ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD June 7, 1990

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)
Complainant,)
v. PQ CORPORATION,) PCB 90-14) (Enforcement)
a Pennsylvania corporation,)
Respondent.)

DISSENTING OPINION (by J. Theodore Meyer):

I dissent from the majority's acceptance of the settlement stipulation in this case.

Neither the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Agency) nor the Attorney General have articulated any standards as to what factors should be considered when negotiating a fine to be imposed pursuant to a settlement agreement. Additionally, although the People state (and PQ denies) in the proposed settlement agreement that PQ's noncompliance with pollution control requirements was economically beneficial in that PQ delayed expenditures for capital improvements until after the spill occurred, there is not any specific information on the amount of that economic benefit. Section 33(c) of the Environmental Protection Act specifically requires the Board to consider any economic benefits accrued by noncompliance. I believe that this provision contemplates a consideration of the amount of the economic benefit, not just a statement that an economic benefit was realized. Without more specific information, it is impossible to know if the penalty of \$7,500 even comes close to the savings realized by PQ.

Finally, I am frustrated that, although this case was brought in the name of the people of the State of Illinois, there is no recognition that costs and fees could have been assessed against PQ. Ill.Rev.Stat.1989, ch. 111 1/2, par. 1042(f). I am pleased that the Attorney General is beginning to bring enforcement cases in the name of the People, but I believe that settlement agreements in such cases should, at a minimum, recognize that the Board could award costs and reasonable fees.

For these reasons, I dissent.

I, Dorothy M. Gunn, hereby certify that the above Dissenting Opinion was filed on the _______, 1990.

Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board