



ILLINOIS WATER QUALITY AND THE CLEAN WATER ACT

*A Report of the **Environmental Law & Policy Center***

Funding Generously Provided by the Lumpkin Family Foundation





Environmental Law & Policy Center

The Environmental Law and Policy Center (ELPC) is the Midwest's leading environmental legal advocacy and eco-business innovation organization. We develop and lead successful strategic environmental advocacy campaigns to protect our natural resources and improve environmental quality. We are public interest environmental entrepreneurs who engage in creative business dealmaking to put into practice our belief that environmental progress and economic development can be achieved together.

ELPC proposes alternatives when we oppose threats to the Midwest environment. We say "yes" to better solutions; we don't just say "no." ELPC works to:

- * Advocate sound environmental management practices that preserve natural resources and improve the quality of life in our communities.
- * Promote sustainable energy strategies by developing energy efficiency and renewable energy resources while reducing pollution from coal and nuclear plants that harms our environment and public health.
- * Design and implement smart growth planning solutions to combat sprawl and encourage innovative transportation approaches, such as the development of a Midwest high-speed rail network, that will lead to cleaner air and more jobs.

ELPC was founded in 1993 after a year-long strategic planning process sponsored by seven major foundations. We have achieved a strong track record of success on clean energy development and pollution reduction, transportation and land use reform (smart growth versus sprawl strategies), and natural resources protection issues. ELPC brings a new form of creative public advocacy that effectively links environmental progress and economic development and improves the quality of life in our Midwestern communities.

The Environmental Law & Policy Center appreciates the generous support for this report provided by the Lumpkin Family Foundation.

ILLINOIS WATER QUALITY AND THE CLEAN WATER ACT

A Report of the Environmental Law & Policy Center

Funding Generously Provided by the Lumpkin Family Foundation

October 2003

Acknowledgments

ELPC Project Team: Howard Learner, Executive Director
Ann Alexander, Staff Attorney
Faith Bugel, Staff Attorney
Albert Ettinger, Senior Staff Attorney*
Shannon Fisk, Staff Attorney

** Principal Author*

This report can be downloaded from www.elpc.org. ELPC requests acknowledgment, in print, of any information or excerpts reproduced in another publication. Printed on recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	4
A.	The Clean Water Act	4
1.	The Basic Purpose and Shape of the Law	4
2.	NPDES Permits	6
3.	Water Quality Standards and WQBELs	7
4.	TMDLs	8
B.	The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and Other State Agencies	9
C.	The Budget for Illinois Water Programs	11
1.	Comparisons to Other States	11
2.	Bureau of Water Needs vs. Available Resources	13
III.	WATER QUALITY TODAY: WHAT IS THE CONDITION OF ILLINOIS LAKES AND STREAMS?	15
A.	What Percentage of Illinois Waters Are Impaired?	15
B.	How is a Water Body Determined to be Impaired?	16
C.	How Do Illinois Water Bodies and Testing Compare With Those of Other States?	18
D.	What Types of Pollution Are Causing the Impairments?	19
E.	What are the Sources of the Pollution Causing Impairments?	21
F.	Do We Have Serious Problems That We Are Not Monitoring?	21
G.	What Are the Trends in Illinois Water Quality?	23
IV.	WATER QUALITY MONITORING: IS IT SUFFICIENT AND ACCURATE?	24
V.	WATER QUALITY STANDARDS: ARE WE GRADING OUR WATERS PROPERLY?	27

A.	Use Designations	27
B.	Standards for Toxic Pollutants	28
C.	Nutrient Standards	28
D.	Antidegradation Standards	30
E.	Mixing Zones	31
VI.	PERMITTING: IS ILLINOIS ISSUING PERMITS THAT ALLOW DISCHARGE OF HARMFUL POLLUTION?	33
A.	Municipal and Industrial NPDES Permits	34
1.	IEPA does not regulate nutrient discharges to prevent violations of the narrative standards regarding “offensive conditions.”	34
2.	Effluent limits on discharges of BOD and nutrients must be imposed to prevent violations of dissolved oxygen standards.	34
3.	IEPA NPDES permits do not prevent violations of Illinois’ standards regarding total residual chlorine.	36
4.	IEPA does not prevent many violations of applicable temperature standards	36
5.	Without a proper justification, IEPA does not follow federal guidance regarding the circumstances in which limits must be placed on the discharge of toxins that have a reasonable potential to cause a violation of water quality standards.	37
6.	Illinois permits fail to require all necessary monitoring.	38
7.	Illinois does not always require analytical methods sensitive enough to detect violations of water quality standards.	38
8.	IEPA fails to require adequate whole effluent testing	39
9.	IEPA permits do not sufficiently restrict sewer treatment bypasses	40
10.	Many Illinois NPDES permits do not comply with the mixing zone provisions of 302.102	40
11.	IEPA’s exemption from pathogen controls is too broad.	41

	12. Antidegradation regulations should be implemented fully	41
B.	Livestock and Animal Feeding Operation Permitting	42
C.	Discharging Residential System Permitting	44
D.	Mining Operations Permitting	45
E.	Public Participation Procedures in the NPDES Permitting Process	46
VII.	ENFORCEMENT ISSUES: IS ILLINOIS ENFORCING NPDES PERMIT LIMITS AND CONDITIONS?	47
A.	Inspections	47
B.	Enforcement Actions	47
C.	Fines and Supplementary Environmental Projects	48
VIII.	WET WEATHER ISSUES: IS ILLINOIS APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSING RAINFALL-RELATED POLLUTION?	50
A.	Stormwater Runoff Management	50
B.	Combined Sewer Overflow Management	51
IX.	IS ILLINOIS DOING ENOUGH TO PREVENT NON-POINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION?	53
A.	Non-Point Source Pollution and Its Effects	53
B.	Methods For Controlling Non-Point Source Pollution	54
C.	Illinois' Section 319 Program	55
D.	Evaluation of Illinois' Non-Point Source Control Efforts and Areas For Improvement	55
	1. IEPA should take steps to improve its Section 319 program	56
	2. The State and IEPA should increase funding for non-point source control activities	56
	3. Illinois should consider implementing regulatory approaches for controlling non-point source pollution	57
X.	CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	59

I. INTRODUCTION

This report contains the conclusions of a study performed by the Environmental Law and Policy Center of the Midwest ("ELPC") on the water quality of Illinois' rivers, lakes and streams, and Illinois' implementation of the Clean Water Act. The Lumpkin Foundation of Mattoon, Illinois provided funding for the study.

Because the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency ("IEPA") is responsible for implementing the Clean Water Act in Illinois and for preparing most of the key reports relating to Illinois water quality, our research necessarily focused on the work of that agency. ELPC studied the publicly available IEPA data on a number of key indicators of water quality and the strength of a number of elements of IEPA's water pollution control efforts. Within the resources available for this study, ELPC also looked, for comparison purposes, at data from federal agencies and selected data collected by pollution control agencies of other states. Further, ELPC conducted interviews with federal and state officials and others with knowledge relating to the relative strengths and weaknesses of the Illinois water quality program. The study considered the following areas:

- **Illinois Water Quality**

ELPC reviewed publicly available reports by IEPA on Illinois water quality. Efforts were also made to look behind the IEPA data and conclusions to see what the data really means. This required an appraisal of the value of the data collected by IEPA and the conclusions IEPA drew from it. To get a more complete picture of Illinois water quality, ELPC also reviewed data from the U.S. Geological Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("U.S. EPA"), the Illinois State Water Survey and the Illinois Natural History Survey.

- **Amount and Kind of Water Quality Data Collected**

Naturally, in determining water quality and the strength of a water quality program, it is important to consider the scope of the water quality-monitoring network. A state may appear to have comparatively good water quality if the state only collects data in healthy waters or only looks for pollutants that are known not to be present; a comprehensive monitoring network is needed to identify problems. As part of this report, ELPC surveyed the depth and breadth of the water quality data available in Illinois and compared it in some cases to that available in other states.

- **Strength of Water Quality Standards**

State water quality standards are the benchmark used to determine the quality of its waters. A water body is considered to be in good or poor condition based on how the quality of that body compares with the relevant standard. State water standards are also important because permit limits are set to prevent violations of standards. For example, if a state adopts a standard that its waters should not have a concentration of more than one part per million of phosphorus (1 mg/Liter), the water bodies containing more than one part per million phosphorus will be listed as impaired in the state's water quality reports. Further, pollution permit limits will be designed to prevent discharges that will cause the receiving water body to have a concentration of more than one part per million of phosphorus. On the other hand, if the state has no phosphorus standard, it may allow phosphorus to be discharged freely and may do little to restore waters with high phosphorus levels.

In this study, ELPC looked at the standards on a few key pollutant parameters. Illinois standards, or lack of standards, were then analyzed to determine whether they are protective of the environment by comparing them with the federally suggested criteria and the standards of other states with eco-systems similar to those in Illinois.

- **Adequacy of Permit Conditions For Preventing Violations of Water Quality Standards**

The primary approach to protecting water quality is the setting of pollution limits in water pollution permits at levels that will not allow standards to be violated. Accordingly, ELPC investigated whether IEPA permit writers make sure that permits have all the effluent limits and other conditions needed to prevent violation of Illinois standards.

- **Permit Enforcement**

Writing a permit does not end the matter. The permit limits and conditions must be enforced. ELPC obtained and reviewed data available on permit compliance, the number of permit enforcement actions, and the number and amount of the penalties collected by IEPA and the Illinois Attorney General in an attempt to determine the efficacy of IEPA's enforcement efforts.

- **Illinois' Stormwater and Combined Sewer Overflow Programs**

Congress and the U.S. EPA have recognized that many water quality problems are caused by rainwater run-off from city streets and construction sites, and from overflowing sewers and urban drain systems. Controlling such pollution, however, is not easy and many key programs, such as the stormwater permitting program, are still in their relative infancy. As part of the study, ELPC reviewed what steps Illinois is taking to control such pollution.

- **Illinois' Non-Point Source Programs**

As discussed below, the Clean Water Act does not generally require regulation of agricultural run-off and other "non-point" sources of pollution. There are, however, a variety of voluntary federal and state programs designed to control non-point pollution. Many of the state programs are funded with federal grants given under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act.

ELPC has reviewed Illinois' non-point programs through publicly available reports. We have attempted to peek behind the reports, to determine if Illinois has effective non-point programs.

A Prefatory Note

We believe that the conclusions drawn in this report are valid, but a number of caveats are necessary. The resources available for this study were limited. Further, there is simply no good way to reach confident conclusions on a number of matters considered by this study. Standards, data collection and the ways of looking at the data have changed over time. Data and standards of different states are almost never directly comparable. Further, it plainly would be unwise to assume that data from other states is sound and unbiased in seeking to gauge the value or bias of Illinois data. In almost every case in which a comparison is made across time or between states, the "apples and oranges" objection could be made with considerable validity.

Finally, it should also be emphasized in this introduction that none of the criticisms here of the state of Illinois water bodies or Illinois' implementation of the Clean Water Act are directed at any particular IEPA official. Illinois and its citizens had over 150 years to bring its waters to the condition that they were in when the Clean Water Act was enacted in 1972. Even after passage of the Clean Water Act, many of the sources of water pollution remained largely outside the control of any branch of the federal or state government. Naturally, much more could have been done had adequate funds been available to IEPA and other branches of government with responsibilities for addressing water quality in Illinois. As the report makes clear, but for the efforts of many dedicated IEPA officials, Illinois water quality would certainly be far worse than it is today. Much more funding is needed if IEPA is to have any real chance of restoring and maintaining Illinois waters.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

To understand this report, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the Clean Water Act and IEPA. The Clean Water Act is the basic law controlling water pollution in the United States and almost all of the data, programs and issues that will be treated here were directly or indirectly generated as a result of requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Generally, administration of the Clean Water Act is done in each state by an agency that has delegated authority from the U.S. EPA. In Illinois, with only a few small exceptions, IEPA has the responsibility for implementing the Act. Further, IEPA is largely responsible, when not exclusively responsible, for the creation of almost all of the reports, standards, permits and programs that are the subject of this study.

A. The Clean Water Act

1. The Basic Purpose and Shape of the Law

The Clean Water Act¹ was passed in 1972—over President Nixon’s veto based upon his concerns about cost.² The Congressionally stated objective of the Act is "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters."³ With the "interim goal" of making all waters of the United States "fishable and swimmable" by July 1, 1983,⁴ the Act required that a number of studies be performed, authorized the spending of billions of federal dollars for water treatment,⁵ and set regulations on various sources of water pollution.

The Act divides pollution into three types for purposes of regulation: point source pollution, non-point source pollution, and fill material. Point source pollution is pollution from "any discernible, confined and discreet conveyance" (e.g. a pipe coming from a factory or sewerage treatment plant).⁶ Such "point source" pollution is said under the Act to come from a "discharge."⁷ Non-point source pollution comes from a diffuse source, such as run-off from agriculture, construction sites, parking lots, and other areas.

The distinction between point source and non-point source pollution has major legal and regulatory implications. Point sources are controlled under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES").⁸ Generally, one must have a NPDES permit to discharge from a point source, and it is a federal crime knowingly to discharge from a "point source" without a NPDES permit.⁹ Non-point sources, however, are basically unregulated by the Clean Water

¹ 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*

² Adler, R.W., Landman, J.C. and Cameron, D.M., *The Clean Water Act 20 Years Later*, Island Press (1993) p. 1.

³ 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a).

⁴ 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a)(3).

⁵ From 1972 to 1987, through Title II of the CWA, Congress provided an average of \$5 billion a year in construction grants to municipalities to build U.S. wastewater treatment infrastructure. Adler, *supra* note 2, at 112.

⁶ 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

⁷ 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12).

⁸ 33 U.S.C. § 1342.

⁹ 33 U.S.C. § 1319(c).

Act. Instead, Section 319 of the Act¹⁰ provides for states to develop plans for controlling non-point source pollution and authorizes federal expenditures for this purpose, but does not establish mandatory controls.

Unfortunately, the line between "point source" and "non-point source" pollution is quite vague. Each molecule of pollution reaches water from some discrete source if one is willing to consider small enough "points." Therefore, substantial litigation and debate has occurred regarding whether particular pollution is point or non-point source pollution.

The CWA sets elimination of discharges by 1985 as a "national goal."¹¹ A lot of progress has been made cleaning up point sources since 1972, but plainly the "elimination" system has not worked so far. There are currently thousands of permitted point sources in Illinois and undoubtedly there are also many illegal discharges. In addition, non-point source pollution, particularly as to nutrients (from fertilizer, manure, and soil run-off) and pesticides, remains a substantial problem.

The third type of pollution under the Clean Water Act is "filling," i.e. the placing of materials in a wetland or other water of the United States for the purpose of creating dry land. Section 404 of the Act requires a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to fill.¹²

Much of the Clean Water Act that has been controversial, but Section 404 has probably sparked the most controversy. The principle areas of disagreement have related to general permits, the range of waters protected, and the meaning of "fill."

Regarding general permits, the Corps has created a number of these permits that do not require full consideration by the Corps or notice to the public. General permits allow certain categories of activities that destroy wetlands and other waters, such as homebuilding that destroys less than one-fourth of an acre of wetlands, to go forward without real regulation or public review.

The Supreme Court recently narrowed the reach of the Clean Water Act over waters that are not "adjacent or connected to" navigable waters.¹³ This opens the possibility that numerous wetlands and certain ephemeral streams and ponds could be filled without a permit under Section 404. The question of what it means for a water body to be adjacent or connected to navigable water is highly debatable and being played out in federal agencies and courts.

Further, like many other key distinctions made in the Act, the distinction between "fills" and other discharges is not clear. For example, there has been substantial debate regarding whether mountaintop removal coal mining (which involves stripping off the tops of mountains and placing the materials in river valleys) constitutes fill or discharge from a point source.¹⁴

¹⁰ 33 U.S.C. § 1329.

¹¹ 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a)(1).

¹² 33 U.S.C. § 1344.

¹³ *SWANCC v. U.S. Army Corps*, 531 U.S. 159 (2001).

¹⁴ See *Kentuckians for the Commonwealth v. Rivenburgh*, 317 F.3d 425 (4th Cir. 2003). The efficacy of the U.S. Army Corps of protecting wetlands in Illinois is an important topic but outside the scope of this report.

Finally, because Section 404 covers only “fills,” draining and excavation activities that destroy wetlands now often avoid regulation. In sum, while Section 404 certainly has done much good, the protective net Section 404 offers for wetlands is full of holes.¹⁵

2. NPDES Permits

As noted, when the Clean Water Act was enacted in 1972, it was hoped that discharges would be eliminated by the mid-1980s. It was thought that, while the technology was developed and put in place to eliminate discharges, municipalities, companies and other persons needing to discharge were to obtain NPDES permits. Over time, NPDES discharge limits were to be tightened until the discharge was eliminated.¹⁶

While the technology to eliminate discharges is developed, permit limitations on the quantity and types of pollution permitted are to be set according to either technology-based effluent limits or water quality standard based limits, whichever is more stringent.¹⁷ Technology based limits are set as to each type of discharger (e.g. oil refineries) based upon what level of pollution control is economically and technologically feasible for all dischargers of that type to achieve. If a polluter is seeking to discharge into a water body with much dilution and not a lot of dischargers, technology-based limits will generally be sufficient to protect water quality. In fact, such limits may be more stringent than is thought necessary to protect drinking water, swimming and aquatic life. Nonetheless, the Clean Water Act requires all dischargers to meet at least the minimum technological standards, on the theory that the solution to pollution is generally not dilution. We are to be working toward zero discharge.¹⁸

Where there is little dilution, there are a lot of dischargers or the discharger seeking a permit is discharging highly toxic materials, technology-based limits are not sufficient to protect human health and aquatic life. Water quality based effluents limits (“WQBELs”) are then necessary. WQBELs are set taking into account the current conditions of the water into which the permittee will be discharging and determining the maximum level of each pollutant that can be discharged without causing a violation of water quality standards.

There are several concepts here, and a very simplified example may be useful. Let us say, hypothetically, that a business wants to discharge iron in its wastewater into a stream and that the effluent flow from its factory will be five (5) cubic feet per second. Based upon analysis of economical wastewater treatment methods for that type of business, U.S. EPA might have determined that the hypothetical business with a certain level of production should not be allowed to discharge wastewater with a concentration of more than 4 mg/L of iron. So 4 mg/L would be the technology based effluent limit and the NPDES permit should contain a limit that allows the business to discharge no more than 4 mg/L of iron in its discharge no matter what the nature of the stream into which it will discharge.

¹⁵ Except for in three northeast Illinois counties, Illinois does not have any program that protects wetlands on private lands. Illinois badly needs to enact a state law that supplements the Clean Water Act’s protections against destructive fills. See Illinois Natural History Survey, Status and Function of Isolated Wetlands in Illinois, Special Publication No. 23 (Winter 2003). However, as this report is focused on implementation of the Clean Water Act, no more will be said here of the efforts to enact state wetland protection legislation.

¹⁶ Adler, *supra* note 2 at p. 137; Rodgers, Jr., W.H., Environmental Law, Second Edition (1994) pp. 361-62.

¹⁷ 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C); *see also* Rodgers, *supra* note 16 at p. 352

¹⁸ More on NPDES permits and how members of the public can participate in the NPDES process can be found at <http://www.rivernetwork.org/marketplace/permitguide.cfm>.

However, the water quality standard for iron is 1 mg/L.¹⁹ If there is less than fifteen cubic feet per second of (iron-free) flow in the stream upstream of the discharge, the technology-based standard of five cubic feet per second at 4 mg/L would lead to a violation of the water quality standard below the discharge point. Therefore, a WQBEL would be needed. For example, if the upstream stream flow were only 5 cubic feet per second, a WQBEL of 2 mg/L would be needed to prevent a violation of the 1mg/L water quality standard for iron. Therefore, the iron limit in the NPDES permit should be 2 mg/L. The hypothetical business would have to get its concentration of iron down to half of what is generally required of the industry because of the particular situation of the water into which it is discharging.²⁰

Permit limits are generally enforced through self-monitoring. The permits are supposed to spell out the monitoring required.²¹ The permit holders are to collect samples and file monthly discharge monitoring reports on the levels of pollution in their discharge. Obviously, this system provides incentives for permit holders to monitor inaccurately or at least to monitor at times in which it is less likely that a permit violation will be found. There are, however, some checks on self-reporting, including facility inspections and ambient water quality monitoring.²² U.S. EPA, states and, after giving 60 days notice, citizens may bring suit to enforce permit limits.²³

3. Water Quality Standards

Water quality standards are composed of designated uses, criteria, implementation rules and antidegradation rules. "Use" designations are, as the name implies, a designation by the state as to the use or uses to be made of the water. For example, a water body might be designated for use as a drinking water source, for aquatic life and/or for swimming. In Illinois, there are only three use categories: general use, public and food processing water supply, and secondary contact.²⁴

States have some latitude as to how they classify uses and the types of classification made, except that states may not designate a water body for the use of waste transport and assimilation.²⁵ In general, the use designation will dictate the criteria that will be applied. So, for example, in Illinois if a water is designated for general use, which includes swimming use, there will be criteria for pathogens that will be applicable that would not be applicable if the water was designated only for secondary contact, i.e., no swimming.

Criteria can be narrative or numeric. Narrative standards contain a narration, e.g., water must not be "offensive,"²⁶ and are generally somewhat subjective and hard to enforce.

¹⁹ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.208(f).

²⁰ Of course, nothing is ever as easy as our example. There is generally some background level of the pollutant in the water and the stream flows, effluent flows and concentration level are never constant over time. There may also be mixing problems and the standards for many pollutants vary based on the hardness or pH of the water because the pollutants involved are more or less toxic depending on hardness or pH.

²¹ 40 C.F.R. § 122.48.

²² Unfortunately, unreported violations are also discovered through fish kills and other obvious environmental damage.

²³ 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319, 1365.

²⁴ 35 Ill. Admin. Code Pt. 302. There are also special rules for Lake Michigan that in effect treat the Lake as an additional use category.

²⁵ 40 C.F.R. § 131.10(a); *see also* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Water Quality Standards Handbook (Second Edition, 1994) p. 2-1

²⁶ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.203.

Numeric standards are generally based on toxicity testing with the general presumption that it is the concentration that makes the poison.²⁷ A substance is acutely toxic at a given concentration if it kills quickly at that concentration. A substance at a particular level may also be chronically toxic; that is, it harms humans or wildlife if they are subjected to it over time. To develop water quality standards for aquatic life, organisms are subjected to various concentrations of pollutants and deaths or other effects are observed.

Normally the process for developing numeric standards is that U.S. EPA develops criteria, which are used by states to set standards. States do not have to adopt U.S. EPA criteria as standards, but must have some scientific basis for setting their own standards.²⁸ In many cases, states have failed to adopt any standard at all despite the fact that U.S. EPA has developed criteria.

Implementation rules tell how to set NPDES permit limits based on water quality standards. The amount of discharge, background conditions and a number of other factors must be taken into account in setting limits. The implementation rules can be as important as the numeric standards because the manner in which factors such as flow, background concentrations, measurement and monitoring are specified may be as important as the numeric standards in deciding on the effluent limits.

Antidegradation rules say when it is permissible to allow new or increased loadings of pollutants into rivers, lakes and streams.²⁹ Under the Clean Water Act, it is basically never permissible to issue permits to pollute in an amount that will harm existing uses of the water body. It may be permissible to allow more pollution into a water body if it is necessary to do so to allow important social or economic development and existing uses will not be harmed. Further, states are required to establish rules for designating "Outstanding National Resource Waters." If a water body is designated as an Outstanding National Resource Water, new loadings of pollutants to it are almost never allowed. Because antidegradation deals mainly with new and increased pollution, it often raises major sprawl and "smart growth" issues.

4. TMDLs

Under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, states are to list water bodies not meeting water quality standards.³⁰ For each listed water body for each pollutant present at levels in excess of the water quality standard, states are to calculate the "total maximum daily load" ("TMDL") of the pollutant that the water body can accept without violating the WQS. TMDL calculations must be approved by U.S. EPA.

Once a TMDL is completed, the issue becomes how to implement it. If the water body is impaired by point sources, NPDES permit limits must be lowered so as to get the total loading within the TMDL.

²⁷ The most frequent exception here relates to chemicals that bioaccumulate up the food chain, for instance, mercury. The object with regard to such chemicals is to limit concentrations in the water body to a level low enough to ensure that valued species at the top of the food chain, such as eagles, are protected and predator species of fish will be safe to eat.

²⁸ 40 CFR § 131.11.

²⁹ 40 C.F.R. §131.12.

³⁰ 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d).

If the water body does not meet WQS because of non-point sources, it is unclear how the TMDL is to be implemented. Should states extend regulatory controls to non-point sources to bring waters into compliance with standards?³¹ Another special problem is air deposition. Should a state limit coal combustion to prevent mercury from coal-fired power plants from reaching state waters? Clean water advocates hoped to use Section 303(d) to leverage regulatory controls or effective voluntary controls of non-point pollution, but that has happened in only a few cases.

States have dragged their feet for 25 years on creating the TMDL water body restoration plans required by the Act. Section 303(d) provides that the U.S. EPA must carry out TMDL studies if the states refuse to do so. A series of lawsuits convinced U.S. EPA to force states to create Section 303(d) lists and do TMDL calculations. However, there was a political backlash against forcing states to move forward with TMDLs, leading the U.S. EPA to revoke the revisions to the TMDL regulations that it issued in 2000.³² EPA is currently considering whether to make new revisions to the TMDL regulations.

Each state, including Illinois, recently issued draft lists of waters needing TMDLs during 2003-04. Illinois' list contains 411 watersheds and sets forth a schedule for TMDL production that stretches through the year 2017.³³ IEPA has completed only a few TMDLs.³⁴ Some other states have done hundreds.

B. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and Other State Agencies

As explained by the IEPA Website:³⁵

The Illinois General Assembly was the first state legislature in the nation to adopt a comprehensive Environmental Protection Act. It was signed into law by Governor Richard Ogilvie and became effective on July 1, 1970. As a part of that act, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency was created.

The mission of the Illinois EPA is to safeguard environmental quality, consistent with the social and economic needs of the State, so as to protect health, welfare, property and the quality of life.

Today, the Illinois EPA is composed of roughly 1,200 employees, working in the headquarters in Springfield and in nine field offices and three laboratories throughout the state.

* * *

The IEPA was delegated authority on October 23, 1977, to issue NPDES permits to Illinois communities and industries. Transfer of this authority to the State gave Illinois industries and municipalities the opportunity to work directly with the IEPA regarding their

³¹ California has done this. See *Pronsolino v. Marcus*, 91 F.Supp. 2d 1337 (N.D. Cal. 2000).

³² 67 Fed. Reg. 70920 (Dec. 27, 2002).

³³ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Illinois 2002 Draft Section 303(d) list, IEPA/BOW/02-009 (June 2002), p.13.

³⁴ Two TMDLs for Illinois water bodies (Cedar Creek in Galesburg and Governor Bond Lake) were prepared by consultants to U.S. EPA and. As of August 2002, IEPA was developing 17 TMDLs using outside consultants. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Performance Self Assessment, IEPA/ENV/02-013 (August 2002) p.31.

³⁵ <www.epa.state.il.us/about>.

wastewater construction and discharge permits. Prior to the State being delegated NPDES authority, a discharger would have to obtain construction permits from the State and discharge permits from the USEPA.

The Director of IEPA is Renee Cipriano. As stated by the press release announcing Ms. Cipriano's re-appointment by Governor Blagojevich:

Cipriano has been asked by Gov. Blagojevich to continue in her capacity at the state's EPA, which she has directed in Springfield since 2001. In that role, she is responsible for the implementation and administration of all environmental laws and programs for the state. She also served as co-chair of the governor's Energy Cabinet.

Prior to her appointment to the EPA, she served as a senior advisor on environmental and natural resources to then-Gov. George Ryan. In the mid-1990s, she was associate director and chief counsel of the Illinois EPA. She has also served in private legal practice, as a partner in the environmental law group at Schiff Hardin & Waite.

She holds her undergraduate and law degrees from Loyola University in Chicago.

Although IEPA is the principal body implementing the Clean Water Act in Illinois, there are four other significant players. The Illinois Pollution Control Board ("IPCB") sets water quality standards, generally based on recommendations by IEPA. The IPCB also is responsible for regulations relevant to permitting, monitoring and enforcement. It hears permit appeals. It is supposed to be a science-oriented quasi-judicial body, but historically some of the appointees have had little relevant expertise.

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources, particularly through the Natural History Survey and the Water Survey, has much of the hydrological and biological expertise in the state but is largely confined to an advisory role in the regulatory process. Until recently, IDNR's advice on standards and permitting issues was generally ignored.

The Illinois Department of Public Health ("IDPH") is in charge of regulating septic wastewater systems. Issues regarding IDPH regulation of septic systems are discussed below.³⁶

Finally, the Illinois Attorney General's office brings cases to prosecute violations of the Clean Water Act. IEPA does not have authority to bring its own causes of action against violators in court or even before the Pollution Control Board.³⁷ Although the Attorney General can bring cases on her own, historically the Attorney General has waited for a referral from IEPA before bringing a case. Under Section 31 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act,³⁸ IEPA generally goes through an elaborate notice and negotiation process with the violator before referring a case to the Attorney General's office for prosecution.³⁹

³⁶ See Section VI.C.

³⁷ People ex. rel. Scott v. Briceland, 65 Ill. 2d 485, 359 N.E. 2d 149 (1976).

³⁸ 415 ILCS 5/31.

³⁹ Of course, there is nothing to keep the Attorney General's office from going through IEPA files to look for violations and then bringing cases on its own. But the last few Attorney Generals have not shown so much initiative.

C. The Budget for Illinois Water Programs

Over the past few years, the total operating expenditures for IEPA's Bureau of Water are as follows:⁴⁰

	Total Operating Expenditures	Clean Water Act Implementation
FY 2001:	\$27 million	\$18.9 million
FY 2002:	\$33 million	\$24.8 million
FY 2003:	\$33 million	\$25.2 million

The majority of Bureau of Water funds come from the federal government. For example, the Bureau of Water utilized \$9.1 million federal dollars in fiscal year 2002 to manage IEPA's largest program, the Revolving Loan Fund. The Fund gave \$153.2 million in loans to local governments in fiscal year 2002. The BOW received another \$16 million in federal grants to administer other water programs in FY 02.

In fiscal year 2003, the Bureau of Water spent \$17 million in federal grants for programs other than Revolving Loan Fund expenditures, which reflects an increase of \$4 \$1 million over fiscal year 2002 federal grants. This increase includes \$400,000 for the drinking water operator certification program and \$400,000 more for the non-point source control program.

Fiscal year 2003 federal grant funds for programs other than Revolving Loan Fund expenditures were as follows: \$13.7 million for clean water programs (\$3.5 million for NPDES program, \$5.4 million for non-point source projects, \$2 million for non-point source control operations, and \$2.8 million for TMDL and other federal activities) and \$3.3 million for the SDWA programs (\$2.7 million Public Water Supervisory System program, \$400,000 drinking water operator certification program and \$200,000 for public water security initiative).

Despite increases in federal grant funding, fiscal year 2003 operating expenditures for the Bureau of Water remained at \$33 million in fiscal year 2003.

1. Comparisons to Other States

In fiscal year 2000, states spent an estimated \$4,479,511,907 on programs to protect water quality, drinking water, marine and coastal areas, and water resources.⁴¹ A significant percentage of these funds come from the federal government, with U.S. EPA the primary source.

It is difficult to compare state funding for Clean Water Act implementation because water resources, and the challenges to those resources, vary widely across the U.S. Moreover, each state environmental agency has a unique organizational structure that makes it cumbersome to compare apples-to-apples. Nonetheless, some comparisons can be made that are useful, and we have focused on Ohio and Minnesota. Ohio is very similar to Illinois in many ways, e.g., water resources, population, and industrial base. Minnesota is less populous and industrial than Illinois, but it has more water resources to protect.

⁴⁰ All budget data in this section comes from conversations that ELPC staff had with the Illinois EPA's budget officer.

⁴¹ Environmental Council of States, *States Put Their Money Where Their Environment Is* (2001).

NPDES Permitting

The data below indicates the number of staff working on NPDES permitting and compliance⁴² at IEPA, the Ohio EPA (OEPA), and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) compared to the number of permitted sources in each state. Compared to Ohio and Minnesota, Illinois appears to devote fewer resources for each regulated source.

	FTEs ⁴³	NPDES Individual Permits	NPDES General Permits	Total
IEPA (2003) ⁴⁴	130	2,050	"Thousands" ~4,000	>6,000
OEPA (2003) ⁴⁵	103	---	---	>4,000
MPCA (2001) ⁴⁶	78	873	551	1,429

Operating Budgets

FY 2000	Operating Expenditures: Water Programs	Clean Water Act Implementation
IEPA ⁴⁷	\$33,000,000	\$24,800,000
Ohio EPA ⁴⁸	\$46,349,000	\$30,265,000
MPCA ⁴⁹	---	\$20,183,000

Distribution of Expenditures for Water Quality Programs

Listed below is the approximate distribution of IEPA resources for Clean Water Act implementation versus national averages in the year 2000. The national average is based on data from 38 states.

	IEPA	National Average
Permitting, Compliance and Enforcement	38%	37%
Septage	0%	1%
TMDLs	7%	8%
Reporting and planning	3%	7%
WQ Standards	2%	3%
Monitoring	25%	10%
Non-point sources	7%	13%
Clean Lakes	3%	N/A
Wetlands	1%	6%
Coastal and Marine	1%	1%
Clean Water SRF, grants mgmt.	7%	9%
Data Management	5%	3%
Regional Initiatives	1%	2%

⁴² Including permitted POTWs, stormwater dischargers, and industrial and other facilities.

⁴³ "FTE" means Full Time Equivalent staff.

⁴⁴ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, NPDES Program Needs (2003). Current FTEs for IEPA are calculated from dollars per FTE identified for future needs.

⁴⁵ Ohio Environmental Protection Agency website <<http://www.epa.state.oh.us/>>.

⁴⁶ Office of Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota, Water Quality: Permitting and Compliance Monitoring (2002).

⁴⁷ Conversation with Illinois EPA budget officer, March 2003.

⁴⁸ State of Ohio, Office of Budget and Management, FY03 Budget.

⁴⁹ Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Fax from Tim Scherkenbach (March 31, 2003).

Significant differences are found with monitoring, reporting and planning, and non-point sources. However, more recent financial data indicates that IEPA is spending less on monitoring, as a percentage of total spending on CWA implementation, and more in other areas. Funding for non-point source programs has increased since 2000, although it appears that the state still spends comparatively less than other states.

2. Bureau of Water Needs vs. Available Resources

As described throughout this report, IEPA can and should implement a number of operational and policy changes to more effectively utilize available resources to protect Illinois' waters. However, it is also clear that IEPA lacks sufficient resources to do the job right. A back-log of permit applications and infrequent inspections and enforcement are in large part attributable to insufficient staffing.

In 2000, IEPA conducted a "Gap Analysis" in concert with the State Water Quality Management Resource Analysis Task Force, and the agency concluded that it needed more than twice as much funding for Clean Water Act implementation than was available at that time. In March of 2003, IEPA identified \$27.356 million in funding needed to administer the NPDES program alone, compared to \$13.491 million in current resources.⁵⁰ IEPA reports that 26 percent of individual permittees are operating on expired permits, and there is a back-log of 1000 permit renewal and modification applications. Moreover, new stormwater and CAFO requirements will result in the need for more permits and inspections.

Historically, one of the main reasons that the Bureau of Water was under funded and heavily dependent on federal funds was that until legislation was passed in Spring 2003 providing for NPDES fees, Illinois was one of only 11 states (and the only Midwest state) that failed to charge fees for reviewing and issuing water permits and monitoring permitted sources.⁵¹

Industrial and municipal wastewater dischargers have long been required to pay for the costs related to the issuance of NPDES permits in most states. In some cases, the revenue collected more than pays for the cost of administering and enforcing the state's water programs. Fees are an equitable source of revenue for permitting, monitoring and enforcement activities because they are paid by the entities that generate the pollution.

Fees in other states are typically collected for the following water pollution sources: (a) Industrial wastewater; (b) Industrial stormwater; (c) Coal mine and quarry runoff; (d) Concentrated animal feedlot operations; (e) Municipal wastewater treatment facilities; and (f) Municipal stormwater discharges. For example:

- Indiana's Department of Environmental Management charges industrial and municipal dischargers an annual permit fee of \$400 - \$1,000, plus an amount ranging from \$240 (<50,000 GPD) - \$34,000 (>100 MGD) per year based on daily discharge volume. The state collects \$4.1 million annually from these permit fees.
- Minnesota charges major municipal dischargers from \$5,900 (<5 MGD) - \$175,000 (>50 MGD) annually based on pollution discharge volume. Major industrial dischargers pay from

⁵⁰ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, NPDES Program Needs (2003).

⁵¹ The State of Illinois charged a fishing license fee for people seeking to fish from our waterways, a canoe license fee and a fee for hunters to hunt along the banks of our streams. But businesses and municipalities paid nothing to discharge millions of gallons of wastewater into Illinois rivers each day

\$8,500 (<5 MGD) - \$44,000 (>20 MGD) annually. Fees for non-major dischargers range from \$500 - \$1,000 annually. Minnesota collects \$2.8 million each year, and the fees were recently increased by 25% to reflect declining support for the program out of general revenue funds.

- Wisconsin's fee structure reflects both the volume discharged and concentrations of various pollutants in the wastewater flow. Wisconsin's stormwater fees alone generated \$8.2 million in 2000

Under the legislation passed in spring 2003, fees for NPDES permits were established that would be sufficient to pay for many of the programs that IEPA has failed to implement properly in the past for lack of funds.⁵² These fees on NPDES permits and certain other IEPA permits relating to water pollution control programs are designed to raise over \$20 million.

Unfortunately, under the budget approved by the legislature in May, most of the funds that will be raised by the fee may be taken by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of balancing the general revenue fund. There will probably be no new money for IEPA programs this year although, as will be discussed further below, IEPA is not now adequately performing many tasks it must do under the Clean Water Act. In addition, IEPA, without new money, must implement substantial new federally-mandated programs to control pollution from urban stormwater and large animal feeding operations.

Finally, it should be noted that some states have passed large bond issues to improve water quality. In 1998, Michigan voters passed a \$675 million Clean Michigan Initiative, much of which is focused on water quality programs.⁵³

⁵² SB 1903, the state budget.

⁵³ Michigan, 2002 Section 305(b) Report (April 2002) p.5.

III. WATER QUALITY TODAY: WHAT IS THE CONDITION OF ILLINOIS LAKES AND STREAMS?

There is a great deal of data on Illinois water quality, much of which is summarized in the report that IEPA files in compliance with Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. The Illinois 305(b) report states the percentage of Illinois waters that are meeting the applicable water quality standards. For the waters that are not meeting standards, the report attempts to identify the "cause" of the impairment, which is the type of pollution that is keeping the water from meeting standards.⁵⁴ The 305(b) report also attempts to identify the "source" of the impairment, that is, the type of human activity that has caused the water to become impaired. For example, a water body might be found to be impaired through evidence that the aquatic life in the water body is not healthy; the cause of the impairment might be that it has too much ammonia in it; and the source of the ammonia might be municipal point sources (i.e., sewerage treatment plants that fail to remove enough ammonia from the wastewater).

Because other states must also compile much data, there is at least an apparent opportunity to make comparisons between Illinois water quality and that of other states. Unfortunately, the huge gaps in the data and the lack of uniform standards for collection or presentation of data make it hard to reach any confident conclusions.⁵⁵

A. What Percentage of Illinois Waters Are Impaired?

According to the most recent Illinois Section 305(b) Report, the 2002 305(b) Report, IEPA monitored or evaluated 15,491 miles of rivers and streams in Illinois in 1999-2000 for whether they were healthy for aquatic life.⁵⁶ Of these, IEPA found that 5,495 (35%) were impaired in the sense that the aquatic community was not healthy or there were levels of contaminants in the water known to harm Illinois aquatic life.⁵⁷

IEPA studied 6,143 miles of Illinois rivers and streams in 1999-2000 regarding whether it is healthy for human beings to eat fish caught from those waters.⁵⁸ It was found that for 2,573

⁵⁴ The Illinois Section 305(b) report properly uses the broad definition of "pollution" of the Clean Water Act in looking at causes. Under 33 U.S.C. §1362(19), "pollution" means "the man-made or man-induced alteration of the chemical, physical, biological and radiological integrity of water." Thus, even activities that are not typically thought of as polluting (e.g. channelizing a stream or logging near a lake) may be listed as a cause of impairment.

⁵⁵ The U.S. General Accounting Office recently discussed this problem in depth. U.S. General Accounting Office, *Inconsistent State Approaches Complicate Nation's Efforts to Identify Its Most Polluted Waters* (Jan. 2002). Over the years, U.S. EPA has provided guidance on the preparation of Section 305(b) reports. *See, e.g.*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Guidelines For Preparation of the Comprehensive State Water Quality Assessments (305(b) Reports) and Electronic Updates* (Sept. 1997). However, only recently has U.S. EPA seriously attempted to impose any coordination or uniformity on state data collection and analysis. *See* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *2000 National Water Quality Report* (Aug. 2002) p.5. It is thus very hard to draw any valid conclusions as to national water quality from the state data particularly if it is sought to make comparisons between states over time.

⁵⁶ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, *Illinois Water Quality Report 2002* (July 2002) p. 42 [hereinafter *Illinois 305(b) Report*].

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

miles of the rivers and streams (42%) it is not healthy to eat the fish because of mercury or PCB levels in the fish tissue.⁵⁹

3,283 miles of Illinois rivers and stream were studied for swimming.⁶⁰ It was found that in 2,272 miles (69%) it is frequently not healthy to swim, generally because of pathogen levels.⁶¹

The Illinois Section 305(b) Report also contains data for lake acreage as follows:⁶²

	Acres Studied	Acres Impaired	% Impaired
Aquatic Life	146,534	61,374	42
Fish Consumption	114,380	30,062	26
Swimming	146,534	127,680	87

B. How Is a Water Body Determined to be Impaired?

The Illinois data on rivers, lakes and streams is of great interest, but the data is incomplete and inconclusive in a number of ways. First, less than 19% of the river and stream miles and only a bit over 60% of the lake acres were assessed.⁶³ Further, how the waters were graded naturally involves a number of judgements, the wisdom of some of which could be debated.

For most streams, whether a river or stream meets the "aquatic life" use basically involves collecting fish and/or macro invertebrates (e.g. water bugs) from the water and then determining the quality of the water by comparing the number and range of species present with what would be expected in a similar stream that was not affected by pollution. If virtually everything in the water is capable of living in low quality water, for instance carp or bloodworms, and many species that biologists would expect in a reference condition stream in that area are not present, the water body receives poor grades. If there are a number of pollution intolerant organisms in the water, such as stone fly larva, the water will be found to be "fully supporting" for aquatic life use.

Obviously, biologists can and do disagree about the relevant indices and grading systems and the systems used among states vary significantly. However, the method of determining the health of a water body by taking samples of the aquatic life is well accepted. The basic systems used by IEPA, the Index of Biotic Integrity ("IBI") and the Macroinvertebrate Biotic Index ("MBI"), are widely recognized across the country and even internationally. Clearly, the best way to look at whether a water body is healthy for aquatic life is to look at the aquatic life in the water body.⁶⁴ If the water chemistry seems poor, but aquatic life is thriving, the pollutants either are

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.* at 62.

⁶³ *Ibid.* at 2, 4.

⁶⁴ The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency notes in its Section 305(b) report that "in general, biology is considered to be the strongest indicator of a water body's ability to support aquatic life." Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 2002 Minnesota Water Quality: Surface Water Section (2002), p. 47.

less dangerous than was thought or they are canceling each other out.⁶⁵ On the other, hand if there is only sparse and unhealthy aquatic life in the water, water sampling that does not show dangerous pollution levels proves only that sampling did not happen at the right times, is not testing for all the right pollutants, or that the harmful effects of the pollutants are additive in their effects.⁶⁶

In large rivers it is impossible to do biological testing because the standard collection and sampling techniques will not work and there are no large rivers unaffected by human pollution, which could serve as a reference for comparison.⁶⁷ As to these rivers, IEPA determines whether the water is impaired by comparing water chemistry data to the numeric water quality standards. If there are numerous samples showing pollutant concentrations higher than the water quality standards (e.g., more than 10% of the samples show the level of iron is greater than 1 mg/L), the water is listed as impaired. For dissolved oxygen, the standard requires that levels stay above the level that fish need to breath and a violation of numeric water quality standards and impairment is found if a number of samples are taken showing that dissolved oxygen levels are too low. The DO standard is generally 5 mg/L in Illinois. Using numeric water quality standards in determining impairment is probably less reliable than biological sampling, but is currently the best that can be done for large rivers.

Determining whether a lake meets the aquatic life use in Illinois involves use of a complex formula that considers water clarity, phosphorus levels, and algae levels. As with large rivers, there are no established reference condition waters with which to compare aquatic life found in lakes.

Fish consumption impairments are found in Illinois based on whether or not a fish advisory has been issued by the Illinois Department of Public Health.⁶⁸ This is not the place for a lengthy discussion of fish advisories, but methods used in deciding when it is safe to eat particular fish, who should eat such fish and in what amount depend on a assessments of uncertain science and a number of assumptions about the level of consumption, body weight, exposures to the contaminant in question from other sources and a number of other factors.⁶⁹

Generally, the tests Illinois uses in determining fish consumption impairments have been made more stringent in recent years with the result that many more water bodies are identified as impaired for fish consumption. This is particularly true as to mercury contamination. Water bodies are listed as impaired when there is fish tissue data showing levels of contaminants that are unhealthy for consumption by women of child-bearing age and other susceptible populations.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ It is well-established that this can happen.

⁶⁶ It is also well-established that groups of pollutants can be lethal to aquatic life although each of them individually is below the safe levels. For this reason, point sources are required to test the whole effluent toxicity of their effluent periodically.

⁶⁷ To some extent the definition of “impaired” is circular when applied to water bodies that have been greatly modified by man. In such cases, it can be argued that a water can only be called “impaired” in comparison to the use that we want it to have.

⁶⁸ Illinois 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 40.

⁶⁹ This problem is discussed at length in Environmental Working Group, *Brainfood: What Women Should Know About Mercury Contamination of Fish* (April 2001).

⁷⁰ There is a statewide fish consumption advisory for certain types of fish based on the need to be protective in the absence of data for many waters, but water bodies are only listed as impaired if there is data for that particular water.

The Illinois system for determining whether a water body is safe for swimming now mainly depends on the fecal coliform bacteria count in the water or, if there is no fecal coliform data, on the clarity of the water.⁷¹ There is generally no pathogen data collected for Illinois lakes except in Lake and Cook Counties, where the county health departments collect such data.⁷²

C. How Do Illinois Water Bodies and Testing Compare With Those of Other States?

U.S. EPA's report summarizing all of the state Section 305(b) reports for the period 1998-2000,⁷³ states that 19% of the nation's river and stream miles were assessed and that approximately 40% of these miles were found to be impaired. U.S. EPA's summary states that 43% of the nation's lake acres were assessed and that 45% of the lake acreage was found to be impaired. While it is dangerous to make comparisons of data from different states because of the differences in state data collection and analysis, the extent of monitoring and impairments of Illinois waters appear to be roughly of the same magnitude as that of the national average.

U.S. EPA's Region 5 has created a report that summarizes state 305(b) reports for 1998-2000 for the states in the region (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin).⁷⁴ Looking at aquatic life use, Region 5 finds that the states in the region have assessed 30.3% of their rivers and stream miles and found 32.7% impaired.⁷⁵ Regarding aquatic life impairments in lakes, states in Region 5 report that they have assessed 25.7% of their lake acreage and found 30.7% to be impaired.⁷⁶ Again admitting the limitations on making comparisons, it appears that Illinois rivers, lakes and streams suffer roughly the same aquatic life use impairment as the regional average. It also appears that Illinois has monitored a higher percentage of its lakes for aquatic life use than the average state, both nationally and in the region.

Finally, while again recognizing the hazards of comparing Section 305(b) reports from different states,⁷⁷ it is interesting to compare Illinois' water quality with that of Michigan, a state that touts its water recreation opportunities. In its report on water quality data taken from 1997 to 2001, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality ("Michigan DEQ") claims to have monitored 55% of its total inland lake acres, excluding the Great Lakes, with the following results:⁷⁸

	Acres studied	Acres impaired	% impaired
Aquatic Life	502,989	6981	1.4
Fish Consumption	502,989	326,943	65
Swimming	502,989	3,956	.8

⁷¹ Illinois 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 41, 49.

⁷² *Ibid* p. 49

⁷³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Water Quality Inventory 2000 Report (Aug. 2002), p. ES-3.

⁷⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5, State of the Waters 2002 Region 5 (Sept. 2002).

⁷⁵ *Ibid*. p. 1-5.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*.

⁷⁷ Michigan considers all lakes surveyed in the last 20 years to be monitored "because under most conditions, a lake will not change considerably in a 15 to 20 year time period. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality and Pollution Control in Michigan: 2002 Section 305(b) Report (April 2002), p. 20.

⁷⁸ *Ibid*. at 20-21.

Michigan DEQ claims to have assessed 21,890 miles of its rivers and streams, 79% of its total perennial rivers and streams.⁷⁹ As to these rivers and streams, Michigan DEQ reports the following:⁸⁰

	Miles studied	Miles impaired	% impaired
Aquatic life use	21,881	777	3.6
Fish Consumption	21,881	1,542	7
Swimming	21,881	588	2.7

D. What Types of Pollution Are Causing the Impairments?

The Illinois Section 305(b) report attempts to identify the type or types of pollution causing impairment for every body of water identified as impaired.⁸¹ The report does not claim to prove a cause and effect relationship between a pollutant and an impairment, but rather simply identifies “potential” causes of the impairments.

Five types of data are used to try to identify the potential cause of impairment in a particular body of water:⁸²

- If water chemistry data on the water body that is impaired shows a violation of a numeric state water quality standard, the pollution for which there has been a violation is listed as a potential cause of the impairment
- For the types of pollution that do not have numeric water quality standards (e.g. phosphorus, suspended solids, siltation), if the level of such pollutant in the impaired body of water exceeds the 85th percentile level of statewide samples for that pollutant, such pollutant is identified as a potential cause of the impairment.⁸³
- Stream habitat may be listed as a potential cause of impairment depending on measures of siltation and habitat alteration, and observations of the stream habitat,
- For fish consumption, the fish tissue contaminants identified from testing, e.g. PCBs, are the cause, and
- Sediment-chemistry data are also used for identifying the potential causes of impairment.

To use an example here, a stream might be shown to be badly impaired through evidence that only a few very pollution tolerant critters can live in the water. Having concluded that the water

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* at 27.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* at 29.

⁸¹ Illinois Section 305(b), *supra* note 52, at 31.

⁸² *Ibid.* at 31-32.

⁸³ For example, because roughly 85 % of the water quality samples taken in Illinois have phosphorous levels at .61 mg/Liter or lower, .61 is the figure used by IEPA to identify potential phosphorus impairments. *Ibid.* No real explanation has ever been given for choosing the 85th percentile cut off.

was impaired, IEPA might hypothetically conclude that the water was potentially impaired by metals if the iron level was higher than the water quality standard for iron (1 mg/L) in the last three years, by phosphorus because the level of phosphorus was higher than the 85th percentile of all samples in at least one sample in most of the last three years, and by habitat alterations by observing that the stream was recently channelized. In this example, one impairment was potentially caused by three different causes.

The fact that impairments are sometimes identified only through violations of numeric standards (regarding large rivers, this is the only way they are identified) results in some counter-intuitive cause listings. For example, an impairment to a certain section of the Illinois River might be identified through data showing that the water has too high a level of a particular metal pollutant. If phosphorus were above the 85th percentile level in that section of the river, phosphorus would be listed as a cause of the impairment although there is little evidence of any relation between metal pollutants and phosphorus levels.

In any event, the Illinois Section 305(b) report identifies the following top ten potential causes of impairments of Illinois rivers and streams.⁸⁴

<u>Cause</u>	<u>impaired miles</u>
Nutrients	3082
Organic enrichment/low DO	2962
Habitat Alterations (other than flow)	2732
PCBs	2435
Pathogens (fecal coliform)	2318
Metals	2228
Siltation	1978
Suspended solids	1728
Priority organics (e.g. atrazine)	743
pH	685

The top ten potential causes of impairments for lakes are.⁸⁵

<u>Cause</u>	<u>acres impaired</u>
Nutrients	114,903
Siltation	98,523
Suspended solids	84,635
Excessive algal growth	83,873
Organic enrichment/low DO	80,135
Noxious Aquatic plants	46,580
PCBs	23,668
Priority organics	21,546
pH	18,239
metals	16,494

⁸⁴ Illinois Section 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 43.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* at 63.

E. What Are the Sources of the Pollution Causing Impairments?

IEPA's identifications of the potential sources of the pollution that reaches the water rely on a variety of data and observations collected by or available to the Agency. The top ten potential sources of pollution causing impairments to rivers and streams are:⁸⁶

<u>Source</u>	<u>miles impaired</u>
Agriculture	4071
Hydromodification (channelization)	2013
Municipal point sources	1566
Resource Extraction (mining)	1079
Urban run off/storm sewers	1004
Habitat modification (other than Hydromodification) ⁸⁷	760
Combined sewer overflow	368
Industrial point sources	348
Contaminated sediments	325
Construction	238

The top ten potential sources of pollution causing impairments to lakes are:⁸⁸

<u>Sources</u>	<u>acres</u>
Agriculture	129,204
Habitat modification	104,819
Run off from forest/grassland or parkland (e.g. golf course fertilizer)	74,919
Recreation activities	73,591
Contaminated sediments	53,835
Urban run off/storm sewers	37,159
Municipal point sources	28,825
Hydromodification	25,180
Land disposal (e.g. dumps, septic)	22,675
Marinas	18,278

F. Do We Have Serious Problems That We Are Not Monitoring?

IEPA is collecting much useful information and its collection and analytical methods appear to have improved considerably over time. Unfortunately, there is reason to believe that there are entire families of chemicals that may be having a significant effect on Illinois water quality but are not being monitored in any systematic matter.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* at 44.

⁸⁷ General modification of the riparian habitat (e.g. logging by stream)

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* at 64.

Most notably, IEPA is collecting little information regarding potential endocrine disrupting chemicals (e.g. surfactants and plasticisers), even though such chemicals may have profound effects on aquatic life and human health. As explained recently in *Water Environment & Technology*:⁸⁹

The endocrine system is a combination of glands and hormones that affect biological reproduction, growth, and development. Endocrine disruptors are compounds that can block, mimic, stimulate, or inhibit the production of natural hormones, thereby disrupting the endocrine system's ability to function properly.

In the early 1990, researchers in Britain noted that male trout downstream from sewerage treatment plants had become hermaphrodites and had chemicals in their blood that are normally found only in females. Similar effects were later found in carp that were caged in the Mississippi River and Minnesota River downstream from the Minneapolis sewerage treatment plant and heavy agricultural runoff.⁹⁰

While fish, of course, are immersed in water and receive the maximum impact of whatever chemicals are in the water, there are researchers who believe that exposure to even very small doses of endocrine disrupting chemicals can adversely impact human health.⁹¹ A federal advisory committee is conducting studies of potential human health effects.⁹²

Known endocrine disrupting chemicals have been found in a large number of water bodies across the United States and there is no reasonable hope that they are not present in many Illinois water bodies.⁹³ IEPA does test for a number of pesticides known to act as endocrine disruptors and, unsurprisingly, has found some disruptors, such as atrazine and other pesticides, in many Illinois waters. Unfortunately, IEPA fails to test for other known endocrine disruptors such as alkylphenols and estrogen.

Moreover, Illinois waters undoubtedly contain a wide range of other chemicals used in industrial, agricultural and consumer products with largely unknown effects on aquatic life and other elements of the environment. A U.S. Geological Survey study of 139 streams across 30 states in 1999 and 2000 broadly found steroids, deodorants, caffeine, perfumes, fire retardants, nonprescription drugs, insect repellants, antibiotics and residues of a host of other modern products, generally at very low concentrations.⁹⁴ IEPA does not test for any of these pollutants.

By not testing for these pollutants, IEPA may be failing to identify impairments and/or potential causes for impairments. In some cases, impairments caused by chemicals for which IEPA is not testing would be identified by biological monitoring, but even in such cases the cause of the problem would probably not be identified properly. So, for example, if fish cannot reproduce

⁸⁹ McGovern, P and McDonald H.S., "Endocrine Disruptors, the Next Generation of Regulatory Concern," *Water Science and Technology* (Jan. 2003) p. 36.

⁹⁰ Rachel's Environment & Health Weekly #545, May 8, 1997; *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. Vol. 15, No. 11 (1996) pp. 1993-2002.

⁹¹ Colborn, T.; Dumanoski, D.; Peterson, J., *Our Stolen Future* (1996); Steingraber, Sandra, *Living Downstream*, Vintage Books 1998) pp. 111, 249.

⁹² McGovern, *supra* note 85, at 37.

⁹³ Daughton, C.G.; Ternes, T.A., *Environ. Health Perspectives* (1999), pp. 107,907

⁹⁴ U.S. Geological Survey, Pharmaceuticals, Hormones and Other Organic Wastewater Contaminants in U.S. Streams, 1999-2000, *Environmental Science Technology*, 36(6) (Mar. 2002) pp.1202-1211.

properly in a stream because of the levels of surfactants in the water, the absence of expected fish species would lead the water to be listed as impaired. The surfactant responsible, however, would not be identified as a cause and the agent responsible for putting the surfactant into the water would not be listed as a source.

G. What Are the Trends in Illinois Water Quality?

It is beyond question that many Illinois waters have improved substantially since 1972. As discussed below, studies by IEPA, the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (“MWRD”) and others demonstrate great improvements to the Chicago, Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.⁹⁵ U.S. EPA Region 5 wrote in 2002 regarding the Illinois River that:

Thirty years ago angler’s catches in the [Illinois] river were chiefly catfish and carp. As dischargers received more effective treatment, the waters cleared and sport fish as well as the macroinvertebrates they feed on returned. Today anglers from throughout the Midwest are catching walleye, sauger, crappie, and variety of bass in the river.⁹⁶

According to an IEPA report, in 1972 11.3% of the streams were in poor condition, 54% were in fair condition and only 34.7% were in good conditions.⁹⁷ In 2000, the numbers for streams were 1.4% poor, 36.1 % fair and 62.5% good. The report states that in 1972 27.8% of the lake acres were in poor condition, 54.4% were in fair condition and only 17.8% were in good condition. The 2000 figures for lake acres were 3.0% poor, 81.1% fair and 15.9% good.

Of course, one must be aware of the dangers of comparing data across time and recognize that there are many forms of water pollution that have not and are not being monitored. Still, the discussion of water quality trends in a 1994 Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources report, appears to be fairly accurate:

Water quality trends indicate a general improvement in Illinois streams and rivers. In particular, there is a decreasing trend in the concentrations in streams of metals (arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, and mercury). Decreasing trends in cadmium, lead and mercury were especially strong. Significant decreasing trends were also identified in chlorides and chemical oxygen demand (COD). Increases in dissolved oxygen—a favorable trend—were observed, but not a statistically significant level. However, two constituents experienced significant increasing levels, causing a degrading impact: phosphorous and nitrate/nitrite nitrogen (NO₂ + NO₃). The likely source of these constituents is nonpoint pollution from agricultural areas. All the other parameters that were examined (phenolics, fecal coliform, pH, total dissolved solids, and ammonia nitrogen) show little or no trend.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Hey and Associates, Inc., Draft Lower Des Plaines Use Attainability Analysis, March 10, 2003, p.1-8 to 1-11.

⁹⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5, State of the Waters 2002 Region 5 (Sept. 2002), p.1-6.

⁹⁷ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, The Condition of Illinois Water Resources 2000 (Aug. 2000).

⁹⁸ Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources, The Changing Illinois Environment: Critical Trends (June 1994), Vol. 2 p.1.

IV. WATER QUALITY MONITORING: IS IT SUFFICIENT AND ACCURATE?

All of IEPA's conclusions about Illinois water quality rely on certain monitoring and sampling of Illinois water bodies. The basic data on water quality for rivers and streams comes from two sources. First, IEPA operates an Ambient Water Quality Monitoring Network consisting of 214 fixed stations that take water quality samples on a six week sampling frequency. Samples are analyzed for a minimum of 55 parameters including pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, suspended solids, nutrients and various metals and other toxins.⁹⁹ Second, through the Intensive Basin Surveys, the IEPA takes biological and chemical data at about 100 sites a year on a five-year rotating basis.¹⁰⁰ These surveys are responsible for the IBI and MBI data that is used to determine whether aquatic life is impaired.¹⁰¹

Other sources of information include data collected on pesticides and fecal coliform levels by certain health departments. In addition, a number of volunteer groups collect various water quality data, but IEPA does not directly rely on that information in making decisions about impairments.

Analysis of the monitoring system yields the conclusion that there are a number of broad flaws in Illinois' measurement of its water quality. Most obviously, IEPA only claims to monitor about one-fifth of Illinois river and stream miles and about 60% of the state's lake acreage. Even these claims rely on extrapolations for long stream segments from data taken at particular points. For example, data from a single monitoring point is generally used to make aquatic life use support determinations for portions of small streams that extend approximately 10 miles upstream and downstream from the monitored point.¹⁰² For pollutants with effects that dissipate within that distance because of the natural breakdown or dispersal (e.g. ammonia, BOD, heat) there could be large dead zones above or below the monitored point that are never detected.

Moreover, IEPA officials have explained that monitoring sites are deliberately placed in areas where they will not be affected by major point sources. This approach is taken to ensure that the data is reflective of ambient conditions in the stream as a whole stream rather than local conditions. IEPA's choice is defensible in terms of the desire to glimpse the overall quality of Illinois' rivers and streams, but means also that there are many segments of Illinois rivers and streams that are in fact impaired but that are listed as unimpaired by IEPA because the water quality was good in a different segment of that stream or river.

Similar deficiencies are seen with IEPA's monitoring of large rivers. For large rivers, IEPA uses data from a monitoring site to extrapolate water quality for portions of the river 50 miles above and below the monitoring site. Further, the monitoring sites tend to be in the main channel. Thus, segments miles above the monitored point and side channels could be suffering from serious impairment, without it being recognized through IEPA's monitoring system. IEPA made this point itself in its prior Section 305(b) report, issued in 2000, when it recognized that many

⁹⁹ Illinois 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 22. In the case of some pollutants (cyanide, cadmium, mercury) the testing done is not sufficiently sensitive to discover water quality impairments that may be there.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* at 23.

¹⁰¹ IEPA also relies on fish tissue data, *ibid.*, and used to collect facility-related stream data downstream of industrial and municipal discharges. The facility-related data collection was essentially discontinued recently due to budget constraints. Testimony of Toby Frevert to Illinois Pollution Control Board, Rulemaking R-011 (July, 2002).

¹⁰² Illinois 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 30.

Illinois River side channels are severely impaired from siltation and eutrophication even while IEPA's chemical data, taken in the main channel, showed that the river was healthy.¹⁰³

In addition to the unavoidable problem of trying to extrapolate water quality along a linear body by monitoring at a limited number of points, there are serious limitations with the monitored data. As noted above, many of the modern industrial and consumer chemicals that we know are in the water are not tested for by IEPA. Moreover, the fixed sites are monitored only every six weeks. Of course, pollution parameters vary on a constant basis and huge slugs of pollution may be completely missed by monitoring that occurs every six weeks. For example, levels of dissolved oxygen in streams affected by nutrients and algae are known to fluctuate over the course of the day with the low oxygen levels, potentially lethal to aquatic life, occurring early in the morning when samples are almost never collected.¹⁰⁴

Clearly, more resources are needed for more continuous monitoring in streams, to look at conditions below known pollution sources including factories, large-scale animal feeding operations and municipal discharges, and to improve the overall coverage of the monitoring system. Still, while recognizing all the limitations in Illinois water quality monitoring, IEPA's monitoring program for aquatic life is probably no worse than that of many other states and is probably much better than many.¹⁰⁵

Regarding monitoring for protection of swimmers, Illinois has serious gaps. As noted, there is generally no pathogen data for counties other than Cook and Lake. Further, in the streams and the few lakes where pathogen data is collected, such collections are limited to fecal coliform data, even though it is generally accepted that different kinds of data should be taken to gauge accurately the level of dangerous pathogens in recreational waters.

U.S. EPA, which in 1976 recommended testing fecal coliform levels as an indication of recreational water quality, has now concluded, based on multi-site epidemiological studies, that enterococci and E.coli levels have a much higher correlation than fecal coliform with swimming-associated gastroenteritis in fresh water.¹⁰⁶ Thus, Illinois authorities, to the extent they have

¹⁰³ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Illinois Water Quality Report 2000 Report (2000) pp. 3-4. Reportedly this admission occurred after IEPA circulated its first draft of its 2000 305(b) report, giving the Illinois River largely a clean bill of health, at the very time that Lt. Governor Wood was in Washington, D.C. attempting to get federal money to address the serious problems in the River and its side channels that can be seen even by casual observers.

¹⁰⁴ Recent, as yet unreviewed and unpublished data collected by the U.S. Geological Survey at Valley City on the Illinois River shows sustained crashes of dissolved oxygen ("DO") levels. IDNR, in its study of the Fox River, concluded that DO levels were crashing during the night and recovering before DO was measured. To some extent, at least for aquatic life uses, the gaps in the types of chemicals tested for and the frequency of the testing are filled by studying the biological data. Aquatic life killed by a crash in dissolved levels at 4:00 am will not come back to life as dissolved oxygen levels recover during the day and biological monitoring should notice the absence of species in the affected water body. As mentioned, however, biological testing is not done for rivers or lakes and it done for streams only on a five year rotating cycle.

¹⁰⁵ Similar to Illinois, the monitoring of other programs reviewed relies largely on a combination of fixed site chemical monitoring data and rotating biological assessments. Kentucky and Michigan have fewer fixed water chemistry monitoring sites per stream mile than Illinois. Kentucky seems to have more rotating sites that do biological monitoring. Kentucky Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet, 2002 Kentucky Report to Congress on Water Quality (Sept. 2002), p. 12-19. Ohio's bio-monitoring system is very well respected but, to be fair, Ohio reportedly has received a great deal of federal money specifically for this purpose.

¹⁰⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Improved Enumeration Methods for the Recreational Water Quality Indicators: Enterococci and Escherichia coli, EPA/821/R-97/004 (March 2000); *see also*, Hey and Associates, Draft Lower Des Plaines Use Attainability Analysis at p. 7-2 to 7-5.

been measuring the healthfulness of recreational waters, have been largely measuring the wrong thing. Illinois should soon change its system for pathogen monitoring to monitor for E.coli or enterococci as a result of the October 2000 enactment of amendments to the Clean Water Act, known as the "Beach Bill".¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ 33 U.S.C. §1346. Many public beaches are already testing for E.coli rather than fecal coliform.

V. WATER QUALITY STANDARDS: ARE WE GRADING OUR WATERS PROPERLY?

State water quality standards consist of use designations, criteria, which may be numeric or narrative, and antidegradation rules. It appears that Illinois has serious flaws in its use designations, indeed in its whole system for designating uses. Further, Illinois has not established use criteria for key pollutants. Illinois' antidegradation standards, however, are reasonably protective, or at least will be if they are properly implemented in permit writing. Illinois mixing zone regulations, which govern how standards are implemented where there is dilution available, have strengths but also a serious flaw.

A. Use Designations

As mentioned above, Illinois has three main use designation categories: drinking water and food processing, general use, and secondary contact. By way of contrast, Ohio has seven aquatic use classifications (warmwater, limited warmwater, exceptional warmwater, modified warmwater, seasonal salmonid, coldwater, and limited resource water), some of which have sub-classifications, and three recreational use classifications (bathing waters, primary contact and secondary contact).¹⁰⁸

Illinois' unrefined classification system has led to a "dumbing down" of Illinois standards for some toxins. Water quality standards are supposed to be set at a level that will protect the "most sensitive use" of the water body to which the standard applies.¹⁰⁹ In a water body listed for "general use," the water quality standards should be stringent enough to protect all aquatic life in that water. Under Illinois's crude use classification system, the water bodies that fall into the general use category include drainage ditches and other water bodies that never harbored pollution sensitive species. Because of this, industry and municipalities have been able to convince the Pollution Control Board that setting a general use waters numeric criteria that would protect pollution intolerant species would require millions in wastewater treatment for waters that do not need so much protection.¹¹⁰ Rather than adopt stringent standards that would make drainage ditches safe for aquatic life, the Pollution Control Board has adopted "one size fits all" standards that are not protective of highly sensitive species in the Illinois water bodies in which they could live.

Although the state budget is now very limited, it would be worth the investment to review and revise the use classification system for Illinois waters. A more refined use classification system would allow for the application of much stricter chemical criteria to protect certain exceptional warm water streams that harbor rare or endangered species, such as native mussels, and to cool water habitats that have relatively sensitive non-salmonid species, such as sculpin and darters.

¹⁰⁸ Ohio Admin. Code 3745-1-7.

¹⁰⁹ 40 C.F.R. 131.11.

¹¹⁰ For example, in setting Illinois ammonia standards the Pollution Control Board in deliberately adopted standards that are not protective of trout populations despite the fact that it was aware that there are some trout populations in Illinois. Illinois Pollution Control Board, Triennial Water Quality Review (Ammonia Nitrogen), R-94(B) (Dec. 19, 1996).

B. Standards for Toxic Pollutants

In large part because of the unrefined use classification system discussed above, Illinois standards for particular toxins often consist of the federal criteria for that toxin loosened to allow more pollution in Illinois. This is done on the theory that the sensitive species relied on in the federal criteria setting process are not present in Illinois.¹¹¹ No effort is made to determine whether there are other species that are sensitive to the toxin under consideration that are present in Illinois but were not considered in development of the federal criteria.¹¹² For example, if the most sensitive species used in developing federal criteria for a particular pollutant is trout, IEPA will recalculate the criteria after eliminating the trout data because trout do not generally live in Illinois. No consideration is given to whether mussels, which were not considered in setting the federal criteria but that are present in Illinois, may be as sensitive or more sensitive to the pollutant in question than trout.

In fact, Illinois numeric criteria are generally not designed to protect mussel species although a number of species of mussels present in Illinois are on federal and state endangered species lists. IEPA's excuse is that the federal criteria are not based on mussel studies and toxicological data is not available for mussels. However, the fact that there is a lack of data on mussels should lead to the conclusion that Illinois water quality standard should be based on the most sensitive species for which there is data, until scientific mussel data is obtained. It is known that mussels are more sensitive to at least some toxins than the species that IEPA suggests are too sensitive to be used in Illinois standard setting.¹¹³

C. Nutrient Standards

As seen above, many Illinois waters have been recognized by IEPA to be impaired by excess nutrients, mainly phosphorus (P) but sometimes forms of nitrogen (N).¹¹⁴ U.S. EPA has described the damage caused by excess nutrients, stating:

Human health problems can be attributed to nutrient enrichment. One serious human health problem associated with nutrient enrichment is the formation of trihalomethanes (THMs). Trihalomethanes are carcinogenic compounds that are produced when certain organic compounds are chlorinated and bromated as part of the disinfection process in a drinking water facility. Trihalomethanes and associated compounds can be formed from a variety of organic compounds including humic substances, algal metabolites and algal decomposition products. The density of algae and the level of eutrophication in the raw water supply has been correlated with the production of THMs.

¹¹¹ Comments of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in Illinois Pollution Control Board Rulemaking 02-11 (July 10, 2002) p.6

¹¹² Testimony of IEPA in Illinois Pollution Control Board Rulemaking 02-11 (Mar. 6, 2002) Tr. 59-60, 86, 140.

¹¹³ Letter from Mary Pat Tyson, U.S. EPA, to Toby Frevert, IEPA, October 25, 2001 and attached draft Review of Ammonia Toxicity to Freshwater Mussels.

¹¹⁴ Illinois is not alone in this. State water quality standards reports indicate that nutrients, phosphorus and nitrogen, are the single biggest overall source of impairment of the nation's rivers and streams, lakes and reservoirs, and estuaries. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Clean Water Action Plan: Restoring and Protecting America's Waters (1998) p. 58.

Effects directly related to nutrients can also result in human health problems. ... The USEPA has an established maximum contaminant level of 10 mg/L because nitrates in drinking water can cause potentially fatal low oxygen levels in the blood when ingested by infants. Nitrate concentrations as low as 4 mg/L in drinking water supplies from rural areas have also been linked to an increased risk of non-Hodgkin lymphoma.

* * *

Nutrient impairment can cause problems other than those related to human health. One of the most expensive problems caused by nutrient enrichment is the increased treatment required for drinking water. ... Adverse ecological effects associated with nutrient enrichment include reductions in dissolved oxygen (DO) and the occurrence of HABs (harmful algal blooms). High algal and macrophyte biomass may be associated with severe diurnal swings in DO and pH in some water bodies. Low DO can release toxic metals from sediments contaminating habitats of local aquatic organisms. In addition, low DO can cause increased availability of toxic substances like ammonia and hydrogen sulfide, reducing acceptable habitat for most aquatic organisms, including valuable game fish. Decreased water clarity (increased turbidity) can cause loss of macrophytes and creation of dense algal mats. Loss of macrophytes and enrichment may alter the native composition and species diversity of aquatic communities.¹¹⁵

Speaking specifically with regard to the Fox River, the Illinois Natural History Survey wrote of the effect of elevated phosphorus levels on the Fox.

High nutrient inputs and still-water environments created by the numerous channel dams situated along the entire main stem of the Fox River in Illinois promote excessive algal growths. Very high phosphorus levels appear to promote and sustain massive algal blooms along the Fox River.

Pronounced algal growth will continue to produce fluctuating DO levels behind the low channel dams unless significant reduction in phosphorus levels occurs.¹¹⁶

Despite the large number of Illinois waters impaired by phosphorous, IEPA has only slowly moved to develop phosphorous standards. While there is a .05 mg/L standard for phosphorus in lakes with a surface area over 20 acres,¹¹⁷ there is generally no phosphorus standard for Illinois rivers, streams or small lakes. As a consequence, few Illinois NPDES permits contain any limit on phosphorus discharges.

¹¹⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Nutrient Criteria, Technical Guidance Manual, Rivers and Streams, EPA -822-B-00-002 (July 2000) (pp. 4-5, citations omitted)

¹¹⁶ Illinois State Water Survey, Considerations in Water Use Planning for the Fox River, Contract Report 586 (September 1995) pp. 100, 104, 113, 120,122.

¹¹⁷ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.205

During his recent election campaign, Governor Blagojevich promised to establish phosphorus standards by 2004. However, IEPA has presented a schedule to U.S. EPA that calls for nutrient standards to be adopted by the IPCB in fall of 2008.¹¹⁸

Reduction of the levels of phosphorous discharged by Illinois wastewater treatment plants is certainly technologically feasible. Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin all generally impose limits at least as strict as 1 mg/L on phosphorous,¹¹⁹ and there are established wastewater treatment methods that consistently allow reduction of phosphorus pollution to well under 1 mg/L.¹²⁰

D. Antidegradation Standards

As mentioned above, the Clean Water Act requires states to establish and implement antidegradation policies. As their name implies, antidegradation standards are designed to ensure that waters do not get dirtier than they already are. The idea of the Clean Water Act is ultimately to bring all of the nation's waters up to "A", not to allow everything to get to "D-".

An antidegradation policy must do three things:¹²¹

- Assure that waters are kept clean enough to protect existing uses. New loadings must not be allowed if they would harm the aquatic species now living in the water body or make it unsafe to swim in a water body in which it is now safe.
- Prohibit new pollution loadings to water bodies unless allowing such pollution is necessary to accommodate significant social or economic development.
- Provide for the designation of Outstanding National Resource Waters.

On February 21, 2002, Illinois established antidegradation standards and implementation rules that should accomplish these three purposes. This development came only after a long battle. As with the TMDL requirement, U.S. EPA and the states, including Illinois, largely ignored antidegradation for the first 25 years after passage of the Clean Water Act.

In Illinois, real progress toward establishing standards began after ELPC, McHenry County Defenders, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club and other groups in October 1997 threatened to sue U.S. EPA because of the failure of IEPA to adopt proper antidegradation rules. This led to a long negotiation and regulatory process that ultimately resulted in IEPA proposing fairly sound draft rules to the IPCB for adoption. A year and a half and much debate later, the IPCB adopted rules that were slightly improved from those proposed by IEPA despite extensive efforts by industrial polluters and others to persuade the IPCB to weaken the IEPA proposal.

Illinois' new antidegradation rules give substantial protection against new pollution to every river, lake and stream in the state. The rules do not contain loopholes for small additions of new

¹¹⁸ Draft Illinois Plan for Adoption of Nutrient Water Quality Standards, June 17, 2003.

¹¹⁹ Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 2002 Minnesota Water Quality, (2002) pp. 35-37; Mich. Admin. Rule 323.1060; Wis. Code NR 217.04(1)(a)1.

¹²⁰ Barnard, J.L.; and Scruggs, C.E., Biological Phosphorus Removal, Water Environment and Technology, (Feb. 2003) p.27

¹²¹ 40 C.F.R. 131.12.

pollution.¹²² In addition, the rules contain procedural safeguards requiring the IEPA to make sure that new permits will not harm drinking water, swimming, or aquatic life. The rules also require applicants seeking permission for any new or expanded discharges to prove that the new pollution is really necessary after considering alternatives. Further, the Illinois rules allow a fair chance for designation of exceptionally high quality waterways as “outstanding resource waters” through a citizen petition process.

While Illinois’ antidegradation rules are strong, they are not perfect. Illinois has essentially grandfathered in all pollution loadings that existed at the time the rules were established. These loadings will never be subjected to an antidegradation analysis although the federal regulations required loadings to be subjected to analysis if they occurred after 1975.¹²³ Further, while Illinois has created rules for designating Outstanding National Resource Waters that should receive no new pollution, no waters have actually been designated as such. In addition, as discussed below, IEPA in reality has hardly begun to follow the new antidegradation standards in its permitting decisions.

Still, Illinois’ antidegradation rules are plainly better than those in most other states. Many states, such as Iowa and Kentucky have essentially no workable antidegradation standards or rules. In other states, the rules are subject to huge loopholes that allow damaging or unnecessary pollution in many waters either by restricting application of the rules to a small subset of the state’s water bodies or by allowing substantial new discharges to slip under the net as “de minimis” loadings.¹²⁴

E. Mixing Zones

"Mixing zones" are areas in a water body that do not have to meet water quality standards because the regulating agency is allowing a discharger to dilute or mix their pollutants with the receiving water body in that area. For example, if a discharger's effluent contains 2 mg/L of iron and the water quality standard is 1 mg/L, the water at the "end of the pipe" will violate water quality standards. Assuming there is sufficient clean dilution water in the receiving stream and the effluent mixes with that clean water quickly, the area in the stream that violates standards may be fairly small.

It is questionable whether mixing zones should ever be allowed. By allowing mixing zones, a public resource, clean water, is used to dilute a discharger's waste. Nonetheless, allowing mixing zones is an accepted practice in Illinois and other states.

There are two basic types of mixing zones. Most mixing zones are areas in which the chronic water quality standards are not met. Chronic standards, it will be recalled, are standards designed to protect aquatic life or human beings from the effects of long-term exposure to the

¹²² By way of contrast, Michigan allows an increase of most pollutants of up to 10% of the unused loading capacity that exists at the time of the application. Mich. Admin. Code R. 323.1098(9)(c). Thus, if the water quality standard for a particular pollutant was 10 mg/L and the water is now free of that pollutant, a NPDES permit applicant could be given a permit to discharge levels of the pollutant that would cause the water to contain 1 mg/L of the pollutant without showing that the new pollution was necessary. The next applicant could then add pollution to degrade the water to the point that it contained 1.9 mg/L of the pollutant without showing any necessity for the new pollution loading.

¹²³ 40 C.F.R. 131.12.

¹²⁴ Wis. Admin. Code NR 102.05; 25 Pa. Code 93.4a *et seq.*

pollutant in question. Other mixing zones, known as "zones of initial dilution" ("ZIDs") are areas that do not meet acute standards, which are standards designed to protect aquatic life from immediate fatality resulting from contact with the pollutant. ZIDs (known by some as "zones of instant death") are supposed to be limited to an area within which effluent dispersion is immediate and rapid.¹²⁵ Assuming that any ZID allowed is strictly limited in area, the only fatalities from the ZID should be aquatic life that has the bad luck to swim immediately in front of the discharge pipe.

It is clear that there are many situations in which a discharger should not be allowed to create a part of a stream or lake that does not meet water quality standards. For example, under Illinois regulations,¹²⁶ it is acceptable to allow a mixing zone with pollutants exceeding chronic toxicity levels in areas of substantial size, twenty-six acres, even though that would be hazardous to fish if they stayed in the area all the time. The theory is that the fish will move around in the water body over the course of their lives and will not be subjected to the unhealthy situation too much. This theory does not work as to mussel beds. Mature mussels do not move. For this reason, Illinois regulations prohibit mixing zones in the area of mussel beds and similar areas.¹²⁷ With the exception of a few loopholes, Illinois mixing zone regulations do set forth protections that protect aquatic life and human water uses from potential ill effects of mixing zones.

A major problem in Illinois' standards regarding mixing zones and ZIDs relates to bio-accumulative toxins. Because bio-accumulative toxins concentrate up the food chain, the theory behind mixing zones – that clean water will dilute a pollutant to a safe level – clearly does not apply. For this reason, mixing zones and ZIDs are being eliminated in the Lake Michigan basin under the Great Lakes Water Initiative.¹²⁸ Citizen group efforts in the early 1990s to eliminate mixing zones for bio-accumulative pollutants in other Illinois waters were rejected by the IPCB.

¹²⁵ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.102(e).

¹²⁶ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.102.

¹²⁷ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.102(b)(4).

¹²⁸ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.530 incorporates this federal requirement into Illinois standards.

VI. PERMITTING: IS ILLINOIS ISSUING PERMITS THAT ALLOW DISCHARGE OF HARMFUL POLLUTION?

Federal regulations prohibit states from issuing permits for discharges that may “cause or contribute” to violations of state numeric or narrative water quality standards.¹²⁹ In other words, the NPDES permits issued by IEPA should have limits and conditions in them that prevent water quality standards from being violated. The permits should also require monitoring so that they can be enforced.¹³⁰ Further, permits should be written and considered in an open atmosphere with the public able to participate fully in the process.¹³¹

It is, however, a notorious fact that states differ as to the extent that the NPDES permits they issue actually prevent violations of water quality standards. By varying the assumptions and procedures used in writing permit limits, different states develop different limits for situations in which all the relevant environmental factors are identical. As explained in a General Accounting Office report:

The permitting authorities also differ considerably in the amount and type of data they require to determine whether pollutants have a reasonable potential to violate a state’s water quality standards and, if so, how extensively such pollutants need to be controlled. Differences in numeric discharge limits occur because both the water quality standards and the policies for implementing these standards in the permits differ among the states. For example, the states have adopted different implementation policies concerning several technical factors that affect discharge limits, including the size and location of the “mixing zones” where the discharges and the receiving waters mix, the potential for dilution, and the background concentration of the pollutants.¹³²

Illinois faces serious challenges with regard to its NPDES permit writing and the manner in which it issues permits to pollute. Many Illinois permits are not adequately protective of water quality. In large part this is due to the fact that IEPA, contrary to Illinois law,¹³³ generally does not require permit applicants to show that they are entitled to the requested permit, but instead places the burden on itself and any objecting third parties to prove that the permit as sought would allow violations of water quality standards. Particularly in view of the severe budget restraints on IEPA, the agency cannot continue trying to do a substantial portion of the applicants’ work for them.

¹²⁹ 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)

¹³⁰ 40 C.F.R. 122.44(i), 122.48

¹³¹ 33 U.S.C. §1251(e)

¹³² U.S. General Accounting Office, Differences Among the States in Issuing Permits Limiting the Discharge of Pollutants, GAO/RCED-96-42 (Jan. 1996) p. 2

¹³³ 415 ILCS 5/39(a)

A. Municipal and Industrial NPDES Permits

IEPA has been issuing NPDES permits to publicly operated treatment works (POTWs) and industrial dischargers since the 1970s. Nonetheless, there remain a number of substantial flaws in such permitting. In general, these flaws can be traced to the fact that IEPA does not have enough resources to do the necessary studies to develop proper permits. However, IEPA also has made the task harder for itself by failing to require permit applicants to do the work that the regulations require them to do to get permits. Discharging pollutants to water bodies should be treated as a privileged to be earned, not a right that the IEPA can restrict only if it proves that the discharge will cause a problem.¹³⁴

1. IEPA does not regulate nutrient discharges to prevent violations of the narrative standards regarding “offensive conditions.”

While Illinois does not have a numeric standard for phosphorous or nitrogen applicable to rivers, streams, and small lakes, it does have a narrative standard that should apply to such nutrient discharges. In particular, 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.203 provides that “the 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.” Unfortunately, IEPA ignores this standard during the permitting process as the agency does not include limits on the discharges of phosphorous or nitrogen in Illinois NPDES permits even under conditions where it is likely that discharge of nutrients will cause or contribute to algal growth, color or turbidity of other than natural origin. For example, IEPA has issued permits containing no limits on the discharge of phosphorous in cases where the receiving waters are suffering from severe algal blooms as a result of such discharges or have been identified as potentially impaired by nutrients.¹³⁵

The lack of numeric standards for these nutrients is no excuse for IEPA’s failure to limit phosphorous and nitrogen discharges. Other states in the Midwest, including Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin are acting now to limit phosphorus discharges even before finalizing numeric phosphorous water quality standards.¹³⁶ Illinois’ failure to act must be traced to its lack of political will to impose the costs of phosphorus removal on Illinois dischargers until it is forced to do so.

2. Effluent limits on discharges of BOD and nutrients must be imposed to prevent violations of dissolved oxygen standards.

In order for fish and other aquatic life to breathe, rivers, lake and streams must contain sufficient levels of dissolved oxygen. Pollutants known as biological oxygen demanding pollutants (“BOD”) or deoxygenating wastes, take oxygen out of the water as they decay and therefore reduce dissolved oxygen levels. BOD comes in two main forms: nitrogenous BOD (mainly ammonia) and carbonaceous BOD (“CBOD”). Too much of these pollutants will reduce the dissolved oxygen levels in waters and thereby threaten aquatic life. In order to avoid this threat,

¹³⁴ The law is clear that there is no “right to pollute.” See 40 CFR ¶121.41(NPDES permit creates no property right);

¹³⁵ For example, Fox River Water Reclamation District West Plant, NPDES Permit No. IL0035891 (March 30, 2001); Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. NPDES Permit No. IL0028053 (Jan. 22, 2002)

¹³⁶ Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 2002 Minnesota Water Quality, (2002) pp. 35-37; Mich. Admin. Rule 323.1060; Wis. Code NR 217.04(1)(a)1.

states set water quality standards specifying a minimum level of dissolved oxygen that should be in the water. In Illinois, the dissolved oxygen standard is generally 5 mg/L.

Illinois does a poor job of protecting dissolved oxygen levels. According to the most recent Section 305(b) report, 2,962 of the 15,993 miles of streams assessed in the state are impaired potentially because of "Organic Enrichment/ Low Dissolved Oxygen."¹³⁷ This same factor was identified as the potential cause for the impairment of 80,135 acres of lakes in Illinois.¹³⁸

The cause of this problem is three-fold. First, unlike the permits of other states studied, Illinois NPDES permits typically do not contain a requirement that there be a minimum level of dissolved oxygen in the discharged effluent. This is true even for discharges to low-flow streams where the lack of dilution water requires that discharges meet water quality standards at the end of the discharge pipe. By contrast, other states include limits in NPDES permits to ensure that dissolved oxygen criteria are met at all times. For example, in its 2002 permit to the Village of Romeo, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality required that Romeo's effluent contain at least a monthly average of 4.0 mg/L dissolved oxygen from December through April, 7.0 mg/L from May through September, and 5.0 mg/L in October and November.¹³⁹

Second, IEPA's permit writers fail to adequately consider the de-oxygenating nature of BOD pollutants. The only effective limit on nitrogenous BOD occurs as an accidental side-effect of IEPA limiting ammonia because of its direct toxicity.¹⁴⁰ Because the pH and temperature factors that determine the toxicity of ammonia do not directly relate to the de-oxygenating effect of ammonia, IEPA's approach is clearly deficient. In fact, IEPA admits that there is a sizable contribution to de-oxygenation from nitrogenous BOD, yet the agency essentially never regulates ammonia discharges to prevent violations of dissolved oxygen standards.¹⁴¹ As for carbonaceous BOD, IEPA imposes only technology-based limits that do not take into account ambient BOD levels and only relate to flow and dilution factors in a very rough manner.

Third, Illinois has not performed modeling or taken other steps to assure that authorized discharges do not cause or contribute to violations of dissolved oxygen standards.¹⁴² Other states in the region regularly sample and model dissolved oxygen to prevent issuance of permits that cause or contribute to violations of dissolved oxygen standards. For example, as explained by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality:

Typically, CBOD5 limits are placed in NPDES permits for all facilities which have the potential to contribute significant quantities of oxygen consuming substances to waters of the state. These limits are developed in direct correlation with limits for ammonia nitrogen and dissolved oxygen.

* * *

¹³⁷ Illinois Section 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 43.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* at 63.

¹³⁹ Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, NPDES Permit for Village of Romeo, Permit # MI 0021679 (draft Oct. 16, 2002). Further, while no one denies that discharge of nutrients can result in violations of dissolved oxygen standards from the resulting algal or macrophyte growth, IEPA does not establish phosphorus or nitrogen permit limits to prevent violations of the dissolved oxygen standard. This is consistent with IEPA's general "wait and see what U.S. EPA requires" approach to nutrient pollution.

¹⁴⁰ IEPA does limit the level of deoxygenating wastes discharged under 35 Ill. Admin. Code 304.120, but that regulation overlooks much of the BOD known to be contained in the pollution stream because it addresses only the CBOD portion of the BOD. Total BOD includes both carbonaceous BOD and nitrogenous BOD.

¹⁴¹ Mosher Testimony, March 6, 2002, Water Quality Triennial Review, R02-11 Tr. 34.

¹⁴² Frevert Testimony, Water Quality Triennial Review, R02-1 July 25, Tr. 75-6.

In determining CBOD5 limits, stream modelers use computer models which simulate actual stream conditions. Model inputs include the flow of the receiving stream, the quantity of water to be discharged, the decay rate for the particular type of wastewater, the stream's slope, and temperature. Other upstream or downstream dischargers are also considered in the model. The modeler determines maximum limits for CBOD5 and ammonia nitrogen and minimum limits for dissolved oxygen. These limits are selected to insure that Water Quality Standards for dissolved oxygen are met in the receiving water.¹⁴³

In order to achieve dissolved oxygen water quality standards, IEPA must similarly model dissolved oxygen issues and impose water quality based BOD effluent limits when necessary.¹⁴⁴

3. IEPA NPDES permits do not prevent violations of Illinois' standards regarding total residual chlorine.

Chlorine is both a blessing and a curse for water quality. Chlorine is frequently added to wastewater to kill pathogens that could cause illness to people who come into contact with the water downstream.¹⁴⁵ Unfortunately, chlorine is also a highly dangerous pollutant that has to be removed before the disinfected water can be discharged.

The applicable acute and chronic water quality criteria for total residual chlorine ("TRC") are 19 and 11 parts per billion ($\mu\text{g/L}$) respectively. Dilution calculations indicate, however, that IEPA permits discharges of TRC at levels that will cause these criteria to be exceeded, even after the discharge is diluted in the receiving water. Evidence is seldom, if ever, provided in the permit file to show that the seemingly excessive TRC limitations will not cause violations of water quality standards. Permit writers incorporate only a limit of 0.05mg/L (50 $\mu\text{g/L}$), which is more than 4 times the chronic criteria level. IEPA is permitting chlorine discharges at concentrations of more than four times the water quality standard even at times when the discharge would not be diluted with cleaner water.

4. IEPA does not prevent many violations of applicable temperature standards.

It is well established that high temperature and quick swings in temperatures can harm aquatic life.¹⁴⁶ Further, at least some species require periods of very cold water temperatures in the

¹⁴³ Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Parameters: Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD), <<http://www.deq.state.mi.us/documents/deq-swq-npdes-BiochemicalOxygenDemand.pdf>>.

¹⁴⁴ Illinois EPA has claimed that it is addressing this problem through use of TMDL studies. However, IEPA has only recently completed its first two TMDLs and is obviously not going to create TMDLs with regard to more than a small fraction of its permitting decisions. See Frevert Testimony, Illinois Pollution Control Board, Rulemaking No. R02-11 (July 25, 2002), Tr. 76. Furthermore, TMDLs will not prevent dissolved oxygen problems because Illinois does not create TMDLs until an impairment is found. TMDL will not prevent impairments from occurring in the first place in Illinois. In IEPA's defense, U.S. EPA has never published guidance as to how to write WQBELs to prevent violations of dissolved oxygen standards although vast numbers of permits across the country involve pollutants that affect dissolved oxygen levels.

¹⁴⁵ The treatment of wastewater with ultra-violet (UV) light will also kill pathogens. While this approach has a number of advantages, many Illinois POTWs are not equipped to use UV light and it may not work well for large plants.

¹⁴⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Temperature Criteria for Freshwater Fish: Protocol and Procedure, EPA-600/3-77-061 (May 1977).

winter for the species to reproduce properly.¹⁴⁷ Recognizing the potentially adverse effects of heat when it wrote water quality standards in the early 1970s, the IPCB established Illinois temperature standards requiring the maintenance of natural daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations and prohibiting an increase of more than five degrees Fahrenheit above natural temperatures.¹⁴⁸

Unfortunately, IEPA routinely ignores these temperature standards in permit writing. Even though IEPA has acknowledged that the effluent from sewerage treatment plants will cause violations of heat standards in low-flow streams during both winter and summer, the IEPA does not consider the temperature standards in permitting such plants.¹⁴⁹

In addition, IEPA fails to require proper temperature modeling of large utilities discharging heat into Illinois waters. For example, the heat discharged into the Des Plaines River system by Midwest Generation's plants appears to be causing violations of heat standards. Commonwealth Edison performed a heat demonstration for those plants in the late 1980s, but IEPA has not required Midwest Generation, which has since purchased the plants, to carry out updated heat demonstrations even though Midwest Generation is operating the plants much more than it was presumed Commonwealth Edison would in its heat demonstration.

5. Without a proper justification, IEPA does not follow federal guidance regarding the circumstances in which limits must be placed on the discharge of toxins that have a reasonable potential to cause a violation of water quality standards.

A major technical challenge that must be faced in writing a permit for a discharge is determining what pollutants the discharge might include in quantities large enough to potentially cause a violation of a water quality standard. It is infeasible for permits to include limits on all of the thousands of possible pollutants that a discharge could hypothetically contain. Therefore, a permit writer must try to estimate what type and quantity of pollutants might be in the discharge by taking samples of the discharge and/or analogizing to other similar discharges. This approach, however, may miss metals and other toxins in the discharge because: (1) generally only a few samples of the effluent are taken, (2) concentrations of a pollutant in the discharge may vary over time, (3) the amount of dilution in the receiving water may vary over time, and (4) the toxicity of the pollutant may vary based on factors such as the hardness of the water.

The US. EPA has addressed this problem through a federal guidance document entitled the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control.¹⁵⁰ The Technical Support Document uses basic statistical principles to establish formulas for determining what metals and other toxins may be in a discharge. The guidance document also calls on permit writers to assume that when few samples of a discharge are taken, substantial variation from the sample

¹⁴⁷ Jones, Hokunson and McCormick, Winter Temperature Requirements for Maturation and Spawning of Yellow Perch, *reprinted in* Towards a Plan of Action for Mankind, Vol. 3 Biological Balance and Thermal Modifications, Proceeding of the World Conference, Permago Press, (N.Y.N.Y 1977) p. 192.

¹⁴⁸ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.211.

¹⁴⁹ During a 2002 hearing on a permit for the Village of Huntley, the Chief of the Permit Division at IEPA acknowledged that water discharged from POTWs is far more than five degrees Fahrenheit above natural water temperatures in the winter. Further, during the summer, the constant flow from a POTW of comparatively cool water into a small stream will prevent natural daily fluctuations in water temperatures.

¹⁵⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control, EPA-505/2-90-001 (1991).

results will occur and that metals and other toxins that do not show up in the samples may still be present..

However, the IEPA refuses to follow the Technical Support Document on the ground that it is “not realistic.”¹⁵¹ In particular, IEPA contends that it knows from experience that Illinois municipalities and most other polluters rarely discharge toxins, and therefore it need not follow the guidance document’s assumptions regarding the presence of those pollutants. However, IEPA has never substantiated its claims.

It is true that when only a few samples of an effluent are available, the federal guidance calls for permit limits that would probably not be necessary if more were known about the effluent. The prudent response in such a situation, however, is to require dischargers to sample their effluent more in order to determine the real risks of a given discharge causing a violation of water quality standards. In practice, IEPA also rejects this alternative without justification.

6. Illinois permits fail to require all necessary monitoring.

Permit limits and conditions, of course, are of little importance if they are not enforced. The main approach to enforcement under the current system is required self-monitoring and reporting.¹⁵²

Many Illinois permits, however, are not clear regarding the monitoring to be done. In some cases, permits leave the development of a plan for monitoring to be created by the permit applicant after the permit is issued, even though this approach generally violates applicable federal regulations.¹⁵³ In other cases, the permits allow conduct subject to conditions for which no reporting is required by the permit. For example, mining permits allow discharges at certain levels if there has been certain levels of rainfall, but do not require the discharger to report the amount of rainfall that has fallen on the site. Many permits for municipal POTWs allow wastewater to be discharged without complete treatment if there are extraordinarily high flows, but do not carefully define what qualifies as an extraordinarily high flow.

7. Illinois does not always require analytical methods sensitive enough to detect violations of water quality standards.

Many pollutants can pose a threat to human health or the environment at levels that are detectable with only the most sophisticated chemical and analytical methods. Unfortunately, IEPA frequently fails to require the use of the most sensitive available analytical technology, thereby creating a situation whereby low, yet potentially dangerous, concentrations of pollutants may be missed. IEPA’s approach is the equivalent of a security guard who has equipment that will only find guns that are above .33 in caliber, even though guns with a .22 caliber bullet can kill.

Currently, IEPA openly refuses to require the use of available analytical methods for mercury, cadmium or cyanide that are sensitive enough to detect these pollutants at levels that are dangerous to human health or wildlife. IEPA reasons that it should not require use of an

¹⁵¹ See e.g., Village of Huntley Responsiveness Survey, East Sewerage Treatment Plant NPDES Permit Renewal (Sept. 2002).

¹⁵² See *United States v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp.*, 118 F.Supp. 2d 615, 618 (W.D. Pa. 2000).

¹⁵³ 40 C.F.R. 122.48. This has occurred recently in permits issued to Black Beauty Coal Company and MWRD.

approved U.S. EPA method until that method is commercially available.¹⁵⁴ This approach, however, virtually assures that these methods will not become commercially available. No discharger would seek to use a more sensitive analytical method than is required by IEPA, because such methods are more costly and could lead to the discovery of dangerous pollutants that would have to be controlled by the discharger. Only if use of the most sensitive testing methods is required, will a supply of laboratories using such methods develop.

8. IEPA fails to require adequate whole effluent testing.

Sometimes combinations of pollutants are more dangerous together than they are separately. For this reason, dischargers should be required to carry out tests of their “whole effluent.” Such whole effluent toxicity (WET) tests are performed by taking a sample of the effluent and exposing test organisms to it. There are two types of WET tests: (1) acute toxicity tests that count how many organisms die within a few hours of being exposed to the effluent, and (2) chronic toxicity tests that expose test organisms to the effluent for days or weeks and determine whether the organisms are healthy and grow and reproduce normally.

In Illinois, most permit applicants and permit holders are required by conditions in their permits to conduct only infrequent acute toxicity tests. Results of such tests are considered acceptable if less than half of the test organisms are killed by the effluent after it is diluted to simulate instream concentrations outside of the zone of initial dilution.¹⁵⁵ This is not protective. Although there are some other checks on the potential for lethal toxicity, IEPA's weak WET testing regime in itself allows instream conditions that are acutely toxic to as much as half of the aquatic life in the stream.

Moreover, while other states have limits in their NPDES permits that forbid both acute and chronic toxicity, IEPA never puts toxicity limits in its permits. IEPA claims that whenever it has encountered a toxic effluent, it has always been able to determine through analysis that there was a specific pollutant in the effluent that was causing the problem. This contention, while theoretically possible, seems improbable given the known synergistic effects of some combinations of pollutants.

Further, IEPA does not believe that chronic toxicity tests are reliable and therefore the agency does not require such testing or include limits on chronic toxicity in its permits. As a result, it is not known if the combination of pollutants that are discharged by specific Illinois NPDES permit holders have long term adverse effects to Illinois aquatic life. IEPA's view of chronic toxicity testing runs contrary to the opinion of the U.S. EPA and other states.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ Mosher Testimony July 25, 2002, Water Quality Triennial Review, R02-11.

¹⁵⁵ “The LC50 ... may not be less than the effluent concentration at the edge of the [ZID],” according to IEPA's Effluent Biomonitoring and Toxicity Assessment Interim Draft (April 2001). In other words the concentration of the toxin can not be higher than the concentration that killed 50% of the test organisms after allowing for mixing of the effluent with water from the receiving stream.

¹⁵⁶ At the insistence of U.S. EPA, chronic WET testing is being done by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (“MWRDGC.”) This testing, however, was the subject of a side agreement because IEPA did not want to put the requirement in the MWRDGC permits.

9. IEPA permits do not sufficiently restrict sewer treatment bypasses.

There are two main types of sewer systems: (1) combined systems in which rainwater combines with sanitary sewerage before both are treated at the sewerage treatment plant, and (2) separate systems in which rainwater is kept separate from the sewerage that is to be treated. Most sewerage systems in Illinois are combined systems.

Combined systems offer an advantage and a disadvantage. When they are large enough to handle the combined flow during most rain events, combined systems have the advantage that rainwater that comes into contact with city streets, yards full of fertilizer and pesticides, and other sources of pollutants receives treatment before it reaches a stream or lake. The disadvantage is that if sewerage treatment plants are not large enough to handle the combined flow, the treatment plant operator may be forced to allow a discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater that contains both sanitary waste and rainwater runoff pollution.

It is probably not possible to require municipalities to build sewerage treatment plants capable of handling the largest imaginable combined flow. Therefore, federal regulations allow for the emergency discharge of combined untreated or partially treated sanitary wastewater and rainwater under certain circumstances usually involving very heavy rainfalls.¹⁵⁷ These untreated discharges are known as “bypasses.” The justification for this practice is that when discharges of only partially treated sanitary wastewater and rainwater occur, there is so much water in the stream, due to the rain, that the untreated discharge will be well diluted.

IEPA, however, appears in some cases to be allowing bypass discharges that do not comply with the federal limits on emergency discharges of untreated wastewater.¹⁵⁸ Further, these discharges that IEPA labels “excess flow discharges,” are not well monitored and the circumstances in which they may occur are not clearly delineated in Illinois NPDES permits. Thus, many Illinois municipalities are often allowed to discharge sanitary wastewater that has not been properly treated during light rainfall conditions that will not adequately dilute the sewerage. While this approach allows municipalities to save money by not building sufficient treatment capacity, it is not good for Illinois water bodies.

10. Many Illinois NPDES permits do not comply with the mixing zone provisions of 302.102.

Except with regards to bio-accumulative pollutants,¹⁶⁰ Illinois’ mixing zone regulations on their face are fairly protective of Illinois waters, but these regulations are frequently ignored in permit writing. IEPA does not generally consider whether there are aquatic habitats that will be affected by mixing zones. As a result, there are areas, such as in the Mississippi River near 3M’s Cordova plant, where IEPA has allowed mixing zones that have killed off mussel beds or endangered species. Further, unlike other states, IEPA rarely conducts dye studies or other studies to determine the true area of a proposed mixing zone. Instead, IEPA often just assumes that the discharge instantly mixes with a fixed percentage of the low flow.

¹⁵⁷ 40 C.F.R. 122.41(m).

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.102(e).

¹⁶⁰ *See* Section V.E.

11. IEPA's exemption from pathogen controls is too broad.

Pathogens in water bodies can pose a health risk to swimmers and others who come in contact with the water. Therefore, dischargers are required to comply with fecal coliform criteria and disinfection requirements for waters designated for general use.¹⁶¹

Illinois, however, exempts dischargers from these requirements if the receiving waters are "unsuited to support primary contact."¹⁶² This exemption would be acceptable if people never really came into contact with waters that are unsuited to primary contact. Unfortunately, the implementation of the exemption rule¹⁶³ allows too many waters to go unprotected for human contact. Children frequently play in water bodies that IEPA believes are unsuited to support primary contact. Unprotected waters currently include waters suitable for wading but without "pronounced deep pools during the summer season," waters containing "physical obstacles," and waters with adjacent land uses that "discourage primary contact activities."¹⁶⁴ The rules and implementation procedures must be revised to ensure that children, who frequently are not discouraged by such physical obstacles, are protected.

Moreover, current Illinois regulations, 35 Ill. Adm. Code 302.209, only require fecal coliform limits during the months of May through October. There are certainly children and others playing in streams in April and other months for which protection is not required.

12. Antidegradation regulations should be implemented fully.

As explained above, the Illinois antidegradation rules adopted February 21, 2002, are generally sound. Unfortunately the rules are not being implemented fully in the permit writing process. IEPA cannot take any action to implement Tier III protections, which prohibit new pollution discharges into Outstanding Resource Waters, until the Illinois Pollution Control Board designates one or more such Waters. However, IEPA can and should be implementing Tier I protections (which assure that existing uses are not harmed by new or increased discharges) and Tier II protections (which prohibit new or increased discharges unless they are necessary to accommodate important social or economic development).

With regards to Tier I protections, it appears IEPA has done little in many cases to determine the existing uses of the waters that would receive the new discharges or the potential impact of the proposed discharges on those uses.¹⁶⁵ Instead, IEPA still seems ready and willing to permit new and increased discharges to streams with high water quality and rare species. For example, IEPA has recently noticed draft permits for large new discharges by the Village of New Lenox to Hickory Creek and by the Village of Plano to Big Rock Creek, without serious study of the potential effects on the receiving waters.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶¹ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.209(a).

¹⁶² 35 Ill. Admin. Code 302.209(b).

¹⁶³ 35 Ill. Admin. Code Pt. 378.

¹⁶⁴ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 378.203.

¹⁶⁵ Antidegradation analyses should also consider the effect of estrogenic and other hormone disrupting chemicals that may be discharged. More work must be done regarding the presence and effect of potential hormone disrupting chemicals in the Lower Des Plaines River, the Fox River and other Illinois waters heavily impacted by sewerage effluent. The results of this research should be made public.

¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, evidence that the new antidegradation rules are having a positive effect and that the Illinois NPDES process has improved to some degree is provided by the City of Joliet's decision to drop its proposal for a large new discharge (7 million gallons per day) to Aux Sable Creek. Five years ago, Joliet's planned new discharge

Similarly, with regards to Tier II protections, the permit writers at IEPA are doing little to assure that new or increased discharges are really necessary. IEPA permit writers are moving very slowly to require the broad consideration of alternatives to new discharges that the antidegradation rules require. Further, they have shown a willingness to accept frivolously superficial considerations of alternatives as satisfying the rule.¹⁶⁷

A basic problem is that alternatives to new or increased discharges generally are not considered until too late in the process. A municipality bent on growth that has a developer eager to build is likely to press IEPA to approve the usual approach of building a mechanical treatment plant and dumping the wastewater, treated to the minimum extent that IEPA will accept, into the nearest stream. Under the existing Illinois Facility Planning Area rules, municipalities are required to apply to IEPA for permission to extend sewerage service into new areas. But the program has not been effectively used to force communities to consider alternatives to developments that will harm streams. The Facility Planning Area program should be improved to build antidegradation analysis into the system. Alternative means of handling wastewater resulting from growth, including land treatment and wetland polishing, should be considered early in the planning process.

By strongly encouraging treatment and uses of wastewater that do not result in discharges, it should be possible to make substantial progress toward protecting streams and aquatic life from nutrients, flow changes, heat pollution and exotic chemicals while saving and replenishing groundwater.¹⁶⁸

B. Livestock and Animal Feeding Operation Permitting

As US. EPA officials explained in 1998:

State reports of water quality conditions indicate that agriculture is the single largest source of water pollution in rivers and lakes, and these reports suggest that animal feeding operations are a significant part of this problem. As noted above, twenty-two States reported on the impacts of specific types of agriculture, and identified animal operations -- including feedlots and animal holding areas -- as the third largest type of agricultural activity affecting water quality and impacting 20% of impaired river miles, or about 35,000 river miles, in these 22 States.

Animal feeding operations can impair water quality in a number of ways. If not collected and treated properly, animal manure can

would probably have gone through without a hitch and Aux Sable Creek, now a very high quality stream with two endangered species, would be on the way to become an effluent dominated water.

¹⁶⁷ IEPA recently has made initial decisions to issue NPDES permits for new or increased discharges without serious consideration of alternatives in draft permits requested by Alumax Extrusion, Inc., Sherwood Lake Home Owners, and the towns of Carol Stream, New Lenox, Wauconda and Plano.

¹⁶⁸ Constructed wetlands and soil aquifer treatment systems should be effective in eliminating endocrine disrupting chemicals because the long residence times and high biological activity involved provide opportunities for biotransformation, which is thought by some researchers to be the most important removal mechanism. P. McGovern, *supra* note 85, at 39.

pollute surface and/or ground water with excess nutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorus. Animal manure is commonly spread on agricultural land for its nutrient and organic value for both crops and the soil. If the manure is not spread in accordance with a nutrient management plan (which applies nutrients at the rates which crops can use them), nitrogen and phosphorus will leave farms and enter waterbodies, causing depletion of dissolved oxygen and eutrophication. In addition, grazing animals can cause streambank erosion and erosion from fields which have been overgrazed.

Studies have shown that animal feeding operations, and particularly when several of these facilities are concentrated in a single watershed, can increase nutrient pollution to a river or stream. For example, a study of Herrings Marsh Run in the coastal plain of North Carolina showed that nitrate levels in stream and ground water were highest in areas with the greatest concentration of swine and poultry production. (Hunt, P.G., et. al. 1995. Impact of animal waste on water quality in an eastern coastal plain watershed. *Animal Waste and the Land-Water Interface*, Kenneth Steele, Ed., Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL, 589 pp.)

Illinois EPA studies and field investigations have confirmed that runoff from confined animal feeding operations can adversely impact surface water resources in Illinois. Observed effects include increases in ammonia-nitrogen concentrations resulting from animal wastes and fish kills as a result of manure application on frozen ground. (Ackerman and Taylor, 1995, *Stream Impacts due to Feedlot Runoff. Animal Waste and the Land-Water Interface*, Kenneth Steele, Ed., Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL, 589 pp.)¹⁶⁹

Large animal feeding operations that fall at or above size categories set forth in federal regulations are defined to be "Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations" ("CAFOs").¹⁷⁰ CAFOs are generally treated as point sources, and therefore are required under the Clean Water Act to have NPDES permits.

Earlier this year, Illinois issued a draft general permit for CAFO discharges. IEPA held hearings and received public comments, but has not yet issued the final permit. The IEPA draft is generally consistent with the federal CAFO guidelines¹⁷¹; but unfortunately, those guidelines are not particularly stringent.¹⁷² Neither the federal guidelines nor the general permit as drafted

¹⁶⁹ Statement of Michael Cook, Director, Office of Wastewater Management, and Elaine Stanley, Director, Office of Compliance U.S. EPA, before the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry and the Subcommittee On Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives (May 13, 1998).

¹⁷⁰ Basically, an operation with over 1000 cattle or 2500 hogs is a CAFO but some operations with less animals are also CAFOs. Different numbers apply to other types of livestock.

¹⁷¹ 68 Fed. Reg. 7176 (Feb. 12, 2003).

¹⁷² The Sierra Club, NRDC, Waterkeepers and other groups have brought suit in an attempt to improve the federal guidelines.

provide control over offsite manure disposal, a large loophole allowing CAFO operations to simply ship their waste off to be disposed of without compliance with a nutrient management plan. Additionally, the draft permit violates a recent ruling by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals requiring notice of general permit authorizations and availability of compliance documents to the public. With respect to spray fields, while the permit provides narrative criteria regarding appropriate times and methods for manure application (e.g., not on saturated or snow-covered fields), it does not outright prohibit discharges from spray fields into surface water.

In order to amend these flaws, and genuinely protect Illinois water quality, the general permit would need to be more stringent than the weak federal guidelines. It should provide not only for control over offsite discharges and the requisite public notices, but for zero discharge from the entire facility, including spray fields; and should require proper monitoring of surface water likely to receive any discharge

C. Discharging Residential System Permitting

There are two kinds of private septic systems operating in Illinois: subsurface systems, which discharge below ground, and surface-discharging systems, which discharge directly to surface water. IDPH has the authority to regulate these systems, but such regulation is minimal. In particular, the regulations exempt from any permitting requirements – NPDES or otherwise – septic systems discharging less than 1,500 gallons per day, which includes most single-family septic tanks. A few counties (e.g., Lake and McHenry) regulate septic systems more stringently, but most do not.

This minimal regulation of septic systems fails to meet Illinois' responsibilities under the Clean Water Act, and puts Illinois essentially dead last among the fifty states in terms of its regulation of these highly polluting systems. The Clean Water Act, as noted above, prohibits any discharge from a "point source" without a NPDES permit, and surface-discharging septic systems are plainly point sources. Most states ban these systems entirely, require that such systems have a NPDES permit or comply with a general permit, or at least restrict surface discharges through some other substantial form of regulation.

Because lax regulations make these surface-discharging septic systems an attractive option for builders and owners, they are rapidly proliferating. There are currently over 120,000 surface discharging septic systems in Illinois, and the number is growing by approximately 6,000 per year.¹⁷⁶ These systems appear to be failing at a substantial rate. Although statistics are hard to come by given that Illinois does not monitor these systems, a recent study in one county that does monitor them concluded that fully 67% of the septic systems in the county were out of compliance for at least one discharge parameter in their County Health Department permit, and 30% were either grossly out of compliance with respect to fecal coliform or out of compliance for two or more parameters.¹⁷⁷ 45% of the systems failed to meet the fecal coliform standard of

¹⁷³ 68 Fed. Reg. 7176 (Feb. 12, 2003).

¹⁷⁴ The Sierra Club, NRDC, Waterkeepers and other groups have brought suit in an attempt to improve the federal guidelines.

¹⁷⁵ This problem is somewhat alleviated by the facts that IEPA personnel do now inspect CAFOs, a reportedly dangerous task for which they deserve public gratitude.

¹⁷⁶ Illinois Department of Public Health, 2001 Private Sewage Statistics (May 10, 2002), p.3.

¹⁷⁷ Mand, K. and Vollmer, M., Management of Individual Mechanical Sewage-Treatment Systems: How Much Is Needed?, Journal of Environmental Health (May 2001), pp. 22-25.

400/100mL, 48% failed to meet the TSS standard of 20 mg/L, and 13% failed to meet the BOD standard of 20 mg/L.¹⁷⁸

Illinois' failure to regulate surface-discharging septic systems is having a significant impact on Illinois water quality. EPA data indicates that failing septic systems can discharge fecal coliform at concentrations exceeding 100,000 times the concentration discharged from a centralized system. The nature of the contamination in impaired waterbodies in Illinois indicates that failing surface-discharging septic systems are a significant cause of such impairments. The problems created by these systems are compounded by the fact that they are most prevalent in some of the least hydrologically appropriate terrain in the state – the southwest karst region in Monroe, Randolph, and St. Clair counties. More than 70% of the new septic systems installed in 2001 in those counties were surface discharging systems.¹⁷⁹ A 1998 evaluation published in the *Journal of Environmental Health* concluded that, although the systems were mostly installed in compliance with local regulations, they were not providing adequate treatment, and that filtration of the sewage before it enters the groundwater through karst sinkholes is insufficient.¹⁸⁰

Environmental organizations in Illinois (including ELPC) called these regulatory deficiencies to the attention of Region 5 last year, and early indications are promising that U.S. EPA is working together with IEPA and IDPH to develop a NPDES permitting program for surface-discharging septic systems. IEPA and IDPH collaborated to draft legislation requiring a general NPDES permit for surface-discharging septic systems, which was introduced in the spring. The proposed legislation would prohibit installation of these systems absent proof that there is no technically feasible alternative, and would provide effluent limits and monitoring requirements for currently existing systems. Unfortunately, heavy opposition from the septic industry and realtor lobbyists stalled the bill during the spring session. The agencies plan to work with legislators to hold public information hearings concerning the issue and the proposed legislation this fall, and have the bill re-introduced in the spring session.

D. Mining Operations Permitting

Illinois law currently makes certain water quality standards inapplicable to NPDES permits for mining operations.¹⁸¹ In particular, permits for mining operations may allow violations of various numeric water quality standards so long as the operation meets certain effluent limits. Although Illinois permitting on this point is now in a state of confusion, mines in the recent past have been given NPDES permits allowing them to discharge seven times the concentration of sulfate and two times the amount of chloride that would be allowed for a non-mining discharger.¹⁸²

On this point, Illinois law is plainly inconsistent with the Clean Water Act. There is nothing in the Clean Water Act that allows mining companies to be held to less stringent water quality standards and there is nothing unique about mining operations that make their pollutants less harmful than the same pollutants from other sources. In addition, while Illinois antidegradation

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* at 23.

¹⁷⁹ Illinois Department of Public Health, *Private Sewage Disposal Systems Installed During Calendar Year 2001* (2002).

¹⁸⁰ Bade, J. and Moss, P., *Protecting a Karst Plain in Southwest Illinois – Investigations, Regulations, and Public Education*, *Journal of Environmental Health* (April 1998), p. 23.

¹⁸¹ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 406.202, 406.203.

¹⁸² Until *Prairie Rivers Network* challenged this interpretation as to the permit for Black Beauty Coal Company, IEPA interpreted 35 Ill. Admin. Code 406.203 as authorizing these higher discharge limits for mining activities.

rules are generally sound, they can be read to exempt mining from antidegradation requirements as to total dissolved solids, chloride, iron and manganese. This is true because the antidegradation rules are located in a section of the regulations¹⁸³ that is not applicable to mining.¹⁸⁴ If IEPA and IPCB do not promptly correct these problems, federal promulgation of standards under Clean Water Act Section 303(c) will be necessary.

E. Public Participation Procedures in the NPDES Permitting Process

Effective public participation in the permitting process can occur only if the public is given a chance to review and comment upon all major elements of a permit. Unfortunately, Illinois' public participation procedures for NPDES permitting are seriously deficient. IEPA has interpreted those procedures,¹⁸⁵ to allow public review of only draft permits even when the final permit includes substantive new elements on which the public did not have a chance to comment. This problem is compounded by the fact, as mentioned earlier, that current Illinois permitting procedures allow essential permitting terms, such as monitoring, to be developed in private by IEPA and the permittee after the permit is issued and public comment is no longer practical.¹⁸⁶ Finally, IEPA frequently proposes permits with little investigation of their potential effect, placing the burden of proving the harmful effects of a permit on citizens and citizen groups.

In January 2003, a number of environmental groups submitted a proposal to correct flaws in permitting procedures to the IPCB. If the IPCB does not act to correct flaws in the Illinois rules relating to public participation in the permitting process, it will become necessary to petition U.S. EPA to exercise its oversight responsibilities and assure that Illinois meets the public participation goals of the Clean Water Act.

¹⁸³ 35 Ill. Admin. Code Pt. 302.

¹⁸⁴ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 406.202, 406.203.

¹⁸⁵ 35 Ill. Admin. Code Pt. 309.

¹⁸⁶ See Prairie Rivers Network v. Illinois Pollution Control Board, 335 Ill. App. 3d 391 (Ill. App. Ct. 2002).

VII. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES: IS ILLINOIS ENFORCING NPDES PERMIT LIMITS AND CONDITIONS?

Permit conditions mean little unless they are enforced. The principle way that NPDES permits are enforced in Illinois is by IEPA referring cases to the Illinois Attorney General, who then brings actions for penalties before the Pollution Control Board. IEPA generally discovers violations by reviewing the discharge monitoring reports that permit holders file every month in compliance with their permits. As well as being reported to IEPA, records of these self-reported violations are compiled by U.S. EPA.¹⁸⁷

A. Inspections

Obviously, there is some incentive for dischargers to fail to report violations in their discharge monitoring report and it would not be adequate for IEPA to rely exclusively on self-reporting to enforce permit conditions. Therefore, IEPA must bolster the enforcement process with inspections. In fiscal year 2002, IEPA conducted approximately 312 inspections of major facilities and 861 of minor facilities, 9,441 reconnaissance/sampling inspections, thirty-seven inspections supporting the grant/loan program, 431 inspections in the agricultural program, and 247 stormwater inspections.¹⁸⁸

Plainly only a small fraction of the thousands of NPDES permit holders have their operations inspected in a given year. It is unknown whether the level of inspection done begins to keep the permittees honest. There does not seem to be any good way to even guess at how many permit violations occur either because the permit holder failed to report them or because the monitoring conditions in the permit were too loose or vague to require the violation to be reported.

B. Enforcement Actions

In response to a recent Freedom of Information Act request by the Sierra Club, IEPA stated that the number of civil and criminal referrals made to the Attorney General for both the Bureau of Water Pollution Control and for all IEPA divisions, including Air, Land, Chemical Safety, and Public Water Supplies, were as follows:

	Bureau of Water Pollution Control	Total
2001	49	201
2000	50	230
1999	53	317
1998	65	324
1997	33	393

¹⁸⁷ U.S. General Accounting Office, Water Pollution: Many Violations Have Not Received Appropriate Enforcement Action, GAO/RCED-96-23 (March 1996).

¹⁸⁸ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Annual Performance Report For FY02 Performance Partnership Grant, filed with U.S. EPA December 27, 2002.

The number of enforcement orders obtained for those years were:

2001	34	180
2000	41	297
1999	38	160
1998	37	466
1997	24	162

The significance of these figures is difficult to gauge. While it is not known how many violations each referral or order covers, it is clear that many violations do not result in any referral to the Attorney General for prosecution. IEPA's quarterly non-compliance report, a public list compiled from discharge monitoring reports filed by permittees, shows that the number of permittees reporting violations far exceeds the number of cases referred for any sort of penalty.

An obstacle here is the cumbersome procedure that IEPA must follow before referring a case to the Attorney General for prosecution. Under Section 31 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act,¹⁸⁹ IEPA must generally confer at length with the permit violator before referring a case for prosecution. Generally, a violation results only in an agreement between IEPA and the violator that the violator will come into compliance in the future.

C. Fines and Supplementary Environmental Penalties

In response to the Sierra Club FOIA, IEPA also provided information on fines and payments made for environmental restoration in lieu of fines ("Supplemental Environmental Projects"). Unfortunately only total data for all prosecutions is available without any breakdown for water:

	<u>Penalties</u>	<u>Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs)</u>
2001	\$5.5 million	\$4.2 million
2000	\$2.6 million	\$ 759,000
1999	\$2.6 million	\$1.9 million
1998	\$10.7 million	\$656,000
1997	\$4.4 million	\$6.9 million

In its annual performance report, IEPA reported that in fiscal year 2001 it entered into settlement agreements in enforcement actions that included SEPs and pollution prevention measures valued at over \$250,000.¹⁹⁰

The efficacy of enforcement against violators in Illinois has been severely limited by the inconsequential penalties routinely assessed against them. Illinois courts have held that penalties were specifically not allowed to be "punitive."¹⁹¹ Yet according to the United States Supreme Court, the very purpose of penalties under the Clean Water Act is to be punitive – i.e., to hit violators hard enough in the pocketbook that neither they nor similarly situated dischargers will be tempted to treat penalties as merely a cost of doing business.¹⁹² Moreover, federal law

¹⁸⁹ 415 ILCS 5/31.

¹⁹⁰ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Annual Performance Report For FY01 Performance Partnership Grant, filed with U.S. EPA December 28, 2001, p. 39.

¹⁹¹ *City of Monmouth v. Pollution Control Board*, 57 Ill.2d 482.

¹⁹² *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.*, 120 S.Ct. 693 (2000).

establishes that economic benefit is a penalty floor, and that a deterrent penalty should generally include both economic benefit *and* a gravity component above and beyond it because “unless the [defendant] is fined an amount at least as great as the economic gain in not complying with the regulations, the statute serves little deterrent value.”¹⁹³ In Illinois, however, the Board has not consistently imposed economic benefit as a base penalty; and, indeed, often uses purportedly minimal economic benefit from a permit violation as a factor for mitigating the penalty. The wide gap between federal and state penalties for NPDES violations could be eliminated if the enforcement authorities pursued NPDES violators in federal court rather than the Board or state court.

Under the CWA, a citizens’ suit generally cannot be filed if U.S. EPA or a state enforcement agency has filed suit.¹⁹⁴ It was the routine practice of the Attorney General’s office under the last Attorney General to file an enforcement action in the IPCB on the 59th day after the filing of a citizen suit 60-day notice letter to prevent the citizen group from enforcing the law. The only apparent purpose of this practice was to protect the violator. If there is a private party ready and willing to seek enforcement through a federal action that may result in substantial penalties, it is unclear what reason there would be for the state using its limited resources through an action brought in the Pollution Control Board.

Recent developments may have improved the situation for enforcement in the future. Lisa Madigan, elected Attorney General in November 2002, has indicated that enforcement of environmental laws will be more aggressive than it has been in the past. Further, with Attorney Madigan’s active sponsorship, SB 1379 was enacted by the legislature last Spring and signed by the Governor in July. Under SB 1379 a strong presumption is created that penalties levied by the IPCB shall be at least equal to the economic benefits realized by the violator through its violation. If this law is properly enforced in the future, it should not be as profitable to violate Illinois environmental laws as it has often been in the past.

¹⁹³ United States v. Roll Coater, Inc., 21 Env’tl.L.Rep. 21073, 21073, 1991 WL 16571 (S.D.Ind. 1991).

¹⁹⁴ 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b).

VIII. WET WEATHER ISSUES: IS ILLINOIS APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSING RAINFALL-RELATED POLLUTION?

A. Stormwater Runoff Management

As a result of litigation and Congressional action, flows of polluted water that result from rain in urban areas coming into contact with industrial, construction and developed sites came to be treated as a point source pollution with permitting instituted in two phases.¹⁹⁵ However, most stormwater runoff is not regulated through individual NPDES permits but through general permits. These general permits do not contain specific pollution limits but instead require the party acting under the permit to follow certain best management practices (e.g. leaving a filter strip between a parking lot and a stream) that it is thought will reduce stormwater pollution.

Under the 1987 amendments to the CWA and U.S. EPA regulations, NPDES regulation of stormwater was developed in two phases. Phase I was promulgated by U.S. EPA in 1990 and applies to medium and large municipal separate stormwater systems generally serving populations over 100,000, construction activity disturbing 5 acres or more, and ten categories of industrial activity.¹⁹⁶

Phase I only applied to one municipality in Illinois (Rockford) because other large towns in Illinois have combined sewer systems. As to industrial activities covered by Phase I, IEPA developed general permits that required persons wanting to operate under the general permit to develop a stormwater pollution prevention plan, submit notice of intent to the IEPA that the industrial facility would be operating under the plan and submit an annual facility inspection report. There is an analogous general permit for covered construction activity.¹⁹⁷

Phase I is not being implemented and enforced properly by IEPA. The general permit does not even require that copies of the finished stormwater pollution prevention plans be sent to IEPA. It is, thus, likely that many industrial facilities have not bothered to prepare a plan. There is little staff to inspect whether the plan has been created, let alone implemented on the ground with best management practices.

Plainly, much more is needed to assure that stormwater pollution prevention plans are actually created and followed by regulated businesses and municipalities. At a minimum, IEPA should require that all plans be filed with the Agency so that it ensures that those required to prepare stormwater pollution prevention plans have actually done so. Staff for inspections, unlikely to be hired in the current budget climate, are needed.

Further, more needs to be done to respond to citizen complaints regarding stormwater pollution. There are too many instances in which IEPA has done little in response to citizens asking IEPA to look at construction sites that are obviously polluting. More generally, more information should be given to the public as to how to report construction sites with stormwater problems.

¹⁹⁵ Adler, *supra* note 2, at 153.

¹⁹⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Storm Water Phase II Final Rule: An Overview, EPA 833-F-00-001 (Jan. 2000).

¹⁹⁷ IEPA website, www.epa.state.il.us/water/permits/storm-water/index.html.

The situation for implementing Phase II appears to be even more grim. Beginning March 10, 2003, construction sites that disturb one acre or more and all municipalities with separate storm systems in urban areas as defined by the Census Bureau are to develop plans for controlling storm water. We have been told that IEPA does not have the staff or other tools necessary to implement Phase II. Except in a few counties in northeast Illinois with strong stormwater programs that have undertaken to advise municipalities in their county, municipalities do not have the resources to create and implement stormwater pollution control plans.

B. Combined Sewer Overflow Management

Combined sewer overflows ("CSOs") take place when combined systems receive more rainwater than they can handle.

In 1994, USEPA issued a policy governing CSOs, intended as a guideline to ensure that state NPDES permits issued for CSOs were consistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act.¹⁹⁸ The policy requires a two-phase program to control CSOs: implementation of the "nine minimum controls" ("NMC") which are preliminary measures to limit the most damaging impacts of CSOs such as discharge of solids and floatables; and a "long term control plan" ("LTCP") to permanently mitigate the impact of the CSOs. The LTCP is presumed adequate to meet water quality standards if it meets any of three criteria: (i) no more than four to six overflows per year, (ii) capture for treatment of 85% of combined sewage, or (iii) elimination of an equivalent mass of pollutants. If none of these criteria are met, the permittee must be required to demonstrate that its effluent does not violate water quality standards. Additionally, in formulating the LTCP, permittees are required under the 1994 policy to take several specific steps, including evaluation of alternative levels of pollutant capture, public participation, and extensive monitoring.

Illinois, unlike most states, had a program in place for treatment of CSO flows well before the 1994 policy came into effect. This program, while effective to some extent, does not meet the array of requirements contained in the 1994 CSO policy.

IEPA's treatment standards,¹⁹⁹ established in 1985, presume that CSO communities are meeting water quality standards as long as they are meeting three conditions:

- (i) all dry weather flows and the first flush of storm flows, as determined by IEPA, must meet applicable effluent standards;
- (ii) additional flows, up to ten times the average dry weather flow for the design year, shall receive a minimum of one hour retention for primary treatment and fifteen minutes retention for secondary disinfection; and
- (iii) flows in excess of ten times dry weather flow shall be treated to the extent necessary to prevent depression of oxygen levels and accumulations of sludge deposits, floating debris, and solids.

These standards, while minimally protective, are not based on the 1994 policy presumptive standard of four to six overflows or 85% capture for treatment. Moreover, in adopting them in 1985, Illinois did not follow the evaluative process required by the 1994 policy, which includes

¹⁹⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy, 59 Fed. Reg. 18,688 (April 19, 1994).

¹⁹⁹ 35 Ill. Admin. Code 306.305.

extensive alternatives analysis and public participation. Additionally, only 57% of Illinois communities require the NMC. The other 43% have implemented the more limited six minimum measures identified in U.S. EPA's 1989 CSO Strategy.

U.S. EPA Region 5 has nonetheless determined that, rather than insisting upon consistency with the letter of the 1994 policy, it will evaluate Illinois' program to determine its overall efficacy. This discussion process with IEPA concerning this evaluation has been in progress since the 1994 policy was promulgated; yet still appears to be in a preliminary phase. No standards for the evaluation have yet been decided upon. Thus far, Region 5 has informally determined that, rather than requiring sweeping changes to the Illinois CSO program, it will look at CSO municipalities individually, and attempt to classify each of them as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The Region considered and rejected the idea of basing the classification on ability to meet the Illinois WQS for fecal coliform (generally the most hazardous pollutant from CSOs), since Illinois allows widespread exemptions from that standard. The Region also appears to have determined that it is unwilling to use the four-to-six overflows/85% capture rate from the 1994 CSO policy as a benchmark, because its experience has demonstrated that the two standards are not necessarily equivalent in protectiveness and the 1994 policy is therefore flawed. Sources suggest that the standard for evaluation will require, in the end, only substantial compliance with the Illinois treatment standards as they are currently written; and only those municipalities deemed to have "utterly failed" to meet the Illinois treatment standards will be classified as unsatisfactory and required to implement improvements.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies in Illinois' CSO program, the programs of some other Region 5 states appear to be even less effective. Ohio and Indiana both have a tremendous backlog of LTCPs submitted for approval that have not yet been reviewed. In Indiana, fifty-six of the eighty-seven CSO communities that are required to submit LTCPs did so just within the past year, meaning there is still a lengthy (it is safe to assume multi-year) process of negotiation before they are approved. In Ohio, only slightly more than half (thirty-four out of sixty-two) required LTCPs have even been submitted, with the remainder indefinitely delayed for various reasons. Additionally, reports from Indiana citizen groups suggest that overflows in that state are substantially underreported.²⁰⁰

Michigan, by contrast, has what Region 5 officials describe as a model program. Nearly all of the fifty-two Michigan CSO communities have implemented both the NMCs and a LTCP. Informal estimates suggest that Michigan has higher per capita expenditure on its CSO program than any other state in the nation. CSO discharges in Michigan are essentially always treated at least with settling and disinfection. Michigan's program requires (i) retention and treatment of the one-year, one-hour design storm; (ii) primary treatment of the ten-year, one-hour design storm (primary treatment defined as thirty-minute detention time); and (iii) limited treatment of flows above the ten-year, one-hour design storm.

²⁰⁰ Wisconsin and Minnesota have a relatively small number of CSO communities, and have more or less effectively addressed the few that they have. Minnesota has separated its systems, with one city still completing the separation, and in Wisconsin, the large Milwaukee system put in a storage tunnel, similar to one in place in Chicago, that reduced the number of annual overflows from sixty or seventy to two.

VIII. IS ILLINOIS DOING ENOUGH TO PREVENT NON-POINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION?

A. Non-Point Source Pollution and Its Effects

A final source of water pollution not addressed by the above-described regulatory programs is non-point source pollution. As its name implies, non-point source pollution does not emerge from a single identifiable source, but rather is caused when rain, snowmelt or irrigation water sweeps pollution from land surfaces into waterways. In essence, non-point source pollution is runoff from farm fields, livestock facilities, paved surfaces, lawns, surface coal mines, and forestry activities, except to the extent that such runoff has been specifically defined to be a point source (for example, Congress has defined CAFOs and urban stormwater from certain activities to be point sources). The primary sources of non-point source pollution in Illinois are: (1) runoff from agriculture and urban areas, (2) modification to streams and streambanks and (3) mining activities.²⁰¹

Non-point source pollution affects water quality in a number of ways. The nutrients from fertilizers and animal waste cause excessive algae growth. When such algae dies, the decaying process reduces oxygen levels in the water, making it harder for fish and other aquatic life to survive.²⁰² Sediments from soil erosion caused by agricultural and construction activity blocks sunlight necessary for plant growth, damages fish gills, and interferes with spawning habitat.²⁰³ Finally, the pesticides, toxic chemicals and bacteria that run off of farm fields, paved surfaces and lawns are hazardous to both humans and aquatic life.²⁰⁴ In Illinois, nutrients and sediments are the most common non-point source pollutants.²⁰⁵

Non-point source pollution is a major contributor to water pollution problems in Illinois. As of 2000, 33.6% of the streams and 92.7% of the inland lakes in Illinois that the IEPA assessed suffered from use impairments that were wholly or partially caused by non-point source pollution.²⁰⁶ These percentages amount to a total of 5,123 miles of streams and 139,644 acres of lakes that, due at least in part to non-point source pollution, are not clean enough to support one or more designated use.²⁰⁷ Given that these totals are based on an assessment of only 18.3% of the miles of streams and 60.6% of the acres of lakes in Illinois,²⁰⁸ the actual amount of Illinois waters impaired by non-point source pollution is much higher. On the national level, the U.S. EPA has identified non-point source pollution as the leading cause of water impairments.²⁰⁹

²⁰¹ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, State of Illinois Section 319 Biannual Report (Sept. 2002), p. 9.

²⁰² U.S. EPA, National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution From Agriculture (2001), p. 2-10.

²⁰³ *Ibid.* at 2-15.

²⁰⁴ U.S. General Accounting Office, Federal Role in Addressing – and Contributing to – Nonpoint Source Pollution (Feb. 1999), pp.19-20.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁶ Illinois 305(b) Report, *supra* note 52, at 81.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Water Quality Inventory – 2000 Report (Aug. 2002).

B. Methods For Controlling Non-Point Source Pollution

The main tool for controlling non-point source pollution is the implementation of Best Management Practices (“BMPs”). BMPs are actions that have been identified as being successful in reducing pollutant loads from various non-point sources by either reducing the amount of potential non-point source pollutants that are created or by preventing such pollutants from reaching waterways.²¹⁰ For example, in the agricultural context, BMPs include conservation tillage that limits erosion from farm fields, riparian buffers that prevent nutrients and sediment from reaching waterways, and programs to reduce the use of pesticides and fertilizers.²¹¹

Rather than mandating the implementation of BMPs or imposing limits on non-point source pollution that would effectively require the use of BMPs, the Clean Water Act seeks to encourage the implementation of BMPs through the non-regulatory Section 319 grant program.²¹² Section 319 provides federal-matching funds to be used by the state to fund projects designed to reduce non-point source pollution. In order to obtain these funds, a state must provide 40% of the total funding for the 319 program, submit to the U.S. EPA an assessment of non-point source pollution in the state, and develop a management program for controlling pollution from non-point sources. The state’s management plan must identify and provide a plan for implementing BMPs for each category of non-point source pollution identified in the state’s assessment. The U.S. EPA then allocates Section 319 money to each state on the basis of a formula that considers factors such as the state’s population, acres of cropland and pasture, and number of critical aquatic habitats and wellhead protection areas.²¹³ In fiscal year 2003, Illinois is expected to receive \$9,579,800 in Section 319 funds.

Section 319 funds are then used by the state to provide financial and technical assistance to BMP projects that local governments, soil and water conservation districts, and other entities voluntarily propose to undertake.²¹⁴ In recent years, the U.S. EPA has encouraged states to better target their funding of BMPs through the use of watershed plans and TMDLs. Under the watershed approach, the state is to identify watersheds that do not meet clean water goals and develop strategies for addressing the various pollution sources in each watershed.²¹⁵ TMDLs, which are required by Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, require states to set maximum pollution levels for each pollutant in an impaired watershed and develop plans for reducing those levels through point source and non-point source controls.²¹⁶ The state may spend up to

²¹⁰ U.S. EPA, National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution From Agriculture (2001), p.2-28.

²¹¹ *Ibid.* at 3-30.

²¹² 33 U.S.C. § 1329. Other federal programs help to address non-point source pollution indirectly. For example, the Conservation Reserve Program and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program provides financial incentives to encourage farmers to remove lands from agricultural production for periods of ten to fifteen years, thereby reducing agricultural runoff. The Wetlands Reserve Program provides assistance for restoring and protecting wetlands on private property. Illinois participates in these programs. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, State of Illinois Section 319 Biannual Report (Sept. 2002), pp. 17-19.

²¹³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Section 319 Success Stories: Volume II (1997), p. 2.

²¹⁴ The states also use Section 319 funds to administer the Section 319 program and to fund programs designed to educate the public about non-point source pollution.

²¹⁵ U.S. EPA, Process and Criteria For Funding State and Territorial Nonpoint Source Management Programs in FY 1999 (Aug. 1998).

²¹⁶ See Section II.A.4 above.

20% of its funds to develop and implement TMDLs, develop watershed plans, and conduct monitoring and program assessment activities.²¹⁷

C. Illinois' Section 319 Program

IEPA administers the Section 319 program as the state's primary response to non-point source pollution. IEPA has developed a list of approximately 150 BMPs, which local entities can apply for financial assistance to implement.²¹⁸ BMP project applications are evaluated on the basis of factors such as the potential for water quality improvement from the BMP, the level of detail included in the application, and the applicant's prior success in carrying out BMP projects. Projects that are submitted as part of a watershed management plan or a TMDL implementation plan are given top priority. For each BMP project, the local project applicant pays 40% of the costs, with the other 60% coming from the state's 319 funds. After the project is done, a project report is completed to assess the project and estimate the amount of pollutant load reduction the project led to.

Between fiscal years 1990 and 2002, Illinois has received a total of approximately \$59.7 million in Section 319 funds from the federal government.²¹⁹ With the 40% state-funding match, this means that the state has spent a total of nearly \$100 million on its Section 319 program.²²⁰ This funding led to the completion of a total of 139 projects between 1990 and 1997. Of those, eighty-one involved the implementation of BMPs, 39 focused on providing education and technical assistance, and nineteen involved monitoring activities.²²¹

D. Evaluation of Illinois' Non-Point Source Control Efforts and Areas For Improvement

Meaningful evaluation of the effectiveness of a state's non-point source pollution control efforts is hindered by a number of factors. For example, because most states (including Illinois) assess only a fraction of their waters in any given year, it is not possible to get a full picture of water quality impairments and trends.²²² In addition, while a state can generally assess how much pollutant load a particular BMP reduced, it is more difficult to make a definitive link between implementation of BMPs and improvement of water quality in a particular watershed.²²³ Also, the individualized nature of each BMP project makes establishing a baseline for evaluating the effectiveness of the projects quite difficult.

The key goal for any non-point source program, of course, is a reduction in the amount of waters impaired by non-point source pollution. On this ground, Illinois's results are mixed. The percentage of Illinois streams reported to be impaired by non-point source pollution has fallen

²¹⁷ U.S. EPA, Supplemental Guidelines For the Award of Section 319 Nonpoint Source Grants to States and Territories in FY2003 (2002).

²¹⁸ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Illinois' Nonpoint Source Management Program (July 2001), pp. 8-9.

²¹⁹ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, State of Illinois Section 319 Biannual Report (Sept. 2002), pp. 13-15.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*

²²¹ *Ibid.* at 22.

²²² U.S. General Accounting Office, Inconsistent State Approaches Complicate Nation's Efforts to Identify Its Most Polluted Waters (Jan. 2002), p. 11.

²²³ Thomas Davenport, *et al.*, National Nonpoint Source Monitoring Program: Document Water Quality Improvements From Best Management Practices Through Long-Term Monitoring Projects (2001).

from 55% in 1992 to 33.6% in 2000. On the other hand, non-point source impairment of lakes has increased from 90.8% in 1992 to 92.7% in 2000. Once again, however, it is difficult to read much into these trends given the limited amount of waters that are assessed each year.

Despite the difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of non-point source pollution control programs, we have identified a number of steps that could be taken to improve Illinois' efforts. First, the state's Section 319 program could be improved by an acceleration of TMDL development, better project selection, and increased project follow-up. Second, funding for non-point source control activities could be increased through actions by both the IEPA and the General Assembly. Finally, following the lead of other states, Illinois could enact regulatory mechanisms for controlling non-point source pollution.

1. IEPA should take steps to improve its Section 319 program.

The most obvious way to make Illinois' non-point source pollution control efforts more effective is to improve the Section 319 program. Such improvement could be made in three primary areas.

First, IEPA needs to increase its efforts at identifying critical non-point source pollution problems and targeting its Section 319 efforts in those areas. As noted above, such targeting would result from the development of TMDLs for watersheds throughout the state. Illinois, however, does not plan to complete the 441 TMDLs needed for the state until 2017. In addition, the Illinois EPA is off to a slow start on meeting even this deadline, as the state has initiated only twenty-one TMDLs, and completed only two TMDLs, since 1999.²²⁴ By comparison, over same time period Ohio has completed eighty-four TMDLs, Oregon has completed 302 TMDLs, and New Mexico has completed eighty-three TMDLs.²²⁵

Second, IEPA could improve its project selection by considering the results of prior BMP projects in deciding on BMP applications. The identification of BMPs relies heavily on learning from past results to determine what steps will be most successful in which situations. Clearly, the results of projects that have already been carried out could provide important information on predicting the value of other BMPs. IEPA, however, has no process for formally considering those results in selecting projects.

Third, the IEPA should engage in increased follow-up to ensure that BMP projects are providing benefits after the project grant has ended. Currently, IEPA's official involvement with a BMP project ends after the project is completed and an assessment is carried out. Many of these projects, however, are ongoing and can have lasting benefit if properly maintained. To help ensure continued effectiveness, IEPA should establish a procedure for regularly monitoring BMP projects after they are completed.

2. The State and IEPA should increase funding for non-point source control activities

The fact that many Illinois waters remain impaired due to non-point source pollution also suggests that the state should increase funding for non-point source pollution control efforts.

²²⁴ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, State of Illinois Section 319 Biannual Report (Sept. 2002), p. 17.

²²⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, TMDL Reports, available at <<http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/>> (visited March 10, 2003).

Increased funding would not only enable more BMPs to be carried out, but could also help IEPA make the improvements to the Section 319 program identified above.

One option for increasing funding would be for the General Assembly to dedicate more funds to the Section 319 program or to create new sources of funds for non-point source control programs. In the absence of increased funding, which is admittedly unlikely in today's tough budgetary times, the IEPA could also obtain more money for non-point source programs from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund ("CWSRF").²²⁶ The CWSRF is a federal program which creates state revolving loan funds (matched by a 20% state grant) that provide low-interest loans to local governments for a variety of clean water activities. Eighteen states currently use a portion of their CWSRF funds for non-point source control programs, and both the U.S. EPA and the Northwest-Midwest Institute have encouraged the other states to do so.²²⁷ Illinois expects to have approximately \$170 million available for loans under the CWSRF program in 2003.²²⁸ IEPA does not plan to apply any of these funds toward non-point source pollution projects, despite statutory authority to do so.²²⁹ The CWSRF could provide a significant source of funding for non-point source pollution control projects and therefore IEPA should consider such use of those funds.

3. Illinois should consider implementing regulatory approaches for controlling non-point source pollution

Finally, Illinois should consider the use of regulatory programs for controlling non-point source pollution. As commentators have noted, states will need to supplement the voluntary Section 319 program with some sort of regulatory controls on non-point source pollution in order to be successful in greatly reducing non-point source pollution.²³⁰ In fact, a number of states have already enacted a variety of regulatory programs aimed at non-point source pollution.²³¹ Illinois should follow their lead.

As outlined by a series of thorough reports by the Environmental Law Institute,²³² the regulatory options for non-point source control are quite varied. For example, Illinois could require a permit or the implementation of BMPs for activities that are likely to lead to significant non-point source pollution such as timber harvesting or concentrated animal feeding operations that fall below the numerical thresholds for NPDES permitting. Illinois could also adopt an after-the-fact approach that enables the state to issue pollution abatement orders to major non-point source polluters. Another option would be for Illinois to require non-point source polluters to engage in watershed

²²⁶ 33 U.S.C. § 1381.

²²⁷ U.S. General Accounting Office, *Federal Role in Addressing – and Contributing to – Nonpoint Source Pollution* (Feb. 1999), p. 29; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *The Clean Water State Revolving Fund – How to Fund Nonpoint Source and Estuary Enhancement Projects* (July 1997); Northeast-Midwest Institute, *The Clean Water State Revolving Fund – A Primer* (March 2002), p. 26.

²²⁸ Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, *FY2003 Wastewater Loan Program Intended Use Plan*.

²²⁹ 415 ILCS 5/19.3(b)(3.5).

²³⁰ Environmental Law Institute, *Putting the Pieces Together: State Nonpoint Source Enforceable Mechanisms in Context* (June 2000), p. 1; Daniel Mandelker, *Controlling Nonpoint Source Water Pollution: Can It Be Done?*, 65 *Chi.-Kent L. Rev.* 479, 480 (1989).

²³¹ *Ibid.*, Environmental Law Institute, *Almanac of Enforceable State Laws to Control Nonpoint Source Water Pollution* (1998); *Pronsolino v. Marcus*, 91 F.Supp. 2d 1337 (N.D.Cal. 2000).

²³² Environmental Law Institute, *Putting the Pieces Together: State Nonpoint Source Enforceable Mechanisms in Context* (June 2000); Environmental Law Institute, *Almanac of Enforceable State Laws to Control Nonpoint Source Water Pollution* (1998); Environmental Law Institute, *Enforceable State Mechanisms for the Control of Nonpoint Source Water Pollution* (Oct. 1997).

assessment and planning. Finally, the state could target its regulatory efforts at particular watersheds, as Maryland has done with the Chesapeake Bay. Given the persistence of non-point source pollution problems in the state, all of these options should be considered.

X. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Clean Water Act is arguably one of the most successful statutes in history. Certainly, Illinois waters have improved greatly in a number of respects since 1972. However, the extent to which water quality has improved is not entirely clear due to the lack of data on many water bodies and pollutants. It is also clear that as to many waters and pollutants much more progress must be made if Illinois water bodies are to meet the “fishable and swimmable” goals of the Clean Water Act.

Progress in reaching these goals would be advanced greatly if sufficient funds were made available to IEPA and a wide variety of flaws in Illinois’ implementation of the Clean Water Act were remedied. In particular, the following steps should be taken to improve water quality and implementation of the Clean Water Act in Illinois:

1. IEPA budget increases have not kept up with increased responsibilities or the extent of Illinois water quality challenge.
 - Illinois must substantially increase its budget for IEPA water programs in order to do the minimum necessary to meet its requirements under the Clean Water Act.
 - The legislation establishing fees for NPDES permits must be kept in place and, as soon as possible, the money raised through these fees must be expended for maintaining and restoring Illinois water quality.
 - Additional sources of funding must also be sought if the goals of the Clean Water Act are to be realized in Illinois waters.
 - A large bond issue addressing water quality problems, such as those approved in other states, should be considered.

2. IEPA should improve Illinois’ water quality standards by:
 - Refining the water use classification system
 - Ensuring that standards for toxic pollutants protect all sensitive species that are present in Illinois waters
 - Establishing nutrient standards that will protect against algal blooms that can harm aquatic life and drinking water quality
 - Restricting further the use of Illinois waters as “mixing zones” for the dilution of pollutants

3. IEPA should improve the NPDES permitting process to help ensure that such permits fully protect human health and wildlife by:
 - Including limits on nutrients, particularly phosphorous, which currently cause problems in vast numbers of Illinois streams and lakes
 - Ensuring that permits do not allow the discharge of pollutants that: (1) harm persons that come into contact with them, (2) cause dissolved oxygen levels to fall to the point that aquatic life is harmed, (3) impact aquatic life through unnatural temperatures or temperature variations, or (4) are toxic substances in toxic amounts.
 - Strengthening the permitting requirements for livestock operations, septic waste systems, and mining operations
 - Allowing for full and meaningful public participation in the permitting process by subjecting all essential permit terms to public review and comment.

 4. Enforcement of NDPEs permits should be strengthened:
 - The Illinois Attorney General should aggressively pursue enforcement actions against polluters who violate their permits
 - IEPA and the Attorney General should work with citizen groups that are willing to take on a share of the burden of enforcing the Clean Water Act

 5. Efforts for controlling rainfall-related pollution from stormwater run-off and combined sewer overflows must be strengthened through increased funding and more thorough implementation of legal requirements for controlling this pollution.

 6. Illinois should increase its efforts to control non-point source pollution by:
 - Improving the identification of non-point source pollution problems and the selection of project designed to address such problems.
 - Devoting increased resources to non-point source pollution control
 - Considering the implementation of various regulatory approaches for controlling non-point source pollution.
-