## ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD August 18, 1982

ALTON WAT	TER CO.,	)
	Petitioner,	)
	ν.	) PCB
ILLINOIS AGENCY,	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	)
	Respondent.	)

CONCURRING OPINION (by J.D. Dumelle):

My reasons for concurring in this matter are the failure of the petitioner to present water quality levels computed at the edge of the mixing zone and the absence of a full analysis as to the effects, if any, upon aquatic life from the alum discharge.

Exhibit 1 is the Illinois State Water Survey's report on the subject water treatment plant. On p. 21 of this report "a 10% mixing" is used. No statement is given as to whether or not this 10% figure is equivalent to the Board's rules which require that water quality standards be met at the edge of the mixing zone.

Secondly, the aluminum concentration in the water resulting from the estimated discharge of 150 lbs. of alum (alum sulfate) is not computed nor compared to aquatic life tolerance levels. Does the aluminum ionize? Or does the excess alum (that not tied up in floc) ionize? The record is silent. The Board does not have a specific water quality standard for aluminum but does have prohibitions against substances toxic to aquatic life.

82-13

Jacob D. Dumelle Chairman

I, Christan L. Moffet, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, hreby certify the above Concurring Opinion was submitted on the  $3^{4}$  day of August, 1982.

Christan L. Moffett, Clerk Illinois Pollution Control Board