BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD CEIVED OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

IN THE MATTER OF:	MAY U 4 2005
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO: REGULATION OF PETROLEUM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (35 ILL. ADM. CODE 732),	STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board R04-22 (UST Rulemaking)
IN THE MATTER OF:	
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO: REGULATION OF PETROLEUM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (35 ILL. ADM. CODE 734)) R04-23) (UST Rulemaking)) Consolidated

NOTICE OF FILING

TO:

ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD

(Service List Attached)

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 4, 2005, filed with the Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board of the State of Illinois an original, executed copy of Pre-Filed Questions from CW³M Company, Inc. for the Illinois Pollution Control Board's 1st Notice of Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734 and 35 Ill. Adm. Code 732 in the above-captioned matter.

Dated: May 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

CW³M Company

By:

Carolyn S. Hesse, Esq.

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

One North Wacker Drive -Suite 4400

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 357-1313

270225v1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, on oath state that I have served the attached Pre-Filed Questions from CW³M Company, Inc. for the Illinois Pollution Control Board's 1st Notice of Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734 and 35 Ill. Adm. Code 732 by placing a copy in an envelope addressed to the Service List Attached from CW³M Company, Inc., 701 West South Grand Avenue, Springfield, IL 62704 before the hour of 5:00 p.m., on this 4th Day of May, 2005.

Carol Rowe

Service List

Gina Roccaforte Kyle Rominger IEPA 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, IL 62794-9276 217/792-5544 217/782-9807 (fax)

William G. Dickett Sidley Austin Brown & Wood Bank One Plaza 10 South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60603 312/853-7000 312/953-7036 (fax)

Bill Fleischi Illinois Petroleum Marketers Association 112 West Cook Street Springfield, IL 62704 217/793-1858

Robert A. Messina General Counsel Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group 3150 Roland Avenue Springfield, IL 62703 217/523-4942 217/523-4948

Lisa Frede Chemical Industry Council of Illinois 2250 East Devon Avenue Des Plaines, IL 60018 (847) 544-5995 Thomas G. Safley Hodge Dwyer Zeman 3150 Roland Avenue P.O. Box 5776 Springfield, IL 62705-5776 217/528-4900 217/523-4948 (fax)

Barbara Magel Karaganis & White, Ltd. 414 North Orleans Street Suite 801 Chicago, IL 60610 312/836-1177 312/836-9083 (fax)

Joe Kelly, PE United Science Industries, Inc. 6295 East Illinois Highway 15 P.O. Box 360 Woodlawn, IL 62898-0360 618/735-2411 618/735-2907 (fax)

Kenneth James Carison Environmental, Inc. 65 East Wacker Place Suite 1500 Chicago, IL 60601

Michael W. Rapps Rapps Engineering & Applied Science 821 South Durkin Drive P.O. Box 7349 Springfield, IL 62791-7349 217/787-2118 217/787-6641 (fax) Joel J. Sternstein, Assistant Attorney General Matthew J. Dunn, Division Chief Office of the Attorney General Environmental Bureau 188 West Randolph, 20th Floor Chicago, IL 60601 312/814-2550 312/814-2347 (fax)

Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk of the Board Marie Tipsord, Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 11-500 Chicago, IL 60601 312/814-3956

Scott Anderson Black & Veatch 101 North Wacker Drive Suite 1100 Chicago, IL 60606

Claire A. Manning Brown, Hay & Stephens, LLP 205 South Fifth Street Suite 700 P.O. Box 2459 Springfield, Illinois 62705-2459 (217) 544-8491 (217) 241-3111 (fax)

Jonathan Furr, General Counsel Illinois Department of Natural Resources One Natural Resources Way Springfield, IL 72702-1271 217/782-1809 217/524-9640 (fax)

A.J. Pavlick Great Lakes Analytical 1380 Busch Parkway Buffalo Grove, IL 60089 847/808-7766 Tom Herlacher, P.E.
Principal Engineer
Herlacher Angleton Associates, LLC
8731 Bluff Road
Waterloo, IL 62298
618/935-2261
618/935-2694 (fax)

James E. Huff, P.E. Huff & Huff, Inc. 512 West Burlington Avenue Suite 100 LaGrange, IL 60525

Melanie LoPiccolo, Office Manager Marlin Environmental, Inc. 1000 West Spring Street South Elgin, IL 60177 847/468-8855

Brian Porter Terracon 870 40th Avenue Bettendorf, IA 52722 563/355-0702

Glen Lee, Manager Wendler Engineering Services, Inc. 1770 West State Street Sycamore, IL 60178 815/895-5008

Joseph W. Truesdale, P.E. CSD Environmental Services, Inc. 2220 Yale Boulevard Springfield, IL 62703 217/522-4085 David L. Rieser, Partner McGuire Woods LLP 77 West Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60601 312/849-8249

Kurt Stepping Director of Client Services PDC Laboratories 2231 West Altorfer Drive Peoria, IL 61615 309/692-9688

Daniel J. Goodwin Secor International, Inc. 400 Bruns Lane Springfield, IL 62702

Richard Andros, P.E. Environmental Consulting & Engineering, Inc. 551 Roosevelt Road, #309 Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Steven Gobelman
Illinois Department of Transportation
2300 Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764

Jennifer Goodman Herlacher Angleton Associates, LLC 522 Belle Street Alton, IL 62002

Ron Dye President Core Geological Services 2621 Monetga Suite C Springfield, IL 62704 (217) 787-6109 Monte Nienkerk Clayton Group Services, Inc. 3140 Finley Road Downers Grove, IL 60515 630/795-3207

Thomas M. Guist, PE Team Leader Atwell-Hicks, Inc. 940 East Diehl Road Suite 100 Naperville, IL 60563 630/577-0800

Dan King, Team Leader United Science Industries, Inc. 6295 East Illinois Hwy 15 Woodlawn, IL 62898 618/735-2411

Terrence W. Dixon, P.G. MACTEC Engineering & Consulting, Inc. 8901 N. Industrial Road Peoria, IL 61615

Collin W. Gray SEECO Environmental Services, Inc. 7350 Duvon Drive Tinley Park 60477

George F. Moncek United Environmental Consultants, Inc. 119 East Palatine Road Palatine, IL 60067

Tina Archer, Attorney Greensfelder, Hemker & Gale 10 South Broadway Suite 2000 St. Louis, MO 63104 314/241-9090 Erin Curley, Env. Department Manager Midwest Engineering Services, Inc. 4243 West 166th Street Oak Forest, IL 60452 708/535-9981

Russ Goodiel, Project Manager Applied Environmental Solutions, Inc. P.O. Box 1225 Centralia, IL 62801 618/533-5953

Eric Minder Senior Environmental Engineer Caterpillar, Inc. 100 NE Adams Street Peoria, IL 61629 (309) 675-1658 Ken Miller, Regional Manager American Environmental Corp. 3700 West Grand Ave., Suite A Springfield, IL 62707 217/585-9517

Jarrett Thomas Vice President Suburban Laboratories, Inc. 4140 Litt Drive Hillside, IL 60162 (708) 544-3260

Daniel Caplice K-Plus Environmental 600 West Van Buren Street Suite 1000 Chicago, IL 60607 (312) 207-1600

208776v1

BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE

IN THE MATTER OF:)	MAY 0 4 2005
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO: REGULATION OF PETROLEUM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (35 ILL. ADM. CODE 732),) R04-22) (UST Rulemaking)	STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
IN THE MATTER OF:)	
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO: REGULATION OF PETROLEUM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (35 ILL. ADM. CODE 734)) R04-23) (UST Rulemaking)) Consolidated	•

Proposed Rule. First Notice

PRE-FILED QUESTIONS FROM CW³M COMPANY, INC. FOR THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD's 1st NOTICE OF AMENDMENTS TO 35 ILL. ADM. CODE 734 AND 35 ILL. ADM. CODE 732

In response to the Illinois Pollution Control Board's (IPCB) Hearing Officer Order dated April 20, 2005, CW³M responds that CW³M is unavailable for hearings on 6/3 through 6/9, 6/22 through 6/27, 7/1 though 7/4 and 7/19.

In addition, CW³M is filing the following questions in order to prepare for the next scheduled hearing on the proposed regulations.

- 1. Will dollars approved in a budget prior to the enactment of the proposed rules be considered when making decisions on budgets following enactment of the rules? For example, a site investigation budget is approved prior to these rules for \$2,500 for a Stage 1 Site Investigation Report, because the current requirements are greater than they will be under the new rules. Then, after the new rules are enacted, the appropriate \$3,200 is requested for a Stage II plan. Will the Agency approve the \$3,200 listed in the proposed rules or will they approve some other amount?
- 2. How will the Agency review Part 731 reimbursement claim submittals, particularly for work in progress?

- 3. Have Agency personnel done any further research into rates since the last hearing? Is there anything that the Agency is willing to do to reduce the uncertainties surrounding the creation of the proposed rates?
- 4. Since the owners and operators and their consultants are being required to reduce expenditures from the fund, what is the IEPA going to do to reduce its expenditures from the fund?
- 5. Since the earlier hearings, are 90% of rates being submitted for budget approval or reimbursement at or below proposed Subpart H numbers? If not, what is the percentage at or below proposed Subpart H numbers?
- 6. What groundwater remediation will still be needed at locations where a groundwater ordinance is still in place? Must free product be removed? Must contamination that exceeds the soil saturation limit be removed? Must Class I or II, as applicable, groundwater quality standards be met at the edge of the area covered by the groundwater ordinance? Will modeling be required to demonstrate that groundwater quality standards will be met outside of the area subject to a groundwater ordinance? Will it be necessary to remediate groundwater to prevent vapor intrusion into buildings? Will any of these activities be reimbursable from the Fund?
- 7. Did the IEPA examine criteria similar to those 35 IAC 620.260 Reclassification of Groundwater by Adjusted Standard with regards to the Agency's proposal to disallow reimbursement of groundwater remediation costs within an area designated with a groundwater ordinance prohibiting potable water well installation? It is clear by 35 IAC 620.260 that the IEPA and the IPCB recognize that changing groundwater standards can affect, among other environmental and economic standards, property values. Specifically, did the IEPA consider the affect on both on-site and off-site property values for sites where IEPA forces owners to leave contamination in place by not reimbursing clean-up costs when a groundwater ordinance is in place?
- 8. The Agency has stated that the proposed Subpart H maximum amounts are consistent with current market rates. If this is the case and the proposed rates are adopted, how will use of the proposed rates result in a cost savings to the UST Fund?
- 9. No Further Remediation Letters typically include and the Illinois Environmental Protection Act lists at 58.10(e) a number of circumstances by which a NFR Letter may become void, including but not limited to previously undiscovered contamination that is above the remediation objectives. See the Act at 58.10(e)(6). If an NFR Letter becomes void, through no fault of the owner, because previously unknown contamination is discovered and if further remediation is required to reinstate the NFR Letter, can the site get back into the UST program and will the remediation costs be eligible for reimbursement from the Fund?
- 10. Will the Agency require the use of institutional controls and/or engineered barriers to meet Tier II or other remediation objectives?

- 11. When the Agency derived the number of \$57 per cubic yard as the allowable costs for excavation, transportation and disposal, what distance between a site and a landfill was used? Was this an average distance? What was the range of distances considered? If the distance between a site and the nearest landfill is greater than the reference distance, will the proposed rule for "atypical" situations (formerly 732.855/734.855, now 732.860/734.860) apply? What was the average volume of soil per site that was excavated, transported and disposed of when the \$57 per cubic yard of soil rate was derived? What was the range of soil volumes?
- 12. Who determines when there is an "atypical" situation? If a professional engineer/professional geologist submits a report which specifically details why a situation is unusual or extraordinary, how much weight will be given to the PE/PGs determination, or will the decision be made solely by the IEPA project manage assigned to the site? To what extent must bids be obtained in an "atypical" situation?
- 13. How did IEPA determine that a 5% "fluff factor" is appropriate? What is the technical basis for this number? Explain how the Agency then determined that this was the equivalent of a larger number, such as 20%?
- 14. The Agency met with various trade groups prior to proposing the rule, and used some of the input provided by these groups. Given the Agency's limited experience performing many of the activities for which rates have been proposed, and given the voluminous comments provided by participants whose cumulative experience far outweighs the Agency in conducting this work, has the Agency reconsidered any of the rates it submitted in its proposal? Did the IEPA re-examine the rates which were developed using the National Construction Cost Estimator after IEPA's interpretations of those rates were proven during hearing to be flawed? Did the IEPA consider revising the rates to match those derived when properly utilizing the guide?
- 15. Why does the IEPA believe that the use of RS Means is not an appropriate method of rate development? . Does the IEPA recognize that, while RS Means has numbers that are national numbers, it also has factors which take into account the state in which the work is being performed? For what specific reason did the IEPA find that the National Construction Estimator was an appropriate reference and RS Means was not?
- 16. Has the IEPA recognized the discrepancy between using average costs as rates and stating that they will cover 90% of packages submitted. Please explain IEPA's understanding and provide examples.
- 17. Did the IEPA discuss or evaluate following the submittal by PIPE the concept of revising the average hourly rate of \$80.00 (used for setting maximum rates with a predetermined number of hours per task) to a rate properly weighted for the type of personnel conducting the work (i.e. technical v. support staff)?
- 18. Does the IEPA still maintain based on the record that the rates proposed are generally consistent with the current rates?

- 19. How and under what framework will consultants be reimbursed for the additional administrative expenses of securing, tracking and submitting proof of payment documentation? For example did the IEPA consider increasing rates for handling charges to cover this expense or consider adding this activity as another line item to be reimbursed.
- 20. The IPCB stated in its first notice proposal, that it was modifying the way Stage 3 site investigations would be paid to a time and materials basis. In the actual language of the proposed rules, the IPCB added to the section labeled "Early Action and Free Product Removal" a statement to that effect. However, in the section labeled "Site Investigation" on the following page, there is a line that indicated Stage 3 site investigations would be paid in lump sums. Will the IEPA propose modifications to correct the placement of the Stage 3 investigation budget and billing procedures?
- 21. The following questions pertain to the Section for travel reimbursement as described on page 80 of the first notice proposal:
 - a. Why did the IEPA find that OSHA regulations requiring a buddy system were not applicable to LUST field work and not reimburseable?
 - b. What specific reason did the IEPA feel that it would be appropriate when establishing rates for travel to include in the average rates of personnel who never leave the office?
 - c. What specific reason did the IEPA believe that effectively limiting an owner/operator's choice of consultant to one within a specific distance was appropriate for purposes of reimbursement?

22. When the bidding process will be used because a subcontractor's cost will exceed Subpart H, related professional services should automatically qualify for the extraordinary circumstances clause. Does the IEPA find this proposal to be appropriate or inappropriate and what are IEPA's reasons?

Dated: May 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

CW³M Company

By:

One of Its Attorneys

Carolyn S. Hesse, Esq. Barnes & Thornburg LLP One North Wacker Drive Suite 4400 Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 357-13 270221v1