

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

MINUTES OF INFORMAL REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 19, 1970, 189 W. MADISON ST., CHICAGO

Mr. Lawton was away on business, and Mr. Aldrich was not in attendance.

Although the Board makes virtually all final decisions in its more formal meetings, because of the press of time Mr. Currie asked the Board to vote on the variance request in #70-11, Olin Corp. v. EPA. The case involves a request for extension of an existing variance to permit the open burning of explosive wastes generated in the manufacture of ammunition at Olin's East Alton Plant. The existing variance expires October 22; because of transitional problems associated with the adoption of the Environmental Protection Act the extension request was not received by the Board until late in September; and a hearing was held in Alton on October 15. Mr. Lawton, who had served as hearing officer, had prepared a proposed order for Board consideration and had indicated his approval of the proposed order in writing. The proposed order granted a four month extension of the variance upon stated conditions. At Mr. Kissel's request, before approving the proposed order, the Board amended the order to provide for reopening the variance rather than for automatic termination in the event of complaints or of new information as to alternative disposal techniques. Mr. Currie, Mr. Dumelle and Mr. Kissel then voted for the adoption of the order as amended and Mr. Aldrich indicated his concurrence by telephone. Mr. Currie said he would ask Mr. Lawton to prepare an explanatory opinion for possible adoption at the Board's October 28 meeting in Edwardsville.

After preliminary discussion of the Neal case, #70-5, Mr. Currie said that he or Mr. Lawton would prepare an opinion for Board consideration on October 28.

Mr. Currie also noted that the Olin Corp. had filed with the Board a second request for the extension of a distinct variance which related to open burning for the destruction of buildings which had been used in another explosives manufacturing operation which had been discontinued. He noted that the company had signed the extension request on September 25, and that it would therefore not be possible to hold a hearing before the expiration of the existing variance on October 1. He said he would have the case docketed and request the Board to authorize a hearing at the October 28 meeting.

Mr. Currie reported that he had received a copy of a letter from Argonne National Laboratory to Mr. Schneiderman of the Institute for Environmental Quality reporting that Argonne's testing

of the source emission regulations for implementation of the sulfur-dioxide and particulate air quality standards for the Chicago region had been somewhat delayed because of an attempt to iron out modeling discrepancies between Argonne and NAPCA, so that information initially promised by Argonne in mid-September was now scheduled to be received during the first week of November. Mr. Currie added that he would like the Board to discuss implementation planning for the sulfur and particulate standards for the St. Louis region when the Board meets in Edwardsville on October 28.

Mr. Currie suggested that it was time for the Board to consider the scheduling of additional rule-making hearings to commence after the present series of hearings on thermal pollution, mercury, phosphates, and episode plans, and the Mississippi compliance dates were completed. He suggested that in order to meet a December 15 deadline for air quality standards governing automotive pollutants it would be necessary to propose such standards even before receiving guidance on this question from NAPCA as had been requested, and said that he would request the Board to schedule a hearing on implementation regulations for the Chicago and St. Louis regions as soon as information was received on those proposed regulations from Argonne. Mr. Dumelle said that he intended soon to propose the adoption of effluent standards for discharges of water pollutants. Interim standards, he said, should be based on the currently unenforceable technical release 20-22 issued by the Sanitary Water Board but that release should be modified so as to eliminate the possibility of dilution of effluents which did not otherwise satisfy the standard. The adoption of such regulations, he said, should then be followed by the adoption of tighter effluent standards requiring the use of the best available technology. Mr. Kissel asked whether it might be better to pursue a basin-by-basin approach based on studies such as that of the State Water Survey which shows a need for tertiary treatment in one section of the Illinois River. Mr. Dumelle responded that an approach in terms of assimilative capacity required too much time and too many studies. Industry, he said, was prepared to meet specific effluent standards, and these standards could be tightened later if studies proved this necessary in particular locations. Mr. Kissel agreed that water quality standards were hard to enforce and to understand and that effluent standards furnished a clear guide and ought to be adopted. He suggested specifically that the Board should consider requiring tertiary sewage treatment throughout the state and that the present provisions in the implementation plans requiring removal of nutrients "when feasible" were inadequate.

Mr. Kissel reported that Mr. Schneiderman was prepared to make Institute money available to assist the Board in making specific studies. Mr. Dumelle suggested that we ask the State Water Survey to conduct more pool studies on the Illinois River comparable to the one Mr. Kissel had mentioned. He also said that Institute

money could be used to finance studies on the state of the art for controlling industrial effluents. Mr. Kissel added that a study was needed on the effect of septic fields and that regulations on septic tanks might be advisable.

Mr. Kissel urged that technical advisory committees be established as soon as possible. Mr. Dumelle suggested that it might be preferable to have a single committee with sub-committees to deal with specialties such as air and water, and Mr. Kissel and Mr. Currie agreed. Mr. Dumelle also suggested that advisory committee members should be appointed for a one year period, perhaps for a calendar 1971, and Mr. Kissel and Mr. Currie again agreed.

Mr. Kissel then outlined the proposed format for the reconvened thermal pollution hearings on November 5 and 6, which were endorsed by Mr. Dumelle and Mr. Currie. All three then noted the desirability of additional Board staff to aid in bringing together material for Board Members to study in preparation for hearings and for the adoption of regulations. Mr. Dumelle suggested that perhaps the Institute could provide staff or consultants to aid the Board in these respects.

I, Regina E. Ryan, certify that the Board has approved the above minutes this *9th* day of *Dec.*, 1970.


Regina E. Ryan
Clerk of the Board

RER/nr