bowline Point***

Bowline Point is located on the Hudson River in New York. A 150-foot long, 0.95-cm mesh net has been deployed in a V-shaped configuration around the intake pump house. The area of the river in which the intake is located has currents that are relatively stagnant, thus limiting the stresses to which the net might be subjected. Relatively low through-net velocities (0.5 ft/s) have been maintained across a large portion of the net because of low debris loadings. Debris loads directly affecting the net were reduced by including a debris boom outside the main net. An air bubbler was also added to the system to reduce the buildup of ice during cold months.

The facility has attempted to evaluate the reduction in the rate of impingement by conducting various studies of the fish populations inside and outside the barrier net. Initial data were used to compare impingement rates from before and after deployment of the net and showed a deterrence of 91 percent for targeted species (white perch, striped bass, rainbow smelt, alewife, blueback herring, and American shad). In 1982 a population estimate determined that approximately 230,000 striped bass were present in the embayment outside the net area. A temporary mesh net was deployed across the embayment to prevent fish from leaving the area. A 9-day study found that only 1.6 percent of the estimated 230,000 fish were ultimately impinged on the traveling screens. A mark-recapture study that released individual fish inside and outside the barrier net showed similar results, with more than 99 percent of fish inside the net impinged and less than 3 percent of fish outside the net impinged. Gill net capture studies sought to estimate the relative population densities of fish species inside and outside the net. The results agreed with those of previous studies, showing that the net was maintaining a relatively low density of fish inside the net as compared to the outside.

## 2.4.2 SUMMARY

Barrier nets have clearly proven effective for controlling *impingement* (i.e., more than 80 percent reductions over conventional screens without nets) in areas with limited debris flows. Experience has shown that high debris flows can cause significant damage to net systems. Biofouling can also be a concern but it can be addressed through frequent maintenance. In addition, barrier nets are also often used only seasonally where the source waterbody is subject to freezing. Fine-mesh barrier nets show some promise for entrainment control but would likely require even more intensive maintenance. In some cases, the use of barrier nets might be further limited by the physical constraints and other uses of the waterbody.

## 2.5 AQUATIC MICROFILTRATION BARRIERS

### *Technology Overview*

Aquatic microfiltration barrier systems are barriers that employ a filter fabric designed to allow water to pass into a cooling water intake structure but exclude aquatic organisms. These systems are designed to be placed some distance from the cooling water intake structure within the source waterbody and act as a filter for the water that enters the cooling water system. These systems can be floating, flexible, or fixed. Because these systems usually have such a large surface area, the velocities maintained at the face of the permeable curtain are very low. One company, Gunderboom, Inc., has a patented full-water-depth filter curtain composed of polyethylene or polypropylene fabric that is suspended by flotation billets at the surface of the water and anchored to the substrate below. The curtain fabric is manufactured as a matting of minute unwoven fibers with an apparent opening size of 20 microns. Gunderboom systems also employ an automated “air burst” system to periodically shake the material and pass air bubbles through the curtain system to clean off of sediment buildup and release any other material back into the water column.

### *Technology Performance*

EPA has determined that microfiltration barriers, including the Gunderboom, show significant *promise* for minimizing entrainment. EPA acknowledges, however, that the Gunderboom technology is currently “experimental in nature.” At this juncture, the only power plant where the Gunderboom has been used at a full-scale level is the Lovett Generating Station along the Hudson River in New York, where pilot testing began in the mid-1990s. Initial testing at that facility showed significant potential for reducing entrainment. Entrainment reductions of up to 82 percent were observed for eggs and larvae, and these levels were maintained for extended month-to-month periods during 1999 through 2001. At Lovett, some operational difficulties have affected long-term performance. These difficulties, including tearing, overtopping, and plugging/clogging, have been addressed, to a large extent, through subsequent design modifications. Gunderboom, Inc. specifically has designed and installed a microburst cleaning system to remove particulates. Each of the challenges encountered at Lovett could be of significantly greater concern at marine sites with higher wave action and debris flows.

Gunderboom systems have been otherwise deployed in marine conditions to prevent migration of particulates and bacteria. They have been used successfully in areas with waves up to 5 feet. The Gunderboom system is being tested for potential use at the Contra Costa Plant along the San Joaquin River in Northern California.

An additional question related to the utility of the Gunderboom and other microfiltration systems is sizing and the physical limitations and other uses of the source waterbody. With a 20-micron mesh, 100,000 and 200,000 gpm intakes would require filter systems 500 and 1,000 feet long (assuming a 20-foot depth). In some locations, this may preclude the successful deployment of the system because of space limitations or conflicts with other waterbody uses.

## 2.6 LOUVER SYSTEMS

### *Technology Overview*

Louver systems consist of series of vertical panels placed at 90 degree angles to the direction of water flow (Haddingh 1979). The placement of the louver panels provides both changes in both the flow direction and velocity, which fish tend to avoid. The angles and flow velocities of the louvers create a current parallel to the face of the louvers that carries fish away from the intake and into a fish bypass system for return to the source waterbody.

### *Technology Performance*

Louver systems can reduce impingement losses based on fishes' abilities to recognize and swim away from the barriers. Their performance, i.e., guidance efficiency, is highly dependant on the length and swimming abilities of the resident species. Because eggs and early stages of larvae cannot swim away, they are not affected by the diversions and there is no associated reduction in entrainment.

Although louver systems have been tested at a number of laboratory and pilot-scale facilities, they have not been used at many full-scale facilities. The only large power plant facility where a louver system has been used is San Onofre Units 2 and 3 (2,200 MW combined) in Southern California. The operator initially tested both louver and wide mesh, angled traveling screens during the 1970s. Louvers were subsequently selected for full-scale use at the intakes for the two units. In 1984 a total of 196,978 fish entered the louver system with 188,583 returned to the waterbody and 8,395 impinged. In 1985, 407,755 entered the louver system; 306,200 were returned and 101,555 impinged. Therefore, the guidance efficiencies in 1984 and 1985 were 96 and 75 percent, respectively. However, 96-hour survival rates for some species, i.e., anchovies and croakers, was 50 percent or less. The facility has also encountered some difficulties with predator species congregating in the vicinity of the outlet from the fish return system. Louvers were originally considered for use at San Onofre because of 1970s pilot testing at the Redondo Beach Station in California, where maximum guidance efficiencies of 96 to 100 percent were observed.

EPRI (2000) indicated that louver systems could provide 80-95 percent diversion efficiency for a wide variety of species under a range of site conditions. These findings are generally consistent with the American Society of Civil Engineers' (ASCE) findings from the late 1970s, which showed that almost all systems had diversion efficiencies exceeding 60 percent with many more than 90 percent. As indicated above, much of the EPRI and ASCE data come from pilot/laboratory tests and hydroelectric facilities where louver use has been more widespread than at steam electric facilities. Louvers were specifically tested by the Northeast Utilities Service Company in the Holyoke Canal on the Connecticut River for juvenile clupeids (American shad and blueback herring). The overall guidance efficiency was found to be 75 to 90 percent. In the 1970s Alden Research Laboratory observed similar results for Hudson River species, including alewife and smelt. At the Tracy Fish Collection Facility along the San Joaquin River in California, testing was performed from 1993 and 1995 to determine the guidance efficiency of a system with primary and secondary louvers. The results for green and white sturgeon, American shad, splittail, white catfish, delta smelt, chinook salmon, and striped bass showed mean diversion efficiencies ranging from 63 percent (splittail) to 89 percent (white catfish). Also in the 1990s, an experimental louver bypass system was tested at the USGS Conte Anadromous Fish Research Center in Massachusetts. This testing showed guidance efficiencies for Connecticut River species of 97 percent for a "wide array" of louvers and 100 percent for a "narrow array." Finally, at the T.W. Sullivan Hydroelectric Plant along the Willamette River in Oregon, the louver system is estimated to be 92 percent effective in diverting spring chinook, 82 percent for all Chinook, and 85 percent for steelhead. The system has been optimized to reduce fish injuries such that the average injury occurrence is only 0.44 percent.

Overall, the above data indicate that louvers can be highly effective (more than 70 percent) in diverting fish from potential impingement. Latent mortality is a concern, especially where fragile species are present. Similar to modified screens with fish return systems, operators must optimize louver system design to minimize fish injury and mortality.

## 2.7 ANGLED AND MODULAR INCLINED SCREENS

### *Technology Overview*

Angled traveling screens use standard through-flow traveling screens in which the screens are set at an angle to the incoming flow. Angling the screens improves the fish protection effectiveness because the fish tend to avoid the screen face and move toward the end of the screen line, assisted by a component of the inflow velocity. A fish bypass facility with independently induced flow must be provided (Richards 1977). Modular inclined screens (MISs) are a specific variation on angled traveling screens, in which each module in the intake consists of trash racks, dewatering stop logs, an inclined screen set at a 10 to 20 degree angle to the flow, and a fish bypass (EPRI 1999).

### *Technology Performance*

Angled traveling screens with fish bypass and return systems work similarly to louver systems. They also provide only potential reductions in impingement mortality because eggs and larvae will not generally detect the factors that influence diversion. Like louver systems, they were tested extensively at the laboratory and pilot scales, especially during the 1970s and early 1980s. Testing of angled screens (45 degrees to the flow) in the 1970s at San Onofre showed poor to good guidance (0 to 70 percent) for northern anchovies and moderate to good guidance (60 to 90 percent) for other species. Latent survival varied by species: fragile species had only 25 percent survival, while hardy species showed greater than 65 percent survival. The intake for Unit 6 at the Oswego Steam plant along Lake Ontario in New York has traveling screens angled at 25 degrees. Testing during 1981 through 1984 showed a combined diversion efficiency of 78 percent for all species, ranging from 53 percent for mottled sculpin to 95 percent for gizzard shad. Latent survival testing results ranged from 22 percent for alewife to nearly 94 percent for mottled sculpin.

Additional testing of angled traveling screens was performed in the late 1970s and early 1980s for power plants on Lake Ontario and along the Hudson River. This testing showed that a screen angled at 25 degrees was 100 percent effective in diverting 1- to 6- inch-long Lake Ontario fish. Similar results were observed for Hudson River species (striped bass, white perch, and Atlantic tomcod). One-week mortality tests for these species showed 96 percent survival. Angled traveling screens with a fish return system have been used on the intake from Brayton Point Unit 4. Studies that evaluated the angled screens from 1984 through 1986 showed a diversion efficiency of 76 percent with a latent survival of 63 percent. Much higher results were observed excluding bay anchovy.

Finally, 1981 full-scale studies of an angled screen system at the Danskammer Station along the Hudson River in New York showed diversion efficiencies of 95 to 100 percent with a mean of 99 percent. Diversion efficiency combined with latent survival yielded a total effectiveness of 84 percent. Species included bay anchovy, blueback herring, white perch, spottail shiner, alewife, Atlantic tomcod, pumpkinseed, and American shad.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, Alden Research Laboratories conducted a range of tests on a variety of angled screen designs. Alden specifically performed screen diversion tests for three northeastern utilities. In initial studies for Niagara Mohawk, diversion efficiencies were found to be nearly 100 percent for alewife and smolt. Followup tests for Niagara Mohawk confirmed 100 percent diversion efficiency for alewife with mortalities only 4 percent higher than those in control samples. Subsequent tests by Alden for Consolidated Edison, Inc. using striped bass, white perch, and tomcod also found nearly 100 percent diversion efficiency with a 25 degree angled screen. The 1-week mean mortality was only 3 percent. Alden performed further tests during 1978 to 1990 to determine the effectiveness of fine-mesh, angled screens.

In 1978, tests were performed with striped bass larvae using both 1.5- and 2.5-mm mesh and different screen materials and approach velocity. Diversion efficiency was found to clearly be a function of larvae length. Synthetic materials were also found to be more effective than metal screens. Subsequent testing using only synthetic materials found that 1-mm screens can provide post larvae diversion efficiencies of greater than 80 percent. The tests found, however, that latent mortality for diverted species was also high. Finally, EPRI tested MIS in a laboratory in the early 1990s. Most fish had diversion efficiencies of 47 to 88 percent. Diversion efficiencies of greater than 98 percent were observed for channel catfish, golden shiner, brown trout, Coho and Chinook salmon, trout fry and juveniles, and Atlantic salmon smolts. Lower diversion efficiency and higher mortality were found for American shad and blueback herring, but the mortalities were comparable to control mortalities. Based on the laboratory data, an MIS system was pilot-tested at a Niagara Mohawk hydroelectric facility on the Hudson River. This testing showed diversion efficiencies and survival rates approaching 100 percent for golden shiners and rainbow trout. High diversion and survival were also observed for largemouth and smallmouth bass, yellow perch, and bluegill. Lower diversion efficiency and survival were found for herring.

In October 2002, EPRI published the results of a combined louver/angled screen assembly study that evaluated the diversion efficiencies of various configurations of the system. In 1999, fish guidance efficiency was evaluated with two bar rack

configurations (25- and 50-mm spacings) and one louver configuration (50-mm clearance), with each angled at 45 degrees to the approach flow. In 2000, the same species were evaluated with the 50-mm bar racks and louvers angled at 15 degrees to the approach flow. Diversion efficiencies were evaluated at various approach velocities ranging from 0.3 to 0.9 m/s.

Guidance efficiency was lowest, generally lower than 50 percent, for the 45 degree louver/bar rack array, with efficiencies distributed along a bell shaped curve according to approach velocity. For the 45 degree array, diversion efficiency was best at 0.6 m/s, with most species approaching 50 percent. All species except one (lake sturgeon) experienced higher diversion efficiencies with the louver/bar rack array set at 15 degrees to the approach flow. With the exception of lake sturgeon, species were diverted at 70 percent or better at most approach velocities.

Similar to louvers, angled screens show potential to minimize impingement by greater than 80 to 90 percent. More widespread full-scale use is necessary to determine optimal design specifications and verify that they can be used on a widespread basis.

## 2.8 VELOCITY CAPS

### *Technology Description*

A velocity cap is a device that is placed over a vertical inlet at an offshore intake. This cover converts vertical flow into horizontal flow at the entrance to the intake. The device works on the premise that fish will avoid rapid changes in horizontal flow but are less able to detect and avoid vertical velocity vectors. Velocity caps have been installed at many offshore intakes and have usually been successful in minimizing impingement.

### *Technology Performance*

Velocity caps can reduce the number of fish drawn into intakes based on the concept that they tend to avoid rapid changes in horizontal flow. They do not provide reductions in entrainment of eggs and larvae, which cannot distinguish flow characteristics. As noted in ASCE (1981), velocity caps are often used in conjunction with other fish protection devices, such as screens with fish returns. Therefore, there are somewhat limited data on their performance when used alone. Facilities that have velocity caps include the following:

- Oswego Steam Units 5 and 6 in New York (combined with angled screens on Unit 6).
- San Onofre Units 2 and 3 in California (combined with louver system).
- El Segundo Station in California
- Huntington Beach Station in California
- Edgewater Power Plant Unit 5 in Wisconsin (combined with 9.5-mm wedgewire screen)
- Nanticoke Power Plant in Ontario, Canada
- Nine Mile Point in New York
- Redondo Beach Station in California
- Kintigh Generation Station in New York (combined with modified traveling screens)
- Seabrook Power Plant in New Hampshire
- St. Lucie Power Plant in Florida
- Palisades Nuclear Plant in Michigan

At the Huntington Beach and Segundo stations in California, velocity caps have been found to provide 80 to 90 percent reductions in fish entrapment. At Seabrook, the velocity cap on the offshore intake has minimized the number of pelagic fish entrained except for pollock. Finally, two facilities in England each have velocity caps on one of two intakes. At the Sizewell Power Station, intake B has a velocity cap, which reduces impingement about 50 percent compared to intake A. Similarly, at the Dungeness Power Station, intake B has a velocity cap, which reduces impingement about by 62 percent compared to intake A.

## 2.9 POROUS DIKES AND LEAKY DAMS

### *Technology Overview*

Porous dikes, also known as leaky dams or dikes, are filters that resemble a breakwater surrounding a cooling water intake. The core of the dike consists of cobble or gravel that permits free passage of water. The dike acts as both a physical and a behavioral barrier to aquatic organisms. Tests conducted to date have indicated that the technology is effective in excluding juvenile and adult fish. The major problems associated with porous dikes come from clogging by debris and silt, ice buildup,

and colonization by fish and plant life.

#### *Technology Performance*

Porous dike technologies work on the premise that aquatic organisms will not pass through physical barriers in front of an intake. They also operate with low approach velocity, further increasing the potential for avoidance. They will not, however, prevent entrainment by nonmotile larvae and eggs. Much of the research on porous dikes and leaky dams was performed in the 1970s. This work was generally performed in a laboratory or on a pilot level, and the Agency is not aware of any full-scale porous dike or leaky dam systems currently used at power plants in the United States. Examples of early study results include:

- Studies of porous dike and leaky dam systems by Wisconsin Electric Power at Lake Michigan plants showed generally lower I&E rates than those for other nearby onshore intakes.
- Laboratory work by Ketschke showed that porous dikes could be a physical barrier to juvenile and adult fish and a physical or behavioral barrier to some larvae. All larvae except winter flounder showed some avoidance of the rock dike.
- Testing at the Brayton Point Station showed that densities of bay anchovy larvae downstream of the dam were reduced by 94 to 99 percent. For winter flounder, downstream densities were lower by 23 to 87 percent.

Entrainment avoidance for juvenile and adult finfish was observed to be nearly 100 percent. As indicated in the above examples, porous dikes and leaky dams show *potential* for use in limiting the passage of adult and juvenile fish and, to some degree, motile larvae. However, the lack of more recent, full-scale performance data makes it difficult to predict their widespread applicability and specific levels of performance.

## 2.10 BEHAVIORAL SYSTEMS

#### *Technology Overview*

Behavioral devices are designed to enhance fish avoidance of intake structures or to promote attraction to fish diversion or bypass systems. Specific technologies that have been considered include:

- **Light Barriers:** Light barriers consist of controlled application of strobe lights or mercury vapor lights to lure fish away from the cooling water intake structure or deflect natural migration patterns. This technology is based on research that shows that some fish species avoid light; however, it is also known that some species are attracted by light.
- **Sound Barriers:** Sound barriers are noncontact barriers that rely on mechanical or electronic equipment that generates various sound patterns to elicit avoidance responses in fish. Acoustic barriers are used to deter fish from entering cooling water intake structures. The most widely used acoustical barrier is a pneumatic air gun or “popper.”
- **Air bubble barriers:** Air bubble barriers consist of an air header with jets arranged to provide a continuous curtain of air bubbles over a cross sectional area. The general purpose of air bubble barriers is to repel fish that might attempt to approach the face of a CWIS.

#### *Technology Performance*

Many studies have been conducted and reports prepared on the application of behavioral devices to control I&E, see, for example, EPRI 2000. For the most part, these studies have been inconclusive or have shown no significant reduction in impingement or entrainment. As a result, the full-scale application of behavioral devices has been limited. Where data are available, performance appears to be highly dependent on the types and sizes of species and environmental conditions. One exception might be the use of sound systems to divert alewife. In tests at the Pickering Station in Ontario, poppers were found to be effective in reducing alewife I&E by 73 percent in 1985 and 76 percent in 1986. No impingement reductions were observed for rainbow smelt and gizzard shad. Testing of sound systems in 1993 at the James A. Fitzpatrick Station in New York showed similar results, i.e., 85 percent reductions in alewife I&E through use of a high-frequency sound system. At the Arthur Kill Station, pilot- and full-scale high-frequency sound tests showed comparable results for alewife to those for Fitzpatrick and Pickering. Impingement of gizzard shad was also three times lower than that without the system. No deterrence was observed for American shad or bay anchovy using the full-scale system. In contrast, sound provided little or no deterrence for any species at the Roseton Station in New York. Overall, the Agency expects that behavioral systems

would be used in conjunction with other technologies to reduce I&E and perhaps targeted toward an individual species (e.g., alewife).

## 2.11 OTHER TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVES

Use of variable speed pumps can provide for greater system efficiency and have reduced flow requirements (and associated entrainment) by 10 to 30 percent. EPA Region 4 estimated that use of variable speed pumps at the Canaveral and Indian River stations in the Indian River estuary would reduce entrainment by 20 percent. Presumably, such pumps could be used in conjunction with other technologies to meet the performance standards.

Perforated pipes draw water through perforations or elongated slots in a cylindrical section placed in the waterway. Early designs of this technology were not efficient, velocity distribution was poor; and the pipes were specifically designed to screen out detritus, not to protect fish (ASCE 1982). Inner sleeves were subsequently added to perforated pipes to equalize the velocities entering the outer perforations. These systems have historically been used at locations requiring small amounts of make-up water; experience at steam electric plants is very limited (Sharma 1978). Perforated pipes are used on the intakes for the Amos and Mountaineer stations along the Ohio River, but I&E performance data for these facilities are unavailable. In general, EPA projects that perforated pipe system performance should be comparable to that of wide mesh wedgewire screens (e.g., at Eddystone Units 1 and 2 and Campbell Unit 3).

At the Pittsburg Plant in California, impingement survival was studied for continuously rotated screens versus intermittent rotation. Ninety-six-hour survival for young-of-year white perch was 19 to 32 percent for intermittent screen rotation versus 26 to 56 percent for continuous rotation. Striped bass latent survival increased from 26 to 62 percent when continuous rotation was used. Similar studies were also performed at Moss Landing Units 6 and 7, where no increased survival was observed for hardy and very fragile species; there was, however, a substantial increase in impingement survival for surfperch and rockfish.

Facilities might be able to use recycled cooling water to reduce their intake flow needs. The Brayton Point Station has a “piggyback” system in which the entire intake requirements for Unit 4 can be met by recycled cooling water from Units 1 through 3. The system has been used sporadically since 1993, and it reduces the make-up water needs (and thereby entrainment) by 29 percent.

## 2.12 INTAKE LOCATION

Beyond design alternatives for CWISs, an operator might be able to relocate CWISs offshore or in others areas that minimize I&E (compared to conventional onshore locations). In conjunction with offshore inlet technologies such as cylindrical wedgewire t-screens or velocity caps, the relocated offshore intake could be quite effective at reducing impingement and/or entrainment effects. However, the action of relocating at existing facilities is costly due to significant civil engineering works. It is well known that there are certain areas within every waterbody with increased biological productivity, and therefore where the potential for I&E of organisms is higher.

In large lakes and reservoirs, the littoral zone (the shore zone areas where light penetrates to the bottom) serves as the principal spawning and nursery area for most species of freshwater fish and is considered one of the most productive areas of the waterbody. Fish of this zone typically follow a spawning strategy wherein eggs are deposited in prepared nests, on the bottom, or are attached to submerged substrates where they incubate and hatch. As the larvae mature, some species disperse to the open water regions, whereas many others complete their life cycle in the littoral zone. Clearly, the impact potential for intakes located in the littoral zone of lakes and reservoirs is high. The profundal zone of lakes and reservoirs is the deeper, colder area of the waterbody. Rooted plants are absent because of insufficient light, and for the same reason, primary productivity is minimal. A well-oxygenated profundal zone can support benthic macroinvertebrates and cold-water fish; however, most of the fish species seek shallower areas to spawn (either in littoral areas or in adjacent streams and rivers). Use of the deepest open water region of a lake or reservoir (e.g., within the profundal zone) as a source of cooling water typically offers lower I&E impact potential than use of littoral zone waters.

As with lakes and reservoirs, rivers are managed for numerous benefits, which include sustainable and robust fisheries. Unlike lakes and reservoirs, the hydrodynamics of rivers typically result in a mixed water column and overall unidirectional flow. There are many similarities in the reproductive strategies of shoreline fish populations in rivers and the reproductive strategies of fish within the littoral zone of lakes and reservoirs. Planktonic movement of eggs, larvae, post larvae, and early

juvenile organisms along the shore zone is generally limited to relatively short distances. As a result, the shore zone placement of CWISs in rivers might potentially impact local spawning populations of fish. The impact potential associated with entrainment might be diminished if the main source of cooling water is recruited from near the bottom strata of the open water channel region of the river. With such an intake configuration, entrainment of shore zone eggs and larvae, as well as the near-surface drift community of ichthyoplankton, is minimized. Impacts could also be minimized by controlling the timing and frequency of withdrawals from rivers. In temperate regions, the number of entrainable or impingeable organisms of rivers increases during spring and summer (when many riverine fishes reproduce). The number of eggs and larvae peak at that time, whereas entrainment potential during the remainder of the year can be minimal.

In estuaries, species distribution and abundance are determined by a number of physical and chemical attributes, including geographic location, estuary origin (or type), salinity, temperature, oxygen, circulation (currents), and substrate. These factors, in conjunction with the degree of vertical and horizontal stratification (mixing) in the estuary, help dictate the spatial distribution and movement of estuarine organisms. With local knowledge of these characteristics, however, the entrainment effects of a CWIS could be minimized by adjusting the intake design to areas (e.g., depths) least likely to affect concentrated numbers and species of organisms.

In oceans, nearshore coastal waters are typically the most biologically productive areas. The euphotic zone (zone light available for photosynthesis) typically does not extend beyond the first 100 meters (328 feet) of depth. Therefore, inshore waters are generally more productive due to photosynthetic activity and due to the input from estuaries and runoff of nutrients from land.

There are only limited published data quantifying the locational differences in I&E rates at individual power plants. Some information, however, is available for selected sites. For example,

- For the St. Lucie plant in Florida, EPA Region 4 permitted the use of a once through cooling system instead of closed-cycle cooling by locating the outfall 1,200 feet offshore (with a velocity cap) in the Atlantic Ocean. This approach avoided impacts on the biologically sensitive Indian River estuary.
- In *Entrainment of Fish Larvae and Eggs on the Great Lakes, with Special Reference to the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Southeastern Lake Michigan* (1976), researchers noted that larval abundance is greatest within the area from the 12.2-m (40-ft) contour to shore in Lake Michigan and that the abundance of larvae tends to decrease as one proceeds deeper and farther offshore. This finding led to the suggestion of locating CWISs in deep waters.
- During biological studies near the Fort Calhoun Power Station along the Missouri River, results of transect studies indicated significantly higher fish larvae densities along the cutting bank of the river, adjacent to the station's intake structure. Densities were generally lowest in the middle of the channel.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

As suggested by the technology studies evaluated in this chapter, the technologies presented can substantially reduce impingement mortality and entrainment. With proper design, installation, and operation and maintenance, a facility can realize marked reductions. However, EPA recognizes that there is a high degree of variability in the performance of each technology, which is in part due to the site-specific environmental conditions at a given facility. EPA also recognizes that much of the data cited in this document was collected under a variety of performance standards and study protocols that have arisen over the years since EPA promulgated its last guidance in 1977.

EPA believes that these technologies can meet the performance standards established in today's final rule. While EPA acknowledges that site-specific factors may affect the efficacy of impingement and entrainment reduction technologies, EPA believes that there are a reasonable number of options available from which most facilities may choose to meet the performance standards. EPA also believes that, in cases where one technology can not meet the performance standards alone, a combination of additional intake technologies, operational measures and/or restoration measures can be employed to meet the performance standards.



## REFERENCES

- American Electric Power Corporation. March, 1980. Philip Sporn Plant 316(b) Demonstration Document.
- American Society of Civil Engineers. 1982. Design of Water Intake Structures for Fish Protection. Task Committee on Fish-Handling Capability of Intake Structures of the Committee on Hydraulic Structures of the Hydraulic Division of the American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Bailey et. al. Undated. Studies of Cooling Water Intake Structure Effects at PEPCO Generating Stations.
- CK Environmental. June, 2000. Letter from Charles Kaplan, CK Environmental, to Martha Segall, Tetra Tech, Inc. June 26, 2000.
- Duke Energy, Inc. April, 2000. Moss Landing Power Plant Modernization Project, 316(b) Resource Assessment.
- Ecological Analysts, Inc. 1979. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Continuously Operating Fine Mesh Traveling Screen for Reducing Ichthyoplankton Entrainment at the Indian Point Generating Station. Prepared for Consolidated Edison, Inc.
- Edison Electric Institute (EEI). 1993. EEI Power Statistics Database. Prepared by the Utility Data Institute for the Edison Electric Institute.
- Ehrler, C. and Raifsnider, C. April, 1999. "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Intake Wedgewire Screens." Presented at EPRI Power Generation Impacts on Aquatic Resources Conference.
- Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). 1999. Fish Protection at Cooling Water Intakes: Status Report.
- EPRI. March, 1989. Intake Technologies: Research Status. Publication GS-6293.
- EPRI. 1985. Intake Research Facilities Manual.
- ESSA Technologies, Ltd. June, 2000. Review of Portions of NJPDES Renewal Application for the PSE&G Salem Generating Station.
- Fletcher, I. 1990. Flow Dynamics and Fish Recovery Experiments: Water Intake Systems.
- Florida Power and Light. August, 1995. Assessment of the Impacts of the St. Lucie Nuclear Generating Plant on Sea Turtle Species Found in the Inshore Waters of Florida.
- Fritz, E.S. 1980. Cooling Water Intake Screening Devices Used to Reduce Entrainment and Impingement. Topical Briefs: Fish and Wildlife Resources and Electric Power Generation, No. 9.
- Haddingh, R.H. 1979. "Fish Intake Mortality at Power Stations, the Problem and its Remedy." In: Hydrological Bulletin, 13(2-3).
- Hutchison, J.B., and Matousek, J.A. Undated. Evaluation of a Barrier Net Used to Mitigate Fish Impingement at a Hudson River Power Plant Intake. American Fisheries Society Monograph.
- Jude, D.J. 1976. "Entrainment of Fish Larvae and Eggs on the Great Lakes, with Special Reference to the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Southeastern Lake Michigan." In: Jensen, L.D. (Ed.), Third National Workshop on Entrainment & Impingement: Section 316(b) – Research and Compliance.
- Ketschke, B.A. 1981. "Field and Laboratory Evaluation of the Screening Ability of a Porous Dike." In: P.B. Dorn and Johnson (Eds.). Advanced Intake Technology for Power Plant Cooling Water Systems.
- King, R.G. 1977. "Entrainment of Missouri River Fish Larvae through Fort Calhoun Station." In: Jensen, L.D. (Ed.), Fourth National Workshop on Entrainment and Impingement.
- Lifton, W.S. Undated. Biological Aspects of Screen Testing on the St. John's River, Palatka, Florida.

- Marley Cooling Tower. August 2001. Electronic Mail from Robert Fleming, Marley Cooling Tower to Ron Rimelman, Tetra Tech, Inc. August 9, 2001.
- Micheletti, W. September, 1987. "Fish Protection at Cooling Water Intake Systems." In: EPRI Journal.
- Mussalli, Y.G., Taft, E.P., and Hofmann, P. February, 1978. "Biological and Engineering Considerations in the Fine Screening of Small Organisms from Cooling Water Intakes." In: Proceedings of the Workshop on Larval Exclusion Systems for Power Plant Cooling Water Intakes, Sponsored by Argonne National Laboratory (ANL Publication No. ANL/ES-66).
- Mussalli, Y.G., Taft, E.P, and Larsen, J. November, 1980. "Offshore Water Intakes Designated to Protect Fish." In: Journal of the Hydraulics Division, Proceedings of the America Society of Civil Engineers. Vol. 106, No HY11.
- Northeast Utilities Service Company. January, 1993. Feasibility Study of Cooling Water System Alternatives to Reduce Winter Flounder Entrainment at Millstone Units 1-3.
- Orange and Rockland Utilities and Southern Energy Corp. 2000. Lovett Generating Station Gunderboom Evaluation Program, 1999.
- PG&E. March 2000. Diablo Canyon Power Plant, 316(b) Demonstration Report.
- Pagano, R. and Smith, W.H.B. November, 1977. Recent Developments in Techniques to Protect Aquatic Organisms at the Intakes Steam-Electric Power Plants.
- Pisces Conservation, Ltd. 2001. Technical Evaluation of USEPA's Proposed Cooling Water Intake Regulations for New Facilities, November 2000.
- Richards, R.T. December, 1977. "Present Engineering Limitations to the Protection of Fish at Water Intakes". In: Fourth National Workshop on Entrainment and Impingement.
- Ringger, T.J. April, 1999. "Baltimore Gas and Electric, Investigations of Impingement of Aquatic Organisms at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, 1975-1999." Presented at EPRI Power Generation Impacts on Aquatic Resources Conference.
- Sharma, R.K. February, 1978. "A Synthesis of Views Presented at the Workshop." In: Larval Exclusion Systems For Power Plant Cooling Water Intakes.
- Taft, E.P. April, 1999. "Alden Research Laboratory, Fish Protection Technologies: A Status Report." Presented at EPRI Power Generation Impacts on Aquatic Resources Conference.
- Taft, E.P. March, 1999. PSE&G Renewal Application, Appendix F, Salem Generation Station.
- Taft, E.P. et. al. 1981. "Laboratory Evaluation of the Larval Fish Impingement and Diversion Systems." In: Proceedings of Advanced Intake Technology.
- Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). 1976. A State of the Art Report on Intake Technologies.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 4. May, 1983. 316a and 316b Finding for Cape Canaveral/Orlando Utilities Plants at Canaveral Pool.
- EPA, Region 4. September, 1979. Brunswick Nuclear Steam Electric Generating Plant. Historical Summary and Review of Section 316(b) Issues.
- University of Michigan. 1985. Impingement Losses at the D.C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant During 1975-1982 with a Discussion of Factors Responsible and Possible Impact on Local Populations.
- Versar, Inc. April, 1990. Evaluation of the Section 316 Status of Delaware Facilities with Cooling Water Discharges. Prepared for State of Delaware Department of Natural Resources.
- Weisberg, S.B., Jacobs, F., Burton, W.H., and Ross, R.N. 1983. Report on Preliminary Studies Using the Wedge Wire Screen

Model Intake Facility. Prepared for State of Maryland, Power Plant Siting Program.

