

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
September 4, 2014

CHATHAM BP, LLC,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	PCB 14-1
)	(UST Appeal)
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL)	
PROTECTION AGENCY,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

WILLIAM D. INGERSOLL; BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP; APPEARED ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER, and

SCOTT B. SIEVERS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, APPEARED ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT.

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD (by J.D. O’Leary):

Petitioner Chatham BP, LLC (Chatham BP) appeals a May 28, 2013 determination of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Agency or IEPA or Illinois EPA). The Agency rejected a Stage 2 site investigation plan and budget and required submission of a Stage 3 site investigation plan. The Agency also modified drum disposal costs for a Stage 1 site investigation. The appeal concerns Chatham BP’s underground storage tank (UST) site at 300 North Main Street, Chatham, Sangamon County (site).

On January 9, 2014, the Board adopted an order granting Chatham BP’s motion for summary judgment and denying the Agency’s motion for summary judgment on the issue of Chatham BP’s proposed Stage 2 site investigation plan. The Board reversed the Agency’s rejection of that plan. On the issue of Chatham BP’s drum disposal costs, the Board found that an issue of material fact existed. The Board denied the parties’ motions for summary judgment and directed them to proceed to hearing on that issue.

For the reasons stated below, the Board today finds that Chatham BP has met its burden of proving that the disputed drum disposal costs in the amount of \$1,145.92 would not violate the Act or the Board’s regulations and directs the Agency to reimburse Chatham BP in that amount from the UST Fund.

The Board’s opinion and order begins with the procedural history and factual background of this case. The Board then summarizes Chatham BP’s petition for review as it addresses the denied disposal costs. After providing legal and statutory background, the Board then discusses the issues presented, reaches its conclusion, and issues its order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 1, 2013, Chatham BP filed its petition for review (Pet.). In an order dated July 11, 2013, the Board accepted the petition for hearing and directed the Agency to file the administrative record by July 31, 2013. On August 19, 2013, the Agency filed a motion for leave to file the administrative record *instanter* accompanied by the administrative record (R.).

On August 20, 2013, Chatham BP filed a motion for summary judgment (Pet. Mot.). On August 27, 2013, the Agency filed a cross motion for summary judgment accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of its motion (Memo.). The Agency's memorandum included a single attachment, an affidavit of Eric Kuhlman, an Environmental Protection Engineer in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Section of the Agency. On September 3, 2013, the Agency filed its response to Chatham BP's motion for summary judgment. On September 10, 2013, Chatham BP filed its response to the Agency's motion for summary judgment (Pet. Resp.).

On January 9, 2014, the Board adopted an order granting Chatham BP's motion for summary judgment and denying the Agency's cross-motion for summary judgment on the issue of Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation plan, reversing the Agency's rejection of that plan. On the issue of Chatham BP's drum disposal costs, the Board found that an issue of material fact existed. The Board denied the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment and directed them to proceed to hearing on that issue. The order also granted the Agency's August 19, 2013 motion for leave to file the administrative record *instanter*.

On April 4, 2014, the parties filed a joint motion for entry of judgment, which requested that the Board enter judgment in favor of Chatham BP on the issue of disputed costs for drum disposal. On May 1, 2014, the Board adopted an order denying the joint motion.

On May 19, 2014, the hearing officer issued an order scheduling hearing on July 29, 2014, in Springfield. On July 10, 2014, Chatham BP filed a motion *in limine*. In an order on July 28, 2014, the hearing officer denied the unopposed motion.

The hearing took place as scheduled, and the Board received the transcript (Tr.) on August 6, 2014. In a hearing report on July 29, 2014, the hearing officer noted that the parties made closing comments in lieu of setting a schedule for post-hearing briefing. *See* Tr. at 15. While the hearing report set a deadline to file public comments, the Board has received no public comment on this matter.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Release at Site

The site is known as Chatham Gas and is an active gas station surrounded by commercial properties. R. at 6, 10; *see id.* at 26 (Site Map). The site has been assigned Agency identification number LPC 1670305023. *E.g.*, R. at 1, 3, 179. The site includes four USTs, three of which are 10,000-gallon gasoline tanks, and one of which is a 4,000-gallon diesel tank. *Id.* at

7 (Table 1-1. Underground Tank Summary). Chatham BP is the owner of the USTs. *Id.* at 16, 21. Two 10,000-gallon gasoline tanks were removed from the site on June 1, 1988. *Id.* at 7.

On September 25, 2007, the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) investigated vapors in a storm sewer and a petroleum sheen in a creek in the vicinity of Main Street in Chatham. R. at 7. The investigator reviewed automatic tank gauge reports with the former owner of the USTs and concluded that approximately 342 gallons of fuel could not be accounted for. *Id.* Inspection revealed that the northwestern tank bed monitoring well contained approximately three inches of “fresh” gasoline. *Id.* Inspection also showed that “the southeastern tank bed monitoring well was clear of product.” *Id.* OSFM indicated that the release appeared to have been caused “by an overfill of the tank by the fuel delivery driver.” *Id.* at 8. The former owner of the site retained W.J. Scott Company to recover free product and contaminated water from the well. W.J. Scott Company recovered approximately 275 gallons of free product and 2,475 gallons of contaminated water from the tank bed monitoring well. *Id.*

Also on September 25, 2007, the former owner of the USTs reported a release to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA), which assigned Incident Number 2007-1289.¹ R. at 6.

On November 27, 2007, the 20-Day Certification was submitted to the Agency.² R. at 6; *see id.* at 12. On November 25, 2008, a Free Product Report was submitted to the Agency, which approved it on January 12, 2009.³ *Id.* at 6; *see id.* at 12. The 45-Day Report was submitted on December 3, 2008.⁴ *Id.* at 6; *see id.* at 12.

On November 14, 2011, OSFM received a Reimbursement Eligibility and Deductible Application regarding Incident Number 2007-1292 at the site. R. at 69. On December 31, 2011, OSFM determined that Chatham BP was eligible to seek reimbursement from the UST Fund, subject to a deductible of \$15,000, for the release from one 10,000-gallon tank. *Id.* at 69-70.

In April 2009, “AES [Adept Environmental Solutions, Inc.] was on-site to conduct Pre Stage 1 samples from around the active tank bed and piping trench. Soil analytical results indicated the Clean-Up Objectives for the site have been exceeded for several of the gasoline indicator contaminants.” R. at 8; *see id.* at 85-88, 124-27 (soil assessment data dated 4-22-09); *see also id.* at 27 (Pre Stage 1 Sample Location Map), 110-23 (Logs of Boring), 131-72 (Analytical Reports). Specifically, soil samples A1, A2, A3, and A5 in the vicinity of the tank bed showed concentrations of at least one parameter exceeding remediation objectives. *Id.* at 34-35 (soil contamination value maps) 85-88 (soil assessment data dated 4-22-09). Soil samples

¹ The Administrative Record does not include this report. The record refers in various documents to Incident Number 2007-1289 (*e.g.*, R. at 74-78, 99, 178), Incident Number 2007-1292 (*e.g.*, R. at 19, 38, 69, 107), or both (*e.g.*, R. at 1, 3, 109). The Board has not located in the Administrative Record any explanation for the apparent assignment of separate incident numbers to the release at the site.

² The Administrative Record does not include this certification.

³ The Administrative Record does not include this report.

⁴ The Administrative Record does not include this report.

A4, A8, and A9 along the piping run at the site also showed concentration of at least one parameter exceeding remediation objectives. *Id.*

On April 5, 2012, CW³M personnel completed Stage 1 investigation activities at the site. R. at 8, 11. “Five monitoring wells (MW), four with soil samples and two soil borings (SB) were advanced as part of the plume delineation activities. Soil samples were collected from each drilling location and were analyzed for benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene and total xylenes (BETX) and methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE).” R at 11; *see id.* at 28 (Soil Boring Location Map), 30 (Monitoring Well Location Map), 72-78 (Drilling Borehole Log), 79-83 (Well Completion Report).

On April 6, 2012, CW³M personnel returned to the site to survey and sample the five monitoring wells. R. at 8, 11. Source well MW-5 just north of the tank bed revealed benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, total xylenes, and MTBE in excess of the most stringent Tier 1 remediation objectives. R. at 90. Samples from MW-1, near the western boundary of the site, revealed benzene, ethylbenzene, and toluene in excess of the most stringent Tier 1 remediation objectives. *Id.* Samples did not detect levels in excess of these objectives from the three other monitoring wells: MW-2, near the southern boundary of the property; MW-3 near the eastern boundary; and MW-4, near the northern boundary. *Id.* Soil samples from MW-1 detected levels of benzene in excess of remediation objectives, although soil samples taken from MW-2, MW-3, and MW-4 did not detect levels in excess of those objectives. *Id.* at 89; *see id.* at 34-35 (Soil Contamination Value Maps). SB-1, to the east of MW-5, showed benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, and total xylenes in excess of those objectives. *Id.* SB-2, to the north of MW-5, showed benzene and ethylbenzene in excess of them. R. at 89; *see id.* at 34-35.

CW³M personnel measured static water levels for each well in order “to determine relative groundwater elevations and the groundwater flow direction.” R. at 11. CW³M concluded based on its activities at the site that “it appears that the groundwater flow direction is toward the west across the site.” *Id.*; *see id.* at 33 (Groundwater Elevation Map April 2012).

Proposed Site Investigation Plan

By letter dated January 17, 2013, CW³M submitted to the Agency a Stage II Site Investigation Plan and Budget for the site regarding Incident Numbers 2007-1289 and 2007-1292. R. at 1-2. The Agency received the submission on January 22, 2013. *Id.* at 3. The plan included a budget summary itemizing actual Stage 1 Site Investigation costs including \$2,291.84 in remediation and disposal costs of eight drums of solid waste at a cost per drum of \$286.48 (*id.* at 41, 53).

Agency Determination Letter

By letter dated May 28, 2013, the Agency stated that it had reviewed Chatham BP’s submission for Incident Number 2007-1292 and issued its determinations. R. at 179.

The Agency’s determination modified actual costs for Stage 1 activities by reducing remediation and disposal costs for drum disposal by \$1,145.92, “which exceed the minimum

requirements necessary to comply with the Act.” R. at 182; *see id.* at 179. The letter stated that, “[a]ccording to the IEPA’s calculations, four of the eight drums listed for solid waste disposal exceed the minimum requirements necessary to comply with the Act. As such, these drums are not eligible for payment from the Fund.” *Id.* at 182, citing 415 ILCS 5/57.7(c)(3) (2012), 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734.630(o); *see* R. at 178 (explaining deduction in LUST Technical File).

Testimony at Hearing

At hearing, Ms. Carol Rowe and Mr. Matthew Rives testified on behalf of Chatham BP.

Ms. Rowe, an employee of the CWM Company for more than 20 years, is a registered professional geologist in a number of states, including Illinois. Tr. at 7. She testified that the material disposed of in drums consists primarily of “drill cuttings that come up from the ground.” *Id.* at 8. She testified that the cuttings typically emerge from the ground in “huge curly ribbons that are sometimes unwieldy.” *Id.* She added that they are clay, which is not always pliable. *Id.* She testified that disposing of these materials in a drum will result in “a lot of voids in the drum.” *Id.* She added the drums also contain decontamination materials, which may include gloves, liners used to probe the ground, and installation materials. *Id.* at 8-9.

Ms. Rowe testified that the number of disposal drums required is not typically consistent from site to site. Tr. at 9. She also testified that the number of barrels necessary for disposal depends on factors including the type of materials encountered, whether the material was dry or wet, and how easy it was to place ribbons of material into drums. *Id.* at 9-10.

Finally, Ms. Rowe testified that the bore hole is a different size from the monitoring well. Tr. at 11. She stated that, depending on the stability of the hole, it may be necessary to “over-drill” the bore hole in order to install the well and annular material surrounding it. *Id.*

Mr. Rives testified that he is an employee of CWM and has worked on nearly 100 UST remediation projects. Tr. at 12. He was project manager for the Chatham BP site. *Id.* at 13. He testified that the material encountered at the site was “a gray, silty clay.” *Id.* He added that it emerged from the ground in a shape resembling a pigtail and was then placed into a drum. *Id.* He testified that work at the site filled eight drums with waste material. *Id.*

During the hearing, the Agency reported that it “has nothing they would like to present in this case.” Tr. at 15. The Agency stated that the parties had “filed a joint motion in this case to have judgment entered against the Agency,” which the Board denied. *Id.* at 16; *see Chatham BP, LLC v. IEPA*, PCB 14-1, slip op. at 3-4 (May 1, 2014). The Agency noted Chatham BP’s request for reimbursement of \$1,145.92 in drum disposal costs and hoped “that we minimize the attorney’s fees and the court reporter costs that are imposed on the underground storage tank fund as a result of this proceeding.” *Id.*

**SUMMARY OF CHATHAM BP'S PETITION FOR REVIEW
ON ISSUE OF DRUM DISPOSAL COSTS**

Chatham BP noted the Agency's conclusion that the number of solid waste disposal drums exceeded the minimum requirements of the Act "[a]ccording to the IEPA's calculations." Pet. at 6, citing R. at 182. Chatham BP stated that "[s]ome description of the inputs to the 'calculations' would be very helpful in understanding the factual basis for the decision." Pet. at 6. Chatham BP argued that this determination "does not come close to" satisfying Section 734.505(b)(3), which requires that the Agency's written rejection of a plan must contain information including "[a] statement of specific reasons why the cited Sections of the Act or regulations may be violated if the plan, budget, or report is approved." Pet. at 6, citing 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734.505(b)(3).

Chatham BP also stressed that it had proposed a budget for drum disposal. Chatham BP argued that "[s]ite-specific circumstances could easily support the difference between four drums and eight drums at this budgeting stage. Besides, the ultimate disposal reimbursement will be supported by documentation of the actual number of drums disposed." Pet. at 6-7.

Chatham BP requested that the Board find that the Agency's May 28, 2013 determination "is arbitrary, capricious and not supported by statutory or regulatory authority." Pet. at 7. Chatham BP also sought to have the Board "[r]everse the Agency's determination and require approval of Petitioner's proposal." *Id.* Chatham BP also requested that the Board award "reasonable attorney's fees and expenses related to bringing this action" in addition to other relief deemed appropriate by the Board. *Id.*

STATUTORY AND LEGAL BACKGROUND

Title XVI of the Act and Part 734 of the Board's Regulations

Title XVI of the Act provides for the administration and oversight of the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program, which includes the UST Fund and requirements for reimbursement from it. 415 ILCS 5/57-57.18 (2012). Section 57.1(a) of the Act provides in its entirety that "[a]n owner or operator of an underground storage tank who meets the definition of this Title [XVI] shall be required to conduct tank removal, abandonment and repair, site investigation, and corrective action in accordance with the requirements of the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program." 415 ILCS 5/57.1(a) (2012).

Section 57.7(c)(3) of the Act addresses the Agency's review of site investigation and provides that, in approving any plan submitted under this section, "the Agency shall determine . . . that the costs associated with the plan are reasonable, will be incurred in the performance of site investigation or corrective action, and will not be used for site investigation or corrective action activities in excess of those required to meet the minimum requirements of the Title [XVI]." 415 ILCS 5/57.7(c)(3) (2012). Section 734.630(o) of the Board's UST regulations provides that "[c]osts ineligible for payment from the Fund include, but are not limited to . . . [c]osts for corrective action activities and associated materials or services exceeding the minimum requirements necessary to comply with the Act." 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734.630(o).

Section 57.8 of the Act provides in part that, “[i]f an owner or operator is eligible to access the Underground Storage Tank Fund pursuant to an Office of State Fire Marshal eligibility/deductible final determination letter issued in accordance with Section 57.9, the owner or operator may submit a complete application for final or partial payment to the Agency for activities taken in response to a confirmed release.” 415 ILCS 5/57.8 (2012). Section 57.8(i) of the Act provides in its entirety that, “[i]f the Agency refuses to pay or authorizes only a partial payment, the affected owner or operator may petition the Board for a hearing in the manner provided for the review of permit decisions in Section 40 of this Act.” 415 ILCS 5/57.8(i) (2012).

Standard of Review and Burden of Proof

The standard of review under Section 40 of the Act (415 ILCS 5/40 (2012)) is whether Chatham BP’s submissions to the Agency would not violate the Act and Board regulations. Ted Harrison Oil Co. v. IEPA, PCB 99-127, slip op. at 5 (July 24, 2003); citing Browning Ferris Indus. of Ill. v. PCB, 534 N.E.2d 616 (2nd Dist. 1989). The Board will not consider new information that was not before the Agency prior to its final determination regarding the issues on appeal. Kathe’s Auto Serv. Ctr. v. IEPA, PCB 95-43, slip op. at 14 (May 18, 1995). The Agency’s denial letter frames the issues on appeal. Pulitzer Cmty. Newspapers, Inc. v. IEPA, PCB 90-142 (Dec. 20, 1990).

The Board’s procedural rules provide that, in appeals of final Agency determinations, “[t]he burden of proof shall be on the petitioner. . . .” 35 Ill. Adm. Code 105.112(a), citing 415 ILCS 5/40(a)(1), 40(b), 40(e)(3), 40.2(a). The standard of proof in UST appeals is the “preponderance of the evidence.” Freedom Oil Co. v. IEPA, PCB 03-54, 03-56, 03-105, 03-179, 04-04 (cons.), slip op. at 59 (Feb. 2, 2006), citing McHenry County Landfill, Inc. v. County Bd. of McHenry County, PCB 85-56, 85-61, 85-62, 85-63, 85-64, 85-65, 85-66 (consol.), slip op. at 3 (Sept. 20, 1985) (“A proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it is more probably true than not.”).

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chatham BP asks that the Board reverse the Agency’s reduction of \$1,145.92 in reimbursement for drum disposal costs associated with its Stage 1 site investigation. In its motion for summary judgment, Chatham BP asserted that Stage 1 activities at the site actually generated eight drums of material that required disposal. Pet. Mot. at 7. Chatham BP argued that it was not necessary or appropriate for the Agency to calculate the number of drums requiring disposal. *Id.* Chatham BP claims that the Board’s regulations do not limit the number of drums of waste that may be generated and disposed of during site investigation.

In the memorandum supporting its motion for summary judgment, the Agency stated that its reviewer calculated the number of drums necessary for disposal of materials from the site because Chatham BP’s costs seemed excessive. Agency Memo. at 15. The Agency determined that number by calculating the volume of the borings with the diameter and depth of the borings reported by Chatham BP and applying a 50 percent fluff factor. Agency Memo. at 15, citing Att.

A at ¶13. By dividing this calculated volume by the drum volume of 55 gallons and rounding up, the Agency determined that four drums were sufficient. Agency Memo. at 15-16, citing Att. A at ¶13.

Chatham BP responded that the record does not include the diameter of borings SB-1, SB-2, MW-1, MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, or MW-5. Pet. Resp. at 5-6. Chatham BP argued that the diameter of the monitoring wells cannot be assumed to be the same as the boring auger used to drill them. *Id.*, citing R. at 49 (two-inch diameter).

In its January 9, 2014 order, the Board found that a genuine issue of material fact exists on the issue of these drum disposal costs and directed the parties to hearing on it.

In reviewing Chatham BP's claim, the Board notes Ms. Rowe's testimony that the reported monitoring well diameter of 2 inches (R. at 49) is not the same size as the boring drilled for it. Tr. at 11. She added that the boring may be wider both to make the bore hole more stable and to allow for the annular sealant surrounding the installed monitoring well. *Id.* Her testimony supports the conclusion that the Agency relied on too small a diameter to calculate the size of the boreholes and underestimated the volume of material generated by Chatham BP's drilling.

The Board also notes Ms. Rowe's testimony that the volume of materials generated by borings will vary from site to site. Tr. at 9. She testified that volume depends on factors including the nature of materials encountered while drilling, whether those materials were wet or dry, and how easily those materials are placed into drums. *Id.* at 9-10. Mr. Rives testified that the materials at the Chatham BP site consisted of a silty clay that emerged from the ground in the shape of a pigtail. *Id.* at 13. Ms. Rowe stated that material such as this is sometimes unwieldy and not always pliable. *Id.* at 8. She added that placing this material into a drum will leave a number of voids. *Id.* In addition, she testified that drums will also usually include various decontamination materials. *Id.* at 8-9. This testimony on the volume of materials persuasively supports Mr. Rives' testimony that work at the site filled eight drums with waste material for disposal. *Id.* at 13.

This testimony by Ms. Rowe and Mr. Rives was not rebutted by the Agency at hearing. Having reviewed the record before it and relying on the unrebutted testimony of Ms. Rowe and Mr. Rives, the Board finds that Chatham BP has met its burden of proving that the disputed drum disposal costs in the amount of \$1,145.92 would not violate the Act or the Board's regulations. In its order below, the Board will direct the Agency to reimburse Chatham BP from the UST Fund in this amount.

In making this finding, the Board notes that counsel for the Agency stated at hearing that the Agency had earlier joined in a motion for entry of judgment. Tr. at 16. When the Board denied that motion, it recognized the statement that Agency counsel "has determined and stipulates that if this matter were to proceed to hearing, sufficient facts exist for the Board to find against Respondent and in favor of the Petitioner by a preponderance of the evidence on the issue of the \$1,145.92 in drum disposal costs." Chatham BP, LLC v. IEPA, PCB 14-1, slip op. at 3 (May 1, 2014). In addition, the Board notes Agency counsel's statement at hearing that the Agency hoped to "minimize the attorney's fees and the court reporter costs that are imposed upon the underground storage tank fund as a result of this proceeding." Tr. at 16. The Board

notes that these costs may be reimbursable under the Act and regulations only in the event that Chatham BP prevails at hearing. *See* 415 ILCS 5/57.8(1) (2012); 35 Ill. Adm. Code 734.630(g).

In its January 9, 2014 order, the Board addressed the issue of Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation plan. The Board granted Chatham BP's motion for summary judgment, denied the Agency's cross-motion for summary judgment, and reversed the Agency's rejection of Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation plan. The Board stated that at the conclusion of this case it would remand Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation budget to the Agency. Having decided the final pending issue in this appeal, the Board in its order below remands Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation budget to the Agency for its review.

CONCLUSION

The Board finds that Chatham BP has met its burden of proving that reimbursement of the disputed drum disposal costs in the amount of \$1,145.92 would not violate the Act or the Board's regulations.

ORDER

- 1) The Board reverses the Agency's May 28, 2013 determination to reduce Chatham BP's reimbursement of drum disposal costs by \$1,145.92.
- 2) The Board directs the Agency to reimburse Chatham BP \$1,145.92 in drum disposal cost from the UST Fund for a total reimbursement of Stage 1 disposal costs of \$2,291.84.
- 3) Pursuant to its January 9, 2014 order, the Board remands Chatham BP's proposed Stage 2 site investigation budget to the Agency for its review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Section 41(a) of the Environmental Protection Act provides that final Board orders may be appealed directly to the Illinois Appellate Court within 35 days after the Board serves the order. 415 ILCS 5/41(a) (2012); *see also* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.300(d)(2), 101.906, 102.706. Illinois Supreme Court Rule 335 establishes filing requirements that apply when the Illinois Appellate Court, by statute, directly reviews administrative orders. 172 Ill. 2d R. 335. The Board's procedural rules provide that motions for the Board to reconsider or modify its final orders may be filed with the Board within 35 days after the order is received. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.520; *see also* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.902, 102.700, 102.702.

I, John T. Therriault, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, certify that the Board adopted the above opinion and order on September 4, 2014, by a vote of 4-0.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John T. Therriault". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John T. Therriault, Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board