ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD July 24, 1980

NORRIS CITY SANITARY DIST	
	Petitioners,)
v.) PCB 80-91
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	AGENCY,
1	Respondent.)

INTERIM ORDER OF THE BOARD (by J. Anderson):

This matter comes before the Board on the petition of the Norris City Sanitary District (District) and the Village of Norris City (Village), filed April 28, 1980 and amended May 15, 1980, for variance from Rule 962(a) of Chapter 3: Water Pollution (Chapter 3). On June 12, 1980, the Environmental Protection Agency (Agency) filed its Recommendation that variance be denied. Petitioners have filed no response to this Recommendation. The Board received one written "objection" from a landowner who protested the fact that her farmland had been chosen as a possible site for the Village's proposed construction. As this "objection" did not go to the merits of the Village's variance request, no hearings have been held, as waivers were filed by both petitioners.

The Village of Norris City, which is located in White County, proposes to make additions to its existing water treatment facility. These consist of a backwash holding tank, pump and forcemain which the Village wishes to connect to the sanitary sewer system operated by the Norris City Sanitary District. The additional loading to the sewer system is anticipated to be a maximum of 10,000 gallons per day, with 200 gallons to be pumped per minute (Pet. 1).

Since June 15, 1977, the District's sewage treatment plant has been on restricted status. At the time the system was placed on restricted status, the treatment facilities were being operated with a tributary waste load of approximately 170% of the design hydraulic capacity. The sewage collection system did not have the capacity to transport peak flow rates, causing overflows and back-ups during the wet season. As this restricted status prevents approval of the construction permit sought by the Village, petitioners seek variance from Rule 962(a) of Chapter 3.

The District has applied for and received Step 1 grant funding for construction of a new sewage treatment facility and for rehabilitation of sewermains and manholes. There is some conflict in the record as to whether the District has in fact

already received Step 2 and 3 funding, but, even if it has, the earliest projected completion date for this work would be November, 1981. (Pet 2., Rec. 3). Summaries of the Discharge Monitoring Reports from December, 1978 to October, 1979 show that the District received flows from May to October which ranged from 0.170 to 0.181 mgd, or 170,000 to 181,000 gallons per day. The plant's design capacity is 0.125 mgd or 125,000 gallons per day.

In support of its petition, the Village states that the District has been attempting to reduce its inflow and infiltration problems by requesting users of the sanitary sewer system to deal with such problems as downspout connections and open septic tanks. While it acknowledges that the District's system is overloaded, the Village has not specifically addressed the issue of the effect its 10,000 gallons maximum daily backwash discharge will have on the system other than to state that a pumping rate of 200 gallons per minute "will prevent any overloading or sudden upset" to the District's system (Pet. 2).

The Village explains that the only alternative to discharging its backwash to the District's sewer system would be to construct a sand filter in addition to a holding tank, and to discharge the filtered backwash into an adjacent creek (which the Board presumes to be an unnamed tributary of Bear Creek which is tributary to the North Fork of the Saline River). This filter and tank system would cost \$55,000 as compared to the \$30,000 cost of the tank and sewer connection favored by the Village. The filter system would additionally impose greater maintenance, operation, and monitoring costs.

The Farmer's Home Administration (FHA) currently has approximately \$15,000 in contingency funds remaining from a recent waterline extension project for the Village, and it is willing to grant these funds to the Village for the sewer connection project. The Village states that installation of the sand filter, which would cost the Village \$40,000 (as opposed to \$15,000 "out of pocket" for the proposed project) "is beyond it's current financial capability and would require an increase in water usage rates" (amount unspecified) (Pet. 4).

The Agency recommends that this variance request be denied because petitioners have not explained how the discharge of backwash to the sewer system will affect the District's continuing overflow and basement backup problems. The Agency received a complaint in July, 1979 from 15 Norris City residents concerning this problem, and feels that before variance is granted petitioners must detail procedures which they will take to minimize the potential of further overflows and backups.

The Board sympathises with the Village's financial plight, and recognizes that an early favorable decision on its variance request is necessary in order to allow it to secure funds from the FHA, which is anxious to close out its books on the Village's recent waterline project. However, this record does not contain

either a) impact minimization plans developed by petitioners, or b) sufficient information to enable the Board to exercise its expertise and discretion to fashion a suitable minimization program. Consequently, variance cannot be granted based upon this deficient record.

Decision in this matter is due, if not waived by petitioner, on August 7, 1980. The Board hereby grants petitioners leave to supplement the record to remedy these deficiencies. Any additional submittal petitioners wish to make must be filed with the Board on or before August 4, 1980.

Mr. Goodman abstained.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Christan L. Moffet(//tlerk

Illinois Pollution Control Board