

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD  
November 17, 2005

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
)  
SETBACK ZONE FOR CITY OF ) R05-9  
MARQUETTE HEIGHTS COMMUNITY ) (Rulemaking - Public Water Supply)  
WATER SUPPLY, NEW 35 ILL. ADM. )  
CODE 618 )

Proposed Rule. First Notice.

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD (by A.S. Moore):

On November 5, 2004, the Board received a rulemaking proposal from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Agency) to establish an expanded setback zone of up to 1,000 feet. The Agency proposes the expanded setback to provide additional protection for the community water supply (CWS) wells of the City of Marquette Heights, in Tazewell County. Today, the Board proposes the new rules for first-notice publication in the *Illinois Register*.

The Agency's proposal is the first of its kind under Section 14.3(d) of the Environmental Protection Act (Act) (415 ILCS 5/14.3(d) (2004)), which allows for the establishment of "maximum setback zones" to prevent contamination of particularly vulnerable groundwater sources used by CWS. The proposed public water supply rules would create a new Part 618 of Title 35 of the Illinois Administrative Code.

In this opinion, the Board first provides the procedural history of this rulemaking and describes how persons may file public comments. The Board then discusses the legal framework for setback zone protection in Illinois, the developments leading to the Agency's proposal, and the contents of and justification for the first-notice proposal. The Board's proposed rules appear in the order following this opinion.

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Procedural History**

As noted, the Agency filed its rulemaking proposal on November 5, 2004. In an order of December 2, 2004, the Board accepted the Agency's proposal for hearing.<sup>1</sup> The Board has held two hearings in this rulemaking. The first hearing took place in Pekin on March 1, 2005, and the second hearing took place in Chicago on April 5, 2005.

At the first hearing, three witnesses testified: Richard P. Cobb, Deputy Manager of the Division of Public Water Supplies of the Agency's Bureau of Water; David Redfield, Mayor of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board cites the Statement of Reasons in the Agency's proposal as "Statement at \_."

Marquette Heights; and Rick Crum, Superintendent of Marquette Heights. Cobb testified at the second hearing.<sup>2</sup> Also participating at hearing were attorneys Kimberly A. Geving and Stephanie Flowers on behalf of the Agency; Michael J. Tibbs, City Attorney with Miller, Hall, and Triggs on behalf of Marquette Heights; Steve Little, an Alderman on the Marquette Heights City Council; and Harold S. Primack, Environmental Business Manager for Atlantic Richfield Company, a BP affiliated company.

The Board hearing officer admitted twelve exhibits (Exhibits A-L) into the record over the course of the two hearings.<sup>3</sup> Nine of the twelve exhibits were offered by the Agency. The other three exhibits were offered by Marquette Heights. The exhibits include an “*Errata* Sheet Number 1” (Exhibit F) offered by the Agency, which shows proposed changes to the rule language originally set forth in the Agency’s proposal.

The transcripts of the Pekin and Chicago hearings were received by the Board on March 11 and April 20, 2005, respectively, and promptly placed in the Clerk’s Office On Line (COOL) on the Board’s Web site at [www.ipcb.state.il.us](http://www.ipcb.state.il.us). Many other documents from this rulemaking record are available through COOL, including Board opinions and orders, hearing officer orders, and the Agency’s proposal and *errata* sheet.

Section 27(b) of the Act requires the Board to request that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) conduct an economic impact study (EcIS) of proposed substantive rules. Section 27(b) of the Act also requires the Board to make DCEO’s response available at least 20 days before holding a public hearing on the proposal’s economic impact. *See* 415 ILCS 5/27(b) (2004). However, Section 14.3(d) of the Act (415 ILCS 5/14.3(d) (2004)) provides that Section 27(b) does not apply to rulemaking proceedings initiated by the Agency under Section 14.3(d), like this one. Accordingly, the Board hearing officer did not solicit any testimony at hearing regarding the issue of DCEO performing an EcIS.

In an April 6, 2005 order, the hearing officer set a pre-first-notice public comment filing deadline of May 20, 2005, for those who wished to ensure that the Board would consider their public comment before proceeding to any first-notice decision. The Board has received no public comments at all in this rulemaking.

### **Filing Public Comments**

First-notice publication in the *Illinois Register* of these proposed rules will start a period of at least 45 days during which anyone may file public comments with the Board at:

---

<sup>2</sup> The Board cites the transcript of the first hearing as “Tr.1 at \_” and the transcript of the second hearing as “Tr.2 at \_.”

<sup>3</sup> The Board cites the hearing transcripts as “Exh. \_ at \_.”

Office of the Clerk  
Pollution Control Board  
James R. Thompson Center  
100 W. Randolph Street, Suite 11-500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Any person may file a public comment, and the Board encourages persons to file public comments on the proposed rules. The docket number (R05-9) should be indicated on the public comment. Additionally, as part of the Board's voluntary electronic filing pilot project, public comments in this rulemaking may be filed through COOL at [www.ipcb.state.il.us](http://www.ipcb.state.il.us). Any questions about electronic filing should be directed to the Clerk's Office at (312) 814-3629.<sup>4</sup>

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Legal Framework**

Section 14.2 of the Act (415 ILCS 5/14.2 (2004)) establishes a "*minimum setback zone*" of 200 feet around each CWS well in Illinois. *See* 415 ILCS 5/14.2(a) (2004). In specified instances where the CWS derives water from an especially vulnerable geological formation, the minimum setback zone is 400 feet. *See* 415 ILCS 5/14.2(d) (2004).

A setback zone restricts land use near the CWS well, providing a buffer between the well and potential sources or routes of contamination. The Act defines a CWS as a "public water supply which serves or is intended to serve at least 15 service connections used by residents or regularly serves at least 25 residents." 415 ILCS 5/3.145 (2004). Generally, absent a setback exception issued by the Board, various defined new "potential primary sources," "potential secondary sources," or "potential routes" of contamination cannot be placed within the minimum setback zone of a CWS well. *See* 415 ILCS 5/14.2(a), (c) (2004).

Section 14.3 of the Act (415 ILCS 5/14.3 (2004)), which is at issue in this rulemaking, allows for *additional* protection beyond the minimum setback zone. Under specified circumstances, Section 14.3 authorizes either the Board, or the county or municipality served by a CWS well, to establish a "*maximum setback zone*" of up to 1,000 feet from the CWS wellhead.<sup>5</sup> Subsection (d) of Section 14.3 provides that the Board may adopt a maximum setback zone after receiving an Agency rulemaking proposal. Specifically, Section 14.3(d) reads in part:

---

<sup>4</sup> Please note that all filings with the Clerk of the Board must also be served on the hearing officer and on those persons on the Service List for this rulemaking. Before filing any document with the Clerk, please check with Sandy Wiley at (312) 814-3623 or [wileys@ipcb.state.il.us](mailto:wileys@ipcb.state.il.us), the hearing officer, or the Clerk's Office to ensure use of the most recent version of the Service List.

<sup>5</sup> In limited instances, a county or municipality may adopt an ordinance establishing a maximum setback zone of up to 2,500 feet from the wellhead. *See* 415 ILCS 5/14.3(f) (2004).

[U]pon written notice to the county or municipality, the Agency may propose to the Board a regulation establishing a maximum setback zone for any well subject to this Section. Such proposal shall be based upon all reasonably available hydrogeologic information, include the justification for expanding the zone of wellhead protection, and specify the boundaries of such zone, no portion of which boundaries shall be in excess of 1,000 feet from the wellhead. Such justification may include the need to protect a sole source of public water supply or a highly vulnerable source of groundwater, or an Agency finding that the presence of potential primary or potential secondary sources or potential routes represents a significant hazard to the public health or the environment. 415 ILCS 5/14.3(d) (2004).

### **Development of Agency's Proposal**

Marquette Heights is located near the intersection of Interstate Route 474 and Illinois Route 29, in Tazewell County. Marquette Heights sits primarily on a bluff overlooking the valley occupied by the Illinois River. Marquette Heights' two CWS wells are located in the Village of North Pekin, which lies to the west of Marquette Heights. Exh. C at 1; Exh. G. The Marquette Heights wells, which are in close proximity to one another, have minimum setback protection of 400 feet. Tr.1 at 15-16; Exh. G.

Section 14.3 of the Act, as indicated, authorizes counties, municipalities, and the Board to establish maximum setback zones. Marquette Heights lacks the legal authority to establish a maximum setback zone by ordinance because its CWS wells are in North Pekin. Tr. 1 at 10-12. On March 22, 2004, Marquette Heights adopted a resolution requesting that the Agency propose a rule to the Board that would increase the setback zone around the Marquette Heights CWS wells. Statement at 1.

The Agency states that it has met the notice requirements of Section 14.3(d) of the Act. Section 14.3(d) reads in part:

[U]pon written notice to the county or municipality, the Agency may propose to the Board a regulation establishing a maximum setback zone for any well subject to this Section. \*\*\* The Agency may proceed with the filing of such a proposal unless the county or municipality, within 30 days of the receipt of the written notice, files a written request for a conference with the Agency. 415 ILCS 5/14.3(d) (2004).

According to the Agency, it provided notice of the rulemaking proposal by certified mail to Marquette Heights, North Pekin, and the Tazewell County Zoning Office in June 2004. Statement at 7; Tr.1 at 8, 41. The proposal notes that the Agency received no comments within the statutory 30-day period from any of these governmental entities. Statement at 8; Tr.1 at 8.

The Agency proposal provides that at separate meetings held in July 2004, the following organizations concluded that they had no objections to the Agency proceeding with the proposal: (1) the Central Regional Priority Groundwater Protection Planning Committee, established under

Section 17.2 of the Act (415 ILCS 5/17.2 (2004)) as one of four priority groundwater protection planning regions in the State;<sup>6</sup> and (2) the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Groundwater and the Groundwater Advisory Council, both established under the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act (415 ILCS 55 (2004)).<sup>7</sup> Statement at 4, 7; Tr.1 at 8-9, 41.

BP Amoco is conducting a groundwater cleanup at a tank farm north of the proposed maximum setback zone. Although BP Amoco was apparently not notified by the Agency about the proposal, representatives of the company are aware of the rulemaking and participated at hearing. Tr.1 at 41-42. Cobb, Deputy Manager of the Agency's Division of Public Water Supplies, testified that this rulemaking has "no direct bearing" on the BP Amoco tank farm cleanup. *Id.* at 41.

In response to the request from Marquette Heights and findings indicating the vulnerability of the City's CWS wells, the Agency proposed this rulemaking to establish a maximum setback zone of up to 1,000 feet, as depicted on a map in Section 618. Appendix A of the proposed rules. In addition to the maximum setback rulemaking, the Agency recommended activities to Marquette Heights to further minimize the risk to the Marquette Heights CWS. The Agency suggested that Marquette Heights develop a contingency plan, review its cross-connection control ordinance, abandon two inactive wells, replace screens on the two current wells, and implement a wellhead protection program. Exh. A, Attachment V at 4.

### **First-Notice Proposal**

This rulemaking proposes to expand the setback zone around the drinking water wells used by Marquette Heights. The proposed rules include the Act's definition of a "setback zone." A "setback zone" means:

*a geographic area, designated pursuant to the Act, containing a potable water supply well or a potential source or potential route, having a continuous boundary, and within which certain prohibitions or regulations are applicable in*

---

<sup>6</sup> The central region consists of Mason, Peoria, Tazewell, and Woodford Counties. Each of the four regions has a committee comprised of representatives of counties, municipalities, public water supplies, and members of the general public, including persons with business, environmental, and agricultural interests. Statement at 4.

<sup>7</sup> The Interagency Coordinating Committee on Groundwater is chaired by the Agency and comprised of the Illinois Department of Public Health, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, the Illinois Department of Agriculture, the Illinois State Fire Marshal, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, and the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. Statement at 7. The Groundwater Advisory Council is comprised of environmental, business, public water supply, county and municipal government, regional planning, and water well driller interest group representatives. The Agency's proposal states that these two organizations (1) work jointly, with the Agency as liason between them, and (2) work with the four regional priority groundwater planning committees described in the preceding footnote. *Id.*

*order to protect groundwaters* [415 ILCS 5/3.450]. See Proposed Section 618.105.

As discussed in more detail below, this record demonstrates that the proposal is needed to protect the groundwater supplied to Marquette Heights residents as drinking water. Statement at 1, 5. Marquette Heights has two CWS wells. As noted, the wells are located not in Marquette Heights, but rather in North Pekin, Tazewell County. The wells have an estimated average daily pumpage from the groundwater source of 240,000 gallons per day, supplying approximately 3,200 persons directly. *Id.* at 4-5. Marquette Heights' water system has approximately 1,064 service connections within the corporate limits and another 56 service connections in an area of anticipated future expansion east of the City. Exh. C at 2-3.

Based on various assessments, including groundwater flow and recharge area modeling, the Agency concluded that the Marquette Heights CWS wells are not adequately protected by the current minimum setback zones, and that the groundwater source is "highly vulnerable." Statement at 5-6. In addition, the Agency issued an "advisory of groundwater contamination hazard" for North Pekin and Marquette Heights in July 1990 because of potential sources of groundwater contamination that represented a "significant hazard to public health and the environment." *Id.* The Agency maintains therefore that expanding the zone of wellhead protection is justified, as Section 14.3(d) of the Act requires. *Id.* at 7.

As proposed, the new Part 618 of the Board's public water supply rules would have two subparts: Subpart A and Subpart B. In proposed Subpart A of Part 618, there are general provisions for maximum setback zones, including definitions. Subpart A's provisions will apply to all maximum setback zones established in Illinois through Board rulemaking, including this first such maximum setback, the Marquette Heights maximum setback.

In proposed Subpart B of Part 618, there are rules specific to the Marquette Heights CWS wells. Proposed Subpart B includes an appendix (Section 618.Appendix A) with a map that delineates the irregularly-shaped boundaries of the proposed maximum setback zone relative to local land use plats. Tr.1 at 9. The distance from the wells to the proposed setback boundaries varies from approximately 600 to 1,000 feet. Exh. G. The appendix also lists identification numbers of parcels that are located wholly or partially within the proposed maximum setback.

Additionally, proposed Subpart B of Part 618 states that (1) certain activities within the setback are banned and (2) other activities within the setback are subject to management and control standards. First, "new potential primary sources" of groundwater contamination are prohibited from locating wholly or partially within the Marquette Heights expanded setback. See Proposed Sections 618.200(b)(1) and 618.205. The Act's definition of a "potential primary source" is set forth in the proposed rules. A "potential primary source" means:

*any unit at a facility or site not currently subject to a removal or remedial action which:*

*is utilized for the treatment, storage, or disposal of any hazardous or special waste not generated at the site; or*

*is utilized for the disposal of municipal waste not generated at the site, other than landscape waste and construction and demolition debris; or*

*is utilized for the landfilling, land treating, surface impounding or piling of any hazardous or special waste that is generated on the site or at other sites owned, controlled or operated by the same person; or*

*stores or accumulates at any time more than 75,000 pounds above ground, or more than 7,500 pounds below ground, of any hazardous substances [415 ILCS 5/3.345]. See Proposed Section 618.105.*

In turn, a “new potential primary source,” to which the location prohibition would apply, is defined in the Act and proposed rules as:

*a potential primary source which is not in existence or for which construction has not commenced at its location as of January 1, 1988; or*

*a potential primary source which expands laterally beyond the currently permitted boundary or, if the primary source is not permitted, the boundary in existence as of January 1, 1988; or*

*a potential primary source which is part of a facility that undergoes major - reconstruction. Such reconstruction shall be deemed to have taken place where the fixed capital cost of the new components constructed within a 2-year period exceed 50% of the fixed capital cost of a comparable entirely new facility [415 ILCS 5/3.345]. See Proposed Section 618.105.*

Second, proposed Subpart B of Part 618 specifies that the Board’s Part 615 or Part 616 “technical standards” or “technology control regulations” (35 Ill. Adm. Code 615 and 616) apply to those new or existing activities regulated by Part 615 or Part 616 that are located wholly or partially within the expanded Marquette Heights setback. *See Proposed Section 618.200(b)(2); Tr.1 at 30, 42-43.* The proposed rules make clear, however, that agrichemical facilities that affirmatively opt out of Part 615 or Part 616 are regulated instead under rules of the Department of Agriculture (8 Ill. Adm. Code 257) or the Department of Public Health (77 Ill. Adm. Code 830). *See Proposed Section 618.200(b)(2); see also 415 ILCS 5/14.6 (2004); Tr.1 at 43-45; Tr.2 at 8-11; Exh. F.*

Part 615 (“Existing Activities in a Setback Zone or Regulated Recharge Area”) and Part 616 (“New Activities in a Setback Zone or Regulated Recharge Area”) contain groundwater monitoring, design, inspection, operating, closure, and post-closure requirements. Parts 615 and 616 generally apply to on-site landfills, on-site land treatment units, on-site surface impoundments, on-site waste piles, underground storage tanks, pesticide storage and handling units, fertilizer storage and handling units, road oil storage and handling units, and de-icing agent storage and handling units.

As Cobb explained, Parts 615 and 616, by their own terms, apply within setback zones, so their application within the Marquette Heights maximum setback zone will be “automatic . . . upon the effective date of the establishment of this maximum setback zone.” Tr.1 at 43. For further clarity, proposed Section 618.200(b)(2) cross-references Parts 615 and 616. *Id.* Cobb added, however, that the Agency’s analysis did not reveal any activities within the proposed expanded setback that would become subject to the technical standards because of this rulemaking. *Id.* at 48-49.

### **Conditions Justifying Expansion of the Marquette Heights Setback**

#### **Environment**

Marquette Heights’ two CWS wells (wells #4 and #5, also identified as wells 50280 and 50281) are located outside of and to the west of the City, in North Pekin, on the Illinois River floodplain. Both wells are approximately 95 feet deep and are screened in the Sankoty Sand or Henry Formation. Exh. A at 13-14; Tr.1 at 31-33, 54. Accessible portions of the Sankoty aquifer appear to lie outside of the corporate limits of Marquette Heights. Tr.1 at 54; Exh. C at 4.

Digging a deeper well would not be an effective means of providing water. Cobb testified that “[i]n this part of the State as you transgress south from Northern Illinois, the deeper aquifer systems become saline in nature due to their depth.” Tr. 1 at 58. Concerns would arise due to naturally occurring high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS), sulfate, and radionuclides. *Id.*

The Agency conducted a source water assessment pursuant to the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) (42 U.S.C. § 300f *et seq.*) for Marquette Heights. Statement at 6; Tr.1 at 23. The assessment, which was completed in April 2003, evaluated existing water quality, geologic vulnerability, and existing potential sources of groundwater contamination to determine the overall susceptibility of the Marquette Heights CWS wells. The assessment found that the wells are susceptible to groundwater contamination. Statement at 5-6.

Twenty-two potential sources of contamination within 1,000 feet of the CWS wells were identified in the “Source Water Assessment Program Fact Sheet” for Marquette Heights. Exh. A, Attachment V. The Agency’s main motivation for issuing the 1990 advisory, however, was an Amoco Mobil (now BP Amoco) tank farm remediation site located north of the Marquette Heights wells. Tr.1 at 22, 33-34, 37-40, 63; Exh. A at 11, Attachment V; Exh. B, D, G.

There is no evidence that the groundwater contamination plume from the BP Amoco tank farm is within the proposed maximum setback. Tr.1 at 18. Indeed, Cobb believes that the BP Amoco contaminant plume is not off-site at this time and is contained on the tank farm site with hydraulic pumping. *Id.* at 18-21. According to Cobb, BP Amoco is:

doing a very active remediation, pump and treat, hydraulic containment, active soil venting and bioventing because they have free product there as well as dissolved contaminants including methyl tertiary butyl ether [MTBE] which is



very mobile. And, of course, they are surrounded by Creve Coeur public water supply to the north and right now North Pekin and Marquette Heights on the south. Tr.1 at 13.

Contamination was found in monitoring wells within the setback zone of North Pekin well #1 (also identified as well 50210). Exh. A, Attachment V at 2; Exh. G. Marquette Heights' two CWS wells are located just east of North Pekin well #1. Exh. A, Att. V at 2; Exh. G; Tr.1 at 31-32, 54.

A maximum setback zone around North Pekin's well #1 currently encompasses the two Marquette Heights wells. North Pekin, however, is in the process of abandoning well #1 and drilling another well in a different location. Tr. 1 at 11-12, 59-60; Exh. C at 7. Cobb testified that North Pekin, in negotiation with BP Amoco, would relocate well #1, extinguishing North Pekin's current maximum setback zone. According to Cobb, under the Tiered Approach to Corrective Action Objectives (TACO) (35 Ill. Adm. Code 742), extinguishing the current maximum setback zone of North Pekin would allow BP Amoco to extend the point of compliance for the remediation. Tr.1 at 11. Specifically, BP Amoco could show compliance with the groundwater standards at the minimum setback of 400 feet from the Marquette Heights CWS wells, instead of at a location farther away from the wells, at the current North Pekin maximum setback boundary. *Id.* at 15-16.

When North Pekin's well is relocated, Marquette Heights expects to lose the protection it has been receiving indirectly from North Pekin's overlapping maximum setback. Tr.1 at 12, 60, 63. Marquette Heights wants to preserve that area of protection through this rulemaking. *Id.* at 12. With a new maximum setback zone that, as delineated, ranges from roughly 600 to 1,000 feet from the Marquette Heights wells, the point of compliance under TACO (*i.e.*, where BP Amoco would be required to meet the groundwater standards) would move farther away from wells #4 and #5 than with the 400-foot minimum setback zone. *Id.* at 15-17.

Cobb stated that the proposed rule currently has no direct bearing on the BP Amoco remediation or on the consent order requiring the cleanup, although the proposed setback might in the future. Tr. at 41; Exh. K. As to the other potential sources of contamination identified in the "Source Water Assessment Program Fact Sheet," the Agency's analysis showed the proposed rules would have no immediate impact on any particular type of existing activity or potential source. Tr. 1 at 48-49.

The Agency contracted with RAPPS Engineering and Applied Science (RAPPS) to model the groundwater flow and delineate the recharge area and wellhead protection area (WHPA) for the Marquette Heights CWS wells. Statement at 4; Exh. A at 4; Exh. H; Tr.1 at 25-28. A WHPA is "the surface and subsurface area around a water well field, supplying a public water system, through which contaminants are reasonably likely to move toward and reach such water well or well field." Exh. L at 2-3. To delineate a WHPA, the capture zone of a well must be determined and projected on to the land surface. *Id.* at 3. A capture zone is "the entire area recharging or contributing water to the well, a three-dimensional volume of aquifer that may or may not intersect the land surface." *Id.*

The Marquette Heights proposed maximum setback zone is based on a sophisticated technique for determining the lateral area of influence (LAI) under 35 Ill. Adm. Code 671.201(g),<sup>8</sup> Illinois' Wellhead Protection Program approved by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and guidance for conducting groundwater protection needs assessments (Cobb, *et al.*, 1995). Exh. A at 4; Tr.1 at 25-28. Other resources that were considered included *Guidelines for the Delineation of Wellhead Protection Areas* (USEPA, 1987) and *Model Assessment for Delineating WHPAs* (USEPA, 1988).

In addition, modeling was performed consistent with *Applied Groundwater Modeling Simulation of Flow and Advective Transport* (Anderson and Woessner, 1992). Exh. A at 4. RAPPS created a groundwater flow model and delineated the capture zone using MODFLOW and MODPATH, the United States Geological Survey (USGS) groundwater flow modeling program and particle tracking program, respectively (McDonald and Harbough, 1988; Pollock, 1989). Exh. L at 3. The model was reviewed and approved by the Agency. Exh. A at 4.

A WHPA was constructed by outlining the area encompassed by the capture zones produced by the model. Exh. A at 24; Exh. G, H. Delineating WHPAs fulfills part of the requirements of Section 1428(a) of the federal SDWA (42 U.S.C. § 300h-7(a)). Exh. L at 1. In general, a WHPA was established by the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act as a 1,000-foot fixed radial area around each CWS well in Illinois. For unconfined aquifers, WHPAs are further delineated using models and hydrogeologic mapping to determine "five-year time-related capture zones," which might extend beyond the 1,000-foot radius. Exh. L at 2.

The WHPA, as outlined by the model capture zones for the Marquette Heights CWS wells, lead to the determination of an irregular shaped maximum setback zone within the WHPA, up to 1,000 feet from the two wellheads. Statement at 6; Exh. G, H. The setback zone is depicted on a map in Appendix A of the proposed rules. Statement at 6. The map details the location of the Marquette Heights CWS wells and proposed maximum setback zone boundaries, as well as local roads and property boundaries. Statement at 9. The Agency's modeling also accounted for scenarios of the North Pekin well and the BP Amoco wells being closed. Tr.1 at 49-50.

The evaluation took into account the regional groundwater gradient, LAI, and pumping stresses. Statement at 5-6. Other pumping stresses on the same aquifer included the wells of Creve Couer, Pekin, North Pekin, and Groveland Township, plus 15 wells operated by BP Amoco as part of the subsurface contamination cleanup system. Tr. 1 at 33; Exh. A at 16. Results demonstrated that recharge is occurring beyond the minimum setback zones, and that the Marquette Heights CWS wells are not adequately protected. Statement at 6; Exh. H.

### **Economics**

---

<sup>8</sup> The Part 671 rules (35 Ill. Adm. Code 671), which were adopted by the Agency, provide procedures to be used by counties or municipalities interested in establishing maximum setback zones around CWS wells by ordinance. The rules include procedures for a county or municipality to request Agency review of the local government's LAI determination.

Marquette Heights Mayor, David Redfield, testified that “wells number 4 and 5 are the only source of raw water for the city’s system.” Tr.1 at 54; Exh. C at 3. The record indicates that relocating the Marquette Heights CWS wells is impractical. Based on the City’s research, there are no suitable alternate sites for the wells. Longer pipelines (as well as associated pumping facilities, easements, and land acquisition) needed to deliver the water are cost-prohibitive. Also, as noted, ready access to the Sankoty aquifer is lacking, such as within Marquette Heights’ corporate limits, and deeper aquifers raise concerns over high levels of TDS, sulfate, and radionuclides. Tr. at 54, 58-59; Exh. C at 3-6.

Further, using the Illinois River as a source is also not an effective solution. The river is outside the boundaries of Marquette Heights and higher costs would apply to delivery and treatment. Tr. 1 at 57. Mayor Redfield emphasized that the “limited availability of alternative sites underscores the importance of protecting the existing sites from contamination.” Exh. C at 5. Even if suitable locations were available for replacement wells in Marquette Heights, the City estimated that it would cost at least \$825,000 to replicate the City’s existing well and treatment facilities. *Id.* at 5-6.

According to Cobb, the proposed rules are economically reasonable and technically feasible. Tr.1 at 48. Cobb also testified that the maximum setback zone would be economically beneficial:

The benefit of prevention in my opinion outweighs the cost of prohibiting any new potential primary sources of groundwater contamination within the proposed maximum setback zone. And the theory here is that good water is good business; that we need good water to maintain the economic growth and economy in an area as well as . . . to see future growth. *Id.* at 9.

Groundwater contamination can produce “significant economic hardships for local businesses and communities.” Exh. A at 27. These hardships include:

devalued real estate; diminished home sales or commercial real estate sales; loss to the tax base; consulting and legal fees; increased operation and maintenance costs; increased water rates for alternative water supplies as well as the cost of new equipment and treatment; and remediation costs. *Id.* at 27-28.

For example, the Agency provided information on the substantial costs faced by the community of East Alton, in Madison County, because of MTBE contamination of groundwater. Exh. A at 28-29. USEPA has estimated that the “ratio of contamination costs to basic prevention costs may be as large as 200:1.” *Id.* at 28. Mayor Redfield stated that the enlarged setback would “decrease the risk both of contaminating those wells [#4 and #5] and of the significant financial burden which such contamination would impose on the City.” Exh. C at 6.

In addition, according to Mayor Redfield, the “only territory available for further expansion” of Marquette Heights lies in the largely undeveloped area to the east of the City’s corporate limits. Exh. C at 2. The Mayor expects new residential and business development to occur in this area as a result of the construction of a five-lane roadway that will intersect with

Interstate 474. *Id.* Communities that deliver water exceeding the drinking water standards are placed on restricted status and therefore are generally unable to get permits for water main extensions. Exh. A at 28.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Board proposes for first notice this new Part 618 on maximum setback zones. Proposed Part 618 has two subparts. Subpart A contains general provisions for maximum setback zones established in Illinois by Board rulemaking. This is the first such rulemaking. Subpart B has rules specific to the maximum setback zone for Marquette Heights, which will provide expanded setback zone protection for the City's two CWS wells.

The Board has made several clarifying changes to IEPA's proposed rule language. Those changes are minor and do not merit discussion. Based on this record, the Board finds that the rules proposed today are technically feasible and economically reasonable and will not have an adverse economic impact on the People of Illinois. *See* 415 ILCS 5/27(a), (b) (2004).

Publication in the *Illinois Register* of this first-notice proposal will start a period of at least 45 days during which anyone may file public comments with the Clerk of the Board at the address set forth at the outset of this opinion. Additionally, as noted above, public comments may be filed through COOL at [www.ipcb.state.il.us](http://www.ipcb.state.il.us) as part of the Board's voluntary electronic filing pilot project.

### **ORDER**

The Board directs the Clerk to cause publication of the following proposed rules in the *Illinois Register* for first notice.

TITLE 35: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
SUBTITLE F: PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES  
CHAPTER I: POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

PART 618  
MAXIMUM SETBACK ZONES

SUBPART A: GENERAL

Section	
618.100	Purpose and Applicability
6 18.105	Definitions

SUBPART B: MARQUETTE HEIGHTS' MAXIMUM SETBACK ZONE

Section	
618.200	Purpose and Applicability
6 18.205	1,000 Foot Maximum Setback Zone Prohibition

## Appendix A: Boundaries of Marquette Heights' Maximum Setback Zone

**AUTHORITY:** Implementing Section 14.3 and authorized by Section 27 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/14.3 and 27].

**SOURCE:** Adopted in R05-9 at \_\_\_ Ill. Reg. \_\_\_\_\_, effective \_\_\_\_\_.

### SUBPART A: GENERAL

#### Section 618.100 Purpose and Applicability

This Part is established in the interest of securing the public health, safety, and welfare; to preserve the quality and quantity of groundwater resources in order to assure a safe and adequate water supply for present and future generations; and to preserve groundwater resources currently in use and those aquifers having a potential for future use as a public water supply. Pursuant to the authority of Section 14.3(d) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act (Act) [415 ILCS 5/14.3(d)], the provisions of this Part apply to all properties located wholly or partially within a maximum setback zone established under Section 14.3(d) of the Act and this regulation.

#### Section 618.105 Definitions

Unless a different meaning of a word or term is clear from the context, the definitions of words or terms in this Part are the same as those used in the Act, the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act [415 ILCS 55/1], or 35 Ill. Adm. Code 671.

“Agency” means the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

“Board” means the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

“Facility” means *the buildings and all real property contiguous thereto, and the equipment at a single location used for the conduct of business* [430 ILCS 45/3].

“New Potential Primary Source” means:

*a potential primary source which is not in existence or for which construction has not commenced at its location as of January 1, 1988; or*

*a potential primary source which expands laterally beyond the currently permitted boundary or, if the primary source is not permitted, the boundary in existence as of January 1, 1988; or*

*a potential primary source which is part of a facility that undergoes major reconstruction. Such reconstruction shall be deemed to have taken place where the fixed capital cost of the new components constructed within a 2-year period exceed 50% of the fixed capital cost of a comparable entirely new facility* [415 ILCS 5/3.345].

“New Potential Route” means:

*a potential route which is not in existence or for which construction has not commenced at its location as of January 1, 1988; or*

*a potential route which expands laterally beyond the currently permitted boundary or, if the potential route is not permitted, the boundary in existence as of January 1, 1988 [415 ILCS 5/3.350].*

“New Potential Secondary Source” means:

*a potential secondary source which is not in existence or for which construction has not commenced at its location as of July 1, 1988; or*

*a potential secondary source which expands laterally beyond the currently permitted boundary or, if the secondary source is not permitted, the boundary in existence as of July 1, 1988, other than an expansion for handling of livestock waste or for treating domestic wastewaters; or*

*a potential secondary source which is part of a facility that undergoes major reconstruction. Such reconstruction shall be deemed to have taken place where the fixed capital cost of the new components constructed within a 2-year period exceed 50% of the fixed capital cost of a comparable entirely new facility [415 ILCS 5/3.355]; and*

*A new potential secondary source excludes an agrichemical facility that modifies on-site storage capacity such that the volume of the pesticide storage does not exceed 125% of the available capacity in existence on April 1, 1990, or the volume of fertilizer storage does not exceed 150% of the available capacity in existence on April 1, 1990; provided that a written endorsement for an agrichemical facility permit is in effect under Section 39.4 of the Act and the maximum feasible setback is maintained. This on-site storage capacity includes mini-bulk pesticides, package agrichemical storage areas, liquid or dry fertilizers, and liquid or dry pesticides [415 ILCS 5/14.2(g)(4)].*

“Potential Primary Source” means any unit at a facility or site not currently subject to a removal or remedial action which:

*is utilized for the treatment, storage, or disposal of any hazardous or special waste not generated at the site; or*

*is utilized for the disposal of municipal waste not generated at the site, other than landscape waste and construction and demolition debris; or*

*is utilized for the landfilling, land treating, surface impounding or piling of any hazardous or special waste that is generated on the site or at other sites owned, controlled or operated by the same person; or*

*stores or accumulates at any time more than 75,000 pounds above ground, or more than 7,500 pounds below ground, of any hazardous substances [415 ILCS 5/3.345].*

*“Potential route” means abandoned and improperly plugged wells of all kinds, drainage wells, all injection wells, including closed loop heat pump wells, and any excavation for the discovery, development or production of stone, sand or gravel [415 ILCS 5/3.350].*

*“Potential secondary source” means any unit at a facility or a site not currently subject to a removal or remedial action, other than a potential primary source, which:*

*is utilized for the landfilling, land treating, or surface impounding of waste that is generated on the site or at other sites owned, controlled or operated by the same person, other than livestock and landscape waste, and construction and demolition debris; or*

*stores or accumulates at any time more than 25,000 but not more than 75,000 pounds above ground, or more than 2,500 but not more than 7,500 pounds below ground, of any hazardous substances; or*

*stores or accumulates at any time more than 25,000 gallons above ground, or more than 500 gallons below ground, of petroleum, including crude oil or any fraction thereof which is not otherwise specifically listed or designated as a hazardous substance; or*

*stores or accumulates pesticides, fertilizers, or road oils for purposes of commercial application or for distribution to retail sales outlets; or*

*stores or accumulates at any time more than 50,000 pounds of any de-icing agent; or*

*is utilized for handling livestock waste or for treating domestic wastewaters other than private sewage disposal systems as defined in the Private Sewage Disposal Licensing Act [415 ILCS 5/3.355].*

*“Setback zone” means a geographic area, designated pursuant to the Act, containing a potable water supply well or a potential source or potential route, having a continuous boundary, and within which certain prohibitions or regulations are applicable in order to protect groundwaters [415 ILCS 5/3.450].*

*“Site” means any location, place, tract of land, and facilities, including but not limited to buildings, and improvements used for purposes subject to regulation or control by the Act or regulations thereunder [415 ILCS 5/3.460].*

*“Unit” means any device, mechanism, equipment, or area (exclusive of land utilized only for agricultural production). This term includes secondary containment structures and their contents at agrichemical facilities [415 ILCS 5/3.515].*

“Unit boundary” means a line at the land’s surface circumscribing the area on which, above which, or below which waste, pesticides, fertilizers, road oils or de-icing agents will be placed during the active life of the facility. The space taken up by any liner, dike or other barrier designed to contain waste, pesticides, fertilizer, road oils, or de-icing agents falls within the unit boundary.

## SUBPART B: MARQUETTE HEIGHTS’ MAXIMUM SETBACK ZONE

### Section 618.200 Purpose and Applicability

- a) This Subpart prescribes maximum setback zone prohibitions and the applicable technology control regulations that apply under 35 Ill. Adm. Code 615 and 616 in the interest of securing the public health, safety, and welfare; to preserve the quality and quantity of groundwater resources in order to assure a safe and adequate water supply for present and future generations; and to preserve groundwater resources currently in use and those aquifers having a potential for future use as a public water supply.
- b) The provisions of this Subpart apply to all properties located wholly or partially within the maximum setback zone boundaries of Marquette Heights delineated in Section 618.Appendix A of this Part:
  - 1) That are new potential primary sources of groundwater contamination pursuant to Section 14.3(d) of the Act; or
  - 2) That are existing or new activities regulated under 35 Ill. Adm. Code 615 or 616, excluding agrichemical facilities that affirmatively opt out of 35 Ill. Adm. Code 615 or 616, which are regulated instead under 8 Ill. Adm. Code 257 or 77 Ill. Adm. Code 830.


### Section 618.205 1,000 Foot Maximum Setback Zone Prohibition

New potential primary sources of groundwater contamination are prohibited from locating wholly or partially within the Marquette Heights’ maximum setback zone boundaries delineated in Section 618.Appendix A of this Part.



Section 618.Appendix A: Boundaries of Marquette Heights' Maximum Setback Zone


Section 618. Appendix A: Boundary of Marquette Heights' Maximum Setback Zone



WHOLLY CONTAINED		PARTIALLY CONTAINED	
102	111	106	118
21-011	27-039	64-010	50-020
38-018	27-049	65-010	51-010
	28-067	66-008	52-018
103	28-008	67-008	53-017
1-005	28-106	68-081	54-016
2-004	28-106	68-032	55-015
	30-033	69-014	56-014
106	30-033	69-014	57-015
58-007	31-081	105-009	58-012
69-006	31-032	122-027	59-011
	31-032	123-026	67-005
70-005	35-000		66-004
71-004	35-044	111	66-003
72-003	34-028	153-021	64-002
73-002	34-027	153-022	
74-001	35-065	28-051	114
75-021	36-063	A-009	E-010
76-022	194-029	115	6-038
77-023	195-019	104	6-039
78-024	195-018	25-042	1-006
79-025	197-017		
80-026	198-016	120	103
81-027	199-015	15-002	3-003
82-028	190-014	14-001	
83-029	181-013		
84-030	182-012	102	102
	183-011	119	39-016
108	184-010	5-005	37-017
109-008	185-009	5-006	22-010
107-007	186-008	7-007	
108-006	187-007	8-008	101
109-005	188-006		26-010
110-004	189-005		
111-003	170-004		
112-002		105	105
113-001	114	106	106
114-019	0-59-006	107	107
115-020	2-02-002	108	108
116-021	2-02-003	109	109
117-022	2-27-007	110	110
118-023		111	111
119-024		112	112
120-025		113	113
121-026		114	114
		115	115
		116	116
		117	117
		118	118
		119	119
		120	120
		121	121
		122	122
		123	123
		124	124
		125	125
		126	126
		127	127
		128	128
		129	129
		130	130
		131	131
		132	132
		133	133
		134	134
		135	135
		136	136
		137	137
		138	138
		139	139
		140	140
		141	141
		142	142
		143	143
		144	144
		145	145
		146	146
		147	147
		148	148
		149	149
		150	150
		151	151
		152	152
		153	153
		154	154
		155	155
		156	156
		157	157
		158	158
		159	159
		160	160
		161	161
		162	162
		163	163
		164	164
		165	165
		166	166
		167	167
		168	168
		169	169
		170	170
		171	171
		172	172
		173	173
		174	174
		175	175
		176	176
		177	177
		178	178
		179	179
		180	180
		181	181
		182	182
		183	183
		184	184
		185	185
		186	186
		187	187
		188	188
		189	189
		190	190
		191	191
		192	192
		193	193
		194	194
		195	195
		196	196
		197	197
		198	198
		199	199
		200	200
		201	201
		202	202
		203	203
		204	204
		205	205
		206	206
		207	207
		208	208
		209	209
		210	210
		211	211
		212	212
		213	213
		214	214
		215	215
		216	216
		217	217
		218	218
		219	219
		220	220
		221	221
		222	222
		223	223
		224	224
		225	225
		226	226
		227	227
		228	228
		229	229
		230	230
		231	231
		232	232
		233	233
		234	234
		235	235
		236	236
		237	237
		238	238
		239	239
		240	240
		241	241
		242	242
		243	243
		244	244
		245	245
		246	246
		247	247
		248	248
		249	249
		250	250
		251	251
		252	252
		253	253
		254	254
		255	255
		256	256
		257	257
		258	258
		259	259
		260	260
		261	261
		262	262
		263	263
		264	264
		265	265
		266	266
		267	267
		268	268
		269	269
		270	270
		271	271
		272	272
		273	273
		274	274
		275	275
		276	276
		277	277
		278	278
		279	279
		280	280
		281	281
		282	282
		283	283
		284	284
		285	285
		286	286
		287	287
		288	288
		289	289
		290	290
		291	291
		292	292
		293	293
		294	294
		295	295
		296	296
		297	297
		298	298
		299	299
		300	300
		301	301
		302	302
		303	303
		304	304
		305	305
		306	306
		307	307
		308	308
		309	309
		310	310
		311	311
		312	312
		313	313
		314	314
		315	315
		316	316
		317	317
		318	318
		319	319
		320	320
		321	321
		322	322
		323	323
		324	324
		325	325
		326	326
		327	327
		328	328
		329	329
		330	330
		331	331
		332	332
		333	333
		334	334
		335	335
		336	336
		337	337
		338	338
		339	339
		340	340
		341	341
		342	342
		343	343
		344	344
		345	345
		346	346
		347	347
		348	348
		349	349
		350	350
		351	351
		352	352
		353	353
		354	354
		355	355
		356	356
		357	357
		358	358
		359	359
		360	360
		361	361
		362	362
		363	363
		364	364
		365	365
		366	366
		367	367
		368	368
		369	369
		370	370
		371	371
		372	372
		373	373
		374	374
		375	375
		376	376
		377	377
		378	378
		379	379
		380	380
		381	381
		382	382
		383	383
		384	384
		385	385
		386	386
		387	387
		388	388
		389	389
		390	390
		391	391
		392	392
		393	393
		394	

IT IS SO ORDERED.

I, Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, certify that the Board adopted the above opinion and order on November 17, 2005, by a vote of 4-0.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dorothy M. Gunn".

Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk  
Illinois Pollution Control Board