BEFORE THE ILL MOIS POLITITION CONTROL BOARD OFFICE

IN THE MATTER OF:		MAR 1 2 2001
GROUNDWATER QUALITY)	STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
STANDARDS AMENDMENTS:)	R01-14
35 ILL. ADM. CODE 620)	(Rulemaking Water)

Testimony of Craig Curtis, J.D., Ph.D.

Craig Curtis hereby prefiles the attached TESTIMONY

DATED: March 6, 2001 Department of Political Science Bradley University 1501 West Bradley Avenue Peoria, IL 61625 309/677-2492

TESTIMONY OF CRAIG CURTIS, J.D., Ph.D. FOR THE PROPOSED MTBE GROUNDWATER QUALITY STANDARDS R01-14

INTRODUCTION

My name is Craig Curtis and I am an Associate Professor of Political Science at Bradley University. Together with my research assistant, C. J. Neu, an undergraduate student at Bradley University, I am conducting exploratory research into the rulemaking process in the state of Illinois. As a part of our research, we attended the March 1 hearing on PROPOSED MTBE GROUNDWATER QUALITY STANDARDS, R01-14, in Springfield, Illinois, at the Illinois Pollution Control Board Hearing Room at 600 S. 2nd Street.

During the course of that hearing, I had occasion to ask a question concerning the lack of findings of contamination of Community Water Supplies ("CWS") in Madison County, Illinois. I had obtained information from a World Wide Web site called "Scorecard" (http://www.scorecard.org/.) that indicated releases of MTBE into the environment in that county were much larger than any other Illinois county. Despite these releases, the testimony of Richard P. Cobb, P.G., of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency indicated that only two sites in Madison County had been affected by MTBE contamination. These were Bethalto CWS and E. Alton CWS.

The answers provided by Mr. Cobb made it very clear that he was not aware of these data. I was asked to file testimony containing the data, and do so here today.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE DATA SOURCE

The data on releases of MTBE were obtained during a search of the World Wide Web. We began with the US Environmental Protection Agency ("US EPA") web site in Fall of 2000 (I am not sure of the exact date). That site, at that time, contained a link to the "Scorecard" site, which C. J. and I followed. The attached documents are printouts of web pages from "Scorecard."

According to the authors of "Scorecard" their charts are derived from the Toxics Release Inventory ("TRI") database collected and maintained by the US EPA. Although the "Scorecard" site is not explicit about this point, one is led to believe that the data from which the charts were compiled are the 1998 TRI reports.

I have included two charts: 1) the first lists the nine Illinois counties with reported releases of MTBE; and, 2) the second lists the 100 counties in the United States with the most reported releases of MTBE. As one can see, three Illinois counties, Madison, St. Clair and Cook, appear on the list of the 100 counties with the largest releases of MTBE.

Attachment I: Counties with Reported Total Environmental Releases of MTBE in Illinois (1 page).



ABOUT THE CHEMICALS By County



Chemical: methyl tert-butyl ether

CAS Number: 1634-04-4

	אָס (select your ranking	g criteria)
Total er	vironmental releases	_ F
in ILLINOI	S	▼ Go (explain
Rank	County	Pound
1.	<u>MADISON</u>	33,66
2.	<u>ST, ĆLAIR</u>	9,90
3.	<u>COOK</u>	6,48
4.	<u>BOONE</u>	1,38
5.	<u>DUPAGE</u>	1,00
6.	<u>LAKE</u>	50
7.	<u>MCLEAN</u>	34
8.	<u>CRAWFORD</u>	10
9,	WILL	

© 2000 Environmental Defense and LocusPocus

Email questions regarding the data or how to use this information to protect the environment.

Attachment II: Counties with Reported Total Environmental Releases of MTBE, nationwide, ranked, the 100 counties with the most releases are charted (4 pages).



ABOUT THE CHEMICALS By County



Chemical: methyl tert-butyl ether

CAS Number: 1634-04-4

Total	environmental releases	T	
n		extraction	
ILLIN	ois	▼ Go	(explain)
Rank	County		Pounds
1.	<u>HARRIS, TX</u>		429,462
2.	CONTRA COSTA, CA		311,268
3.	LOS ANGELES, CA		297,122
4.	NUECES, TX		189,300
5.	BOX ELDER, UT		175,000
6.	<u>UNION, NJ</u>		171,571
7,	LAKE, IN		152,208
8.	WAYNE, MI		144,624
9.	MIDDLESEX, NJ		136,727
10.	GLOUCESTER, NJ		97,204
11.	EAST BATON ROUGE, L	<u>A</u>	85,495
12.	PHILADELPHIA, PA		69,251
13.	JEFFERSON, TX		68,134
14.	ST, CHARLES, LA		60,804
15.	SUFFOLK, MA		59,829
16.	YORK, VA		56,600
17.	BALTIMORE (CITY), MD	<u>.</u>	54,161
18.	DELAWARE, PA		48,752
19.	GALVESTON, TX		46,649
20.	KAY, OK		43,242
21.	ST. CROIX, VI		42,431
22.	<u>OTTAWA, MI</u>		40,578
23.	NEW CASTLE, DE		39,425
24.	SOLANO, CA		38,539

25.	BRAZORIA, TX	37,980
26.	ASCENSION, LA	36,381
27.	ST. LANDRY, LA	35,558
28.	CALCASIEU, LA	35,191
29.	PROVIDENCE, RI	34,501
30.	NASSAU, NY	34,029
31.	MADISON, IL	33,668
32.	NEW HAVEN, CT	33,403
33.	GUAYAMA, PR	30,554
34.	MCKINLEY, NM	29,279
35.	SAN DIEGO, CA	28,683
36.	MARICOPA, AZ	27,847
37.	FAIRFAX, VA	27,310
38.	ST. JAMES, LA	26,421
39.	FAIRFIELD, CT	25,955
40.	DALLAS, TX	25,493
41.	MIDDLESEX, MA	23,335
42.	BOYD, KY	23,000
43.	ST. BERNARD, LA	22,663
44.	SUFFOLK, NY	22,345
45.	TARRANT, TX	22,263
46.	ADAMS, CO	21,995
47.	CANADIAN, OK	21,145
48.	CUMBERLAND, ME	20,574
49.	LARAMIE, WY	20,000
50.	YOLO, CA	19,504
51.	NORFOLK, MA	19,399
52.	SANTA CLARA, CA	19,096
53.	ALLEGHENY, PA	18,901
54.	MONROE, IA	18,840
55.	ESSEX, MA	18,163
56.	ORANGE, NY	16,571
57.	SAN BERNARDINO, CA	16,508
58.	MOORE, TX	16,154
59.	BROWARD, FL	15,474
60.	NEW HANOVER, NC	15,218
61.	DAVIS, UT	14,787
62.	KERN, CA	13,350
63.	PETERSBURG (CITY), VA	12,250
64.	RICHMOND (CITY), VA	11,920
65.	RICHMOND, NY	11,719
	and the second of the second o	Sec. 1986.

2 of 4 3/5/01 11:03 AM

•				
	66.	BREVARD, FL	ŧ · .	11,000
	67.	HAMPDEN, MA	e e e	10,714
•	68.	SAN JOAQUIN, CA		10,548
	69.	CHESAPEAKE (CITY),	<u>VA</u>	10,423
$w_{i} \sim \epsilon_{i}$	70.	ESSEX, NJ		10,354
	71.	ST. CLAIR, IL		9,905
	72.	CAMDEN, NJ		9,796
	73.	JEFFERSON, KY		9,665
	74.	EL PASO, CO		9,205
	75.	HALE, TX		9,205
	76.	QUAY, NM		9,205
	77.	BEAVER, OK		9,205
	78.	DALLAM, TX	andria. Ngjariya	9,205
	79.	ERIE, NY	et da en	9,018
	80.	MONROE, NY		8,942
·	81.	CHESTER, PA		8,933
	82.	KINGS, NY		8,774
	83.	NYE, NV		8,450
	84.	SUMMIT, OH		8,357
Tark of	85.	BERKS, PA		7,553
	86.	FAIRFAX (CITY), VA		7,391
	87.	MONROE, MI		7,247
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	88.	EL PASO, TX		6,815
**	89.	YELLOWSTONE, MT		6,800
·	90.	SACRAMENTO, CA	134	6,705
	91.	CHEMUNG, NY		6,569
	92.	ANNE ARUNDEL, MD		6,504
<u></u>	93.	COOK, IL		6,483
	94.	JONES, TX		6,090
	95.	ALLEN, OH		6,006
e Saus	96.	LEHIGH, PA		5,400
1900	97.	MERCER, NJ	48. 17.8.3	5,299
	98.	PRINCE WILLIAM, VA	in in the second of the second	5,150
	99.	BERNALILLO, NM		5,105
	100.	GUILFORD, NC	i de la proposición de la companya d	4,736

© 2000 <u>Environmental Defense</u> and <u>LocusPocus</u>

Email questions regarding the data or how to use this information to protect the environment.