

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	PCB 10-084
	)	(Enforcement – Land)
PROFESSIONAL SWINE MANAGEMENT,	)	
LLC; HILLTOP VIEW, LLC; WILDCAT	)	
FARMS, LLC; HIGH-POWER PORK, LLC;	)	
EAGLE POINT, LLC; LONE HOLLOW, LLC;	)	
TIMBERLINE, LLC; PRAIRIE STATE GILTS,	)	
LTD; NORTH FORK PORK, LLC; LITTLE	)	
TIMBER, LLC,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**NOTICE OF FILING**

TO: Mr. John T. Therriault  
 Clerk of the Board  
 Illinois Pollution Control Board  
 100 West Randolph Street  
 Suite 11-500  
 Chicago, Illinois 60601  
**(VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL)**


Carol Webb, Esq.  
 Hearing Officer  
 Illinois Pollution Control Board  
 1021 North Grand Avenue East  
 Post Office Box 19274  
 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276  
**(VIA U.S. MAIL)**

**(PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST)**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that I have today filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, Prairie State Gilts, ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT & AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, and MOTION TO SEVER, a copy of which is herewith served upon you.

Respectfully submitted,

**PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD**, Respondent

By:   
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 One of Its Attorneys

Dated: June 17, 2013

**BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP**  
 Claire A. Manning  
 Registration No. 3124724  
 205 S. Fifth Street, Suite 700  
 P.O. Box 2459  
 Springfield, IL 62705-2459  
 (217) 544-8491  
[cmanning@bhslaw.com](mailto:cmanning@bhslaw.com)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing instrument was served upon:

Mr. John T. Therriault  
Clerk of the Board  
Illinois Pollution Control Board  
100 West Randolph Street  
Suite 11-500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Dr. Joseph F. Connor  
Professional Swine Management  
34 West Main Street  
P.O. Box 220  
Carthage, IL 62321

Ms. Carol Webb  
Hearing Officer  
Illinois Pollution Control Board  
1021 North Grand Avenue East  
Post Office Box 19274  
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9274

Matt Bradshaw  
Twin Valley Pumping, Inc.  
22701 U.S. Highway 54  
Griggsville, IL 62340

Ms. Jane McBride  
Illinois Attorney General's Office  
500 South Second Street  
Springfield, IL 62706


Robert L. Rhea  
North Fork Pork, LLC  
106 E. State Street  
Camp Point, IL 62320

Fred C. Prillaman  
Joel A. Benoit  
Mohan, Alewelt, Prillaman & Adami  
First of America Center  
1 North Old State Capitol Plaza, Suite 325  
Springfield, IL 62701

James A. Hansen  
Schmiedeskamp, Robertson, Neu &  
Mitchell, LLP  
525 Jersey Street  
P.O. Box 1069  
Quincy, IL 62306

Edward W. Dwyer  
Jennifer M. Martin  
Hodge Dwyer & Driver  
3150 Roland Avenue  
Post Office Box 5776  
Springfield, IL 62705-5776

by enclosing the same in an envelope addressed to such party at the above address, with postage fully prepaid, and by depositing said envelope in a U.S. Post Office mailbox in Springfield, Illinois, at 5:00 p.m. on this 17th day of June, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Claire A. Manning

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	PCB NO. 10-84
	)	Enforcement
	)	
PROFESSIONAL SWINE MANAGEMENT,	)	
LLC, HILLTOP VIEW, LLC, WILDCAT	)	
FARMS, LLC , PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LLC,	)	
EAGLE POINT, LCC, LONE HOLLOW,	)	
LLC, TIMBERLINE, LLC, PRAIRIE STATE	)	
GILTS, Ltd, AND LITTLE TIMBER, LLC,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

**RESPONDENT PRAIRIE STATE GILT, LTD.'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT & AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

**NOW COMES** Respondents, Prairie State Gilts, Ltd. ("Prairie State Gilts"), by and through its attorneys, Brown, Hay & Stephens, LLP, and as for its Answer to the Second Amended Complaint filed by Complainant, the People of the State of Illinois ("the State"), states as follows:

**COUNT I**

1. The allegations contained in Count I are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT II**

1. The allegations contained in Count II are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT III**

1. The allegations contained in Count III are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT IV**

1. The allegations contained in Count IV are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT V**

1. The allegations contained in Count V are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT VI**

1. The allegations contained in Count VI are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

**COUNT VII**

**WATER POLLUTION VIOLATIONS – PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, SCHUYLER COUNTY**

1. This Count is brought on behalf of the People of the State of Illinois, *ex rel.* LISA MADIGAN, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, on her own motion pursuant to Section 42(d) and (e) of the Illinois Environmental Act (“Act”), 415 ILCS 5/42(d) and (e).

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 1, Count VII.**

2. The Illinois EPA is an agency of the State of Illinois created by the Illinois General Assembly in Section 4 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/4, and which is charges, *inter alia*, with the duty of enforcing the Act.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 2, Count VII.**

3. The Respondent PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD (“Prairie State Gilts”) is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint an Illinois corporation, registered and in good standing with the

Illinois Secretary of State to do business in Illinois. The registered agent for Prairie State Gilts is Gary L. Donley, 303 N. Second St., POB 220, Carthage, IL 62321.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 3, Count VII.**

4. Respondent Prairie State Gilts owns a sow breeding and gestation operation. The legal description of the property is NE 1/4 of Section 11 and NW 1/4 Section 12, T3N, R3W of the 4<sup>th</sup> P.M. in Schuyler County, Illinois. Approximately 2,500 head of swine weighing 55 pounds and 2,000 head of swine weighing less than 55 pounds are confined at the facility. ("Prairie State Gilts site" or "Prairie State Gilts facility").

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 4, Count VII.**

5. The Respondent PROFESSIONAL SWINE MANAGEMENT, LLC ("PSM") is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, an Illinois limited liability company, registered and in good standing with the Illinois Secretary of State to do business in Illinois. The registered agent for Respondent PSM is Gary L. Donley, 303 N. Second St., POB 220, Carthage, IL 62321.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 5, Count VII.**

6. Respondent PSM manages Prairie State Gilt's operations and the physical site.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts admits that, during the relevant time period, PSM performed certain operational services at the site, pursuant to contract with Respondent Prairie State Gilts.**

7. The Prairie State Gilts facility waste handling system consists of shallow pits with drain pull plugs under each confinement buildings on the site but one. A deep pit is under the

remaining confinement building. Individual drain pull plugs are removed to allow the transfer of livestock waste by gravity to one of two reception pits on the site, which in turn then pump livestock waste to the single-celled lagoon. Float-activated switches on the pumps within the reception pits automatically start pumping operations when preset levels within the reception pits are reached.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 7, Count VII.**

8. Two nursery buildings are located on the southwest portion of the Prairie State Gilts site. Livestock waste from the two nursery buildings drains to the south reception pit and is then pumped into the lagoon. The transfer line between the pits under the nursery buildings and the lagoon is underground. There are vertical clean-out pipes in two locations on this underground transfer line, that extend three feet above ground. A hayfield is located between the reception pit and the lagoon, above the transfer line.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations of Paragraph 8, Count VII.**

9. Section 3.165 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.125 provides:

“CONTAMINANT” is any solid, liquid, or gaseous matter, any odor or any form of energy, from whatever source.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

10. Section 3.545 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.545, provides the following definition:

“Water Pollution” is such alteration of the physical, thermal, chemical, biological, or radioactive properties of any waters of the State, or such discharge of any contaminant into any waters of the State as will or is likely to create a nuisance or render such waters harmful or detrimental or injurious to public health, safety or

welfare, or to domestic, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, or other legitimate uses, or livestock, wild animals, birds, fish or other aquatic life.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

11. Section 3.550 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/3.550, provides the following definition:

“WATERS” means all public accumulations of water, surface, and underground, natural, and artificial public and private, or parts thereof, which are wholly or partially within, flow through, or border upon this State.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

12. Section 12 of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/12, provides the following prohibitions:

No person shall:

(a) Cause or threaten or allow the discharge of any contaminants into the environment in any State so as to cause or tend to cause water pollution in Illinois, either alone or in combination with matter from other sources, or as to violation regulations or standards adopted by the Pollution control Board under this Act;

\* \* \*

(d) Deposit any contaminants upon the land in such place and manner so as to create a water pollution hazard.

\* \* \*

(f) Cause threaten or allow the discharge of any contaminant into the waters of the State, as defined herein, including but not limited to, waters to any sewage works, or into any well or from any point source within the State, without an NPDES permit for point source discharges issued by the Agency under Section 39(b) of this Act, or in violation of any regulations adopted by the Board or any order adopted by the Board with respect to the NPDES program.

No permit shall be required under this subsection and under Section 39(b) of this Act for any discharges for which a permit is not required under the

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as now or hereafter amended, and regulations pursuant thereto.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

13. Section 309.102(a) of the Board's Water Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 309.102(a) provides:

Except as in complaint with the provisions of the Act, Board regulations, and the CWA, and the provisions and conditions of the NPDES permit issued to the discharger, the discharge of any contaminant or pollutant by any person into the waters of the State from a point source or into a well shall be unlawful.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

14. Section 502.101 of the Board's Agriculture Related Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 502.101, provides:

No person specified in Section 502.102, 502.103 or 502.104 or required to have a permit under the conditions of Section 502.106 shall cause or allow the operation of any new livestock management facility or livestock waste-handling facility, or cause or allow the modification of any livestock management facility or livestock waste-handling facility, or cause or allow the operation of any existing livestock management facility of livestock waste-handling facility without a National Pollutant Discharge elimination System ("NPDES") permit. Facility expansions, production increase, and process modification which significantly increase the amount of livestock waste over the level authorized by the NPDES permit must be reported by submission of the a new NPDES application.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

15. Section 502.103 of the Board's Agriculture Related Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 501.103, provides:

Very Large Operations



An NPDES permit is required if more than the numbers of animals specified in any of the following categories are confined:

\* \* \*

2,500            Swine weighing over 55 pounds

\* \* \*

1,000            Animal Units

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

16. Section 502.104 of the Board's Agricultural Regulated Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 501.104, provides:

Large Operations

a) An NPDES permit is required if more than the following numbers and types of animals are confined and either condition (b) or (c) is met:

\* \* \*

750              Swine weighing over 55 pounds

\* \* \*

b) Pollutants are discharges into navigable waters through a man-made ditch, flushing system, or other similar man-made devices; or

c) Pollutants are discharges directly into navigable waters which originate outside of pass over, across, or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animal in the operation.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

17. Section 502.106 of the Board's Agriculture Related Pollution Regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 502.106 provides:

a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Part, the agency may require any animal feeding operation not falling within Section 502.201, 502.103, or

502.104 to obtain a permit. In making such designation the Agency shall consider the following facts:

- 1) The size of the animal feeding operation and the amount of wastes reaching navigable waters;
  - 2) The location of the animal feeding operation relative to navigable waters;
  - 3) The means of conveyance of animal wastes and process wastewaters into navigable waters;
  - 4) The slope, vegetation, rainfall and other factors relative to the likelihood or frequency of discharge of animal wastes and process wastewaters into navigable waters; and
  - 5) Other such factors bearing on the significance of pollution problem sought to be regulated.
- b) The Agency, however, may not require a permit under paragraph a) for any animal feeding operation with less than the number of animal units (300) set forth in Section 502.105 above, unless it meets either of the following conditions:
- 1) Pollutants are discharged into navigable waters through a man-made ditch, flushing system, or other similar man-made devices; or
  - 2) Pollutants are discharged directly into navigable waters which originate outside of and pass over, across, or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

18. Section 122.21, 40 CFR 1221.1, provides in pertinent part, as follows:

Application for a permit (applicable to State programs see Section 123.25)

(a) *Duty of apply.*

- (1) Any person who discharges . . . pollutants . . . must submit a complete application to the Director in accordance with this section and part of 124 of this chapter. The requirements for concentrated animal feeding operations are described in Section 122.23 (d).

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

19. Section 122.23, 40 CFR 122.23, provides, in pertinent part, as follows

Concentrated animal feeding operations

- (A) *Scope.* Concentrated animal feeding operations (“CAFOs”), as defined in paragraph (b) of this section or designated in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section, are point sources, subject to NPDES permitting requirements as provided in this section. Once an animal feeding operation is defined as a CAFO for at least one type of animal, the NPDES requirements for CAFOs apply with respect to all animals in confinement at the operation and all manure, litter, and process wastewater generated by those animals or the production of those animals, regardless of the type of animal.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

20. Section 122.23 (b)(1), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(1), provides in pertinent part:

(b) Definitions applicable to this section

- (1) *Animal Feeding operation* (“AFO”) means a lot or facility (other than an aquatic animal production facility where the following conditions are met:
- (i) Animals (other than aquatic animals) have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period, and
  - (ii) Crops, vegetation, forage growth, or post-harvest residues are not sustained in the normal growing season over portion of the lot or facility.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

21. Section 122.23(b)(2), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(2), provided, in pertinent part:

- (2) *Concentrated animal feeding operation* (“CAFO”) means an AFO that is defined as a Large CAFO or as a Medium CAFO by the terms of this paragraph, or that is designated as a CAFO in accordance with paragraph (c)

of this section. Two or more AFOs under common ownership are considered to be a single AFO for the purposes of determining the number of animals at an operation, if they adjoin each other or if they use a common area or system for the disposal of wastes.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie**

**State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

22. Section 122.23 (b)(3), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(5) provides, in pertinent part:

(3) The term *land application area* means land under the control of an AFO owner or operator, whether it is owned, rented, or leased, to which manure, litter or process wastewater from the production are is or may be applied.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie**

**State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

23. Section 122.23 (b)(4), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(4), provides, in pertinent part:

(4) *Large concentrated animal feeding operation* ("Large CAFO"). An AFO is defined as a Large CAFO if it stables or confines as many as or more than the numbers of animals specified in any of the following categories:

\* \* \*

(iv) 2,500 swine each weighing 55 pounds or more,

\* \* \*

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie**

**State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

24. Section 122.23 (b)(5), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(5), provides, in pertinent part:

(5) The term *manure* is defined to include manure, bedding, compost and raw materials or other materials comingled with manure or set aside for disposal.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie**

**State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

25. Section 122.23 (b)(6), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(6), provides, in pertinent part:

(6) *Medium concentrated animal feeding operation* ("Medium CAFO"). The term Medium CAFO includes any AFO with the type and number of animals that fall within any of the ranges listed in paragraph (b)(6)(1) of this section and which has been defined or designated as a CAFO. An AFO is defined as a Medium CAFO if:

(i) The type and number of animals that it stables or confines falls within any of the following ranges:

\* \* \*

(D) 750 to 2,499 swine each weighing 55 pounds or more,

\* \* \*

(ii) Either one of the following conditions are met:

(A) Pollutants are discharged into waters of the United States through a man-made ditch, flushing system, or other similar man-made devices; or

(B) Pollutants are discharged directly into waters of the United States which originate outside of and pass over, across, or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

26. Section 122.23 (b)(7), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(1 ), provides, in pertinent part:

(7) *Process wastewater* means water directly or indirectly used in the operation of the AFO for any or all of the following: spillage or overflow from animal or poultry watering systems; washing, cleaning, or flushing pens, barns, manure pits, or other AFO facilities; direct contact swimming, washing, or spray cooling of animals; or dust control. Process wastewater also includes any water which comes into contact with any raw materials, products, or byproducts including manure, litter, feed, milk, eggs or bedding.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

27. Section 122.23 (b)(8), 40 CFR 122.23(b)(1), provides, in pertinent part:

- (8) *Production area* means that part of an AFO that includes the animal confinement area, the manure storage area, the raw materials storage area, and the waste containment areas. The animal confinement area includes but is not limited to open lots, housed lots, feedlots, confinement houses, stall barns, free stall barns, milkrooms, milking centers, cowyards, barnyards, medication pens, walkers, animal walkways, and stables. The manure storage area includes but is not limited to lagoons, runoff ponds, storage sheds, stockpiles, under house or pit storages, liquid impoundments, static piles and composting piles. The raw materials storage area includes but is not limited to feed silos, silage bunkers, and bedding materials. The waste containment area includes but is not limited to settling basins, and areas within berms and diversions which separate uncontaminated storm water. Also included in the definition of production area is any eff (sic) washing or egg processing facility, and any area used in the storage, handling, treatment or disposal of mortalities.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

28. Section 122.23 (c), 40 CFR 122.23(c), provides, in pertinent part:

- (1) *How may an AFO be designated as a CAFO?* The appropriate authority (i.e. State Director or Regional Administrator, or both, as specified in paragraph (c)(1) of this section) may designate any AFO as a CAFO upon determining that it is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

\* \* \*

- (2) In making this designation, the State Director or the Regional Administrator shall consider the following factors:
- i) The size of the AFO and the amount of wastes reaching waters of the United States;
  - ii) The location of the AFO relative to waters of the United States;
  - iii) The means of conveyance of animal wastes and process waste waters into waters of the United States;
  - iv) The slope, vegetation, rainfall and other factors affecting the likelihood or frequency of discharge of animal wastes manure and process waste waters into waters of the United States; and
  - v) Other relevant factors.
- (3) No AFO shall be designated under this paragraph unless the State Director or the Regional Administrator has conducted an onsite inspection of the operation and determined that the operation should and could be regulated under the permit program. In addition, no AFO with numbers of animals below those established in paragraph (b)(6) of this section may be designated as a CAFO unless:

- (i) Pollutants are discharged into waters of the United States through a man-made ditch, flushing system, or other similar man-made devices; or
- (ii) Pollutants are discharged directly into waters of the United States which originate outside of and pass over, across, or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

29. Section 122.23(d) (1), 40 CFR 122.23(d)(1), provides, in pertinent part:

*(c) NPDES permit authorization*

- (1) *Permit requirement.* A CAFO must not discharge unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. In order to obtain authorization under an NPDES permit, the CAFO owner or operator must either apply for an individual NPDES permit or submit a notice of intent for coverage under an NPDES general permit.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

30. Section 302.203 of the Board's water pollution regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 302.203, state, in pertinent part:

Waters of the State shall be free from sludge or bottom deposits, floating debris, visible oil, odor, plant or algal growth, color or turbidity of other than natural origin. The allowed mixing provisions of Section 302.102 shall not be used to comply with the provisions of this Section.

**RESPONSE: Complainant makes no factual allegation against Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.**

31. One of the vertical clean-out pipes was knocked over or mowed over during hay bailing operations on the subject hay field between the reception pit and the lagoon. The vertical

clean-out pipes were not protected by bollards, fence posts, gates, fencing or other means of making and protecting the pipes.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits the allegations in Paragraph 31, Count VII. To the extent that the allegations of paragraph 31 are directed toward PSM, PSG has insufficient knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 31 as to PSM and therefore denies these allegations.**

32. On July 7, 2008, with the event of a drain pull plug being removed in one of the nursery buildings to release waste, livestock waste entered the reception pit to a level that activated the pumps that transfer the contents of the reception pit to the lagoon. Livestock waste exited the pipeline at the decapitated clean-out pipe rather than at the lagoon, and entered a small unnamed tributary of one of the facility's on-site ponds. The pond is used to provide water for the swine in the fall when it is dry and the on-site well does not yield adequate water.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations in Paragraph 32, Count VII. To the extent that the allegations of paragraph 32 are directed toward PSM, PSG has insufficient knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 32 as to PSM and therefore denies these allegations.**

33. The pond that received the swine waste has a surface area of .5 to .75 acres and during periods of high water discharges into an adjacent pond to the east. The east pond ultimately discharges to an unnamed tributary of Horney Branch.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts admits to the factual allegations concerning size and pond location, but denies that there has been any discharge of a contaminant from the facility to a jurisdictional water body water and demands strict proof thereof.**



34. The unnamed tributary of Horney Branch is indentified as an intermittent creek on the USGS topographical map. Horney Branch is identified as a perennial creek on the USGS topographical map and therefore water flow exists in the creek all year. The unnamed tributary to the facility ponds and the facility ponds were conveyances, this is, surface hydrological connections, that discharge to waters of the United States.

**RESPONSE: Complainants make no factual allegations against Respondent Prairie State Gilts in Paragraph 34, Count VII, and as such, Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto except to state that it has no knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the facts alleged and demands strict proof thereof.**

35. On July 24, 2008, the Illinois EPA conducted an inspection of the Prairie State Gilts site in response to a report of the release. A narrow channel of swine waste was observed entering the north end of the receiving pond. The pond was covered with algae and had a septic odor consistent with that of swine waste. The north end of the pond was observed to have a dark gray/black color and to be turbid. An overflow pipe existed on the site, between the receiving pond and the adjacent pond to the east.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts admits the allegation in Paragraph 35, Count VII that the IEPA conducted an inspection on July 24, 2008, but Respondent Prairie State Gilts lacks the specific information or knowledge with which to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 35, Count VII regarding the specific behavior, observations, or sampling performed by the Illinois EPA, and is therefore unable to either admit or deny the allegations and demands strict proof thereof. Respondent Prairie State Gilt admits the existence of an overflow pipe. To the extent that the allegations of paragraph 35**

are directed toward PSM, PSG has insufficient knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 35 as to PSM and therefore denies these allegations.

36. At the time of inspection, facility personnel indicated the facility intended to pump down the receiving pond and land apply the contents to wheat ground.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts admits the allegation in Paragraph 36, Count VII, that facility personnel had a communication with an IEPA inspector but denies the factual and legal allegations asserted and demands strict proof thereof. To the extent that the allegations of paragraph 36 are directed toward PSM, PSG has insufficient knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 36 as to PSM and therefore denies these allegations.**

37. On October 29, 2008, the Illinois EPA inspector spoke to facility personnel to determine if contents of the receiving pond had been land applied. On October 30, 2008, the facility responded that nothing had been pumped from the pond. Facility personal reiterated that the two ponds were interconnected and periods of heavy or frequent rainfall result in a single pond.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts admits the allegation in Paragraph 37, Count VII, that facility personnel had a communication with an IEPA inspector on October 30, 2008, but denies the factual and legal allegations asserted and demands strict proof thereof. To the extent that the allegations of paragraph 37 are directed toward PSM, PSG has insufficient knowledge to either admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 37 as to PSM and therefore denies these allegations.**

38. Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have caused or allowed the discharge of contaminants to waters of the State at the Prairie State Gilts site as will or is likely to create a

nuisance or render such water harmful or detrimental or injurious to public health, safety or welfare, or to domestic, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, or other legitimate uses.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 38, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

39. By causing, allowing or threatening the discharge of contaminants to waters of the State at the Prairie State Gilts site so as to cause or tend to cause water pollution in Illinois, Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have violated Section 12(a) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/12(a).

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 39, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

40. Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have caused or allowed contaminants to be deposited upon the land in such place and manner as to create a water pollution hazard by causing contaminants to remain on the land and subject to surface drainage or leaching into waters of the State.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 40, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

41. By depositing contaminants upon the land in such a place and manner as to create a water pollution hazard at the Prairie Sate Gilts site, Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have violated Section 12(d) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/12(d).

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 41, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

42. By causing or allowing the discharge of contaminants that resulted in turbid, discolored and odor conditions in the waters of a pond that is in an up gradient drainage to Horney Branch, Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have violated Section 12(a) of the Act, 415 ILCS

5/12(a), and Section 302.203 of the Board's Water Pollution Regulations, 35. Ill. Adm. Code 302.203.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 42, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

43. At the time of July 7, 2008 discharge, Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM did not have a NPDES permit for the Prairie State Gilts facility, nor had the Respondents applied for one. The discharge from the clean-out pipe at the Prairie State Gilts facility is a point source discharge.

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts generally admits that it did not have an NPDES permit prior to the incident, but denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 43, Count VII and any legal conclusion or consequences arising therefrom.**

44. By causing or allowing the discharge of livestock wastewater to conveyances that discharge to waters of the United States without an NPDES permit, Respondents Prairie State Gilts and PSM have violated 12(f) of the Act, 415 ILCS 5/12(f), and 35 Ill. Adm. Code 309.102(a).

**RESPONSE: Respondent Prairie State Gilts denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 44, Count VII and demands strict proof thereof.**

#### **COUNT VIII**

1. The allegations contained in Count VIII are not directed at Respondent Prairie State Gilts and therefore Respondent Prairie State Gilts makes no response thereto.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

##### **First Affirmative Defense**

The Complaint, which alleges a discrete discharge which occurred in July 2008, is defective in that it has not been properly filed or processed pursuant to the Act's relevant enforcement mechanism,

contained in Title VII of the Act. Count VII is filed pursuant to Section 42 (d) and (e) of the Act, not Section 31, where the Board derives its enforcement authority. Any references to Title VII and Section 31 are noticeably absent from Count VII, and as Section 31 is expressly relevant to the Board's enforcement authority, the failure to properly plead and meet the requirements of Section 31 is a fatal flaw that requires dismissal.

**Second Affirmative Defense**

The alleged discharge described in Count VII occurred because of a discrete incident that occurred in 2008. There have been no discharges from the facility following this singular incident; thus there is no duty to apply for an NPDES permit


WHEREFORE, Respondent, Prairie State Gilts, Ltd. requests that Count VII of the Complainant's Second Amended Complaint be dismissed and that the specific relief requested in the Prayer for Relief be denied. In the alternative, Respondent Prairie State Gilts, Ltd. denies that the Complainant is entitled to the relief requested in the Prayer for Relief and requests that the Complainant be made to prove the allegations contained therein.

Respectfully submitted,

**PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, Ltd.**, Respondent,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

One of Its Attorneys



**BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP**

Claire A. Manning  
Registration No. 3124724  
205 S. Fifth Street, Suite 700  
P.O. Box 2459  
Springfield, IL 62705-2459  
(217)544-8491  
[cmanning@bhslaw.com](mailto:cmanning@bhslaw.com)

STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 ) SS  
COUNTY OF SANGAMON )

Claire A. Manning on oath, deposes and states as follows:


1. That I am one of the attorneys representing the party on whose behalf this Answer was prepared.
2. That certain Answers contain certain statements claiming insufficient knowledge upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in the Complaint.
3. That said allegations of insufficient knowledge are true and correct to the best of her information, knowledge and belief.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

*Claire A. Manning*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Claire A. Manning

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2013.

*Jennifer L. Powers*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public



Dated: June 17, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD

Respondent,

By:

*Claire A. Manning*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
One of Its Attorneys

**BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP**  
Claire A. Manning  
Registration No. 3124724  
205 S. Fifth Street, Suite 700  
P.O. Box 2459  
Springfield, IL 62705-2459  
(217)544-8491  
[cmanning@bhslaw.com](mailto:cmanning@bhslaw.com)

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	PCB NO. 10-84
	)	Enforcement
	)	
PROFESSIONAL SWINE MANAGEMENT,	)	
LLC, HILLTOP VIEW, LLC, WILDCAT	)	
FARMS, LLC , HIGH-POWER PORK, LLC,	)	
EAGLE POINT, LCC, LONE HOLLOW,	)	
LLC, TIMBERLINE, LLC, PRAIRIE STATE	)	
GILTS, Ltd, AND LITTLE TIMBER, LLC,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

**RESPONDENT PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD.'S MOTION TO SEVER**

**NOW COMES** Respondent, PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD. ("Prairie State"), by and through its attorneys, BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP, and as and for its Motion to Sever, pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.408, states as follows:

**I. Facts**

The State of Illinois (the "State") filed its original Complaint on April 15, 2010. Following various motions filed by the Respondents, the State filed its Second Amended Complaint on December 13, 2012 (the "Complaint"). On February 11, 2013, the Respondents filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to the Complaint and a Joint Motion to Strike Part of the Complaint's Prayer for Relief.

The Respondents' Joint Motion to Strike Part of the Complaint's Prayer for Relief was denied by the Board on May 2, 2013, and Respondents were directed to answer the Complaint by June 17, 2013. Prairie State now moves the Illinois Pollution Control Board (the "Board") to

sever the claims in Count VII of the Complaint. The Complaint contains eight separate counts alleging violations of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act (the "Act") and Board regulations at different livestock operations (all swine) in Illinois.

The eight livestock operations at issue are owned by separate entities and are located in four different counties. Three livestock operations, including Prairie State, are located in Schuyler County (Counts I, VI, and VII); three livestock operations are located in Hancock County (Counts II, V, and VII); one livestock operation is located in Fulton County (Count IV); and one livestock operation is located in Adams County (Count III). Furthermore, the livestock operations at issue are located in two different appellate districts because Fulton and Hancock counties are under the jurisdiction of the Third Appellate District while Adams and Schuyler counties are under the jurisdiction of the Fourth Appellate District.

The Respondent, Professional Swine Management, LLC ("PSM"), provides certain operational services at the site, pursuant to contract with Prairie State.

The sole portion of the Complaint relative to Prairie State is Count VII.

**II. The Board should sever Count VII from the Complaint because Count VII only involves Prairie State and is distinct from the other Respondents.**

Under Section 101.408 of the Board's procedural rules, the Board may sever claims involving numerous parties "in the interest of convenient, expeditious, and complete determination of claims, and where no material prejudice will be caused." 35 Ill. Adm. Code § 101.408. Conversely, the Board only will consolidate claims if "consolidation would *not* cause material prejudice to any party." 35 Ill. Adm. Code § 101.406 (emphasis added).

Here, the facts alleged in Count VII of the Complaint apply only to Prairie State. Further, Prairie State is not a respondent with respect to Counts I-VI and Count VIII and said Counts involve factual allegations unrelated to Prairie State.



The Board should sever Count VII from this action because severance: (A) allows for a complete and proper determination of the claims; (B) avoids material prejudice; and (C) saves time and resources.

**A. Severing the claim against Prairie State allows for complete and proper determination of claims.**

Where there is an express grant of authority, the Board must act “in furtherance of the intention of the legislature as stated within the four corners of the statute.” *See Chemetco Inc. v. Ill. Pollution Control Bd.*, 140 Ill. App. 3d 283, 286 (5th Dist. 1986). The legislature has granted the Board clear and express authority to “conduct proceedings upon complaints charging violations” of the Act. 415 ILCS 5/5(d). That express authority, however, is not without limitation or restraint. The legislature has provided that enforcement decisions of the Board may be directly appealed to the appellate court, but the Act also provides that such appeal would be to the district where the cause of action arose. 415 ILCS 5/41(a). Further, the Board’s procedural rules provide that hearings in enforcement proceedings “are generally held in the county in which the source of facility is located . . . .” 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.600.

This “site of the cause of action requirement” also drives the Board’s Notice and Hearing requirements, which are set forth in the Board’s procedural rules, and which have been developed pursuant to the Act. *See* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.602 (“The Clerk will provide notice of all hearings . . . in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the facility or pollution source is located, or where the activity in question occurred.”). *See also* 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.600 (“The hearings are generally held in the county in which the source or facility is located unless otherwise ordered by the hearing officer.”)

While the above language does not apply to regulatory proceedings, which often concern state-wide issues of general regulatory import, enforcement actions are necessarily different

procedural creatures, which require procedural due process in the context of an adjudicatory proceeding. The State's filing here is antithetical to the entire concept of "cause of action" since such terminology generally refers to an event or incident that arises out of the same transaction or series of transactions, and the existence of a common question of law or fact. *See* 735 ILCS 5/2-405.

Here, the Complaint alleges violations of the Act at eight separate facilities, owned by eight separate companies and located in three distinct counties and two different appellate districts. The sole commonality is the fact that the respondents are all owners or operators of livestock operations and have contracted with PSM to perform certain operational services. It is not unlike a complaint that would be filed against various landfills (or chemical companies or utilities) in Illinois, located throughout the state, alleging separate and distinct facts and violations of the Act.

Such litigation involving multiple respondents at multiple sites charging discreet pollution incidents in various counties of multiple judicial districts, is simply not contemplated by the Act or the Board's rules, as the statutory enabling language is not consistent with this type of industry-driven, industry-specific enforcement. Moreover, it will be impossible for any judicial review of the Board's enforcement decisions to comply with the Act's mandate that judicial review be afforded in the appellate district where the "cause of action arose" for each livestock operation. Thus, severance of Count VII will be in furtherance of the intention of the legislature and will allow for complete and proper determination of the claims.

**B. Severing the claim against Prairie State avoids material prejudice.**

The courts have recognized there is inherent prejudice in requiring parties to try unrelated sets of facts in the same consolidated action, which results in reversible error. *See Mount v.*

*Dusing*, 414 Ill. 361, 367-68 (1953); *Rogala v. Silva*, 16 Ill. App. 3d 63, 64-65, 68 (1st Dist. 1973) (affirming severance of counts with one common defendant when counts involve entirely separate transactions, different parties, and different theories); *Sommers v. Korona*, 54 Ill. App. 2d 425, 435 (1st Dist. 1964) (appellate court affirmed dismissal of count in suit against multiple defendants for injuries arising out of separate and unrelated car accidents, noting that plaintiff would not be prejudiced by having to file separate suits).

Prairie State will be prejudiced by the alleged violations of the other Respondents. The Complaint improperly consolidates claims arising from eight separate and unrelated events which, based on the face of the Complaint, took place at different times and on different facilities owned by different companies. Requiring Prairie State to defend the claims against it in a single action would be in error, because a finding of a violation against one of the other Respondents would create an impermissible negative inference toward Prairie State on the claims alleged against it. In addition, Prairie State will be forced to spend time and resources to the proceedings involving Count I-VI and Count VIII, even though Prairie State is in no way involved or implicated in said Counts. Severance of Count VII will protect Prairie State from being materially prejudiced in this matter.

**C. Severing the claim against Prairie State saves time and resources.**

The Board does not sever claims when severing results in multiple hearings on the same violations concerning the same parties and the same facility. *See People v. Cmty. Landfill Co., Inc.*, PCB 03-191 (Mar. 15, 2007). However, the Board generally allows claims to be severed when severing does not require duplicitous effort on the part of the parties involved. *See People v. Clark Oil & Refining Corp.*, PCB 93-250 (Feb. 3, 1994). Courts recognize that cases should be

severed when “disparate issues would make a joint trial overly complicated.” *Cook v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 144 Ill. 2d 548, 555 (1992).


Severance will avoid confusion of the record and serve the convenient, expeditious and complete determination of the issues, in a manner that protects the rights of the livestock operation in defending itself and the obligation of the State in proving evidence sufficient to find a violation of the Act. The State should have filed each of these claims separately in the first instance, as prosecutorial discretion cannot obfuscate due process.

As stated above, the Complaint alleges violations of the Act at eight separate facilities, owned by eight separate companies. Each count in the Complaint contains allegations of wholly separate and distinct violations that occurred at eight separate facilities – all at different times. The creation of a separate docket for each Respondent does not require duplicitous effort on the part of the Attorney General and the Board. Each count of the Complaint contains facts alleging different violations concerning different parties at different facilities. Allowing severance is beneficial because it will narrow the disputed issues before the Board. Severance also gives the parties the incentive and opportunity to settle each of their claims individually.

Thus, the Board should sever Count VII so that a facility-specific determination can appropriately be made.

**WHEREFORE**, Respondent, PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD., prays for the Board to grant its Motion and sever Count VII of the State's Complaint from the remaining counts, and requiring the State to bring Count VII as a separate action, and for any other and further relief that the Board deems just and proper.

PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD., Respondent,

By:   
One of Its Attorneys

**BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP**

Claire A. Manning

Registration No. 3124724

205 S. Fifth Street, Suite 700

P.O. Box 2459

Springfield, IL 62705-2459

(217)544-8491

[cmanning@bhslaw.com](mailto:cmanning@bhslaw.com)