

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: LET US ENERGIZE YOU

Victoria Prussen Spears

SECURITIES LITIGATION IN THE ENERGY SECTOR

Michael J. Biles, Frances Fink, Cheri A. Grosvenor and Tyler W. Highful

AS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SIDESTEPS SITING DECISIONS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING, WILL CHAOS ENSUE?

John B. (Jack) Lyman

COMPLIANCE, ENFORCEMENT RISKS AND EMERGING ISSUES REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S VESSEL GENERAL PERMIT

Jeanne M. Grasso and Dana S. Merkel

NEW REMOVABILITY AND REPLACEABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BATTERIES MARKETED IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Cándido García Molvneux

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 23	NUMBER 5	May 2023	
Editor's Note: Let Us E	nergize You		
Victoria Prussen Spears			147
Securities Litigation in Michael J. Biles, Frances	the Energy Sector Fink, Cheri A. Grosvenor	and Tyler W. Highful	149
As Federal Government Charging, Will Chaos F John B. (Jack) Lyman	Sidesteps Siting Decisions	s for Electric Vehicle	167
Compliance, Enforceme	ent Risks and Emerging Is on Agency's Vessel Genera ana S. Merkel		175
New Removability and Marketed in the Europe Cándido García Molynei		nts for Batteries	179



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission,				
please call or email:				
Jessica Carnevale, Esq. at	(212) 229-4942			
Email: jessica.carnevale@lexisnexis.com				
For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:				
Customer Services Department at	(800) 833-9844			
Outside the United States and Canada, please call	(518) 487-3385			
Fax Number	(800) 828-8341			
Customer Service Website				
Your account manager or	(800) 223-1940 (937) 247-0293			

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)

ISSN: 2374-3395 (print) ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] Pratt's Energy Law Report [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea, 14 Pratt's Energy Law Report 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW & BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Samuel B. Boxerman

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

R. Todd Johnson

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Energy Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

Compliance, Enforcement Risks and Emerging Issues Regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's Vessel General Permit

By Jeanne M. Grasso and Dana S. Merkel*

In this article, the authors explain that, with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's focus on Vessel General Permit (VGP) compliance and enforcement, it is critical for companies to closely review VGP compliance for the vessels in their fleet and implement strict oversight and quality control, including audits, to ensure VGP requirements are complied with, crew are trained, and any deficiencies are promptly corrected.

For the past couple years, there has been an increase in inspections and enforcement of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Vessel General Permit (VGP) in several EPA regions around the country.

When the trend began, one EPA attorney indicated that it was "just the beginning," and we have continued to see more aggressive reviews of VGP compliance and penalty demands, particularly on the U.S. West Coast.

More recently, the EPA has continued demanding significant penalties for alleged violations, sometimes citing interpretations of the VGP that are not outlined in any guidance documents. Additionally, in January 2023, the EPA published an Enforcement Alert, titled the EPA Reminder About Clean Water Act Vessel General Permit Requirements, reminding the maritime industry of the VGP requirements and impacts of non-compliance, and citing recent enforcement examples.

THE VGP AND VIDA IMPLEMENTATION

The VGP was issued under the Clean Water Act's (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and provides permit coverage nationwide for discharges incidental to the normal operation of commercial vessels more than 79 feet in length. The EPA issued the first version of the VGP in 2008 and then another, more stringent version in 2013. The VGP set effluent limits and mandated Best Management Practices to control certain types of incidental discharges. It also required vessels to conduct routine and annual inspections and imposed numerous recordkeeping obligations, as well as monitoring and reporting requirements.

^{*} Jeanne M. Grasso and Dana S. Merkel, attorneys with Blank Rome LLP, may be contacted at jeanne.grasso@blankrome.com and dana.merkel@blankrome.com, respectively.

https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-01/vgpcwaenfalert11023.pdf.

The 2013 VGP was set to expire in December 2018 and a new VGP was to be issued. However, in December 2018, the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act (VIDA) was signed into law, with the intent of replacing the VGP and bringing uniformity, consistency, and certainty to the regulation of incidental discharges throughout the United States from U.S.-flag and foreign-flag vessels alike. VIDA amended the CWA and will substantially alter how the EPA and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) regulate vessel discharges. VIDA required the EPA to finalize uniform performance standards for each type of incidental discharge by December 2020, a deadline that the EPA has missed by more than two years already, and required the USCG to implement the EPA's final standards within two years.

Significantly, on January 19, 2023, the EPA announced plans to issue a Supplemental Notice in Fall 2023 to its Vessel Incidental Discharge National Standards of Performance proposed rule, originally issued in October 2020 but never finalized. The EPA indicated that the Supplemental Notice is intended to clarify its proposed rule, share ballast water data compiled by the USCG, and propose additional regulatory options that the EPA is considering. The EPA plans to request comments on the issues identified in the Supplemental Notice prior to finalizing its performance standards in Fall 2024 – nearly four years after the deadline mandated by Congress. Once the EPA finalizes its performance standards, VIDA requires the USCG to promulgate regulations implementing the EPA's standards, including equipment, compliance, monitoring, inspections, and enforcement, within two years. Until such time as VIDA is fully implemented, likely in late 2026, the VGP will remain in effect.

LITIGATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

The EPA's delay in finalizing its performance standards prompted the Center for Biological Diversity and Friends of the Earth to file a lawsuit in February 2023 to force the EPA to finalize its standards. The plaintiffs seek a declaration by the court that the EPA's failure to finalize the incidental discharge standards violates the Clean Water Act and ask the court to order the EPA to implement final standards within 60 days.

The premise of the environmental groups' complaint is that the EPA's inaction harms aquatic ecosystems, with the principal allegations focused on ballast water discharges. The environmental groups allege that vessel pollution contributes to a range of environmental and public health problems, and that pollutants from vessels include aquatic invasive species, oil and grease, toxic chemicals, metals, plastics, and pathogens.

VGP ENFORCEMENT

Up until about two years ago, the EPA had brought only a handful of enforcement actions for VGP violations. The penalties for these violations ranged from letters of warning and de minimis monetary penalties for minor violations, to fines between \$20,000 and \$40,000 for more serious discharge violations.

In recent years, however, the EPA has begun a targeted VGP enforcement campaign, particularly in Regions 6, 9, and 10.2 Although the EPA has conducted vessel inspections for VGP compliance with the USCG during port State control inspections, enforcement actions generally seem to begin with a close review of vessels' Notices of Intent, Annual Reports, and National Ballast Information Clearinghouse (NBIC) reports. Findings of self-reported violations in Annual Reports or conflicting information in Annual Reports and NBIC reports inevitably trigger the EPA to informally request additional information on VGP compliance issues, which in turn may lead to demands for significant penalties. The EPA's enforcement method has largely consisted of informal allegations followed by settlement negotiations regarding the alleged violations.

Some key areas where the EPA has focused:

- Annual Comprehensive and Routine Inspections Failures to conduct annual comprehensive or routine inspections must be included in each vessel's Annual Report so they are easy for the EPA to identify and assess penalties. The fact that the violations were self-reported has not resulted in a significant mitigation of penalties.
- Ballast Water Monitoring This is of great interest to the EPA. Failure
 to conduct the required monitoring for ballast water management
 systems is a common omission and must be reported. Key issues
 include annual calibration, functionality monitoring, and analytical
 sampling.
- Ballast Water Exchange The EPA has begun focusing on vessels managing ballast water by exchange in accordance with a compliance date extension issued by the USCG, considering this to be a VGP violation if any other VGP violations are present, seemingly disregarding the intent and history behind USCG extensions and the EPA's Enforcement Response Policy.

The EPA is applying its penalty calculation policies very aggressively, resulting in high penalty demands for every violation type, substantially higher

² Region 6 serves Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas; Region 9 serves Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, and the Pacific Islands; and Region 10 serves Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and 271 Native Tribes.

PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT

than in the first 10+ years of VGP enforcement. Every violation, even paperwork violations, is considered to have presented a risk to the marine environment.

CONCLUSION

With the EPA's focus on VGP compliance and enforcement, as evidenced by its January Enforcement Alert, it is critical for companies to closely review VGP compliance for the vessels in their fleet and implement strict oversight and quality control, including audits, to ensure VGP requirements are complied with, crew are trained, and any deficiencies are promptly corrected. It is also important to ensure that all filings are accurate, including the annual reports filed in February for calendar year 2022.