

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
June 04, 2009

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)
)
Complainant,)
)
v.) PCB 09-110
) (Enforcement – Land)
E.F. HEIL, LLC, an Illinois limited liability)
company,)
)
Respondent.)

ORDER OF THE BOARD (by G.T. Girard):

On May 20, 2009, the Office of the Attorney General, on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois (People), filed a five-count complaint against E.F. Heil, LLC, an Illinois limited liability company (Heil). *See* 415 ILCS 5/31(c)(1) (2006); 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204. The complaint concerns Heil's 93 acre clean construction and demolition debris (CCDD) facility, located at CR 089SE, in Kankakee, Kankakee County.

Under the Environmental Protection Act (Act) (415 ILCS 5 (2006)), the Attorney General and the State's Attorneys may bring actions before the Board to enforce Illinois' environmental requirements on behalf of the People. *See* 415 ILCS 5/31 (2006); 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103. In this case, the People allege that respondent violated Sections 21(d)(1) and (e), and 21.51(a) and (c) of the Act (415 ILCS 5/21(d)(1), 21(e), 22.51(a), 22.51(c) (2006)), and Sections 722.11 and 808.121(a) of the Board's Waste Disposal Regulations (35 Ill. Adm. Code 722.11, 808.121(a)). The People also allege that respondent violated Sections 1100.201(a) and 1100.205(a)(1), (b)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3), (f) and (g) of the Board's CCDD Regulations (35 Ill. Adm. Code 1100.201(a), 1100.205(a)(1), (c)(2), (f), (g) (2006)).

The People further allege that Heil violated these provisions by (1) conducting a waste disposal operation without a permit, by causing or allowing the disposal of a pile of painted brick and concrete blocks with protruding metal onto his Kankakee site, (2) failing to determine if the waste accepted onto his site was hazardous or special, (3) disposing of non-clean construction or demolition debris, (4) failing to use a photo ionization detector or other equivalent device to check all incoming loads, and (5) failing to conduct daily discharge inspections. The People ask the Board to order Heil to cease and desist from further violations and pay, for each count, a civil penalty of \$50,000 per violation and \$10,000 for each day of violation, as well as any costs expended by the State in pursuit of this action.

The Board accepts the complaint for hearing. *See* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.212(c). A respondent's failure to file an answer to a complaint within 60 days after receiving the complaint may have severe consequences. Generally, if the respondent fails within that timeframe to file an answer specifically denying, or asserting insufficient knowledge to form a belief of, a material

allegation in the complaint, the Board will consider the respondent to have admitted the allegation. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204(d).

The Board directs the hearing officer to proceed expeditiously to hearing. Among the hearing officer's responsibilities is the "duty . . . to ensure development of a clear, complete, and concise record for timely transmission to the Board." 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.610. A complete record in an enforcement case thoroughly addresses, among other things, the appropriate remedy, if any, for the alleged violations, including any civil penalty.

If a complainant proves an alleged violation, the Board considers the factors set forth in Sections 33(c) and 42(h) of the Act to fashion an appropriate remedy for the violation. *See* 415 ILCS 5/33(c), 42(h) (2006). Specifically, the Board considers the Section 33(c) factors in determining, first, what to order the respondent to do to correct an on-going violation, if any, and, second, whether to order the respondent to pay a civil penalty. The factors provided in Section 33(c) bear on the reasonableness of the circumstances surrounding the violation, such as the character and degree of any resulting interference with protecting public health, the technical practicability and economic reasonableness of compliance, and whether the respondent has subsequently eliminated the violation.

If, after considering the Section 33(c) factors, the Board decides to impose a civil penalty on the respondent, only then does the Board consider the Act's Section 42(h) factors in determining the appropriate amount of the civil penalty. Section 42(h) sets forth factors that may mitigate or aggravate the civil penalty amount, such as the duration and gravity of the violation; whether the respondent showed due diligence in attempting to comply; any economic benefit that the respondent accrued from delaying compliance; and the need to deter further violations by the respondent and others similarly situated.

With Public Act 93-575, effective January 1, 2004, the General Assembly changed the Act's civil penalty provisions, amending Section 42(h) and adding a new subsection (i) to Section 42. Section 42(h)(3) now states that any economic benefit to respondent from delayed compliance is to be determined by the "lowest cost alternative for achieving compliance." The amended Section 42(h) also requires the Board to ensure that the penalty is "at least as great as the economic benefits, if any, accrued by the respondent as a result of the violation, unless the Board finds that imposition of such penalty would result in an arbitrary or unreasonable financial hardship."

Under these amendments, the Board may also order a penalty lower than a respondent's economic benefit from delayed compliance if the respondent agrees to perform a "supplemental environmental project" (SEP). An SEP is defined in Section 42(h)(7) as an "environmentally beneficial project" that a respondent "agrees to undertake in settlement of an enforcement action . . . but which the respondent is not otherwise legally required to perform." SEPs are also added as a new Section 42(h) factor (Section 42(h)(7)), as is whether a respondent has "voluntary self-disclosed . . . the non-compliance to the [Illinois Environmental Protection] Agency" (Section 42(h)(6)). A new Section 42(i) lists nine criteria for establishing voluntary self-disclosure of non-compliance. A respondent establishing these criteria is entitled to a "reduction in the portion of the penalty that is not based on the economic benefit of non-compliance."

Accordingly, the Board further directs the hearing officer to advise the parties that in summary judgment motions and responses, at hearing, and in briefs, each party should consider: (1) proposing a remedy for a violation, if any (including whether to impose a civil penalty), and supporting its position with facts and arguments that address any or all of the Section 33(c) factors; and (2) proposing a civil penalty, if any (including a specific total dollar amount and the portion of that amount attributable to the respondent's economic benefit, if any, from delayed compliance), and supporting its position with facts and arguments that address any or all of the Section 42(h) factors. The Board also directs the hearing officer to advise the parties to address these issues in any stipulation and proposed settlement that may be filed with the Board.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

I, John Therriault, Assistant Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, certify that the Board adopted the above order on June 4, 2009, by a vote of 5-0.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John T. Therriault". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

John Therriault, Assistant Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board