

207



ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1021 NORTH GRAND AVENUE EAST, P.O. BOX 19276, SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62794-9276 - (217) 782-3397  
JAMES R. THOMPSON CENTER, 100 WEST RANDOLPH, SUITE 11-300, CHICAGO, IL 60601 - (312) 814-6026


ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, GOVERNOR DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, DIRECTOR

217/782-0610

February 1, 2007

Southern Illinois Power Cooperative  
11543 Lake of Egypt Road  
Marion, Illinois 62959

Re: Southern Illinois Power Cooperative - Marion Station  
NPDES Permit No. IL0004316  
Final Permit



Gentlemen:

Attached is the final NPDES Permit for your discharge. The Permit as issued covers discharge limitations, monitoring, and reporting requirements. Failure to meet any portion of the Permit could result in civil and/or criminal penalties. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency is ready and willing to assist you in interpreting any of the conditions of the Permit as they relate specifically to your discharge.

The Agency has begun a program allowing the submittal of electronic Discharge Monitoring Reports (eDMRs) instead of paper Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs). If you are interested in eDMRs, more information can be found on the Agency website, <http://epa.state.il.us/water/edmr/index.html>. If your facility is not registered in the eDMR program, a supply of preprinted paper DMR Forms for your facility will be sent to you prior to the initiation of DMR reporting under the reissued permit. Additional information and instructions will accompany the preprinted DMRs upon their arrival.

The Permit as issued is effective as of the date indicated on the first page of the Permit. You have the right to appeal any condition of the Permit to the Illinois Pollution Control Board within a 35 day period following the issuance date.

Should you have questions concerning the Permit, please contact Blaine Kinsley at the telephone number indicated above.

Sincerely,

Alan Keller, P.E.  
Manager, Permit Section  
Division of Water Pollution Control

SAK:BAK:JMC:04110101.jmc

Attachment: Final Permit

cc: Records  
Compliance Assurance Section  
Marion Region  
USEPA  
Facility

ROCKFORD - 4302 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103 - (815) 987-7760 • DES PLAINES - 9511 W. Harrison St., Des Plaines, IL 60016 - (847) 294-4000  
ELGIN - 595 South State, Elgin, IL 60123 - (847) 608-3131 • PEORIA - 5415 N. University St., Peoria, IL 61614 - (309) 693-5463  
BUREAU OF LAND - PEORIA - 7620 N. University St., Peoria, IL 61614 - (309) 693-5462 • CHAMPAIGN - 2125 South First Street, Champaign, IL 61820 - (217) 278-5800  
SPRINGFIELD - 4500 S. Sixth Street Rd., Springfield, IL 62706 - (217) 786-6892 • COLLINSVILLE - 2009 Mall Street, Collinsville, IL 62234 - (618) 346-5120  
MARION - 2309 W. Main St., Suite 116, Marion, IL 62959 - (618) 993-7200

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency

Division of Water Pollution Control

1021 North Grand Avenue East

Post Office Box 19276

Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

Reissued (NPDES) Permit

Expiration Date: February 29, 2012

Issue Date: February 1, 2007

Effective Date: March 1, 2007

Name and Address of Permittee:

Southern Illinois Power Cooperative  
11543 Lake of Egypt Road  
Marion, Illinois 62959

Facility Name and Address:

Southern Illinois Power Cooperative - Marion Station  
10825 Lake of Egypt Road  
Marion, Illinois 62959  
(Williamson County)

Discharge Number and Name:

002 Ash Pond No. 4 Effluent  
A02 Chemical Metal Cleaning Wastewater  
003 Condenser Cooling Water  
004 Intake Screen Backwash  
005 Fly Ash and Scrubber Sludge Disposal Pond B-3  
A05 Chemical Metal Cleaning Wastewater  
006 Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activity

Receiving Waters:

Little Saline Creek  
Little Saline Creek  
Lake of Egypt  
Lake of Egypt  
Little Saline Creek  
Little Saline Creek  
Lake of Egypt

In compliance with the provisions of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, Title 35 of Ill. Adm. Code, Subtitle C and/or Subtitle D, Chapter 1, and the Clean Water Act (CWA), the above-named permittee is hereby authorized to discharge at the above location to the above-named receiving stream in accordance with the standard conditions and attachments herein.

Permittee is not authorized to discharge after the above expiration date. In order to receive authorization to discharge beyond the expiration date, the permittee shall submit the proper application as required by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) not later than 180 days prior to the expiration date.



Alan Keller, P.E.  
Manager, Permit Section  
Division of Water Pollution Control

SAK:JMC:04110101.jmc

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Effluent Limitations and Monitoring

PARAMETER	LOAD LIMITS lbs/day DAF (DMF)		CONCENTRATION LIMITS mg/l		SAMPLE FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM		
1. From the effective date of this permit until the expiration date, the effluent of the following discharge(s) shall be monitored and limited at all times as follows:						
Outfall: 002 Ash Pond No. 4 Effluent*						
This discharge consists of:			Approximate Flow			
1. Process wastewater				2.0 MGD		
2. Boiler evaporation and blowdown				0.1 MGD		
3. Bottom ash slurry				2.5 MGD		
4. Coal pile runoff				Intermittent		
5. Yard drains				0.005 MGD		
6. Floor drains and equipment drains				0.002 MGD		
7. Slag storage pile runoff				Intermittent		
8. Scrubber sludge slurry water				0.05 MGD		
9. Scrubber sludge disposal area runoff				Intermittent		
Flow (MGD)	See Special Condition 1				1/Week	Continuous
pH	See Special Condition 2				1/Week	Grab
Oil and Grease			15	20	2/Month	Grab
Total Suspended Solids			15	30	1/Week	8-Hour Composite
Total Dissolved Solids				1000	1/Month	8-Hour Composite
Iron (total)			2	4	1/Month	8-Hour Composite
Boron				**	1/Month	8-Hour Composite
Fluoride			1.4		1/Month	8-Hour Composite
Copper***			0.023	0.037	1/Month	8-Hour Composite
Mercury****					1/Month	8-Hour Composite

\*See Special Condition 13

\*\*See Special Condition 16

\*\*\*See Special Condition 17

\*\*\*\*See Special Condition 19



NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Effluent Limitations and Monitoring

PARAMETER	LOAD LIMITS lbs/day		CONCENTRATION		SAMPLE FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM		

1. From the effective date of this permit until the expiration date, the effluent of the following discharge(s) shall be monitored and limited at all times as follows:

Outfall: 003 Condenser Cooling Water\*

This discharge consists of:

Approximate Flow

- |                            |         |
|----------------------------|---------|
| 1. Condenser cooling water | 229 MGD |
| 2. Auxiliary cooling water | 0.4 MGD |
| 3. HVAC system discharge   | 0.4 MGD |

Flow (MGD)	See Special Condition 1	Daily	Continuous
Temperature	See Special Condition 4	Daily	Continuous
Total Residual Chlorine	See Special Condition 5	0.2	1/Week Grab

\*See Special Condition 7 and 8 concerning additional thermal discharge requirements.

Outfall: 004 Intake Screen Backwash

See Special Condition 10



NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Effluent Limitations and Monitoring

PARAMETER	LOAD LIMITS lbs/day DAF (DMF)		CONCENTRATION LIMITS mg/l		SAMPLE FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM		
1. From the effective date of this permit until the expiration date, the effluent of the following discharge(s) shall be monitored and limited at all times as follows:						
Outfall: 005 Fly Ash and Scrubber Sludge Disposal Pond B-3*						
This discharge consists of:			Approximate Flow			
1. Fly ash sluice water				Intermittent		
2. Scrubber sludge slurry water				Intermittent		
3. Floor and equipment drains				Intermittent		
4. Yard drains				Intermittent		
5. Miscellaneous plant blowdowns				Intermittent		
6. Coal Pile Runoff				Intermittent		
Flow (MGD)	See Special Condition 1				Daily When Discharging	Continuous
pH	See Special Condition 2				Daily When Discharging	Grab
Oil and Grease			15	20	1/Month	Grab
Total Suspended Solids			15	30	Daily When Discharging	Grab
Total Dissolved Solids				1000	1/Month	Grab
Iron (total)			2	4	1/Month	Grab
Boron				9.0**	1/Month	Grab
Zinc***					1/Month	Grab
Mercury****					1/Month	8-Hour Composite

\*See Special Condition 13  
 \*\*See Special Condition 16  
 \*\*\*See Special Condition 11  
 \*\*\*\*See Special Condition 19

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Effluent Limitations and Monitoring

PARAMETER	LOAD LIMITS lbs/day DAF (DMF)		CONCENTRATION LIMITS mg/l		SAMPLE FREQUENCY	SAMPLE TYPE
	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM	30 DAY AVERAGE	DAILY MAXIMUM		

1. From the effective date of this permit until the expiration date, the effluent of the following discharge(s) shall be monitored and limited at all times as follows:

Outfalls: A02 and A05 Chemical Metal Cleaning Wastewater

Flow (MGD)					*	Measurement
Iron (total)			1.0	1.0	*	8-Hour Composite
Copper (total)			1.0	1.0	*	8-Hour Composite

\*See Special Condition 19

Outfall: 006 Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activity

See Special Condition 15

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

SPECIAL CONDITION 1. Flow shall be recorded as a monthly average and daily maximum and shall be reported as such on the DMR form.

SPECIAL CONDITION 2. The pH shall be in the range 6.0 to 9.0. The monthly minimum and monthly maximum values shall be reported on the DMR form.

SPECIAL CONDITION 3. Samples taken in compliance with the effluent monitoring requirements shall be taken at a point representative of the discharge, but prior to entry into the receiving stream. For internal Outfalls A02 and A05, samples shall be taken at a point representative of the discharge, but prior to mixture with other wastestreams. If chemical metal cleaning wastewater is used as scrubber make-up water, samples shall be taken prior to use as make-up water.

SPECIAL CONDITION 4. Discharge of wastewater from this facility must not alone or in combination with other sources cause the receiving stream to violate the following thermal limitations at the edge of the mixing zone which is defined by Section 302.211, Illinois Administration Code, Title 35, Chapter 1, Subtitle C, as amended:

- A. Maximum temperature rise above natural temperature must not exceed 5 F (2.8 C).
- B. Water temperature at representative locations in the lake shall not exceed the maximum limits in the following table during more than one (1) percent of the hours in the 12-month period ending with any month. Moreover, at no time shall the water temperature at such locations exceed the maximum limits in the following table by more than 3 F (1.7 C).

<u>Jan.</u>	<u>Feb.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug.</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>Oct.</u>	<u>Nov.</u>	<u>Dec.</u>
60	60	60	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	60
16	16	16	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	16

- C. The monthly maximum value shall be reported on the DMR form.
- D. The computer model, PDS program, shall be used to predict plume trajectory and the area enclosed by the surface isotherms to determine compliance with the above temperature limitations.

SPECIAL CONDITION 5. Total residual chlorine limit is an instantaneous maximum limit which shall not be exceeded at any time. The maximum weekly value shall be reported on the DMR form.

Results of all weekly grab samples shall be submitted with the monthly DMR form if maximum limit is exceeded during any week.

Chlorine may not be discharged from each units main cooling condenser for more than two hours in any one day.

SPECIAL CONDITION 6. There shall be no discharge of polychlorinated biphenyl compounds.

SPECIAL CONDITION 7 Due to increase in thermal discharge volume Southern Illinois Power Cooperative shall comply with Section 302.211f of Title 35, Chapter 1, Subtitle C: Water Pollution Regulations and Section 316(a) of the CWA by demonstrating that thermal discharge from Marion Generating Station will not cause and cannot reasonably be expected to cause significant ecological damage to Lake of Egypt. Pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 302.211g no additional monitoring or modification is being required for reissuance of this NPDES Permit.

SPECIAL CONDITION 8. The Permittee's facility has been deemed to meet the criteria as a Phase II existing facility (under section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act) pursuant to 40 CFR 125.91. Therefore, the permittee must fulfill the applicable requirements of 40 CFR 125 subpart J, and 40 CFR 122(r)(2), (3) and (5). The regulation at 40 CFR 125.95 requires submittal of a Proposal for Information Collection (PIC) to support the development of a Comprehensive Demonstration Study (CDS) for the herein permitted facility. The PIC will be reviewed by the Agency and a response will be provided. An extension of time to submit the CDS has been granted. Therefore, you must submit your CDS on or before January 7, 2008. Once the CDS has been reviewed by the Agency and a compliance strategy has been approved, this permit will be modified to include implementation, monitoring, and reporting requirements pursuant to 40 CFR 125.98.

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

SPECIAL CONDITION 9. The Permittee shall record monitoring results on Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) Forms using one such form for each outfall each month.

In the event that an outfall does not discharge during a monthly reporting period, the DMR Form shall be submitted with no discharge indicated.

The Permittee may choose to submit electronic DMRs (eDMRs) instead of mailing paper DMRs to the IEPA. More information, including registration information for the eDMR program, can be obtained on the IEPA website, <http://www.epa.state.il.us/water/edmr/index.html>.

The completed Discharge Monitoring Report forms shall be submitted to IEPA no later than the last calendar day of the following month, unless otherwise specified by the permitting authority.

Permittees not using eDMRs shall mail Discharge Monitoring Reports with an original signature to the IEPA at the following address:

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency  
Division of Water Pollution Control  
1021 North Grand Avenue East  
Post Office Box 19276  
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Attention: Compliance Assurance Section, Mail Code # 19

SPECIAL CONDITION 10. There shall be no discharge of collected debris from Outfall 004 Intake Screen Backwash.

SPECIAL CONDITION 11. Sample frequency for zinc at outfall 005 shall be once a month until six samples have been collected; after which and upon written notification to the Agency, the sampling may cease, unless the Agency modifies the permit to require continued sampling at some frequency.

SPECIAL CONDITION 12. For the purpose of this permit, Outfall 003 is limited to non-contact cooling water, free from additives other than chlorine. If the permittee wishes to use cooling water additives, the following information must be submitted to the Agency for review:

- a. Brand name;
- b. List of active and inactive ingredients expressed as a percentage of the total product;
- c. Feed rate and expected discharge concentration;
- d. Aquatic toxicity results.

The additive(s) shall not be used until Agency approval has been given.

SPECIAL CONDITION 13. The Permittee shall conduct biomonitoring of the effluent from Outfall 002 and 005. The Permittee shall conduct biomonitoring of the effluent discharge no earlier than one (1) year prior to the expiration date of this Permit. The results shall be submitted with the Permit renewal application.

Biomonitoring

1. Acute Toxicity - Standard definitive acute toxicity tests shall be run on at least two trophic levels of aquatic species (fish, invertebrate) representative of the aquatic community of the receiving stream. Except as noted here and in the IEPA document "Effluent Biomonitoring and Toxicity Assessment", testing must be consistent with Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms (Fourth Ed.) EPA-600/4-90-027. Unless substitute tests are pre-approved; the following tests are required:
  - a. Fish - 96 hour static LC<sub>50</sub> Bioassay using one to two week old fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*).
  - b. Invertebrate 48-hour static LC<sub>50</sub> Bioassay using *Ceriodaphnia*.

## NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

2. Testing Frequency - The above tests shall be conducted on a one time basis using 24-hour composite effluent samples unless otherwise authorized by the IEPA. Results shall be reported according to EPA/600/4-90/027, Section 12, Report Preparation, and shall be submitted to IEPA with the renewal application.
3. Toxicity Assessment - Should the review of the results of the biomonitoring program identify toxicity, the Agency may require that the permittee prepare a plan for toxicity reduction evaluation and identification. This plan shall include an evaluation to determine which chemicals have a potential for being discharged in the plant wastewater, a monitoring program to determine their presence or absence and to identify other compounds which are not being removed by treatment, and other measures as appropriate.

The Agency may modify this permit during its term to incorporate additional requirements or limitations based on the results of any biomonitoring. In addition, after review of the monitoring results, the Agency may modify this permit to include numerical limitations for specific toxic pollutants. Modifications under this condition shall follow public notice and opportunity for hearing.

SPECIAL CONDITION 14. The Agency has determined that the effluent limitations at outfall 002 and 005 constitute BAT/BCT for storm water which is treated in the existing treatment facilities for purposes of this permit reissuance, and no pollution prevention plan will be required for such storm water. In addition to the chemical specific monitoring required elsewhere in this permit, the permittee shall conduct an annual inspection of the facility site to identify areas contributing to a storm water discharge associated with industrial activity, and determine whether any facility modifications have occurred which result in previously-treated storm water discharges no longer receiving treatment. If any such discharges are identified the permittee shall request a modification of this permit within 30 days after the inspection. Records of the annual inspection shall be retained by the permittee for the term of this permit and be made available to the Agency on request.

SPECIAL CONDITION 15.STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP)

- A. A storm water pollution prevention plan shall be developed by the permittee for the storm water associated with industrial activity at Outfall 006. The plan shall identify potential sources of pollution which may be expected to affect the quality of storm water discharges associated with the industrial activity at the facility. In addition, the plan shall describe and ensure the implementation of practices which are to be used to reduce the pollutants in storm water discharges associated with industrial activity at the facility and to assure compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit.
- B. The plan shall be completed within 180 days of the effective date of this permit. Plans shall provide for compliance with the terms of the plan within 365 days of the effective date of this permit. The owner or operator of the facility shall make a copy of the plan available to the Agency at any reasonable time upon request. [Note: If the plan has already been developed and implemented it shall be maintained in accordance with all requirements of this special condition.]
- C. The permittee may be notified by the Agency at any time that the plan does not meet the requirements of this condition. After such notification, the permittee shall make changes to the plan and shall submit a written certification that the requested changes have been made. Unless otherwise provided, the permittee shall have 30 days after such notification to make the changes.
- D. The discharger shall amend the plan whenever there is a change in construction, operation, or maintenance which may affect the discharge of significant quantities of pollutants to the waters of the State or if a facility inspection required by paragraph G of this condition indicates that an amendment is needed. The plan should also be amended if the discharger is in violation of any conditions of this permit, or has not achieved the general objective of controlling pollutants in storm water discharges. Amendments to the plan shall be made within the shortest reasonable period of time, and shall be provided to the Agency for review upon request.
- E. The plan shall provide a description of potential sources which may be expected to add significant quantities of pollutants to storm water discharges, or which may result in non-storm water discharges from storm water outfalls at the facility. The plan shall include, at a minimum, the following items:
  1. A topographic map extending one-quarter mile beyond the property boundaries of the facility, showing: the facility, surface water bodies, wells (including injection wells), seepage pits, infiltration ponds, and the discharge points where the facility's storm water discharges to a municipal storm drain system or other water body. The requirements of this paragraph may be included on the site map if appropriate.

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

2. A site map showing:
    - i. The storm water conveyance and discharge structures;
    - ii. An outline of the storm water drainage areas for each storm water discharge point;
    - iii. Paved areas and buildings;
    - iv. Areas used for outdoor manufacturing, storage, or disposal of significant materials, including activities that generate significant quantities of dust or particulates.
    - v. Location of existing storm water structural control measures (dikes, coverings, detention facilities, etc.);
    - vi. Surface water locations and/or municipal storm drain locations
    - vii. Areas of existing and potential soil erosion;
    - viii. Vehicle service areas;
    - ix. Material loading, unloading, and access areas.
  3. A narrative description of the following:
    - i. The nature of the industrial activities conducted at the site, including a description of significant materials that are treated, stored or disposed of in a manner to allow exposure to storm water;
    - ii. Materials, equipment, and vehicle management practices employed to minimize contact of significant materials with storm water discharges;
    - iii. Existing structural and non-structural control measures to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges;
    - iv. Industrial storm water discharge treatment facilities;
    - v. Methods of onsite storage and disposal of significant materials;
  4. A list of the types of pollutants that have a reasonable potential to be present in storm water discharges in significant quantities.
  5. An estimate of the size of the facility in acres or square feet, and the percent of the facility that has impervious areas such as pavement or buildings.
  6. A summary of existing sampling data describing pollutants in storm water discharges.
- F. The plan shall describe the storm water management controls which will be implemented by the facility. The appropriate controls shall reflect identified existing and potential sources of pollutants at the facility. The description of the storm water management controls shall include:
1. Storm Water Pollution Prevention Personnel - Identification by job titles of the individuals who are responsible for developing, implementing, and revising the plan.
  2. Preventive Maintenance - Procedures for inspection and maintenance of storm water conveyance system devices such as oil/water separators, catch basins, etc., and inspection and testing of plant equipment and systems that could fail and result in discharges of pollutants to storm water.
  3. Good Housekeeping - Good housekeeping requires the maintenance of clean, orderly facility areas that discharge storm water. Material handling areas shall be inspected and cleaned to reduce the potential for pollutants to enter the storm water conveyance system.

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

4. Spill Prevention and Response - Identification of areas where significant materials can spill into or otherwise enter the storm water conveyance systems and their accompanying drainage points. Specific material handling procedures, storage requirements, spill clean up equipment and procedures should be identified, as appropriate. Internal notification procedures for spills of significant materials should be established.
  5. Storm Water Management Practices - Storm water management practices are practices other than those which control the source of pollutants. They include measures such as installing oil and grit separators, diverting storm water into retention basins, etc. Based on assessment of the potential of various sources to contribute pollutants, measures to remove pollutants from storm water discharge shall be implemented. In developing the plan, the following management practices shall be considered:
    - i. Containment - Storage within berms or other secondary containment devices to prevent leaks and spills from entering storm water runoff;
    - ii. Oil & Grease Separation - Oil/water separators, booms, skimmers or other methods to minimize oil contaminated storm water discharges;
    - iii. Debris & Sediment Control - Screens, booms, sediment ponds or other methods to reduce debris and sediment in storm water discharges;
    - iv. Waste Chemical Disposal - Waste chemicals such as antifreeze, degreasers and used oils shall be recycled or disposed of in an approved manner and in a way which prevents them from entering storm water discharges.
    - v. Storm Water Diversion - Storm water diversion away from materials manufacturing, storage and other areas of potential storm water contamination;
    - vi. Covered Storage or Manufacturing Areas - Covered fueling operations, materials manufacturing and storage areas to prevent contact with storm water.
  6. Sediment and Erosion Prevention - The plan shall identify areas which due to topography, activities, or other factors, have a high potential for significant soil erosion and describe measures to limit erosion.
  7. Employee Training - Employee training programs shall inform personnel at all levels of responsibility of the components and goals of the storm water pollution control plan. Training should address topics such as spill response, good housekeeping and material management practices. The plan shall identify periodic dates for such training.
  8. Inspection Procedures - Qualified plant personnel shall be identified to inspect designated equipment and plant areas. A tracking or follow-up procedure shall be used to ensure appropriate response has been taken in response to an inspection. Inspections and maintenance activities shall be documented and recorded.
- G. The permittee shall conduct an annual facility inspection to verify that all elements of the plan, including the site map, potential pollutant sources, and structural and non-structural controls to reduce pollutants in industrial storm water discharges are accurate. Observations that require a response and the appropriate response to the observation shall be retained as part of the plan. Records documenting significant observations made during the site inspection shall be submitted to the Agency in accordance with the reporting requirements of this permit.
- H. This plan should briefly describe the appropriate elements of other program requirements, including Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) plans required under Section 311 of the CWA and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and Best Management Programs under 40 CFR 125.100.
- I. The plan is considered a report that shall be available to the public under Section 308(b) of the CWA. The permittee may claim portions of the plan as confidential business information, including any portion describing facility security measures.
- J. The plan shall include the signature and title of the person responsible for preparation of the plan and include the date of initial preparation and each amendment thereto.

NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

Construction Authorization

- K. Authorization is hereby granted to construct treatment works and related equipment that may be required by the Storm Water Pollution Prevention developed pursuant to this permit.

This Authorization is issued subject to the following condition(s).

1. If any statement or representation is found to be incorrect, this authorization may be revoked and the permittee there upon waives all rights thereunder.
2. The issuance of this authorization (a) does not release the permittee from any liability for damage to persons or property caused by or resulting from the installation, maintenance or operation of the proposed facilities; (b) does not take into consideration the structural stability of any units or part of this project; and (c) does not release the permittee from compliance with other applicable statutes of the State of Illinois, or other applicable local law, regulations or ordinances.
3. Plans and specifications of all treatment equipment being included as part of the storm water management practice shall be included in the SWPPP.
4. Construction activities which result from treatment equipment installation, including clearing, grading and excavation activities which result in the disturbance of one acre or more of land area, are not covered by this authorization. The permittee shall contact the IEPA regarding the required permit(s).

REPORTING

- L. The facility shall submit an annual inspection report to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. The report shall include results of the annual facility inspection which is required by Part G of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan of this permit. The report shall also include documentation of any event (spill, treatment unit malfunction, etc.) which would require an inspection, results of the inspection, and any subsequent corrective maintenance activity. The report shall be completed and signed by the authorized facility employee(s) who conducted the inspection(s).
- M. The first report shall contain information gathered during the one year time period beginning with the effective date of coverage under this permit and shall be submitted no later than 60 days after this one year period has expired. Each subsequent report shall contain the previous year's information and shall be submitted no later than one year after the previous year's report was due.
- N. Annual inspection reports shall be mailed to the following address:

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency  
Bureau of Water  
Compliance Assurance Section  
Annual Inspection Report  
1021 North Grand Avenue East  
Post Office Box 19276  
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

- O. If the facility performs inspections more frequently than required by this permit, the results shall be included as additional information in the annual report.

SPECIAL CONDITION 16. Once per month, an eight hour composite sample shall be collected at outfalls 002 and 005 for boron. Flow shall be measured at each outfall during this eight hour period.

The daily maximum effluent limitation for boron at outfall 005 is 9.0 mg/l. The daily maximum effluent limitation for boron at outfall 002 shall be calculated utilizing the following formula:

$$\text{Limit 002: } \frac{(9.0 \text{ mg/l} (\text{Flow 005} + \text{Flow 002})) - (\text{Flow 005}) (\text{Conc. 005})}{\text{Flow 002}}$$



NPDES Permit No. IL0004316

Special Conditions

Where: Limit 002: Calculated daily maximum effluent limitation for boron at outfall 002  
Flow 002: Measured effluent flow rate at outfall 002 during 8 hour composite sample period  
Conc. 005: Measured boron effluent concentration at outfall 005 from 8 hour composite sample period  
Flow 005: Measured effluent flow rate at outfall 005 during 8 hour composite sample period  
9.0 mg/l: Stream standard for boron set forth in Illinois Pollution Control Board Adjusted Standard  
(AS 92 - 10) dated July 1, 1993

Measured boron effluent concentrations at both outfalls from the eight hour composite sample shall be reported on the DMR form. Calculations for the effluent limitation for boron at outfall 002 shall be attached to the DMR form.

SPECIAL CONDITION 17. Pursuant to provisions of 35 IAC Section 309.157, the Permittee may gather data in support of determining a site-specific copper translator. Should the Permittee choose to gather such data, a minimum of twelve (12) effluent and twelve (12) downstream samples shall be taken within a minimum of one week in between samples. Such samples shall be consistent with "The Metals Translator: Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit for Dissolved Criterion."

The IEPA may modify the Permit to include the revised copper limits only if such permit modification is consistent with 35 IAC Section 309.157 and with 40 CFR 122.44(l).

SPECIAL CONDITION 18. Daily Outfall sampling of 002 and 005 (if flowing) for iron and copper shall commence from the first day of use of boiler clean wastewater in the scrubber, and shall continue for seven days following the conclusion of the use of boiler clean wastewater in the scrubber. These sampling results shall be reported in the monthly reports. The applicant shall derive limits using the formula defined in 40 CFR 403.6(l) for the discharges from the outfalls during this period. The calculation used to derive limits shall be submitted with DMR form.

SPECIAL CONDITION 19. Sample frequency for Mercury at outfall(s) 002 and 005 shall be once a month until twelve samples have been collected; after which and upon written notification to the Agency, the sampling may cease, unless the Agency modifies the permit to require continued sampling at some frequency. Monitoring shall be performed using USEPA analytical test method 1631 or equivalent.

Attachment H  
Standard Conditions  
Definitions

Act means the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, 415 ILCS 5 as Amended.

Agency means the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

Board means the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

Clean Water Act (formerly referred to as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act) means Pub. L 92-500, as amended. 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.

NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) means the national program for issuing, modifying, revoking and reissuing, terminating, monitoring and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements, under Sections 307, 402, 318 and 405 of the Clean Water Act.

USEPA means the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Daily Discharge means the discharge of a pollutant measured during a calendar day or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents the calendar day for purposes of sampling. For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurements, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the average measurement of the pollutant over the day.

Maximum Daily Discharge Limitation (daily maximum) means the highest allowable daily discharge.

Average Monthly Discharge Limitation (30 day average) means the highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

Average Weekly Discharge Limitation (7 day average) means the highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

Best Management Practices (BMPs) means schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures, and other management practices to prevent or reduce the pollution of waters of the State. BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site runoff, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

Allquot means a sample of specified volume used to make up a total composite sample.

Grab Sample means an individual sample of at least 100 milliliters collected at a randomly-selected time over a period not exceeding 15 minutes.

24 Hour Composite Sample means a combination of at least 8 sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters, collected at periodic intervals during the operating hours of a facility over a 24-hour period.

8 Hour Composite Sample means a combination of at least 3 sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters, collected at periodic intervals during the operating hours of a facility over an 8-hour period.

Flow Proportional Composite Sample means a combination of sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters collected at periodic intervals such that either the time interval between each aliquot or the volume of each aliquot is proportional to either the stream flow at the time of sampling or the total stream flow since the collection of the previous aliquot.

- (1) **Duty to comply.** The permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Act and is grounds for enforcement action, permit termination, revocation and reissuance, modification, or for denial of a permit renewal application. The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if the permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.
- (2) **Duty to reapply.** If the permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the permittee must apply for and obtain a new permit. If the permittee submits a proper application as required by the Agency no later than 180 days prior to the expiration date, this permit shall continue in full force and effect until the final Agency decision on the application has been made.
- (3) **Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense.** It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.
- (4) **Duty to mitigate.** The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of this permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.
- (5) **Proper operation and maintenance.** The permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes effective performance, adequate funding, adequate operator staffing and training, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up, or auxiliary facilities, or similar systems only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.

- (6) **Permit actions.** This permit may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminate for cause by the Agency pursuant to 40 CFR 122.62. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance, does not stay an permit condition.
- (7) **Property rights.** This permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or an exclusive privilege.
- (8) **Duty to provide information.** The permittee shall furnish to the Agency within reasonable time, any information which the Agency may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this permit, or to determine compliance with the permit. The permittee shall also furnish to the Agency upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.
- (9) **Inspection and entry.** The permittee shall allow an authorized representative of the Agency, upon the presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:
  - (a) Enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of this permit;
  - (b) Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;
  - (c) Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this permit; and
  - (d) Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purpose of assuring permit compliance, or as otherwise authorized by the Act, any substances or parameters at any location.
- (10) **Monitoring and records.**
  - (a) Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.
  - (b) The permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records, and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for this permit, for a period of at least 3 years from the date of this permit, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Agency at any time.
  - (c) Records of monitoring information shall include:
    - (1) The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
    - (2) The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;
    - (3) The date(s) analyses were performed;
    - (4) The individual(s) who performed the analyses;
    - (5) The analytical techniques or methods used; and
    - (6) The results of such analyses.
  - (d) Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136, unless other test procedures have been specified in this permit. Where no test procedure under 40 CFR Part 136 has been approved, the permittee must submit to the Agency a test method for approval. The permittee shall calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring and analytical instrumentation at intervals to ensure accuracy of measurements.
- (11) **Signatory requirement.** All applications, reports or information submitted to the Agency shall be signed and certified.
  - (a) **Application.** All permit applications shall be signed as follows:
    - (1) For a corporation: by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president or a person or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the corporation;
    - (2) For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or
    - (3) For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official.
  - (b) **Reports.** All reports required by permits, or other information requested by the Agency shall be signed by a person described in paragraph (a) or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
    - (1) The authorization is made in writing by a person described in paragraph (a); and
    - (2) The authorization specifies either an individual or a position responsible for the overall operation of the facility, from which the discharge originates, such as a plant manager, superintendent or person of equivalent responsibility; and
    - (3) The written authorization is submitted to the Agency.

- (c) **Changes of Authorization.** If an authorization under (b) is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of (b) must be submitted to the Agency prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications to be signed by an authorized representative.
- Reporting requirements.**
- (a) **Planned changes.** The permittee shall give notice to the Agency as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility.
- (b) **Anticipated noncompliance.** The permittee shall give advance notice to the Agency of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity which may result in noncompliance with permit requirements.
- (c) **Compliance schedules.** Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this permit shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date.
- (d) **Monitoring reports.** Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified elsewhere in this permit.
- (1) Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR).
- (2) If the permittee monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by the permit, using test procedures approved under 40 CFR 136 or as specified in the permit, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR.
- (3) Calculations for all limitations which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified by the Agency in the permit.
- (e) **Twenty-four hour reporting.** The permittee shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within 5 days of the time the permittee becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and time; and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance. The following shall be included as information which must be reported within 24 hours:
- (1) Any unanticipated bypass which exceeds any effluent limitation in the permit;
- (2) Violation of a maximum daily discharge limitation for any of the pollutants listed by the Agency in the permit to be reported within 24 hours.
- The Agency may waive the written report on a case-by-case basis if the oral report has been received within 24 hours.
- (f) **Other noncompliance.** The permittee shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under paragraphs (12)(c), (d), or (e), at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in paragraph (12)(e).
- (g) **Other information.** Where the permittee becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application, or in any report to the Agency, it shall promptly submit such facts or information.
- (13) **Transfer of permits.** A permit may be automatically transferred to a new permittee if:
- (a) The current permittee notifies the Agency at least 30 days in advance of the proposed transfer date;
- (b) The notice includes a written agreement between the existing and new permittees containing a specific date for transfer of permit responsibility, coverage and liability between the current and new permittees; and
- (c) The Agency does not notify the existing permittee and the proposed new permittee of its intent to modify or revoke and reissue the permit. If this notice is not received, the transfer is effective on the date specified in the agreement.
- (14) All manufacturing, commercial, mining, and silvicultural dischargers must notify the Agency as soon as they know or have reason to believe:
- (a) That any activity has occurred or will occur which would result in the discharge of any toxic pollutant identified under Section 307 of the Clean Water Act which is not limited in the permit, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following notification levels:
- (1) One hundred micrograms per liter (100 ug/l);
- (2) Two hundred micrograms per liter (200 ug/l) for acrolein and acrylonitrile; five hundred micrograms per liter (500 ug/l) for 2,4-dinitrophenol and for 2-methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol; and one milligram per liter (1 mg/l) for antimony.
- (3) Five (5) times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the NPDES permit application; or
- (b) That they have begun or expect to begin to use or manufacture as an intermediate or final product or byproduct any toxic pollutant which was not reported in the NPDES permit application.
- (15) All Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) must provide adequate notice to the Agency of the following:
- (a) Any new introduction of pollutants into that POTW from an indirect discharge, which would be subject to Sections 301 or 306 of the Clean Water Act if it were directly discharging those pollutants; and
- (b) Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of issuance of the permit.
- (c) For purposes of this paragraph, adequate notice shall include information on (i) the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW, and (ii) an anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW.
- (16) If the permit is issued to a publicly owned or publicly regulated treatment works, the permittee shall require any industrial user of such treatment works to comply with federal requirements concerning:
- (a) User charges pursuant to Section 204(b) of the Clean Water Act, and applicable regulations appearing in 40 CFR 35;
- (b) Toxic pollutant effluent standards and pretreatment standards pursuant to Section 307 of the Clean Water Act; and
- (c) Inspection, monitoring and entry pursuant to Section 308 of the Clean Water Act.
- (17) If an applicable standard or limitation is promulgated under Section 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), or 307(a)(2) and that effluent standard or limitation is more stringent than any effluent limitation in the permit, or controls a pollutant not limited in the permit, the permit shall be promptly modified or revoked, and reissued to conform to that effluent standard or limitation.
- (18) Any authorization to construct issued to the permittee pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 309.154 is hereby incorporated by reference as a condition of this permit.
- (19) The permittee shall not make any false statement, representation or certification in any application, record, report, plan or other document submitted to the Agency or the USEPA, or required to be maintained under this permit.
- (20) The Clean Water Act provides that any person who violates a permit condition implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 318, or 405 of the Clean Water Act is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$10,000 per day of such violation. Any person who willfully or negligently violates permit conditions implementing Sections 301, 302, 306, 307, or 308 of the Clean Water Act is subject to a fine of not less than \$2,500 nor more than \$25,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.
- (21) The Clean Water Act provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under permit shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 per violation, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months per violation, or by both.
- (22) The Clean Water Act provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this permit shall, including monitoring reports or reports of compliance or non-compliance shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 per violation, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months per violation, or by both.
- (23) Collected screening, slurries, sludges, and other solids shall be disposed of in such a manner as to prevent entry of those wastes (or runoff from the wastes) into waters of the State. The proper authorization for such disposal shall be obtained from the Agency and is incorporated as part hereof by reference.
- (24) In case of conflict between these standard conditions and any other condition(s) included in this permit, the other condition(s) shall govern.
- (25) The permittee shall comply with, in addition to the requirements of the permit, all applicable provisions of 35 Ill. Adm. Code, Subtitle C, Subtitle E, and all applicable orders of the Board.
- (26) The provisions of this permit are severable, and if any provision of this permit, or the application of any provision of this permit is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this permit shall continue in full force and effect.
- (Rev. 3-13-98)

Attachment 11  
Standard Conditions

Definitions

**Act** means the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, 415 ILCS 5 as Amended.

**Agency** means the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

**Board** means the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

**Clean Water Act** (formerly referred to as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act) means Pub. L. 92-500, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.

**NPDES** (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) means the national program for issuing, modifying, revoking and reissuing, terminating, monitoring and enforcing permits, and imposing and enforcing pretreatment requirements, under Sections 307, 402, 318 and 405 of the Clean Water Act.

**USEPA** means the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

**Daily Discharge** means the discharge of a pollutant measured during a calendar day or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents the calendar day for purposes of sampling. For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurements, the "daily discharge" is calculated as the average measurement of the pollutant over the day.

**Maximum Daily Discharge Limitation** (daily maximum) means the highest allowable daily discharge.

**Average Monthly Discharge Limitation** (30 day average) means the highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

**Average Weekly Discharge Limitation** (7 day average) means the highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

**Best Management Practices** (BMPs) means schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures, and other management practices to prevent or reduce the pollution of waters of the State. BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site runoff, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.

**Alliquot** means a sample of specified volume used to make up a total composite sample.

**Grab Sample** means an individual sample of at least 100 milliliters collected at a randomly-selected time over a period not exceeding 15 minutes.

**24 Hour Composite Sample** means a combination of at least 8 sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters, collected at periodic intervals during the operating hours of a facility over a 24-hour period.

**8 Hour Composite Sample** means a combination of at least 3 sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters, collected at periodic intervals during the operating hours of a facility over an 8-hour period.

**Flow Proportional Composite Sample** means a combination of sample aliquots of at least 100 milliliters collected at periodic intervals such that either the time interval between each aliquot or the volume of each aliquot is proportional to either the stream flow at the time of sampling or the total stream flow since the collection of the previous aliquot.

(1) **Duty to comply.** The permittee must comply with all conditions of this permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Act and is grounds for enforcement action, permit termination, revocation and reissuance, modification, or for denial of a permit renewal application. The permittee shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the Clean Water Act for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if the permit has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement.

(2) **Duty to reapply.** If the permittee wishes to continue an activity regulated by this permit after the expiration date of this permit, the permittee must apply for and obtain a new permit. If the permittee submits a proper application as required by the Agency no later than 180 days prior to the expiration date, this permit shall continue in full force and effect until the final Agency decision on the application has been made.

(3) **Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense.** It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit.

(4) **Duty to mitigate.** The permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of this permit which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.

(5) **Proper operation and maintenance.** The permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with conditions of this permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes effective performance, adequate funding, adequate operator staffing and training, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of back-up, or auxiliary facilities, or similar systems only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.

for cause by the Agency pursuant to 40 CFR 122.62. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance, does not stay a permit condition.

(7) **Property rights.** This permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or an exclusive privilege.

(8) **Duty to provide information.** The permittee shall furnish to the Agency within reasonable time, any information which the Agency may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this permit, or determine compliance with the permit. The permittee shall also furnish to the Agency upon request, copies of records required to be kept by this permit.

(9) **Inspection and entry.** The permittee shall allow an authorized representative of the Agency, upon the presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, to:

(a) Enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of the permit;

(b) Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit;

(c) Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under the permit; and

(d) Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purpose of assuring permit compliance, or as otherwise authorized by the Act, any substances or parameter at any location.

(10) **Monitoring and records.**

(a) Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity.

(b) The permittee shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records, and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this permit, and records of all data used to complete the application for this permit, for a period of at least 3 years from the date of this permit, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Agency at any time.

(c) Records of monitoring information shall include:

(1) The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;

(2) The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;

(3) The date(s) analyses were performed;

(4) The individual(s) who performed the analyses;

(5) The analytical techniques or methods used; and

(6) The results of such analyses.

(d) Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136, unless other test procedures have been specified in this permit. Where no test procedure under 40 CFR Part 136 has been approved, the permittee must submit to the Agency a test method for approval. The permittee shall calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring and analytical instrumentation at intervals to ensure accuracy of measurements.

(11) **Signatory requirement.** All applications, reports or information submitted to the Agency shall be signed and certified.

(a) **Application.** All permit applications shall be signed as follows:

(1) For a corporation: by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president or a person or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the corporation;

(2) For a partnership or sole proprietorship: by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or






(3) For a municipality, State, Federal, or other public agency: by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official.

(b) **Reports.** All reports required by permits, or other information requested by the Agency shall be signed by a person described in paragraph (a) or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

(1) The authorization is made in writing by a person described in paragraph (a); and

(2) The authorization specifies either an individual or a position responsible for the overall operation of the facility, from which the discharge originates, such as a plant manager, superintendent or person of equivalent responsibility; and

(3) The written authorization is submitted to the Agency.



# Evaluation of Site-Specific Thermal Standards at Marion Power Plant

Submitted in Support of  
NPDES Permit Renewal

Prepared for:



**Southern Illinois  
Power Cooperative**

**Southern Illinois Power Cooperative  
11543 Lake of Egypt Road  
Marion, IL 62959**

Prepared by:



**AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.  
3199 Riverport Tech Center Drive  
Maryland Heights, Missouri**

**AMEC Project No. 3250115515**

**October 2013**

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "William J. Elzinga".

---

William J. Elzinga, MS  
Senior Principal Scientist

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wayne Ingram".

---

D. Wayne Ingram, PE  
Principal Engineer

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes the data from water quality and fisheries surveys performed on the Lake of Egypt in Southern Illinois. Its purpose is to provide supporting evidence for a site-specific rule change in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for Southern Illinois Power Cooperative (SIPC)'s Marion Power Plant. Under the current permit, the thermal limitations are:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the 26-acre mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums (60 degrees Fahrenheit [°F] from December through March; 90°F from April through November) by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period.
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.
- Maximum temperature rise above natural temperature must not exceed 5°F (2.8°C).

The proposed revised standards are as follows:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the 26-acre mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period:
  - 72°F from December through March;
  - 90°F from April through May;
  - 101°F from June through September; and
  - 91°F from October through November
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.

The rationale for proposing these revised standards is as follows:

1. The requested relief is necessary to accommodate current operating conditions.
2. The requested relief would not alter the Lake of Egypt's existing thermal regime. The Marion Station's thermal discharge affects a small percentage of the 2,300-acre lake.
3. Assessments of the effects of the proposed changes on representative important species indicate that under normal summer conditions, habitats would remain within thermal tolerance limits throughout the lake. Under a modeled condition that simulated rarely expected extreme conditions, there were still extensive areas in the lake that fish could utilize as thermal refugia.
4. Surveys from 2010 and earlier years indicate that fish populations in the Lake of Egypt have adapted to warm temperatures. Increased thermal loading associated with the operation of a new boiler in 2003 did not appear to negatively affect the fish community. Species composition and abundance estimated by these surveys suggest that the populations are healthy and self-sustaining.
5. Potentially beneficial effects include higher, stable water temperatures in the late winter and early spring that may promote earlier spawning, improved survival, and increased

growth and development of the early life stages of several species, notably largemouth bass. Additionally, the warmer conditions in the Lake of Egypt almost certainly enhance the population of threadfin shad (important forage species) by preventing winter mortality.

6. Lake of Egypt is considered to be a “low impact area” for five other biotic categories including phytoplankton, zooplankton and meroplankton, habitat formers, shellfish and macroinvertebrates, and other vertebrate wildlife. There is no evidence of appreciable harm to any of the biotic categories addressed in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)’s draft guidance for 316(a) demonstrations.
7. Fish kills in the Lake of Egypt have not occurred historically, and are not likely to occur as a result of these proposed standards. For the majority of the year, water temperature conditions are well below their temperature tolerance thresholds. During the periods of highest lake temperatures, there is an abundance of thermal refugia. Fish can migrate laterally to other areas of the lake, or can move downward in the water column to avoid stressful conditions.



## Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Regulatory Background and Report Purpose .....	1
1.2 Station and Lake Descriptions.....	1
1.3 Existing Regulatory Requirements .....	2
2.0 Master Rationale for Demonstration .....	3
2.1 Master Rationale Overview .....	3
2.2 Key Conclusions and Recommendations of the Master Rationale .....	3
3.0 Representative Important Species.....	6
3.1 Threadfin Shad .....	7
3.2 Gizzard shad.....	11
3.3 Channel Catfish .....	12
3.4 Bluegill .....	12
3.5 Largemouth Bass.....	13
3.6 White and Black Crappie.....	14
4.0 Biotic Category Rationales .....	15
4.1 Phytoplankton .....	15
4.2 Zooplankton and Meroplankton.....	16
4.3 Habitat Formers .....	18
4.4 Shellfish and Macroinvertebrates .....	18
4.5 Fish.....	20
4.5.1 Composition and Abundance of Fish Communities Before and After the 2003 Boiler Replacement .....	20
4.5.2 Results of 2010 Fish Surveys.....	22
4.6 Other Vertebrate Wildlife.....	23
5.0 Engineering and Hydrological Data .....	24
5.1 Hydrological Data.....	24
5.1.1 Water Temperature .....	24
5.1.2 Bathymetry .....	25
5.2 Hydrothermal Modeling.....	26
5.2.1 Introduction .....	26
5.2.2 Model Inputs.....	27
5.2.3 Model Results .....	30
6.0 Rationale for Proposed Alternate Effluent Limitation.....	39
6.1 Existing Permit Conditions .....	39
6.2 Biothermal Assessment .....	39
6.2.1 No Anticipated Alteration of Lake of Egypt's Thermal Regime .....	39
6.2.2 Biotic Categories Eliminated from Detailed Consideration .....	39
6.2.3 Representative Important Fish Species .....	40
6.2.4 Effects on RIS Spawning and Recruitment .....	45
6.2.5 Adaptability and Available Refugia .....	50
6.2.6 Beneficial Thermal Effects .....	51
6.2.7 Potential for Fish Kills .....	51
6.3 Continuing Efforts .....	52

7.0	Summary of the Path Forward.....	54
7.1	Comparison with Other Illinois Cooling Lakes .....	54
7.2	Summarization of the Fish Community Status.....	54
7.3	Suggested Mixing Zone and Compliance Monitoring Location .....	55
7.4	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	55
8.0	Literature Cited.....	58

### List of Appendices

Appendix A	Marion Power Plant 316(b) Impingement Mortality Characterization Report
Appendix B	Surface Water Temperatures along Five Transects in the Lower Portion of the Lake of Egypt
Appendix C	AmerenCIPS Newton Lake Project, 15 August 1997 – 30 August 1999 (Volume 2)
Appendix D	Current Status of Sport Fish Populations in Lake of Egypt-1988
Appendix E	Status of Sport Fish Populations in Lake of Egypt and Management Recommendations-1990
Appendix F	Supplemental Spring and Fall Hydrothermal Modeling

## List of Tables

Table 3-1	Species Composition and Abundance in July and August Electrofishing Samples (Combined Stations) from Lake of Egypt, 2010 .....	7
Table 3-2	Species Composition and Catch-Per Effort (#/hour) in Electrofishing Samples from Upper and Lower Lake Sections (Combined Months) in Lake of Egypt, 2010.....	8
Table 3-3	Comparison of Average Length and Biomass for Each Species Between Survey Periods and Between Lake Sections for Electrofishing Samples from Lake of Egypt, 2010 .....	9
Table 3-4	Catch Rates (# fish/hour) of the Ten Most Abundant Species in Electrofishing Surveys at Lake of Egypt .....	11
Table 4-1	Fish Species Collected from Lake of Egypt Prior to and After the 2003 Boiler Replacement at the Marion Power Plant .....	18
Table 5-1	Water Temperature (°F) at Depths of 2 Feet and 8 Feet near Electrofishing Stations in Lake of Egypt, July and August 2010 .....	22
Table 5-2	Summary of Annual Maximum Series 30-day Running Average .....	26
Table 5-3	Heat Load to Lake of Egypt for January – February 2011 .....	28
Table 5-4	Heat Load to Lake of Egypt for July – August 2010.....	29
Table 5-5	Summary of Model Inputs for Lake of Egypt Thermal Simulations–Summer ....	30
Table 5-6	Summary of Model Inputs for Lake of Egypt Thermal Simulations–Winter .....	31
Table 5-7	Comparison of Model Predicted Water Temperature with Measured Temperatures on July 22, 2010.....	32
Table 6-1	Lake of Egypt Surface Acreage by Water Temperature (°F) in Normal and Stressed Model Scenarios .....	37
Table 6-2	Maximum Weekly Average Temperatures (°F) for Growth and Upper Incipient Lethal Temperatures (°F) of Representative Important Species .....	38
Table 6-3	Summary of Crappie Electrofishing Catch from 1997 and 1998 .....	42
Table 6-4	Summary of Reproductive Temperature Characteristics of Selected RIS in Lake of Egypt .....	42
Table 6-5	Summary of Reported Hatch Characteristics of Selected RIS in Lake of Egypt	42
Table 6-6	Summary of Fish Species Stocked in Lake of Egypt .....	42

## List of Figures

- Figure 1-1 Map of Lake of Egypt Showing Location of SIPC's Marion Plant
- Figure 1-2 Close-up of Northwest Section of Lake of Egypt, Showing the Intake and Discharge Areas
- Figure 3-1 Length Frequency Histograms for Threadfin Shad from the Upper and Lower Portions of Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010
- Figure 3-2 Length Frequency Histograms for Gizzard Shad from the Upper and Lower Portions of Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010
- Figure 3-3 Length Frequency Histograms for Channel Catfish from the Upper and Lower Portions of Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010
- Figure 3-4 Length Frequency Histograms for Bluegill from the Upper and Lower Portions of Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010
- Figure 3-5 Length Frequency Histograms for Largemouth Bass from the Upper and Lower Portions of Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010
- Figure 4-1 Map of Lake of Egypt Showing Locations of Electrofishing Zones in Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake
- Figure 5-1 1998 Lake of Egypt Temperature in the Vicinity of the CWIS
- Figure 5-2 Water Temperature near the CWIS, February 2005 through May 2007
- Figure 5-3 Dissolved Oxygen Concentration near the CWIS, February 2005 through May 2007
- Figure 5-4 Surface Water Temperature (°F) in the Lower Portion (Approximately 128 Acres) of Lake of Egypt, June 12, 2006
- Figure 5-5 Surface Water Temperature (°F) in the Lower Portion (Approximately 128 Acres) of Lake of Egypt, August 1, 2006
- Figure 5-6 Surface Water Temperature (°F) in the Lower Portion (Approximately 128 Acres) of Lake of Egypt, September 6, 2006
- Figure 5-7 Surface Water Temperature (°F) in the 26 Acre Mixing Zone of Lake of Egypt, July 14, 2010
- Figure 5-8 Surface Water Temperature (°F) in the Lower Portion (Approximately 150 Acres) of Lake of Egypt, July 14, 2010
- Figure 5-9 Bathymetric Profile of the Lower Portion (Approximately 150 Acres) of Lake of Egypt Based on Measurements Taken in July 2010
- Figure 5-10 Hydrothermal Model Output- Summer Period Normal Condition (April-November)
- Figure 5-11 Hydrothermal Model Output- Summer Period Stressed Condition (April-November)
- Figure 5-12 Hydrothermal Model Output- Winter Normal Condition (January-February 2011)
- Figure 5-13 Hydrothermal Model Output- Winter Period Maximum Condition (December-March)

- Figure 5-14 Results of Summer “Normal” and “Stressed” Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section A
- Figure 5-15 Results of Summer “Normal” and “Stressed” Hydrothermal Models Conditions at Cross Section B
- Figure 5-16 Results of Winter “Normal” and “Maximum” Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section A
- Figure 5-17 Results of Winter “Normal” and “Maximum” Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section B

**List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

°C	degrees Celsius
CFB	circulating fluidized bed
CSHE	Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWIS	circulating water intake structures
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
GEMSS	Generalized Environmental Modeling System for Surface Waters
GLLVHT	Generalized Longitudinal Lateral Vertical Hydrodynamic Transport
IEPA	Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
m	meters
MGD	million gallons per day
mg/L	milligrams per liter
mm	millimeter
msl	mean sea level
MW	megawatts
MWAT	maximum weekly average temperature for growth
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RIS	representative important species
SIPC	Southern Illinois Power Cooperative
T <sub>eq</sub>	surface equilibrium temperature
UILT	upper incipient lethal temperature
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
WARM	Water & Atmospheric Resources Monitoring

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Regulatory Background and Report Purpose

Electric utilities are typically obligated to submit applications for re-issuance of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit once every 5 years. Section 316(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) provides for the regulation of thermal discharges.

As Special Condition No. 7 of the February 2007 NPDES permit for Southern Illinois Power Cooperative (SIPC)'s Marion Power Plant, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) required the utility to comply with Illinois Administrative Code 302.211(f) and Section 316(a) of the CWA by demonstrating that the thermal discharge from the plant "will not cause and cannot reasonably be expected to cause significant ecological damage to the Lake of Egypt."

The purpose of this report is to fulfill the requirements of Special Condition No. 7, which asks SIPC to perform a heated effluent demonstration, and to support a request for a less stringent thermal effluent limit. This report evaluates the potential for SIPC's thermal effluent discharges to cause significant ecological damage to the Lake of Egypt by describing the existing environmental conditions using field measurements, predicting future conditions through application of computer models, and examining historical and current fisheries data to determine whether populations will be adversely affected by plant operations. This report further evaluates whether the Lake of Egypt provides conditions capable of supporting shellfish, fish, and wildlife and will continue to do so even under the requested relief.

### 1.2 Station and Lake Descriptions

SIPC is a consumer-owned generation and transmission cooperative, with headquarters in Marion, Illinois. The coal-fired Marion Power Plant is located approximately 7 miles south of the City of Marion and consists of a 173 megawatt (MW) net cyclone boiler, and a 109 MW net circulating fluidized bed (CFB) boiler. The cyclone boiler came on line in 1978, and provides steam to one large turbine, whereas the CFB boiler came on line in 2003 and provides steam to three small turbines. All four turbines use once-through cooling with a common intake and discharge. The plant draws water from the Lake of Egypt, which was created by SIPC in 1963, by impounding the south fork of the Saline River. The original stream ran in a northerly direction, so the dam impounding the lake is at its northern end. In this report, lake sections will be referred to as "lower," referring to areas close to the dam at the northern end, and "upper," referring to areas more distant from the dam toward the southern end. The plant is located along the northwest bank of the lake (Figure 1-1), and for the purposes of this study, is considered to be in the lower section. The once-through cooling water discharges back into a cove of the lake separated from the intake structure by a narrow peninsula (Figure 1-2). The additional boiler that became operational in 2003 resulted in increases of water use and volume of thermal water discharged into the lake.

SIPC owns the land around the lake up to the 50-year high water elevation, but does allow access for fishing and recreational activities to shoreline residents and members of the public. The Lake of Egypt is approximately 2,300 acres in surface area and has approximately 93 miles of shoreline. The lake level generally varies between 499 and 501 feet mean sea level (msl) (MACTEC, 2007). The average depth is 18 feet, with a maximum of 52 feet.

### **1.3 Existing Regulatory Requirements**

Currently, the NPDES permit for SIPC's Marion Power Plant requires that:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the 26-acre mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums (60 degrees Fahrenheit [°F] from December through March; 90°F from April through November) by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period.
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.
- Maximum temperature rise above natural temperature must not exceed 5°F (2.8 degrees Celsius [°C]).



## 2.0 Master Rationale for Demonstration

### 2.1 Master Rationale Overview

The following key points summarize the existing status of the fishery of Lake of Egypt and the findings of this report with respect to the proposed thermal limits and their effect on sustaining the balanced and indigenous community:

- *Game Fish Representative Important Species (RIS) Status.* Observed temperatures outside the mixing zone at the lower end of the lake were within the tolerance limits of RIS such as channel catfish, bluegill, and largemouth bass when the plant was at full capacity. Based on modeling results, proposed thermal limits under normal late summer weather conditions would only result in avoidance or adaptive behaviors in localized areas within the lower lake. More thermally sensitive species such as white and black crappie are expected to similarly adapt their behavior to avoid limiting surficial water temperatures under stressed conditions.
- *Threadfin Shad Support.* Existing and proposed thermal limits will continue to sustain threadfin shad overwintering survival which will benefit the food base of largemouth bass and other predators.
- *Community Stability.* The resident fish community has been stable in terms of composition and abundance over the past 13 years. Proposed thermal limits are expected to sustain similar community composition and abundance such that its stability will not be adversely affected.
- *Habitat Availability.* There is abundant habitat available, both horizontally throughout the lake and vertically in the water column, as refuge from localized sub-optimum thermal conditions. These habitat refuge areas will similarly be available under the proposed thermal limits.

Therefore, these patterns indicate that the thermal conditions in the Lake of Egypt have been protective of a balanced indigenous community. Moreover, the temperature thresholds proposed as part of the requested site-specific rule revision reflect current thermal conditions and will continue to be protective of the balanced indigenous community.

This document represents a hybrid, Type III, demonstration because it uses a combination of predictive and empirical (i.e., retrospective) assessment methods and data to analyze the biological effects of the proposed thermal limits. The Marion Plant/Lake of Egypt site is one of low potential impact.

### 2.2 Key Conclusions and Recommendations of the Master Rationale

Data from previous studies and the 2010 study indicate that the Lake of Egypt has historically supported and continues to support a high quality sport fishery. Fish populations in the lake have adapted to the condition of warmer water, and have ample areas available for thermal refuge. Increased thermal loading associated with the operation of a new boiler in 2003 has not

negatively affected the fish community, and SIPC does not intend to increase generating capacity in the future. Moreover, stable, higher water temperatures in late winter and spring likely promote growth and development for most species, and support the survival of threadfin shad, an important subset of the forage base.

Results of field measurements and hydrodynamic modeling demonstrated that temperatures well above the current NPDES limit (90°F) are routinely present in the summer at the mixing zone boundary. Furthermore, ambient lake temperatures frequently exceed this threshold in the warmest periods of the year. We recommend that the thermal limitations in the NPDES permit for SIPC's Marion Power Plant be changed from the current conditions of:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums (60°F from December through March; 90°F from April through November) by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period, and
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.
- Maximum temperature rise above natural temperature must not exceed 5°F (2.8°C).

to:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the 26-acre mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period,
  - 72°F from December through March;
  - 90°F from April through May;
  - 101°F from June through September; and
  - 91°F from October through November
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.

The rationale for proposing these revised standards is as follows:

1. The proposed change would not alter the Lake of Egypt's existing thermal regime (i.e., dissipation of heat within the lake or have an effect in altering natural lake stratification).
2. Assessments of the effects of the proposed changes on representative important species indicate that under normal summer conditions, habitats would remain within thermal tolerance limits throughout the lake. Under a modeled condition that simulated rarely-expected extreme conditions, there were still extensive areas in the lake that fish could utilize as thermal refugia.
3. Surveys from 2010 and earlier years indicate that fish populations in the Lake of Egypt have adapted to warm temperatures. Species composition and abundance estimated by these surveys suggest that the populations are healthy and self-sustaining.
4. Potentially beneficial effects include higher, stable water temperatures in the late winter and early spring that may promote earlier spawning, improved survival, and increased growth and development of the early life stages of several species, notably largemouth

bass. Additionally, the warmer conditions in the Lake of Egypt almost certainly enhance the population of threadfin shad by minimizing winter mortality.

5. Fish kills in the Lake of Egypt have not occurred historically, and are not likely to occur as a result of these proposed standards. For the majority of the year, water temperature conditions are well below the temperature tolerance thresholds of the representative important species. Even during the periods of highest lake temperatures, there is an abundance of thermal refugia. Fish can migrate laterally to other areas of the lake, or can move downward in the water column, to avoid stressful conditions.

The five other biotic categories considered in USEPA's Technical Guidance Manual are either: (a) unaffected (or beneficially affected) by the heated effluent – such as submerged aquatic vegetation and wildlife, or (b) consist of species that are not threatened/endangered, of commercial importance (macroinvertebrates and shellfish), and/or generally have short life spans, reproduce rapidly or are expected to exhibit only localized population shifts (phytoplankton and zooplankton). It is reasonable to conclude that the plant's discharge will cause no appreciable harm to these resident communities in the lake.

### 3.0 Representative Important Species

In this evaluation of lake temperature effects on the fishery of the Lake of Egypt, AMEC (formerly MACTEC) selected five species that have commercial and/or ecological importance and that can be considered representative for other species occupying the same trophic group. Representative important species (RIS) selected for this analysis include threadfin shad, gizzard shad, channel catfish, bluegill, and largemouth bass.

Representative important species are those that have the biological requirements representative of a balanced, indigenous community from the body of water being considered. Categories considered in the RIS designation include: commercially or recreationally valuable species; threatened or endangered species; and species (e.g., prey species) that are necessary for the survival of the aforementioned species. In the Lake of Egypt, channel catfish, bluegill, largemouth bass and crappies (white and black) are recreationally important, and threadfin shad and gizzard shad are considered an important prey species for largemouth bass. Channel catfish, bluegill, largemouth bass and crappies are appropriate selections as RIS in part because their populations have been collected and analyzed in previous studies on the Lake of Egypt fishery (Appendix C, Chapter 9). No threatened or endangered species have been collected in previous surveys of the lake.

While undocumented, it is likely that four of these RIS – gizzard shad, channel catfish, bluegill, and largemouth bass – were initially introduced into the lake following its construction in 1963. Nonetheless, these four species have been referred to as species of fish “normally associated with Southern Illinois reservoirs.” (see Appendix D, page 1). SIPC introduced threadfin shad in the 1970s to enhance the forage base for predator species. Although the populations of all five have been either initiated or supplemented by stocking, they are currently maintained by natural reproduction.

In support of the following discussion, Tables 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 present the results of electrofishing within Lake of Egypt during 2010. The intent of this sampling program was to provide more recent supplemental data to that previously collected as part of the more comprehensive studies by Heidinger et al (2000) in the late 1990s and the work previously performed in the vicinity of the CWIS as part of the Impingement Mortality Characterization Study (MACTEC, 2007). Tables 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 provide general compositional information about the resident fish community and can be used to identify relative abundances of taxa within the fishery and the spatial characteristics of the more dominant taxa. For those taxa that are less well represented caution should be exercised in inferring conclusions regarding their spatial patterns and response to thermal conditions. Table 3-4 provides a comparison of the ten most dominant taxa from these historical data sets and can be used to reflect the general stability of the primary taxa within the lake. Again, some caution should be exercised in comparing data of less well represented taxa (e.g. threadfin shad, gizzard shad, channel catfish, etc.) as these sampling programs differed in their intent and intensity. For example, the absence of threadfin

shad and gizzard shad from electrofishing collections in 2005 and 2006 suggests a notable change in the resident fish community from that documented by Heidinger et al (2000). In reality however, this is an artifact of a lower overall electrofishing sampling effort. As documented in sampling using other gear types (gill nets, impingement samples) both gizzard shad and threadfin shad were well represented in the vicinity of the intake structure in both 2005 and 2006 and are expected to be similarly represented in the current fish community.

### 3.1 Threadfin Shad

Threadfin shad is a primary forage species in the Lake of Egypt. It has been stocked into the lake beginning in 1971, in an attempt to increase the forage base of the fishery. While threadfin shad are not indigenous to Lake of Egypt, they were selected as a representative important species because they are a primary forage fish for largemouth bass and are a crucial component in support of the food web for the Lake of Egypt ecosystem. Although threadfin shad have rarely been among the most numerous species in electrofishing surveys, their numbers in impingement samples taken at the circulating water intake structures (CWIS) indicate that they are abundant in the lake (MACTEC, 2007). Additionally, large numbers of schooling threadfin shad have been observed during other surveys, but their small size and offshore habitat preference makes them less susceptible to the survey gears used. It is planktivorous, its habits are similar to the closely related gizzard shad, and in lakes it generally occurs in the upper five feet of water (Pflieger, 1997). Threadfin shad do not live as long or grow as large as gizzard shad, however, and are sensitive to low temperatures (e.g., less than 45°F). Threadfin shad spawning generally occurs between April and August when temperatures are greater than 68°F [University of California-Davis (UCD), 2010]. Eggs hatch in three to six days, and develop into juveniles approximately two to three weeks later, depending on water temperature (UCD, 2010).

Threadfin shad were collected from the Lake of Egypt in all studies since 1997, but never in large numbers. In the Impingement Mortality Characterization Study, threadfin shad was reported to be the most commonly impinged species in both years (2005 and 2006), where it accounted for 66 and 78 percent of the total, respectively (MACTEC, 2007). There is no clear evidence of any population change for this species since the 2003 boiler replacement. In 2010 field studies, 36 threadfin shad were collected; most (33) of which were collected during the July survey (Table 3-1). The catch rate was greater in the upper portion of the lake (i.e., farther from the power plant) than in the lower lake (Table 3-2). However, as stated previously, electrofishing catch rates were low and do not support substantive conclusions about temporal or distributional patterns within the lake. The average length of threadfin shad was higher in the lower lake [71.6 millimeter (mm)] than in the upper lake (50.3 mm) (Table 3-3). Most of the specimens collected were young-of-the-year and age 1+ fish, and were 40 to 70 mm in length (Figure 3-1).

**Table 3-1. Species Composition and Abundance in July and August Electrofishing Samples (Combined Stations) from Lake of Egypt, 2010**

Species	July	August
Gizzard shad	8	3
Threadfin shad	33	3
Common carp		1
Black bullhead		13
Yellow bullhead	22	6
Channel catfish	8	5
Blackstripe topminnow	1	
Inland silverside	5	1
Green sunfish	39	10
Warmouth	17	22
Bluegill	792	597
Longear sunfish	177	118
Redear sunfish	61	87
Sunfish hybrid	2	6
Largemouth bass	79	111
White crappie		1
Black crappie	5	8
Total	1249	992

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12

Checked by: WJE/1-27-12

**Table 3-2. Species Composition and Catch-Per-Effort (#/hour) in Electrofishing Samples from Upper and Lower Lake Sections (Combined Months) in Lake of Egypt, 2010 (Power Plant Discharge and Intake are in the Lower Lake Section)**

Species	(#/hour)	(#/hour)
Gizzard shad	1.6	0.9
Threadfin shad	9.6	1.0
Common carp	0.0	0.1
Black bullhead	0.3	1.8
Yellow bullhead	1.0	3.7
Channel catfish	3.0	0.6
Blackstripe topminnow	0.0	0.1
Inland silverside	0.3	0.7
Green sunfish	12.2	1.8
Warmouth	2.0	4.9
Bluegill	129.1	146.9
Longear sunfish	59.6	16.8
Redear sunfish	18.8	13.4
Sunfish hybrid	0.3	1.0
Largemouth bass	20.1	19.0
White crappie	0.3	0.0
Black crappie	2.6	0.7
Total	260.9	213.5

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12  
Checked by: WJE/1-27-12

**Table 3-3. Comparison of Average Length and Biomass for Each Species Between Survey Periods and Between Lake Sections for Electrofishing Samples from Lake of Egypt, 2010**

Species	July		August		Upper Lake		Lower Lake	
	(mm)	(grams)	(mm)	(grams)	(mm)	(grams)	(mm)	(grams)
Gizzard shad	321.4	2751	372.3	1533	347.0	2119	325.5	2165
Threadfin shad	53.0	51	71.0	10	50.3	39	71.6	22
Common carp	--	--	629.0	3538	--	--	629.0	3538
Black bullhead	--	--	218.4	2088	225.0	161	217.8	1927
Yellow bullhead	169.8	2014	177.3	578	146.0	201	174.5	2391
Channel catfish	520.9	10467	557.6	7871	544.1	13305	514.5	5033
Blackstripe topminnow	46.0	1	--	--	--	--	46.0	1
Inland silverside	60.0	8	45.0	1	63.0	2	56.4	7
Green sunfish	109.2	1264	116.5	362	114.1	1364	100.1	262
Warmouth	119.5	831	93.0	457	116.0	283	102.5	1005
Bluegill	92.4	11379	95.1	7744	100.0	6245	91.0	12878
Longear sunfish	103.8	3941	96.0	2182	101.2	3833	99.8	2290
Redear sunfish	131.5	2747	154.7	5386	146.9	3213	144.1	4920
Sunfish hybrid	139.0	122	108.3	169	120.0	30	115.4	261
Largemouth bass	305.3	42072	321.9	64603	281.2	26786	331.0	79889
White crappie	--	--	330.0	397	330.0	397	--	--
Black crappie	187.8	559	174.4	643	181.0	711	177.2	491

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12  
Checked by: WJE/1-27-12



**Table 3-4. Catch Rates (# fish/hour) of the Ten Most Abundant Species in Electrofishing Surveys at Lake of Egypt (Between-Year Comparability, SIU Electrofishing Data was Limited to Fall Samples in the Lake Segment Nearest the Circulating Water Intake Structures [CWIS])**

Species	SIU-C <sup>a</sup>		MACTEC <sup>b</sup>		MACTEC 2010
	1997	1998	2005	2006†	
Gizzard shad	19.2	15.9			
Threadfin shad		1.3			3.7
Common carp	1.2	1.4	2.0	4.0	
Golden shiner	1.2				
Black bullhead					
Yellow bullhead				2.0	2.9
Channel catfish					1.3
Blackstripe topminnow			3.0		
Brook silverside		1.4			
Inland silverside			1.0	4.0	
Green sunfish	11.2		1.0	3.0	5.0
Warmouth			3.0	2.0	4.0
Bluegill	130.1	93.0	56.0	100.0	141.4
Longear sunfish	23.0	9.5	4.0	2.0	30.0
Redear sunfish	56.1	39.8	20.0	46.0	15.1
Hybrid sunfish		1.3			
Largemouth bass**	65.7	56.1	21.0	67.0	19.3
White crappie	4.8				
Black crappie	2.5	3.8	1.0		1.3

<sup>a</sup>Source: Heidinger et al. 2000, as summarized in MACTEC, 2007

<sup>b</sup>Source: MACTEC, 2007

†Only nine total species collected.

\*\*The lake is fished heavily for this species during commercial tournaments.

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12

Checked by: WJE/1-27-12

### 3.2 Gizzard shad

Gizzard shad is a forage species in the Lake of Egypt during its young-of-year life stage. Older size classes of gizzard shad become too large for large predators such as largemouth bass to feed upon. Gizzard shad were selected as a representative important species because they serve as a forage fish for largemouth bass and support the food web for the Lake of Egypt ecosystem. It is planktivorous, its habits are similar to the closely related threadfin shad, and in lakes it generally occurs in the upper portion of the water column. Gizzard shad spawning generally occurs between April and May. Eggs hatch in two to seven days, depending on water temperature. Sexual maturity is reached at Age II or III (Pflieger, 1997).

Although gizzard shad have not been a common species in electrofishing surveys, they have been collected during every survey year since 1997 (MACTEC, 2007). Their offshore habitat

preference makes them less susceptible to the survey gears used and their numbers are likely underestimates of their actual abundances. In the Impingement Mortality Characterization Study, gizzard shad was reported in both years (2005 and 2006), where it accounted for 2.5 and 3.7 percent of the total biomass, respectively (MACTEC, 2007). There is no clear evidence of any population change for this species since the 2003 boiler replacement. In 2010 field studies, 11 gizzard shad were collected; 8 of which were collected during the July survey (see Table 3-1). The catch rate was slightly greater in the upper portion of the lake (i.e., farther from the power plant) than in the lower lake (see Table 3-2). However, as stated previously, electrofishing catch rates were low and do not support substantive conclusions about temporal or distributional patterns within the lake. The average length of gizzard shad was higher in the upper lake (347.0 mm) than in the lower lake (325.5 mm) (see Table 3-3). All of the individuals collected were large adults greater than 260 mm in total length (Figure 3-2).

### 3.3 Channel Catfish

Channel catfish were selected as a representative important species because they are a recreational species that are highly prized as a game and food fish. Adults prefer habitats with woody debris and bank cavities, and generally are found in deeper water during daylight hours (Pflieger, 1997). Due to their nocturnal habits and habitat preferences, channel catfish have not been collected in large numbers in daytime electrofishing surveys at the Lake of Egypt. Even so, they have been encountered in all study years since 1997. Spawning generally occurs in the spring at temperatures ranging from 70 to 82°F, and eggs hatch in 3 to 10 days (Hubert, 1999). The larval stage lasts for 12 to 16 days (Fishbase, 2010).

Channel catfish abundance does not appear to have decreased since the boiler replacement in 2003, as electrofishing catch rates were slightly greater for this species in the 2010 survey (Table 3-4). Thirteen channel catfish were collected from the Lake of Egypt in 2010 surveys (see Table 3-1). The difference was slight between July and August, but the catch rate was greater in the upper portion of the lake (see Table 3-2). However, as stated previously, electrofishing catch rates were low and do not support substantive conclusions about temporal or distributional patterns within the lake. All but two of the individuals collected were large adults (greater than 500 mm in total length) and were probably age V+ or older (Figure 3-3). All specimens appeared to be in excellent condition, with no external abnormalities found.

### 3.4 Bluegill

Bluegill is the numerically dominant species in the Lake of Egypt (see Table 3-4). It is primarily an invertivore as an adult, and as a juvenile is an important forage component. Bluegill is a desirable pan fish and is much pursued by anglers. Bluegill were selected as a representative important species because they are a primary forage fish for predator fish such as largemouth bass and are a highly sought after recreational species. Temperature maxima for spawning range from 82 to 93°F (ESE, 1988), and the maximum temperature for embryo survival is 93°F (Brungs and Jones, 1977). Spawning reportedly occurs from late May through August at temperatures ranging from 67 to 80°F (Cornish and Welke, 2004). Eggs hatch in about 2 days

at a temperature of 77°F (Merriner, 1971), and the larval stage lasts for approximately 30 days at 74.3°F (Fishbase, 2010).

Bluegill has historically been the most abundant species in the Lake of Egypt and was again the numerical dominant in 2010 electrofishing surveys. Bluegill numbers, as represented by electrofishing catch-per-effort have varied considerably but have not decreased since the boiler replacement in 2003 (see Table 3-4). Abundance was moderately greater in July than in August, and catch rates were similar in the upper and lower portions of the lake (see Table 3-2). A bimodal length frequency distribution was evident in both portions of the lake, with the 60 to 79 mm and 90 to 119 mm groups generally being the most numerous (Figure 3-4). These individuals fall within the II+ and III+ age groups. The condition of the bluegills collected was very good, with only 0.1 percent of the individuals exhibiting external anomalies.

### 3.5 Largemouth Bass

Largemouth bass is the primary predator species in the Lake of Egypt, and is one of the most important North American warm-water sport fishes (Smith, 2002). Largemouth bass were selected as a representative important species because they are a highly sought after sportfish for the Lake of Egypt fishery. It commonly spends the day in deeper water or lurking near cover, and then moves to shallower water in the evening to feed (Pflieger, 1997). Optimal spawning temperatures for largemouth bass vary between 60 and 75°F (Heidinger, 1975). Eggs hatch in three to four days at temperatures of 60 to 67°F (Kramer and Smith, 1960), and the period of larval development to the juvenile stage is 19 days at 67°F (Fishbase, 2010).

Largemouth bass has been common or abundant in electrofishing surveys at the Lake of Egypt since 1997. Annual variability in abundance likely reflects the relatively small sample sizes of the surveys; periodic bass fishing tournaments may also be a factor in the variability. Its abundance does not appear to have decreased since the boiler replacement in 2003, as electrofishing catch rates were similar for this species in the 1997 and 2007 surveys (see Table 3-4). In 2010, it was the third most numerous species in both July and August, with a total of 190 individuals collected (see Table 3-1). Catch rates were nearly identical in the upper and lower portions of the lake (see Table 3-2). This species was particularly abundant along the riprap shoreline of the spillway in the lower lake. Largemouth bass of all length categories between 40 and 480 mm were encountered (Figure 3-5). In both the upper and lower portions of the lake, individuals between 300 and 460 mm were most numerous, and probably represented III+ to V+ age fish. Young-of-the-year specimens were also collected during both survey periods. External abnormalities were more prevalent on largemouth bass than on other species, with over 16 percent of individuals having at least one anomaly. The most frequently observed maladies were hook scars on the mouth, lesions on the mouth and body, and emaciation. Since largemouth bass was the only common species with such a high incidence of abnormalities, it was felt that this trend reflected angling pressure rather than degraded environmental conditions. Large numbers of bass tournaments are held in the Lake of Egypt annually, and it is likely that a substantial proportion of the population has been caught and

handled. The stress of this experience was almost certainly associated with many of the cases of external abnormalities.

### 3.6 White and Black Crappie

White crappie generally occurs in sand-bottomed and mud-bottomed pools and backwaters of creeks and small to large rivers, and lakes and ponds (Fishbase, 2013a). White crappie is often found in turbid water where it is frequently more abundant than black crappie (Pope and Willis, 1998). White crappie is generally more abundant in lakes and reservoirs greater than 5 acres in area. It is often associated with structural features such as submerged trees, stumps, aquatic vegetation and boulders. White crappie also prefers low velocity habitats such as pools and backwaters of rivers and lakes (Edwards et al, 1972b). Black crappie is a species that also inhabits lakes, ponds, sloughs, and backwaters and pools of streams. It usually occurs among vegetation over mud or sand, most common in clear water. Lake of Egypt provides a fringe of floating-leaved aquatic vegetation throughout much of the lake. Younger individuals of both species feed on planktonic crustaceans and free-swimming dipteran larvae, whereas larger size classes feed on small fishes (Fishbase 2013a,b). Optimal spawning temperatures for white crappie varies between 60 and 68°F (Edwards et al, 1972b) whereas spawning temperatures for black crappie varies between 64 and 68°F (Edwards et al, 1972a). Both white and black crappie (collectively, “crappies”) were selected as a RIS because they are a both a sought after sportfish for the Lake of Egypt fishery and are species that are more thermally sensitive. SIPC stocked Lake of Egypt with black crappie fingerlings in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Crappies have not been dominant taxa within electrofishing collections from Lake of Egypt. According to earlier assessments by Heidinger from 1988 and 1990, crappie historically demonstrated good populations at Lake of Egypt. Heidinger also noted that crappie populations are cyclical and that for both 1998 and 1990, they were likely at a low point. More recent investigations of Lake of Egypt by Heidinger et al (2000) reported the collection of both black and white crappie in electrofishing results however, abundances between survey years (1997 and 1998) were variable among species and reaches of the lake. Annual variability in abundance within Lake of Egypt likely reflects the relatively small sample sizes of the surveys; extensive fishing pressure and the characteristic cyclical population trends of these species within larger reservoirs. As stated by Pope and Willis (1998), factors such as turbidity, water level fluctuation, the abundance of aquatic vegetation and many other environmental factors often contribute to the cyclical nature of crappie populations in impoundments.

## 4.0 Biotic Category Rationales

In its 1977 draft of the 316(a) Technical Guidance Manual (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA], 1977), the USEPA lists six biotic categories that should initially be considered in a demonstration study. These are:

- Phytoplankton;
- Zooplankton and meroplankton (organisms with planktonic larval stages);
- Habitat formers;
- Shellfish and macroinvertebrates;
- Fish; and
- Other vertebrate wildlife

Categories for which the site can be considered low impact do not need to be studied in detail for the demonstration. In this report, only fish were examined in detail. The Lake of Egypt was considered a low impact site for the other five categories, and the following section outlines the justification for this approach. In each case, results of studies at this and other similar sites in southern and central Illinois indicated that there has been, and will continue to be, no appreciable harm to the balanced, indigenous community. The following narratives provide the rationales for each of the required biotic categories.

### 4.1 Phytoplankton

The criteria to determine whether the site is a low impact area for phytoplankton are as follows:

1. A shift toward nuisance species of phytoplankton is not likely to occur;
2. There is little likelihood that the discharge will alter the indigenous community from a detrital to a phytoplankton-based system; and
3. Appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community is not likely to occur as a result of phytoplankton community changes caused by the heated discharge.

Lake of Egypt is an open water impounded lacustrine system (rather than one characterized by mangrove swamps, salt marshes, freshwater swamps, rivers, or streams which are detrital based), it is considered to be an ecosystem that has a phytoplankton-based food web (USEPA, 1977). No studies specific to phytoplankton have been performed on Lake of Egypt. However, in spite of the absence of this information a sufficient basis exists by which to conclude that the Lake of Egypt is a low impact area for phytoplankton in consideration of the proposed site-specific standard:

- A detailed study on a central Illinois artificial cooling lake of similar size (Lake Sangchris) concluded that the operation of a larger generating station (1,232 MW as compared to the 282 MW Marion Power Plant) did not appear to be deleterious to its phytoplankton community (Moran, 1981a).
- Studies performed by Heidinger et al (2000) on Newton Lake found that rates of photosynthesis were notably higher during the summer months but were similar to the range of values from other lakes. Additionally, while there were some decreases in mean

total phytoplankton densities in July and August, there was not a significant change in the rate of photosynthesis.

- The resident community in the Lake of Egypt has developed under the environmental conditions (i.e., heated influence in the downstream end of the lake) that are similar to the conditions that will persist in the future, and there has thus far been no indication of phytoplankton community impairment.
- A biotic characteristic of the phytoplankton community is that members of this group generally have short life spans and reproduce rapidly. If there were any temporary effects on the community, there are extensive areas outside the zone of thermal influence that could act as either refugia or sources of recolonization potential.
- There have been no recent occurrences of algal blooms on the Lake of Egypt that suggest that the aquatic ecosystem (and associated water quality) is prone to or susceptible to a shift to the predominance of nuisance populations of phytoplankton. While some incidences of historical plankton blooms have been reported, these occurred prior to the improvements to the Goreville wastewater treatment plant and the general conversion of shoreline homes from septic systems to a combined sewer system (SIPC, 2004). Subsequent to these measures water quality of the lake has shifted away from the strongly eutrophic condition reflected by such nutrient loading, suggesting that the historical plankton blooms were not attributable to the thermal influence of the Marion Plant. Based on the observation that the fish community has remained similar since the establishment of the lake (Heidinger, 2007), it is reasonable to infer that there has not been a shift in the food base.
- Although no site-specific data have been collected to describe the phytoplankton communities at Lake of Egypt, it is expected that their composition would be similar to that of other regional cooling lakes. Some community compositional variations may exist between regions of the lake that are thermally influenced, but notable differences in community composition are expected to be localized to the mixing zone area. Potential variations beyond the mixing zone are likely to be insignificant in altering the overall primary productivity of the ecosystem. Accordingly, no significant disruption to related trophic levels or the biotic community at large is expected.

The lack of a community shift toward nuisance phytoplankton species and the presumed stability of the existing assemblages (e.g., no shift from a detritus-based community, no algal blooms after water quality improvements in the system) combine to indicate that there has been, and will be, no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category.

## 4.2 Zooplankton and Meroplankton

The criteria to determine whether the site is a low impact area for zooplankton and meroplankton are as follows:

1. Changes in the zooplankton and meroplankton community in the study area that may be caused by the heated discharge will not result in appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous fish and shellfish populations;

2. The heated discharge is not likely to alter the standing crop, relative abundance, with respect to natural population fluctuations in the far-field study area from those values typical of the receiving water body segment prior to plant operation;
3. The thermal plume does not constitute a lethal barrier to the free movement (drift) of zooplankton and meroplankton.

While no studies of the zooplankton or meroplankton communities have been performed on Lake of Egypt, a sufficient basis exists to demonstrate that the Lake of Egypt is an area of low impact for this biological component. Evidence supporting this conclusion includes the following:

- Related studies performed at a manmade cooling lake, Lake Sangchris, demonstrated that in comparison to an unheated manmade reservoir (Lake Shelbyville), the diversity of zooplankters did not differ significantly between heated and unheated arms of Lake Sangchris (i.e., spatially)(Waite, 1981). Thermal loading was noted to be associated with a decrease in both biomass and abundance. Thermal effluents at Lake Sangchris, however, provided for enhanced zooplankton communities during autumn, winter and spring.
- Related studies performed by Heidinger *et al* (2000) on Newton Lake found that zooplankton densities varied widely among segments within the lake, but there were no specific trends between seasons, location or by water temperatures.
- The fact that the fish community of Lake of Egypt has remained similar and stable since the establishment of the lake suggests that the underlying trophic levels represented by zooplankton (food source for many fish species) and fish meroplankton have not been appreciably harmed by the thermal discharge. It is likely that any shifts that may have occurred in the standing crop or relative abundances of far-field community members have been naturally induced.
- The resident community in the Lake of Egypt has developed under the environmental conditions (i.e., heated influence in the downstream end of the lake) that are similar to the conditions that will persist in the future, and there has thus far been no indication of zooplankton community impairment. A wide-spread plant-induced shift in the composition of this biological component in the absence of a markedly altered thermal regime is therefore, unlikely.
- As with phytoplankton, members of the zooplankton community generally have short life spans and reproduce rapidly. If there were any temporary effects on the community, there are extensive areas outside the zone of thermal influence that could act as either refugia or sources of recolonization potential.
- Finally, the location of the discharge at the far downstream (north) end of the lake minimizes potential negative effects of the thermal plume constituting a barrier, or attractant, to the free movement of these organisms throughout the lake.
- Although no site-specific data have been collected to describe the zooplankton and meroplankton communities at Lake of Egypt, It is expected that the composition of zooplankton and meroplankton communities at Lake of Egypt would be similar to that of other regional cooling lakes. Some community compositional variations may exist between regions of the lake that are thermally influenced, but notable differences in community

composition are expected to be localized to the mixing zone area. Potential variations in community structure beyond the mixing zone are likely to be insignificant in altering the overall trophic structure of the ecosystem. Accordingly, no significant disruption to related trophic levels or the biotic community at large is expected.

The unlikelihood of a detrimental impact on the existing zooplankton and meroplankton assemblages, coupled with the lack of a barrier to their movement indicate that the proposed site specific thermal standard will not cause appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category.

### 4.3 Habitat Formers

The criteria to determine whether the site is a low impact area for habitat formers are as follows:

1. The heated discharge will not result in any deterioration of the habitat formers community, or that no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community will result from such deteriorations; and
2. The heated discharge will not have an adverse impact on threatened or endangered species as a result of impact upon habitat formers.

Habitat formers are organisms that provide cover, foraging, or spawning habitat for other species. In Lake of Egypt, the only organisms that could be considered habitat formers are the rooted aquatic macrophytes. No systematic studies of aquatic vegetation have been performed on Lake of Egypt. However, field observations have noted aquatic vegetation along shallow shorelines, particularly in the downstream (northern) end of the lake. This pattern is comparable to results reported by Moran (1981b). In ESE (1995), it was reported that communities in warmer areas of the upper Illinois River drainage were not impaired in comparison to the sampled communities in cooler areas. At the Lake of Egypt, areas supporting aquatic macrophytes are predominantly in the downstream portions of the system. Since these areas are relatively near the plant discharge, it suggests that the thermal effluent has not and will not result in the deterioration of the aquatic macrophyte community. The importance of this biological category to the balanced indigenous community largely consists of its use by small fish (i.e., forage species such as minnows and/or young-of-the-year of larger species). Since the fish community has remained stable and of similar composition since the establishment of the lake, it is reasonable to conclude that there has not been a deterioration of the habitat former community. Further, no threatened or endangered fish species are present in the Lake of Egypt, thus no adverse impact would be expected to species of concern even if the thermal discharge had a negative effect on habitat formers. Therefore, there is unlikely to be any appreciable harm to the balanced, indigenous community for this biotic category.

### 4.4 Shellfish and Macroinvertebrates

The criteria to determine whether the site is a low impact area for shellfish and macroinvertebrates are as follows:

1. There should be no reductions in the standing crops of shellfish or macroinvertebrates unless it can be shown that such reductions will cause no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community in the water body.



2. There should be no reductions in the diversity of this biological category unless it can be shown that the critical functions of the macroinvertebrate fauna are being maintained in the water body as they existed prior to the introduction of heat.
3. It must be shown that either: (a) macroinvertebrates do not serve as a major forage for the fisheries, (b) food is not a factor limiting fish production in the water body, or (c) drifting invertebrate fauna are not harmed by passage through the thermal plume.
4. The thermal plume does not impact areas that serve as spawning or nursery sites for important shellfish or macroinvertebrate fauna.

While no systematic studies of the shellfish or macroinvertebrate communities have been performed on Lake of Egypt, considerable rationale exists to support the conclusion that this is a low impact biotic component.

- Based on the characteristics of similar Illinois impoundments, there are no species of commercial or recreational value present in the lake. In other studies of central Illinois cooling lakes, results indicated that the macroinvertebrate communities were dominated by larvae from the insect order Diptera, oligochaetes and sphaerid clams (Webb, 1981; Heidinger et al., 2000). Macroinvertebrate taxa found in the Lake of Egypt in the 2007 impingement study included the Asiatic clam *Corbicula*, the crayfish *Orconectes*, and the grass shrimp *Palaemonetes*. None of these are state or federally listed species.
- The area of thermal influence is very small in relation to the 2,300-acre lake. Additionally, there is a deep, hypolimnetic area in the vicinity of the thermal discharge, which is less thermally affected than surface or near-surface waters. Within and beyond the mixing zone the thermal plume is mostly surficial, and does not markedly elevate the temperatures of the benthic environment, even under stressed conditions. Consequently, no reductions in the standing crop or diversity of the benthic community are expected. Webb (1981) reported that, in Lake Sangchris in central Illinois, macroinvertebrate assemblages were similar between areas influenced by thermal discharge and uninfluenced control areas, and it is similarly unlikely that a substantial detrimental influence exists in the Lake of Egypt.
- Although macroinvertebrates likely serve as an important forage component in Lake of Egypt, the relative stability of the fish community in terms of composition and abundance indicate that food availability does not limit fish production. Plankton is another critical subset of the forage base, supporting the threadfin and gizzard shads that are important prey of the lake's piscivores. Benthic invertebrate abundance therefore is not a major factor limiting the production of fish species such as largemouth bass.
- As for the last item in the criteria for this biotic category, since there are no important (i.e., commercially or recreationally important) shellfish or macroinvertebrate species in the Lake of Egypt, there are no spawning or nursery sites associated with them. The lack of a reduction in the abundance or diversity of shellfish and macroinvertebrates, and the absence of a barrier to the free movement of these organisms formed by the thermal plume combine to indicate that there has been, and will continue to be, no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category.

## 4.5 Fish

The most important biotic category, in terms of economic importance and sensitivity to alterations in the thermal conditions of the lake, is the fishery. Numerous fisheries investigations have been conducted on Lake of Egypt within the past 30 years; but these have primarily focused on game fish and issues relating to recreational fishing and were used to support management recommendations for the fishery (Heidinger 1988, 1990, 2007). Data from these studies included general population assessments for each target sport fish species as well as age and growth characteristics. Information contained in these reports is valuable in terms of characterizing the fish community prior to 2003. From 2005 through 2007, AMEC performed fish surveys using electrofishing, seining, and gill netting methods in the Lake of Egypt, and collected impingement samples from the intake of the Marion Plant. AMEC performed additional electrofishing surveys in 2010. Information from the MACTEC studies will be used to characterize the Lake of Egypt fish community after the 2003 boiler replacement at the Marion Plant.

### 4.5.1 Composition and Abundance of Fish Communities Before and After the 2003 Boiler Replacement

A comparison of fish species encountered in studies of the Lake of Egypt prior to, and after, the boiler replacement at the Marion Plant in 2003 is presented in Table 4-1. The pre-replacement data were collected from 1997 through 1999 (Heidinger et al., 2000), and the post-replacement data were collected from 2005 through 2007 and in 2010. Species composition was similar between these periods, as 23 of 31 species were collected in both periods. The exceptions were limited to species that are only present in low numbers in the lake. The fish community includes pelagic species (i.e., gizzard shad, threadfin shad, hybrid striped bass, white bass), species commonly associated with littoral habitats (i.e., largemouth bass, crappies, and sunfishes), and species more commonly characterized as benthic-dwelling (i.e., channel catfish, yellow bullhead, and darters). The lake has been compositionally dominated by centrarchids (ten species), with no other family represented by more than four species.

Electrofishing surveys performed in 1997 and 1998 (Heidinger et al., 2000) and in 2005, 2006, and 2010 (MACTEC, 2007) (Appendix A) and the present study) indicate that compositionally, the fish community in the Lake of Egypt has remained similar. Bluegill, redear sunfish, and largemouth bass have consistently been the most abundant species (see Table 3-4). Longear sunfish has also been consistently common and occasionally abundant. Other species that have occasionally been common include gizzard shad, green sunfish, and white crappie. The pelagic community members are not as vulnerable to the sampling gear, and their numbers are likely underestimates of their actual abundances. Annual variation in their numbers is not necessarily indicative of a shift in community composition.

**Table 4-1. Fish Species Collected from Lake of Egypt Prior to and After the 2003 Boiler Replacement at the Marion Power Plant**

Species	Common Name	Before Replacement <sup>*)</sup>	After Replacement <sup>†</sup>
<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>	Gizzard shad	X	X
<i>Dorosoma petenense</i>	Threadfin shad	X	X
<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Common carp	X	X
<i>Notemigonus crysoleucas</i>	Golden shiner	X	X
<i>Opsopoedus emiliae</i>	Pugnose minnow		X
<i>Pimephales notatus</i>	Bluntnose minnow	X	
<i>Minytrema melanops</i>	Spotted sucker	X	X
<i>Ameiurus melas</i>	Black bullhead		X
<i>Ameiurus natalis</i>	Yellow bullhead	X	X
<i>Ictalurus notatus</i>	Channel catfish	X	X
<i>Noturus gyrinus</i>	Tadpole madtom	X	X
<i>Esox americanus</i>	Grass pickerel	X	X
<i>Esox niger</i>	Chain pickerel	X	
<i>Fundulus notatus</i>	Blackstripe topminnow	X	X
<i>Gambusia affinis</i>	Mosquitofish	X	X
<i>Labidesthes sicculus</i>	Brook silverside	X	
<i>Menidia beryllina</i>	Inland silverside	X	X
<i>Morone chrysops</i>	White bass	X	X
<i>Morone chrysops x saxatilis</i>	White x striped bass	X	
<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	Green sunfish	X	X
<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>	Warmouth	X	X
<i>Lepomis humilis</i>	Orangespotted sunfish	X	X
<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	Bluegill	X	X
<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>	Longear sunfish	X	X
<i>Lepomis microlophus</i>	Redear sunfish	X	X
<i>Micropterus punctulatus</i>	Spotted bass	X	
<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	Largemouth bass	X	X
<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>	White crappie	X	X
<i>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</i>	Black crappie	X	X
<i>Etheostoma flabellare</i>	Fantail darter		X
<i>Percina sp.</i>	Darter sp.	X	

\* Heidinger et al. (2000) – study utilized electrofishing and seining.

† MACTEC (2007) and the present study – studies utilized electrofishing, impingement collections, gill netting, and seining.

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12

Checked by: WJE/1-27-12

## 4.5.2 Results of 2010 Fish Surveys

### 4.5.2.1 Temporal Comparison

Electrofishing surveys were performed at nine stations in the Lake of Egypt in 2010 with five stations in the lower and 4 in the upper sections of the lake (Figure 4-1). The five stations in the lower section of the lake were subdivided into two subsets to reduce the handling stress on collected fish. A total of 2,241 fish representing 16 species and one hybrid were collected (see Table 3-1). Bluegill was the dominant species by number in both July and August collections. Longear sunfish and largemouth bass were second and third, respectively, in terms of abundance in both months. Other common species were redear sunfish, green sunfish, and warmouth. Threadfin shad and yellow bullhead were common in July, but not in August. Taxonomic richness was similar between months, with 13 and 15 species collected in July and August, respectively. The average lengths of most species increased slightly between July and August collections (see Table 3-3). The exceptions to this pattern included inland silverside, warmouth, longear sunfish, hybrid sunfish, and black crappie. Biomass was greater in July for most species. The exceptions to the trend were common carp, black bullhead, redear sunfish, sunfish hybrid, largemouth bass, and black crappie.

### 4.5.2.2 Spatial Comparison

Most common or abundant species (i.e., bluegill, redear sunfish, and largemouth bass) had similar catch rates between the upper and lower portions of the lake (see Table 3-2). However, the catch rates of threadfin shad, channel catfish, green sunfish, longear sunfish, and black crappie were considerably greater in the upper lake. In contrast, black and yellow bullheads were collected more frequently in the lower lake. Differences in the average lengths of various species between lake sections were generally slight, and likely reflected random variation. The exception to this pattern was largemouth bass, for which individuals averaged 331 millimeters (mm) in the lower lake as opposed to 281 mm in the upper lake. This appeared to reflect the greater abundance of large individuals near the spillway, which is in the lower lake immediately northeast of the discharge, in comparison to all other areas surveyed. Largemouth bass abundance was greater in this area despite its higher water temperatures. The nearshore habitat at this station consisted primarily of riprap, and the spaces between these large rocks were preferred habitat for many species, including largemouth bass and the forage species they preyed on. Biomass for most species paralleled the spatial pattern of catch rates. In instances where catch rates were similar but biomass was greater in the lower lake (e.g., bluegill, redear sunfish, and largemouth bass), it reflected the greater amount of sampling effort expended there (ten stations versus four stations in the upper lake).

Spatial patterns evident in the 2010 surveys were comparable to those of previous studies, and indicate that the fish community in the Lake of Egypt has remained stable over the 12- to 13-year period considered. For example, bluegill, redear sunfish, and largemouth bass have consistently been among the most abundant species in the lake (see Table 3-4). Between-year variability in the abundances of these species is likely associated with factors such as differences in the amount of sampling effort and natural variation in recruitment success. No persistent pattern of increase or decrease over time was noted for these species.

#### 4.6 Other Vertebrate Wildlife

The criteria to determine whether the site is a low impact area for other vertebrate wildlife are as follows:

- It must be shown that the site is one of low potential impact for other (i.e., non-fish) vertebrate wildlife and
- that they will not suffer appreciable harm from plant operations.

Sport species such as ducks (e.g., mallard, wood duck) and Canada geese are commonly observed on Lake of Egypt, along with other waterfowl such as herons and various shorebirds (L. Hopkins, SIPC, personal communication). Migratory waterfowl such as teal, scaup, mergansers, and other species are expected to use Lake of Egypt during the spring and fall as foraging/resting areas. Beaver and muskrat lodges have not been observed, suggesting that they are either uncommon or not present at Lake of Egypt. In other studies of wildlife use on lakes used for cooling, Sanderson and Anderson (1981) found that winter concentrations of waterfowl were approximately equal on areas of Lake Sangchris that were influenced by thermal discharge and on uninfluenced areas.

The observed use of the Lake of Egypt by numerous species of wildlife, coupled with the lack of negative effects of plant operations on truly aquatic species, indicate that the proposed thermal standard will not cause appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category.

## 5.0 Engineering and Hydrological Data

### 5.1 Hydrological Data

Physicochemical (i.e., water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and water depth) and fisheries data collected from Lake of Egypt in previous years as well as the results of surveys and temperature measurements made in 2010 were available for this evaluation. Heidinger et al. (2000) documented the occurrence of lake stratification with regard to temperature in the vicinity of the intake structure (Figure 5-1). During their period of measurement (1998-1999), the lake in this area was stratified for nearly the entire year. The exception occurred in March, during a period in which Midwestern lakes generally undergo mixing and turnover. The normal seasonal pattern of higher temperature/lower dissolved oxygen concentrations in the summer and the inverse pattern of these conditions in the winter are illustrated in Figures 5-2 and 5-3. Measurements taken at the surface near the intake structure indicated that water temperature ranged from winter lows in the upper 40°s to summer highs in the low 90°s. Near surface dissolved oxygen levels generally exceeded 8 milligrams per liter (mg/L) in the spring and summer months, but occasionally decreased to below 5 mg/L in late summer and early fall.

#### 5.1.1 Water Temperature

Water temperature profiles were measured along five transects on June 12, August 1, and September 6, 2006 (MACTEC, 2007). In mid-June, surface water temperatures greater than 5°F above ambient levels were estimated to be present over a 4.5-acre area within the historic 26-acre mixing zone (Figure 5-4). Temperatures at the edge of the mixing zone were approximately 84°F and values along all transects were well below the 90°F allowable maximum. In early August, surface temperatures were greater than 5°F above ambient over an area of approximately 80 acres (Figure 5-5). At the edge of the mixing zone, the temperature was approximately 98°F, and temperatures were above 95°F at all locations along each transect. In early September, the area where temperatures exceeded 5°F above ambient was approximately 63 acres (Figure 5-6). The temperature at the edge of the mixing zone ranged from 90 to 92°F, and temperatures in the mid-80s were present in the intake cove and across the lake from the thermal discharge. Tables summarizing temperature measurements at each transect and depth location are provided in Appendix B.

Water temperature measurements were taken concurrently with fisheries and bathymetric surveys in July and August, 2010. Surface temperatures measured on July 14, 2010 decreased from approximately 98°F at the discharge to approximately 94°F at the eastern edge of the mixing zone (Figure 5-7). Temperatures in the lower portion of the lake, but outside the mixing zone, decreased to the upper 80s in the intake cove (Figure 5-8). Otherwise, surface temperatures remained near or above 90°F within the approximately 150-acre area of the lower lake where measurements were taken. Water temperatures were measured at depths of 2 and 8 feet at each of the electrofishing sampling stations during fisheries surveys in July and August 2010 (see Figure 2-1). Water temperatures at sampling stations in the lower portion of the lake (Stations 1 through 5) ranged from 91 to 94°F in July and from 88 to 101°F in August

(Table 5-1). Stations in the upper portion of the lake varied between 85 and 88.5°F during both survey periods. Variation in water temperature between depths was substantial at Stations 2 through 5 in mid-August, with differences ranging from 3.1 to 7.6°F. In late July, however, differences between depths at stations in the lower lake did not exceed 1.5°F. In the upper lake, temperature variation between depths was less than 1°F at Stations 6, 7, and 9. At Station 8, a larger depth difference (2.1 to 2.7°F) was measured in both July and August.

**Table 5-1. Water Temperature (°F) at Depths of 2 Feet and 8 Feet near Electrofishing Stations in Lake of Egypt, July and August 2010<sup>a</sup>**

Station	July 22, 2010		August 17, 2010	
	2 feet	8 feet	2 feet	8 feet
<b>Lower Lake</b>				
1	94.3	94.1	90.1	88.3
2	94.3	94.3	94.5	88.9
3	93.9	93.0	100.6 <sup>b</sup>	93.0
4	93.4	91.9	95.9	92.8
5	92.3	90.9	95.9	89.1
<b>Upper Lake</b>				
6	88.2	88.2	87.8	87.6
7	87.4	86.9	88.5	87.3
8	88.0	85.3	88.5	86.4
9	87.3	87.4	88.2	87.4

<sup>a</sup> No fish kills were noted during either the July or August surveys.

<sup>b</sup> Measurement was taken inside the mixing zone, near the discharge outfall.

Prepared by: SBM/1-27-12  
Checked by: WJE/1-27-12

### 5.1.2 Bathymetry

The Lake of Egypt is a relatively narrow 2,300-acre water body with several tributary branches (see Figure 1-1). The lake is approximately 6.2 miles long from the dam on the northern end (lower lake) to its most upstream southeastern extent (upper lake). AMEC performed a bathymetric study of the lower end of the Lake of Egypt in July 2010 to provide more specific information as to the physical configuration of the discharge area, mixing zone and lower lake. As is illustrated in Figure 5-9, the bathymetric study indicates the narrowness of the shallow (less than [ $<$ ] 10 feet) nearshore littoral zone habitat in the lower half of the lake. Extensive areas of water 25 to 40 feet deep are present in the main body of the lake, including the cove containing the intake structure. The cove into which the heated effluent is discharged, however, primarily consists of water less than 20 feet in depth. This area is characterized by a very shallow fringe area (2 to 5 feet in depth) that surrounds a central channel with depths ranging from 10 to 25 feet. This depth trend is also present in the other two major coves in the upper half of the lake.

## 5.2 Hydrothermal Modeling

### 5.2.1 Introduction

The objective for this modeling effort was to provide information for the Lake of Egypt for both potential summer and winter conditions that would result in higher than normal seasonal water temperatures due to maximum heat loading and infrequent summer and winter weather climate conditions. Model results were then used to provide water temperature information and supporting information for the assessment of the Marion Power Plant impacts on the Lake of Egypt aquatic biota.

Critical warm water temperatures occur during the dry late summer months when surface inflows to the lake and outflows from the lake are low. For late summer model conditions it was assumed that the Lake of Egypt behaves essentially as a closed system with little water inflow and outflow relative to lake volume during those critical seasonal periods. Lake temperatures are determined by the lake volume, surface area, mixing, interaction with climatic conditions, and the plant's thermal discharge. To predict potential future thermal conditions associated with the cooling water discharged from the SIPC Marion power plant to the Lake of Egypt, a hydrodynamic and transport model of the lake was used. The model calculates an energy balance based on lake mixing and surface heat losses (or gains) from three-dimensional cells formed by a horizontal grid and vertical layers. The lake model was developed using the Generalized Longitudinal Lateral Vertical Hydrodynamic Transport (GLLVHT) which is described in Edinger (2002). The GLLVHT model uses the same computational algorithms and is a fixed input parameter version of the model Generalized Environmental Modeling System for Surface waters (GEMSS), a time-varying, finite difference numerical model.

A hydrodynamic model was selected for this analysis because of the configuration of the Lake of Egypt and the hydrodynamic and hydrologic conditions. A plume type of model, while applicable to a near-field area within the northern end of the lake, would not be able to model the overall lake configuration, including boundaries, and would not be appropriate to analyze far-field thermal conditions for this water body.

GLLVHT model inputs include lake bathymetry, climate parameters, boundary conditions including heat input sources, and initial water temperature profile. Bathymetric data for the lake obtained by AMEC as described above were discretized into 500 ft squares forming an X-Y grid. Vertical layers of uniform depth (18 inches) were used to complete the three-dimensional representation of the water body. Weather/climatic data used as input for the model included dewpoint temperature, wind direction and velocity, and solar radiation. These inputs are used to calculate circulation and to estimate the temperature of the lake surface at equilibrium using a heat balance for the lake. Heat losses (or gains) from the lake surface and between individual layers in the lake profile are tracked and water temperatures updated at a six minute time step interval by the model.



Initially, a time period ending July 22, 2010, was simulated to calibrate the model to lake temperatures measured on that date. AMEC used weather data from the Illinois Climate Network for Carbondale (SIU station) and plant operating data to simulate lake temperatures for July 2010. Lake temperature data collected July 22, 2010 and cooling water discharge temperature data from the corresponding period were used to calibrate the predicted temperatures made by the model. Agreement between measured field temperatures and model simulation results provided confidence in the predictive modeling simulations. After completion of model calibration, AMEC used the model to predict lake water temperatures during summer (end of July 2010) and winter (late February 2011).

Following calibration of the model to match July 22, 2010 conditions, a simulation was performed with the model to assess potential lake temperatures under more extreme weather conditions. A similar simulation of lake temperatures was also made using observed plant cooling water discharge temperatures, flow rates, and weather data from late February 2011. However, the only lake water temperature data available for the winter period was the cooling water intake temperature, which was presumed to be representative of the lake. No field measurements of thermal profiles within the lake were available for the winter period.

These potential less typical conditions, summer or winter, are referred to as “stressed” conditions in the discussion below, reflecting a set of weather/climatic conditions for each, that are considered to be rarely exceeded in terms of potentially generating warmer lake temperatures. The simulation did not include any increase in generation capacity or thermal load to the lake from SIPC plant operations. As described in Section 5.2.3.6, supplemental modeling was performed in response to comments by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) to evaluate thermal conditions during transitional months in both the spring and fall.

The development of model inputs, calibration and predictions are described in greater detail in Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.

## 5.2.2 Model Inputs

Inputs used by the GLLVHT model include:

- Lake Bathymetry – Lake boundaries were approximated by a rectangular grid representing the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the lake. The Lake of Egypt model used 26 vertical layers.
- Lake Inflow/Outflow – Hydrologic inputs to and outflows from the lake, including both surface and groundwater flows, were assumed to be zero during both summer and winter modeled conditions based on review of long-term stream flow records of regional U.S. Geological Survey monitored streams and review of Lake of Egypt observed water levels that are often below the spillway level.
- Climatic Conditions – Climatic parameters including solar radiation, wind speed and direction, and dew point temperature were used to determine model inputs. Inputs for observed conditions/calibration scenarios used summer weather for the 30 days prior to

July 22, 2010 and a similar time period during February 2011. For the stressed condition, statistical estimates of these parameters were made from a local long-term meteorological station (Section 5.2.2.2).

- Heat Load to the Lake – The quantity of heat discharged in cooling water circulation was determined from plant measurements of cooling water flow rate and temperature rise during July 2010 and February 2011.
- Initial Water Temperatures – The initial water temperatures in the lake, which were uniform laterally but varying with depth, were based on water temperature measurements made June 12, 2010 for the summer model; only intake temperatures were available for the February model and the temperature profile was assumed based on literature values for winter lake temperatures.

### 5.2.2.1 Model Grid

Two model grids were developed such that the first covers the entire lake with 500-foot by 500-foot [(152 meters (m) by 152 m)] grid cells. A second grid covering the lower half of the lake was developed with 230 feet by 230 feet (70 m by 70 m) grid cells. The shape of the lake was approximated by superimposing the grid cells over an outline of the lake shoreline obtained from a U.S. Geological Survey 1:24,000 scale topographic map of the lake. Lake bathymetry was based on results of mapping conducted in July 2010, available topographic information, and supplemented with data from fishing maps. Maximum lake depth used in the model was 40 feet (12.2 meters) and the water column was discretized into a maximum of 27 layers of 18 inches (0.457 m).

### 5.2.2.2 Weather Conditions

Weather conditions are not used directly as model inputs. Solar radiation, wind speed, and dew point temperature are instead used to calculate a Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange (CSHE) and a surface equilibrium temperature ( $T_{eq}$ ) for the lake that become input for the model. The CSHE, in units of Watts/square meter/ $^{\circ}$ C, is the rate at which heat is gained or lost at the lake surface. When lake surface temperature is above the equilibrium temperature, the lake loses heat to the atmosphere at the rate of CSHE times the temperature difference between the lake equilibrium temperature and the actual lake water temperature. A positive value corresponds to lake warming and a negative value results in cooling of the lake surface. Twenty-two years of daily weather data (1990 to 2012) were obtained from the SIU–Carbondale weather station, which is operated as part of the Illinois Climatic Network (ICN) – Water & Atmospheric Resources Monitoring (WARM) Program–[www.isws.illinois.edu/warm/datatype.asp](http://www.isws.illinois.edu/warm/datatype.asp). For development of the  $T_{eq}$  input for the stressed conditions models, daily data for the summer months (June 1 to August 31) and winter months (January 1 to March 31) were used to calculate the maximum 30-day running average  $T_{eq}$  value for both summer and winter periods during each year. A frequency analysis was performed on each series to estimate the probability of exceedance. Model inputs for summer and winter conditions were based on the 95% non-exceedance event corresponding to an average occurrence frequency of approximately once in 20 years. However, following the occurrence of a March 31, 2012 30-day average  $T_{eq}$  value of 18.2 $^{\circ}$ C (64.8 $^{\circ}$ F), the winter stressed condition  $T_{eq}$  value selected was

17.0°C (62.6°F). Results are shown in Table 5-2. The  $T_{eq}$  values are given as both percentile values and the annual non-exceedance probability from frequency analysis. A 30-day averaging period is appropriate for use in the Lake of Egypt equilibrium model with constant inputs. Additional discussion of  $T_{eq}$  relationships to the model and modeling of transition conditions during fall and spring is provided in Appendix F.

### 5.2.2.3 Generating Plant Heat Load

An important input variable in determining temperature impacts of the Marion Power Plant on the lake is the heat load to the lake resulting from the discharge of power plant cooling water. Heat load to the lake under “normal” conditions was based on power plant records from July 2010. For the stressed conditions, heat loads were calculated from plant data (cooling water intake and discharge temperatures and flow rates) recorded for January through February 2011 (winter) and July through August 2010 (summer). These plant data are recorded at four-hour intervals. The stressed condition model heat load inputs were 724 MW for summer and 674 MW for the winter period. These values are approximately equal to the maximum 14-day running average heat loads for the winter 2011 period and summer 2010 period and are equal to the 68th percentile values (Tables 5-3 and 5-4) of the instantaneous heat load rates during those same periods (i.e., approximately one-third of the instantaneous heat load values in each case exceeded the heat load used for the stressed condition model). The standard deviations of the instantaneous data values for these winter and summer periods were 39 MW and 61 MW, respectively, or approximately 6 percent and 9 percent of the mean values for these periods.

### 5.2.2.4 Initial Conditions

Water temperature profiles were collected at ten lake locations on June 12, 2010. The profiles began 9000 feet upstream from the dam and extended towards the dam. These temperatures were used to establish the initial water temperatures in the model layers at the start of summer simulated conditions. For the February 2011 model scenario, only cooling water intake temperatures were available during January and an initial temperature profile was estimated.

### 5.2.2.5 Model Sensitivity

The model uses an energy balance approach to simulate lake temperatures. The thermal mass of the volume of water in the lake (estimated to be 41,400 acre-ft) makes the model relatively insensitive to small variations in thermal loading to the lake over the 30-day period simulated. Solar radiation, cloud cover, dew point temperature, and wind are used to calculate the two weather related model inputs: equilibrium temperature ( $T_{eq}$ ) and the coefficient of surface heater exchange (CSHE). Modeled lake temperatures were found to be most sensitive to the input value used for  $T_{eq}$ . An increase of 1°C used for  $T_{eq}$  in the model resulted in nearly a 1°C increase in the lake temperature simulated. The calculated equilibrium temperature was reduced by 1.0°C as part of model calibration to provide a better fit of simulated temperatures to July and August 2011 measured temperatures. In contrast, lake temperatures were found to be relatively insensitive to values used for the CSHE. Increasing the CSHE by 33 percent from 30 to 40 Watts per square meter per degree Celsius ( $W/m^2/°C$ ) showed no impact on maximum

surface temperature near the outfall and reduced the surface temperatures for mid and upper lake areas by roughly 0.8°F (0.4°C).

### 5.2.3 Model Results

The model was used to simulate two summer and two winter lake conditions. Summer weather conditions and lake temperatures for July 2010 were used to calibrate the model. Summer and winter “stressed” scenarios were developed to represent relatively infrequent but not extreme summer and winter weather conditions. Model inputs for the two scenarios are shown in Table 5-5 and Table 5-6. A comparison of the model predicted summer 2010 temperatures with measured temperatures is provided in Table 5-7.

**Table 5-2. Summary of Percentile Data and Non-Exceedance Probability Estimates for 30-day Running Average**

Percentile	Summer (Jun-Aug 1990-2012)		Winter (Jan-Mar 1990-2012)	
	Lake Surface Equilibrium Temperature (T <sub>eq</sub> ) °F	Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange (CSHE) (W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C)	Lake Surface Equilibrium Temperature (T <sub>eq</sub> ) °F	Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange (CSHE) (W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C)
100%	91.6 (33.1 °C)	34.8	64.8 (18.2 °C)	23.9
95%	90.7 (32.6 °C)	31.0	58.3 (14.6 °C)	22.8
90%	89.8 (32.1 °C)	29.7	55.6 (13.1 °C)	22.0
80%	89.4 (31.8 °C)	28.6	54.5 (12.5 °C)	21.1
60%	87.4 (30.8 °C)	27.4	53.1 (11.7 °C)	18.7
50%	87.2 (30.7 °C)	26.9	52.5 (11.4 °C)	17.5
40%	86.2 (30.1 °C)	26.4	51.4 (10.8 °C)	16.1
20%	83.9 (28.8 °C)	25.3	50.4 (10.2 °C)	13.5
10%	83.4 (28.6 °C)	24.6	49.8 (9.9 °C)	13.0
5%	83.2 (28.4 °C)	23.9	47.1 (8.4 °C)	12.5
Annual Probability of Non-Exceedance				
99%	95.0 (35.0 °C)		64.8 (18.2 °C)	
98%	93.6 (34.2 °C)		62.6 (17.0 °C)	
96%	92.1 (33.4 °C)		60.6 (15.9 °C)	
95%	91.6 (33.1 °C)		59.9 (15.5 °C)	
90%	90.1 (32.3 °C)		57.7 (14.3 °C)	
80%	88.7 (31.5 °C)		55.4 (13.0 °C)	

**Table 5-3. Heat Load to Lake of Egypt for January – February 2011**

Percentile	Flow	Delta T		Heat Discharged to Lake (MW)				
	MGD	°F	°C	From Percentile Data <sup>a</sup>	From Plant Time Series Data <sup>b</sup>	Running Averages <sup>b</sup>		
						7-day	14-day	30-day
0%	186.9	26.0	14.4	494.0	532.0	602	612	638
5%	186.9	30.0	16.7	570.0	570.0	606	618	642
10%	186.9	31.0	17.2	589.0	589.0	612	621	643
20%	186.9	32.0	17.8	608.0	608.0	628	638	646
25%	186.9	32.0	17.8	608.0	617.4	643	650	647
30%	186.9	33.0	18.3	626.9	626.9	651	656	650
40%	186.9	34.0	18.9	645.9	645.9	656	658	656
50%	186.9	34.0	18.9	645.9	650.7	658	660	658
60%	186.9	35.0	19.4	664.9	664.9	662	662	660
68%	186.9	36.0	20.0	683.9	674.4	664	662	662
70%	186.9	36.0	20.0	683.9	674.4	664	662	662
75%	186.9	36.0	20.0	683.9	674.4	665	663	662
80%	186.9	36.0	20.0	683.9	683.9	666	663	662
90%	186.9	37.0	20.6	702.9	693.4	668	665	663
95%	186.9	37.0	20.6	702.9	702.9	672	667	664
100%	249.1	38.0	21.1	962.3	721.9	675	670	665

<sup>a</sup> Heat load from percentile flow and temperature data

<sup>b</sup> Percentile values of time series heat load as calculated from time series constructed from filtered plant records

**Table 5-4. Heat Load to Lake of Egypt for July– August 2010**

Percentile	Flow	Delta T		Heat Discharged to Lake (MW)				
	MGD	°F	°C	From Percentile Data <sup>a</sup>	From Plant Time Series Data <sup>b</sup>	Running Averages <sup>b</sup>		
						7-day	14-day	30-day
0%	277.0	16.0	8.9	450.4	561.8	654	664	686
5%	290.9	18.0	10.0	532.2	605.4	656	667	687
10%	290.9	19.0	10.6	561.8	606.1	663	669	687
20%	290.9	20.0	11.1	591.4	635.7	672	674	688
25%	290.9	20.0	11.1	591.4	650.5	674	678	689
30%	290.9	21.0	11.7	620.9	650.5	679	679	689
40%	290.9	22.0	12.2	650.5	680.1	681	685	690
50%	290.9	22.0	12.2	650.5	708.4	692	698	692
60%	290.9	23.0	12.8	680.1	706.4	695	700	694
68%	290.9	24.0	13.3	709.6	724.4	703	701	695
70%	290.9	24.0	13.3	709.6	739.2	706	703	695
75%	290.9	25.0	13.9	739.2	739.2	716	706	698
80%	290.9	25.0	13.9	739.2	742.2	720	712	699
90%	290.9	26.6	14.8	786.5	770.2	729	719	703
95%	290.9	27.0	15.0	798.3	798.3	733	721	704
100%	290.9	29.0	16.1	857.5	842.7	749	722	706

<sup>a</sup> Heat load from percentile flow and temperature data – 4-hour time series value

<sup>b</sup> Percentile values of time series heat load as calculated from time series constructed from filtered plant records

**Table 5-5. Summary of Model Inputs for Lake of Egypt Thermal Simulations – Summer**

Input Parameter	July 2010		Stressed Condition	
	Value	Source	Value	Source
Wind Direction	From South	Predominant wind direction	From South	Prevailing summer wind direction
Wind Speed	2.14 m/s	Avg. Wind Speed during 30 days prior to 7/22/2010	1.68 m/s	20% non-exceedance probability for 30-day running average for January through March (1990 to 2011)
Cooling Water Discharge	291 MGD (12.74 m <sup>3</sup> /sec)	30-day average calculated from Plant data for June-July 2010	291 MGD (12.74 m <sup>3</sup> /sec)	Maximum 14-day running average for Jun-July 2010
Temperature Rise in Discharge Water	20.5 °F (11.4 °C)	Avg. calculated from Plant Data June-July 2010	24.5 °F (13.6 °C)	Estimated from plant data, cooling discharge, and plant generating capacity
Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange	28.8 W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C	Calculated from weather data for June-July 2010 normal weather inputs	28.8 W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C	Calculated from stressed weather inputs
Lake Equilibrium Temperature	30.2 °C	Calculated from normal weather inputs	91.4 °F (33 °C)	Calculated from stressed weather inputs
Heat Load Added to Lake	608 MW	Calculated from cooling water discharge and temperature rise	724 MW	Calculated from cooling water discharge and temperature rise
Simulation Time	30 days	steady state model	30 days	Steady state model
Horizontal Grid Size	500'x500' and 230'x230'	Entire lake and upper 1/3 included	500'x500' and 230'x230'	Entire lake and upper 1/3 included
Vertical Layers	27 layers (18 in. deep) (500'x500' grid) 24 layers (20 in. deep)	Maximum lake depth 40 feet (12.2 m)	27 layers (18 in. deep) (500'x500' grid)	Maximum lake depth 40 feet (12.2 m)
Initial Lake Temperature Conditions	29.2 °C (surface) to 14.0 °C (bottom)	Averaged from 10 temperature profiles collected June 12, 2006 in lower lake	Same as for July 2010 simulation	Averaged from 10 temperature profiles collected June 12, 2006 in lower lake

W/m<sup>2</sup>/°C= watts per square meter per degree

°C = degrees Celsius

m<sup>3</sup>/sec = cubic meters per second

Prepared by: CJE/9-26-2013

Checked by: DWI/10-2-2013



**Table 5-6. Summary of Model Inputs for Lake of Egypt Thermal Simulations – Winter**

Input Parameter	Normal Conditions		Stressed Conditions	
	Value	Source	Value	Source
Wind Direction	From West	Avg. wind direction Jan-Feb 2011	From West	Prevailing winter wind direction
Wind Speed	7.7 mph (3.46 m/s)	30-day avg. wind speed for Jan-Feb 2011	5.8 mph (2.61 m/s)	10% non-exceedance probability for 30-day running average for January through March (1990 to 2011)
Cooling Water Discharge	187 MGD (8.19 m <sup>3</sup> /sec)	Cooling water discharge Jan-Feb 2011	187 MGD (8.19 m <sup>3</sup> /sec)	Cooling water discharge for Jan-Feb 2011
Temperature Rise in Discharge Water	34.7 °F (19.3 °C)	Cooling water temperature rise Feb 2011	35.5 °F (19.7 °C)	Maximum 14-day running average for Jan-Feb 2011
Coefficient of Surface Heat Exchange	16.9 W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C	Calculated from 30 day avg. weather data Jan-Feb 2011	19.0 W/m <sup>2</sup> /°C	Calculated for stressed weather inputs
Lake Equilibrium Temperature	41 °F (5.0 °C)	Calculated from 30 day avg. weather data Jan-Feb 2011	62.6 °F (17.0 °C)	Calculated for 95% non-exceedance using annual maximum weather inputs (Jan-Mar 1990-2011)
Heat Load Added to Lake	660 MW	Calculated from cooling water discharge and temperature rise	674 MW	Calculated from cooling water discharge and temperature rise
Simulation Time	30 days	steady state model	30 days	Steady state model
Horizontal Grid Size	500'x500' and 230'x230'	Entire lake and upper 1/3 included	500'x500' and 230'x230'	Entire lake and upper 1/3 included
Vertical Layers	27 layers (18 in. deep) (500'x500' grid)	Maximum lake depth 40 feet (12.2 m)	27 layers each 18 inch depth	Maximum lake depth 40 feet (12.2 m)
Initial Lake Temperature Conditions	2.9 to 4.0°C	January Lake Profile Temperatures estimated from literature	2.9 to 4.0°C	January Lake Profile Temperatures estimated from literature

W/m<sup>2</sup>/°C = watt per square meter per degree Celsius

°C = degrees Celsius

m<sup>3</sup>/sec = cubic meters per second

Prepared by: CJE/9-26-2013

Checked by: DWI/10-2-2013

**Table 5-7. Comparison of Model Predicted Water Temperatures with Measured Temperatures on July 22, 2012**

Station	2 feet Depth			8 feet Depth		
	Measured	Simulated	Difference	Measured	Simulated	Difference
<b>Lower Lake</b>						
1	94.28	94.82	-0.54	94.28	94.64	-0.36
2	94.28	94.64	-0.36	94.10	94.46	-0.36
3	93.92	93.92	0.00	93.02	92.84	0.18
4	93.38	93.20	0.18	91.94	92.30	-0.36
5	92.30	93.20	-0.90	90.86	93.20	-2.34
Mean	93.63	93.96	-0.32	92.84	93.49	-0.65
Std. Dev.	0.83	0.77	0.43	1.45	1.02	0.97
<b>Upper Lake</b>						
6	88.16	91.04	-2.88	86.36	90.32	-3.96
7	87.44	87.62	-0.18	86.90	87.08	-0.18
8	87.98	86.72	1.26	85.82	87.08	-1.26
9	87.26	89.60	-2.34	87.44	86.72	0.72
Mean	87.71	88.75	-1.03	86.63	87.80	-1.17
Std. Dev.	0.43	1.95	1.92	0.70	1.69	2.03

All Temperatures in Table 5-7 are in degrees Fahrenheit

### 5.2.3.1 Summer Conditions-Baseline Scenario

The GLLVHT is a hydrodynamic steady-state equilibrium model that uses fixed-value input parameters. That is, climate and heat load to the lake are assumed to remain constant over a selected 30-day period in mid-summer. The  $T_{eq}$  value reflecting weather conditions was derived from 30-day running averages. Figure 5-10 illustrates lake surface temperatures generated by the model calibrated to measured temperatures under July 2010 (“normal”) weather conditions.

For conditions that occurred during July 2010, the model predicts a surface temperature of 95.0°F within the area of the 26-acre mixing zone, which decreases to 94.5°F near its outer boundary. Most of the lake, and all of the upper lake, remained at an ambient temperature near or below 94°F. These values are similar to field measurements recorded in mid-July 2010, but somewhat lower than field measurements collected from early August 2006 (see Section 3.1.1).

### 5.2.3.2 Summer Conditions-Stressed Scenario

Lake temperatures generated from inputs for the assumed “stressed” condition are illustrated in Figure 5-11. These inputs were modified to simulate stressed conditions for the lake, corresponding to:

- a warm summer with less cloud cover and higher humidity, low average wind speed; and
- Weather conditions based on an annual probability of non-exceedance of 95 percent, for the annual maximum 30-day running average, corresponding to an average return interval for these climatic conditions of 20 years.

Thermal load to the lake by the power plant was assumed to be 724 MW, based on the maximum thermal load that occurred during the July 2010 baseline simulation. The stressed model predicts an average surface temperature of 99.7°F for the area nearest the discharge. Surface water temperatures of 97°F or greater would be expected to be found throughout much of the lower lake. Under this scenario, surface temperatures for even the distant arms of the upper lake would be expected to exceed 90°F. The difference in predicted temperatures between the July 2010 and “stressed condition” models was an increase of approximately 6°F in the lower lake.

#### **5.2.3.3 Winter Conditions-Normal Condition**

Winter temperature conditions were simulated for late February 2011 using observed weather data and plant discharge heat input records from that date. Lake temperature data for this time period were not available; simulated lake temperatures were checked against plant temperature data from influent cooling water temperatures. Temperatures estimated from February 2011 weather and thermal loading show a maximum surface temperature in the lower lake of 52°F (Figure 5-12). Temperatures in the upper lake ranged from 40 to 49°F. The February 2011 weather parameters controlling predicted lake temperatures were near normal. The simulated lake water temperatures along cross section “B” demonstrate predicted values of approximately 48°F at mid-depth, which are similar to the recorded intake water temperatures.

#### **5.2.3.4 Winter Conditions-Stressed Scenario**

Surface temperatures for the simulation for stressed winter conditions are presented in Figure 5-13. The  $T_{eq}$  input value was taken from the 98 percent non-exceedance value of annual maximum 30-day  $T_{eq}$  values for January-March at Carbondale, Illinois between 1990 and 2012. A 30-day  $T_{eq}$  value of 64.8°F (18.2°C) occurred at the end of March 2012. It is also noted that the winter stressed condition simulation is based on climatic data extending to the end of March. Because March is included in the defined winter period, “winter” season temperatures are characterized by the warming temperatures evident in later March that are uncharacteristically high relative to the February 2011 results. Accordingly, the predicted surface temperatures for the “winter” stressed condition range from 16 to 18°F warmer than the February 2011 predicted temperatures (based on observed data), with the differences larger in the lower area of the lake than at the upper end.

#### **5.2.3.5 Cross-Sectional Profiles of Each Scenario**

Cross-sectional diagrams of model results under “normal” and “stressed” conditions are illustrated in Figures 5-14 and 5-15 for the summer period and in Figures 5-16 and 5-17 for the winter period.

For both summer model scenarios, cross sections within the mixing zone indicate that warmer water temperatures are closest to the discharge (see Figure 5-12). Water temperature decreases considerably with depth. The temperature reduction is generally 5 to 7°F from the surface to approximately mid-depth, then remains approximately uniform to the bottom. Otherwise, the patterns are nearly identical, but temperatures are approximately 7°F higher in the “stressed” scenarios. In the cross sections from outside the mixing zone, there is much less

of a difference along the transverse axis (see Figure 5-13). The warmest water is in the center of the cross section, and generally cools approximately 2°F moving toward either shore. The depth profile again reflects a substantial decrease (3 to 4°F) from the surface to approximately one-third of the depth of the water column. The spatial patterns are very similar between the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios, with surface temperatures approximately 5 °F higher in the latter model.

#### **5.2.3.6 Supplemental Modeling of Spring and Fall Conditions**

As requested by IEPA, SIPC also performed supplemental modeling of spring (April through May) and fall (October through November) conditions to support the recommendation of adjusted criteria for these transitional periods between winter and summer. Modeling was performed in a manner similar to that described above for the winter and summer periods. However, the supplemental modeling was performed using additional recent operational data for these periods. Climatic inputs were based on 30-day running averages of conditions prior to May 31 (spring) and October 1 (fall). Results for this supplemental modeling work are presented separately in Appendix F and were used to recommend the adjusted thermal criteria described in Section 7.4.

## 6.0 Rationale for Proposed Alternate Effluent Limitation

### 6.1 Existing Permit Conditions

Currently, SIPC's NPDES permit requires that temperatures at the outside edge of its 26-acre mixing zone cannot exceed seasonally varying maxima (60°F in December through March; 90°F in April through November) for more than one percent of the hours in a 12-month period. Additionally, the permit requires that water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone cannot exceed these maxima by 3°F at any time. Section 316(a) of the CWA provides a process for modification of any effluent limitation proposed for the control of the thermal component of a discharge. Specifically, it states that when the power plant owner/operator can demonstrate that an effluent limitation is more stringent than necessary, then it can apply for a variance to its permit. In Illinois, authority under Section 316(a) to grant alternate thermal limits for heated effluent discharges to artificial cooling lakes has been delegated to the Illinois Pollution Control Board. Under Illinois regulations, the discharger must demonstrate that conditions in the artificial cooling lake receiving the heated discharge will be environmentally acceptable, and remain capable of supporting shellfish, fish, and wildlife. SIPC is seeking an alternate thermal limit applicable to the heated effluent from the Marion Power Plant to the Lake of Egypt. The results of this study, and previous studies, indicate that existing thermal limitations are more stringent than necessary, and that the plant's operations have caused no appreciable harm to the biological communities in the Lake of Egypt. Furthermore, no appreciable harm is expected as a result of the requested maximum temperatures.

### 6.2 Biothermal Assessment

#### 6.2.1 No Anticipated Alteration of Lake of Egypt's Thermal Regime

SIPC does not anticipate any increase in thermal loading from plant operations to the Lake of Egypt. Accordingly, foreseeable future conditions and the resulting temperature regime will likely be consistent with those of the current conditions. In terms of the horizontal characteristics of the temperature regime, the areas in which warmer conditions occur are, and will continue to be, small in comparison to the rest of the lake. Additionally, current plant operations would not alter the vertical stratification of the lake under normal seasonal conditions. Even an increase in thermal conditions within the lake (e.g., as may occur in extreme climatological conditions) would be unlikely to have an effect on the horizontal or vertical characteristics of its thermal regime. As discussed in Section 2.1, under the present conditions, the lake is stratified with regard to temperature for much of the year (Heidinger et al., 2000), with deeper areas consistently available as thermal refugia.

#### 6.2.2 Biotic Categories Eliminated from Detailed Consideration

Lake of Egypt is considered to be a "low impact area" for the biotic categories including phytoplankton, zooplankton and meroplankton, habitat formers, shellfish and macroinvertebrates, and other vertebrate wildlife. There is no evidence that the thermal discharge of the Marion Plant will cause appreciable harm to any of these categories. The lack of a community shift toward nuisance phytoplankton species and the presumed stability of the

existing assemblages (e.g., no shift from a detritus-based community, no algal blooms after water quality improvements in the system) combine to indicate that there has been, and will be, no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category. The unlikelihood of a detrimental impact on the rapidly reproducing zooplankton and meroplankton assemblages, coupled with the lack of a barrier to their movement indicate that the proposed site specific thermal standard will not cause appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category. Since the fish community has remained stable and of similar composition since the establishment of the lake, it is reasonable to conclude that there has not been a deterioration of the habitat former community. Further, no threatened or endangered fish species are present in the Lake of Egypt, thus no adverse impact would be expected to species of concern even if the thermal discharge had a negative effect on habitat formers. The lack of a reduction in the abundance or diversity of shellfish and macroinvertebrates, and the absence of a barrier to the free movement of these organisms formed by the thermal plume combine to indicate that there has been, and will continue to be, no appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category. Finally, the observed use of the Lake of Egypt by numerous species of wildlife, coupled with the lack of negative effects of plant operations on aquatic species, indicate that the proposed thermal standard will not cause appreciable harm to the balanced indigenous community for this biotic category.

### 6.2.3 Representative Important Fish Species

The five representative important species considered in this study are each tolerant of warm summer temperatures. The following discussion is centered on summer thermal conditions as these are considered to be potentially more limiting to fish than winter conditions. Accordingly, summer lake surface temperature distribution data as presented in Table 6-1 are discussed in conjunction with published thermal tolerance data (Table 6-2). Even under “stressed” conditions, there would be extensive areas of suitable habitat available to them.

The upper incipient lethal temperature (UILT) tolerance range of threadfin shad is 93 to 97°F (Wrenn, 1975). Under the conditions of the hydrothermal model simulations discussed previously, this species would have almost no areas of the lake (of a total of 2,217) above the upper boundary of its tolerance range in “normal” summer conditions (see Table 6-1). Under “stressed” conditions, approximately 884 acres of the lake would be below the UILT range on the surface. However, considering the vertical aspect of the water column, the lower third of the lake within the mixing zone and the lower two-thirds of the lake outside the mixing zone would be within the temperature tolerance limits for threadfin shad. Additionally, there are no barriers to the movement of threadfin shad from areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. Consequently, thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios would not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be harmed.

**Table 6-1 Lake of Egypt Surface Acreage<sup>1</sup> by Water Temperature (°F) in Normal and Stressed Summer Model Scenarios**

Temperature	Normal	Stressed
<85	0	0
<86	655	0
<87	928	0
<88	1070	0
<89	1217	0
<90	1382	0
<91	1580	0
<92	1812	737
<93	2029	884
<94	2215	1029
<95	2217	1179
<96	2217	1382
<97	2217	1606
<98	2217	1892
<99	2217	2111
<100	2217	2217
<101	2217	2217
<102	2217	2217
<103	2217	2217
<104	2217	2217

<sup>1</sup>Note: acreage totals are less than total lake surface area (approx. 2300 acres) due to model boundary inconsistencies

Prepared by: BSM/10-2-13

Checked by: WJE/10-2-13

**Table 6-2. Maximum Weekly Average Temperatures (°F) for Growth and Upper Incipient Lethal Temperatures (°F) of Representative Important Species**

Species	MWAT (Growth)		UILT	
	Yoder <sup>j</sup>	Other Historical Literature	Yoder <sup>j</sup>	Other Historical Literature
Threadfin shad	--	--	--	91.9 <sup>a</sup>
Gizzard shad	89.4	93.2 <sup>b</sup>	96.4	97.7 <sup>f</sup>
Channel catfish	92.3	93.2 <sup>i</sup>	100.9	96.8 <sup>b</sup> 98.6 <sup>g</sup> 96.8 <sup>h</sup>
Bluegill*	90.3	93.2 <sup>j</sup>	97.5	98.6 <sup>b</sup> 100.9 <sup>e</sup> 106.7 <sup>c</sup>
Largemouth bass	87.6	90.9 <sup>i</sup>	94.1	96.8 <sup>b</sup> 98.1 <sup>c</sup> 99.1 <sup>d</sup>
White Crappie	85.8	82 <sup>b</sup>	90.5	91.4 <sup>b</sup>
Black Crappie	86.0	81 <sup>b</sup>	94.5	91.4 <sup>b</sup>

Sources: <sup>a</sup>Monirian et al. (2010); <sup>b</sup>Brungs and Jones (1977); <sup>c</sup>Carlander (1977); <sup>d</sup>Fields et al. (1987); <sup>e</sup>Reutter and Herdendorff (1976); <sup>f</sup>WSU (1995); <sup>g</sup>Brown (1974); <sup>h</sup>Yoder and Gammon (1976); <sup>i</sup>ESE (1988); <sup>j</sup>Yoder and Rankin (2005) and Yoder et al. (2006).  
\*Note: Observed lower lake surface temperatures in which bluegill were represented by high catch rates ranged between 94 and 98 F.

Prepared by: MCB 10-2-2013  
Checked by: WJE 10-2-2013

For gizzard shad, the maximum weekly average temperature for growth (MWAT) and the UILT are considered to be 89°F and 96°F, respectively (see Table 6-2). Considering the predicted conditions from the model simulations discussed previously, this species would have almost no areas of the lake above the UILT threshold under normal summer conditions. Under “stressed” conditions, approximately 1,382 acres of the lake would be less than the UILT above this range on the surface. Additionally, approximately 1,217 acres of the lake would be less than the MWAT for gizzard shad under “normal” conditions, whereas no surface areas would be less than the MWAT value under the modeled “stressed” conditions (see Table 6-1). Even so, much more of the lake’s area would be suitable when considering deeper waters. Under “normal” modeled conditions, gizzard shad would have the lower half of the water column available inside the mixing zone and the entire water column available outside the mixing zone. Under the



“stressed” model conditions, it is expected that gizzard shad would exhibit avoidance behavior of the mixing zone and near mixing zone areas, as no depths in the mixing zone and only waters deeper than 35 feet outside the mixing zone would be available in the lower half of the lake. Additionally, there are no barriers to the movement of gizzard shad from areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. Consequently, thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios would not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be harmed.

For channel catfish, the MWAT for growth and the UILT tolerance are considered to be 92°F and 101°F, respectively (see Table 6-2). Considering the predicted conditions from the model simulations discussed previously, almost no surface water areas of the lake would exceed the UILT under either normal or stressed summer conditions. By comparison, approximately 1,812 acres and 737 acres of surface waters would be less than the MWAT under normal and stressed conditions, respectively (see Table 6-1). Even so, much more of the lake’s area would be suitable when considering deeper waters. Under “normal” modeled conditions, channel catfish would have the lower half of the water column available inside the mixing zone and the entire water column available outside the mixing zone. Under the “stressed” model conditions, it is expected that channel catfish would exhibit avoidance behavior of the mixing zone and near mixing zone areas, as no depths in the mixing zone and only waters deeper than 35 feet outside the mixing zone would be available in the lower half of the lake. Additionally, there are no barriers to the movement of channel catfish from areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. Consequently, thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios would not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be harmed.

Reported tolerance values of bluegill are notably variable, with UILT values ranging from 97.5 to 106.7°F for adults, and a MWAT values ranging between 90 and 93°F (see Table 6-2). Given that bluegill catch rates were observed to be very high near the warmwater discharge of the Marion Plant during July 2010 electrofishing surveys where measured surface water temperatures ranged from 94-98°F, 93°F was selected as the most appropriate MWAT value, and 98°F was selected as the UILT value. Under the “normal” summer conditions predicted by the hydrothermal model, the entire lake would have surface water temperatures below the UILT. Additionally, 2029 acres of surface waters of the lake would be less than the maximum weekly average value. Under the modeled “stressed” conditions, approximately 1,892 surface acres would be below the UILT, whereas approximately 884 acres of surface water would be below the MWAT value (see Table 6-1). However, with regard to deeper waters, temperatures below the UILT would be evident in the lower third of the water column within the mixing zone, and lower two-thirds of the water column outside the mixing zone. No depths in the mixing zone, and only the deepest (>35 feet) areas of the lower lake outside the mixing zone, would be below the bluegill’s maximum weekly average temperature under these extreme conditions. As stated for other RIS, there are no barriers to the movement of bluegill from areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. Consequently, thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios would not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be harmed.

For largemouth bass, the MWAT for growth and the UILT values are considered to be 88°F and 94°F, respectively (see Table 6-2). Considering the predicted conditions of the model simulations discussed previously, this species would have approximately 2,215 surface acres of the lake less than the UILT under “normal” summer conditions. Under “stressed” conditions, approximately 1029 surface acres of the lake would have temperatures less than the UILT (see Table 6-1). But even in these “stressed” conditions, deeper waters would be suitable. Specifically, the deeper third of the water column within the mixing zone, and the deeper two-thirds of the water column outside the mixing zone would be below the short-term tolerance limits for largemouth bass. Approximately 1,070 surface water acres would be less than the MWAT value under normal conditions, but no surface waters of the lake would be less than the MWAT value under “stressed” conditions. However, as described above the cooler, deeper water does provide habitat suitability under these conditions to sustain largemouth bass communities. Furthermore, largemouth bass were collected at very similar catches rates between the upper and lower portions of the lake during July 2010 electrofishing surveys (see Table 3-2), indicating that this species is well adapted to warmer surface temperatures. Under “normal” modeled conditions, largemouth bass would have the deeper third of the water column available inside the mixing zone and the deeper two-thirds of the column available outside the mixing zone. Under the “stressed” model conditions, no depths in the mixing zone or in the areas immediately outside the mixing zone would be below the largemouth bass maximum weekly average temperature. There are no barriers to the movement of largemouth bass from areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. Consequently, thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios would not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be appreciably harmed.

For white and black crappie (collectively, “crappie”), the MWAT for growth and the UILT values are considered to be 85.8°F and 90.5°F, respectively (see Table 6-2). Considering the predicted conditions of the model simulations discussed previously, this species would have approximately 1,580 surface acres of the lake less than the UILT under “normal” summer conditions. Under “stressed” conditions, none of the surface acres of the lake would have temperatures less than the UILT (see Table 6-1). While such surface waters may be limiting to crappie under these “stressed” conditions, deeper waters would be suitable. Under both “normal” and “stressed” summer conditions, all areas of the lake would have surface water temperatures that exceed the MWAT value of 85.8°F. However, as described above the cooler, deeper water are considered to provide habitat suitability under these conditions to sustain crappie communities. According to earlier assessments by Heidinger from 1988 and 1990, crappie historically demonstrated good populations at Lake of Egypt. Heidinger also noted that crappie populations are cyclical and that for both 1998 and 1990, they were likely at a low point. More recent investigations of Lake of Egypt by Heidinger et al (2000) reported the collection of both black and white crappie in electrofishing results. As is shown in Table 6-3, crappie catch between upper (Segment 2) and lower (Segment 1) reaches of the lake were generally low and not consistent between years. However, the sustained presence of crappie within the lake and the anecdotal reports of periodically good crappie catches (SIPC, personal communication) suggest that, while thermally influenced, Lake of Egypt continues to support a viable crappie population. Additionally, it is noted that there are no barriers to the movement of crappie from

areas that may be thermally less suitable to habitats characterized by cooler temperatures. In conclusion, whereas crappie habitat (?) may be limited under summer conditions of thermal stress, the availability of acceptable thermal refugia at depth coupled with the observed continued presence of both white and black crappie within the lake over the years, supports the conclusion that thermal conditions under the “normal” and “stressed” scenarios do not represent conditions in which the populations of this species are likely to be appreciably harmed.

**Table 6-3. Summary of Crappie Electrofishing Catch from 1997 and 1998**

	Total Effort	Total Number	Catch per Unit Effort
<b>1997</b>			
White Crappie			
Segment 1 <sup>a</sup>	>6 hours	29	4.8
Segment 2		7	2.5
Black Crappie			
Segment 1	>6 hours	15	1.0
Segment 2		7	1.6
<b>1998</b>			
White Crappie			
Segment 1	>5 hours	3	0.5
Segment 2		1	0.2
Black Crappie			
Segment 1	>5 hours	21	3.8
Segment 2		13	2.3

Source: Heidinger et al, 2000

<sup>a</sup> Segment 1-lower, near dam; Segment 2-upper

In summary, summer temperatures predicted by the “normal” simulation of the hydrothermal model would be within the upper incipient lethal temperature tolerances of all RIS throughout the Lake of Egypt. When considering the maximum weekly average temperatures to promote growth, 188 to 1,289 acres (8.4 to 58.1 percent) in the lower portion of the lake’s surface waters would be excluded. Even so, sub-surface areas would be suitable even in the mixing zone. Under the worst case scenario conditions predicted by the “stressed” model, these species would still have the majority of the lake’s surface waters available at temperatures below their short-term maximum levels; and an even larger area would be available in consideration of sub-surface waters. When considering the lower maximum weekly averages of these species, however, they would presumably be confined to sub-surface waters; but considerably larger areas of sub-surface water would consist of cooler waters and be available for RIS use.

#### 6.2.4 Effects on RIS Spawning and Recruitment

Potential effects of an enhanced thermal regime on the reproductive cycles of RIS can be considered by examining published literature characterizing typical reproductive biology of each species, coupled with prior work done at Lake of Egypt and other cooling lakes within Illinois. Of potential concern is that the thermal regime induced by plant operations accelerates gamete formation and initiate spawning in advance of the aquatic ecosystem’s capacity to support them. The following narrative evaluates this potential by examining:

1. Published spawning temperatures and timing for RIS
2. Reported literature from other Illinois cooling lakes, and
3. Observed trends in larval fish abundance and recruitment in Lake of Egypt

### Gizzard Shad/Threadfin Shad

Gizzard shad typically spawns at temperatures ranging from 50 to 88°F (Fishbase, 2012b), but optimal spawning temperatures for gizzard shad range from 60 to 75°F (Heidinger, 1975). Within Illinois spawning typically occurs in April, May and June (Smith, 2002). By comparison, threadfin shad typically spawns at temperatures ranging from 58 to 81°F from April through July (Fishbase, 2012a).

Early spawning by *Dorosoma* spp. has been documented in other regional lakes that receive thermal effluents. Lake Sangchris, also located in central Illinois, receives thermal effluent from the Kincaid Generating Station (Larimore and Tranquilli, 1981). During 1975-1977, gizzard shad larvae were collected as early as April 22 in both the discharge arm and the intake arm. Water temperatures in the discharge arm ranged from 69 to 75°F whereas temperatures in the intake arm were only 64°F. Little difference was noted in the temporal distribution of gizzard shad between the discharge and intake arms.

As is summarized in Table 6-4, monitored temperatures during the spring at Lake of Egypt demonstrated earlier lake warming, with optimal spawning temperatures for *Dorosoma* spp. reached within the lower (northern) portion of the lake in March (1998 only) and April (1998 and 1999)(Heidinger et al, 2000). The differential warming of the lake by thermal effluent resulted in optimal spawning temperatures lagging within the upper (southern) portion of the lake until late April extending into May. Hatching temperatures for gizzard shad were calculated to range from 63-92°F in 1998 and from 63-89°F in 1999.

Prior ichthyoplankton studies performed at Lake of Egypt from 1998 to 1999 by Heidinger et al (2000) documented the spawning cycles of *Dorosoma* spp. Presumably, this taxon included representatives of both threadfin shad and gizzard shad. In fact, the representation of multiple species by these larval taxonomic groupings may, in part, also explain the presence of multiple spawning peaks in 1998 and 1999 in each zone of the lake (Table 6-5).

Figures 3-1 and 3-2 summarize the length frequency data for threadfin shad and gizzard shad based on electrofishing in 2010. Sample sizes for gizzard shad are small and do not allow for substantive discussion regarding recruitment. Catch rates of both gizzard shad and threadfin shad from 1998 and 1999 were also variable (Heidinger et al, 2000), reflecting the pelagic, schooling nature of these species and the inefficiencies of sampling gear. However, the sample size for threadfin shad is more representative from the upper (unheated) end of the lake and reflects good recruitment of threadfin shad in Lake of Egypt. Substantial catch rates of gizzard shad were also obtained during impingement studies in the lower (heated) end of the lake from 2005 to 2007 and demonstrate good recruitment of young of the year individuals.

Based on the above discussion, it is evident that the thermal effluents of the Marion Power Plant result in higher water temperatures and earlier spawning within the heated (northern) reaches of Lake of Egypt. However, based on similar catch rates of young of the year threadfin shad, the thermal regime does not appear to adversely affect the recruitment of

this species into the population. It is likely that gizzard shad, while not well represented in collections from Lake of Egypt, is similarly not adversely affected.

### Largemouth Bass

Optimal spawning temperatures for largemouth bass range from 60 to 75°F (Heidinger 1975) and such temperatures within Illinois typically occur in May and June (Smith 2002). At 60-67°F, largemouth bass eggs hatch in 4 to 5 days (Wallus and Simon, 2008). Life stage duration for the larval stage is 19 days (Fishbase, 2012d).

Early spawning by largemouth bass has been documented in other regional lakes that receive thermal effluents. Lake Sangchris, also located in central Illinois, receives thermal effluent from the Kincaid Generating Station (Larimore and Tranquilli, 1981). During 1975-1977, spawning in Lake Sangchris occurred at 59-70°F in early April to mid-May in the heated area of the lake and late April to mid-May in other areas. Additionally, Tranquilli and Perry (1981) used the maturation stage of the gonads of female largemouth bass, as well as their gonadosomatic index (GSI: gonad weight relative to total body weight), to estimate spawning dates in Coffeen Lake. Earlier spawning behavior in Coffeen Lake relative to Lake Sangchris was attributed to the warmer temperatures in Coffeen Lake. Tranquilli and Perry (1981) also demonstrated spatial dissimilarity in largemouth bass spawning within Coffeen Lake. Specifically, in the heated, eastern arm of the lake, largemouth bass began spawning in mid or late March, but did not begin spawning in the western arm until late April or May.

Monitored temperatures during the spring at Lake of Egypt (from 1998 and 1999) demonstrated earlier lake warming that reached optimal near surface spawning temperatures of largemouth bass within the lower (northern) portion of the lake in March in both years (Table 6-4). The differential warming of the lake by thermal effluent resulted in optimal spawning temperatures lagging within the upper (southern) portion of the lake until April.

Prior ichthyoplankton studies performed at Lake of Egypt from 1998 to 1999 by Heidinger et al (2000) provides some information about the spawning cycles of largemouth bass. Similar to the findings reported by Tranquilli and Perry (1981), spawning within the heated regions of Lake of Egypt occurred somewhat earlier than within the unheated portions of the lake. Hatching temperatures within Lake of Egypt were calculated to be between 63 and 92°F in 1998 and between 63 and 89°F in 1999, and larvae were evident in collections from late April through early June (Heidinger et al, 2000).

Based on results of electrofishing in 2010, recruitment between heated and unheated reaches of Lake of Egypt appears to be similar (Figure 3-5). Heidinger et al (2000) also noted that recruitment of largemouth bass in Lake of Egypt was relatively similar between 1998 and 1999.

Based on the above discussion, it is evident that the thermal effluents of the Marion Power Plant result in higher water temperatures and earlier spawning within the heated (northern) reaches of Lake of Egypt. However, based on similar catch rates of young of the year and

Age I fish, the thermal regime does not appear to adversely affect the recruitment of largemouth bass into the population.

**Table 6-4. Summary of Reproductive Temperature Characteristics of Selected RIS in Lake of Egypt.**

Year	(Published Spawning Temperature °F)	Initial Date Spawning Temperatures Achieved		Hatching Range Temperature (F) <sup>1</sup>	
		Zone 1 (Lower)	Zone 2 (Upper)	Beginning Temp	Ending Temp
1998	Sunfishes (67-80)	April 21	May 9	67	91
	Gizzard shad (61-70)	March 16	April 21	63	92
	Largemouth Bass (60-75)	March 16	April 21	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>
	Channel catfish (70)	April 21	May 9	NA <sup>3</sup>	NA <sup>3</sup>
	White and black crappie (60-68)	March 16	May 9	NA <sup>3</sup>	NA <sup>3</sup>
1999	Sunfishes (67-80)	April 27	May 7	74	87
	Gizzard shad (61-70)	April 1	April 13	63	89
	Largemouth Bass (60-75)	March 14	April 13	NA <sup>2</sup>	NA <sup>2</sup>
	Channel catfish (70)	April 27	May 7	NA <sup>3</sup>	NA <sup>3</sup>
	White and black crappie (60-68)	April 1	April 13	NA <sup>3</sup>	NA <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hatching temperatures derived by linear regression

<sup>2</sup>Hatching range temperatures fall within the range of gizzard shad for that year

<sup>3</sup>Not calculated

Source: derived from Heidinger et al, 2000

**Table 6-5. Summary of Reported Hatch Characteristics of Selected RIS in Lake of Egypt.**

Year	Taxon	Initial Hatching Peak		No. Principal Hatching Peaks <sup>1</sup>	
		Zone 1 (Lower)	Zone 2 (Upper)	Zone 1 (Lower)	Zone 2 (Upper)
1998	<i>Lepomis</i>	5/15	5/18	2	5
	<i>Dorosoma</i>	4/06	4/17	4	3
1999	<i>Lepomis</i>	5/06	5/22	3	6
	<i>Dorosoma</i>	4/11	4/12	3	4

<sup>1</sup>Spawning peaks and temperatures derived by linear regression

Source: Modified from Heidinger et al, 2000

### Bluegill

Optimal spawning temperatures for bluegill range from 67 to 80<sup>o</sup> F (Cornish and Welke 2004) and spawning in Illinois is similar to that of other *Lepomis* spp. whereby spawning occurs in May and continues into the summer over excavated nests (Smith 2002). Optimal temperatures for successful embryo development are 72-81 °F, and development will occur from 72-93 °F (Stuber et al, 1982). At 67 °F, bluegill eggs hatch in 2 to 3 days (Wallus and Simon, 2008). Life stage duration for the larval stage is 30 days (Fishbase, 2012)

Prior ichthyoplankton studies performed at Lake of Egypt from 1998 to 1999 by Heidinger et al (2000) documented the spawning cycles of *Lepomis* spp. Bluegill is likely to be the dominant *Lepomis* species, although other species may reasonably be expected to be present. In fact, the representation of multiple species by these larval taxonomic groupings may also in part, explain the presence of a large number of spawning peaks, particularly of *Lepomis*, particularly in Zone 2 (Table 6-5). However, *Lepomis* taxa are also known to spawn cyclically over the course of the season, thus also contributing to peaks in larval abundance. Heidinger et al (2000) estimated that initial spawning within Lake of Egypt occurred at 67°F in 1998 and at 74°F in 1999. Optimal spawning temperatures for bluegill were ranged from 67-91°F in 1998 and from 74-87°F in 1999 (Table 6-4). These temperatures were reached within the lower (northern) portion of the lake in April and within the upper portion of the Lake in early May (Table 6-4). However, due to differential warming of the lake from the thermal effluent, optimal spawning temperatures lagged within the upper (southern) portion of the lake until May.

Based on results of electrofishing in 2010, recruitment between heated and unheated reaches of Lake of Egypt appears to be similar (Figure 3-4). Heidinger et al (2000) also noted that recruitment of bluegill in Lake of Egypt was good and relatively similar between 1998 and 1999.

Based on the above discussion, it is evident that the thermal effluents of the Marion Power Plant result in higher water temperatures and earlier spawning of bluegill within the heated (northern) reaches of Lake of Egypt. However, based on similar catch rates of young of the year and Age I fish, the thermal regime does not appear to adversely affect the recruitment of bluegill into the population.

#### Channel Catfish

Channel catfish spawns in late spring and early summer (generally late May through mid-July) when temperatures reach about 70°F. At 67 to 85°F, channel catfish eggs hatch in 4 to 5 days (Simon and Wallus, 2004). The optimal temperature range for growth of channel catfish fry is 84-86°F (McMahon and Terrell, 1982)

Optimal spawning temperatures for channel catfish within the lower (northern) portion of the lake were reached in April based on monitored temperatures during the spring at Lake of Egypt (from 1998 and 1999 (Table 6-4). Due to differential warming of the lake from the thermal effluent, optimal spawning temperatures lagged within the upper (southern) portion of the lake until May. Prior ichthyoplankton studies performed at Lake of Egypt from 1998 to 1999 by Heidinger et al (2000) did not document the spawning cycles of channel catfish. However, based on the differential temperature patterns within the lake, it is likely that spawning in the lower (heated) region of the lake was advanced relative to that in the upper (unheated) sections.

Electrofishing surveys have been conducted as part of this assessment and by Heidinger et al (2000). Notably, catch rates for channel catfish in 2010 were similar as those reported

from 1998 and 1999 and were characteristically low and composed of larger (older) individuals. It was concluded by Heidinger et al (2000) that the lack of smaller fish in the 1999 samples was not attributable to recruitment failure since younger specimens taken in the fall of 1998 were also represented in the spring of 1999. While complete life history, recruitment and growth information for channel catfish is relatively lacking within Lake of Egypt, the apparent absence of effects on recruitment seem to point to the absence of thermal effects on this species.

#### White and Black Crappie

Both white and black crappie spawn in late spring and early summer (generally late May through mid-July) when temperatures exceed 60°F (white crappie) or 64°F (black crappie) (Wallus and Simon, 2008). At 65 to 67°F, white crappie eggs hatch in approximately 2 days whereas black crappie hatches in 2 to 3 days at 65°C (Wallus and Simon, 2008).

Optimal spawning temperatures for crappie within the lower (northern) portion of the lake were reached in March or the first week of April based on monitored temperatures during the spring at Lake of Egypt (from 1998 and 1999 (Table 6-4). Due to differential warming of the lake from the thermal effluent, optimal spawning temperatures lagged within the upper (southern) portion of the lake until early May. Prior ichthyoplankton studies performed at Lake of Egypt from 1998 to 1999 by Heidinger et al (2000) did not document the spawning cycles of crappie. However, based on the differential temperature patterns within the lake, it is likely that spawning in the lower (heated) region of the lake is advanced relative to that in the upper (unheated) sections.

Electrofishing surveys have been conducted as part of this assessment and by Heidinger et al (2000). Notably, catch rates for crappie were generally low and somewhat variable in both studies. Complete life history, recruitment and growth information for crappie is relatively lacking within Lake of Egypt and potential direct inferences regarding thermal effects on recruitment are limited. However, a somewhat bimodal spawning cycle in the lower and upper portions of the lake are likely to be supported by an accompanying productivity of organisms within lower trophic levels. Further, the apparent successful recruitment of other centrarchid taxa (bluegill, largemouth bass, etc.) which have similar spawning seasons provides indirect evidence of the absence of significant thermal effects on this species.

#### **6.2.5 Adaptability and Available Refugia**

The fish community in the Lake of Egypt consists primarily of species that are tolerant of warm summer temperatures. Species-specific studies of temperature tolerance suggest that most fish in the lake would rarely encounter their temperature maxima. Moreover, these maxima likely underestimate the tolerances of these species, as they are derived from laboratory studies, and that in the field organisms can adapt and acclimate to higher values (ASA, 2008).

Additionally, there is evidence that fish can recover from short-term thermal stress by utilizing lower temperature refuge areas within the system when necessary (Coutant, 2003). There is a large amount of habitat available as thermal refuge in the Lake of Egypt. Considering only the



surface area, the mixing zone is only a 26-acre subset of an approximately 2,300-acre lake. Resident populations can simply avoid areas that are above their temperature tolerance. Evidence of this behavior was observed in July and August 2010 electrofishing surveys, where no individuals were captured in the area immediately surrounding the discharge structure. There is also an available refuge with greater depth, i.e., temperatures are 3 to 7°F lower in the bottom half of the water column as compared to the surface (see Sections 2.3 and 3.4).

Past and current studies have demonstrated that fish populations in the Lake of Egypt are healthy. Sport species such as largemouth bass, bluegill, and redear sunfish are abundant and generally in good condition. The prevalence of external abnormalities on largemouth bass appears to be more associated with angling pressure rather than thermal effects.

### **6.2.6 Beneficial Thermal Effects**

Higher, stable water temperatures in winter and early spring are hypothesized to promote earlier spawning, improved survival, and increased growth/development in the early life stages of several species, notably largemouth bass (ASA, 2008). For this species, earlier spawning and a prolonged growing season may result in faster growth, in particular to the size at which piscivory begins, and may lead to improved overwinter survival (ASA, 2008). For channel catfish and bluegill, higher temperatures may extend the spawning seasons and promote growth throughout the year. Accelerated development to the less temperature-sensitive juvenile life stages may likewise promote overwinter survival for these species. Anecdotal evidence to support the presence of early spawning for several species in the Lake of Egypt was indicated by the presence of young-of-the-year juveniles in seine samples collected in early spring as part of 316(b) studies (MACTEC, 2007).

Threadfin shad is a valuable forage species for several game species (Heidinger and Imboden, 1974). One of the limitations to its successful establishment in Illinois lakes was its inability to overwinter under normal temperature regimes. At the recommendation of Dr. Roy Heidinger (formerly of SIU-Carbondale), threadfin shad were stocked in Lake of Egypt in the 1970s to provide a more effective forage species (see Section 3.1). Since that initial stocking event, the warmer conditions in the Lake of Egypt have sustained the population of threadfin shad by minimizing winter mortality. Thus the forage base, particularly for largemouth bass, is preserved between years, adding to the overall condition and health of the fish community.

### **6.2.7 Potential for Fish Kills**

Fish kills associated with elevated water temperatures can occur under conditions of high elevated temperatures (often associated with lower dissolved oxygen saturation levels) coupled with habitat limitations that prevent escape and avoidance. Mortality may occur for a given species when temperatures in the water body exceed the species' short term maximum temperatures AND where there are no, or limited, areas of thermal refuge available. Small, closed systems with little depth or habitat heterogeneity are particularly vulnerable to periodic fish kills. Such conditions are not present in the Lake of Egypt.

The fish populations of the lake, as reflected by the RIS, are adapted to warm-water conditions. For the majority of the year, water temperature conditions are well below their temperature tolerances. Moreover, during the periods of highest lake temperatures, there is an abundance

of habitats that act as thermal refugia. Fish can migrate laterally to other areas of the lake, or can move downward in the water column to avoid stressful conditions. Additionally, as demonstrated in Section 6.2.4, such refuge areas are large relative to the areas that may present unfavorable conditions for a given species.

Fish kills can also occur in the winter under conditions of prolonged low water temperatures. The only species among the Lake of Egypt fish community vulnerable to mortality from prolonged low water temperatures is the threadfin shad and gizzard shad, with the threadfin shad being more sensitive to prolonged low water temperatures. The warmer water temperatures produced from the plant discharge sustain these shad species by minimizing winter mortality. If an un-planned outage occurred at the Marion Power Plant for a prolonged period of time during the winter, mortality could occur to shad species as a result of the decreased water temperatures. In order to guard against this potential scenario, SIPC conducts planned outages for plant maintenance in the spring and fall of each year to minimize the chance of an un-planned outage. Thereby, reducing the probability of temperature induced winter mortality in threadfin shad and gizzard shad.

Finally, the likelihood of thermal-induced fish kills in a cooling lake is also indicated by the history of fish kills. In the Lake of Egypt there have been no past incidences of summer fish kills. This again indicates that community members have adapted to the changing physical conditions. The absence of historical thermal-related fish kills, combined with no anticipated increase in thermal loading, suggest that future fish kills are extremely unlikely.

### **6.3 Continuing Efforts**

SIPC stocked threadfin shad into the Lake of Egypt in 1971 in an attempt to expand the forage base of the system (Heidinger, 1977). This has resulted in improvements in fish condition and overall fishery quality (Heidinger, 1990). The utility has also stocked species such as walleye, hybrid striped bass, inland silverside, and black crappie with the intention of improving the lake's fishery (Table 6-6). SIPC will remain committed to the support and enhancement of the Lake of Egypt ecosystem through stocking programs and lake management.

**Table 6-6. Summary of Fish Species Stocked in Lake of Egypt**

Year	SIPC Sponsorship	Fish Stocked	Number
1971	Yes	Threadfin shad	2,300 adults
1985	Yes	Walleye	8,000 4"-6" fingerlings
1986	Yes	Hybrid Striped Bass	250,000 fry 500 1"-2" fingerlings
1987	Yes	Hybrid Striped Bass	15,000 1.5"-2" fingerlings
1987	Yes	Inland silverside	500 adults
1988	Yes	Hybrid Striped Bass	15,000 1"-2" fingerlings
1989	Yes	Hybrid Striped Bass	15,000 1"-2" fingerlings
1990	Yes	Hybrid Striped Bass	15,000 1"-2" fingerlings
2008	Yes	Black Crappie	15,000 2"-3" fingerlings
2009	Yes	Black Crappie	20,000 2"-3" fingerlings
2010	Yes	Black Crappie	20,000 2"-3" fingerlings

Source: Heidinger, 1990; SIPC unpublished.

Prepared by/Date: WJE/1-27-12  
Checked by/Date: SRC/1-27-12

## 7.0 Summary of the Path Forward

The proposed thermal limit should be based on historical data, anticipated operating conditions, multiple scientific lines of evidence, and also viewed in relation to other Illinois artificial cooling lakes. The following sections provide this discussion.

### 7.1 Comparison with Other Illinois Cooling Lakes

To assess the general regulatory environment in Illinois, we compared the thermal limitations at the Lake of Egypt with those listed in the NPDES permits of several other Illinois power plants with cooling lakes. At three of these plants, Baldwin, Dresden, and LaSalle County, temperature limitations on the thermal effluent are the same as for the Marion Plant on the Lake of Egypt. However, the locations where water temperatures are measured for the three plants are in the rivers receiving water from the cooling lakes. For the other five plants, water temperatures are measured at some point in the lake itself. But mixing zones comparable to that of the Marion Plant (i.e., 26 acres in area) were only established for the Coffeen Plant and Newton Plant cooling lakes. The temperature restrictions for the Newton and Coffeen cooling water lakes were also noted to be much less restrictive than those for SIPC's Marion Plant on the Lake of Egypt.

### 7.2 Summarization of the Fish Community Status

The following key points summarize the existing status of the fishery of Lake of Egypt and the findings of this report with respect to the proposed thermal limits and their effect on sustaining the balanced and indigenous community:

- *Game Fish RIS Status.* Observed temperatures outside the mixing zone at the lower end of the lake were within the tolerance limits of RIS such as channel catfish, bluegill, and largemouth bass when the plant was at full capacity. Based on modeling results, proposed thermal limits under normal late summer weather conditions would only result in avoidance or adaptive behaviors in localized areas within the lower lake.
- *Threadfin Shad Support.* Existing and proposed thermal limits will continue to sustain threadfin shad overwintering survival which will benefit the food base of largemouth bass and other predators.
- *Community Stability.* The resident fish community has been stable in terms of composition and abundance over the past 13 years. Proposed thermal limits are expected to sustain similar community composition and abundance such that its stability will not be adversely affected.
- *Habitat Availability.* There is abundant habitat available, both horizontally throughout the lake and vertically in the water column, as refuge from localized sub-optimum thermal conditions. These habitat refuge areas will not change under the proposed thermal limits.

Therefore, these patterns indicate that the thermal conditions in the Lake of Egypt have been protective of a balanced indigenous community. Moreover, the higher water temperature thresholds proposed as part of the requested site-specific rule revision will continue to be protective of the balanced indigenous community.

### 7.3 Suggested Mixing Zone and Compliance Monitoring Location

Based on recent discussions held with the IEPA it is recommended that the 26-acre mixing zone be maintained as indicated on Figures 5-10 to 5-13. The eastern (downstream) boundary of this area generally corresponds to the 101°F isotherm as predicted in the summer stressed condition modeling scenario. Additionally, it is recommended that the monitoring point for compliance be established at the edge of the mixing zone boundary. Establishment of the compliance monitoring point at this location is technically more feasible than other locations within the open lake and provides a reasonable measure of security for installed equipment.

### 7.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

Data from previous studies and the 2010 study indicate that the Lake of Egypt has historically supported and continues to support a high quality sport fishery. Fish populations in the lake have adapted to the condition of warmer water, and have ample areas available for thermal refuge. Increased thermal loading associated with the operation of a new boiler in 2003 has not negatively affected the fish community, and SIPC does not intend to increase generating capacity in the future. Moreover, stable, higher water temperatures in late winter and spring likely promote growth and development for most species, and support the survival of threadfin shad, an important subset of the forage base.

Results of field measurements and hydrodynamic modeling demonstrated that temperatures well above the current NPDES limit (90°F) are routinely present in the summer at the mixing zone boundary. Indeed, ambient lake temperatures frequently exceed this threshold in the warmest periods of the year. Based upon the hydrodynamic modeling performed for the Lake of Egypt (including spring and fall periods), and the results of the above biothermal assessment, we recommend that the thermal limitations in the NPDES permit for SIPC's Marion Power Plant be changed from the current conditions of:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums (60°F from December through March; 90°F from April through November) by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period, and
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.
- Maximum temperature rise above natural temperature must not exceed 5°F (2.8°C).

to:

- Lake temperatures at the edge of the mixing zone shall not exceed the following maximums by more than 1 percent of the hours in a 12-month period:
  - 72°F from December through March;
  - 90°F from April through May;
  - 101°F from June through September; and
  - 91°F from October through November
- At no time shall the water temperature at the edge of the mixing zone exceed these maximums by more than 3°F.

The rationale for proposing these revised standards is as follows:

1. The proposed change would not alter the Lake of Egypt's existing thermal regime (i.e., natural lake stratification). The Marion Station's thermal discharge affects a small percentage of the 2,300-acre lake.
2. Assessments of the effects of the proposed changes on representative important species indicate that under normal summer conditions, habitats would be within thermal tolerance limits throughout the lake. Under a modeled condition that simulated rarely-expected extreme conditions, there were still extensive areas in the lake that fish could utilize as thermal refugia.
3. Surveys from 2010 and earlier years indicate that fish populations in the Lake of Egypt have adapted to warm temperatures. Species composition and abundance estimated by these surveys suggest that the populations are healthy and self-sustaining.
4. Potentially beneficial effects include higher, stable water temperatures in the late winter and early spring that may promote earlier spawning, improved survival, and increased growth and development of the early life stages of several species, notably largemouth bass. Additionally, the warmer conditions in the Lake of Egypt almost certainly enhance the population of threadfin shad by minimizing winter mortality.
5. Fish kills in the Lake of Egypt have not occurred historically, and are not likely to occur as a result of these proposed standards. For the majority of the year, water temperature conditions are well below the temperature tolerance thresholds of the representative important species. Even during the periods of highest lake temperatures, there is an abundance of thermal refugia. Fish can migrate laterally to other areas of the lake, or can move downward in the water column, to avoid stressful conditions.
6. The five other biotic categories considered in USEPA's Technical Guidance Manual are either: (a) unaffected (or beneficially affected) by the heated effluent – such as submerged aquatic vegetation and wildlife, or (b) consist of species that are not threatened/endangered, of commercial importance (macroinvertebrates and shellfish), and/or generally have short life spans and reproduce rapidly (phytoplankton and zooplankton). It is reasonable to conclude that the plant's discharge will cause no appreciable harm to these resident communities in the lake.

7. The point of compliance monitoring is recommended to be at the the edge of the mixing zone.

## 8.0 Literature Cited

- ASA Analysis and Communication, Inc. (ASA). 2008. Evaluation of potential adverse impacts from revised site-specific thermal standards in May and October for Coffeen Lake. Unpublished report to Ameren Corporation, St. Louis, MO.
- Brown, H.W. 1974. Handbook of the effects of temperature on some North American fishes. American Electric Power Service Corp., Canton, OH.
- Brungs, W.S. and B.R. Jones. 1977. Temperature criteria for freshwater fish: protocols and procedures. EPA-600/3-77-061. Environmental Research Laboratory, Ecological Resources Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, MN.
- Carlander, K.D. 1977. Handbook of freshwater fishery biology, Volume 2. Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, IA.
- Cornish, M. and K. Welke. 2004. Bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*). Pp. 177-180 in: J.M. Pitlo, Jr. and J.L. Rasmussen (eds.) Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee Fisheries Compendium, 3rd edition. Rock Island, IL.
- Coutant, C.C. 2003. Proceedings from the EPRI workshop on 316(a) issues: Technical and regulatory considerations. Columbus, OH. October 16-17, 2003.
- Edinger, J.E. 2002. Waterbody hydrodynamic and water quality monitoring. ASCE Press, Reston, VA. 215 pp.
- Edwards, E.A., D.A. Krieger, G. Gebhart, and O.E. Maughan. 1982. Habitat suitability index models: White crappie. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-82/10.7.
- Edwards, E.A., D.A. Krieger, M. Backett, and O.E. Maughan. 1982. Habitat suitability index models: Black crappie. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-82/10.6.
- Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc. (ESE). 1988. Biological evaluation of predicted thermal discharge in Clinton Lake. Report to Illinois Power Co., Decatur, IL.
- Environmental Science & Engineering, Inc. (ESE). 1995. The Upper Illinois Waterway study interim report: 1994 aquatic macrophyte investigation and habitat assessment. Report to Commonwealth Edison Co., Chicago, IL.
- Fields, R., S.S. Lowe, C. Kaminski, G.S. Whitt, and D.P. Philipp. 1987. Critical and chronic thermal maxima of northern and Florida largemouth bass and their reciprocal F1 and F2 hybrids. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 116: 856-863.
- Fishbase. 2010. <http://www.fishbase.org>
- Fishbase, 2012a. Summary for *Dorosoma petenense* larvae Threadfin shad, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on November 28, 2012.



- Fishbase, 2012b. Summary for *Dorosoma cepedianum* larvae American gizzard shad, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on November 28, 2012.
- Fishbase, 2012c. Summary for *Lepomis macrochirus* larvae Bluegill, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on November 28, 2012.
- Fishbase, 2012d. Summary for *Micropterus salmoides* larvae Largemouth black bass, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on November 28, 2012.
- Fishbase, 2013a. Summary for *Pomoxis annularis* White crappie, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on September 6, 2013.
- Fishbase, 2013b. Summary for *Pomoxis nigromaculatus* Black crappie, available at: <http://www.fishbase.com>, Accessed on September 6, 2013..
- Hayhoe, K, J. VanDorn, V. Naik, & D. Wuebbles. 2009. Climate Change in the Midwest – Projections of Future Temperature and Precipitation..A publication of the US Global Change Research Program. Accessed at [www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/global\\_warming/midwest-climate-impacts.pdf](http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/global_warming/midwest-climate-impacts.pdf)
- Heidinger, R.C. 1975. Life history and biology of the largemouth bass. Pp. 11 – 20 in: R.H. Stroud and H. Clepper (eds.) Black bass biology and management. Sport Fishing Institute. Washington, D.C.
- Heidinger, R. C. 1977. Potential of the threadfin shad as a forage fish in Midwestern power cooling reservoirs. Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science. 70(1):15-25.
- Heidinger, R. C. 1988. Draft and Final Reports. Current status of sport fish populations in Lake of Egypt. Southern Illinois University Fisheries Research Cooperative Laboratory.
- Heidinger, R.C. 1990. Status of sport fish populations in Lake of Egypt and management recommendations. Unpublished report by Southern Illinois University – Carbondale Fisheries Research Laboratory.
- Heidinger, R.C. 2007. Status of sport fish populations in Lake of Egypt (1964-2007). Unpublished report by Southern Illinois University – Carbondale Fisheries Research Laboratory.
- Heidinger, R.C. and F. Imboden. 1974. Reproductive potential of young-of-the-year threadfin shad (*Dorosoma petenense*) in southern Illinois lakes. Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science 67:397-401.
- Heidinger, R.C., R. Sheehan, and R.C. Brooks. 2000. AmerenCIPS Newton Lake Project, 15 August 1997 – 30 August 1999 (Volume II). Unpublished report by Southern Illinois University – Carbondale Fisheries Research Laboratory (June 2000).

- Hubert, W.A. 1999. Biology and management of channel catfish. Pp. 3 – 22 in: E.R. Irwin, W.A. Hubert, C.F. Rabeni, H.L. Schramm, Jr., and T. Coon (eds.) *Catfish 2000: Proceedings of the International Ictalurid Symposium*. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.
- Kramer, R.H. and L.L. Smith, Jr. 1960. Formation of year classes in largemouth bass. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 91:29-41.
- MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (MACTEC). 2007. Power Plant 316(b) Impingement Mortality Characterization Report. Unpublished report for Southern Illinois Power Cooperative, Marion, Illinois (December 2007).
- McMahon, T. E., and J. W. Terrell. 1982. Habitat suitability index models: Channel catfish. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-82/10.2. 29 pp.
- Merriner, J.V. 1971. Development of intergenetic centrarchid hybrid embryos. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 100:611-618.
- Moran, R.L. 1981a. Aquatic macrophytes in Lake Sangchris. Pp. 394-412 in R.W. Larimore and J.A. Tranquilli (eds.). *The Lake Sangchris study: Case History of an Illinois Cooling Lake*. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Moran, R.L. 1981b. Phytoplankton dynamics in a cooling-water reservoir. Pp. 320-341 in R.W. Larimore and J.A. Tranquilli (eds.) *The Lake Sangchris study: case history of an Illinois cooling lake*. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Monirian, J., Z. Sutphin, and C. Myrick. 2010. Effects of holding temperature and handling stress on the upper thermal tolerance of threadfin shad (*Dorosoma petenense*). *Journal of Fish Biology* 76:1329-1342.
- Pflieger, W.L. 1997. *The fishes of Missouri*, revised edition. Missouri Department of Conservation, Jefferson City, MO. 372 pp.
- Pope, K.L., Willis D.W. 1998. Early life history and recruitment of black crappie (*Pomoxis nigromaculatus*) in two South Dakota waters. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 1998: 7: 56-68.
- Reutter, J.M. and C.E. Herdendorff. 1976. Thermal discharge from a nuclear power plant: predicted effects on Lake Erie fish. *Ohio Journal of Science* 26: 39-45.
- Sanderson, G.C. and W.L. Anderson. 1981. Waterfowl studies at Lake Sangchris, 1973-1977. Pp. 656-690 in R.W. Larimore and J.A. Tranquilli (eds.) *The Lake Sangchris study: case history of an Illinois cooling lake*. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Simon, T. and R. Wallus. 2004. Reproductive biology and early life history of fishes in the Ohio River drainage, Ictaluridae—Catfish and Madtoms. Volume 3. CRC Press, Washington, D.C.
- Southern Illinois Power Cooperative (SIPC). 2004. Proposal for information collection – Marion Power Plant. Report submitted in compliance with Section 316(b) Phase II rules, Marion, IL.

- Smith, P.W. 2002. The Fishes of Illinois. University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago. 314 pp.
- Stuber, R. J., G. Gebhart, and O. E. Maughan. 1982. Habitat suitability index models: Bluegill. U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-82/10.8. 26 pp.
- Tranquilli, J.A. and L.A. Perry. 1981. Spawning periodicity and fecundity of fishes inhabiting heated and ambient areas of Coffeen Lake. Chapter 16 In: Tranquilli, J.A. and R.W. Larimore (eds). Final report to Central Illinois Public Service Company. Part I: Environmental studies of Coffeen Lake, a thermally-altered reservoir. Illinois Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois. July 1981.
- University of California – Davis (UCD). 2010. California fish website: threadfin shad. <http://ucce.usdavis.edu/datastore/datastorereview/showpage.cfm?usernumber=100&surveynumber=241>. Accessed October 15, 2010.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1977. Interagency 316(a) technical guidance manual (draft). Office of Water Enforcement, Washington, DC.
- Waite, S. 1981. Effects of Cooling Lake Perturbations upon the Zooplankton Dynamics of Lake Sangchris. Pp. 342-357 in R.W. Larimore and J.A. Tranquilli (eds.). The Lake Sangchris study: Case History of an Illinois Cooling Lake. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Wallus, R. and Simon, T. 2008. Reproductive biology and early life history of fishes in the Ohio River drainage, Elasmobranchia and Centrarchidae. Volume 6. CRC Press, Washington. D.C.
- Webb, D.W. 1981. The Benthic Macroinvertebrates from the Cooling Lake of a Coal-Fired Electric Generating Station. Pp. 358-377 in R.W. Larimore and J.A. Tranquilli (eds.) The Lake Sangchris study: case history of an Illinois cooling lake. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Wrenn, W.B. 1975. Seasonal occurrence and diversity of fish in a heated discharge channel, Tennessee River. Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Southeast Game Fish Commission.
- Wright State University (WSU). 1995. Reviews of the literature concerning: 1. Effects of temperature on freshwater fish; 2. Effects on freshwater biota from interactions of temperature and chemicals; and 3. Effects of turbidity and barge traffic on aquatic ecosystems. Report for Commonwealth Edison Company, Chicago, IL.
- Yoder, C.O. and J.R. Gammon. 1976. Seasonal distribution and abundance of Ohio River fishes at the J.M. Stuart Electric Generating Station. Pp. 284-295 in: G.W. Esch and R.W. McFarlane (eds.), Thermal Ecology II. ERDA Symposium Series #40.
- Yoder, C.O. and E.T. Rankin. 2005. Temperature Criteria Options for the Lower Des Plaines River, Final Report *submitted to* U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA November 23, 2005. Center for Applied Bioassessment and Biocriteria..

Yoder, C.O., B.J. Armitage, and E.T. Rankin. 2006. Re-evaluation of the Technical Justification for Existing Ohio River Mainstem Temperature Criteria. Midwest Biodiversity Institute, Inc.

# Figures





Figure 1-1: Map of Lake of Egypt Showing Location of SIPC's Marion Plant


0 0.25 0.5  
Miles



Created by: CGS Approved by: WJE

Checked by: SBM October 22, 2010






Lake of Egypt

Discharge



CWIS



DRAWN BY:	CGS
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	1-27-11
Revisions:	
PROJECT NO.:	3250065201

Figure 1-2. Close-up of Northwest Section of the Lake of Egypt Showing Intake and Discharge Areas







DRAWN BY:	MCB
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	4-26-12
PROJECT NO.:	3250115515



**Figure 3-1. Length Frequency Histograms for Threadfin Shad from the Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010.**







DRAWN BY:	MCB
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	4-26-12
PROJECT NO.:	3250115515





**Figure 3-2. Length Frequency Histograms for Gizzard Shad from the Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010.**



DRAWN BY:	MCB
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	4-26-12
PROJECT NO.:	3250115515





**Figure 3-3. Length Frequency Histograms for Channel Catfish from the Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010.**



DRAWN BY:	MCB
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	4-26-12
PROJECT NO.:	3250115515




**Figure 3-4. Length Frequency Histograms for Bluegill from the Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010.**




DRAWN BY:	MCB
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	4-26-12
PROJECT NO.:	3250115515



**Figure 3-5. Length Frequency Histograms for Largemouth Bass from the Upper and Lower Portions of the Lake of Egypt, Summer 2010.**



Lower Lake Area



Upper Lake Area


Figure 4-1: Map of Lake of Egypt Showing Locations of Electrofishing Zones in Upper and Lower Portions of Lake



Created by: CGS    Approved by: WJE

Checked by: SBM    January 17, 2012

### Lake of Egypt - Segment 1




Heidinger et al, 2000

DRAWN BY:	CGS
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	10/15/2010
PROJECT NO.:	3250065201


Figure 5-1. 1998 Lake of Egypt Temperature in the Vicinity of the CWIS.





DRAWN BY:	CGS
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	10/15/2010
PROJECT NO.:	3250065201


Figure 5-2. Water Temperature near the CWIS, February 2005 through May 2007




DRAWN BY:	CGS
CHECKED BY:	WJE
DATE:	10/15/2010
PROJECT NO.:	3250065201

Figure 5-3. Dissolved Oxygen Concentration near the CWIS, February 2005 through May 2007












-Ambient temperature of 83 F was obtained from T1.  
 -63 acres 5 F greater than ambient temperature.















Figure 5-10: Hydrothermal Model Output  
 Summer Period Normal  
 Condition (April-November)



- Legend**
- Mixing Zone
  - Summer Normal Temps
- Temp F
- 84 - 85
  - 85 - 86
  - 86 - 87
  - 87 - 88
  - 88 - 89
  - 89 - 90
  - 90 - 91
  - 91 - 92
  - 92 - 93
  - 93 - 94
  - 94 - 95
  - 95 - 96
  - 96 - 97
  - 97 - 98
  - 98 - 99
  - 99 - 100
  - 100 - 101
  - 101 - 102
  - 102 - 103
  - 103 - 104
  - 104 - 105
  - 105 - 106
  - 106 - 107
  - 107 - 108
  - 108 - 109

0 0.25 0.5  
 Miles




Created by: BSM Approved by: WJE

Checked by: MCB Date: 2/14/2013



Figure 5-11: Hydrothermal Model Output  
 Summer Period Stressed  
 Condition (April-November)




**Legend**

Mixing Zone

**Temp F**


- 90.1 - 91
- 91.1 - 92
- 92.1 - 93
- 93.1 - 94
- 94.1 - 95
- 95.1 - 96
- 96.1 - 97
- 97.1 - 98
- 98.1 - 99



Created by: BSM Approved by: WJE

Checked by: MCB Date: 10/4/2013









Figure 5-13: Hydrothermal Model Output  
Winter Period Maximum  
Condition (December-March)

**Legend**

Mixing Zone

**Temp F**


- 60.0 - 61
- 61.1 - 62
- 62.1 - 63
- 63.1 - 64
- 64.1 - 65
- 65.1 - 66
- 66.1 - 67
- 67.1 - 68
- 68.1 - 69



Created by: BSM Approved by: WJE  
Checked by: MCB Date: 10/4/2013

### "Normal" Conditions


A



A'



### "Maximum" Conditions

A




A'

Figure 5-14: Results of Summer "Normal" and "Stressed" Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section A



Created by: BSM    Approved by: WJE  
Checked by: MCB    Date: 10/4/2013

## "Normal" Conditions



## "Maximum" Conditions





Figure 5-15: Results of Summer "Normal" and "Stressed" Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section B

- Legend**
- Transect B - Summer Period Normal  
Temp F
- 89.4 - 90
  - 90.1 - 91
  - 91.1 - 92
  - 92.1 - 93
  - 93.1 - 94
  - 94.1 - 95
  - 95.1 - 96
  - 96.1 - 97
  - 97.1 - 98
- Transect B - Summer Period Stressed  
Temp F
- 92.1 - 93
  - 93.1 - 94
  - 94.1 - 95
  - 95.1 - 96
  - 96.1 - 97
  - 97.1 - 98
  - 98.1 - 99
  - 99.1 - 100




Created by: BSM    Approved by: WJE  
Checked by: MCB    Date: 10/4/2013

Figure 5-16: Results of Winter "Normal" and "Maximum" Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section A


### "Normal" Conditions

A A'




### "Maximum" Conditions

A A'




- Legend**
- Transect A - Winter Period Normal  
Temp F
- 48.1 - 49
  - 49.1 - 50
  - 50.1 - 51
  - 51.1 - 52
  - 52.1 - 53
  - 53.1 - 54
  - 54.1 - 55
- Transect A - Winter Period Max  
Temp F
- 63.1 - 64
  - 64.1 - 65
  - 65.1 - 66
  - 66.1 - 67
  - 67.1 - 68
  - 68.1 - 69
  - 69.1 - 70



Created by: BSM Approved by: WJE  
Checked by: MCB Date: 10/4/2013



## "Normal" Conditions



## "Maximum" Conditions






Figure 5-17: Results of Winter "Normal" and "Maximum" Hydrothermal Model Conditions at Cross Section B



Created by: BSM    Approved by: WJE  
 Checked by: MCB    Date: 10/4/2013

**Appendix A**  
**Marion Power Plant 316(b) Impingement**  
**Mortality Characterization Report**

**Appendix B**  
**Surface Water Temperatures along Five**  
**Transects in the Lower Portion of the Lake of**  
**Egypt**



**Appendix C**  
**AmerenCIPS Newton Lake Project**  
**15 August 1997 – 30 August 1999**  
**(Volume 2)**

**Appendix D**  
**Current Status of Sport Fish Populations in Lake**  
**of Egypt-1988**

# **Appendix E**

## **Status of Sport Fish Populations in Lake of Egypt and Management Recommendations-1990**

# Appendix F

## Supplemental Spring and Fall Hydrothermal Modeling

16324-0016  
CH2\13643075.1\10.08.13 01:46