

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

JOHNS MANVILLE, a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	PCB No. 14-3
)	(Citizen Suit)
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF)	
TRANSPORTATION,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

NOTICE OF FILING AND SERVICE

To: ALL PERSONS ON THE ATTACHED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Please take note that today, October 4, 2016, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, as provided for under Section 103.204(d) of the Pollution Control Board's rules, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.204(d), has filed and served its "Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint" with the Clerk of the Pollution Control Board, a copy of which are hereby served upon you.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: s/ Evan J. McGinley
EVAN J. MCGINLEY
ELLEN O'LAUGHLIN
Assistant Attorneys General
Environmental Bureau
69 W. Washington, 18th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 814-3153
emcginley@atg.state.il.us
eolaughlin@atg.state.il.us
mccaccio@atg.state.il.us

MATTHEW J. DOUGHERTY
Assistant Chief Counsel
Illinois Department of Transportation
Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 313
2300 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, Illinois 62764
(217) 785-7524
Matthew.Dougherty@Illinois.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Johns Manville v. Illinois Department of Transportation, PCB 14-3 (Citizens)

I, EVAN J. MCGINLEY, do hereby certify that, today, October 4, 2016, I caused to be served on the individuals listed below, by electronic mail, a true and correct copy of Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation's, "Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint"

Bradley Halloran
Hearing Officer
Illinois Pollution Control Board
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph, Suite 11-500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Brad.Halloran@illinois.gov

[John Therriault](mailto:John.Therriault@illinois.gov)
[Clerk of the Pollution Control Board](mailto:John.Therriault@illinois.gov)
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph, Suite 11-500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
john.therriault@illinois.gov

Susan Brice
Lauren Caisman
Bryan Cave LLP
161 North Clark Street, Suite 4300
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Susan.Brice@bryancave.com
Lauren.Caisman@bryancave.com

s/ Evan J. McGinley
Evan J. McGinley

under this Act, any permit or term or condition of a permit, or any Board order.” 415 ILCS 5/31(d).

ANSWER:

Respondent admits that Paragraph 2 accurately states a portion of Section 31(d) of Act.

3. “Person” is defined under the Act as “any individual, partnership, co-partnership, firm, company, limited liability company, corporation, association, joint stock company, trust, estate, political subdivision, state agency, or any other legal entity, or their legal representative, agent or assigns.” 415 ILCS 5/3.315.

ANSWER:

Respondent admits that Paragraph 3 accurately states a portion of Section 3.315 of Act.

4. Complainant JM is a Delaware corporation authorized to do business in Illinois.

ANSWER:

Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 4.

5. Respondent IDOT is an agency of the State of Illinois and was formerly known as the Division of Highways (a division of the Department of Public Works and Buildings).

ANSWER:

Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 5.

Factual Background

6. Complainant JM owned and operated a manufacturing facility on property consisting of approximately 300 acres in Waukegan, Illinois, which manufactured construction and other materials, some of which contained asbestos (the “JM Site”).

ANSWER:

Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 6.

7. On September 8, 1983, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) added a portion of the JM Site to the National Priorities List (“NPL”) under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), due to asbestos materials.

ANSWER:

Respondent admits USEPA listed a 120 acre portion of the JM site on the NPL, in the Federal Register published on September 8, 1983, 48 Fed. Reg. 50658, although the EPA Superfund Record of Decision states that the site was listed on the NPL in December of 1982. Further responding, on or about the time of USEPA’s listing of the JM Site on the NPL, USEPA determined that almost 600,000 pounds of asbestos waste was present at the JM Site, as well as various quantities of other hazardous wastes.

8. JM has conducted and completed certain remediation activities at the JM Site under the direction and oversight of the EPA.

ANSWER:

Due to the vague and ambiguous nature of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Third Amended Complaint, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny those allegations.

9. JM ceased operations onsite in approximately 1998. Thereafter, asbestos-containing material (“ACM”) was discovered beyond the boundaries of the JM Site, on adjacent property owned by Commonwealth Edison (“ComEd”) and the State of Illinois.

ANSWER:

Due to the vague and ambiguous nature of the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the Third Amended Complaint, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the

allegations relating to the nature and scope of the “operations” alleged in this paragraph or the date that “JM ceased operations onsite”. IDOT admits that the Administrative Order on Consent notes that ACM was discovered on the former parking lot in 1998. IDOT specifically denies that it is the owner of any real property located in the immediate vicinity of the former JM Site. Further responding, ACM has been found along the west and south sides of the former JM Site.

10. On June 11, 2007, Complainant JM entered into an Administrative Order on Consent (“AOC”) with EPA whereby JM agreed to conduct a “removal” action at four specific off-site areas. These sites are individually designated as Site 3, Sites 4 and 5 (combined under the AOC as “Site 4/5”) and Site 6 and are collectively referred to as the “Southwestern Site Areas.”

ANSWER:

IDOT acknowledges that JM entered into an AOC with the USEPA on or about the time alleged in Paragraph 10. Further responding, IDOT states that the AOC speaks for itself and thus no further response on IDOT’s part is required.

11. ComEd is also a party to the AOC, as the current owner of Site 3 and Site 4/5, and pursuant to the terms of the AOC has agreed to undertake certain response activities at these sites.

ANSWER:

IDOT acknowledges that ComEd entered into an AOC with the USEPA, but lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 11. Further responding, IDOT states that the AOC speaks for itself and thus no further response on IDOT’s part is required.

12. On information and belief, since at least 1971, the State of Illinois, acting by and through IDOT (or its predecessor agency), has owned, held an interest in and/or controlled portions of Site 3 and Site 6, including rights of way on both “the southern (“S ROW” or Parcel No. 0393”) and northern sides (“N ROW”) of Greenwood Avenue. The S ROW encompasses portions of Site 6 and Site 3. The N ROW is located on the northwest portion of Site 6. Together, these areas shall be referred to hereafter as the “ROWS.” Other parts of Site 6 appear to be owned by the City of Waukegan, which is not a party to the AOC.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies that it has ever owned any portion of Site 3 or Site 6. Further answering, IDOT admits that it holds a right of way over Parcel 0393. Further responding, IDOT admits that it holds a right of way that lies on the north side of Greenwood Avenue, which is shown as Parcel 0392 on Exhibit 15-3 and as further described in Exhibit 41-1 and 41-2. IDOT denies that any portion of Parcel 0392 lies within either Site 3 or Site 6. IDOT denies any portion of Parcel 0393 lies within what is currently defined as Site 6. IDOT denies that it holds any type of interest or control over any portion of Site 6. Additionally, IDOT specifically denies the allegation that “The N ROW is located on the northwest portion of Site 6.” IDOT admits that “Other parts of Site 6 appear to be owned by the City of Waukegan, which is not a party to the AOC.”

13. Site 3 is located south of Greenwood Avenue and east of North Pershing Road in Waukegan, Illinois.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits the allegations set forth in Paragraph 13.

14. Site 6 is located on the north and south edges of Greenwood Avenue east of North Pershing Road and north of Site 3 in Waukegan, Illinois.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the AOC states that Site 6 is composed of “the shoulders of Greenwood Avenue and within the right-of-way of Greenwood Avenue in Waukegan, Illinois and extending from the east end of the Greenwood Avenue’s elevated approach to Pershing Road on the west to the boundary of Site 2 on the east.”

15. In December 1998, ACM was discovered at the surface of the area currently designated as Site 3.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 15, in as much as JM has always had knowledge that ACM was located at Site 3, and, further, because JM is the party that placed ACM at Site 3 and one of the two responsible parties that has been ordered by USEPA to remove the ACM which is located on Site 3.

16. Subsequent sub-surface investigations of Site 3, including the S ROW, have revealed ACM at the surface and at a depth of one to three feet below ground surface (bgs), primarily at the north end of the site, and at a depth of up to four feet bgs in at least two areas of the site.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 16 as Johns Manville has failed to identify what sub-surface investigations it is making reference to in the allegations set forth in this paragraph.

17. Investigations of Site 6, including on the ROWs, have similarly revealed ACM at the surface and at a depth of one to three feet below ground surface. Pieces of Transite® pipe, a non-friable form of ACM, are the predominant ACM found at Site 3 and Site 6.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 17. IDOT denies that “Pieces of Transite® pipe, a non-friable form of ACM, are the predominant ACM found at Site 3 and Site 6. Further responding, IDOT denies that it holds any right of way that lies within the boundaries of Site 6.

18. The northwest portion of Site 3 and the west portion of Site 6, including the ROWs, also contain miscellaneous fill material, some of which has been found to contain asbestos.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the AOC states that “miscellaneous fill material” has been found at Site 3. IDOT denies that it holds any right of way that lies within the boundaries of Site 6. Further responding, IDOT otherwise lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 18.

19. Many utility lines run through Site 3 and Site 6, including the ROWs.

ANSWER:

IDOT generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 19.

20. In approximately the 1950s and 1960s, JM used Site 3 as a parking lot for its employees and invitees, pursuant to a license agreement with ComEd.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that JM has produced copies of license agreements with ComEd from the period of time alleged in Paragraph 20 that purport to confer upon JM the license to use certain ComEd property which is now part of Site 3, as a parking lot.

21. Asbestos-containing Transite® pipes were used for curb bumpers on the parking lot surface. Aerial photographs show that these bumpers were in place in the 1950s.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that documentary records make reference to asbestos-containing Transite® pipes having been utilized at the former Johns Manville parking lot in this fashion and as otherwise alleged in Paragraph 21.

22. Records show that in approximately 1971 Respondent IDOT began construction of a ramp to the Amstutz Expressway as part of its reconstruction of the Pershing Road/Greenwood Avenue intersection.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that it began a project which in part involved the construction of an embankment to carry Greenwood Avenue over certain railroad tracks, and a bridge carrying Greenwood Avenue over the Amstutz Expressway in late 1971.

23. During this construction, IDOT built embankments on the north and south side of Greenwood Avenue, including within the ROWs. These embankments involved the removal of “unsuitable material” and the placement of fill up to and above the original grade.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 23, in so far as it built only one embankment, not two, as alleged in Paragraph 23. IDOT admits that the construction of this singular

embankment “involved the removal of ‘unsuitable material’ and the placement of fill up to and above the original grade.” IDOT denies that this embankment was constructed within any right of way or on Sites 3 or 6.

24. Also during construction, IDOT built three detour roads (the “Detour Roadways”).

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that it constructed three temporary detour roads as part of the construction of a ramp to the Amstutz Expressway, but denies any allegations that are otherwise inconsistent with its answer to Paragraph 24.

25. Two of these detour roads, Bypasses A and B, cut through Sites 3 and 6.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that portions of Bypass A passed through portions of what are today referred to as Site 3 and 6, but, as the allegations in Paragraph 25 are lacking in detail, IDOT is unable to state precisely just what portion of Detour Road A passed through Site 3. IDOT denies that any portion of Bypass B passed through any portion of either Site 3 or Site 6, however, as the exhibits introduced by Johns Manville into evidence at hearing held on May 23-25, 2016, June 23, 2016 and June 24, 2016 (“Hearing”) clearly show that no portion of Detour Road B passed through what today is defined as Sites 3 or 6.

26. Bypass A begins on Site 6 and cuts a large, curved swath through the former parking lot of Site 3, which was destroyed by IDOT during this construction.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that it constructed Bypass A as a temporary detour road during the Amstutz construction project and that Bypass A ended at a point on Greenwood Avenue that is

today a part of Site 6, but denies that it “destroyed” the parking lot “during this construction.”

27. Bypass B cuts through the western portion of Sites 3 and 6.

ANSWER:

The allegations in Paragraph 27 stand in direct contradiction to documents which Complainant introduced and which were received into evidence at Hearing (e.g., Exhibit 16-17) and accordingly, IDOT denies the allegations in this Paragraph.

28. Bypasses A and B were used until the ramp construction was completed in approximately 1976.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that Bypasses A and B were used while construction on the Greenwood Avenue ramp was taking place, but denies that the ramp “was completed in approximately 1976.”

29. Records show that a contractor was paid a “special excavation” fee to “remove and obliterate the Detour Roadways” after construction was complete. Neither Bypasses A or B nor the former parking lot are intact at Sites 3 and 6.

ANSWER:

Because Johns Manville has failed to allege in Paragraph 29 just what “records” it is making reference to, or what contractor it is referring to, IDOT is unable to respond to Paragraph 29, because it lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations therein.

30. IDOT has admitted to EPA that it dealt with asbestos pipe during the construction project. IDOT stated in a CERCLA Section 104(e) Response that a retired engineer, Mr. Duane

Mapes, recalled “dealing with asbestos pipe during the project and burying some of it. As the Department does not have information about where ACM was located at the start of the project and where it is alleged to have been disposed, he was unable to ask Mr. Mapes to provide more information.”

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that in its 2000 response to USEPA’s 104(e) information request that it stated that Duane Mapes, a retired IDOT Resident Engineer, “recalled ‘dealing with asbestos pipe during the project and burying some of it.’” Further responding, the “project” referred to in IDOT’s 104(e) response covered a far larger area than the area covered by Sites 3 or 6. Further responding, IDOT denies that a retired engineer had any authority to make any admissions against the Department’s interests. IDOT further denies that it did anything with “asbestos pipe” at Site 3, including, but not limited to “burying some of it.” IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 30.

31. IDOT was not ultimately made a party to the 2007 AOC with EPA. At the time the AOC was signed, EPA took the position that there was insufficient evidence to name IDOT because IDOT did not admit to burying any ACM on or near Site 3 or 6.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that it was not made a party to the 2007 AOC. IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the balance of the allegations in Paragraph 31.

32. Subsequent investigations have revealed buried Transite® pipe in the area. Portions of Transite® pipe have been found in the south side shoulder of Greenwood Avenue on parts of Site 3 and 6, including on the ROWs, at various depths, including at a depth of

approximately 2.5 feet below the ground surface. The elevation of this Transite® pipe is roughly one foot higher than the adjacent surface.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies that it holds any right of way which overlaps with Site 6. Further responding, due to the vague and ambiguous nature of the allegations contained in Paragraph 32, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations contained therein.

33. Review of IDOT engineering drawings indicates that IDOT, among other things, used ACM as fill when building the embankments to Greenwood Avenue on Sites 3 and 6, including on the ROWs.

ANSWER:

Notwithstanding the fact that Johns Manville has failed to specify what “IDOT engineering drawings” it is making reference to in Paragraph 33, even after the admission of over 100 exhibits during the five days of hearing in this matter, IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 33, as no such “engineering drawings” exist.

34. Review of IDOT engineering drawings indicates that IDOT, among other things, used, spread and/or buried ACM during its construction and/or obliteration of Bypasses A and B.

ANSWER:

Notwithstanding the fact that Johns Manville has failed to specify what “IDOT engineering drawings” it is making reference to in Paragraph 34, even after the admission of over 100 exhibits during the five days of hearing in this matter, IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 34, as no such “engineering drawings” exist.

35. Pursuant to the terms of the AOC, on June 13, 2008, JM and ComEd submitted to EPA for its review and approval an initial "Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis" ("EE/CA") for a proposed response action at the Southwestern Sites.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no document with the alleged title or date was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing on this matter. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary support for the allegations in this paragraph, IDOT denies all of the allegations contained therein.

36. After several rounds of revisions in consultation with EPA, JM and ComEd submitted their final EE/CA to EPA on April 4, 2011 ("EE/CA Revision 4"). EE/CA Revision 4 evaluated four potential response action options for Sites 3 and 6, based on discussions with EPA.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 36. IDOT admits that "EE/CA Revision 4 evaluated four potential response action options for Sites 3 and 6, based on discussions with EPA." However, IDOT denies that four potential response actions were ever considered for Site 6. Further responding, IDOT notes that EE/CA Revision 4 considered potential response actions for Sites 4/5, in addition to Sites 3 and 6, with respect to the first three potential response actions evaluated under EE/CA Revision 4. IDOT neither admits nor denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 36.

37. EE/CA Revision 4 identified "Alternative 2" as the preferred remedy for Site 3. This alternative included limited soil excavation (approximately 660 cubic yards) in the northeast

corner of Site 3 to a depth of approximately three (3) feet below the ground surface and installation of a vegetated soil barrier over the entire site, at an estimated cost of between \$595,000 and \$630,000.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that in EE/CA Revision 4, Johns Manville identified Alternative 2 as the preferred remedy for Site 3. Further responding, IDOT admits that Johns Manville also identified Alternative 2 as the preferred remedy for Sites 4/5, as well. Further responding, IDOT admits that the second sentence of Paragraph 38 appears to accurately reflect statements contained in Exhibit 63-31. IDOT neither admits nor denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 37.

38. EE/CA Revision 4 identified “Alternative 3” as the preferred remedy for Site 6. This alternative was described as a “hybrid remedy” combining excavation and off-site disposal of approximately 2400 cubic yards of ACM-affected soil with a vegetated soil barrier running adjacent to Site 3 to avoid disrupting current stormwater drainage patterns. The total cost to implement Alternative 3 on Site 6 was estimated at between \$417,500 and \$500,000.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that Johns Manville identified Alternative 3 as the preferred remedy for Site 6. Further responding, IDOT admits that the second sentence of Paragraph 38 appears to accurately reflect statements contained in Exhibit 63-34 and 63-35. IDOT neither admits nor denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 38.

39. EE/CA Revision 4 was approved by EPA with modifications on February 1, 2012. In its EE/CA approval letter, EPA proposed a new alternative remedy, which it termed “Alternative 5.”

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 39, as there is no evidentiary support for the allegations indicating USEPA's approval of EE/CA Revision 4 on or about the date alleged in this paragraph. IDOT further notes that no evidence pertaining to this allegation was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing in this matter. IDOT neither admits nor denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 39.

40. EPA's Alternative 5 included a new proposed remedy for Site 3—termed “Modified Alternative 2”—which was a markedly different remedy from those previously proposed by JM and ComEd. This modified alternative not only included a requirement to remove all asbestos-impacted soils to a depth of four (4) feet below the ground surface in the northeast portion of Site 3, but also required JM and ComEd to create a clean corridor for all utilities running through Site 3 by excavating all soil to a depth of two (2) feet below each utility line and a minimum width of twenty-five (25) feet centered on each utility line. EPA's estimated cost for construction of this Modified Alternative 2 was \$2,196,000.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no document indicating USEPA's approval of EE/CA Revision 4 and discussing Alternative 5 was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing in this matter. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary support for the allegations in this paragraph, IDOT denies the allegations contained therein.

41. EPA's Alternative 5 also included a new proposed remedy for Site 6. This alternative—which EPA termed “Modified Alternative 1”—required excavation of “all soil contaminated with ACM and/or asbestos fibers at Site 6 including, but not limited to the area

identified as “Area of Excavation for ACM Affected Soil” and “Paving and Potential Subsurface ACM” in Figure 13 in EE/CA” and to make special arrangements necessary for utilities (e.g., additional support or removal and replacement) in areas where removal of ACM is required below three (3) feet below the ground surface. Further, because “Greenwood Avenue was not sampled during the EE/CA Study” and “[i]t is unknown if ACM is located under the Greenwood Avenue Paved Road Surface,” EPA required JM to obtain an environmental covenant signed by the owner of Site 6, the City of Waukegan. EPA’s estimated cost for construction of this Modified Alternative 1 was \$1,869,000.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no document indicating USEPA’s approval of EE/CA Revision 4 and discussing Alternative 5 was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing in this matter. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary support for the allegations in this paragraph, IDOT denies the allegations contained therein.

42. On November 30, 2012, EPA issued an (sic) Action Memorandum selecting a remedy for the Southwestern Sites, including the Modified Alternative 2 that it had proposed for Site 3 and the Modified Alternative 1 it had proposed for Site 6. However, the (sic) Action Memorandum included further modifications that were not previously included in the February 1, 2012 EE/CA approval letter.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that USEPA’s November 30, 2012 Enforcement Action Memorandum identifies Modified Alternative 2 for Site 3 and Modified Alternative 1 for Site 6. Further responding, IDOT notes that the alleged USEPA EE/CA approval letter was never received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing in this

matter. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary support regarding the purported approval letter, IDOT denies all allegations pertaining thereto.

43. Specifically, as to Site 3, the Modified Alternative 2 set forth in the (sic) Action Memorandum requires JM and ComEd to create a clean corridor for each utility line “extending to a depth requested by the owner of the utility line with placement of a continuous barrier at the base and sides of the excavation to inhibit further excavation and/or exposure beyond the clean fill.” It also includes a new “compliance alternative” of abandoning and relocating utility lines in lieu of creating clean utility corridors, pending written approval from EPA and provided that each utility owner signs a voluntary subrogation agreement to abandon its line(s). Any new utility lines would be required to bypass the ACM-contaminated areas of the site or to be fully enclosed within utility vaults so as to eliminate the need for excavation during repair or maintenance activities.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 43 completely and accurately describe the scope of Johns Manville’s and Commonwealth Edison’s obligations under the Enforcement Action Memorandum.

44. Similarly, as to Site 6, whereas the Modified Alternative 1 set forth in the EE/CA approval letter had merely required JM and ComEd to “make special arrangements necessary for utilities” in areas where ACM may extend below three (3) feet below the ground surface, the Modified Alternative 1 set forth in the (sic) Action Memorandum requires JM and ComEd to create a clean corridor for each utility line by excavating “all soil and sediment to a minimum width of 25 feet centered on any utility line (limited only by the edge of Greenwood Avenue to the extent it is demonstrated to provide a competent barrier to excavation) and to a minimum

depth of two feet below the deepest utility line (and extending to a depth needed for protectiveness of utility workers at the deepest utility line) with placement of a continuous barrier at the base and sides of the excavation to inhibit further excavation beyond the clean fill.” No “alternative compliance alternative” was proposed for Site 6.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 44 completely and accurately describe the scope of Johns Manville’s and Commonwealth Edison’s obligations under the Enforcement Action Memorandum.

45. The (sic) Action Memorandum states that a response action at the Southwestern Sites is necessary “to abate or mitigate releases of hazardous substances that may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health and the environment posed by the presence of soils that are contaminated with hazardous substances.” It further states that a response action is necessary to “reduce the actual and potential exposure to the nearby human population and the food chain to hazardous substances” and that the action is “expected to result in the removal and capping of contaminated materials at or near the surface which present a threat to trespassers or workers at the Site.”

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the allegations in Paragraph 45 appear to accurately reflect statements made on the first page of the Enforcement Action Memorandum.

46. According to the (sic) Action Memorandum, the potential health risks associated with ACM contamination at the Southwestern Sites include “exposure to asbestos fibers via inhalation [which] results in significant health effects including mesothelioma, lung cancer, asbestosis, thickening of pleural lining around the lungs and pulmonary deficits. Exposures to

soils containing asbestos fibers have been associated with all of these health effects including cancer.” Due to the presence of asbestos in soils, the (sic) Action Memorandum indicates that “adverse health risks are reasonably anticipated in the event that exposure occurs.”

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the allegations in Paragraph 46 appear to accurately reflect statements made on the page 6 of the Enforcement Action Memorandum.

47. The (sic) Action Memorandum directs JM and ComEd to conduct the following response actions as the selected remedy for Site 3:

- a. Excavate soil in the northeast portion of the Site 3 (approximately 0.14 acres) identified as the “limited excavation area,” to remove all ACM and asbestos fibers (estimated to a depth of 4 feet);
- b. Excavate soil and sediments contaminated with ACM and/or asbestos fibers to a minimum depth of 2 feet below each utility line and extending to a depth requested by the owner of each utility line with placement of a continuous barrier at the base and sides of the excavation to inhibit further excavation and/or exposure beyond the clean fill and a minimum width of 25 feet centered on each utility line and clean backfill to provide a clean corridor for utility maintenance on Site 3 or, alternatively, abandon and relocate utility lines, conditioned on signed voluntary subrogation agreements from the utility owners;
- c. Conduct post-excavation sampling and analysis to confirm there are no remaining ACM or asbestos fibers in soil or sediment within either the limited excavation area or within each utility corridor;
- d. Dispose of all excavated materials in an off-site landfill;

- e. Place and maintain a vegetated soil cover in any areas of Site 3 where ACM or asbestos fibers remain in place;
- f. Implement certain institutional controls in the form of an environmental covenant, pursuant to the Illinois Environmental Covenants Act, 765 ILCS Ch. 122;
- g. Reroute, pipe, or remove surface water as needed to perform the required excavation;
- h. Install and maintain security fencing with warning signs every 100 feet and at all gates completely surrounding all areas where ACM or asbestos fibers remain in place;
- i. Conduct long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) of the vegetated soil cover for a minimum of 30 years beginning when construction is completed.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the allegations in Paragraph 47 appear to be a summary of statements contained on pages 11 and 12 of the Enforcement Action Memorandum (Ex 65-11 and 65-12).

48. EPA has estimated the cost of construction of the selected remedy for Site 3 at between \$1,705,696 and \$2,107,622. JM disputed portions of EPA's remedy selected for the Southwestern Sites on December 20, 2012 and May 16, 2013, including certain of EPA's cost analyses.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 48. As no exhibits were entered into evidence by Johns Manville during the five days of hearing in this matter that pertain to the allegations in the second sentence of this Paragraph, there is

no evidentiary basis for those allegations and, accordingly, IDOT denies those allegations.

49. The (sic) Action Memorandum directs JM and ComEd to conduct the following response actions as the selected remedy for Site 6, including the ROWs:

- a. Excavate all soil contaminated with ACM and/or asbestos fibers without limitation to depth including at a minimum, but not limited to the area identified as “Area of Excavation for ACM Affected Soil” and “Paving and Potential Subsurface ACM” in Figure 13 of the EE/CA (which, in non-utility areas, is anticipated to extend to a minimum depth of three (3) feet below ground surface);
- b. Excavate soil and sediments contaminated with ACM and/or asbestos fibers to a minimum depth of 2 feet below each utility line and extending to a depth requested by the owner of each utility line with placement of a continuous barrier at the base and sides of the excavation to inhibit further excavation and/or exposure beyond the clean fill and a minimum width of 25 feet centered on each utility line and clean backfill to provide a clean corridor for utility maintenance on Site 6;
- c. Conduct post-excavation sampling and analysis to confirm there are no remaining ACM or asbestos fibers in soil or sediment within either the limited excavation area or within each utility corridor;
- d. Dispose of all excavated materials in an off-site landfill or, with approval from EPA, in the JM industrial canal and/or pumping lagoon under a vegetated soil cover;

- e. Implement certain institutional controls in the form of an environmental covenant signed by the City of Waukegan, pursuant to the Illinois Environmental Covenants Act, 765 ILCS Ch. 122, or, if this environmental covenant is not feasible, provide for the investigation and full removal of any ACM or asbestos fibers that may remain under Greenwood Avenue to prevent its potential release during road or utility maintenance;
- f. If during or after soil excavation at Site 6, samples and/or visual observation indicate the presence of ACM or asbestos fibers under Greenwood Avenue, then install and maintain security fencing with warning signs every 100 feet and at all gates completely surrounding all areas where ACM or asbestos fibers remain in place.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the allegations set forth in Paragraph 49 appear to come from certain portions of pages 9 and 10 of the Enforcement Action Memorandum (i.e., Ex. 65-9 and 65-10), but denies that the allegations in Paragraph 49 fully and accurately set forth the statements contained on the aforementioned pages. Further responding, IDOT denies that the Enforcement Action Memorandum contains any reference to the ROWs or directs any actions being taken specifically thereon. Further responding, IDOT denies that any portion of rights of way which it may hold lie within any portion of Site 6.

50. EPA has estimated the cost of construction of the selected remedy for Site 6 at \$1,868,790. JM disputed portions of EPA's remedy selected for the Southwestern Sites on December 20, 2012 and May 16, 2013, including certain of EPA's cost analyses.

ANSWER:

IDOT admits that the figure alleged in Paragraph 50 is set forth on Page 18 of the Enforcement Action Memorandum. Further responding, as no exhibits were received into evidence or testimony elicited during the five days of hearing in this matter regarding any activity on the aforementioned dates, there is no evidentiary basis for those allegations and, accordingly, IDOT denies those allegations.

51. EPA issued a Notice to Proceed with the selected remedy for all of the Southwestern Sites on May 6, 2013. Under the terms and conditions of the AOC, this Notice to Proceed triggers a 120-day period within which JM and ComEd must submit to EPA a Removal Action Work Plan (“RAWP”) for performing the response actions at the Southwestern Site Area.¹

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no exhibits were received into evidence during the five days of hearing in this matter pertaining to USEPA’s alleged May 6 2013 issuance of a Notice to Proceed. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary basis for the allegations set forth in this paragraph, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 51 or the footnote thereto.

52. JM submitted a draft RAWP for the Southwestern Site Area to EPA in November 2013 and the agency provided comments on December 11, 2013.

¹ JM and ComEd have disputed the selected remedy, pursuant to the dispute resolution provisions of the AOC, on grounds that the EPA substantially modified the selected remedy between its final approval of the EE/CA and the issuance of the Action Memorandum. However, despite this ongoing dispute, EPA did not agree to toll the 120-day period for preparing the Removal Action Work Plan.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no document with the alleged title or date referenced in the Paragraph 52 was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing on this matter. As there is no evidentiary basis for the allegations set forth in this paragraph, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 52.

53. JM submitted a final RAWP to EPA on January 24, 2014. The agency has not yet approved the final RAWP.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that as no document with the alleged title or date referenced in the Paragraph 53 was ever received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing on this matter, Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary basis for the allegations set forth in this paragraph, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 53.

54. With the exception of removing surficial ACM, no response action has commenced at Site 3 or Site 6.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 54.

COUNT I

Violations of Section 21 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act

55. Complainant realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-55 of this Third Amended Complaint as if set forth herein in full.

ANSWER:

IDOT realleges and reincorporates by reference all of its responses to paragraphs 1-55 of JM's First Amended Complaint, as if fully set forth therein.

56. Respondent IDOT's actions in using, spreading, burying, placing, dumping, disposing of and abandoning ACM waste, including Transite® pipe, throughout Site 3 and portions of Site 6, including the ROWs, and in using ACM waste as fill during construction of the Greenwood Avenue ramp and expressway bypass from 1971 to 1976 constitute violations of Section 21 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act ("Act").

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 56. Further responding, no response is required as to the allegation that "IDOT's actions in using, spreading, burying, placing, dumping, disposing of and abandoning ACM waste, including Transite® pipe, throughout Site 3 and portions of Site 6 and in using ACM waste as fill during construction of the Greenwood Avenue ramp and expressway bypass from 1971 to 1976 constitute violations of Section 21 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act ("Act")", as these allegations constitute conclusions of law for which no response is required.

57. Section 21 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/21, provides, in pertinent part:

No person shall:

(a) Cause or allow the open dumping of any waste; [or]

(e) Dispose, treat, store, or abandon any waste, or transport any waste into this State for disposal, treatment, storage or abandonment, except at a site or facility which meets the requirements of this Act and of regulations and standards thereunder.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 57 accurately states the provisions of Sections 21(a) and (e) of the Act, and no further answer is required.

58. Section 21 of the Act also provides that no person shall “conduct any waste-storage, waste-treatment or waste-disposal operation” without a permit issued by the agency or in violation of any regulations or standards adopted by the Board. 45 ILCS 5/21(d).

ANSWER:

Paragraph 58 accurately summarizes a portion of Section 21(d) of the Act, and no further answer is required.

59. Section 3.535 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.535, defines “waste” as:

any garbage, sludge from a waste treatment plant, water supply treatment plant, or air pollution control facility or other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semi-solid, or contained gaseous material resulting from industrial, commercial, mining and agricultural operations, and from community activities, but does not include solid or dissolved material in domestic sewage, or solid or dissolved materials in irrigation return flows, or coal-combustion products . . . or industrial discharges which are point sources subject to permits under Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as now or hereafter amended, or source, special nuclear, or by-product materials as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 . . . or any solid or dissolved material from any facility subject to the Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 or the rules and regulations thereunder or any law or rule or regulation adopted by the State of Illinois pursuant thereto.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 59 accurately states the provisions of Section 3.535 of the Act, and no further answer is required.

60. Discarded ACM at Sites 3 and 6 are “waste” within the meaning of the Act.

ANSWER:

The allegations in Paragraph 60 constitute legal conclusions and thus no answer is required.

61. Section 3.305 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.305, defines “open dumping” as “the consolidation of refuse from one or more sources at a disposal site that does not fulfill the requirements of a sanitary landfill.”

ANSWER:

Paragraph 61 accurately states the provisions of Section 3.305 of the Act, and no further answer is required.

62. Section 3.185 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.185, defines “disposal” as “the discharge, deposit, injection, dumping, spilling, leaking or placing of any waste or hazardous waste into or on any land or water or into any well so that such waste or hazardous waste or any constituent thereof may enter the environment or be emitted into the air or discharged into any waters, including ground waters.”

ANSWER:

Paragraph 62 accurately states the provisions of Section 3.535 of the Act, and no further answer is required.

63. Section 3.445 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.445, defines “sanitary landfill” as:

a facility permitted by the Agency for the disposal of waste on land meeting the requirements of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, P.L. 94-580, and regulations thereunder, and without creating nuisances or hazards to public health or safety, by confining the refuse to the smallest practical volume and covering it with a layer of earth at the conclusion of each day’s operation, or by such other methods and intervals as the Board may provide by regulation.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 63 accurately states the provisions of Section 3.535 of the Act, and no further answer is required.

64. Section 3.540 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.540, defines “waste disposal site” as “a site on which solid waste is disposed.”

ANSWER:

Paragraph 64 accurately states the provisions of Section 3.540 of the Act, and no further answer is required.

65. Site 3 and Site 6 are not disposal sites that fulfill the requirements of a sanitary landfill.

ANSWER:

The allegations in Paragraph 65 constitute conclusions of law and as such no response is required.

66. Site 3 and Site 6 are not permitted waste disposal sites or facilities which meets the requirements of the Act or its regulations as they relate to the disposal or abandonment of waste.

ANSWER:

The allegations in Paragraph 66 constitute conclusions of law and as such no response is required.

67. IDOT engaged in the open dumping of waste and disposed of ACM waste between 1971 and 1976 when it: (a) used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of and abandoned ACM waste on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, when it built an embankment on the north and south sides of Greenwood Avenue; (b) used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of and abandoned ACM waste on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, when constructed and obliterated Bypasses A and B; and (c) generally used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of and abandoned ACM waste on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, during construction of the Greenwood Avenue ramp and expressway bypass from 1971 to 1976.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations contained in Paragraph 67. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way are located within any part of Site 6.

68. The ACM waste dumped and disposed of on and under Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, was abandoned by IDOT around 1976 and currently remains in situ.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies that “the ACM waste dumped and disposed of on and under Sites 3 and 6 was abandoned by IDOT around 1976 . . .” Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way are located within any part of Site 6. Further responding, IDOT states that Johns Manville abandoned the ACM when it ceased using the Parking Lot.

69. IDOT caused the open dumping of ACM waste in violation of Section 21(a) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/21(a).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 69.

70. IDOT caused or allowed the disposal of and abandonment of ACM waste in an area that does not meet the requirements of the Act or its regulations in violation of Section 21(e) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/21(e).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 70.

71. IDOT, as an agent of the State of Illinois, since approximately 1970 has caused and allowed and continues to cause and allow the open dumping, disposal and abandonment of ACM waste within the ROWs in violation of 415 ILCS 5/21(a), (e) and has operated and continues to operate a waste-storage, waste-treatment and/or waste-disposal operation involving

the ROWs without a permit issued by IEPA and not in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board in violation of 415 ILCS 5/21(d).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegation in Paragraph 71.

72. IDOT's violations are continuing in nature.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations in Paragraph 72.

73. By moving ACM materials both horizontally and vertically within and outside the boundaries of the areas currently designated as Sites 3 and 6, IDOT introduced contamination to Site 3 and 6, including the ROWs; exacerbated any existing contamination at those Sites and directly contributed to the scope of the EPA's selected remedy for Site 3 and for Site 6, which requires Complainant JM and ComEd to conduct extensive sub-surface excavation, including by creating clean corridors for each of the utilities running through the site, including the ROWs.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies that it moved "ACM materials both horizontally and vertically within and outside the boundaries of the areas currently designated as Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, IDOT introduced contamination to Site 3 and 6[.]" Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way are located within any part of Site 6. Further responding, IDOT denies that it "exacerbated any existing contamination at those Sites and directly contributed to the scope of the EPA's selected remedy for Site 3 and for Site 6[.]" IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the balance of the allegations in Paragraph.

74. JM contends that because IDOT's violations of the Act have directly impacted the scope of the proposed remedy for Sites 3 and 6, including the need to excavate buried portions of Transite® pipe and to create clean corridors around the six utilities (portions of the remedy not proposed by JM and ComEd but ordered by EPA in 2012), IDOT should be required to participate in the response action for Sites 3 and 6.

ANSWER:

As the allegations set forth in Paragraph 74 consist solely of JM's contentions, and not allegations of fact, no response to this Paragraph is required. Further responding, the Environmental Protection Act does not provide authority to the Board to compel IDOT's participation in a USEPA-mandated "response action" at Sites 3 and 6.

75. As JM submitted a final Remedial Action Work Plan to EPA on January 24, 2014 and must begin implementation of EPA's proposed remedy shortly after the RAWP is approved, it stands to suffer immediate and irreparable injuries for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that no exhibits were received into evidence or testimony elicited during the five days of hearing in this matter regarding any activity on the aforementioned date, IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the any of the allegations in Paragraph 75. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way are located within any part of Site 6. Further responding, IDOT denies that JM stands to suffer any "immediate and irreparable injuries [.]". Further responding, IDOT denies that JM can "suffer immediate and irreparable injuries for which there is no adequate remedy at law"

where JM is responsible for causing and/or creating the conditions that have given rise to any purported “immediate and irreparable injuries.”

76. Complainant JM is not aware of any identical or substantially similar action pending before the Board or in any other forum against Respondent IDOT based on the same conduct or alleging the same violations of the Act.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 76.

COUNT II

Violations of Section 1021 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act²

77. Complainant realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-55 of Count I of this Third Amended Complaint as if set forth herein in full.

ANSWER:

IDOT realleges and reincorporates by reference all of its responses to paragraphs 1-55 of Count I of JM’s Third Amended Complaint, as if fully set forth herein.

78. Respondent IDOT’s actions in using, spreading, burying, placing, dumping, disposing of and abandoning ACM refuse, including Transite® pipe, throughout Site 3 and portions of Site 6 including the ROWs and in using ACM refuse as fill during construction of the Greenwood Avenue ramp and expressway bypass from 1971 to 1976 constitute violations of Section 1021 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act (“Act”).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations in Paragraph 78. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way lies within any part of Site 6.

² For purposes of this third Amended Complaint, JM cites the provisions of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act in effect from 1970-1973. Because IDOT’s violations were are [sic] and are continuing, however, subsequent versions of the Act also apply. Subsequent versions of the Act do not materially differ from the Act as effective from 1970-1973.

79. Section 1021 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1021, provides, in pertinent part:

No person shall:

(b) Cause of (sic) allow the open dumping of any other refuse in violation of regulations adopted by the Board; [or]

(f) Dispose of any refuse, or transport any refuse into this State for Disposal, except at a site or facility which meets the requirements of this Act and of regulations thereunder.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 79 accurately states the provisions of former Section 1021 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1021(b) and (f) of the Act.

80. Section 1021 of the Act also provides that no person shall “(c)onduct any refuse-collection or refuse-disposal operations, except for refuse generated by the operator’s own activities, without a permit granted by the Agency. IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1021(e).

ANSWER:

Paragraph 80 accurately states the provisions of former Section 1021 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1021.

81. Section 1003 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1003(k), defines “refuse” as “any garbage or other discarded solid materials.”

ANSWER:

Paragraph 81 accurately states the provisions of former Section 1003 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1003.

82. Discarded ACM at Sites 3 and 6 are “refuse” within the meaning of the Act.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 82.

83. Section 1003 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1003(h), defines “open dumping” as “the consolidation of refuse from one or more sources at a central disposal site that does not fulfill the requirements of a sanitary landfill.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 83 accurately states the provisions of former Section 1003(h) of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1003(h).

84. Section 1003 of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1003(l), defines “sanitary landfill” as:

The disposal of refuse on land without creating nuisances or hazards to public health or safety, by confining the refuse to the smallest practical volume and covering it with a layer of earth at the conclusion of each day’s operation, or at such more frequent intervals as may be necessary.

ANSWER:

Paragraph 84 accurately states the provisions of former Section 1003(l) of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶1003(l).

85. Site 3 and Site 6 have never been central disposal sites that fulfill the requirements of a sanitary landfill.

ANSWER

The allegations contained in Paragraph 85 of Johns Manville’s Third Amended Complaint constitute conclusions of law to which no answer is required.

86. Site 3 and Site 6 have never been permitted refuse disposal sites or facilities which meets the requirements of the Act or its regulations as they relate to the disposal of refuse.

ANSWER:

The allegations contained in Paragraph 86 of Johns Manville’s Third Amended Complaint constitute conclusions of law to which no answer is required.

87. IDOT engaged in the open dumping of refuse and disposal of ACM refuse, between 1971 and 1976 when it: (a) used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of, and abandoned ACM refuse on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, when it built an embankment on the north and south sides of Greenwood Avenue; (b) used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of and abandoned ACM refuse on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, when constructed and obliterated Bypasses A and B; and (c) generally used as fill, spread, buried, dumped, placed, disposed of and abandoned ACM refuse on Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, during construction of the Greenwood Avenue ramp and expressway bypass from 1971 to 1976.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations contained in Paragraph 87 of Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way lie within any part of Site 6.

88. The ACM refuse dumped and disposed of on and under Sites 3 and 6, including the ROWs, was abandoned by IDOT around 1976 and currently remains in situ.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way lie within any part of Site 6.

89. IDOT caused or allowed the open dumping of ACM refuse in violation of Section 1021(b) of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1021.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations contained in Paragraph 89 of Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint.

90. IDOT caused or allowed the disposal of and abandonment of ACM refuse in an area that does not meet the requirements of the Act or its regulations in violation of Section 1021(f) of the Act, IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1021(f).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations contained in Paragraph 90 of Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint.

91. IDOT, as an agent of the State of Illinois, since approximately 1970 has caused and allowed and continues to cause and allow the open dumping and disposal of ACM refuse with the ROWs in violation of IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1021(b), (f) and has operated and continues to operate a refuse collection and/or refuse disposal operation involving the ROWs without a permit issued by IEPA and not in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board in violation of IL ST CH 111 ½ ¶ 1021(e).

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 91 of Complainant's Third Amended Complaint.

92. IDOT's violations are continuing in nature.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies the allegations in Paragraph 92 of Complainant's Third Amended Complaint.

93. By moving ACM material both horizontally and vertically within and outside the boundaries of the areas currently designated as Sites 3 and 6, IDOT introduced contamination to Site 3 and 6, including the ROWs; exacerbated any existing contamination at those Sites; and directly contributed to the scope of the EPA's selected remedy for Site 3 and for Site 6, which

requires Complainant JM and ComEd to conduct extensive sub-surface excavation, including by creating clean corridors for each of the utilities running through the site, including within the ROWs.

ANSWER:

IDOT denies all of the allegations in Paragraph 93 of Complainant's Third Amended Complaint. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way lie within any part of Site 6.

94. JM contends that because IDOT's violations of the Act have directly impacted the scope of the proposed remedy for Sites 3 and 6, including the need to excavate buried portions of Transite® pipe and to create clean corridors around the six utilitarian (portions of the remedy not proposed by JM and ComEd but ordered by EPA in 2012), IDOT should be required to participate in the response action for Sites 3 and 6.

ANSWER:

Because the allegations in Paragraph 94 consist of John Manville's are contentions and not allegations of fact, no response is necessary. Further responding, IDOT disagrees with John's Manville's contentions in this Paragraph and denies that the Board has any authority to order IDOT to participate in a USEPA-ordered response action for Sites 3 and 6.

95. As JM submitted a final Remedial Action Work Plan to EPA on January 24, 2014 and must begin implementation of EPA's proposed remedy shortly after the RAWP is approved, it stands to suffer immediate and irreparable injuries for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

ANSWER:

IDOT notes that the document referred to in Paragraph 95 was not one of the over 100 documents received into evidence by the Hearing Officer during the five days of hearing held in this matter. Accordingly, as there is no evidentiary support for the allegations in this Paragraph 95, IDOT denies the allegations in this paragraph. Further responding, IDOT specifically denies that Johns Manville stands to any “suffer immediate and irreparable injuries” as alleged in Paragraph 95. Further responding, IDOT denies that any of its rights of way lie within any part of Site 6.

96. Complainant JM is not aware of any identical or substantially similar action pending before the Board or in any other forum against Respondent IDOT based on the same conduct or alleging the same violation of the Act.

ANSWER:

IDOT lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 96.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT

IDOT’s First Affirmative Defense (Unclean Hands)

1. All of the asbestos-containing materials (“ACM”) located at Sites 3 and 6 were placed on those Sites by Johns Manville (“JM”) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (“IDOT”) had no role in bringing the ACM to Sites 3 and 6.

2. USEPA initially identified JM and Commonwealth Edison as the potentially responsible parties (“PRP”) for the ACM contamination at Site 3 and, subsequently, at Site 6. No additional PRPs have ever been identified for Sites 3 and 6, and USEPA has never determined that IDOT was a PRP for the ACM contamination at Site 3 or, subsequently, Site 6.

3. The USEPA only required JM and Commonwealth Edison, and not IDOT, to enter into an Administrative Order on Consent (“AOC”) for the investigation and removal of the ACM at Sites 3 and 6.

4. JM and Commonwealth Edison, and not IDOT, are currently under a legal obligation to remove the ACM at Sites 3 and 6, because USEPA has determined that they are responsible for the ACM at those sites.

5. ACM waste materials were discovered at Site 3 at various depths and consisted of asbestos-containing felt paper, tar paper, roofing materials, flash paper and insulation, as well as Transite.

6. ACM waste materials were discovered at Site 6 at various depths and consisted of asbestos-containing fibrous sludge, roofing materials, brake materials, shingles and Transite.

7. In addition to the ACM discovered at Sites 3 and 6, ACM waste materials was discovered at Sites 4/5 (the western edge of the former JM facility) at various depths and consisted of Transite, roofing materials, brake shoe materials and other forms of ACM. Sampling field work undertaken in the early months of 2008, showed that ACM waste materials were pervasive in the subsurface at Sites 4/5.

8. Given the prevalence of various forms of ACM material at the JM Site, Sites 3, 4/5, and 6, and JM’s existing obligations under the AOC for removing this ACM, JM’s efforts to name IDOT as a respondent in this present action should be barred, as Johns Manville has unclean hands.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT’s First

Affirmative Defense, that Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

IDOT's Second Affirmative Defense (Waiver)

1. JM was aware at the time that IDOT began construction work on Greenwood Avenue and in the former Parking Lot that ACM Transite pipe was located on and at the Parking Lot.

2. At least as early as 2000, JM asserted to USEPA that IDOT was responsible for the ACM at Site 3.

3. In a July 6, 2000 email from JM's counsel to an attorney with USEPA Region V, JM's counsel urged USEPA to name IDOT as a PRP at Site 3.

4. In an August 7, 2000 email from JM's counsel to the Illinois Attorney General, JM's counsel raised the same allegations concerning IDOT's potential liability for ACM contamination at Site 3 that it now makes in its Third Amended Complaint.

5. On information and belief, JM continued to urge USEPA to name IDOT as a PRP for Site 3 at least up through the entry of the AOC in June 2007.

6. JM was aware even before the AOC was entered in June 2007 that it would be required under the terms of the AOC to undertake a substantial amount of work at Sites 3 and 6, including "determining the extent of asbestos contamination at or near the Southwestern Site Area (AOC, § VIII.15.a), the development of an "Extent of Contamination Work Plan" (AOC, § VIII.15.b), and the implementation of the scope of work identified under that plan.

7. By failing to commence its action before the Pollution Control Board ("Board") for approximately 13 years after JM first raised issues about IDOT's potential liability for ACM contamination at Site 3, as well as six years after the signing of the AOC by all parties, including

JM, and long after it was aware of the nature and extent of IDOT's construction project, JM waived its rights to bring this action when it initially filed it with the Board on July 9, 2013.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Third Affirmative Defense is barred under the doctrine of waiver.

IDOT's Third Affirmative Defense (Laches)

1-6. IDOT realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 6 of its Second Affirmative Defense as Paragraphs 1-6 of its Third Affirmative Defense.

7. By failing to commence its action before the Board for approximately 13 years after JM first raised issues about IDOT's potential liability for ACM contamination at Site 3, as well as some six years after it entered into the AOC with USEPA, and long after it was aware of the nature and extent of IDOT's construction project, JM's claims against IDOT are now barred under the doctrine of laches.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Third Affirmative Defense, finding that Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint.

IDOT's Fourth Affirmative Defense (Statute of Limitations)

1-6. IDOT realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 6 of its Second Affirmative Defense as Paragraphs 1-6 of its Fourth Affirmative Defense.

7. Section 13-205 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, 735 ILCS 5/13-205 provides for a five year statute of limitations for the causes of actions that JM has brought under its Third Amended Complaint.

8. JM's causes of action under the Act began accruing no later than June 2007, when it entered into the AOC with USEPA, if not earlier, back in 2000, when it first sought to have IDOT named as a potentially responsible party for the site.

9. Accordingly, JM's causes of action are barred by the five year statute of limitations found at 735 ILCS 5/13-205.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Fourth Affirmative Defense, finding that Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint is barred by the statute of limitations set forth under 735 ILCS 5/13-205.

IDOT's Fifth Affirmative Defense (Lack of Jurisdiction)

1. JM, through its Prayer for Relief, requests the Board grant it relief that the Board does not have the statutory authority to grant.

2. Paragraph C of the Prayer for Relief in JM's Third Amended Complaint asks that the Board enter an order:

Requiring Respondent to participate in the response actions on Sites 3 and 6 - implementing the remedy approved or ultimately approved by EPA – to the extent attributable to IDOT's violations of the Act, pursuant to the Board's broad authority to award equitable relief under Section 33 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/33[.]

3. The Board does not have the statutory authority to require IDOT to participate in the implementation of a remedy that the USEPA has ordered JM and Commonwealth Edison to perform.

4. The Board cannot grant JM's requested relief without the approval and consent of USEPA, as the AOC is an agreement negotiated between and entered into by JM, Commonwealth Edison and USEPA.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Fifth Affirmative Defense, that the relief sought through Paragraph C of Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint is unavailable to Johns Manville, as the Board does not have the statutory authority to grant the requested relief.

IDOT's Sixth Affirmative Defense (Failure to Join Necessary Parties)

1-2. IDOT realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 2 of its Fifth Affirmative Defense as Paragraphs 1-2 of its Sixth Affirmative Defense.

3. At all times relevant to JM's Third Amended Complaint, Commonwealth Edison has been the fee simple owner of the property on which Site 3 is located.

4. At all times relevant to JM's Third Amended Complaint, JM has been required, pursuant to the AOC, the terms of which JM and Commonwealth Edison negotiated with USEPA, to investigate and remove ACM from Sites 3, 4/5 and 6.

5. Pursuant to Paragraph 74 of the AOC, JM and Commonwealth Edison must seek prior approval from USEPA before it can deviate from its obligations under the AOC.

6. JM, through the Prayer for Relief in its Third Amended Complaint, seeks to require IDOT to participate in the removal action which JM and Commonwealth Edison are obliged to perform under the terms of the AOC that they negotiated with USEPA.

7. JM's requested relief would constitute a deviation from its obligations under the AOC.

8. Because the Board does not have the statutory authority to modify the terms of the AOC to require IDOT to participate in the removal action, and because the inclusion of IDOT as

a participant in the removal action would constitute a deviation from the terms which JM has agreed to under the AOC, USEPA is a necessary party to this action.

9. Commonwealth Edison, as the party owning Site 3 is a necessary party to this action.

10. As alleged above in Paragraphs 1-9 of this Sixth Affirmative Defense, JM has failed to name all necessary parties that are required to participate in this action, such that the Board can grant full and complete relief.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Sixth Affirmative Defense, that Johns Manville's Third Amended Complaint fails to name all necessary parties to this action.

IDOT's Seventh Affirmative Defense (IDOT's Alleged Actions Were Not a Violation of the Environmental Protection Act at the Time That They Occurred)

1. Johns Manville's claims against IDOT are based on alleged actions that purportedly constitute violations of the Environmental Protection Act ("Act"), as currently drafted.

2. At the time that IDOT caused the Project to be constructed, the Act was more limited in scope than is currently the case.

3. At the time that IDOT caused the Project to be constructed, Section 21(a) of the Act provides that: "No person shall cause or allow the open dumping of garbage."

4. At the time that IDOT caused the Project to be constructed, Section 21(d) of the Act provided that: "No person shall abandon any vehicle in violation of the "Abandoned Vehicles Amendment to the Illinois Vehicle Code", as enacted by the 76th General Assembly."

5. At the time that IDOT caused the Project to be constructed, Section 21(e) of the Act provided, in relevant part, that: “No person shall conduct any refuse-collection or refuse-disposal operations, except for refuse generated by the operator’s own activities, without a permit granted by the Agency . . .”

6. Any control, ownership, or authority which IDOT may have ever held over Sites 3 and 6 ended once IDOT completed all work on Greenwood Avenue extension to the Amstutz Expressway.

7. The actions which JM alleges IDOT undertook in the course of conducting the Project were not violations of the Act at the time those actions were undertaken.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT’s Seventh Affirmative Defense, finding that Johns Manville’s claims against IDOT under Third Amended Complaint cannot stand, as they constitute an impermissible imposition of retroactive liability on IDOT..

IDOT’s Eighth Affirmative Defense

1. The land that JM constructed the Parking Lot on the north end of Site 3 and adjacent to the south side of Site 6, was historically a low-lying, wet area.

2. On information and belief, JM constructed the Parking Lot using ACM, including asbestos-containing Transite pipe, as well as other ACM that was used for the sub-base of the Parking Lot.

3. On information and belief, at a time better known to JM, JM ceased using the Parking Lot.

4. At the time that JM ceased its use of the Parking Lot, it abandoned thereon the ACM materials that had been used to construct at the Parking Lot and took no steps to remove any of the aforementioned ACM.

5. The ACM materials which JM abandoned at the Parking Lot are the very same ACM materials which the United States Environmental Protection Agency is now requiring JM and Commonwealth Edison to remove, pursuant to the terms of the AOC.

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Illinois Department of Transportation, requests that the Board enter an order in its favor and against Complainant, Johns Manville, upon IDOT's Eighth Affirmative Defense.

Respectfully Submitted,

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION

BY: s/ Evan J. McGinley
EVAN J. MCGINLEY
ELLEN O'LAUGHLIN
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Bureau
69 West Washington Street
Suite 1800
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Phone: (312) 814-3153
(312) 814-3094
emcginley@atg.state.il.us
eolaughlin@atg.state.il.us
mcacaccio@atg.state.il.us

MATTHEW D. DOUGHERTY
Special Assistant Attorney General
Illinois Department of Transportation
Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 313
2300 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, Illinois 62764
Phone: (217) 785-7524
matthew.dougherty@Illinois.gov