EIS 77-0301 F

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5
230 S. DEARBORN ST
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

DECEMBER 1976

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FINAL

TUNNEL COMPONENT OF THE TUNNEL AND RESERVOIR PLAN PROPOSED BY THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO

CALUMET TUNNEL SYSTEM

[redacted]

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TUNNEL COMPONENT OF THE

TUNNEL AND RESERVOIR PLAN

PROPOSED BY THE

METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT

OF GREATER CHICAGO

Prepared By The

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION V

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

And

BOOZ, ALLEN AND HAMILTON, INC.

BETHESDA, MARYLAND

APPROVED BY:

VALDAS V. ADAMKUS
DEPUTY REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

DECEMBER 1976

SUMMARY SHEET

( ) Draft
(x) Final

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1. (x) Administrative Action
   ( ) Legislative Action

2. Description of the Action - see Executive Summary, pgs. xvii to xxviii
3. Environmental Impact - see Executive Summary, pgs. xxix to xxxx
4. Alternatives Considered - see Executive Summary, pg. xviii to xix

5. Federal, State, and Local Agencies and Individuals Notified to this Action

Senator Adlai E. Stevenson, III
Senator Charles H. Percy
Representative George M. O'Brien
Representative Philip M. Crane
Representative Frank Annunzio
Representative Abner J. Mikva
Representative Sidney R. Yates
Representative Dan Rostenkowski
Representative Martin A. Russo
Representative Candiss Collins
Representative Henry J. Hyde
Representative John G. Fary
Representative Edward J. Derwinski
Representative Morgan F. Murphy
Representative Ralph H. Metcalfe

Water Resources Council
Council on Environmental Quality
Environmental Protection Agency
- Office of Federal Activities
- Office of Public Affairs
- Office of Legislation
- Office of Water Programs Operations
- Environmental Evaluation Branch

Department of the Interior
- Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
- Fish and Wildlife Servies
- National Park Service
- Geological Survey
- Bureau of Mines

Department of Defense
- Army Corps of Engineers
  - North Central Division
  - Chicago District Office

Department of Agriculture
- Soil Conservation Service
- Forest Service

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Department of Housing and Urban Development

Department of Transportation
  Federal Aviation Administration
  Coast Guard
Department of Commerce
  National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Department of Labor
  Occupational Health and Safety Administration
Great Lakes Basin Commission

Governor of Illinois
Illinois Institute for Environmental Quality
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Illinois Division of Waterways
Illinois Department of Public Health
Illinois Department of Conservation
State Historic Preservation Office
Bureau of Environmental Science
Business and Economic Development
Bureau of Soil and Water Conservation

Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
Cook County Department of Environmental Control
Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago
City of Chicago
  Department of Environment Control
  Department of Development and Planning
  Department of Aviation
Public Libraries

Others

6. Dates Draft Statement made available to:

The Council on Environmental Quality	July 16, 1976
The Public	July 23, 1976

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FOREWORD

This executive summary supplements the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Tunnel Component of TARP, specifically the segments and branches of the Calumet Tunnel system. Copies of the Draft EIS may be obtained by writing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, Planning Branch, EIS Preparation Section, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604; or by telephoning the TARP project officer at (312)353-2157.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Executive Summary

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This chapter first defines the legal basis and the scope of the EIS and then describes the authority and program of the applicant for EPA funding, the MSDGC. Finally, the history and objectives of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) are reviewed. This chapter of the executive summary corresponds to Chapter I of the environmental impact statement (EIS).

1.1 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE EIS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the administering agency for a major Federal environmental program entitled "Grants for Construction of Treatment Works."[1] This program allows the EPA Administrator to provide financial aid to any state, municipality, intermunicipal agency, or interstate agency for the construction of publicly owned water pollution control facilities. The program will encourage reduction of point sources of water pollution and improve national water quality.

The EPA's granting of funds for a water pollution control facility may require an EIS. Each proposed water pollution control facility is evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the appropriate EPA regional office to determine whether the proposed facility is expected to have significant environmental effects or be highly controversial. The EPA has prepared this EIS because it expects the environmental effects of the tunnel system to be significant.

This EIS is being issued pursuant to PL 91-90, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, and Executive Order 11514, "Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality" dated March 5, 1970. Both NEPA and Executive Order 11514 require that all Federal agencies prepare such statements in connection with their proposals for major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

---

1 Authorized by Title II, Section 201(g)(1), of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-500 (FWPCAA)

This EIS has been prepared in accordance with the regulations and guidance set forth in the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Guidelines dated August 1, 1973, and the EPA's Final Regulations 40 CFR-Part 6, dated April 14, 1975.

1.2 SCOPE OF THE EIS

The EIS addresses the cumulative effects of constructing and operating three conveyance tunnel systems which are part of the total Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) proposed by MSDGC. These three tunnel systems are:

- Mainstream (59th Street to Addison Street)
- Calumet
- Lower Des Plaines.

Where appropriate, this statement also assesses the effects associated specifically with the Calumet Tunnel system route. Two other statements address separately the effects associated with the Mainstream Tunnel system and the Lower Des Plaines Tunnel system. The Mainstream statement has already been developed and issued, whereas the Lower Des Plaines statement is currently in the development stage. These tunnel systems comprise what is referred to in the statement as "TARP, Phase I."

The subject of these statements is confined to the tunnel systems and their associated components because EPA is now considering whether to grant funds to construct these tunnels under its water pollution control authority. Other components of TARP, including the reservoirs, flood relief tunnels, instream aeration, and wastewater treatment plant improvements, are either ineligible for EPA funding or are not now under consideration for construction grants. Therefore, these other components are not considered to be part of the proposed action under review. The effects of these other components on water quality and the likelihood of their being financed is analyzed in this EIS in order to provide a context for evaluating the significance of the water quality improvements expected from the three tunnel systems.

1.3 IDENTIFICATION OF THE APPLICANT

The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSDGC) is the construction grant applicant for the component of Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) addressed by this EIS. The MSDGC was organized in 1889 under an act to create sanitary districts to remove obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.[1] Under the provisions of the act, the MSDGC is responsible for providing surface water and sewage drainage within the District's boundaries, which it does by constructing necessary facilities, conveyance systems, and treatment plants. The MSDGC is authorized to treat wastewater, either totally or partially, from any municipality within its designated jurisdiction, as well as to own and operate all wastewater facilities located within the MSDGC jurisdiction.

The MSDGC service area is approximately 860 square miles. Approximately 44 percent of this area, or 375 square miles, is served by MSDGC-owned combined-sewer systems (see Figure I-1) in which wastewater or sewage collected in local sewer systems is conveyed to treatment plants. These systems serve 120 municipalities which have a total population of approximately 5.5 million. The District owns and operates 70.5 miles of navigable canals, 6 wastewater treatment plants, and approximately 440 miles of intercepting sewers. The three major plants (North-Side, West-Southwest, and Calumet) in the MSDGC service area have a secondary capacity of over 1,750 million gallons per day (MGD). The remaining plants have a combined tertiary capacity of over 70 MGD. A water reclamation plant, the John F. Egan plant, is presently under construction and will have a capacity of about 30 MGD.

1.4 PROJECT HISTORY

The MSDGC initiated its wastewater facilities planning study in September 1967, with a ten-year clean-up and flood control program. The objectives of the program are to solve the District's flooding problem, protect Lake Michigan from further pollution, and improve the water quality of rivers and streams in the Chicago metropolitan area. The Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) has evolved from this ten-year program.

Concerned officials from the State of Illinois, Cook County, the MSDGC, and the city of Chicago reactivated a Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC) in November 1970 to investigate the pollution and flooding problems in the Chicago metropolitan area. The Committee's primary assignment was to develop a viable plan to minimize the area's

---

1 Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 42, Section 320, approved May 29, 1889.

FIGURE I-1
Metropolitan Sanitary District
of Greater Chicago
Service Area



pollutant discharges and the flooding caused by overflows of mixed sewage and wastewater. Another priority item in the plan was elimination of the need to release polluted river and canal flood waters into Lake Michigan. The Committee's plan was to address the combined-sewer area within Cook County, covering 375 square miles. The deliberations and studies of the FCCC and of a technical advisory committee which they formed resulted in the selection of TARP as less costly and more environmentally acceptable than the other plans they evaluated. The Committee then initiated additional studies to develop and refine TARP.

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF TARP

A primary objective of TARP is to improve surface water quality within the planning area. TARP is designed to meet the standards set forth in the "Water Pollution Regulations of Illinois."[1] These regulatory standards were established for three surface water-use classifications: (1) General (primary body contact), (2) Public and Food Processing (drinking water), and (3) Secondary Body Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life. All surface waters in the State of Illinois have been given a water-use classification by the Illinois Pollution Control Board (IPCB) and should comply with the appropriate water quality standards. Details of these standards are presented in Chapter II of this EIS. Other important objectives of TARP are to:

- Preserve the health and well-being of the population
- Prevent further pollution of Lake Michigan due to backflow
- Utilize treated waste byproducts
- Prevent flooding.

The final TARP is a combination of several alternative plans designed to collect urban runoff during all wet weather conditions except those storms of a magnitude equal to the three most severe storms recorded to date by the U.S. Weather Bureau Service.

II. EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

To provide a basis for assessing the impacts of a proposed project, an EIS initially describes the existing natural, social, economic, and cultural setting of the area which may be affected by a project. This chapter summarizes the major findings of the EIS with respect to the natural and man-made environments of the Chicago metropolitan area. This chapter is divided into two sections which correspond to Chapters II and III of the EIS text: Natural Environment and Man-made Environment.

2.1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

The existing natural environment of the Chicago area summarized in this section focuses on those features relevant to impact assessment of the proposed TARP project. This section is divided into the following categories:

- Water Resources
- Land Resources
- Atmospheric Resources.

2.1.1 Water Resources

The surface water systems of the Chicago area consist of a network of rivers and canals whose natural flow into Lake Michigan is controlled by a series of locks. These surface water systems include the Chicago River, the Sanitary and Ship Canal, the Calumet River system , and the Des Plaines River system. Lake Calumet and Lake Michigan also constitute an important part of the area's surface water resources.

The quality of the surface water systems is affected by steady-state effluent discharges and by injections or discharges of polluted wastewaters. The polluted wastewater results from overflows of combined-sewer systems during rainfall events of nominal size (approximately 0.1 inches or greater). The frequency of these rainfall events is approximately 100 times per year, and the resulting overflows are discharged directly to the Chicago area's streams and rivers.

Pollutant concentrations in the streams and rivers presently exceed water quality standards established by the State of Illinois Pollution Control Board. Concentration ranges of various pollutants in the Chicago area's surface systems are presented in Table II-1. Further details on the water quality of specific water systems are presented in Section 2.1.1 of the EIS.

Table II-1
Summary of Pollutant Concentration Ranges in Chicago's Surface Water Systems

Pollutant	Chicago River — Sanitary and Ship Canal System	Calumet River System	Des Plaines River System	Applicable Illinois Standards* Secondary Contact	General Use
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	1.2 to 7.7 mg/l	3.9 to 9.0 mg/l	6.0 to 10 mg/l	5.0 mg/l[1] 4.0 mg/l (1978)[2] 3.0 mg/l 4.0 mg/l min.[1] 2.0 mg/l min.	6.0 mg/l 5.0 mg/l min.[3]
Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)	5.2 to 9.2 mg/l	4.1 to 7.3 mg/l	5.0 to 6.7 mg/l	4-20 mg/l[4]	4-20 mg/l[4]
Ammonia (as N)	0.8 to 6.2 mg/l	1.3 to 13 mg/l	0.3 to 1.2 mg/l	4.0 mg/l (winter) 2.5 mg/l (summer)	2.6 mg/l[3]
Suspended solids (SS)	19 to 54 mg/l	12 to 73 mg/l	29 to 68 mg/l	5-25 mg/l[5]	5-25 mg/l[5]
Fecal coliform	477 to 12,700 (counts/100 ml)	152 to 738 (counts/100 ml)	411 to 8,700 (counts/100 ml)	1000/100 ml[1]	200/100 ml[2]

* Effluent discharge standards apply if water quality standard is not designated.

1 North Shore Channel Standards

2 Chicago River-Sanitary and Ship Canal System and Calumet River system.

3 General Use Standard applicable to Des Plaines River system.

4 4 mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants
10 mg/l-WSW and Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant
20 mg/l-Lemont Sewage Treatment Plant

5 5mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare STP
12mg/l-WSW and Calumet STP
25mg/l-Lemont STP

Serious public health problems involving contamination of Chicago's drinking water supply has led to implementation of regulatory measures to protect Lake Michigan, an important drinking water resource, from pollution. Locks and gates have been installed to divert river flows away from Lake Michigan, allowing eventual drainage into the Illinois River. Lake Michigan supplies most of the drinking water for the Chicago area. The withdrawal amount is approximately 1,600 cubic feet per second (CFS), and the maximum amount that can be withdrawn from Lake Michigan is 3,200 CFS.[1] This withdrawal limit, or allotment, is presently divided into three usage types: domestic water supply, indirect waterway diversion, and direct waterway diversion. The diversion usages allow improved effluent dilution and improved navigation.

1 Supreme Court Decision.

In the Chicago metropolitan area, there are two main aquifer systems: the upper aquifer, which consists of glacial drift and dolomites, and the lower aquifer, which consists of dolomite and sandstone formations. Unconsolidated Quaternary deposits and Silurian dolomites of the upper aquifer are hydraulically connected and function, in most areas, as a single water-bearing unit. Clayey deposits in the glacial drift act as confining layers to create artesian conditions in the upper aquifer. The lower aquifer includes dolomite and sandstone formations extending from the base of the Maquoketa Group to the top of the Eau Claire shales of the Cambrian system. The average thickness of the upper aquifer and lower aquifer is approximately 400 feet and 1,000 feet, respectively. The sources of recharge for the groundwater in the upper aquifer are infiltration of precipitation and influent streams. The lower aquifer is recharged in parts of McHenry, Kane, and De Kalb Counties where the Maquoketa Group outcrops, and further west where the Group has been removed by erosion. With respect to using the aquifers as a water resource, studies indicate that the lower aquifer is capable of producing about 25 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) and the upper aquifer is capable of a potential yield of 108 MGD.

Discharges into the waterways of the Chicago area originate from several sources, including: wastewater treatment facilities, industrial plants, and combined-sewer overflows. Six wastewater treatment facilities currently discharge treated water to existing waterways. The outfalls are located adjacent to the facilities. Most of these facilities are in compliance with the BOD and SS effluent standards (under present permit conditions), and two smaller plants are within the ammonia-nitrogen standard. With respect to industrial plants, wastewater is conveyed to treatment plants and processed before discharging. The industrial waste load averages approximately 195 MGD or equivalent to a population of 4.5 million. Combined-sewer overflows, which occur about 100 times per average year, inject pollutants in large amounts into waterways at approximately 640 outfall points in the Chicago area. During such events, minimum Illinois water quality standards established for restricted-use waters are not met.

Numerous water resource management programs have been initiated to address the flooding and/or pollution problems of the Chicago area. These programs have been or are currently being conducted either regionally or locally. A few of these programs include: the Section 208 Areawide Waste Treatment Management Planning program, the Chicago-South End of Lake Michigan study (C-SELM), the City of Chicago

Sewer Construction program, Thornton Quarry Flood Control project, and the Chicago Metropolitan Area River Basin Plan (CMARBP).

2.1.2 Land Resources

The Sanitary and Ship Canal and the Calumet-Sag Channel have significantly altered the natural drainage patterns which are from west to southwest in the area near Lake Michigan. Prior to construction of the Canal and Channel, the drainage flow was toward Lake Michigan. The flow is presently toward the Chicago River and the Sanitary and Ship Canal, which drain into the Illinois Waterway system. The overall low relief of the MSDGC combined-sewer system area makes it prone to flooding caused by sewer system backups and/or overbank flows. The areas with the highest overbank flooding potential lie along the North Branch-Chicago River and in the Calumet River system.

The Chicago area lies on the broad, gently sloping, northwesterly-trending Kankakee Arch. This arch, which connects the Wisconsin Arch to the northwest with the Cincinnati Arch to the southwest, separates the Michigan Basin from the Illinois Basin. The northeast sector of the Chicago area lies on the northeastern side of the Kankakee Arch, while the southwestern sector of the Chicago area lies on the southwest flank of the Arch. In the Chicago area, overall, a number of gentle east-west-trending folds are superimposed on the area's broad regional geologic structures. Numerous minor faults and several major faults have been mapped, including: the Sandwich fault near Joliet and the Des Plaines disturbance near the community of Des Plaines. The uppermost 500 feet of rock layers, particularly the dolomites and shales between the top of the Racine formation and the base of the Brainard formation, will be relevant to the proposed construction of the TARP tunnel systems. The surface layer (glacial deposits) has an average thickness of approximately 80 feet. Drop shaft and construction shaft installations will be constructed within this layer.

Based on 175-year historical earthquake records, four major earthquakes occurred within 100 miles of Chicago with intensities equal to or greater than MMI VIII (Modified Mercalli Intensity scale). These earthquakes originated at Fort Dearborn (Chicago) (1804), near Rockford (1909), near Aurora (1912), and near Amboy (1972). Within the MSDGC combined-sewer service area, there are 30 faults with moderate vertical displacement characteristics and 86 minor faults with small vertical displacement characteristics.

2.1.3 Atmospheric Resources

Air quality in the Chicago metropolitan area is presently monitored by the city of Chicago Department of Environmental Control and the Cook County Department of Environmental Control. A total of 61 monitoring stations have been established in Cook County; 30 of these are located within the city limits of Chicago. Based on the 1974 Annual Air Quality Report published by the State of Illinois EPA, ambient air quality standards were frequently violated at one or more stations. The pollutant standards violated include: sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and photochemical oxidants (measured as ozone).

The existing outdoor noise levels in most areas of Chicago are caused mainly by street traffic. Other noise sources include trains, aircraft, and industrial plants in city areas, and power lawn mowers, power tools, and other motor-driven equipment in residential areas. Based on a recent EPA study, typical noise levels for the Chicago area ranged from 36.3 dBA (decibels-A scale) (night) to 106.2 dBA (day). The day-night level (L_{dn}) ranged from 59.0 dBA to 71.2 dBA (overall average).

2.1.4 Biological Resources

Many species of wildlife reside in or migrate to the forest preserves, parks, and other natural areas in the Chicago region. Over 200 species of birds have been sited in these areas and about half of these species are the migratory and waterfowl type. Common mammals residing in the preserves include: whitetail deer, eastern cottontail, opossum, racoon, gray squirrel, red fox, and woodchuck. Approximately 40 species of reptile and amphibian can also be found in the Calumet area. A comprehensive list of the wildlife species is provided in Appendix J of the EIS.

Aquatic life in the rivers and streams of the Calumet watershed is currently limited to pollution-tolerant or hardy species. Poor water quality conditions of these waterways have reduced the diversity and abundance of aquatic life. The major species of fish in the watershed include: central mudminnow, white sucker, carp, goldfish, stone-roller, creek chub, bluntnosed minnow, fathead minnow, golden shiner, black bullhead, largemouth bass, green sunfish, bluegill, pumpkinseed, sunfish (lepomis), Johnny darter.

The natural vegetation normally found in the natural areas of the Calumet Tunnel project area consists of a modified form of the beech-maple forest, in the more moist areas, and Oak-hickory forests in the more open areas. The transitional flora between these two forest types include maple-basswood and maple-basswood-red oak forest. A recent survey was conducted along the Little Calumet River, and a few areas in a natural state were found. Natural vegetation was observed near Kennedy Avenue, Cline Avenue, Colfax Street, and Burr Street in which the majority of species were cottonwoods, poplars and willow with occasional oak, maple, and mulberry. Wetland areas along various streams are predominated by willow species, eastern cottonwood, and yellow poplar. Various grasses, forbs, cattails, arrowheads, and nettles are also common.

2.2 MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

The various components related to man's activities in the Chicago area are summarized in this section. These components include: Socioeconomic, Land Use, Sensitive Areas, Financial and Labor Resources, Transportation, and Major Projects and Programs.

2.2.1 Socioeconomic

The Chicago metropolitan area has experienced growth and change in its demographic profile similar to other major cities in the United States. Chicago, the third largest standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) in the United States, has experienced typical population redistribution trends within the SMSA. The close-in suburban jurisdictions grew rapidly during the 1950's from a substantial inmigration of population from the south and an out-migration of people from the city of Chicago. During the 1960's, the counties adjacent to Cook County urbanized rapidly. Continued redevelopment of the City, when combined with smaller household trends, uncertainties regarding energy availability and cost, and the increasing cost of suburban new construction, should result in a strengthening of the urban centers and a lessening of the outward population movements. Chicago's population is expected to stabilize after 1980.

Contract construction income accounts for less than eight percent of total earnings in the Chicago region. While average monthly wages for construction employment are high relative to other industries in the Chicago region, total earnings from contract construction have ranged from 6.5 to 7.7 percent of total earnings over the period 1950 to 1971. The construction industry is heavily unionized, and the current union hourly wage rate averages $11.02. (Refer to Table III-6 of the EIS).

The Chicago area has traditionally sustained strong construction activity in the public and private sectors. Major public redevelopment projects have stimulated private investment and development, particularly within the city of Chicago. Construction employment opportunities have thus attracted and created a large construction labor force. Construction employment in the Chicago SMSA numbered 136,897 people in 1970 or approximately 4.8 percent of the total employed. Construction employment in the Chicago SMSA accounted for 61 percent of total construction employment in the State of Illinois. The Chicago area construction work force is highly flexible and can expand rapidly, given the demand for construction services.

2.2.2 Land Use

The predominant land use bordering the Calumet Tunnel route can be characterized by its industrial zoning in which large portions of land are underutilized and vacant. There are a few small residential areas bordering the tunnel route. Rock taken from the tunnel will probably be disposed of at McCook, Stearns, and Thornton quarries. Sludge will be disposed of at a number of sites or by a number of programs, including: the Fulton County project, NuEarth, broker sales, Lawndale Lagoons, and other landfills.

The land areas bordering the proposed tunnel route are expected to remain generally the same along the main and branch segments. New recreational park development along the riveredges are envisioned as a land enhancement movement by the communities in the Calumet area.

Redevelopment plans may also call for the strengthening of various industrial areas. Industrial uses along the Calumet-Sag Channel are likely to continue because of the need for low cost water transport. Improved water quality in the rivers and the channel plus storm water management would enhance improvement of industrial areas.

2.2.3 Sensitive Areas

There are no known archeological or historically significant sites adjacent to or within the Calumet Tunnel route. MSD is presently investigating areas adjacent to planned tunnel routes. There are selected sites of historic and architectural interest within the vicinity of the tunnel route, but none within the immediate 500-foot impact area of the tunnel. These sites are listed in Chapter III of the EIS.

2.2.4 Financial Resources

Financial resources are currently available to fund the Calumet Tunnel system. TARP's Phase I tunnel system cost breakdown is approximately $1.03 billion[1] for water pollution elements and $0.81 billion for flood control measures. Operation and maintenance of TARP has been estimated at $13 million annually. The estimated cost of the Calumet system alone is $378.2 million, with an annual maintenance cost of $2.5 million.

Analysis of the funding resources required to finance the Calumet Tunnel system reveals that sufficient funds are currently available from the Federal Government, the State, and the MSDGC. (See Section 3.3.1 of the EIS). Additionally Federal Water Pollution Control funds of approximately $290.0 million will be required to meet the implementation plan for the other conveyance tunnel systems. In view of the sound fiscal posture of the MSDGC, the high funding priority assigned TARP by the State, and the very conservative estimates of future Federal appropriations, it can be reasonably assumed that future financing requirements can be satisfied.

Maintenance costs can either be covered through an *ad valorem* property tax, or through a user charge system based on water consumption. EPA favors the latter approach and has awarded the MSDGC two grants to develop such a user charge system.

---

1 Cost estimates based on values presented in MSDGC's "Facilities Planning Study—MSDGC Overview Report," Revised, January 1975.

2.2.5 Labor Resources

Labor resources are considered adequate to meet construction and implementation needs of TARP and other projects. The diversified labor force in the Chicago metropolitan area is vulnerable to economic recession because of the emphasis upon manufacturing and nonservice employment. Thus, while national unemployment was about 8.4 percent in the third quarter of 1975, Cook County had a 9.6 percent rate, and the city of Chicago sustained a 11.2 percent rate of unemployment. Increasing productivity rates and an expanding labor force should contribute to keeping Chicago unemployment levels higher than the national rate for the next few years. Therefore, new employment opportunities presented by TARP and other projects should not experience a shortage of labor resources.

The labor force is predominantly male, with white collar workers comprising 53 percent of the labor force in the SMSA.

2.2.6 Transportation

Implementation of the Calumet Tunnel system will involve the use of roadways and waterways. Trucks carrying rock and spoil material from construction sites will utilize several surface streets and expressways in reaching the quarry or disposal site. The roadways range from dirt roads to six-lane divided highways. The Calumet Tunnel route also is proximate to major waterways; the Calumet River, the Little Calumet River, and the Calumet-Sag Channel. Waterborne commerce is important to the Chicago economy; of the 46.2 million tons of waterborne freight traffic handled by the Port of Chicago, an average of 37 percent or 17.1 million tons are moved over the inland waterways annually.

2.2.7 Major Projects and Programs

There are no planned major projects and programs proposed over the next 10 years in the vicinity of the Calumet Tunnel route. Possible projects and programs that could develop during this period would consist mainly of transportation system improvements. Other possible public projects include the proposed acquisition of rights-of-way along the northern segment of the Calumet River. These rights-of-way are privately owned, and used by Commonwealth Edison and Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America for energy transmission. The intent of the public acquisition would be to establish a permanent utility corridor to more efficiently service growing energy demands.

III. THE PROPOSED ACTION

Identifying and defining a plan and its systems and subsystems establishes the proposed action for which the environmental setting is described and the environmental impacts are assessed. The proposed action identified and defined for this EIS is the Phase I conveyance tunnel systems and their associated subsystems only. The planned storage reservoirs, waste treatment plant upgrading and expansion, on-line reservoirs, and instream aeration facilities were not included.

The information presented in Chapter IV and V of the EIS is summarized in this chapter and divided into seven parts:

- Alternative Plans
- Plan Selector
- TARP Tunnel Systems
- TARP Subsystems
- Calumet Tunnel Segments and Branches
- Cost of Tunnel System and Subsystems
- TARP Financing.

3.1 ALTERNATIVE PLANS

Many plans to resolve the Chicago area's flooding and water pollution problems were developed during the past two decades by concerned government agencies, local organizations, and individuals. At first, the plans focused primarily on the flood control problem, however, as water quality conditions in the area worsened, more emphasis was placed on controlling the water pollution. A total of 23 plans were formulated, and many were evaluated in detail by a Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC), consisting of representatives from the State of Illinois, Cook County, the MSDGC, and the city of Chicago.

In screening the alternative plans, the FCCC established overall flood and pollution control objectives which provided a basis for evaluating alternative plans. A plan was automatically rejected if it did not:

- Prevent all backflows to Lake Michigan to protect water supply resources

- Reduce pollutant discharges caused by combined-sewer overflows

- Reduce flooding in the combined-sewer and downstream areas.

In the initial screening, 6 plans were eliminated and the remaining 17 were modified to meet the objectives more fully as well as to provide a more quantitative basis for comparison. The modifications were referred to as MODs, and consisted basically of a combination of different storage capacities and waterway improvement actions. The resulting MODs yielded 51 alternative subsystem plans, or subplans, to be evaluated by the FCCC. In the next screening phase, the FCCC defined eight principal parameters, including capital costs (1972 dollars), estimated annual operating and maintenance costs (1972), project benefits, land acquisition acreage, underground easement requirements, resident and business relocations, construction impacts, and operation impacts. A technical advisory committee was organized by the FCCC to evaluate the modified alternatives in detail using the eight parameters. The advisory committee's interim report, "Evaluation Report of Alternative Systems," recommended a 50,000 acre-feet (ac-ft) storage level, which was part of the modified alternative designated as MOD 3. After reviewing the report, the members of the FCCC unanimously concluded that the flood and pollution control plan should be in the form of one of the four Chicago Underflow plans developed (four of the seventeen plans) or a combination of these plans, along with the recommended storage level. The FCCC stated that, "These alternatives are less costly and more environmentally acceptable to the community than any of the other plans presented. Detail studies along the lines of these alternatives should proceed to develop the final plan layout."

3.2 PLAN SELECTION

In August 1972, the FCCC members presented their final recommendations in a report with seven technical appendices. The report recommended consolidating the favorable features of the four Underflow plans into the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP). TARP was developed further and refined, then evaluated in detail with four selected alternatives and the "no-action" alternative. In this evaluation, 15 significant environmental impact parameters were identified as the basis for evaluation. The FCCC concluded that very few negative impacts are expected for any of the alternatives incorporating conveyance tunnels, and that adverse impacts will occur if the "no-action" alternative is chosen. The FCCC also concluded that the construction impacts of all plans on the environment will most likely be relatively short-term and localized. Finally, the beneficial impacts of the plans will far exceed the adverse impacts. Within the scope of the FCCC analysis, TARP had the highest ranking and was selected as the most suitable plan to solve the flood and pollution problems of the Chicago metropolitan area.

TARP would provide the most benefits for the lowest cost and the least adverse environmental impacts. Field studies and subsurface exploration programs further refined the plan; however, they did not change the original TARP concept. They were conducted only to optimize overall system effectiveness. Presently, TARP will enable collection of runoff water resulting from all but three of the severest rainfall storms recorded during the past 21 years.

3.3 TARP TUNNEL SYSTEMS

The four tunnel systems that are a part of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan are the Mainstream, Calumet, Lower Des Plaines, and O'Hare systems. Each system is a completely independent operating unit with collection, storage, conveyance, and treatment capabilities. Figure III-1 shows the present routes and layout of these systems relative to the MSDGC combined-sewer service area, the MSDGC overall service area, and Cook County. Each of the TARP systems shown in the figure consists of three component systems: reservoirs, conveyance tunnels, and sewage treatment plants. A total of three reservoirs, 120 miles of conveyance tunnels, and four sewage treatment plants are included in the plan.

The TARP systems have two basic features which play a major role in solving the flood and pollution problems. First, the combined storage capacity of the plan is almost 136,800 ac-ft of which 127,600 ac-ft of the total is reservoir capacity and 9,200 ac-ft is tunnel capacity. The planned treatment capacity of TARP will be approximately 2,240 MGD. Second, over 640 existing overflow points will be eliminated within the MSDGC combined-sewer service area by the TARP systems.

FIGURE III-1
Tunnel and Reservoir Plan
System Layout and Routes



The proposed locations for the three reservoirs are: McCook quarry, Thornton quarry, and an area northwest of O'Hare International Airport. The conveyance tunnels, located 150 to 290 feet below ground level, will be constructed under existing waterways and public rights-of-way. Of the sewage treatment plants, three of the four plants are currently activated sludge plants with a combined planned capacity of approximately 2,150 MGD. The remaining plant is the proposed O'Hare-Des Plaines plant which will have a treatment capacity of over 70 MGD. A water reclamation plant, the John F. Egan plant, is presently under construction and the capacity will be 30 MGD.

3.4 TARP SUBSYSTEMS

The subsystems common to all TARP tunnel systems include drop shafts, collecting structures, and pumping stations. The drop shafts range from 4 to 17 feet in diameter and have two basic designs. One design features a slotted inner wall to assist in aerating the incoming water. The wall separates the air shaft from the water shaft and allows air either to enter or to escape while water is flowing in or being pumped out. The other design features a separate air shaft, to be installed in areas where high overflow rates prevail. The inside diameter of this drop shaft design ranges from 10 to 17 feet.

Approximately 640 collecting structures will be constructed to collect the overflows at established locations. The collecting structure basically consists of a diversion unit at the overflow point and a connecting pipe to the drop shaft entrance chamber. Most of the new structures will be constructed near curbs or in low points adjacent to major public thoroughfares.

Pumping stations will be constructed underground at the end of all conveyance tunnel routes and adjacent to all storage reservoirs. These stations permit a rate of dewatering of the tunnels and reservoirs which will allow a full tunnel or reservoir to be emptied within two to three days. The stations will also be used to transport bottom sludge dredged from reservoirs to treatment facilities.

3.5 CALUMET TUNNEL SEGMENTS AND BRANCHES

The Calumet system of TARP consists of: one waste treatment plant with a total capacity of approximately 220 MGD; over 37 miles of conveyance tunnel with a storage volume of 1,690 ac-ft; and one main storage reservoir with a maximum capacity of 40,900 ac-ft. The component subsystems associated with the Calumet system include 59 drop shafts; over 100 collecting structures; and two pumping stations located near the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant and the intersection of the Torrence Avenue and plant-to-Calumet city Tunnels. The system and its component subsystems will be constructed in two phases. In Phase I, approximately 30 miles of tunnel will be constructed, and in Phase II, the remaining 7 miles will be constructed. The Phase II tunnel route is parallel to the Indiana Avenue segment of the Phase I tunnel, as shown in Figure III-1, and it will be used as a relief tunnel.

This EIS addresses the Phase I segments and branches of the Calumet system and focuses only on the conveyance tunnel system. The overall length of this tunnel system is approximately 30 miles. The subsystems associated with it include 59 drop shafts, 5 construction shafts, 22 access shafts, 101 collecting structures, and 2 pumping stations.

3.6 COST OF TUNNEL SYSTEM AND SUBSYSTEMS

The MSDGC estimated cost[1] of a 10-foot diameter tunnel in rock with nominal aquifer protection is $200[2] per lineal foot. In rock with high quality aquifer protection, the cost is $230. Tunnel cost for soft ground construction is $350. Similarly, for a 35-foot diameter tunnel, the estimated costs are $1,030, $1,090, and $1,680 per lineal foot, respectively.

Large rectangular tunnels adjacent to construction shafts will be excavated by the drill and blast method and the estimated cost with nominal aquifer protection is $2,090 per lineal foot

1 MSDGC, January 1975.

2 All cost figures presented in this section are based on 1972 values.

for a 30-foot square tunnel. The same type and size of tunnels with high quality aquifer protection would cost an estimated $2,170 per lineal foot.

The tunnel costs estimated above include the following base figures:

- Cost of muck disposal, estimated to be $4.00 per solid cubic yard
- Nominal grouting[1] for control of infiltration during construction, estimated to be $0.30 per square foot of tunnel wall
- Access and ventilation shaft construction
- Ventilation and hoist equipment
- Grout and grout inspection equipment
- Average aquifer protection costs.

Additional grouting for aquifer protection in unlined tunnel segments in the upper aquifers is estimated to cost $1.50 per square foot of tunnel wall. This grouting would be provided to a depth of about one tunnel diameter beyond the excavated tunnel limit.

The total construction cost for all the Phase I TARP tunnel systems is approximately $567 million. The estimated total costs for the subsystems are: $93 million for collecting/connecting structures, and $38 million for pumping stations. These subsystem costs are based on the following:

- Collecting Structures and Connecting Lines. The cost of the near-surface collection structures leading to the drop shafts includes the gravity interceptor sewers and the necessary connecting structures. Table III-1 lists the costs for these subsystems with respect to the TARP tunnel systems.

---

1 Grouting is a procedure whereby a mixture of cement and water is injected under pressure into a drilled hole that intersects a source of seepage such as an open joint, fault, or bedding plane.

Table III-1
Estimated Costs For
Collecting Structures and Connecting Lines

Tunnel System	Estimated Cost ($ Million)		
	Intercepting Structures	Collection System	Total
Mainstream	8.701	3.648	12.349
Calumet	1.084	1.088	2.172
Lower and Upper Des Plaines	1.043	3.489	4.532
TOTALS	10.828	8.225	19.053

- Drop Shafts. The estimated cost of drop shafts includes all drop shaft components. The costs are related to the shaft diameter and to the depth of penetration into the rock formations. The cost of 250-foot deep drop shafts varies from $80,000 for a shaft two feet in diameter to $1,400,000 for a 20-foot diameter shaft.

- Pumping Stations. The estimated construction cost of pumping facilities includes the structure, pumping equipment, power generation for the operation of larger units, and discharge piping to the appropriate treatment plant. The estimates have been based on use of variable-speed, motor-driven units. Total capital costs for pumping vary as follows:

Lift Height	Estimated Cost ($ Million) Pumping Capacity 1000 cfs	100,000 cfs
300 feet	5.6	200
525 feet	5.7	300

3.7 TARP FINANCING

Financing of the entire $3.54 billion MSDGC Flood and Pollution Control Plan over the next 11 years is doubtful. As illustrated in Table III-2, however, the financing requirements for all conveyance tunnels could be met by a modest increase in Federal and MSDGC funding over a period of 11 years, from 1976-1986. An additional $290 million appropriation of funds are estimated to be required to

Table III-2

Financing Schedule - Phase I Tunnel System
and Other Non-TARP Elements of the
MSDGC Pollution Control Plan

Priority List of Projects	Estimated Costs[1]	EPA			STATE OF ILLINOIS			MSDGC			COE		
		Currently Available[2]	Currently Projected[3]	Additionally Required[4]	Currently Available[5]	Currently Projected	Additionally Required	Currently Available[6]	Currently Projected[7]	Additionally Required	Currently Available[8]	Currently Projected[9]	Additionally Required
1. Conveyance Tunnels	1,032.4	372.6[10]	220.0	0.0	300.0	0.0	0.0	66.3	73.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. In-stream Aeration	16.[illegible]	0.0	0.[illegible]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Treatment Plant Upgrading[11]	1,01[illegible]	0.0	560.[illegible]	[illegible]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0-254.8	0.0-166.6[1]	0.0	0.0	0.0
a) Calumet	352.8	0.0	261.[illegible]	[illegible]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
b) West-Southwest	666.3	0.0	181.2	[illegible]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0-166.6	0.0-166.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Reservoirs and Flood Control	810.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	810.1
Total[12]	2878.1	372.6	780.0	166.[illegible]	300.0	0.0	0.0	66.3	90.2-345.0	0.0-166.6[1]	0.0	0.0	810.1

FOOTNOTES

1 All cost estimates are based on those presented in the MSDGC's Facilities Planning Study (January 1975) and are escalated 6 percent annually for inflation.

2 These funds represent the remainder of the FY 1975 and FY 1976 PL 92-500 appropriation which are expected to be allocated to MSDGC by the State.

3 These are Federal funds, above and beyond the existing PL 92-500 appropriation, which are expected (in the form of a new appropriation) over the period FY 1977-1982.

4 These are Federal funds above and beyond the additional $780 million expected over the FY 1977-1982 period.

5 These are funds, under the State's current $750 million bonding authorization, which are expected to be available to MSDGC to finance the Tunnel Plan.

6 The funds in this category represented those available by virtue of the unused bonding authority of the MSDGC under the current $380 authorization.

7 This category represents funds expected to be available under an additional $200 to $400 million bonding authority for which the MSDGC is currently formulating plans to ask the State of Illinois.

8 There is no current COE appropriation for any MSDGC Flood and Pollution Control Plan elements.

9 There is no near future COE appropriation expected for any MSDGC Flood and Pollution Control Plan elements.

10 Includes approximately $49.6 million already obligated to the North Shore section of the Mainstream Tunnel Plan (Addison-Wilmette segment).

11 Figure doesn't include the estimated $124 million already obligated for the O'hare treatment plant project.

12 The total estimated cost $3030.6 million differs from the $3536.5 million (Table III-10 of the main body of the EIS) because of the exclusion of the following projects: sewers, solids disposal, O'Hare Treatment plant, and flood control (non-TARP).

finance the three (Mainstream, Calumet, and Lower Des Plaines) TARP tunnel systems. The additional Federal funds represent a modest portion (28.3 percent) of the conservatively estimated $780 million of new PL 92-500 money which is expected to be forthcoming to MSDGC over the next six fiscal years. Congress, however, has not yet approved any additional appropriation beyond the initial $18 billion which was authorized under PL 92-500 and totally allocated over the FY 1972-1976 period. The $73.5 million of MSDGC funds represents an increase of about 19 percent over the current MSDGC bonding authorization. This amount, however, represents a very modest proportion of the additional $200-400 million bonding authorization for which MSDGC is currently formulating plans to ask the State of Illinois.

If the Phase I tunnels of TARP are not implemented, there is a very high probability that approximately 90 percent of the currently available Federal funds assigned to the MSDGC will be lost by both the State of Illinois and the MSDGC. This potential loss to the MSDGC and state stems from the fact that the Calumet treatment facility expansion project, (which represent the next major project in terms of priority for Federal funds) will not meet the September 30, 1977 deadline for Step 3 funding eligibility. Assuming this project did not qualify in time for existing Federal funds, it is estimated that only approximately 10 percent of the $323.6 million could alternatively be allocated to other MSDGC or statewide prioritized pollution control projects.

The financing feasibility of other key elements (non-Phase I TARP) of the MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control Plan (see Table III-2), which are closely related to the overall goal of meeting the 1983 water quality standards, ranges from almost certainty to near zero. Addressing these elements in the order of priority specified in the MSDGC's 1975 Facilities Plan, instream aeration stands slightly ahead of the conveyance tunnels. The approximately $16.7 million required for instream aeration can easily be met from existing state and MSDGC funding sources.[1] It is very unlikely, however, that the financing will be available to increase the treatment levels, efficiencies, and capacities at the Calumet and West-Southwest treatment plants. The total required financing ($1.02 billion) would necessitate a significant increase above the additional levels of Federal ($780 million) and MSDGC ($200-400 million) funds expected to be available over the FY 1977-1986 timeframe. The financing feasibility of the Calumet treatment plant expansion, however, is reasonable in view of their combined total

1 As of May 1976, funding for instream aeration has already been authorized.

estimated costs of $352.8 million. The Federal funding portion ($264.6 million) could be provided from the additional $780 million PL 92-500 appropriation expected over the next six years. The MSDGC portion ($88.2 million) could be provided from the anticipated $200-400 million additional bonding authorization.[1] In terms of the West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project (estimated cost of $666.3 million), the financing feasibility is very questionable in view of the requirement for additional funds beyond the levels (Federal and MSDGC) expected to be available over the period FY 1977 to 1986.

The operation and maintenance costs of the TARP tunnel systems will be financed by a user charge system rather than the current ad valorem tax system. PL 92-500 requires the development of a user charge system and the State of Illinois presently has the authority to impose a user charge. This system of financing the annual operations and maintenance costs of the tunnel systems is not expected to have a significant economic impact in the commercial, industrial, and household sectors. The incremental charge in the MSDGC tax rate per $100 of assessed valuation (1975 rate was $.4005) is estimated to be $.0541 (for operations and maintenance) and $.0532 (for tunnel construction) by the year 1986. The tunnel construction impact will continually decline after 1986 with the continuing growth of the tax base. Details of this financial system are provided in the EIS in Sections 3.3.1 and 9.3.

1 However, to provide the $126.3 million, the MSDGC's additional bonding authorization must be at least $216.5 million.

IV. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS CONCERNING THE EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Chapters VI through IX of the EIS assess the beneficial and adverse effects of the construction and operation of the conveyance tunnel systems on greater Chicago's natural and man-made environments. This chapter presents the principal findings of that analysis only for those effects expected to be relatively significant.

The most significant finding relates to the expected improvement in water quality resulting from the operation of the three Phase I tunnel systems. To assess the significance of this improvement the EIS includes the consideration of the possible and likely cumulative effects of TARP components which are not a part of the Phase I systems. These other components are the reservoirs, treatment plant improvements, and instream aeration.

The principal findings of the EIS are listed as follows:

(1) Effects of Operation on Water Quality

(2) Effects of a Significant Earthquake on Tunnel System

(3) Effects of Rock Spoil Generated During Construction

(4) General Effects of Construction

(5) Effects of Infiltration and Exfiltration

(6) Worker Safety During Construction

(7) Effects of Operation on Land Use

(8) Effects of Construction on Employment

(9) Funding Uncertainty for TARP

(10) Effects of Flooding on Lake Michigan.

(1) Effects of Operation on Water Quality

THE TUNNEL WILL SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE POLLUTANT LOAD CURRENTLY DISCHARGED TO CHICAGO'S WATERWAYS, HOWEVER, THE TUNNELS ALONE WILL NOT RESULT IN ATTAINING APPLICABLE ILLINOIS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS, AND, THEREFORE, WILL NOT ENABLE ADDITIONAL USES OF THE AFFECTED WATERWAYS. THE ATTAINMENT OF ILLINOIS WATER QUALITY STANDARDS DEPENDS ON ADDITIONAL CONTROL MEASURES FOR WHICH THE FUNDING PROSPECTS ARE NOW POOR.

This conclusion is based on the following findings:

- The tunnels will capture approximately 90 percent of the pollutant load now discharged during combined-sewer overflows and will reduce the pollutant load 75 percent overall and the frequency of overflows from 100 to 10 times per year. 1977 Illinois water quality standards will continue to be violated during overflow events because of uncontrolled injections of pollutants into the waterways.

- The tunnels may not result in the attainment of 1977 Illinois standards for ammonia over lengthy reaches of waterway, because high concentrations of this pollutant are discharged from local wastewater treatment plants. Although data are not presently available to allow a more definitive determination of effects on this point, the attainment of water quality standards in the area's major river systems is clearly and intimately tied to the upgrading and expansion of MSDGC treatment plants.

- With the tunnels on line, 1977 Illinois standards of 4 mg/l for dissolved oxygen (DO) will still be violated along approximately 50 of the 80 miles of the Main Channel and of the Calumet River systems during the critical late summer months. Conditions along the Des Plaines River system have not yet been modeled by the MSDGC, but will be completed under the Section 208 planning program.

- 1977 Illinois standards for DO are likely to be met over the entire 80-mile length of the modeled waterways during critical summer dry flow conditions, assuming implementation of the following pollution control components:

  - Tunnels
  - Reservoirs
  - Treatment plant improvements
  - Instream aeration.

  The water quality impact of these various pollution control options is summarized in Table IV-1.

- Given current projections of Federal, State, and MSDGC financing capabilities and policies, the financing of the tunnels and instream aeration appears secure. The financing of the Calumet treatment plant expansion is probable; but financing the costly West-Southwest treatment plant is very doubtful. The financing of the reservoirs in the near future is very unlikely given the absence of any Federal commitment to provide assistance.

Additional details on water quality are provided in Sections 2.1 and 8.1 of the EIS text and details on financing in Section 3.3.1.

(2) <u>Effects of a Significant Earthquake on Tunnel System</u>

IF A SIGNIFICANT EARTHQUAKE OCCURS IN THE CHICAGO AREA, THE EVENT MAY OFFSET TUNNEL ALIGNMENT AND CAUSE SIGNIFICANT DAMAGE TO PORTIONS OF THE TUNNEL SYSTEM.

This conclusion is based on the following findings:

- The 175-year historical earthquake records indicate that a seismic event with a Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) of VIII can recur in the Chicago area at a rate of about once per 100 years. Assuming the tunnel system is in operation for 100 years, the probability of this event occurring at some time during this period is 100 to 1 or 10,000 to 1 for any given year. If an MMI VIII event occurs, severe alterations to tunnel alignment or tunnel surface may result.

Table IV-1
Impact of Potential Pollution Control Options on Water Quality Along Main Channel and Calumet River Systems[1]

Notes (a) Tunnels plus instream aeration effects addressed in Section 8.1.1 of EIS.
(b) Phasing of options shown in order adopted by MSDGC in modeling studies.

Water Quality Component \ Pollution Control Option	No Action	Phase I Tunnels	Phase I Tunnels Plus Instream Aeration	Tunnels Plus Treatment Plant Upgrading[2] Plus Instream Aeration	Tunnels Plus Reservoirs Plus Treatment Plant Upgrading Plus Instream Aeration
Combined-Sewer Overflows	Overflow to waterways 100 times per year. Illinois standards violated most of the time.	Overflows reduced from 100 to 10 per year. 75 percent of pollutant load captured and treated.	No significant change	No significant change	Overflows reduced to four occasions in 25 years. Standards met in waterways even during these rare overflow events.
Ammonia Levels	Ammonia standard violated by treatment plant discharges.	Ammonia standard violated due to treatment plant discharges.	No significant change	Ammonia standard met most of the time (not during overflow episodes).	Ammonia levels in waterways improved beyond standard.
Dissolved Oxygen (DO) Concentrations[3]	DO levels below Illinois standards along 80 percent of waterways. Anaerobic conditions exist over large stretches.	DO levels below Illinois standards along 70 percent of waterway. Anaerobic conditions greatly relieved.	Illinois standard met over entire 80-mile length of waterway. Anerobic conditions completely eliminated.	No significant change	No significant change
Allowable Water Uses	Illinois water use standards not met along area waterways.	No significant change	No significant change	No significant change	Illinois water use standards met. Fishing, boating, and shoreline activities permitted.

1 Computer simulations of water quality along the Des Plaines River not yet available.

2 Upgrading to tertiary level assumed with nitrogen and phosphorus removal.

3 Evaluated for dry weather flow conditions.

4 Computer simulations of dry weather flow conditions.

- The conveyance tunnels will pass through several active faults prevalent in the TARP project area and will be sensitive to earth movement at these locations. Information on the distribution and nature of the active faults is insufficient to assess accurately the extent of damage which could result from an MMI VIII earthquake.

Further information on this subject may be found in Sections 2.2.3, 2.2.4, and 8.2.2 of the EIS.

(3) Effects of Rock Spoil Generated During Construction

THE ROCK SPOIL MATERIAL GENERATED DURING TUNNEL CONSTRUCTION IS NOT EXPECTED TO BE MARKETABLE. THEREFORE, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH DISPOSAL OF THE ROCK SPOIL WILL DEPEND LARGELY ON THE AVAILABILITY OF LANDFILL DISPOSAL SITES.

Approximately 4,563,000 cubic yards (bulk measure) of spoil will be removed from the Calumet Tunnel segments and branches. Although this amount can be adequately contained within Thornton Quarry, the large quantities of spoil involved in reservoir excavation could complicate disposal plans for tunnel spoil. Disposal of rock spoil from the reservoirs was addressed briefly in Section 6.2.4 of the EIS. A significant portion of rock spoil generated by reservoir construction is likely to be marketable and to be stockpiled on the quarry site for eventual sale by the quarry owners.

Major findings supporting the above conclusions are:

- Shale and other constituents present in the rock excavated from the Phase I tunnels will limit the rock's suitability for low-grade commercial uses.

- Landfill disposal sites capable of accepting the entire volume of tunnel spoil to be generated during TARP Phase I have not yet been identified by the MSDGC.

- Thornton Quarry has enough volume to accept the entire quantity of spoil to be excavated from the Calumet Tunnel segments and branches.

- Since conventional methods will be used to excavate rock from Thornton Quarry for reservoir construction, it is likely that a significant portion of the spoil will be marketable. Present plans envision stockpiling the saleable portion on the quarry sites for eventual sale by the quarry owners. Various stockpile configurations are being considered. Nonsaleable spoil can be stockpiled on-site, as is proposed for the Thornton Quarry site, or at a site located south of Lake Calumet and owned by the MSDGC.

A more detailed discussion is provided in Section 6.2.4 of the EIS.

(4) General Effects of Construction

CONSTRUCTION OF THE TARP TUNNEL SYSTEMS WILL RESULT IN TEMPORARY PUBLIC ANNOYANCE AND INCONVENIENCE FROM THE CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF NOISE, HANDLING OF CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS, VIBRATION FROM BLASTING, DISRUPTION OF VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC, AND GLARE FROM THE ILLUMINATION OF CONSTRUCTION AREAS AT NIGHT. ALTHOUGH THE CUMULATIVE EFFECTS MAY BE NOTICEABLE, TAKEN SINGLY, EACH EFFECT IS MINOR.

This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

- Surface construction sites are located in areas which are generally either vacant or near low-utilized industrial land.

- Noise at each construction site should be within levels mandated by Chicago ordinances and, at each surface construction site, noise will only occur for periods of three to nine months.

- Because blasting will be used only to excavate shafts and not the tunnel, itself, blasts will be relatively infrequent and will continue at any one site for not more than 120 days.

Further information on this subject may be found in Sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 7.1.1, 7.2.1, 7.4, and 10.2.

(5) Effects of Infiltration and Exfiltration

IF THE GROUTING PROGRAM IS NOT EFFECTIVE,[1] GROUNDWATER INFILTRATION DURING CONSTRUCTION AND WASTEWATER EXFILTRATION DURING TUNNEL OPERATION CAN BE A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM.

This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

- The inflow rate of groundwater for the TARP tunnel systems is estimated to be an average of approximately 0.5 MGD per mile of tunnel. In the absence of appropriate mitigative measures, this rate is sufficient to lower the piezometric or hydraulic pressure level of the upper aquifer. Tunnel grouting is the most effective method to reduce infiltration and a grouting program has been incorporated in TARP. Grouting integrity, however, must be maintained to keep inflows below the allowable limit of 500 gallons per day per inch of tunnel diameter per mile of tunnel. Observation wells will be required to monitor integrity throughout the operational phase of the tunnel.

- Exfiltration will most likely occur when tunnel pressures exceed inflow pressures during high storm runoff conditions. The TARP grouting program is expected to prevent extensive

1 The objective of grouting is to achieve maximum penetration and a uniform grout spread. If grouting is ineffective, maximum infiltration/exfiltration flows will result.

exfiltration of tunnel wastewaters into the upper aquifer. However, if grouting integrity is not maintained during tunnel operation, exfiltration will be at a high enough rate to degrade groundwater quality of the upper aquifer. Observation wells will be necessary to determine whether exfiltration is occurring along the tunnel routes.

EIS Sections 2.1.2, 6.1.2, and 8.1.2 provide more information on the subject of groundwater infiltration and wastewater exfiltration. Specifications for observation well spacing and for the monitoring program are also presented in these sections.

(6) Worker Safety During Construction

TUNNEL OR UNDERGROUND CONSTRUCTION WORKERS WILL BE MORE SUSCEPTIBLE TO INJURY, DISABILITY, AND FATALITY THAN SURFACE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS. THE INCIDENCE OF INJURIES AND FATALITIES, HOWEVER, IS NOT EXPECTED TO BE GREATER THAN NORMAL FOR THIS TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK.

This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

- Based on recent national statistics for all types of construction activities, the Calumet Tunnel system construction may result in 90 disabling injuries and in one permanent disability or fatality. For construction of the entire tunnel system, injuries and fatalities are expected to increase proportionately.

- Based on the safety statistics of the current construction of a rapid-transit system subway in Washington, D.C., construction of the entire TARP tunnel system could result in 1,525 injuries and in nine fatalities.

- Analysis of the geologic and seismic characteristics of the project area indicates that most of the area is stable and suitable for the construction of underground tunnels. Precautionary measures will be required to protect workers in segments where rockfall and partings (loosened material) may occur frequently and shale deterioration conditions prevail.

Further information on this subject may be found in Sections 6.2.2 and 7.1.2.

(7) Effects of Operation on Land Use

THE QUALITY OF LAND IN CERTAIN RIVERBANK SECTIONS ALONG THE CALUMET TUNNEL ROUTE MAY BE ENHANCED BY REDUCED FLOODING CONDITIONS.

Vacant land exists in the flood-prone areas associated with the Calumet Tunnel system. The reduction of flooding in these areas may enable development of this under-utilized land into open space uses such as: parks, playgrounds, sport fields, and parking areas.

(8) Effects of Construction on Employment

CONSTRUCTION OF THE CALUMET TUNNEL WILL PROVIDE OVER $89 MILLION IN CONSTRUCTION INCOME OVER AN EIGHT-YEAR PERIOD AND WILL CREATE A PEAK SUPPLY OF APPROXIMATELY 680 JOBS OVER A THREE-YEAR PERIOD.

Further information may be found in Section 7.1.3.

(9) Funding Uncertainty for TARP

THE CONVEYANCE TUNNELS CAN BE FINANCED BETWEEN 1976-1987 WITH MODEST INCREASES IN ANTICIPATED FEDERAL AND LOCAL FUNDING. HOWEVER, THE FUNDING OF THE RESERVOIR DURING THIS TIME PERIOD IS NOT A PART OF THE CURRENT FINANCING PLAN AND COULD NOT BE ACCOMPLISHED WITHOUT HAVING A MAJOR FINANCIAL IMPACT ON THE STATE, CITY, OR MSDGC.

Additional details on this finding may be found in Section 3.3.1 of the EIS.

estimated costs of $352.8 million. The Federal funding portion ($264.6 million) could be provided from the additional $780 million PL 92-500 appropriation expected over the next six years. The MSDGC portion ($88.2 million) could be provided from the anticipated $200-400 million additional bonding authorization.[1] In terms of the West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project (estimated cost of $666.3 million), the financing feasibility is very questionable in view of the requirement for additional funds beyond the levels (Federal and MSDGC) expected to be available over the period FY 1977 to 1986.

The operation and maintenance costs of the TARP tunnel systems will be financed by a user charge system rather than the current ad valorem tax system. PL 92-500 requires the development of a user charge system and the State of Illinois presently has the authority to impose a user charge. This system of financing the annual operations and maintenance costs of the tunnel systems is not expected to have a significant economic impact in the commercial, industrial, and household sectors. The incremental charge in the MSDGC tax rate per $100 of assessed valuation (1975 rate was $.4005) is estimated to be $.0541 (for operations and maintenance) and $.0532 (for tunnel construction) by the year 1986. The tunnel construction impact will continually decline after 1986 with the continuing growth of the tax base. Details of this financial system are provided in the EIS in Sections 3.3.1 and 9.3.

1 However, to provide the $126.3 million, the MSDGC's additional bonding authorization must be at least $216.5 million.

IV. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS CONCERNING THE EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Chapters VI through IX of the EIS assess the beneficial and adverse effects of the construction and operation of the conveyance tunnel systems on greater Chicago's natural and man-made environments. This chapter presents the principal findings of that analysis only for those effects expected to be relatively significant.

The most significant finding relates to the expected improvement in water quality resulting from the operation of the three Phase I tunnel systems. To assess the significance of this improvement the EIS includes the consideration of the possible and likely cumulative effects of TARP components which are not a part of the Phase I systems. These other components are the reservoirs, treatment plant improvements, and instream aeration.

The principal findings of the EIS are listed as follows:

(1) Effects of Operation on Water Quality

(2) Effects of a Significant Earthquake on Tunnel System

(3) Effects of Rock Spoil Generated During Construction

(4) General Effects of Construction

(5) Effects of Infiltration and Exfiltration

(6) Worker Safety During Construction

(7) Effects of Operation on Land Use

(8) Effects of Construction on Employment

(9) Funding Uncertainty for TARP

(10) Effects of Flooding on Lake Michigan.

5. Since the majority of the construction shafts and drop shafts are in close proximity to area waterways, runoff from these sites could adversely affect water quality. Berms will be constructed around stockpiles of construction materials and spoil materials to preclude runoff into the waterways.

6. It is presently proposed that water pumped from the tunnels during construction be discharged directly to the waterways after a period of settling. Since the possibility of silt and other pollutants still exists after settling, it is recommended that these dewatering flows be discharged to MSDGC's intercepting system for treatment, except during periods of combined sewer overflows. This will be a condition of any grant awarded for the Calumet Tunnel System.

7. Although no known historic, architectural, or archaeological resources will be affected by the proposed project, the possibility of finding archaeological resources must be investigated by the MSDGC. This must be accomplished by contacting the State Historic Preservation Officer.

8. Conformance with applicable regulation of the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior is essential for safety of construction workers.

9. There exists a wide range of potential adverse impacts which could develop during construction. This includes blasting, waste spillage, traffic congestion, light glare, and fugitive dust at construction and disposal sites. While these effects could be considered insignificant any measures taken to reduce their impact would aid in public acceptability of the project. These suggested mitigative measures are discussed in Chapter X.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

A P P E N D I C E S

A. WATER QUALITY MONITORING DATA

B. STRATIGRAPHY DESCRIPTION FOR THE CHICAGO AREA

C. DESCRIPTION OF FAULTS LOCATED IN THE CHICAGO AREA

D. AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

E. NOISE: UNITS AND STANDARDS

F. SOCIOECONOMIC DATA BY COMMUNITY FOR THE MAINSTREAM, CALUMET, AND DES PLAINES TUNNEL SYSTEMS

G. CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS - 1954 THROUGH 1975

H. METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO - GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTORS

I. METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO - GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS - SEWERS

J. WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION INVENTORIES

K. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS AND EPA RESPONSES

I. INTRODUCTION

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND GOALS

In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act, Public Law 91-190 (NEPA). NEPA established a Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and a national policy to:

- Encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment
- Promote efforts to prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and stimulate public health and welfare
- Enrich man's understanding of ecological systems and of the Nation's natural resources.

NEPA states that the Federal Government will have the continuing responsibility of improving and coordinating Federal actions (i.e., plans, programs, resources, and functions) which affect environmental, resource, and health quality. NEPA further states that all Federal agencies are required to "... utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment ..." Federal agencies are also required to investigate and develop procedures and technology to evaluate unquantifiable environmental amenities and values and give them appropriate consideration, in addition to quantifiable technical and economic factors.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is administering a major Federal environmental program entitled "Grants for Construction of Treatment Works."[1] This program allows the EPA administrator to provide financial aid to any state, municipality, intermunicipal agency, or interstate

---

1 Authorized by Title II, Section 201(g)(1), of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-500 (FWPCA).

agency for the construction of publicly owned water pollution control facilities. The national program encourages reduction of point sources of water pollution to improve water quality.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA, all Federal agencies are required to prepare environmental impact statements (EIS) for those actions significantly impacting the human environment. On August 1, 1973, the CEQ published guidelines[1] on the preparation of an EIS to instruct agencies in meeting NEPA requirements. The EPA subsequently published its own regulations[2] for the preparation of an EIS. The regulations specify minimum standards to present all pertinent data in a consistent, organized and comprehensive manner to enable the reader to assess the proposed action independently. As stated in both the CEQ and EPA guidelines, the purpose of an EIS is to provide a means of assessing impacts on the environment and not to provide a justification for decisions made.

The EPA's granting of funds for water pollution control facilities may be contingent on whether an EIS is required. Each proposed water pollution control facility is evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the appropriate EPA regional office. Generally, an EIS is required if the action is expected to have significant environmental effects or is highly controversial. The EPA has determined that the TARP tunnel system may have an effect on the environment and, therefore, has prepared this EIS.

An EIS presents only the information necessary to address the specific environmental issues of the action, while focusing on the critical issues and summarizing the less critical issues. An overview of the contents of a typical EIS is presented as a flow scheme in Figure I-1. The scheme illustrates the approach normally used for systematic gathering and processing of information during document preparation. Initially, a draft statement is prepared and circulated for comment. After the comment period, the final statement is prepared and issued to all agencies, organizations, and individuals affected by the proposed action.

---

1 Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Chapter V, Part 1500.

2 Title 40, CFR, Chapter I, Part 6.

FIGURE I-1
Flow Scheme of EIS Contents



1.3 GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The draft EIS must satisfy, to the fullest extent possible, the requirements established for the final EIS as set forth in Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA. Once completed, the draft statement is distributed for comment in accordance with the CEQ guidelines. Decisionmakers and outside reviewers are allowed at least 45 days to comment on the environmental issues as described in the draft statement. Comments from Federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction by law or with special expertise in environmental impacts are solicited and considered in the impact statement process. In addition, comments are solicited from public and private sources.

Although every effort is made to define and evaluate all major environmental effects of the proposed action in the draft statement, the commenting process often reveals additional environmental effects, relevant facts, and different viewpoints. When previously overlooked issues and opposing views are brought to the attention of the agency preparing the EIS, the agency addresses them in the final environmental statement. All substantive comments received on the draft EIS are included as an attachment to the final EIS, some of which may be addressed by the agency in the EIS text.

1.4 IDENTIFICATION OF THE APPLICANT

The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSDGC) is the construction grant applicant for the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) addressed by this EIS. The District presently covers an area of approximately 860 square miles within Cook County, Illinois, as shown in Figure I-2. The MSDGC was organized in 1889 under an act to create sanitary districts to remove obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.[1] Under the provisions of the act, the MSDGC is responsible for providing surface water and sewage drainage within the District's boundaries. The District, constructs the necessary facilities, conveyance systems, and treatment plants to service this area and is authorized to treat wastewater from any municipality within its boundaries. In addition, MSDGC may operate all wastewater facilities located within its jurisdiction.

Although the major function of the MSDGC is planning, construction, and operation of sewers and sewage treatment facilities, the District also oversees various flood control and electrical generation operations. Other MSDGC functions

---

1 Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 42, Section 320, approved May 29, 1889.

FIGURE I-2
Metropolitan Sanitary
District of Greater Chicago
Service Area



involve: purchasing or leasing real and personal property, both within and outside its jurisdiction; initiating condemnation proceedings within its service area; approving sewer connection plans; and issuing water discharge permits.

The MSDGC presently collects, treats, and disposes of wastewater from a highly urbanized and industrialized area consisting of 120 municipalities and a total population of approximately 5.5 million. The district owns and operates 70.5 miles of navigable canals, six sewage treatment plants, and over 440 miles of intercepting sewers. The three major plants (North-Side, West-Southwest, and Calumet) in the MSDGC service area have a secondary capacity of over 1,750 million gallons per day (MGD). The remaining plants have a combined tertiary capacity of over 70 MGD. A new plant, the John Egan Reclamation Plant, will be operational in the near future and will have a capacity of approximately 30 MGD.

1.5 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT HISTORY

The MSDGC initiated its wastewater facilities planning study in September 1967, with 10-year clean-up and flood control program. The objectives of the program are to solve the District's flooding problem, protect Lake Michigan from further pollution, and improve surface water quality in the Chicago metropolitan area. The Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) evolved from this 10-year program, as most of the MSDGC's planning efforts have to date. The following sections present background information on the MSDGC's TARP planning effort and describe the events leading to its selection.

1.5.1 Background Information

Approximately 44 percent of the 860-square mile MSDGC service area, or 375 square miles, consists of combined-sewer systems (see Figure I-2) in which sewage collected in local sewer systems is conveyed to treatment plants. These combined-sewer systems handle only industrial, commercial, and household wastewater at the present time, and, when urban runoff in amounts greater than 0.1 inch enters the systems during wet weather conditions, the systems' capacity is easily exceeded. Once this occurs, the pollutant-laden runoff bypasses or overflows to adjacent streams. Overflows have occurred on an average of 100 times per year in the Chicago area and have significantly affected the water quality of the streams.[1]

1 The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, "Environmental Impact Statement," preliminary draft, November 1973.

During heavy rain storms, excessive overflows raise the water levels in the region's waterways several feet above flood stage levels. The resulting flooding damages private and public property and creates health problems along certain reaches of the waterways. In addition, backflows to Lake Michigan are allowed to help reduce flooding when water levels reach a critical height. Over a 30-year period, many plans and studies were made to solve the flooding problem, which have been followed, since 1967, by efforts to solve both the flooding and pollution problems.

1.5.2 Project History

Concerned officials from the State of Illinois, Cook County, the MSDGC, and the city of Chicago reactivated the Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC) in November 1970, to investigate the pollution and flooding problems in the Chicago metropolitan area. The Committee's primary assignment was to develop a viable plan to minimize the area's pollutant discharges and flooding caused by overflows of mixed sewage and runoff water. Another priority item in the plan was elimination of polluted river and canal flood water backflows into Lake Michigan. The Committee's plan was to address the 375-square mile combined-sewer within Cook County. The location of this area with respect to the surrounding counties is shown in Figure I-3. The Committee formed a technical advisory committee to develop the plan and to solicit engineers and scientists from government agencies and private consulting firms to assist in the study. Fifty-one alternative solutions were identified which met water quality standards, reduced flooding conditions, and prevented backflows to Lake Michigan. These alternative solutions were analyzed by comparing their capital cost, annual maintenance and operation costs, benefits, land acquisition and underground easement requirements, and requirements for relocating residential, commercial and industrial developments.

The Flood Control Coordinating Committee members evaluated the alternative plans in detail and selected TARP as the least costly and most environmentally acceptable. They initiated further studies to develop and refine TARP and in October 1972, the final TARP plan was presented at a public meeting conducted by the MSDGC to obtain community and citizen reaction. On July 26, 1973 the MSDGC conducted a public meeting to discuss TARP environmental issues and assessments. Many hearings conducted by government and local agencies have been held on TARP. A few of the recent hearings include:

FIGURE I-3
Planning Area and
Surrounding Counties



The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers hearing on the entire tunnel and reservoir plan (November 1975)

- The State of Illinois EPA hearing on the design grants for the first phase tunnels (September 1975)
- The MSDGC hearing concerning the EPA construction grants for the Wilmette-to-Addison segment of TARP's Mainstream system (July 1975)
- The Northern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) hearing on the TARP facility plans (April 1974).

1.6 OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAN

The primary objective of TARP is to improve surface water quality within the planning area. The plan is designed to meet water quality standards set forth in the "Water Pollution Regulations of Illinois."[1] These regulatory standards were established for three surface-water-use classifications: (1) General (primary body contact), (2) Public and Food Processing (drinking water), and (3) Secondary Body Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life. All surface waters in the State of Illinois have been given a water-use classification by the IPCB and must comply with the applicable water quality standards. These standards are described in Chapter II of this EIS. Other objectives of TARP include:

- Preserve the health and well-being of the population
- Prevent further pollution of Lake Michigan
- Utilize treated waste byproducts
- Prevent flooding.

The final TARP is a combination of features from several alternative plans. TARP is designed to collect urban runoff during all wet weather conditions except those storms of a magnitude equal to the three most severe storms recorded to date by the U.S. Weather Bureau Service. The plan consists of four tunnel systems, 150 to 290 feet below existing waterways, as shown in Figure I-4, with a total length of approximately 120 miles. Within the 375-square-mile combined-sewer area, urban runoff from 640 existing overflow points and sewage from industrial facilities and residents will be collected in the tunnel systems, conveyed to four treatment

---

1 Issued by the Illinois Pollution Control Board (IPCB) on January 31, 1974 (amended).

FIGURE I-4
Tunnel and Reservoir Plan
System Layout and Routes



plants, and then discharged to waterways. Three storage reservoirs are also a part of TARP and will have a total capacity of over 130,000 acre-feet. During peak rainfall periods, overflow water will be collected in these reservoirs, stored until dry weather conditions, and then conveyed to treatment facilities and processed.

1.7 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS OF THE PLAN

In view of the potential environmental impacts of TARP, the MSDGC has prepared facilities planning documents and several environmental assessment reports. The reports and planning documents pertain to the tunnel, reservoir, and treatment systems of the plan and their component parts or subsystems. Four tunnel system routes have been identified by the MSDGC and are designated as follows:

- Mainstream
- Calumet
- Lower Des Plaines
- O'Hare - Des Plaines.

To obtain environmental approvals and construction grants, the MSDGC submitted the facilities planning documents and environmental reports to the U.S. EPA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of Illinois EPA for review and evaluation. The U.S. EPA review focused on all the pollution control aspects of TARP, while the Corps of Engineers review[1] included the water management aspects of the entire Chicago area. The Illinois EPA review focused on the design aspects of the Phase I tunnels only.

In accordance with U.S. EPA procedures for determining whether an environmental impact statement is necessary, the EPA reviewed the proposed TARP systems and subsystems based on the reports and plans presented by the MSDGC. The EPA concluded that no significant environmental impacts are expected for the Addison-to-Wilmette segment of the Mainstream system. Consequently, a decision not to prepare an EIS was made for this segment. However, in the EPA review of the other tunnel system segments (Mainstream, Calumet, Lower Des Plaines, and O'Hare - Des Plaines), the possibility of significant environmental impacts prevailed. The EPA concluded that an environmental impact statement will be necessary for each of these tunnel segments.

1 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is presently preparing an overall EIS for the water managements aspects of the Chicago area.

1.8 SCOPE OF THE TARP EIS

The EIS for the MSDGC's Tunnel and Reservoir Plan addresses the environmental issues relevant to the pollution control systems of the plan. These systems include the tunnels only and their associated subsystems of the four routes identified in the previous section. The purpose of the EIS is to assess the positive and negative impacts of TARP pollution control systems, on the physical, biological and socioeconomic environment. The Calumet Tunnel system EIS includes only the Phase I tunnel and not the relief or parallel tunnel, which will be used for flood control purposes. Likewise, no proposed storage reservoirs are included, since their primary purpose is flood control.

The environmental impacts associated with each TARP system will be presented in a separate statement and will focus on the conveyance tunnels only. This EIS has been prepared for the Calumet Tunnel system in accordance with the regulations and guidance set forth in the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Guidelines (August 1, 1973), and the U.S. EPA Final Regulations CFR 40-Part 6 (April 14, 1975), which concern the preparation of environmental impact statements.

For the proposed Calumet Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, the U.S. EPA, Region V, Chicago, Illinois, is the "responsible or lead Federal agency" as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

To ensure that the public is kept fully informed regarding this action, and that it participates to the fullest extent possible in the Agency's decisionmaking process, this draft EIS is being circulated for a 45-day review as required by the CEQ, August 1, 1973, Guidelines.

II. EXISTING NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

II. EXISTING NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

This chapter describes the natural environment in the Chicago metropolitan area which may be affected by the proposed tunneling project and is divided into four main sections:

- Water Resources
- Land Resources
- Atmospheric Resources
- Biological Resources.

In the Water Resources section the quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater that are likely to be affected by the Calumet Tunnel systems are discussed. Sources polluting these waters are also identified. Finally, programs to abate pollution and to manage water resources in the entire Chicago metropolitan area are described.

The Land Resources section provides information on drainage basins served by the Calumet Tunnel systems. and identifies the flood prone areas in the project service area. The geology and seismicity of the entire Chicago metropolitan area are described and pertinent details on the areas affected by the proposed project are given.

Finally, the air quality and noise levels in the Chicago metropolitan area are presented in the Atmospheric Resources section and the wildlife, vegetation, and aquatic life inventories of the area are described in the Biological Resources section.

The information contained in this chapter provides a basis for evaluating the effects of the proposed project on the natural environment. Thus, only those elements of the natural environment that are likely to be affected by the proposed project are discussed. Instead of an exhaustive environmental inventory, only those details that are necessary for impact evaluation are presented in the sections below.

2.1 WATER RESOURCES

Chicago depends on the area's groundwater and surface water supplies for many uses beyond drinking water, including commerce, transportation, recreation, and sanitation. This section describes the status of Chicago area water resources prior to the implementation of TARP. The discussion of groundwater and surface water addresses the quality, availability, and uses of these water resources, as well as pollution sources, resource management programs, and flood prone areas.

2.1.1 Surface Water

The surface waterways of the Chicago area constitute an interconnected network of rivers and canals whose natural flow into Lake Michigan has been reversed by a series of locks. The major surface waterways under study are the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal System, the Calumet River system, the Des Plaines River System, Lake Calumet, and Lake Michigan. The remainder of this section describes the quality and availability of surface water supplies, the regulation of surface water flow, the potable water supplies, and the deposition of sludge in the three water systems. These systems are depicted in Figure II-1, along with water use classifications which were established by the state of Illinois EPA.

The Chicago River System includes:

- North Shore Channel from Lake Michigan at Wilmette
- North Branch of the Chicago River from the confluence of West Fork and the Skokie River downstream to the Chicago River
- Chicago River flowing westward from the Chicago River Controlling Works at Lake Michigan to the junction with the North and the South Branches of the Chicago River
- Tributaries to the North Branch of the Chicago River as they cross the Lake-Cook County line.

The Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal System includes the South Branch of the Chicago River from the junction with the North Branch, the Chicago River, and the Sanitary and Ship Canal downstream to the Lockport Lock and Dam.

FIGURE II-1
Chicago Area Waterways and State Water Use Classifications



The Calumet River System includes:

- The Grand Calumet River from Lake Michigan westward
- The Little Calumet River which originates east of Gary, Indiana near Lake Michigan and crosses the Indiana-Illinois state line to its junction with the Calumet-Sag Channel (the MSDGC boundary is at the state line)
- Calumet-Sag Channel to its confluence with the Sanitary and Ship Canal.

Tributaries to the Calumet River System are the Grand Calumet River which joins the system south of the O'Brien Locks and Thorn Creek which flows into the Little Calumet River.

The Des Plaines River System originates in the southern part of Wisconsin. In the MSDGC service area, the system consists of the Des Plaines River from where it crosses Lake-Cook County line to just above its confluence with the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal above Lockport, Illinois. Salt Creek, a tributary to the Des Plaines River, joins the river at Riverside, Illinois.

(1) Surface Water Quality

The quality of Chicago area waterways is affected not only by steady-state effluent discharges, but also by periodic injections of pollutants as well. These pollutants are due to combined sewer overflows during storm events. Approximately 100 times per year, rainfall runoff causes the combined sewer loads to overflow to area streams and rivers. The frequency and severity of these overflow episodes is sufficient to negate any improvements in water quality due to control of other point sources. The problem of combined sewer overflows is discussed in more detail in Section 2.1.3 on pollution sources. This section presents existing water quality data and the relationship with allowable water uses in the Chicago area.

The MSDGC routinely carries out a water quality sampling program of the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal System, the Calumet River System, the Des Plaines River System, and their tributaries. Samples are taken by the MSDGC at least once each month at 41 stations which are shown in Figure II-2. Some stations are sampled twice each month. The samples are analyzed for various physical, chemical, and biological characteristics. The physical analysis includes determination of temperature and concentration of suspended and dissolved solids. Chemical factors analyzed include: dissolved oxygen (DO), biological oxygen demand (BOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), ammonia-nitrogen, nitrite-nitrate nitrogen, total phosphorus, methylene blue-active substances (MBAS), cyanide (CN), and the heavy metals. Bacteriological tests are performed to determine total and fecal coliform concentrations and the presence of fecal streptoccoci.

A summary of the data collected and analyzed by the MSDGC is presented in the sections below for the three major waterway systems. The presentations of average pollutant concentrations for the three systems follow closely the discussion of the MSDGC's monitoring program for water quality found in Appendix C of "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," second revision, January 1975. Of the many parameters routinely monitored by MSDGC, five key water quality indicators are discussed in the sections below: dissolved oxygen (DO), biological oxygen demand (BOD), ammonia nitrogen, suspended solids (SS), and fecal coliform counts. The measured levels of each parameter are summarized in tabular form and related to applicable standards for each of the three major waterways at the close of the discussion of water quality in Table II-2.

Reference is made in the discussion to Table II-1 showing Illinois water quality standards. Virtually all of Chicago's major surface water bodies, except for Lake Michigan, are classified under water standards for Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life. This is the lowest water use designation made by the State of Illinois, allowing only uses in which "contact with the water is either incidental or accidental and in which the probability of ingesting appreciable quantities of water is minimal".[1]

1. <u>Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal</u>

Average water quality parameters for the Chicago-River-Sanitary and Ship Canal System for 1973 are presented in Table A-1 of Appendix A.

---

1 Illinois Pollution Control Board Rules and Regulations, Chapter III, Water Pollution.

Table II-1
Selected Illinois Standards for Water Use and Effluent Discharge[1]

Parameter	General Use Standards[a]	Public and Food Processing Water Supply Standards[b]	Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life Water Standards[c]	Lake Michigan Standards	Effluent Discharge Standards
Unnatural Sludge Deposits	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed
Floating Debris	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed
Oil	No Visible Oil Allowed	0.1 mg/l	15 mg/l	0.1 mg/l	15 mg/l
Unnatural Plant Growth	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed
Unnatural Color or Turbidity	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed
Odor	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed	None Allowed
pH	6.5-9.0	6.5-9.0	6.0-9.0	7.0-9.0	5.0-10.0
Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	5.0 mg/l minimum	5.0 mg/l minimum	2.0 mg/l min., 4.0 mg/l after 12/31/77	> 90% of saturation value	10 mg/l BOD_5, 12 mg/l, SS[d].
Phosphorus[e]	0.05 mg/l	0.05 mg/l	1.0 mg/l max	0.007 mg/l	1.0 mg/l max
Cadmium	0.05 mg/l	0.01 mg/l	0.15 mg/l	0.01 mg/l	0.15 mg/l
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	1000 mg/l	500 mg/l	3500 mg/l max.	180.0 mg/l	< 750 mg/l above background
Ammonia nitrogen	1.5 mg/l	1.5 mg/l	4.0 mg/l max	0.02 mg/l	4.0 mg/l max
Temperature	5°F max. above natural level	5°F max. above natural level	< 93°F for 95% of time, 100°F max.	3° max. above natural level	< 20°F above ambient
Fecal Coliforms	200/100 ml, 30-day geometric mean	200/100 ml, 30-day geometric mean	1,000/100 ml, 30 day geometric mean	20/100 ml, 30-day geometric mean	400/100 ml

a. General Use Waters: All Illinois waters except those designated as Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life Waters

b. *Public and Food Processing Water Supply.* All Illinois waters except those designated as Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life Waters and except for the Chicago River and Little Calumet River

c. Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life Waters. 1) Sanitary and Ship Canal, 2) Calumet—Sag Channel, 3) Little Calumet River from junction with Grand Calumet River to Calumet-Sag Channel, 4) Grand Calumet River, 5) Calumet River, 6) Lake Calumet, 7) South Branch of the Chicago River, 8) North Branch of Chicago River from confluence with North Shore Channel to confluence with South Branch, 9) Des Plaines River from confluence with Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal to the Interstate 55 Bridge, 10) North Shore Channel except that DO standard for Channel shall be 6 mg/l for 16 hours out of 24 hour period and not less than 4 mg/l at any time

d. BOD and Suspended Solids standard for sources with dilution ratio less than 5 to 1.

e. Phosphorus standard applies only to Lake Michigan and not area streams and rivers

1 Illinois Pollution Control Board Rules and Regulations, Chapter III, Water Pollution.

The average dissolved oxygen concentration decreased with increasing distance from Lake Michigan, ranging from 7.65 mg/l at the upstream stations on the North Shore Channel to 3.4 mg/l at Ohio Street on the North Branch of the Chicago River. The Sanitary and Ship Canal showed dissolved oxygen levels that varied from 5.53 mg/l just after the confluence of the Chicago River down to 1.2 mg/l at the downstream stations.

The average BOD of the water entering the North Shore Channel was about 5.2 mg/l. This increased to 9.2 mg/l in the downstream sector of the North Branch of the Chicago River while the observed levels of BOD in the Sanitary and Ship Canal ranged between 5.5 and 7.4 mg/l.

Ammonia levels increased as incoming Lake Michigan waters mixed with effluents discharged from area treatment plants and other sources. Ammonia-nitrogen averaged 0.84 mg/l-N near the lake and increased downstream to 5.49 mg/l-N. After mixing with Chicago River water the average ammonia concentration decreased to 3.49 mg/l, but then increased to 6.22 mg/l below the West-Southwest Sanitary Treatment Works discharge.

The average suspended solids concentration decreased from 54 mg/l to a level of about 22 mg/l in the lower reach of the North Branch of the Chicago River. Levels at the stations along the Sanitary and Ship Canal varied between 19 and 31 mg/l.

Fecal coliform counts ranged from a geometric mean of 3,134 per 100 ml at Central Avenue to 12,705 per 100 ml at Ohio Street on the North Branch of the Chicago River. However, immediately below the North Side Sanitary Treatment Works the geometric mean dropped to 477 per 100 ml. The highest counts in the Sanitary and Ship Canal System were at Damen Avenue with a geometric mean of 5,512 per 100 ml. These levels dropped below the West-Southwest Sanitary Treatment Works to a geometric mean of 770 per 100 ml.

The significance of these measurements becomes apparent from an examination of Table II-1, Illinois Water Quality Standards. Water standards for

Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life are not met for dissolved oxygen, ammonia-nitrogen and fecal coliforms along large segments of the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal System. Standards for biological oxygen demand (BOD) and suspended solids (SS) have been set only for effluents discharged to streams. BOD values in the open waterways are close to the discharge standard, and SS concentrations exceed the discharge standard in many areas. This situation emphasizes the need for continued upgrading of existing pollution sources to comply with effluent discharge regulations.

2. Calumet River System

Table A-2 of Appendix A shows the average values of various water quality parameters for 1973 from sampling stations along the Calumet River System. Dissolved oxygen levels in the Calumet River System averaged 9.0 mg/l at the mouth of the river and gradually declined downstream until at Highway 83 on the Cal-Sag Channel. The average concentration was 3.9 mg/l.

The BOD of the Calumet River stations averaged 4.1 mg/l, increasing to 7.3 mg/l below the Calumet Sanitary Treatment Works and the confluence of the Little Calumet River. The BOD level then declined slowly to 6.2 mg/l in the Calumet-Sag Channel just above the confluence with the Sanitary and Ship Canal.

Within the main waterways of the Calumet River System the ammonia concentrations ranged from 1.31 mg/l-N at 92nd Street to 9.1 mg/l-N at Ashland Avenue below the Calumet Sanitary Treatment Works. The highest ammonia levels occur in the Grand Calumet River with an average of 13.3 mg/l-N.

The average concentration of suspended solids at the various sampling stations of the main waterways fell between 12 mg/l and 73 mg/l. The highest concentrations occurred in the tributary streams.

Fecal coliform counts were lowest near the mouth of the Calumet River with a geometric mean of 152 per 100 ml. The highest counts were observed in the lower part of the Cal-Sag Channel with a geometric mean of 738 per 100 ml. Extremely high fecal coliform counts were obtained in the two tributaries just below the Indiana-Illinois line averaging 18,200 and 24,500 counts per 100 ml on the Grand Calumet and Little Calumet River, respectively.

In summary, dissolved oxygen concentrations along the Calumet River System currently exceed the water standards for Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life. Measured values of ammonia-nitrogen and fecal coliforms did not meet minimum standards over large portions of the system and measured values for suspended solids in the stream did not meet the effluent discharge standard.

3. Des Plaines River System

Average 1973 values for various water quality parameters are given in Table A-3 of Appendix A. The average dissolved oxygen levels found in the Des Plaines River ranged from 6.0 mg/1 to 10.2 mg/1. Some values greater than saturation occurred probably as a result of photosynthetic oxygen production.[1]

BOD levels at the Lake-Cook County line averaged 6.7 mg/1. This level decreased slightly moving downstream to an average of 5.0 mg/1. Some of the highest levels were observed in Salt Creek, with an average of 6.1 mg/1, just above the junction with the Des Plaines River.

The Des Plaines River had relatively low levels of ammonia with average concentrations between 0.34 mg/1-N and 1.21 mg/1-N. Salt Creek had the highest ammonia levels averaging 2.92 mg/1-N at one location.

---

1 MSDGC, "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Appendix C, "Water Sampling, Testing and Water Quality Monitoring Program," Revised January 1975.

The concentration of suspended solids fluctuated from a high of 68 mg/l at the Lake-Cook County line down to a low of 29 mg/l at Ogden Avenue in the lower reach of the river.

Fecal coliform counts on the Des Plaines River fluctuated from a low geometric mean of 411 counts per 100 ml at the county line to a high of 8,699 counts per 100 ml in the middle reach and then declined to 1,692 counts per 100 ml at Willow Springs Road.

In comparison with the General Use Standards applicable to that portion of the Des Plaines sampled by the MSDGC, the data presented in Table II-2 shows that concentrations of dissolved oxygen and ammonia-nitrogen are better than those levels mandated by the standard; however, fecal coliform counts exceed allowable levels along portions of the Des Plaines River. In addition, suspended solids concentrations in the river are higher than those allowed under effluent discharge standards.

4. Water Quality Standards

As indicated in Table II-1, Illinois has developed four classifications of water use: general use, public and food processing water supply, restricted use, and Lake Michigan. General use waters should be suitable for supporting aquatic life; all waters except those designated as restricted are for general use. Water standards for public and food processing are somewhat more stringent than those for general use. As noted in Table II-1, all Illinois waters should be suitable for public and food processing water supply except for restricted waters and the Chicago and Little Calumet Rivers. Standards for Lake Michigan are even more stringent than those covering public and food processing water supply.

Those waters classified as restricted (Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life water use) are allowed to meet less stringent water quality standards. All Illinois waterways on the restricted list belong to one of the three major waterways under discussion here. The presentation of water quality data made earlier showed

Table II-2
Summary of Pollutant Concentration Ranges in Chicago's Surface Water Systems

Pollutant	Chicago River — Sanitary and Ship Canal System	Calumet River System	Des Plaines River System	Applicable Illinois Standards* Secondary Contact	General Use
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	1.2 to 7.7 mg/l	3.9 to 9.0 mg/l	6.0 to 10 mg/l	5.0 mg/l[1] 4.0 mg/l (1978)[2] 3.0 mg/l 4.0 mg/l min.[1] 2.0 mg/l min.	6.0 mg/l 5.0 mg/l min.[3]
Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)	5.2 to 9.2 mg/l	4.1 to 7.3 mg/l	5.0 to 6.7 mg/l	4-20 mg/l[4]	4-20 mg/l[4]
Ammonia (as N)	0.8 to 6.2 mg/l	1.3 to 13 mg/l	0.3 to 1.2 mg/l	4.0 mg/l (winter) 2.5 mg/l (summer)	2.6 mg/l[3]
Suspended solids (SS)	19 to 54 mg/l	12 to 73 mg/l	29 to 68 mg/l	5-25 mg/l[5]	5-25 mg/l[5]
Fecal coliform	477 to 12,700 (counts/100 ml)	152 to 738 (counts/100 ml)	411 to 8,700 (counts/100 ml)	1000/100 ml[1]	200/100 ml[2]

* Effluent discharge standards apply if water quality standard is not designated.

1 North Shore Channel Standards

2 Chicago River-Sanitary and Ship Canal System and Calumet River system.

3 General Use Standard applicable to Des Plaines River system.

4 4 mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants
10 mg/l-WSW and Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant
20 mg/l-Lemont Sewage Treatment Plant

5 5mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare STP
12mg/l-WSW and Calumet STP
25mg/l-Lemont STP

that standards for restricted use are not met along sizable segments of all three river systems. This data is summarized and compared to Illinois Standards in Table II-2. For these areas even secondary contact would be ruled out. Eventual use of the substandard segments would depend largely upon improvements in dissolved oxygen, ammonia-nitrogen, and fecal coliform values.

Some Federal guidelines in this area are available in the form of suggested minimum standards for various water uses (see Table II-3). Although these suggested standards do not provide a comprehensive basis for deciding appropriate water uses in the Chicago area, these Federal guidelines do indicate that, if Illinois standards for water use were met, water quality would be suitable on currently substandard segments for designated recreational uses. In addition, if applicable Illinois water quality regulations were met, primary contact would be possible on the river sections not classified as restricted (North Branch of the Chicago River, Des Plaines River upstream from McCook, part of the Little Calumet River, Des Plaines-Illinois River, and Lake Michigan). In other areas at least secondary contact (boating but not swimming or game fishing) would be allowed. These potential water uses, assuming Illinois water quality standards are met, are shown in Figure II-3.

(2) Surface Water Quantity

Data on the flows and elevation levels of the major surface waterways in the Chicago area are presented below. These surface waterways include the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal, Des Plaines River, Calumet River, Lake Calumet, and Lake Michigan. For the river systems, the existing low, mean, and high flow rates (annual average) are provided for specific locations. For the river systems and lakes, the low, mean, and high surface evaluation levels (annual average) are given based on U.S. Geological Survey Datum. (Elevation 579.48 USGS corresponds to Elevation 0.00 Chicago City Datum.)

1. Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal

Annual average flow rates (low, mean, and maximum) for gaging stations along the North

Table II-3[1]

Minimum Federal Standards for Selected Water Uses[a]

	General Recreational[b]	Designated Recreational[c]	Primary Contact[d]	Growth of Freshwater Organisms
Fecal Coliform				
Mean	2,000/100 ml	1,000/100 ml	200/100 ml	-
Maximum	4,000/100 ml	2,000/100 ml	400/100 ml	-
pH				
Normal Range			6.5-8.3	-
Absolute Range			5.0-9.0	6.0-9.0
Dissolved Oxygen				
Coldwater Biota				
Mean				7.0 mg/l
Spawning Mean				6.0 mg/l
Normal Mean				4.0 mg/l
Warm Water Biota				
Mean				5.0 mg/l
Minimum				4.0 mg/l
Total Dissolved Solids				
Maximum			1,500 mg/l	

a These are suggested standards.

b General recreational use areas are those areas suitable for human use in recreation activities not involving significant risks of ingestion without reference to official designation of recreation as a water use.

c Designated recreational use areas are those areas suitable for recreational activities not involving significant risks of ingestion and officially designated as a recreation area.

d Primary contact use areas are those areas suitable for human use in recreation activities involving significant risks of ingestion.

1 Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, U.S. Department of Interior, Water Quality Criteria: Report of the National Technical Advisory Committee, April 1, 1968, Washington, D.C. (U.S. EPA expects to publish later this year a set of guidelines to replace this report.)

Table II-3[1]
Minimum Federal Standards for Selected Water Uses[a]

	General Recreational[b]	Designated Recreational[c]	Primary Contact[d]	Growth of Freshwater Organisms
Fecal Coliform				
Mean	2,000/100 ml	1,000/100 ml	200/100 ml	-
Maximum	4,000/100 ml	2,000/100 ml	400/100 ml	-
pH				
Normal Range			6.5-8.3	-
Absolute Range			5.0-9.0	6.0-9.0
Dissolved Oxygen				
Coldwater Biota				
Mean				7.0 mg/l
Spawning Mean				6.0 mg/l
Normal Mean				4.0 mg/l
Warm Water Biota				
Mean				5.0 mg/l
Minimum				4.0 mg/l
Total Dissolved Solids				
Maximum			1,500 mg/l	

a These are suggested standards.

b General recreational use areas are those areas suitable for human use in recreation activities not involving significant risks of ingestion without reference to official designation of recreation as a water use.

c Designated recreational use areas are those areas suitable for recreational activities not involving significant risks of ingestion and officially designated as a recreation area.

d Primary contact use areas are those areas suitable for human use in recreation activities involving significant risks of ingestion.

1 Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, U.S. Department of Interior, Water Quality Criteria: Report of the National Technical Advisory Committee, April 1, 1968, Washington, D.C. (U.S. EPA expects to publish later this year a set of guidelines to replace this report.)

FIGURE II-3
Recreational Uses of Chicago Waterways Assuming Illinois Standards Are Met



Branch of the Chicago River for the years 1960 to 1969 are shown in Table II-4. Also shown in Table II-4 are the stream stages corresponding to the annual maximum flow rate. As the table shows, the lowest mean stream flow for the North Branch, 2.48 cubic feet per second (CFS), occurred in 1963 while the highest values for mean flow, 118 CFS and 112 CFS, were recorded in 1965 and 1969, respectively. Over this 10-year period, the largest fluctuation in stream elevation at maximum flow, was almost four feet. It was recorded at the gaging station farthest downstream and measured from 611.82 feet to 608.08 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL). Table II-4 also contains flow data for the same period recorded farther downstream at the Lockport Lock on the Sanitary and Ship Canal. At this point, lowest values for mean flow, 3359 CFS and 3342 CFS, were observed in 1963 and 1964 while the highest value for mean flow, 3473 CFS, was recorded in 1962. The water depth and flow rate in the Sanitary and Ship Canal is maintained at a nearly constant level by additions from Lake Michigan to allow navigation.

2. Calumet River System

The Calumet River, from 1971 through October 1975 had an average flow rate of 335 CFS with high and low flow values of 4,378 CFS and 238 CFS, respectively, as measured just downstream of O'Brien Lock and Dam. The river level at this point fluctuated six feet over that four-year period, or between 582.98 and 576.98 feet with a mean elevation of 577.58 feet above MSL.

Little Calumet River over the same period had a mean flow rate of 324 CFS with high and low flow extremes of 3,176 CFS and 38 CFS, respectively. Surface water levels ranged from 582.98 and 576.98 feet with a mean level of 577.38 feet above MSL.

In the Calumet-Sag Channel over the period from 1966 to 1975 estimates of flow rates past the Cal-Sag Junction ranged from a low of 293 CFS to a high of 10,000 CFS with a mean value of 1,078 CFS. Levels in the Cal-Sag Channel varied 5.4 feet from 580.88 to 575.48 feet with a mean elevation of 577.18 feet above MSL.

Table II-4

Annual Average Flow Rates[1] and Maximum Stream Stages[2] Along the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal, 1960-1969

Year	North Branch, Chicago River at Deerfield				West Fork - North Branch, Chicago River at Northbrook				North Branch, Chicago River at Niles				Sanitary and Ship Canal at Lockport			
	Flow Rate (CFS)			Elevation	Flow Rate (CFS)			Elevation	Flow Rate (CFS)			Elevation	Flow Rate (CFS)			Elevation
	Min.	Mean	Max.	(Max.Ft.)	Min.	Mean	Max.	(Max.Ft.)	Min.	Mean	Max.	(Max.Ft.)	Min.	Mean	Max.	(Max.Ft.)
1960	0	15.6	284	648.47	0.7	11.5	275	645.99	7.7	92.3	1340	610.14	494	3427	16834	
1961	0	10.3	178	647.68	0	11.0	502	644.85	6.0	73.5	1290	610.11	462	3411	19423	
1962	0	11.8	268	647.74	0	9.09	428	644.54	2.4	63.1	1010	609.37	181	3473	16860	
1963	0	2.48	134	646.98	0.10	4.15	350	644.19	4.0	29.7	905	609.13	157	3359	22801	
1964	0	8.02	228	647.34	0.20	9.49	298	644.67	5.6	57.3	810	608.81	164	3342	16286	
1965	0.10	23.3	208	647.46	0.20	15.5	285	643.84	10.0	118	658	608.08	508	3413	19268	
1966	0	13.0	311	647.96	1.20	10.8	390	644.98	6.8	91.9	1360	610.24	530	3363	25508	
1967	0	14.3	386	648.34	0.80	13.4	712	646.84	6.9	93.7	2210	611.82	168	3439	18154	
1968	0.26	8.69	173	647.25	3.20	9.91	397	644.33	8.9	63.0	858	608.95	461	3422	28598	
1969	0.39	21.4	359	648.26	3.10	17.2	634	645.58	14.0	112	1300	610.86	197	3400	19738	

1 USGS, *Surface Water Supply of the United States*, "Water Supply Papers Corresponding to Upper Mississippi River Basin Below Keokuk, Iowa," 1971

2 for stream stage data: U.S. Department of Commerce, *Hydrograph of Monthly Mean Levels of the Great Lakes*, 1971

3. Des Plaines River System

Data for 1970 on flow and water elevation were reported by the Illinois Division of Waterways for two gaging stations along the Des Plaines River and for one station on Salt Creek. At Hoffman Dam on the Des Plaines River the mean yearly flow rate was found to be 890 CFS, with average high and low flow rates of 3,800 CFS and 366 CFS, respectively. Water elevation varied from 606.88 feet at low flow to 612.78 feet at flood level with a mean elevation of 609.48 feet above MSL.

Further upstream at the Des Plaines Gage stream flow averaged 503 CFS with average high and low flow rates of 2,000 CFS and 215 CFS, respectively. Water elevations measured at this point fluctuated about a mean of 627.28 feet above MSL with high and low elevations of 629.88 feet and 626.78 feet recorded, respectively.

The Western Springs Gage on Salt Creek registered high and low flow rates of 1,050 CFS and 85 CFS, respectively, with a calculated mean flow rate of 137 CFS. Stream elevation fell to between 631.88 feet and 625.68 feet above MSL with a mean elevation of 626.98 feet.

4. Lake Calumet and Lake Michigan

The surface elevations of these two lakes, as observed from 1900 through 1974, have varied together from 585.08 feet to 576.68 feet above MSL with a common mean elevation of 579.38 feet.

(3) Flow Regulation

Serious public health problems involving contamination of the city's drinking water supply led Chicago to implement measures to protect Lake Michigan, an important source of drinking water, from pollution. The approach adopted was to alter the drainage pattern of the area through the construction of a system of canals, locks, and sluice gates. Under this program the natural flow of several waterways into Lake Michigan was diverted and in some cases reversed so that rainfall runoff drained away from Lake Michigan and into the Illinois

River. This program led to the creation of the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal System and to the modification of the Calumet River System as described below.

1. Control Measures

The Sanitary and Ship Canal was completed in 1900 followed by the completion of the North Shore Channel in 1910. The construction of this system allowed surface water flow from the North Branch of the Chicago River, the North Shore Channel, the Chicago River and the South Branch of the Chicago River to be discharged to the Illinois River rather than to Lake Michigan, the original receiving body. Water levels in the Chicago River are now controlled by a system of sluice gates. Navigation is made possible by a boat lock at Wilmette.

Similarly, the completion of the Calumet-Sag Channel in 1922 allowed the MSDGC to either fully or partially reverse the flow of the Little Calumet, the Grand Calumet, and the Calumet Rivers away from Lake Michigan. These rivers now flow, by means of the Calumet·Sag Channel, into the Sanitary and Ship Canal at Sag Junction. Water levels in the Calumet River System are regulated by the Thomas J. O'Brien Controlling Works and Locks on the Calumet River.

2. Stormwater Runoff

The lock system is designed to prevent the flow of polluted water into Lake Michigan. Prior to a storm the water level in the Sanitary and Ship Canal is lowered at Lockport to accommodate expected runoff volumes. Storms generating in excess of 0.1 inch of runoff exceed the capacity of the interceptor sewers and cause an overflow of rainwater and raw sewage into local waterways at about 640 locations. This currently happens approximately 100 times per year.[1] Under severe circumstances rainfall runoff surpasses even the

1 MSDGC, "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Revised January 1975.

storage capacity of the river systems, threatening widespread flooding of the combined sewer area. Water levels at the controlling locks, located at Wilmette on the North Shore Channel, at the mouth of the Chicago River, and at O'Brien Lock on the Calumet River, are allowed to rise to heights of five feet, three feet, and three feet, respectively, above Chicago City Datum (approximately the level of Lake Michigan). Above this point, impounded waters are released to Lake Michigan to prevent severe flooding. Over the last 21 years there have been 30 occasions on which the locks were opened to Lake Michigan, releasing biological oxygen demand (BOD) substances, sediment, phosphorus, and other pollutants.

Releases made during the summer cause the closing of public beaches until coliform counts are reduced to safe levels. Other impacts include flooding of basements and ground floors of homes and businesses as well as flooding of major transportation arteries. Navigation along waterways is disrupted during the drawing down of waterway levels in anticipation of a storm and does not return to normal until channel levels and velocities have subsided.

(4) Domestic Water Supply

Lake Michigan traditionally supplies most of the drinking water for the Chicago area. Withdrawal of water from the lake was essentially unlimited until 1930 when the U.S. Supreme Court set a ceiling of 1,500 CFS including domestic pumpage. The amount was revised upward in 1970 to 3,200 CFS including domestic pumpage. This amount of water taken from Lake Michigan over a period of 1 year, 2,317,000 acre-feet in all, supplies most domestic needs and supplements waterway flows, allowing for improved effluent dilution and nagivation.

The 3,200 CFS allotment is divided among three uses: domestic needs, indirect diversion, and direct diversion. Indirect diversion is that estimated quantity of stormwater runoff which formerly drained directly into Lake Michigan but which now is diverted to other area waterways. This amount varies depending upon yearly rainfall. In 1970, domestic use constituted about 50 percent or 1,600 CFS of the total of 3,200 CFS. This amount supplied the water needs of 4,520,000 people within the city of Chicago service area.

When the water supplied for domestic use and the water diverted from Lake Michigan (indirect diversion) are subtracted from the 3,200 CFS allotment, the amount remaining is available for direct diversion use, i.e., diversion to local waterways for effluent dilution and for navigation. The relationship among these three components of Lake Michigan pumpage is portrayed in Figure II-4.

It is clear from the discussion that as domestic water needs increase, less water will be available for direct diversion uses. This assumes that the 3,200 CFS ceiling is to be maintained and that indirect diversion remains relatively constant. Present water supplies are adequate for current needs but increases in population and in commercial and industrial water users are likely to lead to increased demands for water. Although some of this demand may be met by increased groundwater utilization, groundwater pumpage in some portions of the Chicago area already exceeds recharge. By storing combined sewer overflow until it can be treated and released to area waterways, the proposed tunnel systems with their total storage capacity of 9,200 acre-feet will help to alleviate dilution and navigation problems to an extent dependent on the frequency and severity of storms.

(5) Benthal Deposits

Raw sewage sludge and sediment washed into surface waterways during overflow episodes add to the pollution load. Organic material deposited in this manner degrades water quality by consuming oxygen during its stabilization and by liberating BOD to overlying waters. During stabilization of the organic wastes anaerobic as well as aerobic conditions prevail as the depth of the deposits increases. Figure II-5 illustrates the accumulation of benthal (bottom) deposits in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal from below the Lockport Lock to just above Damen Avenue. Canal deposits lying between Willow Springs Road and Damen Avenue range from about five to 13 feet in depth. Waterway deposits

FIGURE II-4
Components of Lake Michigan Diversion[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, p. 114.

FIGURE II-5
Benthal Deposits in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal[1]



1 MSDGC - Alternative Management Plans for Control of Flood and Pollution Problems due to Combined Sewer Discharges in the General Service Area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, p. 129.

measured by the MSDGC as part of the bottom sampling program are shown in Figure A-1 of Appendix A. Sampling locations shown on the map are described in Table A-4 of Appendix A.

The full impact on water quality of sediment deposited during combined sewer overflow events is not always felt immediately. The stabilization of organic material deposited during the winter months is suppressed because of the cold temperatures. This ultimately results in heavy biological loading of the waterways during the summer months with the overdriving of the assimilative capacity of the rivers and streams. The intense demand for oxygen in the waterways during the warm months after leads to anaerobic conditions in the deposited material and septic or near-septic conditions do not meet minimum Illinois standards for restricted water use as described in Section 2.1.1, Surface Water Quality.

2.1.2 Groundwater

Quality and quantity of subsurface waters are of major importance to the construction and operation of the tunnel system. This section describes the groundwater regime of the Chicago area in Cook County.

(1) General Hydrogeology

As summarized in Table II-5, there are two main aquifer systems within the study area: the upper aquifer comprised of glacial drift and dolomites, and the lower (Cambro-Ordovician) aquifer comprised of dolomites and sandstones. Unconsolidated Quaternary deposits and Silurian dolomites of the upper aquifer are hydraulically connected and function as a single water bearing unit, except in localized areas where impermeable strata separate them and perched water conditions exist. Clayey deposits in the glacial drift act as confining layers and thus, create artesian conditions in the upper aquifer. Ordovician shales and dolomites of Maquoketa Group (on the average 150 feet thick) separate the upper and lower aquifers and act an an effective aquiclude.

Table II-5
Generalized Hydrology of the Chicago Area

System	Series or Group	Hydrology
Quaternary	Pleistocene	Upper Aquifer
Silucian	Niagaran Alexandrian	
Orduvician	Maquoketa	Aquiclude
	Galena	
	Platteville	
	Ancell	Lower Aquifer
	Prairie Du Chien	
Cambrian		

The lower aquifer includes dolomite and sandstone formations extending from the base of the Maquoketa Group to the top of the Eau Claire shales (Cambrian). Average thickness of the upper aquifer is approximately 400 feet, while average thickness of the lower aquifer is about 1,000 feet.

(2) Recharge-Discharge Relationships

Sources of groundwater recharge to the upper aquifer are precipitation and influent stream infiltration. In general, response of water levels to precipitation is rapid. The lower aquifer is recharged in parts of McHenry, Kane, and DeKalb Counties where the Maquoketa aquiclude outcrops and further west where the Maquoketa has been removed by erosion. The lower aquifer has a lower potentiometric head than the upper aquifer; therefore, the lower aquifer is also recharged by leakage from the upper aquifer through confining layers of Maquoketa shales. Vertical permeability of the Maquoketa shales is about $5x10^{-5}$ gpd/ft^2, and the calculated[1] recharge to the lower aquifer, for the northeast Illinois area, is about 2,100 gpd/mi^2.

1 Walton, W.C., "Selected Analytical Methods for Well and Aquifer Evaluation," Illinois State Water Survey, Bulletin 49, 1962.

Groundwater is discharged primarily by pumping activities in the area. Water levels fluctuate widely and are indicative of these activities. Groundwater also discharges as base flow to streams and to Lake Michigan. In addition, a relatively small amount is consumed by evapotranspiration.

(3) Water Levels - Areal and Temporal Character

A contour map of the potentiometric surfaces of the lower aquifer in the region around the study area is provided in Figure II-6. The figure indicates several significant cones of depression in the lower aquifer around major pumping centers in Cook County. Consequently, the direction of groundwater flow in the study area is toward these potentiometric depressions. Figure II-7, showing potentiometric contours of the upper aquifer, indicates that similar depressions occur in the vicinity of McCook and Thornton quarries, the locations of the proposed storage reservoirs. These depressions are attributed to long-term quarry dewatering operations. Elsewhere, groundwater levels exhibit a low gradient.

In the Chicago Central Business are (CBA), Lake Michigan appears to be recharging the aquifer, while a piezometric high in the area north of Belmont Avenue indicates the aquifer may be discharging into the Lake. The lower water levels in the CBA probably result from dewatering operations in deep basements of commercial buildings. The groundwater contour configuration does not indicate that the Chicago River and the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal are hydraulically connected to the upper aquifer.[1]

With regard to temporal fluctuations in water levels, long-term records indicate that the most

---

1 Harza Engineering Company (HEC), Geotechnical Design Report: Tunnel and Reservoir Plan - Mainstream Tunnel System, August 1975.

FIGURE II-6
Elevation*of Piezometric Surface of
Lower (Cambrian-Ordovician)
Aquifer in October 1971[1]



*mean sea level (msl)

1 Sasman, R.T., C.R. Benson, G.L. Dzurisin and N.E. Risk, "Water Level Decline and Pumpage in Deep Wells in Northern Illinois, 1966-1971," Illinois State Water Survey, Circular 113, 1973.

Table II-6
Permeabilities of Aquifers in the Chicago Area[1]

Aquifer	Geologic System	Series, Group or Formation	Thickness Ft.	Transmissibility gpd/ft.	Storage (HEC & Bauer Engineering, Inc., 1969)	Permeability	
						10^{-4} ft/min	10^{-4} cm/sec
Upper Aquifer	Silurian	Niagara-Alexandrian	394	400		1	0.5
Lower Aquifer	Cambrian-Ordovician		1,058	22,400		21	11
		Galena-Platteville	323	300		1	0.4
		Glenwood-St. Peter	91	500	0.00013	5	3
		Prairie du Chien, Eminence and Potosil	340	17,500	0.0005	50	24
		Franconia	127	3,500	0.0012	40	20
		Ironton-Galesville	172	13,200	0.000075	82	42

1 Harza Engineering Company, "Development of a Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area," Geology and Water Supply, Technical Report Part 4, December 1972.

Table II-7
Results of Tests in the Upper Aquifer[1] (Silurian Dolomite)

Well Location	Type of Aquifer Test	Pumping Recharge or Inflow Rate (gpm)	1-Day Specific Capacity (gpm/dd or Buildup in Feet)	Average Coefficient of Transmissivity gpd/ft	Average Coefficient of Storage Dimensionless)	Remarks	Permeable Zones	Depth
NW side of McCook Quarry	Pumping Recharge Recharge	400 505 730	11.5 10 [illegible] [illegible]	30,150	1.4×10^{-4}	Widespread homogeneous conditions	Upper half of Edgewood formation, lower Racine thru Romeo and Markgraf Members	290-340' 210-255
SW side of McCook Quarry	Bail	5	-	130	4.0×10^{-5}		Limited, sporadic zones in Racine Formation (interreef)	45-90
NE side of McCook Quarry	Pumping	62	0.7	1,780	1.0×10^{-5}	Polluted water, negative boundary about 1/2 mile S of site	Interreef of Racine middle Edgewood Romeo-Markgraf contact	110-120 307-317 182-192
SE corner of McCook Quarry	Pumping	42	0.4	295	1.3×10^{-5}	Slight leaky aquifer conditions, no hydraulic connection w/river; coefficient of leakage through aquitard ave. 0.00062 gpd/ft^2	Lower Kankakee down 75' thru most of Deadwood (extremely permeable)	
1 mile NE of McCook Quarry	Bail	15	-	530	1.0×10^{-4}	Partially penetrating monitoring well	Upper Silurian dolomite	65-133 and 149-154
1 mile south of Thornton Quarry	Bail	2.5	-	14	1.0×10^{-4}		Interreef Racine	Upper 100'
1 2 mile west of Thornton Quarry	Pumping	440 Av.	3.8	18,900	2.4×10^{-4}	At least two negative boundaries close to test well	Racine reef	Top of rock -140' and 100-140 @ test well

1 HEC, 1975.

which resulted in a potential yield of 92 MGD for the Silurian dolomites of the upper aquifer and 6 MGD for the glacial sand and gravel sediments.[1]

Groundwater use in the area is currently extensive. In 1970, pumpage from glacial sand and gravel was about 3 to 4 MGD and about 36.5 MGD from shallow dolomites. Therefore, about 59 percent of the total potential yield was undeveloped. Pumpage of the lower aquifer, however, was more extensive and exceeded practical sustained yield in the vicinity of Summit by 2.3 times. By 1966, water levels in the Chicago, Des Plaines, and Elmhurst pumping centers declined below levels at the top of the lower (Cambro-Ordovician) aquifer, resulting in some dewatering of the Galena-Platteville strata. Figures II-8 and II-9 provide an indication of groundwater deficiencies that may result if water demands projected through the year 2020 are realized. Groundwater conservation and management will be necessary in the future to optimize use of groundwater resources.

(6) Chemical Characteristics

Tabulated water quality data from test wells in the study area, for both the upper and lower aquifers,[2] is presented in Table A-5 of Appendix A. Several constituents found in the upper Silurian aquifer (e.g., Fe, SO_4, and turbidity) are highly variable. Water from Galena-Platteville strata (lower aquifer) has a higher mineral content and more uniform water quality characteristics than the upper aquifer. In general, water quality from different geologic series throughout the lower aquifer does not change significantly with depth.

---

1 Moench, A.F. and A.P. Visocky, "A Preliminary Least Cost Study of Future Groundwater Development in Northeast Illinois," Illinois State Water Survey, Circular 101, 1971.

2 Buschbach, T.C. and George E. Heim, "Preliminary Geologic Investigations of Rock Tunnel Sites for Flood and Pollution Control in the Greater Chicago Area," Illinois State Geological Survey Environmental Geology Notes, Number 52, 1972.

FIGURE II-8
Projected Groundwater
Deficiencies[1]-Natural Recharge



1 Schicht and Moench, 1971.

FIGURE II-9
Projected Groundwater
Deficiencies[1] - Natural
Recharge and Mining



1 Schicht and Moench, 1971.

Water hardness in the lower (Cambro-Ordovician) aquifer increases towards the east in the study area from about 350 ppm in the vicinity of the Des Plaines River to about 600 ppm near Lake Michigan.[1] In this same area, chloride concentrations also show west to east increases from about 40 ppm at the river to 150 ppm at the lake.[1]

During late 1974, water quality tests were performed on samples obtained from test wells penetrating the upper aquifer. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table A-6 of Appendix A. The concentrations of many constituents are greater and more variable than those reported in Table A-5 for the upper aquifer. With the exception of the test well located on the NE side of McCook Quarry (see Figure II-6), water hardness was high due to the presence of calcium sulfate. Water from the NE-McCook well was polluted with high concentrations of COD, ammonia, surfactants, metals, and coliform bacteria which may have originated from a nearby landfill site.

2.1.3 Pollution Sources

Surface water quality in the area served by the combined-sewer system is dependent upon inputs from three major sources; sanitary outfalls, industrial waste outfalls and combined-sewer overflows. Characteristics of these sources of input and the implications for area water quality are discussed in the following sections.

(1) Municipal Waste Loads

Six wastewater treatment facilities are currently in operation within the MSDGC service area. They are Streamwood, Hanover, Lemont, Northside, West-Southwest and Calumet. Location for these plants and for the John E. Egan Water Reclamation Plant, which is currently nearing full-scale operation are shown in Figure II-10. Outfalls from the existing facilities are adjacent to the plants. Characteristics of the existing treatment

---

1 Suter, et al, 1959.

FIGURE II-10
Locations of MSDGC
Wastewater Treatment
Facilities



facilities, including the receiving stream, the average flow for 1973, and the average influent and effluent concentration of BOD, SS, and ammonia nitrogen are presented in Table II-8.

The largest treatment plants; West-Southwest, Northside and Calumet, provide preliminary, primary and secondary treatment using chlorination and post-aeration. Hanover, Lemont and Streamwood provide preliminary, primary, secondary and tertiary treatment using chlorination and post-aeration. The John E. Egan plant, presently nearing operation, will also provide tertiary treatment.

Both BOD and SS concentrations easily meet the Federal guidelines of 30 mg/l (roughly equivalent to 30 ppm) for each. Although more stringent Illinois discharge standards for BOD, SS and ammonia nitrogen (see Table II-8) do not have to be met until December 31, 1977, most of the MSDGC plants are already in compliance with the BOD and SS standards, 10 mg/l and 12 mg/l, respectively, and two plants better the ammonia nitrogen standard.

(2) Industrial Waste Loads

Industrial waste flows sent to MSDGC treatment plants total about 195 MGD, broken down as follows: 135 MGD to the West-Southwest facility, 22 MGD to the Northside facility and 38 MGD to the Calumet plant. In addition there are other industrial and privately-owned treatment plants which discharges in the area as shown in Figure A-2 of Appendix A. Discharges from these sources are subject to the MSDGC Sewage and Waste Control Ordinance and must meet the State of Illinois effluent discharge standards shown in Table II-1.

(3) Combined-Sewer Overflows

Chicago area waterways are subject to increased pollutant inputs from the combined sewers during periods of overflow. Rainfall runoff in excess of about 0.1 inches leads to discharge of raw sewage and runoff at about 640 outfalls in the area. Such events occur approximately 100 times per year, injecting BOD, SS, grease, pathogenic organisms and other pollutants into the waterways in large quantities. During such events minimum Illinois standards for restricted use waters are not met.

Table II-8
Pollutant Removal Efficiencies of MSDGC Wastewater Treatment Plants - 1973[1]

Plant	Receiving Stream	Average Flow[1]	Average BOD			Average Suspended Solids[1]			Ammonia Nitrogen		
		(MGD)	Influent[1] (ppm)	Effluent[2] (ppm)	% Reduction	Influent (ppm)	Effluent (ppm)	% Reduction	Influent[1] (ppm)	Effluent[2] (ppm)	% Reduction
West-South-West	Sanitary and Ship Canal	866	183	11.3	94%	222	9	96%	7.3	5.8	21%
North-side	North Shore Channel	344	115	10	91%	126	13	90%	10.5	4.1	61%
Calumet	Calumet River	210	145	20	86%	122	12	90%	20.8	15	28%
Hanover	Salt Creek	5.6	164	3	98%	202	5	98%	16.1	1	94%
Streamwood	Poplar Creek	2.4	132	9*	93%	178	16*	91%	Not Avail.	12	-
Lemont	Sanitary and Ship Canal	0.9	184	2	99%	282	3	99%	9.1	0.2	98%

* Average of last six months of 1973 after plant modifications

1 MSDGC, "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Revised January 1975, pp. M-V-2, 4.

2 Effluent concentrations for West-Southwest, North-side, Calumet and Lemont plants taken from "Evaluation of Water Quality of Chicago Area Streams," Harza Engineering Company, March 1976, pp III-13,14.

Beyond the immediate impact of the combined-sewer overflow are long-term effects on water quality. Sewage solids that settle in the waterways eventually decompose liberating BOD in the stream and decreasing the dissolved oxygen (DO) content of the waters. The stabilization of sewage solids is suppressed during the cold months so that the maximum impact on the waterways results in the summer months when other pollutant loadings are also high. Figures II-11, 12, and 13 show DO profiles developed by the MSDGC which simulate existing dry weather conditions in the North Shore Channel and North Branch of the Chicago River, in the Chicago River and Sanitary and Ship Canal, and in the Calumet River and Calumet-Sag Channel. 1977 Illinois standards for DO are shown with each figure. Maintenance of DO concentrations at mandated levels during the critical summer months is possible only if benthal loads deposited during combined-sewer overflow episodes are eliminated. The magnitude of the problems is so great that combined-sewer overflows constitute the largest obstacle to attaining state water quality standards. Estimates of BOD released to area waterways during the approximately 100 yearly overflow occurrences indicate that on an average basis BOD from sewer overflow nearly equals the total BOD output for all six MSDGC treatment plants.[1]

2.1.4 Water Management Programs

Management of area water resources is being addressed in the Chicago area by a variety of programs on a regional and local basis. These programs and their relationship with the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan are discussed briefly below.

(1) The Chicago Metropolitan Area River Basin Plan (CMARBP)

The CMARBP program focuses on eliminating further pollution of the Chicago Basin and developing management strategy to meet water quality goals. The basin plan will assess the extent of pollution in the basin's waters as well as define the nature and volume of pollutants that can be discharged and still meet certain minimum water quality standards. The plan will also

1 Hearing on the Proposed Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Chicago, Illinois, March 28, 1974.

FIGURE II-11
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Existing Conditions Along North Shore Channel[1]



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

FIGURE II-12
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Existing Conditions Along Calumet River System[1]



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

FIGURE II-13
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Existing Conditions Along Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal[1]



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1975.

establish priorities for the construction and modification of treatment plants. Principal agencies in this study are the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the MSDGC. The plan explicitly recognizes the need for TARP as part of a larger plan for upgrading water quality of the Chicago area.

(2) <u>208 Planning Program</u>

An areawide waste treatment management planning program, as required under Section 208 of PL 92-500, has been initiated under the direction of Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) which is the designated planning agency. Their effort will take about two years and culminate in a comprehensive regional report which will address the results of several management programs currently underway.

Under the 208 Program, sampling projects will be conducted to assess and characterize:

- Existing water quality.
- The extent of floodwater pollution
- Benthic conditions
- Diversity and abundance of aquatic life.

Data resulting from the planned 45 in-stream monitoring stations will provide input to a computerized water quality model. This model will be used to project the impact of additional development and system response to suggested water resource management strategies.

The regional overview gained from the 208 Planning Program is expected to provide the additional documentation needed to substantiate the requirement for planned waterway improvements, of which TARP is a major component.

(3) <u>The Chicago-South End of Lake Michigan (C-SELM) Study</u>

The C-SELM Study represents another regional approach to wastewater management. C-SELM discusses various methods to treat all wastewater flows in the Chicago area. Methods considered include: advanced physical/chemical treatment of wastes, advanced techniques for biological treatment, and spray irrigation of effluent in a land disposal system. The study assumes that an underground conveyance and storage system would be adopted.

(4) Thornton Quarry Flood Control Project

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service is currently considering using a portion of Thornton Quarry as a flood reservoir. Flows during peak rainfall periods would be routed from Thorn Creek on the region's far south side to the quarry. TARP also plans to use the quarry for storing combined-sewer overflows until treatment measures can be applied. Different areas of the quarry and separate facilities may have to be employed so that this project and TARP are compatible and complementary.

(5) City of Chicago Sewer Construction Program

Auxiliary outlet sewers are planned for areas within the city as well as for some suburban communities. This program will increase the conveyance capacity of the sewer systems in the local tributary areas. TARP is currently designed to accommodate the projected increased flow rate.

(6) Area Treatment Plant Upgrading and Expansion

As part of its effort to improve water quality, the MSDGC plans significant upgrading and expansion of existing wastewater treatment plants. Modification of the West-Southwest, North-Side and Calumet plants is proposed as an integral part of the effort to meet Illinois water quality standards.

(7) Des Plaines River Watershed - Floodwater Management Plan

This program is being carried out under the sponsorship of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the MSDGC. The plan affects the Des Plaines River and its tributary streams. Significant aspects include:

- A land treatment program
- Flood plain management
- Construction of flood-retarding structures.

(8) Du Page County - Salt Creek Study

This plan, sponsored by the Forest Preserve District of Du Page County and the Illinois Division of Water Resources, was developed for flood prevention along Salt Creek. It employs land use zoning and the construction of flood-retaining structures.

(9) Addison Creek Improvements

The Illinois Division of Water Resources plans the construction of a retention reservoir near George Street and a channel bypass from a point near where the creek enters Cook County to the vicinity of Mannheim Road. Four flood-retention reservoirs would ultimately be constructed.

(10) Dredging of Illinois Waterways

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers currently performs regular maintenance dredging of the major river systems in the MSDGC's service area. The dredging of oxygen-depleting wastes in the waterways is important in the upgrading of dissolved oxygen concentrations in the waterways.

(11) Lakefront Plan

The city of Chicago's ambitious Lakefront Plan calls for extensive new recreational improvements along the Lake Michigan shoreline. Development alternatives include:

- Expanding the park base through shoreline extension
- Expanding the park base through shoreline extension and creation of sheltered water areas either through the use of peninsulas or through the construction of off-shore breakwaters
- Expanding the park base through the development of islands as well as shoreline extensions.

Enhanced use of the waterways is an essential goal of the plan and contingent upon the extent of water quality improvements largely as a result of TARP. The broader aspects of the plan are discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use.

2.2 LAND RESOURCES

The following section describes the land resources of the Chicago metropolitan area, and is divided into separate discussions of drainage basins, flood prone areas, geology, and seismicity.

2.2.1 Drainage Basins

Construction of the Sanitary and Ship Canal in 1900 and the Calumet-Sag Channel in 1922 significantly altered drainage patterns around Lake Michigan. Drainage from an area of about 70 square miles north of downtown Chicago and along Lake Michigan previously flowed to Lake Michigan. Now, however, this drainage feeds the Illinois waterways via the Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal System. In addition, reversal of water flow through the Calumet-Sag Channel has diverted normal flow from the area around Lake Calumet away from Lake Michigan and into the Illinois waterways. Ultimately, the Illinois Waterway System flows into the Illinois River along with two other large tributaries, the Des Plaines River and the Du Page River.

The overall low relief of the combined-sewer system area makes it prone to flooding from sewer system backups. The sewer system is designed to contain a five-year storm. Total land area flooded by storms larger than present sewer capacity is given below:

Event	Size of Flooded Area (Sq.Mi.)
Ten Year Storm	50
Twenty-five Year Storm	161
Fifty Year Storm	210
One Hundred Year Storm	254

Figures II-14 through II-17 show graphically the spread of flooding throughout the combined-sewer system area as a result of successively larger storms.

FIGURE II-14
Areas with Drainage
Problems During 10-Year
Storm[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pp. 105-108.

FIGURE II-15
Areas with Drainage
Problems During 25-Year
Storm[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pp. 105-108.

FIGURE II-16
Areas with Drainage
Problems During 50-Year
Storm[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pp. 105-108.

FIGURE II-17
Areas with Drainage
Problems During 100-Year
Storm[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pp. 105-108.

2.2.2 Flood-Prone Areas

The lack of topographic relief throughout the Chicago area is a significant factor in overbank flooding. Because high waterway elevations can seriously affect sewer hydraulic capacity, overbank flooding often occurs concomitantly with combined-sewer backup. Areas subject to overbank flooding are shown in Figure II-18.

The greatest potential area for overbank flooding lies along the North Branch of the Chicago River and in the Calumet River System. Releases of flood waters to Lake Michigan at Wilmette, at the mouth of the Chicago River, and throughout the Calumet River have largely forestalled overbank flooding along the North Shore Channel, the North and South Branches of the Chicago River, and the Calumet River. Were such releases not allowed, significant overbank and basement flooding would occur in these areas. Along the Des Plaines River, flooding is limited chiefly to forest preserve lands.

2.2.3 Geology

The Chicago area lies on the broad, gently sloping, northwesterly-trending Kankakee Arch. This arch connects the Wisconsin Arch to the northwest with the Cincinnati Arch to the southwest and is a structural high separating the Michigan Basin from the Illinois Basin. The northeast part of the Chicago area lies on the northeastern side of the arch and the lower Paleozoic formations here dip eastward. The southwestern portion of the area lies on the southwest flank of the arch and the upper Paleozoic sediments dip southwest toward the Illinois Basin. Erosion of the Kankakee Arch has exposed older geologic units along the arch and younger rocks along the flanks.

The oldest rocks in the region are of Precambrian age, collectively known as the basement complex, and can be found in several northern states areas. These rocks are composed of metamorphic and igneous materials which were subjected to complex tectonic and erosional processes prior to the deposition of the oldest Paleozoic sediments. The effects of erosion results in stratigraphic breaks, or unconformities in the sedimentary rock sequence. A sharp unconformity marks the division between these Precambrian rocks and the lowest Cambrian rocks.

FIGURE II-18
Areas Subject to Overbank Flooding[1]



1 MSDGC Environmental Assessment - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pg. 101.

In the immediate Chicago area, the Precambrian/Cambrian unconformity is 3,000 to 5,000 feet below the surface. The Cambrian rock is composed of marine deposits comprising both near-shore and deeper water sediments. The rocks are predominately sandstones in the lower portion and mixed sandstones, siltstones, dolomites, and sandy dolomites in the upper portion. These sediments represent a sea that covered the entire region. Only a minor unconformity separates the Cambrian and lower Ordovician rocks.

After the deposition of the lower Ordovician, erosion occurred and the middle Ordovician lies directly on Cambrian strata or truncates lower Ordovician rocks. The unconformity is irregular and is locally marked by sandstone-filled valleys and sinkholes. This unconformity is exposed in areas to the west, south, and north but lies 300 to 1,000 feet deep within the Chicago region. The erosion in lower Ordovician time may represent an earlier movement along the Kankakee Arch.[1] The Ordovician sediments include sandstone, shale, dolomite, and limestone, and are considered to be of marine origin.

The end of Ordovician time was marked by uplift, and resulted in deep valleys being cut in the uppermost Ordovician rocks. In places these valleys are 150 feet deep. The Silurian sediments are indicative of shallow interior seas. The rocks are almost all dolomite, and highly fossiliferous reef deposits mark the Niagaran series. The Silurian rocks form much of the bedrock surface in the Chicago area as shown in Figure II-19.

Within the immediate region of Chicago, a marked unconformity occurs at the base of the middle Devonian. This conformity coincides with the tectonic uplift in the Appalachians. The Middle Devonian truncates units as low as the middle Silurian, although lower Devonian rocks are present and undisturbed to the south in the center of the Illinois Basin. Devonian rocks are found in the Chicago area beneath Lake Michigan and possibly in some crevices in the eroded surfaces of the Silurian Racine formation, as well as in the Des Plaines disturbance. The relations of the Devonian to older units appears to be the result of uplift along the Kankakee Arch.[1] The Devonian sediments consist of limestone and shales with occasional sandstones.

---

1 Willman, H.B., "Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area," Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 460, 1971.

2 Ibid.

FIGURE II-19
Bedrock Surface Geology[1]

GEOLOGY OF THE CHICAGO AREA



1 Willman, H.G., "Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area," Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 460, 1971.

Mississippian sediments are found around the edges of the Michigan and Illinois Basin and the Ozark Dome, northeast and southwest, respectively, of the Chicago area. These rocks are predominately limestone and cherty (flintlike) limestone with some shales, dolomite, and sandstone. Within the Chicago area, the Mississippian is found as shale and cherty limestone in the Des Plaines fault zone.

Pennsylvanian rocks are found south, west, and east of Chicago and may be present in the Des Plaines structure. A major unconformity marks early Pennsylvanian time, resulting from regional uplift and warping of the Kankakee Arch. Depression of the Illinois Basin in mid to late Pennsylvanian resulted in deposition of upper Pennsylvania sediments on the truncated older rock units. The Pennsylvanian rocks are predominately shales and sandstone with clay and coal measures and occur in cyclothams.

The Chicago area was uplifted and warped during the major tectonic movements in the Appalachians at the end of the Palezoic.[1] Renewed uplift along the Kankakee Arch caused the erosion of Pennsylvanian sediments from the Chicago area. Although Cretaceous sediments are found west and south of Chicago, there is no evidence for their deposition within the area.

A major unconformity occurs between the Paleozoic and Quaternary systems. In the Chicago region, the glacial deposits of Pleistocene age rest directly on the erosional surface of Pennsylvanian and older rocks. During the Wisconsinan stage, the Chicago area was buried under several thousand feet of glacial ice that spread over the region from the northeast. These glaciers were part of the Lake Michigan lobe (rounded division or projection) but may have included marginal portions of the Saginaw and Green Bay lobes.

The Wisconsinan glaciation eroded the Chicago area so intensely that no deposits of earlier glaciers have been found.[2] Deposits from the Illinoian glaciation which preceded the Wisconsinan, may remain in some of the bedrock valleys in the Chicago region. Deposits of the Kansan stage are present southwest of Chicago and it is probable that the northern edge of a Kansan glacier from the northeast also may have covered part of the region. There is no evidence that the earliest Pleistocene glaciers of the Nebraskan stage covered the Chicago area.

---

1 Willman, H.B., "Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area," Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 460, 1971.

2 Ibid.

Most of the glacial drift in the Chicago area was deposited during Woodfordian time. This was a time of maximum Wisconsinan glaciation, which was 22,000 to 12,500 years ago. At its maximum, the Woodfordian glacier extended westward nearly to the Mississippi River, southwestward to Peoria, and southward to its contact with the Erie lobe advancing from the east. At the maximum, the Chicago area was buried by 3,000 to 5,000 feet of ice. As the glacier retreated northward, the Lake Michigan Basin filled with melt water which formed Lake Chicago.[1]

Readvance of the glaciers in northern Michigan during Valderan time caused a rise in Lake Chicago level. Subsequently, the Valderan glaciers advanced on the land as far as Milwaukee and even further south in the central part of Lake Chicago. Valderan time is marked by lacustrine, fluvial, and aeolian deposits in the Chicago area.

The post-glacial stage has been called the Holocene and, according to some, includes the present or recent geologic processes acting on the landscape. The Holocene is considered to have commenced some 7,000 years ago and in the Chicago area is marked by soil formation, peat, stream, and Lake deposits. Additionally, such man-made features as lake fill, land fill, and strip mine wastes, may be considered as Holocene deposits.

(1) Physiography

The present topography or physiography of the Chicago area owes its origin to the glacial and post-glacial processes including stream erosion, wind blown deposits, and wind erosion. Depositional features of the area include substantially unaltered moraines (glacial deposits), outwash plains, valley trains, filled lake basins, river flood plains, and sand dunes. Erosional features include glacial floodwater sluiceways, glacial lake wave cut cliffs, and numerous small stream valleys. Total relief is on the order of 590 feet.

The Chicago area is in the Central Lowlands Province, a broad, relatively low glaciated area extending from the Appalachians to the Great Plains along its east-west axis and from the Superior uplands to the

1 Willman, H.B., "Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area," Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 460, 1971.

Interior low plateaus and Ozark plateaus along its north-south axis. The boundary between two major subdivisions of the central lowlands, the Great Lakes section, and the Till Plains section lies just to the west of Cook County.

The Great Lakes section includes the younger glacial drift surrounding the Great Lakes and is characterized by permanent rough-surfaces moraines and many lakes. Within the Chicago area the Great Lakes section has two subdivisions, the Wheaton Morainal Country and the Chicago Lake Plain. The former contains continental glaciation physiographic features including glacial deposits, hill and hollow topography, short ridges and numerous lakes. The Chicago Lake Plain comprises the former bottom of glacial Lake Chicago and is relatively flat and uneroded by modern streams.

The Till Plains section also has two subdivisions in the Chicago area, the Bloomington Ridges Plain and the Kankakee Plain. The Bloomington Ridges Plain is an area of older Wisconsinan drift and is less rugged and with fewer lakes than the Wheaton Morainal Country. The scarcity of Lakes is in part due to the older age of the drift. The gentler slopes and lower relief is due to the slower melting of the ice and less stagnation at the front of the glacier. The Kankakee Plain lies in the southwest portion of the Chicago area and is a comparatively flat surface. The physiographic subdivisions of the Chicago area are shown in Figure II-20.

(2) Site Stratigraphy

The uppermost 500 feet of strata, particularly in the dolomites and shales between the top of the Racine formation and the base of the Brainard formation are most relevant to the proposed construction of the tunnel and reservoir systems. The glacial deposits are relevant to the drop shaft construction and, partially, to the reservoir containments. The formations above the base of the Maquoketa group's Brainard formation are a part of the Quartenary, Silurian, and Ordovician systems and a brief description highlighting their major features are presented below. The general stratigraphic relations of the rock formations below this group have been described in a broad manner in the previous section on geologic history. The general geologic column for the Chicago area is presented in Figure II-21 and a brief description of the three uppermost rock systems is provided in the following sections. A more detailed description of these systems is provided in Appendix B.

FIGURE II-20
Physiographic Divisions in
the Chicago Area[1]

GEOLOGY OF THE CHICAGO AREA



1 Willman, 1971.

1. Quartenary

Underlying the surficial soil and artificial fill material in the project area are the Pleistocene Series of deposits. These consist of a variety of materials transported by, or directly related to, the continental glaciers that covered the Chicago area. These deposits, designated as glacial drift, range in thickness locally from 0 to over 200 feet. The depth range of the glacial deposits at most places is perhaps 60 to 90 feet.

2. Silurian

The Racine dolomite, the youngest most variable and topographically highest of the Silurian system consists of dolomite with some chert and shale. The thickness of the formation is 0 to 20 feet, north of the O'Hare Airport area. Towards the south and east, the thickness reaches 70 feet in Wilmette, 213 feet at Roosevelt Road and Lake Shore Drive, and a maximum of 291 feet in the Lake Calumet area. The overall thickness throughout the Chicago area ranges from 100 to 175 feet.

The Joliet formation is the next underlying formation in the Silurian system and consists of three members: the Romeo, the Markgraf, and the Brandon Bridge. The Romeo member is a persistent thin, uniform, light gray, very dense, fine grained dolomite, generally about 9 to 17 feet thick, that underlies the Racine dolomite and grades downward into the Markgraf member. The Markgraf member, however, is a widespread, distinctively light bluish gray dolomitic unit with an average thickness of 31 feet. The member underlies the Romeo member with a sharp contact and minimum thickness is 9 feet with a maximum of 51 feet. The Brandon Bridge member is absent in most of the Chicago area. This member is found chiefly in the northwestern portion of the area, especially in the Des Plaines Valley.

Below the Joliet formation in the Kankakee the characteristic features of the dolomite in this formation are: wavy beds of fine to medium grained gray, locally pink, dolomite layers, 1 to 3 inches thick. The Kankakee dolomite as found throughout the Chicago area, usually has a thickness of 35 to 45 feet, but may vary somewhat from these figures. The contact with the Edgewood formation below is conformable.

The Edgewood formation is the lowermost formation in the Silurian System. The material in this formation is a light gray, fine to medium grained, argillaceous, cherty dolomite. It includes a porous upper zone and a middle and lower zone that contain numerous shale partings. Deposited unconformably on the irregularly channeled, eroded surface of the Ordovician Maquoketa Group (generally the Brainard Shale), the Edgewood thickens from averages of approximately 20 feet in interchannel areas to over 100 feet in depressions within the Brainard.

3. Ordovician

The Neda formation, the uppermost formation of the Ordovician system is an iron oxide-bearing, brick red shale, 0 to 15 feet thick (5 feet average) of restricted distribution. In general, the formation is found in the same places as the Brandon Bridge Formation. Much of the Neda was probably removed by pre-Edgewood erosion.

The Brainard formation consists of a material that is a dark green-gray, thin bedded fossiliferous, silty claystone to shale, and interbedded dolomite.

As a result of pre-Edgewood erosion, as described above, the Brainard Shale as observed has acquired a variable thickness of from 1 to 136 feet depending on the configuration of the Brainard-Edgewood unconformity. In many holes, thickness of the formation is less than 50 feet. In the Calumet area, the Brainard is absent at places.

(3) Unconformities

Contacts between adjacent rock strata which show that deposition was interrupted and that beds have been removed by erosion are unconformities. Most of the rock units in the Chicago area show conformable relations with the beds above and below. This indicates that there was no major interruption in deposition within or between these formations.

Major unconformities within the general Chicago region occur at the base of the Middle Ordovician, the Silurian (top of the Maquoketa), the Middle Devonian, the Pennsylvanian, the Cretaceous, and the Pleistocene (bedrock surface) systems. Of these major unconformities, only two, the bedrock surface and Maquoketa unconformities, may be affected by the TARP project. These two unconformities are discussed below while the other unconformities have been previously discussed.

1. Bedrock Surface Unconformity

The surface of bedrock is an erosional surface. Over most of the Chicago area the Niagaran Racine dolomite forms the bedrock surface. Both older and younger rocks are at the top of rock within the disturbed zone of the Des Plaines complex. To the northwest of this faulted area, the Joliet formation, Kankakee, and Edgewood dolomites and the Maquoketa shale are locally at the bedrock surface.

Erosion during and following the uplift of the Kankakee Arch contributed to the exposure of the present rock surface. Glacial erosion, however, appears to have been a major factor in shaping and lowering the rock surface to its present form. Topography on the bedrock surface shows a rolling plain cut by steep eastward grading valleys over 100 feet deep. Evidence of previous geologic structure caused by folding and faulting has been modified by the preglacial and glacial erosion. Glacial drift has unconformably filled in depressions in the bedrock surface so that present day drainage patterns are almost entirely independent of preglacial drainage.

2. Top of Maquoketa Group Unconformity

The top of the Maquoketa group is an erosional surface. Generally eastward grading valleys up to 150 feet deep have been carved into the Maquoketa surface. The configuration of the surface appears to be independent of that of the underlying Galena surface. In some areas, a structural high on the top of the Galena may be reflected in a corresponding topographic high on the top of the Maquoketa, as in the southern portion of the Mainstream Tunnel segment between Western and Kedzie Avenues. The effect of the high Maquoketa top in this hole and others appears, however, to be reflected upward in sedimentary beds (e.g., Edgewood, Kankakee, and Joliet formations) deposited at a later time.

Erosion has removed the Neda shale at the top of the Maquoketa group over most of the area. In the drilling program, Neda was encountered only in the northwestern part of the project area, along the Des Plaines River and along the North Branch of the Chicago River. Erosion has also thinned the Brainard shale in all holes where the Neda is absent. In portions of the Lake Calumet area, erosion has cut entirely through the Brainard shale into the Fort Atkinson dolomite.

(4) Folds

Folding of the bedrock units in the Chicago area is represented by very gentle folds with eastwest trends which are superimposed on the regional southeasterly dip of 10 to 15 feet per mile. The folds are gentle structures which develop relief of 200 feet, or generally less, over an extent of several miles. Structure surface slopes, which may be taken to approximate the dip of the strata involved in the folding, are found locally to approach 100 feet per mile. The fold axes in the Galena trend east-west and appear to be generally conformable with deeper structures. The gently undulating fold structures can be observed in the geologic sections prepared from the core borings which have been included in this report as Figure II-22 for the Calumet system tunnel route. Borings for the other tunnel routes are shown in Figures II-23 and II-24 for the Mainstream system, and II-25 and II-26 for the Lower Des Plaines system. The dip of the strata shown on the sections, even if the sections were constructed true to scale rather than with 20:1 exaggeration as drawn, would not represent true dips at many places because the geologic section lines often cross the fold axes obliquely.

(5) Joints

Data on the orientation dip and spacing of joints in the Silurian strata were obtained primarily from the mapping of outcrops and quarries as well as tunnels, especially druing construction of the Southwest Intercepting Sewer 13A, Calumet Intercepting Sewer 18-E, Ext. A, and Lawrence Avenue Tunnels (including the Harding Avenue Tunnel). Vertical drill holes of relatively small diameter rarely intersect essentially vertical joints. Such joints were intersected, however, in some drill holes and were followed intermittently throughout considerable lengths of the holes. The orientation of the most highly developed set of joints trends northeast ranging from north-50-degrees-east to north-60-degrees-east. Another important set trends northwest, from north-25-degrees west to north-65 degrees west. Joint data for formations underlying the Silurian strata are not available but could be gathered from outcrops remote from the Chicago area or from mines such as those near Galena.

The tunnels listed above were excavated in dolomite strata of the Racine, Joliet, and Kankakee formations, all belonging to the Silurian system. The Racine formation was encountered only in the Calumet Tunnel and the Kankakee was found only in the South-West and Lawrence Avenue Tunnels. Only the upper five feet of the Kankakee was penetrated in each case.

FIGURE II-22
Geologic Section Crawford St.
to Grand Calumet River
Calumet System[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

FIGURE II-23
Geologic Section
59th Street to Damen Avenue
Mainstream System[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

FIGURE II-24
Geologic Section
Damen Avenue to Addison Street
Mainstream System[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

FIGURE II-25
Geologic Section 47th St. to Fullerton Ave. Lower Des Plaines System[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

FIGURE II-26
Geologic Section Fullerton Ave. to Thacker Lower Des Plaines System[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

Data on jointing from tunnel exploration, therefore, was limited essentially to the Joliet formation and to strata a few feet above and below the formation.

Surface observation and tunnel mapping in the Silurian formations excavated shows an average spacing of joints of approximately 30 to 40 feet. This spacing is subject to great variation in local areas. Joints appear to be open near the bedrock surface with depths of 100 feet or more. Joints are thought generally to close with depth but exceptions may occur. Joint openness as a near-bedrock-surface phenomenon has been discussed in the section on Racine stratigraphy.

Most of the joint surfaces are separated from a hairline to a fraction of an inch, however, a few obtain greater widths. For example, the Southwest Tunnel has a fracture width of 12 inches, the Calumet Tunnel one of 24 inches, and the Lawrence Avenue Tunnel one of 6 inches. The joints are variably filled with grey, black or green clay, and frequent residual rock fragments. Crystallization of calcite, quartz or pyrite is also found along joint surfaces. In some areas solutioning along joint plains has produced horizontal fluting or a "washboard" structure, in which clay fills the pockets. Up to 100-foot wide sections filled with clay have been reported near the Lake Shaft of the Chicago Avenue Tunnel. Seepage was noted as being common in such sections and structural support was usually required.

(6) Faults

Two areas of major disturbance due to faulting as well as numerous individual faults or minor fault zones are known within the Chicago region. The major zones are the Sandwich Fault lying to the southwest of the project area, and the Des Plaines disturbance. The location of the Sandwich Fault zone is shown in Figure II-19 while the location of the Des Plaines structure and the distribution of other faults are shown in the areal map presented as Figure II-27. A detailed map of the Des Plaines fault structure is given in Figure II-28.

The Sandwich Fault zone extends northeastward from near Ottawa, Illinois for some 80 miles into the southern part of the Chicago area. This major fault is nearly vertical with the northern block moving down

FIGURE II-28
Complex Faulting
Des Plaines Disturbance[1]



1 HEC, 1972.

relative to the southern block. Maximum displacement is 900 feet 20 to 30 miles west of Chicago, but decreasing eastward. South of Joliet, another fault paralleling the main zone, shows a reversal in movement indicating a scissors-like motion. This second fault has a maximum displacement of 100 feet.

The Des Plaines disturbance, on the Des Plaines River, is a roughly circular area, 5.5 miles in diameter, of intense faulting. Numerous nearly vertical faults with displacements of up to 600 feet bring rocks as old as the Middle Ordovician St. Peter sandstone and lower Ordovician Oneota dolomite to the bedrock surface. In addition, Mississippian and Pennsylvanian rocks not found in the surrounding area have been preserved in some of the downthrown blocks.

The location of faults within, and the complexity of, the Des Plaines disturbance is indicated in Figure II-28. The Des Plaines structure is surrounded by nearly horizontal Silurian rocks in which there are, comparatively, few faults (Figure II-27). The bedrock is buried beneath 75 to 200 feet of glacial drift, and there is no indication of the structure on the present surface.[1]

Aside from these areas of major disturbances, previous exploration has indicated the existence of additional faults or fault zones within the project area. A Vibroseis survey conducted by Seismograph Service Corporation in 1968 provided the greatest overall coverage of the area. The faults mapped by this survey are shown on the Fault Location Map, Figure II-27.

Along the Mainstream, North Branch, and Des Plaines tunnels, where core drilling was done during the 1971 program, holes were drilled specifically to confirm the existence of the faults mapped by the Vibroseis survey. In the Calumet area, no drilling has been done to confirm faults indicated by Vibroseis survey.

Not shown on Figure II-27, are 86 minor faults mapped in three recently constructed tunnels. Nearly 90 percent of these faults are oriented in a northwest-southeast direction, generally parallel to the similarly trending major joint set. The remainder parallels the

1 Willman, 1971.

orientation of the northwest-southwest joint set. The number of faults found in the tunnels, appears to indicate that faulting with small vertical displacement is common in the Chicago area and that numerous small faults should be expected throughout the proposed tunnel system. A detailed description of the minor faults and a discussion of survey results are provided in Appendix C.

2.2.4 Seismicity

From the 175-year historical earthquake record, four earthquakes were identified as significant in terms of their size and distance from the proposed project. These earthquakes occurred within 100 miles of Chicago during the recorded history of the area. In addition, a series of the most violent earthquakes in United States history occurred in 1811 and 1812 at New Madrid, Missouri, about 400 miles southwest of Chicago. Table II-9 summarizes the known earthquakes, with intensity III or greater, assumed to have been felt in the Chicago area.

The four earthquakes, identified as significant, originated at Fort Dearborn (Chicago) in 1804, near Rockford in 1909, near Aurora in 1912, and near Amboy in 1972. These earthquakes have been characterized as follows:

- 1804 Fort Dearborn earthquake. The Fort Dearborn earthquake of 1804 has been assigned an epicentral intensity of VII in the project's earthquake catalog. This earthquake has also been assigned an intensity of V to VI[1]. EQHUS[2] reports no intensity in the catalog and remarks sections, but VIII to XI on the generalized map in the inset. Considering the comparatively low population density and the probably irregular population distribution in 1804, as well as the small number of felt reports,

---

1 Docekal, J.D., Earthquakes of the Stable Interior, With Examples on the Mid-Continent, University of Nebraska, Ph.D., University microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970.

2 Coffman, J.L., and von Hake, C.A., Earthquake History of the United States (EQHUS), Pub. 41-1, revised (through 1970), U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, Environmental Data Service, 1973, p. 37-58.

Table II-9
Summary of Earthquakes Felt in Chicago Area
(Intensity III or Greater)[1]

Year	Date	Epicenter Locality	Estimated Magnitude	Intensity at Chgo. (M.M.)*	Epicenter Distance to Chgo.-Miles
1795	Jan. 8	Kaskaskia, Ill.		III	300
1804	Aug. 20	Fort Dearborn (Chgo.)	5.6	VII	15
1811	Dec. 16	New Madrid, Mo.	8.0 to 8.5		400
1812	Jan. 23	New Madrid, Mo.	8.0 to 8.5		400
1812	Feb. 7	New Madrid, Mo.	8.0 to 8.5		400
1827	Aug. 6	New Albany, Ind.	4.9		275
1833	June 9	St. Louis, Mo.	4.9		250
1843	Feb. 16	St. Louis, Mo.	6.9		250
1875	June 18	Ohio	5.6	III	225
1886	Aug. 31	Charleston, S.C.	7.6	III	800
1895	Oct. 31	Charleston, Mo.	6.8	V or VI	350
1906	May 26	Keewenaw Pen., Mi.	6.7	III or IV	375
1909	May 26	Illinois (Near Springfield)	6.4	VI or VII	75
1909	July 18	Illinois (Near Springfield)	5.6	III or IV	150
1909	Aug. 16	SW Illinois	5.7		300
1909	Sept. 27	Indiana	5.6	III	175
1912	Jan. 2	Illinois (Near Aurora)	5.4	V	75
1917	April 9	East Missouri	5.8	III	300
1925	Feb. 28	Canada	7.0	IV or Less	950
1935	Nov. 1	Canada	7.6	<V	550
1937	March 2	Western Ohio	5.9	III	200
1937	March 9	Western Ohio	5.8	III	200
1939	Nov. 23	Griggs, Ill.	5.7	III or IV	300
1939	Nov. 23	Waterloo, Ill.	5.9		300
1947	Aug. 9	S-Central, Mi.	5.4	III or IV	150
1968	Nov. 9	Illinois-Indiana Border	5.5	III	240

1 HEC, 1975.

* Modified Mercalli Intensity scale.

and the fact that intensity V may have occurred 200 miles away in Indiana, the earthquake may well have had an epicentral intensity of about VIII. Although the location cited is 15 miles from Chicago, it is within the northern boundary of the project.

- 1811-1812 New Madrid, Missouri series. Information on the intensity at Chicago of the New Madrid, Missouri earthquakes of 1811 and 1812 is not available, and no intensity is listed in the project earthquake catalog. Nevertheless, the observed attenuation of earthquake intensity from events occurring 200 to 400 miles south of Chicago and the descriptions of effects in EQHUS and Fuller[1] suggest that any of these three earthquakes may have produced an intensity of VI to VII at Chicago.

- 1909 "Springfield, Illinois" earthquake. The so-called Springfield, Illinois event is reported with an epicentral intensity of VII in the project earthquake catalog; an intensity with which other sources agree. However, no other sources suggest Springfield, near the center of the state, to be near the epicenter. The latitude and longitude cited in EQHUS and in the project earthquake catalog is on the Wisconsin border. From the felt reports in EQHUS and other sources, the most probable epicenter was found to be in the vicinity of Aurora, approximately 35 miles from Chicago.[2] Felt reports suggest a maximum intensity of VIII in parts of Aurora and near Chicago. In the absence of specific data that would relate intensity VIII effects to softer ground and poorly constructed structures, this earthquake should be assumed to have approached intensity VIII. This event may actually have occurred closer to Chicago, or less than 35 miles away.

- 1912 near Aurora, Illinois. An epicentral intensity of VI is attributed to the Illinois earthquake of 1912, and the epicenter is recorded as being southwest of Aurora. The location indicated by the epicenteral coordinates, 41.5N-88.5W, is about 50 miles from Chicago.

---

1 Fuller, Myron L., "The New Madrid Earthquake," U.S. Department of Interior, Bulletin 394, 1912, p. 21-30.

2 Docekal, 1970.

The following sections discuss the possible risk to the project from future earthquakes and the factors affecting this assessment.

(1) Epicentral Location Accuracy

All of the earthquakes discussed above were located by evaluating macroseismic effects. Any of these events may actually have occurred 10 to 15 miles from the locations of maximum intensity reported in the catalogs.[1] This does not reduce the importance of the 1804 event, because it probably occurred within the boundary of the project area. However, the 1909 earthquake, near Aurora, may have occurred only five to ten miles from some of the proposed project structures. An epicentral location nearer to Chicago is supported by reports of macroseismic effects.[2] Similarly, the 1912 earthquake may have occurred 25 miles from some of the structures of the project. The foregoing is summarized in Table II-10, which also includes revised epicentral intensities from the previous section. It should be noted that these are probable epicentral intensities, not maximum intensities.

Table II-10
Revised Partial Earthquake Catalog[1]

Date	Probable Epicentral Intensity (MMI*)	Location	Probable Intensity at Chicago or the Project (MMI*)	Minimum Epicentral Distance from Project Structures (Miles)
1804	VIII	Fort Dearborn	VIII	0
1811-1812	XII	New Madrid, Missouri	VI-VII	~400
1909	VIII	Aurora, Illinois	VII-VIII	~ 7
1912	VI	SW of Aurora, Illinois	V	~ 25

* Modified Mercalli Intensity.

1 HEC, 1975.

---

1 Docekal, 1970.

2 EQHUS and Docekal, 1970.

(2) Frequency, Magnitude, and Probability of Occurrence

The catalog of earthquakes felt in Chicago over about 175 years contains only four moderate earthquakes within 100 miles of Chicago, but several more distant and larger earthquakes have been felt. Of these, only the New Madrid, Missouri events significantly affected Chicago. Historical records are not sufficient to establish magnitude-frequence relationships or determine probability of occurrence. However, from the data in previous reports, suggested relationships have been evaluated between probable intensity at the project and frequency of occurrence (Figure II-29). Figure II-29 shows the recurrence period at Chicago for macroseismic effects greater than or equal to a specific Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI), based on data from Tables II-9 and II-10. As presented in the figure, the historical earthquake record suggests that an intensity of VIII can be expected to recur at Chicago at the rate of about once each 100 years. The figure also suggests that higher intensities might occur at longer intervals. Insofar as the historical earthquake record can be relied upon to predict seismic events, a high intensity earthquake is not expected to occur over the life of the project. A detailed evaluation of geologic structure potential in the Chicago region to generate earthquakes would be required to estimate the magnitude of earthquakes likely to occur.

(3) Relationship of Faults and Seismicity

Two areas are identified as major disturbances due to faulting: the Des Plaines disturbance, within the area of the project; and the Sandwich Fault zone, approximately 30 miles to the southwest. There are 30 minor faults or fault zones within the project area as revealed by Vibroseis surveys and drilling. Eighty-six other minor faults (small vertical displacement and width) were found in a sewer excavation area which may affect a small portion of the project area. Faults of this type can be assumed to occur through the project area. Classification of these faults as minor, however, may not be justified in view of the lateral nature of displacement suggested by the faults' slickened sides.

FIGURE II-29
Recurrence Period for Macroseismic Effects Greater Than or Equal to Specific Intensities[1]



1 HEC, 1975.

Previous reports state that no evidence of activity has been observed for the faults described, however, no studies to detect fault activity appear to have been performed. Therefore, the historic earthquake record provides the best indication of activity of faults crossing the tunnels.

The 1804 Fort Dearborn earthquake occurred within the bounds of the project area. Given the lack of definitive information, it should be assumed, in order to be conservative, that this event was associated with the Des Plaines disturbance or with one or more of the faults, fault zones, or minor faults that intersect the tunnels.

The 1909 Aurora earthquake could have occurred as close as five to ten miles to the southwest of the project area. It could also have occurred on a fault that traverses the project area. In view of the local seismicity record, the faults in the project area should be assumed to be potentially active.

(4) <u>Relationship of Seismic Causes and Effects</u>

Two types of potential tunnel damage resulting from seismic activity have been identified in earlier reports:

- Dislocation of the tunnel along a fault
- Rockfalls along faults or joints.

Tunnel dislocation along a fault could only occur if an active fault intersects a tunnel and if an earthquake or fault creep occurs. Because there is no evidence that the faults intersecting a tunnel are inactive, this sort of damage is possible in a local earthquake. Two local earthquakes have occurred in the 175-year historic record. Both may have had epicentral intensities of VIII, and presumably were associated with minor movements on faults.

Rockfalls along faults or joints could occur either from vibratory ground motion, as suggested in previous reports, or in association with dislocation on a fault which intersects a tunnel. The previous reports conclude that damage to a tunnel will likely be limited to small rockfalls in highly fractured areas of a tunnel.

This conclusion is likely to be conservative if ground motions at the surface are typically greater than those at depth at the fault site.[1,2]

In previous reports, it has been estimated that a peak particle velocity of 12 inches per second (in/s) or 30.5 centimeters per second (cm/s) will cause rock along unlined tunnels to fall out along existing cracks or joints; and a velocity of 24 in/s (61.0 cm/s) will cause new cracks to develop, along which rockfall will also occur.[3] These estimates may be somewhat high because they were developed from experience in blasting projects, however, they are useful for comparison to observed particle velocities in earthquakes.

Trifunac and Brady[4] have used a much more extensive data set than previous authors to correlate peak velocities and earthquake intensities between V and VII. The data are still insufficient for calculating mean values and standard deviations of peak velocities corresponding to other intensities. However, a projection of their data to an MMI of VIII suggests that peak vertical velocities of 38 cm/s with a standard deviation about 18 cm/s may occur. Thus, peak vertical velocity may be expected to be between 20 and 56 cm/s for about 68 percent of MMI VIII earthquakes. Because rockfall along existing joints begins at about 30.5 cm/s, rockfall could be extensive along a tunnel wherever other than isolated single joints intersect. The particle velocity, however, is still not likely to be high enough to cause new crack formation and general rockfall.

---

1 Kanai, K., Takahashi, R., and Kawasumi, H., "Seismic Characteristics of Ground," Proc. World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Berkeley, California, 1956, p. 31-1.

2 Tamura, C., Mizukoshi, T., and One, T., "Characteristics of Earthquake Motion at Rock Ground," Proc. of 4th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Chile, 1969, No. A2, p. 26-37.

3 Langefors, U., and Kihlstrom, B., "The Modern Technique of Rock Blasting," John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

4 Trifunac, M.D., and Brady, A.G., 1975, On the correlation of seismic intensity scales with the peaks of recorded strong motion: Bulletin Seismological Society of America, V. 65, No. 1, pp. 139-162.

2.3 ATMOSPHERIC RESOURCES

2.3.1 Air Quality

Air quality depends on the quantity of air pollutants emitted into the air, local meteorological conditions, and topography. Since air pollutants are likely to be generated by the construction of the proposed project, it is important to analyze the current air quality of the area.

Ambient air quality is usually reported in terms of the concentration of pollutants in the air. The following substances have been identified by the U.S. EPA as air pollutants for which Federal and state air quality standards have been established: sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, photochemical oxidants, and nitrogen dioxide. Federal and state air quality standards for these pollutants are described in Appendix D. This section describes the observed 1974 air quality in the Chicago area.

Air quality in the Chicago metropolitan area is monitored primarily by the city of Chicago Department of Environmental Control and the Cook County Department of Environmental Control. These agencies have 61 monitoring stations in Cook County, including 30 within the city of Chicago. They monitor one or more of the following pollutants at each station: particulate, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and oxidants. Hydrocarbons are measured at one central location by the State of Illinois EPA.

Air quality data from the above monitoring sites are published monthly and quarterly in preliminary form, and annually in final form by the Illinois EPA. The latest available data are found in the 1974 Annual Air Quality Report, and the data applicable to the Chicago metropolitan area are summarized below.

Except for nitrogen dioxide, the ambient standards for all the pollutants were exceeded at one or more monitoring sites in the Chicago metropolitan area in 1974:

- The annual primary standard of 0.03 ppm for sulfur dioxide was exceeded at the Medical Center monitor. The sulfur dioxide levels in other parts of the metropolitan area were below the standards.

- The annual primary standard of 75 $\mu g/m^3$ for particulates was exceeded at 29 monitoring sites. The 24-hour primary standard, on the other hand, was exceeded at only two sites.

- Although the one-hour primary standard for carbon monoxide was met, the eight-hour standard was frequently violated. Of the 192 violations of the eight-hour standard, 174 were recorded at the monitor next to Congress Street, a very heavily travelled commuter route.

- The annual standard of 0.05 ppm for nitrogen dioxide was met at all monitoring sites.

- The only hydrocarbon monitor, at the University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago, recorded 67 violations of the three-hour primary standard of 0.24 ppm from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m.

- The one-hour standard of 0.08 ppm for photochemical oxidants was frequently violated at five of the ten monitoring stations in the metropolitan area.

2.3.2 Noise

Because construction of the proposed project will generate some noise, it is important to analyze the existing noise levels in the Chicago area. This section describes the existing ambient noise levels in the Chicago area in terms of the Day-Night Sound Level, L_{dn}. Other noise terminology, units, and standards are defined in Appendix E.

The existing outdoor noise levels in most parts of Chicago are primarily determined by the street traffic. Specific noise sources, such as trains, aircrafts, and industrial plants, contribute heavily to the ambient noise in nearby areas, and use of power tools, such as lawn mowers and chain saws raise the noise levels in residential areas. Wherever construction activity exists, the equipment will generate some noise.

A nationwide 100-site noise survey conducted by the U.S. EPA included several sites in Chicago.[1] Although none of the monitored sites in Chicago were located near the proposed tunnel routes, the data obtained at the survey sites

---

1 U.S. EPA, Population Density Distribution of the United States as a Function of Outdoor Noise Levels, Vol. 2, June 1974.

may be considered as representative of the noise levels in most areas along the proposed tunnel routes.

The monitored sites in the EPA study were located in areas with population density varying from 6,600 to 65,000 persons/square mile. The recorded noise levels varied from a minimum of 36.3 dBA at night to a maximum of 106.2 dBA during the daytime. The L_{dn} varied from 59.0 dB to 71.2 dB. Table II-11 summarizes the EPA findings.

The data in Table II-11 do not indicate a direct relationship between L_{dn} and population density. However, the noise levels in the downtown area (sites 7 and 8) were generally higher than those in the residential areas (sites 2,3,4,5,6). The noise level at site No. 1 was the highest despite the lowest site population density, primarily because the noise monitor there was located close to an arterial street. In all cases, the outdoor noise levels are lower then those levels identified by the EPA as the limit necessary to protect the public against hearing loss (see Appendix E). However, these outdoor noise levels are generally higher than those identified by the EPA as the limit necessary to protect the public against annoyance.

Table II-11
Noise Monitoring Data for Chicago[1]

Site Number	Site Location	Population Density (people/mi^2)	Roadway Type at Site (vicinity)*	Traffic	L_{DN} (dB)
1	W. 111th St. & S. Bell Ave.	6,600	Arterial (Collector)	Cars, Trucks, Buses	71.2
2	W. 110th Pl. & S. Bell Ave.	7,400	Local (Collector)	Cars, Trucks	59.0
3	W. 73rd St. & S. Pauline Ave.	12,900	Local (Collector)	Cars, Trucks	60.6
4	64th St. & Wolcott	19,800	Collector (Arterial)	Cars, Trucks	66.9
5	71st & S. Hermitage	20,600	Collector (Arterial)	Cars, Trucks Buses	64.4
6	65th St. & S. Peoria	32,600	Local (Collector)	Cars, Trucks	63.1
7	15th St. & Drake	65,000	Collector (Arterial)	Cars, Trucks	68.4
8	W. Douglas Blvd. & St. Louis	65,000	Collector (Arterial)	Cars, Trucks Buses	70.7

* The items within parentheses refer to the roadway in the general vicinity while those without parentheses refer to the monitored site.

1 U.S. EPA, Population Density Distribution of the United States as a Function of Outdoor Noise Levels, Vol. 2, June 1974.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The forest preserves, parks, wetlands, and other natural preserves of the Chicago area consist of many types of vegetation which provide habitats or food resources for a wide variety of wildlife. The river systems of the area, however, do not have a wide variety of aquatic life because of the high pollutant load conditions of these systems. To establish the existing biological resources of the Chicago area, the following sections identify and describe the area's major fish and wildlife species and dominant vegetation types.

2.4.1 Vegetation

The vegetation in the natural areas southwest of Lake Michigan is basically a transitional zone type which follows a narrow route near the lake. Adjacent to this zone, a modified form of the beech-maple forest is found in the more moist areas and oak-hickory forests are found in more open areas west of the beech-maple. The major vegetation species found between these two forest types fall into the category of maple-basswood and maple-basswood-red oak forest.[1] A survey conducted by MSDGC personnel along the Little Calumet River showed natural areas near Kennedy Avenue, Cline Avenue, Colfax Street, and Burr Street. The major species found during this survey were cottonwoods, poplars and willow with occasional oak, maple, and mulberry. Wetland areas adjacent to streams of the project area consist mostly of willow species. Common vegetation found in these areas includes cottonwoods, poplars, various grasses, forbs, cattails, arrowheads, and nettles. High water tables limit the vegetation in these areas to water-tolerant species. Additional details describing the plant communities in the Calumet-Sag Channel Watershed are presented in Appendix J.

2.4.2 Fish

Most of the fish in the streams and rivers of the Calumet River system are pollutant-tolerant or very hardy species because of the polluted conditions of these waterways. This condition severely limits the desirability of these waterways for sport fishing. Sport fishing, however,

---

1 Soil Conservation Service, "Environmental Resource Inventory - Calument-Sag Channel Watershed, Cook, DuPage, and Will Counties, Illinois," October 1975.

is still evident along many of these streams and rivers, but catches include only carp and species of bullheads. The fish species listed below can be found in the Calumet-Sag Channel as well as the rivers and streams of the Calumet River system. The presence of these species in all water bodies of the system is due to the similarity in water quality characteristics.

- Central mudminnow
- White sucker
- Carp
- Goldfish
- Stone-roller
- Creek chub
- Bluntnose minnow
- Fathead minnow
- Golden shiner
- Black bullhead
- Largemouth bass
- Green sunfish
- Bluegill
- Pumpkinseed
- Sunfish (Lepomis)
- Johnny darter

2.4.3 Wildlife

The Calumet-Sag Channel Watershed is inhabited by a wide variety of wildlife. Over 114 species of birds are known to breed within the watershed area. Half of these species prefer wetland habitat and at least eight species migrate to the area each year. Although a comprehensive survey has not yet been conducted, the most common mammals in the area are white tail deer, eastern cottontail, gray squirrel, raccoon, opossum, fox, and woodcock. In addition, a large number of reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates can be found along the streams, in wetlands, and in uplands of the watershed. Wildlife and wildlife habitats are diverse and abundant in the Calumet-Sag Channel Watershed. A detailed inventory of the watershed's wildlife species and their preferred habitat is provided in Appendix J, prepared by the Soil Conservation Service.[1] The inventory includes amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals along with an indication of which species are included in the Illinois Nature Preserve List of Rare and Endangered Vertebrates of Illinois.

---

1 Op Cit, SCS, October 1975.

Bird species listed in the inventory include both resident and migratory species. Waterfowl migrating to and from the general area include such species as: mallards, baldpates, pintails, black ducks, scaup, ring-necked ducks, Canada geese, and snow geese. Field observations have also confirmed the presence of black terns and yellow-headed blackbirds.

III. EXISTING MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

III. EXISTING MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

This chapter contains a description of the man-made environment of the Chicago metropolitan area, which may be affected by the proposed tunneling project and is divided into five main sections:

- Socioeconomic
- Land Use
- Resources
- Transportation
- Major Projects and Programs.

The initial section describes the socioeconomic conditions of the Chicago area and presents the current and projected population statistics. Contract construction income, and employment, from primary as opposed to secondary sources, are also described. The land use section discusses current urbanization patterns and future urbanization plans. Also identified are the archeological, cultural, historical, and recreational sites in the Chicago metropolitan area which may be affected by the proposed project. The third section discusses the financial and labor resources of the area which may be affected by the project and the fourth section presents the applicable transportation systems which may have an impact on the proposed project. Finally, the major projects and programs possibly related to the proposed action will be described.

The information in this chapter provides a basis to evaluate the effects of the proposed project on the man-made environment. Instead of an exhaustive description of the man-made environment, only those elements that are necessary for this impact evaluation are presented in the following sections.

3.1 SOCIOECONOMIC

The current and projected demographic profile of the study area provides a basis for analyzing the socioeconomic element of the man-made environment. For the purposes of this environmental impact statement, the study area, or impact area of the proposed action, is Cook County. There are over 40 communities, including Chicago, within Cook County which are located within the service area of the Mainstream, Calumet, and Des Plaines Tunnel Systems. Demographic data will be presented in this section for Cook County, Chicago, and the Chicago Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) levels. Data for individual communities are contained in Appendix F.

3.1.1 Current and Projected Population

The population growth trends in the Chicago metropolitan area have been similar to those experienced in other major cities in the United States. The city of Chicago has been losing population since 1950 at an average annual rate of -.02 percent during 1950 to 1960, and at -.51 percent from 1960 to 1970. The great movement from Chicago into the suburban areas of Cook County, as well as a substantial immigration of people from the south to Cook County, occurred during the 1950's, as shown in Table III-1. The growth rate for Cook County was 13.7 percent for an average annual rate of 1.37 percent, which represents 61,570 new residents per year. During the 1960's, the greatest growth occurred in the outlying but rapidly urbanizing counties bordering Cook County, such as Du Page and Lake. Table III-2 further emphasizes the geographical redistribution of the population by presenting population share trends of the city of Chicago and Cook County, and Cook County and the SMSA. The position and proportionate population share of both Chicago and Cook County, is decreasing within the expanding SMSA.

Population projections through 1985 are presented in Table III-3. They have been based upon the more conservative OBERS projections forecast for the Chicago SMSA by the U.S. Department of Commerce. Local and regional planning groups' population projections are consistently higher than OBERS. The NIPC projection for the Chicago SMSA in 1985 is 8,750,000 compared with 7,987,800 from OBERS. The NIPC projection assumes an accelerated rate of population growth which is not consistent with growth trends for the SMSA. As shown in Tables III-1, 2, and 3, the annual growth rates have declined since 1950. Given current demographic patterns of smaller household size and a depressed birth rate, the OBERS projections which assume a slightly declining growth rate are considered more defensible.

Table III-1
Population Changes 1950-1970[1]

Jurisdiction	1970	1960	1950	Percent Change 1960-1970	Percent Change 1950-1960
Chicago	3,362,825	3,550,404	3,620,962	-5.1	-1.4
Cook County	5,488,328	5,124,489	4,508,792	7.1	13.7
Chicago SMSA	6,978,947	6,220,913	5,495,364	12.2	13.2

1 County and City Data Book, 1972 edition, "A Statistical Abstract Supplement," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, pp. 126, 550, 678.

Table III-2
Population Share Trends 1950-1970

	1970	1960	1950
Chicago as Percent of Cook County	61%	69%	80%
Cook County as Percent of SMSA	78%	82%	82%

Table III-3
Population Projections 1970-1985[1]

Jurisdiction	1970	1980	1985	Percent Change 1970-1980	1980-1985
Chicago	3,369,357	3,172,315	3,148,791	-5.8	-.71
Cook County	5,488,328	5,664,848	5,831,094	3.2	2.9
Chicago SMSA	6,978,947	7,655,200	7,987,800	9.7	4.3

1 OBERS Projections, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 109.

Growth in the SMSA is anticipated to slow to an average annual rate of .97 percent through 1980 and, subsequently, to .43 percent through 1985. Chicago's population should begin to stabilize after 1980 with the projected completion of the Chicago 21 Plan for the Central Area Communities, and the South Loop New Town, which will assist the city in reestablishing vital urban neighborhoods. Several general demographic trends, which should also help stablize the higher density urban areas of Cook County and the city of Chicago in the late 1970's and 1980's are:

- The decreasing size of the household
- The increasing rate of household formation due to the increasing rate of marriage dissolution and the increasing segregation of the elderly into separate households
- The increase in numbers of all adult households
- The increase in high compensation service employment.

The above trends have been experienced in most of the large metropolitan areas in the United States. When these demographic factors are combined with the uncertainties of energy and fuel availability and the rising costs of fuel, energy, and housing, the urban centers should be strengthened and the outward population trends of the 1950's and 1960's slowed.

3.1.2 Contract Construction Income

The Chicago metropolitan area has long been a center for large-scale public and private construction projects, including mass transit system development, airport construction, and major commercial and residential development. The relatively high level of construction needs in the area has resulted in a large construction employment base. The income derived from contract construction employment from 1950 to 1971 is shown in Table III-4. Contract construction employment income exceeded two billion dollars in 1971. As shown in Table III-4, income earned from contract construction increased at a faster rate than industrial sector earnings and total personal income until 1969. In the years from 1969 to 1971, Chicago experienced a depression economy, which is reflected in the significant drop in earnings and income growth. (See Table III-4).

Table III-4
Contract Construction Income[1] - Chicago Region*
(in Millions)

Year	Contract Construction Income	Industrial Sector Earnings**	Total Personal Income
1950	$ 514.7	$ 9,286.3	$10,945.7
1959	$ 992.6	$15,365.8	$18,169.4
1965	$1,174.0	$20,126.4	$24,528.6
1967	$1,400.2	$23,452.4	$28,417.0
1969	$1,858.4	$27,468.4	$33,274.1
1971	$2,055.4	$30,426.5	$37,299.6
Percent Increase 1950-1959	92.9%	65.5%	66.0%
Percent Increase 1959-1969	87.2%	78.8%	83.1%
Percent Increase 1969-1971	10.6%	10.8%	12.1%

* The region is defined as the SMSA plus Kendall, Grundy, and Kankakee Counties.

** Earnings include only wages and salaries.

1 Illinois State and Regional Economic Data Book, 1973 Edition, State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, p. 70.

Secondary employment earnings related to contract construction in the Chicago region cannot be determined. Goods and services of several industries are directly involved with construction activity, such as trucking, finance and insurance, real estate, manufacturing, and wholesale and retail trade. Trying to derive construction-related income for a specific region or jurisdiction would be highly speculative. However, the economic benefit or multiplier of construction employment income could be up to 1.8 on a secondary basis. Table III-5 shows the proportionate share of contract construction earnings to total earnings (wages and salaries) within the Chicago region. Contract construction income has accounted for about eight percent of total Chicago regional earnings since 1969.

Table III-5

Contract Construction Earnings as Proportionate Share of Total Earnings - Chicago Region[1]

Year	Contract Construction Earnings		Total Earnings	
	Millions	Percent	Millions	Percent
1950	514.7	6.5	7,964.1	100.
1959	992.6	7.5	13,208.9	100.
1965	1,174.0	6.7	17,404.1	100.
1967	1,400.2	6.9	20,409.1	100.
1969	1,858.4	7.7	24,203.2	100.
1971	2,055.4	7.7	26,790.3	100.

1 Illinois State and Regional Economic Data Book, 1973 edition, State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, p. 70.

Average monthly wages for construction employment are high, relative to other industries in the Chicago metropolitan area. Average wage levels are shown below:

Industry	Average Monthly Wages (Jan.-Mar.) 1970	1971	1972
Selected Industries, Total	$675	$709	$ 764
Mining	845	921	961
Contract Construction	927	986	1,099
Manufacturing	717	755	826
Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities	777	811	961
Wholesale and Retail Trade	577	604	644
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	696	743	800
Services and Miscellaneous Industries	576	610	640

Source: Illinois State and Regional Economic Data Book, 1973 Edition, Bureau of Employment Security, Illinois Department of Labor, p. 81.

Current monthly wages in contract construction have been estimated at $1,653, based on 1,800 hours per man-year at an average hourly rate of $11.02. Estimated 1976 union labor rates for the major trades in contract construction were published in "Engineering News Record," and are shown in Table III-6. These rates are considered to be appropriate for the Chicago metropolitan area.

3.1.3 Contract Construction Employment

Contract construction employment in the Chicago metropolitan area naturally fluctuates according to the magnitude of construction activity generated by both the public and private sector. Levels of construction activity are influenced by national economic conditions, the status and availability of Federal program assistance, and state and local government spending programs. The city of Chicago has been particularly successful in obtaining Federal program assistance for urban renewal, model cities, and other assisted housing development. The following examples typify major public construction and development projects which occurred in the Chicago metropolitan area during the past two decades:

- University of Illinois Circle Campus
- Mc Cormick Place Convention Center
- Rapid transit development and expansion
- Expansion and improvements at O'Hare Airport
- Civic Center - a complex of Federal and local government office buildings
- Major expansions in infrastructure - particularly schools and sewage system facilities.

Private sector activity has been consistently strong in the metropolitan area over the past 20 years, as well. During the past ten years, several major projects were initiated and completed in the city of Chicago, particularly

Table III-6
Current Union Hourly Wage Rates[1]

Worker Class	Dollars/Hour
Common Laborer	
Heavy Construction	8.80
Building Construction	8.80
Skilled Laborer	
Bricklayer	11.63
Carpenter	11.69
Structural Iron Worker	13.17
Plasterer	10.92
Electrician	12.94
Steam Fitter	12.37
Equipment Operator	
Hoist-One Drum	12.50
Tractor (including dozer)	11.20
Tractor - Scraper (15-16 c.y.)	11.20
Power Crane	12.50
Motor Grader	12.50
Air Compressor	10.05
Air Tool	9.105
Truck Drivers	
Dump Truck (4 c.y.)	8.90
Dump Truck (4 c.y.)	9.15
Average Hourly Rate	11.02

1 "Engineering News Record," January 1, 1976, p. 28.

the downtown area, which added significantly to the demand for construction services; these projects include:

Project	Year Completed	Cost
Sears Tower and Plaza	1974	$150 million
Water Tower Place	1975	$150 million
Standard Oil Building	1974	$150+ million
CNA Center	1974	$ 80 million
Illinois Center (One, Two)	1969, 1972	$ 83+ million
Marina City	1966	$ 40 million
First National Bank Complex	1973	$150 million
John Hancock Center	1969	$100 million
Hyatt Regency	1974	$ 45 million
Total		$948 million

Much of the above activity was stimulated by the public sector construction which began to revitalize the older downtown areas.

The construction-related employment opportunities in the Chicago SMSA have established a skilled labor force which is predominantly unionized, and have accounted for approximately 61 percent of total construction employment in Illinois in 1970. Table III-7 presents construction employment levels for Illinois, Cook County, and the Chicago SMSA in 1970. Table III-8 reflects the fluctuation in construction employment levels for the Chicago region for 1967, 1969, and 1971. As shown, the industry added over 19,000 jobs in one 2-year period and then dropped 8,161 jobs in the succeeding 2-year period. The industry is flexible and can expand or contract rapidly given the demand for construction services.

Table III-7
Construction Employment by Area - 1970[1]

	Civilian Labor Force	Total Employed	Construction Employment	Construction Employment as Percent of Total Employed
Illinois	4,591,634	4,419,915	225,416	5.1
Chicago SMSA	2,954,153	2,852,017	136,897	4.8
Cook County	2,355,804	2,269,683	99,866	4.4

1 County and City Data Book, 1972 Edition, "A Statistical Abstract Supplement," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, pp. 128, 550, 680.

Table III-8
Change in Construction Employment Level
Chicago Region 1967-1971[1]

	1967	1969	1971
Chicago Region	123,048	142,180	134,019

1 Illinois State and Regional Economic Data Book, 1973 Edition, State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, p. 80.

The past few years of national economic recession and the cutbacks in Federal and local program spending have had a significant impact on the construction industry employment levels. Current construction employment estimates for the Chicago SMSA and State of Illinois are shown in Table III-9.

Table III-9
Current Construction Employment Levels[1]

	1970	1975*	Percent Decrease
Illinois	225,416	185,800	17.6
Chicago SMSA	136,897	119,000	13.1

1 Division of State and Area Monthly Surveys, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Commerce, November 1975.

* Private communication, MSDGC, verbal estimate.

The overall impact was apparently more severe in other regions of the state given the 17.6 percent drop in employment in Illinois as compared to the 13.1 percent drop in Chicago.

3.2 LAND USE

The current and future land uses near the proposed TARP project are described in this section. Archeological sites, present and planned cultural sites, and historical sites are also presented as well as the locations of existing and planned recreational sites near the proposed tunnel system.

3.2.1 Current Urbanization Patterns

The current land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Calumet Tunnel system are described below for the land within 500 feet of the tunnel route, the proposed locations of drop shafts and construction shafts, and access shafts. Consequently, this section is limited to only the current land uses and facilities within these 500-feet limits.

(1) Tunnel Route

The tunnel route for the Calumet portion of the TARP system generally follows the Cal-Sag Channel, the Little Calumet River, and Calumet River. In general, these areas contain a wide variety of existing land use including residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and vacant space. The majority of the tunneling and conveyance structures follow existing waterways and should not cause relocation of existing development.

The land immediately adjacent to the route along the Cal-Sag Channel (Crawford Avenue to Western Avenue) is primarily industrial with some vacant lands. The tunnel routing along the Little Calumet River has a variety of land uses nearby including the railroad tracks of B&OTC, Chicago and Western Indiana lines. Residential areas are primarily encountered along Indiana Avenue between 140th Street and Sibley Road. The Dixmoor Branch of the Calumet system passess through mixed residential and vacant lands as well as the Forest Preserve. The Lansing Branch passes by the Little Calumet River and some residential and vacant undeveloped lands.

Most of the land in the Calumet area is currently highly urbanized and developed. The land use distribution has been estimated as follows:

- Residential 49 percent
- Commercial and Industries 16 percent
- Open Space and Parks 35 percent

(2) Potential Rock Disposal Areas

Rock accumulated from tunneling operations will be of a type similar to currently quarried rock in the metropolitan area, such as rock from McCook and Thornton quarries. These two quarries have temporary storage capacity for rock prior to its sale for commercial use. The largest rock size expected from tunnel excavations will be about three inches in diameter, and the rock will be roughly cubical in shape. Stearns quarry is commercially inactive and is capable of accepting large quantities of nonsaleable fill from TARP. Nonsaleable fill includes rock fines and clayey or flint-like rocks which make up the majority of the excavated material. All of these quarries are located in industrial areas.

(3) Potential Tunnel-Sludge Disposal Areas

Approximately 32 percent of the metropolitan area's sewage sludge is shipped to the MSDGC's 10,000-acre landfill in Fulton County. The balance of the sludge is distributed to the NuEarth Program, broker sales, Lawndale Lagoons, and landfill. Although only a few suitable landfill sites exist in the metro area, the Fulton site is capable of accepting additional sludge removed from the proposed tunnels.

3.2.2 Urbanization Plans

This section describes the relationships between the Calumet area's land use plans and the existing land use along the proposed tunnel route, and at existing sites which could be used for the disposal of excavated rock and dredged sludge from the tunnels.

(1) Tunnel Route

The Calumet Tunnel system section of TARP is designed to serve the south facility area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago area which contains approximately 293.2 square miles. This area includes the southernmost part of the city of Chicago, six suburban communities, and numerous neighborhood areas. (See Appendix F). The area is highly urbanized, with land use and development planning functions fragmented among the many jurisdictions.

There are no major plans for redevelopment or new large-scale development among the towns and communities currently underway or under active consideration. The tunnel route follows existing waterways and if constructed would improve water quality, which might attract additional water-using industry to the Calumet area, as well as improve recreational park and water-oriented development along the Calumet and Little Calumet Rivers, and the Cal-Sag Channel.

(2) Potential Rock Disposal Areas

The operating quarries are likely to continue in operation, while Stearns quarry will probably be filled up eventually and possibly used as a park.

The Chicago Lakefront Plan has several alternatives. One alternative recommends landfilling along the Lake Michigan shoreline and constructing numerous islands about a mile off shore. This operation could provide adequate sites for rock excavated from TARP tunnels. Although construction of the tunnel would make excavated material available, use of the rock for this purpose would have to be examined as part of the environmental assessment of the lakefront Plan itself. The other alternatives will also require landfilling and recommend the following:

- Expansion of the park base through shoreline extension. This landfill would complete a continuous public shoreline, add new parkland, and strengthen the shoreline to withstand erosion.

- Breakwater construction and shoreline extension and creation of sheltered water areas which increase shore protection and provide opportunities for small boating, swimming and fishing.

Overall, the Lakefront Plan depends on suitable excavated material from the TARP project to construct these new land forms.

(3) Potential Tunnel-Sludge Disposal Areas

The metropolitan area will probably continue to rely on the Fulton County site for disposal of sewage sludge, including tunnel sludge cleaned from TARP tunnels.

3.2.3 Archeological Sites

There are no known sites of archeological interest along the route of the Calumet Tunnel system. There is provision in the MSDGC Contract Documents, General Specifications for sewers, Page GSS-6 for the preservation of historical as well as archeological specimens. This section reads as follows:

> "Historical and Scientific Specimens
>
> The Contractor shall preserve and deliver to the Engineer any specimens of historic or scientific value encountered in the work as directed by the Engineer."

Any archeological sites which may have existed at potential rock disposal or sludge disposal areas cited above have probably been destroyed or covered with fill.

3.2.4 Cultural Sites

There are several sites and facilities near the tunnel route which could be termed sensitive rather than historic or archeological. These sites are considered cultural sites and are identified as follows:

• Church	142nd Street west of Burnham Avenue
• First Reformed Church	South Park Avenue south of Little Calumet River
• First Baptist Church	Riverview Drive and Cottage Grove Avenue
• Church	151st Street and State Street

.	Thornton Junior College	158th Street and State Street
.	Church	159th Street and State Street
.	Holmes Schools	160th Street and Finch Avenue
.	Riley School	160th Street and Lincoln Avenue
.	Lincoln School	Broadway and Chicago Street, Blue Island
.	St. Paul's School	138th Street and Indiana Avenue
.	St. Mary's School	138th Street and Leyden Avenue
.	Scanlan School	133rd Street and Calumet Avenue
.	Aldridge School	130th Street east of Chicago & Western Indiana RR.

3.2.5 Historical Sites

There are no sites or facilities of historic significance along the Calumet Tunnel route which appear in the National Historic Register. There are also no sites or facilities under consideration for registration. As mentioned in Section 3.2.3, however, if during construction specimens of historic or archeological interest are uncovered, the contractor must preserve and deliver same to the project engineer for safekeeping.

3.2.6 Recreational Sites

As the Calumet Tunnel route follows existing waterways there are several parks and recreational facilities located nearby or adjacent to the route. These have been identified as follows:

.	Boat Harbor	Little Calumet River west of the Calumet Expressway

.	Boat Yards	Grand Calumet and Little Calumet River
.	Gombos Boat Yard	Little Calumet River and New York Central RR
.	Forest Preserve	Thornton Road between Loomis Street and Ashland Avenue
.	Veterans Memorial Park	South Park Avenue and 160th Place
.	Riverview Park	Riverview Drive and Wood-lawn East Avenue
.	Little Calumet Park	158th Street and Keinbank Avenue
.	Tomahawk Park	151st Street and State Street
.	Wigwam Park	158th Street and State Street
.	Raceway Park	Vermont Street and Ash-land Avenue-Calumet Park
.	Triplex Marina	Little Calumet River west of Halsted
.	Lion Field	South Indiana Avenue and 124th Street.

3.3 RESOURCES

The following two sections discuss financial and labor resources. The first section provides an analysis of the financial resources available to fund the Calumet Tunnel system and the other two tunnel systems, and the second section presents a profile of the labor force in the Chicago metropolitan area.

3.3.1. Financial

This section discusses the financing schedule and availability of pollution control funds for:

- The MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control Program
- The Calumet Tunnel system (water pollution control tunnels only)
- The total Phase I Tunnels (water pollution control tunnels only).

In addition, this section addresses the availability of funds for certain elements of the MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control Plan, which are not part of the plan for the Phase I Tunnels and which are closely related to the overall goal of meeting the 1983 water quality standards. These elements include:

- Instream aeration
- TARP storage reservoirs
- Increases in treatment levels, efficiencies, and plant capacities.

Both existing and potential funding sources are considered for the pollution control aspects of the program and for the key elements which are not part of the Phase I Plan to assess how much financial assistance current programs might provide and to indicate how these programs must be augmented to complete program implementation. The impact of the Phase I tunnels on the MSDGC's property tax rate is also considered, and the annual sequence of anticipated contract award dollars is identified for the construction of the Phase I Tunnel projects. The fund commitment schedule is also presented, indicating anticipated sources necessary for the support of this award program. The data and analyses presented in this section indicate that the financing requirements of constructing the Phase I tunnels of TARP can be met. In addition, it can be reasonably assumed that the financing requirements of other key elements of the MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control Plan associated with meeting 1983 water quality standards (instream aeration and expansion of the Calumet treatment facilities) can be met. In the case of the West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project, the financing feasibility is very doubtful. Finally, financing for the TARP storage reservoirs is uncertain. The complex issue of the authority of the Corps of Engineers in the case of urban drainage improvement projects is currently under consideration. However, there is presently no congressional appropriation and no request from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for an appropriation to help support the construction of the TARP reservoirs.

(1) Construction Cost Schedule

The total Chicago Flood and Pollution Control Program has two major parts; TARP, to correct the combined-sewer overflow problem, and a series of projects identified by the MSDGC. Major goals of this series of projects include:

- Increases in treatment levels, efficiencies, and plant capacities
- Extensions and enlargements of interceptor sewer facilities
- Flood control in separate storm sewer areas
- Waterway dredging
- Provision of sludge handling facilities.

Table III-10 presents the MSDGC construction and financing schedule designed to meet the 1983 goals of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (PL 92-500) and the flood control abatement objectives. The schedule requires that project awards be forthcoming through FY 1986. The table presents a summary of the Flood and Pollution Control Plan by major category and anticipated award levels. The cost projections are based on 1975 construction costs and incorporate a six percent annual cost escalator. Although the sewer construction cost index rose 20 percent in 1974 and rose an estimated 12 to 13 percent in 1975, the consensus of opinion among Federal and business financial leaders is that the inflation rate will stabilize at five to seven percent over the next decade. The six percent escalator thus represents a reasonable expectation in terms of the future impact of inflation on the relevant construction cost figures. The plan has a total expected cost of approximately \$3.54 billion, of which approximately \$1.84 billion is associated with TARP. Of the \$1.84 billion, elements related to water pollution control account for approximately \$1.03 billion and measures related principally to flood control for \$.81 billion.[1]

1 This \$.81 billion primarily includes the TARP storage reservoirs and Phase II relief tunnels.

Table III-10
MSDGC Flood and Pollution Control Plan - Implementation Schedule[1]

Program	Fiscal Year 76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	Totals
Sewers	56.3[*]	59.4	11.0	0.1	2.0							128.8
Plant Improvements	176.3	19.3	120.1	282.8	281.5	222.0						1,102.0[2]
Solids Disposal	24.2	8.0	31.6	66.5	4.5	4.0	4.0					142.8
Instream Aeration	2.8	13.9										16.7
TARP												
No Cost Escalator	111.2	338.7	282.9	205.8	200.4	115.8	159.0	73.5	32.4	5.7	2.2	1,527.6
Six Percent Annual Escalator	111.2	359.0	317.9	245.1	253.0	155.0	225.5	110.5	51.6	9.6	3.9	1,842.3
Flood Control	8.6	26.2	10.2	3.6	0.5		0.3	0.1	2.5			52.0
Total Annual Awards												
No Cost Escalator	379.4	465.5	455.8	558.8	488.9	341.8	163.3	73.6	34.9	5.7	2.2	2,969.9
Six Percent Annual Cost Escalator	379.4	493.4	512.1	665.7	617.2	457.3	231.6	110.7	55.6	9.6	3.9	3,536.5

1 Figures are derived from the data presented in the MSDGC Facilities Planning Study, revised version dated January 1975

2 Includes the $124 million already obligated for the O'Hare Treatment Plant Project

* All figures are in $ millions.

Table III-11 presents the construction and award schedules for the Calumet Tunnel system. The estimated construction cost for the Calumet tunnels (in 1976 dollars, escalated six percent annually) is $378.2 million. The EPA have made a preliminary determination that approximately 84 percent ($87.0 million in 1976 dollars) of the collecting structure and drop shaft costs will be eligible for construction grant funds under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1972 (PL 92-500).[1] The other 16 percent is associated with flood control benefits and is, therefore, ineligible for pollution control funding. The annual operating and maintenance costs for the Calumet Tunnel system are estimated to be approximately $2.5 million; the estimate for the entire tunnel system is $3.0 million annually.

(2) Sources of Funds

Certain funds are either already available or may be requested under existing legislation for implementing a part of the total Flood and Pollution Control Plan. These funds are derived from local, State, and Federal sources. The Federal sources include grant programs involving water pollution control, flood control, urban renewal, and recreation facilities development. This section focuses on the sources of pollution control funds for implementing the Calumet Tunnel system.

1. Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSDGC)

The MSDGC customarily finances construction and facilities replacement by proceeds from the sale of construction bonds. The District is authorized to incur indebtedness in an amount not to exceed five percent of its total assessed valuation. As of January 1, 1976, the unexercised debt-incurring capacity is $718.5 million.

1 The figure of 84 percent may not hold for the Lower Des Plaines Tunnel system. Certain costs for this system are still under review with no final conclusions derived to date.

Table III-11
Construction Award Schedule for the Phase I Calumet Tunnel System
($ million)

Construction Contracts[1]	Fiscal Year 76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	Totals
Crawford to Plant	-	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	7.6	-	-	-	-	61.6
Plant to Calumet City	-	3.5	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.2	-	-	-	-	33.7
Torrence Avenue Branch	-	5.0	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	5.0	3.4	-	-	-	53.8
Plant to Thornton Quarry and Markham Branch	-	-	-	-	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	4.5	0.3	-	39.6
Dixmoor and Lansing Branches	-	-	-	-	-	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	4.5	-	48.1
Pumping Stations - #1	-	-	8.2	9.8	9.8	6.6	-	-	-	-	-	34.5
#2	-	-	-	5.6	5.6	5.6	2.8	-	-	-	-	19.5
Calumet Phase I Totals												
No Cost Escalator	0	19.3[2]	36.1	43.3	52.0	59.7	37.2	23.0	15.4	4.8	-	290.8
6% Cost Escalator[3] (annual)	0	20.5	40.6	51.6	65.6	79.9	52.8	34.6	24.5	8.1	-	378.2

1 Includes conveyance tunnels, drop shafts, access shafts, grouting, and collecting structures.

2 1976 dollars.

3 Escalated from 1976 dollar values.

Prior to 1971, the plan to issue bonds required a referendum. In 1971, however, a bill was enacted authorizing the issuance of up to $380 million in general obligation construction bonds without referendum. The MSDGC can issue these bonds at a maximum rate of $100 million per year, plus carry-over of the unused portion of that rate from previous years. The bonds must be repaid within 20 years from the date of issuance.

In support of existing national and state goals, the District has already issued $249.5 in Capital Improvement Bonds and has remaining unused authority to issue $130.5 million of additional bonds. Approximately $66.3 million of the remaining authorization is targeted by the MSDGC for the Phase I Tunnels.

The present authorization of the District to issue bonds for pollution control work is based on previous water quality standards. Since water quality standards have become more stringent, the MSDGC is currently formulating plans to ask Illinois for an increased bonding authority in the vicinity of $200-400 million. In view of the District's AA bond rating and additional dept-carrying capacity, additional bond funds in the range of $200-300 million should be available in the near future at a reasonable interest rate.

The MSDGC is also authorized to levy an ad valorem tax for construction purposes in an amount not to exceed $.26 for each $100 of assessed valuation. Table III-12 presents an estimate of the change in property tax rate attributable to the anticipated Tunnel Plan financing requirements.

For illustration purposes, the ad valorem property tax for a $50,000 home is computed for 1981 (peak construction year), and for 1986 (end construction year). In 1981, the home owner would pay a $0.35 ad valorem construction tax, while in 1986, he would only pay a $0.265 ad valorem construction tax.

Table III-12
1976 Estimate of the Change in Property Tax Rate Attributable to the Implementation of the Phase I Tunnel System

Fiscal Year	Cost of Tunnel Plan ($Millions)	Incremental Change in Tax Rate ¢/$100 Assessed Valuation	Cumulative Change in Tax Rate ¢/$100 Assessed Valuation
76	50.7	.005	.005
77	92.2	.007	.012
78	159.8	.013	.025
79	183.5	.013	.033
80	189.9	.012	.049
81	173.0	.021	.070
82	95.7	(.004)	.066
83	57.5	(.005)	.061
84	22.2	(.002)	.059
85	5.7	(.003)	.056
86	2.2	(.003)	.053

Assumptions:

- MSDGC's share of construction costs is 25 percent
- MSDGC financing is accomplished with 20-year bonds, 5 1/2 percent coupon
- TAX BASE ($22.7 billion in 1975) is escalated at six percent annually
- Operating/maintenance cost not included in Tunnel Plan cost figures
- Effect of construction grant program disbursement schedule on MSDGC is not considered.

1 **This represents a 13.3 percent increase over the 1975 MSDGC tax rate of $.4005 per $100 of assessed valuation.**

2. State of Illinois

By approval of the bond issue referendum of 1970, the State of Illinois was authorized to issue bonds up to a maximum of $750 million. Approximately $150 million of these funds have already been raised through bond sales leaving approximately $300 million potentially available (by agreement with the State) to the MSDGC for implementing Phase I TARP. For FY 1976, the MSDGC. A conservative posture would suggest that approximately $300 million would potentially be available to the District in FY 1976-1977. statewide appropriation of these funds is $206 million; therefore, it would be unreasonable to expect that a major portion of this potential $300 million would be available in FY 1976 to the MSDGC for the Tunnel Plan. A conservative posture would suggest that approximately $300 million would potentially be available to the District in FY 1976-1977.

The State's ability to raise funds in the general obligations municipal bond market is good, as exemplified by its AA bond rating, which should ensure that funds can be raised at reasonable coupons. The prospects of future or increased bonding authorization are extremely bleak because of lack of political feasibility and the requirement for referendum.

3. Federal (PL 92-500)

Of the total $18 billion appropriation under PL 92-500, the State of Illinois was allocated a total of $1.137 billion ($125 million in FY 1973; $187.5 million in FY 1974; $252.3 million in FY 1975; and $571.0 million in FY 1976). By virtue of the State's priority scheme, the MSDGC anticipates that approximately 50 percent of the funds will be allocated for its Water Pollution Control Program. Substantial portions of FY 1973-1975 funds have already been obligated to the District. The major obligations include:

- $43.65 million for the O'Hare Sewer Project

- $49.22 million for the North Shore section of TARP (Addison-Wilmette)

- $93.0 million for the construction of the O'Hare Treatment Plant Facilities.

Unobligated Federal funds currently total approximately $646.1 million ($5.5 million FY 1973 and 1974 funds; $68.9 million FY 1975 funds; and $571.7 million FY 1976 funds). FY 1975 and prior years' funds must be obligated by June 30, 1976; FY 1976 funds must be obligated by September 30, 1977. Of this $646.1 million funds total, approximately $323.1 million will be available to the MSDGC in FY 1976 and 1977. The Illinois priority scheme for the allocation of these remaining funds to the District provides that:

- Mainstream tunnels, drop shafts, and collecting structures receive 100 percent priority

- The Calumet system has some Step 2 and Step 3 projects in funding range

- The Lower Des Plaines system has some Step 2 projects within funding range.

EPA headquarters has requested an increase of $42 billion in the future Federal Pollution Control funding authorization under PL 92-500. EPA recommends an annual appropriation of $7 billion for FY 1977-1982. Staff members of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee have indicated that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) recommendation to the President will probably entail a multiyear appropriation of $5 billion annually. The staff also indicated that the allocation scheme used to parcel out funds to the states is likely to change. The FY 1973-1976 funds ($18 billion) were allocated primarily on the basis of needs, as defined in the 1974 Needs Survey. Under this scheme several states (including New York, California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania) were allocated over 50 percent of the total appropriation. The allocation of the State of Illinois has averaged approximately 6.32 percent. EPA-Washington has recommended a formula which would give equal weight both to state needs (as defined in the 1974 survey) and to projected state population in 1990. It is reasonable to expect that a formula similar to this will be adopted by Congress and applied to the FY 1977 appropriation. The impact of this change in the allocation formula would be to reduce Illinois' share of future national appropriations to approximately 5.2 percent. Even if the allocation formula remains the same, the state's share of the national appropriation is expected to decline somewhat because its needs have been declining as a result of employing Pollution Control Bond funds. The MSDGC's share of future Federal water pollution control appropriations is conservatively estimated to be 50 percent over the FY 1977-1982 period. Assuming a $5 billion annual appropriation and a 5.2 percent allocation to the State of Illinois, the District could reasonably expect $780 million of additional Federal Funds available over FY 1977-1982.

(3) Phase I Tunnels Financing Schedule - Currently Available and Additionally Required Funds

Table III-13 presents the award schedules anticipated for the Mainstream and Calumet Tunnel systems, and the total Flood and Pollution Control plan. The table shows that the existing available funding from the State and the MSDGC is sufficient to implement the Calumet Tunnel system. Additional Federal Water Pollution Control funds of approximately $221.6 million will be required to meet the implementation schedule for the Mainstream and Calumet Tunnels. In view of the very conservative estimates of future Federal appropriations, it can be reasonably assumed that the future financing requirements can be met.

(4) Financing of Maintenance and Operations Costs

For maintenance and operations, the District is authorized to levy an ad valorem tax in an amount not to exceed $.37 for each $100 of assessed valuation, less the amount received pursuant to the Industrial Waste Surcharge Ordinance. The State statute also contains authority to impose a user charge which is currently required under PL 92-500.

Table III-13

Financing Schedule - Phase I Mainstream and Calumet Tunnel System

Fiscal Year	Awards Schedule ($ Millions)			Funding Sources ($ Millions)					
				Federal (EPA)		State		MSDGC	
	TARP	Mainstream Tunnel System	Calumet Tunnel System	Existing	Additional** Requirement for Phase I Tunnels	Existing	Additional** Requirement for Phase I Tunnels	Existing	Additional** Requirement for Phase I Tunnels
76	379.4	16.6	-	372.6*	-	300	-	66.3	-
77	493.4	54.9	20.5				-		-
78	512.1	76.9	40.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	665.7	91.4	51.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
80	617.2	96.7	65.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	457.3	90.2	79.9	-	82.4	-	-	-	27.8
82	231.6	51.8	52.8	-	71.8	-	-	-	23.9
83	110.7	18.2	34.6	-	43.1	-	-	-	14.4
84	55.6	8.6	24.5	-	16.7	-	-	-	5.5
85	9.6	2.9	8.1	-	4.3	-	-	-	1.4
86	3.9	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	.5
Total	3,536.5	508.2	378.2	372.6	220.0	300	-	66.3	73.5

* Includes approximately $49.6 million already obligated to the North Shore section of Mainstream TARP (Addison-Wilmette segment).

** Assumes required financing will be forthcoming; 75 percent from Federal and state sources and 25 percent from the MSDGC.

Despite the fact that many municipalities historically have funded operation and maintenance costs of treatment facilities by imposing *ad valorem* taxes, this system does not provide incentives for domestic and low-volume commercial users to conserve water. EPA headquarters has contended, however, that "a properly formulated user charge system based on *ad valorem* taxes is a viable and appropriate method of funding operation and maintenance costs."[1] Region V EPA has awarded two grants to the MSDGC to develop a user charge system to comply with the requirements of PL 92-500. The final system will probably be based on water usage (as opposed to *ad valorem* taxes) with several categories of user charge schedules.

(5) Major Non-Phase I TARP Elements: Currently Available and Additionally Required Funds

This section addresses the financing schedule and availability of funds for certain elements of the MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control Plan, which are not part of the Phase I Tunnel and Reservoir Plan and are closely associated with the overall goal of meeting 1983 water quality standards. These elements include:

- Instream aeration to add dissolved oxygen to the waterway system receiving plant effluents
- Increases in treatment levels, efficiencies, and plant capacity
- Excavation of three TARP storage reservoirs to capture remaining pollutant discharges, reduce backflows to Lake Michigan, and control flooding.

1. Instream Aeration

In terms of project phasing and priorities, instream aeration stands ahead of the Tunnel Plan (tunnel systems, drop shafts, and connecting structures).[2] Instream aeration is not a treatment system and is thus not eligible for FWPCA funding. The Illinois EPA, however, has committed funds for

1 Letter from EPA Administrator Russell E. Train to House Speaker Carl Albert, February 3, 1975.

2 *MSDGC Facilities Planning Study*, January 1975, p. M-XI-14.

the instream aeration phase of the project. The funding requirement (approximately $16.7 million for a series of eleven batteries of diffusers located adjacent to and parallel to the banks of the waterway) will most likely be met from the $300 million of State funds targeted for the MSDGC or from funds raised by the District through an anticipated increased or additional bonding authorization.

Funding of instream aeration with the currently available State funds would increase the additional funds required by the MSDGC to implement the Tunnel Plan, from $73.5 million to $90.2 million (see Table III-13). In view of the sound fiscal posture of the MSDGC, it can reasonably be assumed that the future financing requirements can be met.

2. Treatment Plant Improvements

Treatment plant improvements (Calumet and West-Southwest plants) require an estimated $1.02 billion. Construction of the O'Hare treatment plant is planned for the near future; the project entails an estimated cost of $124 million, of which EPA has obligated $93 million in Step 3 FWPCA funding, and the MSDGC is funding the remainder.

In terms of priorities, the treatment plant expansion at Calumet (estimated cost of $352.8 million) stand directly behind instream aeration.[1] According to current estimates, this project will be ready for Step 3 FWPCA funding in January of 1979. The West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project (estimated cost of $666.3 million) is currently expected to be ready for Step 3 FWPCA funding in December 1979.[2]

Focusing on the higher priority Calumet expansion project, it is anticipated that sufficient FWPCA and MSDGC funds will be available to finance the proposed project. As discussed in a previous section of this report, the MSDGC can reasonably expect $780 million of additional FWPCA funds over the FY 1977-1982 period. An estimated $345.8 million

1 MSDGC Facilities Planning Study, January 1975, p. M-XI-14.

2 The cost estimates for the three treatment plant projects are based on the estimates provided in the MSDGC's Facility Plan (January, 1975). These estimates were in 1975 dollars and had to be escalated for the assumed 6 percent annual inflation rate.

of this total is required for implementation of the Phase I Tunnel system. The remaining $434.2 million of Federal funds would more than cover the required $264.6 million (75 percent of $352.8 million) for the Calumet treatment plant expansion project. The MSDGC's share of the project ($88.2 million) will increase the District's additional funding requirement from $132.0 million (additional funds required for the Tunnel Plan and instream aeration) to $220.2 million. In view of the MSDGC's AA general obligation bond rating and its current formulation of plans to ask Illinois for an increased or additional bonding authority in the vicinity of $200-400 million, it is reasonable to expect that the Calumet treatment plant expansion project can be financed.

For the West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project, the financing feasibility cannot be defined at this time. According to current estimates, this project will not be ready for Step 3 FWPCA funding until December 1979. The remaining portion of the $780 million of FWPCA funds estimated to be available to the MSDGC for the period FY 1977-1982, would fall short by approximately $330.1 million, if it were obligated to the West-Southwest treatment plant expansion project.[1] In addition, the funding of this project would increase the MSDGC's additional funding requirement from $220.2 million to $386.8 million. The projected shortfall in Federal funds and the significant increase in MSDGC funds required combine to make the funding feasibility highly doubtful for the West-Southwest treatement plant expansion project.

3. Reservoirs

The estimated cost of the three TARP storage reservoirs (Upper Des Plaines, Mainstream, and Calumet systems) is $471.6 million in 1975 dollars.[2]

1 EPA's portion of this project would be approximately $499.7 million; the MSDGC's portion would be $166.6 million.

2 Addition of the flood control tunnels raises this figure to approximately $.81 billion in 1975 dollars escalated 6 percent annually.

The benefits derived from the construction of the reservoirs primarily are control of overbank flooding and decrease of flood discharges into the downstream reaches of the waterways.

The reservoirs, however, could potentially qualify for Federal flood control funding. The Flood Control Act of 1937 established the principle of Federal participation in flood control projects. The 1944 Flood Control Act redefined flood control to include channel and major drainage improvement. In practice, however, this authority (drainage improvement) has only been applied to the agricultural area. There is no precedent for Federal participation (drainage improvement) in urban applications such as the TARP reservoirs.

The Corps of Engineers is now in the process of determining the Federal interest in providing funding for the total Underflow Plan. The Chicago District Corps of Engineers has prepared a report entitled Urban Water Damage Study, The Chicagoland Underflow Plan, dated December 1975. Final recommendations regarding the division of Underflow Plan responsibilities depend on the character and degree of interest at EPA headquarters. The Chicago District has sent the report to the North Central Division office of the Corps of Engineers which will, in turn, be sent to the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

4. Relationship of TARP Phases

The systems and subsystems of TARP will be constructed in two phases. Phase I involves construction of only the pollution control elements of TARP and consists of the main wastewater conveyance tunnels, drop shafts, and pumping stations. The remaining phase will be the construction of the flood control elements, which include the relief tunnels and storage reservoirs.

3.3.2 Labor

This section provides a general profile of Chicago's labor force and should be reviewed in conjunction with Section 3.1.3 which discusses in detail the contract construction labor force.

The Chicago metropolitan area labor force is diverse. Traditionally, it has drawn workers from nearby states and from rural areas in the south as employment opportunities have increased or were perceived to be better than those elsewhere in the south and central United States. In 1970, the Chicago SMSA civilian labor force comprised 64 percent of the total Illinois labor force. Labor force characteristics for 1970 are detailed in Table III-14. The labor force is predominantly male, with women comprising approximately 40 percent of the civilian labor force in 1970. Total white collar workers comprised 53 percent of the labor force in the Chicago SMSA in 1970.

Unemployment rates obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Commerce are shown below:

Jurisdiction	Rate	Date
State of Illinois	8.7%	November 1975
Cook County	9.6%	October 1975
City of Chicago	11.2%	October 1975

National unemployment for the third quarter was 8.4 percent. Chicago's employment profile is heavily dependent upon manufacutring and nonservice employment, all of which were more vulnerable to the economic recession than other employment types. Two other general trends that will contribute to the Chicago area's keeping a relatively high unemployment rate are higher productivity and labor force growth. Nationwide, productivity increased faster than employment during the busy recovery period of 1970 to 1973 and this is expected to happen again during 1975 to 1978.[1] The labor force is also growing because of an increasing participation rate among women. It is unlikely that this trend will reserve itself in the next decade.

---

1 *Fortune Magazine*, November 1975, p. 22.

Table III-14
1970 Labor Force Characteristics[1]

	Civilian Labor Force	Percent Female	Total Employment	Percent of Employment Distribution: Manufacturing	Wholesale and Retail Trade	Services	Educ. Services	Construction	Government	Professional/ Managerial	Sales and Clerical	Craftsmen, Foremen	Percent Unemployed
City of Chicago	1,451,432	41.3	1,387,908	32.0	20.0	8.3	5.5	3.7	11.1	17.8	30.0	12.7	4.4
Chicago SMSA	2,954,153	38.7	2,852,017	31.7	20.8	7.4	6.2	4.8	11.7	23.0	30.0	13.9	3.5
Cook County	2,355,804	39.4	2,269,683	31.3	21.0	7.7	6.0	4.4	11.8	22.0	30.8	13.5	3.7

1 County and City Data Book, 1972 Edition, "A Statistical Abstract Supplement," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 128, 550, 680.

3.4 TRANSPORTATION

Surface roadways and waterways are likely to be affected by the construction and operation of the proposed tunneling project. Therefore, this section describes the existing conditions of highways, streets, and waterways in the project service area which might be affected.

3.4.1 Highways and Streets

The roadways that are likely to be affected by the proposed project primarily include those to be used by trucks transporting rock and spoil material from construction sites to disposal areas. Since no decision on the disposal method has yet been made, exact locations of disposal sites and, hence, truck routes cannot be identified. If Thornton Quarry is used for disposal of the rock and spoil material from the Calumet Tunnel system, the most likely truck routes for the proposed five construction shafts, that is, No. 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 would be as follows:

- From construction shaft No. 2, (located near the boundaries of the city of Chicago, Calumet City, and Burnham) to Thornton Quarry via 130th Street, Indiana Avenue, and Vincennes Road.
- From construction shaft No. 4, 5, and 6 (located along Indiana Avenue) to Thornton Quarry via Indiana Avenue and Vincennes Road.
- From construction shaft No. 7 (located along 159th Street near Cottage Grove Avenue) to Thornton Quarry via 159th Street, Indiana Avenue and Vincennes Road.

Among the roads mentioned above, 159th Street is a four-lane highway with total annual average daily traffic volume in 1972 near the intersection of Indiana Avenue of about 22,900 vehicles, including about 2450 commercial vehicles and less than 100 heavy trucks.[1] Recent traffic counts for the other affected roads are not available. However, the 1967 traffic counts indicate an average of 17,100 vehicles per day on 130th Street near the intersection of

1 Based on traffic maps prepared by the Illinois Department of Transportation, Office of Planning, Programming, and Environmental Science.

Indiana Avenue.[1] Similarly the 1969 traffic counts on Indiana Avenue indicate an average daily traffic volume of 10,600 vehicles near 130th Street, 13,500 vehicles near 142 d Street, 9,500 vehicles near 159th Street and 6,100 vehicles near Vincennes Road.[2]

3.4.2 Waterways

This section describes transportation activities on the waterways in the Chicago metropolitan area. General information concerning the waterways is given in Section 2.1.1. Harbors and waterways in the Chicago metropolitan area are shown in Figure III-1. The discussion in this section is presented as follows:

- Navigational season
- Water level
- Cargo movement.

(1) Navigational Season

Commercial traffic uses Calumet Harbor throughout the year. The general navigation season for Chicago harbor extends from April to December.

For the years from 1959 through 1974, the closing date for the Chicago Harbor varied from December 2 to December 17.[3]

(2) Water Level

The depths of the waterways vary with location. The minimum depth in the waterways or segments of waterways is termed the controlling depth. As of June 30, 1974, the controlling depth was nine feet for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, the Calumet-Sag Channel, and the Little Calumet River and Calumet River from the east end of the Calumet-Sag Channel to Turning Basin No. 5 in the Calumet River.[3] The controlling depth in the Chicago River varies from nine feet in the South Branch to 21 feet in the North Branch.

1 Traffic Map, Chicago, Illinois, prepared by Illnois Department of Public Works and Buildings, Division of Highways, Bureau of Planning 1967.

2 1969 Traffic Map, Cook County, Illinois, prepared by Illinois Department of Public Works and Building, Division of Highways Bureau of Planning 1969.

3 Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Identification of Facilities at the Port of Chicago, for State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, June 1975.

FIGURE III-1
Harbors and Waterways of the Chicago Area[1]



Harbors and Waterways of the Chicago Area. (Updated from Mid-Chicago Economic Development Study, Mayor's Committee for Economic and Cultural Development of Chicago, 1966)

1 Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Identification of Facilities at the Port of Chicago, for State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, June 1975.

(3) Cargo Movement

The Chicago waterways play an important role in area waterborne commerce. Of the 46.155 million tons of waterborne freight traffic through the Port of Chicago in 1969, 17.268 million tons moved over the inland waterways.[1] During 1974, the freight movement over the waterways grew to 37.2 million tons.[1] The waterway traffic growth patterns in the State of Illinois are shown in Figure III-2.

The facilities along some portions of the Chicago River handle deep draft traffic (draft greater than nine feet) and the remaining waterways accommodate shallow draft barge traffic.

3.5 MAJOR PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

This section describes those capital projects costing over one million dollars of various local, state, and Federal government agencies and of private firms, which would be constructed in the area of the proposed Calumet Tunnel system.

3.5.1 Rail and Truck Terminal Improvements

The vicinity of the proposed tunnel route is a major transportation corridor for railways and trucks. New facilities will be added during the period from 1976 to 1995 and presently underutilized facilities will be used for other purposes. Details of proposed rail and truck terminal improvements can be found in "Recommendations for the Chicago Area Freight System for 1995."[2] The recommendations suggest no major alterations of the existing pattern of rail and truck terminal development.

---

1 Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Economic Analysis of the Port of Chicago, for the State of Illinois, Department of Business and Economic Development, November 1975.

2 Chicago Area Transportation Study, CATS project 364 08, February 1974.

FIGURE III-2
Illinois Waterway Traffic
Growth[1]



1 MSDGC, Environmental Impact Statement Related to the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, November 1973.

3.5.2 Public Acquisition of Energy-Utility Corridor

The reference cited on the previous page also recommends the public purchase of a right-of-way along part of the north segment of the Calumet River which coincides with the proposed Torrence Avenue route of the Calumet system. Presently, privately owned rights-of-way along the river are used for transmission lines by Commonwealth Edison electric utility and by Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America for a 36-inch diameter gas pipeline. No petroleum pipelines currently use rights-of-way along the river.[1]

The public right-of-way would concentrate future utility lines in a single right-of-way to make better use of land resources while accommodating the growing residential and industrial energy needs. Under the proposed acquisition program, the state would purchase those parts of the designated energy-utility corridor which might be in danger of being abandoned. Lands would be classified as "land-bank property," and funds derived from the sale or lease of the right-of-way would be used to repay principal and interest. Based on Cost analyses of reserving the right-of-way in the area of the proposed tunnel route, the corridor would consist of Commonwealth Edison rights-of-way near the river and several railway corridors which cross the river at right angles.

1 "Freight Facility Compendium," Chicago Area Transportation Study, CATS project 354 04, April 1972.

IV. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

IV. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Several basic alternatives have been considered to resolve the flooding and pollution problems of the Chicago metropolitan area. These alternatives are:

- Separate sewers, which provide a separate storm sewer line parallel to existing sanitary sewers and involves laying over 440 miles of additional lines under city streets

- Collect discharges from 640 outfalls into 340 collection basins and provide surface or subsurface storage at or near each of those outfalls

- Ultimate surface collection, which conveys and collects wastewaters from the 340 basins into several large reservoirs or storage basins

- Tunnels and reservoirs (TARP) which is similar to ultimate surface collection except conveyance is done by deep tunnels.

It is EPA's opinion that these alternatives have been thoroughly weighed and evaluated in past studies and that the proposed action (TARP) is clearly the most effective and least costly. The following sections summarize many of the options which have been analyzed over the past five years[1] and highlights the events leading up to the selection of TARP.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE PLANS

During the past 20 years, numerous plans to solve the flooding and water pollution problems in the Chicago

---

1 Based on information presented in the Flood Control Coordinating Committee report, "Summary of Technical Reports - Alternatives," August 1972.

metropolitan area have been developed by government agencies, local organizations, and individuals. The early plans focused mainly on flood control, but as degradation of water resources continued to increase, plans began to address water pollution control. Promulgated water quality standards and Lake Michigan backflow regulations also influenced the development of additional plans.

In November 1970, the Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC) was reactivated to review and evaluate the plans developed and formulate additional ones to address both the flooding and water pollution problems. The committee consisted of representatives from the State of Illinois, Cook County, the MSDGC, and the city of Chicago. Twenty-three alternative plans were evaluated in detail with respect to possible facility sites, sizes, and costs. Alternatives were selected for detailed study if they met overall objectives. Details of the process used in this selection are presented in Section 4.1.2. The overall project objectives were established by the MSDGC to comply with Illinois Pollution Control Board (IPCB) standards, and are as follows:

- Prevent all backflows to Lake Michigan to protect water supply resource
- Reduce pollutant discharges caused by combined-sewer overflows
- Reduce flooding in the combined-sewer and downstream areas.

A chronology of the plans proposed and studies performed during the past 22 years is provided in Appendix G, "Chronology of Important Events - 1954 through 1975."

The first section of this chapter identifies the alternative plans evaluated by the FCCC from 1970 to 1972 and the additional plans developed since 1972. In the following sections, the evaluation process used is discussed, as well as the consequences of the "no action" alternative.

4.1.1 Description of Plans

This section provides a brief description of the plans proposed to solve the flooding and water pollution problems in the Chicago metropolitan area.[1] The plan designation indicated in parentheses are found in the FCCC's report, "Development of a Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area" (August 1972). The plan descriptions were extracted from this report.

(1) Original Deep Tunnel Plan with Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet Area (Alternative A)

The original Deep Tunnel plan was outlined in the Harza-Bauer Reports of 1964, 1966, and 1968. The 1964 report proposed large tunnels under the waterways to store and convey the overflows from combined-sewers to treatment points. The 1966 and 1968 reports proposed a series of tunnels in the Niagaran and Galena-Platteville rock strata to convey the combined-sewage to a single storage location in the Calumet vicinity. Mined storage volumes would be provided in the Galena formation. Surface storage, in conjunction with mined storage, could be used for power generation. Captured combined-sewer overflows would be treated at the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant and at a new plant constructed nearby. Variations of these plans considered underground storage in other locations, such as under the North-Side Treatment Plant.

(2) Deep Tunnel Plan With Pumped Storage Power (Alternative A_p*)

This plan is the Deep Tunnel plan, as described above, with mined and surface storage in the Calumet

---

1 The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, "Environmental Impact Statement," preliminary draft, November 1973.

* The subscript "$_p$" indicates a power generation plan for the alternative plan of the same letter. The flood and pollution control features of the basic plan are still retained in the "$_p$", designated plan, except where noted.

area. The plan includes pumped-storage power as a source of revenue benefits.

(3) Deep Tunnel Plan With Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet and Stickney Areas (Alternative B)

The plan, proposed in the Harza-Bauer Report of November 1968, included a series of tunnels in the Niagaran and Galena-Platteville formations to convey combined sewage to storage locations in the vicinity of the West-Southwest and Calumet Sewage Treatment Plants. Mined storage volumes would be provided in the Galena-Platteville formation. Survace storage in conjunction with the mined volumes could accommodate peaking power generation.

(4) Deep Tunnel Plan (Calumet, Stickney Storage) With Pumped Storage (Alternative B_P)

The Deep Tunnel plan described above (Alternative B) included a variation which would utilize pumped-storage power as a source of revenue benefits.

(5) Deep Tunnel Plan With Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet, West-Southwest and North-Side Sewage Treatment Plant Areas (Alternative C)

This plan is a modification of Alternatives A and B. A series of tunnels in Niagaran and Galena-Platteville formations would convey combined sewage to the vicinities of the three major sewage treatment plants: Calumet, West-Southwest, and North-Side. Mined storage in the Galena-Platteville formations and pumping to either surface reservoirs or to constructed quarries would be optional. Captured combined-sewer overflows would be treated at the existing West-Southwest, Calumet, and North-Side Sewage Treatment Plants.

(6) Deep Tunnel Plan (Storage in Three Locations) With Pumped-Storage Power (Alternative C_P)

The Deep Tunnel plan described above (Alternative C) includes a variation which would utilize pumped-storage power as a source of revenue benefits.

(7) State of Illinois, Division of Waterways Plan (Alternative D)

The Waterway Improvements plan outlined in the Illinois Division of Waterways Report of November 1968, included channel improvements and treatment of combined-sewer overflows. Waterway improvements would comprise a ten-foot widening and deepening of the Calumet-Sag Canal and the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal up to Throop Street, removal of Brandon Road Lock and Dam, and reconstruction of the Lockport Lock and Dam. This plan was subsequently updated to delete the channel improvements and to provide for 341 detention basins near major outfall points that would be connected to MSDGC interceptor sewers for the controlled release of detained combined-sewer flow.

(8) Composite Plan (Alternative E)

The Composite plan, outlined in the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering Report of September 1968, included a series of tunnels in Niagaran and Galena-Platteville formation to transfer overflows to the West-Southwest, Calumet, North-Side, or O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants. Volumes of mined storage, surface storage, pit or quarry storage, tunnel capacity, and pumping capacity would be optimized. Mined storage areas at several locations would be included to reduce tunnel sizes. Captured combined-sewer overflows would be treated at the West-Southwest, Calumet, North-Side, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants.

(9) Chicago Underflow Plan - Lockport (Alternative F)

The Underflow plan, as outlined in the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering Report of May 1970, included a series of conveyance and storage tunnels to increase conveyance to Lockport, to provide the required storage volumes in the tunnel systems, and to provide for the treatment of the captured volumes either through existing plants or new facilities at Lockport. The system would have an outlet below the Lockport Dam. Tunnels would slope to existing and proposed wastewater treatment plants where captured combined-sewer overflows would be pumped to treatment.

(10) Chicago Underflow Plan - Single Quarry (Alternative G)

The Single Quarry plan by the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering, comprised a series of tunnels in the Niagaran formation to convey combined sewage to a pit in the McCook area. Flow into the pit would be by gravity during storms. The tunnels would be dewatered by pumping the tunnel volume to the pit. Captured combined-sewer overflows would be treated at the West-Southwest Treatment Plant.

(11) Chicago Underflow Plan - Two Quarries (Alternative H)

The Two Quarry plan proposed by the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering, is a modification of Alternative G, comprising a series of tunnels in the Niagaran formation which would convey combined sewage to pits in the McCook and Calumet areas. Flow into the pits would be by gravity. The tunnels would be dewatered by pumping into the pits. Captured combined sewage would be treated at the West-Southwest and Calumet Sewage Treatment Plants.

(12) Chicago Underflow Plan - Three Quarries (Alternative J)

The Three Quarry plan, a further modification of Alternative G, also proposed by the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering, is similar to Alternative H. Stearns Quarry, however, has been added to provide additional storage volume and to improve the hydraulic behavior of the system.

(13) Leffler Plan (Alternative K)

The Leffler plan comprises the construction of a series of dikes in Lake Michigan to develop ponds with a total area of about 14,680 acres: 3,800 acres for the North Shore Channel, 2,560 acres for the Chicago River, and 8,320 acres for the Calumet River. The plan visualizes the development of an uninterrupted highway from Wilmette to 95th Street, a series of swimming areas, skating ponds, small boat harbors, a local sightseeing highway, and a depository for river dredgings.

(14) Meissner Plan (Alternative L)

The flood control plan outlined in the Meissner Engineers Report of August 1958, comprises channel improvements, surface reservoirs, and discharges to Lake Michigan (possibly into reservoirs). More than 100,000 acre-feet of surface storage along waterways and in Lake Michigan would be provided. The main capacity would be increased to 56,000 cfs. The possible use of stone quarries to store stormwater runoff was first developed in this plan.

(15) Ramey-Williams Channel Improvement Plan (Alternative M)

This flood control plan, outlined in the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Report of April 1959, was developed to correct inadequacies of the main channel outlet at Lockport. Widening improvements to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal would increase the outflow at Lockport to 30,000 cfs without attaining flood stages in the waterway.

(16) Sheaffer Plan (Alternative N)

The Sheaffer plan proposes abandonment of the existing sewage treatment plants and conveyance of all combined sewage to areas in central Illinois for treatment in aerobic treatment cells with spray irrigation of effluent on underproductive farmland. This plan could be a supplement to the several containment systems, with or without the abandonment of the sewage treatment plants.

(17) Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Flood Control Studies (Alternative P)

A flood control project outlined in the MSDGC Report of July 1964, proposed flow diversions to the Des Plaines River at Willow Springs and at Sag Junction, removal of the rock humps at Summit, and utilization of quarries, clay pits, and surface storage for flood water storage.

(18) Four Storage Plan (Alternative Q)

The Four Storage plan is a further development of the three storage locations and three quarry plans. The plan comprises a series of separate zone tunnels and conveyance structures and storage at the four major sewage treatment plants: West-Southwest, Calumet, North-Side, and proposed O'Hare. Tunnels would be dewatered by pumping, typically to surface or pit storages at the North-Side, West-Southwest, Calumet, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants. Surface storage would be provided where it would be more economical. The North-Side area storage would be in both a mined area and a surface reservoir.

(19) Four Storage Plan with Pumped Storage Power (Alternative Q_p)

The Four Storage plan described above (Alternative Q) includes a variation which utilizes pumped-storage power as a source of revenue benefits.

(20) McCook, Calumet and O'Hare Storage Plan (Alternative R)

The McCook, Calumet, and O'Hare Storage plan comprises a series of separate zone tunnels and conveyance structures and storage at West-Southwest, Calumet, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants. Tunnels would be dewatered by pumping at the West-Southwest and proposed O'Hare locations. The plan would provide quarry storage in the McCook area, surface storage at the O'Hare plant, and mined and surface or pit storage in the Calumet area.

(21) McCook, Calumet, and O'Hare Storage Plan with Pumped-Storage Power (Alternative R_p)

The McCook, Calumet, and O'Hare Storage plan described above (Alternative R) includes a variation which utilizes pumped-storage power as a source of revenue benefits.

(22) Chicago Underflow Plan, McCook and O'Hare Storage (Alternative S)

The McCook and O'Hare Storage plan comprises a series of tunnels, conveyance structures, and storage at McCook and at the O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plant. Tunnels would be dewatered by pumping at the West-Southwest and O'Hare plants. The plan provides for pit storage at McCook and surface storage at the O'Hare plant.

(23) Separate System of Sanitary Sewers (Alternative T)

The Sewer Separation plan, as outlined in the city of Chicago, Bureau of Engineering Report of April 1971 (revised), developed a cost estimate for the separation of sanitary and industrial wastes from stormwater by constructing parallel sanitary sewers. The proposed separate sanitary sewers would drain into existing MSDGC interceptors for conveyance to existing wastewater treatment plants. The separate storm sewers would discharge directly to the waterways as at present. No treatment for storm sewer outflows was provided.

(24) Additional Plans

Plans developed, but not evaluated by the FCCC, are described below. Although these plans appear to be additional alternatives, they are variations or combinations of evaluated plans.

1. Original Keifer Underflow Plan

Tunnels would be constructed in bedrock approximately 200 feet below the surface to serve both as a conveyance system and as a storage facility. For larger storms, excess runoff would still be released to the waterways. After each storm the tunnel-sewer would be dewatered by pumping to the interceptor sewer. The original plan suggested that a series of special tributary sewers be installed throughout the metropolitan area with connections to large main sewers extending along the waterways. Three of these underflow sewers are now under construction.

2. Tunnel and Reservoir Plan

The Tunnel and Reservoir plan proposes a series of rock tunnels in the Niagaran formation to convey combined-sewer flows to a primary storage reservoir in the McCook area. The reservoir would be a 330-foot-deep rock quarry designed to hold 57,000 acre-feet of runoff. Additional surface storage would be provided near the proposed O'Hare Treatment Plant to serve the northwest suburbs and at Stearns Quarry to reduce peak discharge. Captured overflows from combined-sewers would be treated at the West-Southwest Treatment Plant, assuming upgrading and expansion of this plant to handle one and one-half times dry weather flow. This plan is a composite of Alternatives G, H, J, and S, which were presented on the preceding pages.

3. C-SELM Study

The Chicago South End of Lake Michigan study, reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is a regional approach to wastewater management. This study assumes that some variation of an underground conveyance and storage system would be adopted to capture combined-sewer overflows. The C-SELM study goes on to discuss various methods of treatment of all wastewater flows, including advanced physical-chemical waste treatment, advanced biological waste treatment, and spray irrigation of effluent in a land treatment system.

The alternative plans can be divided into four categories: deep tunnel, underflow, waterway improvement, and surface. These categories represent different flood/pollution control schemes, which have also been evaluated. The following listing groups the alternatives by scheme category:

- Deep tunnel plans: Alternatives A, A_p, B, B_p, C, C_p, and E
- Underflow plans: Alternatives F, G, H, J, Q, Q_p, R, R_p, S, Tunnel and Reservoir, the Original Keifer, and C-SELM
- Waterway improvement plans: Alternatives D, K, L, M, N, and P

- Surface (or near surface) plans: Alternative T and C-SELM (certain portions).

4.1.2 Plan Evaluation and Elimination

Of the 23 alternatives described in the previous sections, six alternatives were eliminated which did not meet overall project objectives. The remaining 17 plans were modified to meet the established objectives. The rationale for eliminating the six alternatives, as stated in the FCCC report,[1] is summarized in the following sections.

(1) Leffler Plan (Alternative K)

The Leffler plan did not meet the project criteria because it used the existing waterways to convey untreated combined-sewer overflows to a series of diked-in storage ponds along the Lake Michigan shoreline.

(2) Meissner Plan (Alternative L)

The Meissner plan was entirely a flood control plan. It proposed channel improvements to convey large quantities of water downstream and into Lake Michigan and to store water in surface reservoirs and quarries. No provisions were provided for the treatment of combined-sewer overflows. While the Meissner plan did not meet the criteria, some of its features have been included in other alternatives.

(3) Ramey-Williams Channel Improvement Plan (Alternative M)

This plan was a flood water routing plan, to reduce flooding through waterway improvements. It did not include provisions for water quality control and, therefore, does not meet project criteria.

---

1 The Flood Control Coordinating Committee, "Development of a Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area," Summary of Technical Reports, August 1972.

(4) Sheaffer Plan (Alternative N)

The Sheaffer plan proposed conveyance of all sanitary sewage, combined-sewer overflows, and a portion of the stormwater runoff from the separately sewered area, to remote, down-state land disposal sites. If such a plan were considered, a collecting system and local storage facilities would be required, not unlike those contained in many of the other alternatives. Therefore, the Sheaffer plan is considered an extension of these systems and not considered further.

(5) Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Flood Control Studies (Alternative P)

This plan is essentially an integration of several special purpose flood control projects. It does not meet project criteria because water quality considerations were not included.

(6) Separate System of Sanitary Sewers (Alternative T)

This plan was not given further consideration because of: the cost, estimated by Chicago to be $4,466,500,000; the disruption of traffic and other municipal service; and ineffectiveness, because sewer separation would not reduce pollution of the waterways from surface runoff, and would not provide for flood control.

4.1.3 The No-Action Alternative

The short- and long-term environmental impacts of allowing existing wastewater conditions to continue are discussed in the following sections. The purpose is to compare the impacts assessed for each proposed plan with the consequences of a "no-action" course. The negative and/or beneficial impacts of the no-action alternative on the Chicago metropolitan area fall under five environmental categories: water quality, water supply, water management goals, flooding and backflow, and financial resources.

(1) Water Quality

The water quality of the Chicago area's waterways will continue to deteriorate as combined-sewer overflows become more frequent and more concentrated with pollutants. As land development and population increase, so will sewage discharges, and dilution-water from Lake Michigan will have to be drawn to lower pollutant concentrations to meet present water quality standards. Lake Michigan flow regulations limit dilution-water discharges to 3,200 cfs. This allowable flow rate is not sufficient to dilute pollutant levels to water quality standards.

Urban runoff containing combined-sewage overflow will continue to increase in volume with land development and population growth. In Lake Michigan and the inland waterways, water quality will be degraded to severe levels by this runoff. Some of the pollutants commonly associated with urban/sewage runoff include: ammonium compounds, suspended solids (SS), biochemical oxygen demanding compounds (BOD), oils, grease, organic and inorganic fertilizers, pesticides, solvents, herbicides, and coliform.

(2) Water Supply

Lake Michigan is presently a water supply resource for Cook County. If additional water is drawn from the lake for dilution purposes, the supply may be temporarily threatened, and other water supply resources will have to be explored. The critical demands for Lake Michigan as a water supply, however, presently take precedence over the demand for it as dilution water. The possibility of altering the established discharge regulation is slight while water pollution problems persist.

Groundwater is another water supply resource which will be depleted eventually. Piezometric or hydraulic pressure levels of certain aquifers are already reduced, and further pumping will limit the use of these aquifers as a viable supply.

(3) Water Management Goals

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, PL 92-500, have established goals for maintaining or improving the water quality of the Nation's surface water systems. PL 92-500 states that pollutant discharge sources must be eliminated by 1983 and, wherever attainable, interim water quality standards must be met by 1977 to protect and propagate fish, shellfish, and wildlife, as well as to provide for water recreation. These goals will not be achieved in the combined-sewer service area of Greater Chicago even when existing dischargers meet current Federal and state effluent requirements.

(4) Flooding and Backflow

Flooding frequency within the combined-sewer service area and backflows to Lake Michigan will also increase as the area grows in population and develops. Damages to shorelines, personal property, public thoroughfares, and businesses will increase at a rate greater than that of flooding frequency, and the impact will be more severe than before. Backflows, carrying combined-sewer overflow pollutants, will increase in volume and frequency and will further pollute Lake Michigan.

(5) Financial Resources

The only beneficial impact of the no-action alternative on the community is in the area of taxes. Tax assessments for water and sewer use will increase by approximately 10 to 15 percent as a result of implementing any of the alternative plans. For example, a maximum of one-third of the costs projected for implementing Phase I, the tunnel system phase of the Tunnel and Reservoir plan, could be funded by the local property taxes since Federal and state funds might cover only two-thirds of the project costs. Normal tax rate increases can be expected if the no-action alternative is implemented.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE PLAN MODIFICATIONS

The Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC) modified each of the remaining 17 alternative plans so that they would achieve uniformly the project objectives, thus, eliminating complex weighting factors and allowing immediate direct comparison of alternatives. The committee applied four collection storage levels (MODS) to each of the alternative plans. This section addresses the MODS (modifications) or subsystems of the plans developed by the FCCC in the following sections:

- Description of Subsystems
- Evaluation and Comparison
- Recommendations and Further Studies
- Plan Selection.

4.2.1 Description of Modifications

The subsystems or MODS, as developed by the FCCC and evaluated in detail by the FCCC's technical advisory committee, are described as follows:

- MOD 1 is the original plan, as proposed by the author, in which the storage volume differs significantly from the other plans.

- MOD 2 provides a system storage capacity of 118,000 acre-feet (ac-ft) to contain the largest storm event of record.

- MOD 3 provides a storage capacity of 50,000 ac-ft to prevent backflow to Lake Michigan without improvements to existing waterways.

- MOD 4 adds a storage volume of 20,000 ac-ft to the plan to collect a worst-storm rainfall which has a recurrence interval of one year, and includes waterway improvements to prevent backflow to Lake Michigan for all storms recorded to date.

The estimated storage volumes for MODS 2, 3, and 4 were based on precipitation data collected during a 21-year period (1949 to 1969). The largest storms of record occurred during this period and were considered in the storage volume estimations. To maintain consistency in the evaluation and comparison of alternatives, a computer program incorporated the features of each MOD in each alternative. MOD's 2, 3, and 4 were the only modifications applied to each alternative plan in this computational effort. MOD 1 was eliminated from further consideration because it represents the original proposed plan, which did not meet the established overall objectives of the program. Some of the MOD 1 or original plan features, however, have been incorporated in MOD's 2, 3, and 4.

4.2.2 Evaluation and Comparison of Modified Plans

The evaluation and comparison of the 51 subsystems (17 plans with 3 modifications each) was based on 8 principal factors, all of which were given equal weight in the next step. The parameters, for which values were estimated, included: present worth (1972) capital costs, expected annual operating and maintenance costs (1972 value), project benefits, land acquisition acreage, underground easement acreage, resident and business relocations, overall construction environmental impacts, and overall operation environmental impacts. For the purpose of comparing the alternatives, Table IV-1 presents a matrix of the factors and the modified plans under each MOD category. The derivation of the values indicated in the table and the rationale used in the evaluation, are summarized in the following sections.[1]

(1) Capital Costs and Annual Costs

The capital cost and equivalent annual cost figures shown in Table IV-1 under each alternative, were calculated on a present worth basis as of 1972. The total equivalent annual costs include estimates calculated for the project, operation, maintenance, equipment replacement, and power sales, with the latter treated as a negative benefit (a benefit which will cause an impact on existing conditions).

A present worth analysis was performed to determine, on a comparative basis, one-time construction cost factors and continuing operation, maintenance, replacement, and benefit factors. A preliminary construction schedule for the pertinent phases of the flood control and pollution abatement program was developed for the 10-year period from 1972 to 1982, and taken into consideration in the analysis.

For the economic analysis, a discount rate of 7 percent was used, and all costs and benefits were based on 1971 price levels that were accumulated to 1972. The project life selected for the purpose of financial analysis is 50 years and covers the period of 1972 to 2022. No charges were specifically included in the analyses which reflect interest during

1 The Flood Control Coordinating Committee, August 1972.

Table IV-1
Alternative Plan Comparison Matrix

MOD 2

Alternative Plans	Capital Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Tangible Benefits (10^6 dollars)	Benefit - Cost Ratio **	Land Acquisition (Acres)	Underground Easement (Acres)	Resident and Business Relocations	Overall Environmental Impacts
A***	2815	239	47	0.56	400	2000	Low	(See parts (4) and (5) of Section 4.2.2)
Ap	3137	223	47	0.60	2000	3200	Med.	
B	2211	194	47	0.69	600	1600	Low	
Bp	2523	182	47	0.73	1800	3400	Med.	
C	2183	193	47	0.69	1100	1800	High	
Cp	2491	179	47	0.74	2000	3600	High	
D	2680	243	43	0.55	5000	0	High	
E	2071	183	47	0.73	800	1600	Med.	
F	3615	294	47	0.45	1600	0	Low	
G	1923	162	47	0.82	600	0	Low	
H	1557	137	47	0.97	800	0	Low	
J	1554	138	47	0.96	600	0	Low	
Q	1551	138	47	0.96	1300	400	High	
Qp	1583	133	47	1.00	700	700	High	
R	1580	149	47	0.89	800	300	Med.	
Rp	1894	157	47	0.85	900	1200	High	
S	1843	157	47	0.85	800	0	Med.	

MOD 3

Alternative Plans	Capital Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Tangible Benefits (10^6 dollars)	Benefit - Cost Ratio **	Land Acquisition (Acres)	Underground Easement (Acres)	Resident and Business Relocations	Overall Environmental Impacts
A***	1621	148	46	0.57	300	300	Low	(See parts (4) and (5) of Section 4.2.2)
Ap	1957	139	44	0.61	1100	1900	Med.	
B	1360	129	46	0.66	400	300	Low	
Bp	1637	120	44	0.71	1200	2000	Med.	
C	1380	129	46	0.66	400	700	Low	
Cp	1676	121	44	0.70	1400	2100	High	
D	1589	159	44	0.54	3600	0	High	
E	1401	129	46	0.66	500	500	Med.	
F	1834	156	44	0.55	1100	0	Low	
G	1002	90	44	0.94	400	0	Low	
H	912	85	44	1.00	400	0	Low	
J	921	86	44	0.99	400	0	Low	
Q	1014	97	44	0.88	500	500	Med.	
Qp	1070	93	44	0.91	500	400	High	
R	1040	103	46	0.82	500	100	Med.	
Rp	1195	103	44	0.82	600	700	High	
S	979	89	44	0.95	500	0	Med.	

MOD 4*

Alternative Plans	Capital Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Costs (1972) (10^6 dollars)	Equiv. Annual Tangible Benefits (10^6 dollars)	Benefit - Cost Ratio **	Land Acquisition (Acres)	Underground Easement (Acres)	Resident and Business Relocations	Overall Environmental Impacts
A***	1804	150	57	0.77	0	1000	Low	(See parts (4) and (5) of Section 4.2.2)
Ap	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
B	1533	129	57	0.89	0	1000	Low	
Bp	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
C	1484	124	57	0.93	0	1000	Low	
Cp	--	--	--	--		--	--	
D	1512	116	57	0.79	2500	0	High	
E	1470	122	57	0.94	100	1000	Med.	
F	1530	124	57	0.93	200	0	Low	
G	1477	115	57	1.00	200	0	Low	
H	1456	115	57	1.00	400	0	Low	
J	1366	116	57	0.99	400	0	Low	
Q	1367	118	57	0.97	400	200	Med.	
Qp	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	
R	1363	120	57	0.96	200	300	Med.	
Rp	--	--	--	--		--	-	
S	1346	115	57	1.00	200	0	Med.	

* Considered not economically feasible for Alternative Ap, Bp, Cp, Qp, and Rp.

** A policy decision was made to control flooding and waterway pollution in the Chicago metropolitan area. Since this public policy has been established, the assumption is that the least cost plan for fulfilling the policy is justified and that the benefits of the project to the public are equal to the least costly alternative in each MOD. The benefit-cost ratio, therefore, was calculated based on this assumption.

*** FCCC designations.

construction. In addition, the costs and benefits were not escalated to reflect inflation.

(2) Tangible Benefits

The cost studies previously described were made to determine the most economical plan which would comply with established pollution standards, as well as provide flood control for the several surface waterways without releasing flood waters into Lake Michigan. Since this public policy has been established, the least cost project for fulfilling the policy is assumed to be justified and the benefits of the project to the public are equal to project costs. Some of these benefits are tangible and can be quantified, while other intangible benefits cannot. Benefit analyses were performed to determine whether appreciable differences in the tangible, quantifiable benefits exist among project schemes.

Monetary values for some of the tangible benefits were assigned to determine whether the benefits effected the relative desirability of the alternatives evaluated. Benefits for pumped-storage power generation differed from surface transport and navigation in alternatives. However, benefits for recreation and land enhancement, and flood damage alleviation were essentially equal to all alternatives. The revenues from pumped-storage power generation were considered to increase total project costs. Benefits for navigation and surface transport are applicable only for the MOD 4 alternatives, as shown in Table IV-1. The incremental navigation benefit, expressed as an equivalent annual value, is approximately $15.0 million per year and is less than the cost increment between the MOD 3 and 4 alternatives, which is approximately $30.0 million (see Alternative H). The benefits, therefore, are nearly equal for all schemes of a given MOD and do not significantly affect alternative selections.

(3) Acquisition, Easements, and Relocations

The tax base is normally reduced when land is transferred from private ownership to public ownership. For several alternative plans, land requirements for either surface or underground easements do not apply since the land is already publicly owned.

The purchase of land for surface reservoirs, holding basins, pits or quarries, and the extensive easements required for mined storage chambers may result in costly delays. Land and underground easement acquisition, therefore, is an important consideration in the evaluating alternatives. Many of the alternatives will not require displacement of homes or businesses. Alternatives with surface reservoirs or holding basins located in densely populated or developed areas, are expected to have a significant relocation impact.

(4) Construction Environmental Impacts

Construction activities of each alternative are expected to have localized effects on the environment. These effects may include such impacts as: traffic disruptions, navigation disruption, fugitive dust emissions, and higher noise levels. Construction activity will cause relatively short-term impacts, and these changes are not irreversible. Thus, areas can be restored and used.

Rock and spoil disposal is expected to be a major problem with most of the alternatives. Alternatives which will produce large quantities of rock and spoil will require either land or water disposal sites. Rock may be stockpiled and sold commercially, used as fill, or used to develop winter recreational areas. Rock and spoil material is considered "clean" and treatment or refining will not be required.

Fugitive dust emissions resulting from quarry excavations, surface reservoir dike construction, and other rock handling operations must employ proper construction techniques to minimize dust problems.

Vehicle traffic is not expected to be interrupt significantly. However, in a few locations near dropshafts, some disruption will be unavoidable. The separation of combined-sewers into separate storm and sanitary sewers, (Alternative T), may cause a major impact on the environment. Excavation of many streets is required to implement this alternative. This will result in traffic noise and other disruptions over most of the project area throughout the construction phase of the project.

Most alternatives are expected to be located underground in industrial areas. Disruptions caused by construction activities will most likely be minimal. For example, noise will be minimal and, if necessary, current noise abatement technology can be applied.

Disruptions to navigation are expected to occur in all MOD 4 alternatives which require increased depth and channel width in the Calumet-Sag Channel and the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. The impact is unavoidable and measures to mitigate this impact are limited. The other alternatives do not require waterway improvement.

(5) <u>Operation Environmental Impacts</u>

The environmental impacts of each alternative will most likely be minimal, since many of the systems will be located underground. Surface systems will be on land zoned for industrial use. Quarries are presently surrounded by undeveloped land barriers, which will minimize noise and adverse aesthetic effects. Since surface reservoirs occupy relatively large tracts of land, the structure should be designed to be aesthetically acceptable.

Odor may become an operational problem, and a properly operated facultative lagoon will be necessary for each quarried pit or surface reservoir. All pits and surface reservoirs will most likely require mechanical aeration equipment, which oxidizes the odor-causing organic matter contained in the combined-sewer wastewater.

Conveyance tunnels and mined storage subsystems specified in various alternative plans will be located in the Niagaran and Galena geologic formations, about 300 and 800 feet below ground surface, respectively. The level of the groundwater aquifer in the Niagaran formation is above the proposed tunnels in most places, and infiltration of groundwater into the tunnels will result. The water flow will be at a sufficiently high rate, however, to eliminate the probability of aquifer pollution. The amount of water infiltrating the tunnels is expected to be small in relation to the total aquifer supply, and no adverse effects on the long-term water supply will occur. In overdeveloped areas (e.g., McCook) where the upper aquifer water levels are low, the aquifer can be recharged to prevent exfiltration of polluted water from tunnel and reservoir subsystems. Groundwater levels in the Galena formation will be above proposed mined storage cavities in most of the planned locations. Groundwater inflow is not expected in these areas because the piezometric (hydraulic pressure) level is lowered annually about 13 feet due to overdevelopment. Costs for an artificial recharge well system have been included in each alternative. This system would prevent leakage of polluted water into the aquifers. The recharge water quality specifications will comply with present drinking water standards, and the mineral content will not exceed natural groundwater concentrations. Thus, the overall quality of the groundwater will be protected.

Alternative D is the only plan that may affect wildlife and vegetation in the Chicago metropolitan area. If excavated rock and spoil material is discarded adjacent to the canals, some habitats may be permanently damaged. Transporting the material to a disposal site away from existing waterways will mitigate this effect.

Fish species are not expected to be affected adversely during overflow periods. The DO level during dry weather, the high temperatures during the summer, and the ammonia-nitrogen levels in the restricted waterways have limited the variety of fish. In nonrestricted waterways, warm water biota and native game fish are also not adversely affected by short-term oxygen depletion during overflows.

Existing and planned recreational lands adjacent to waterways will be enhanced by any of the alternative plans. Swimming, boating, and fishing may be allowed in waterways which presently are restricted because of poor water quality.

In summary, the results of the comparative analyses are as follows:

- Land enhancement. All alternatives will meet specified water quality standards; land enhancement of the recreational resources of the region will be similar for all alternatives.

- Overbank flooding. All alternatives will eliminate backflows to Lake Michigan, will reduce the frequency and severity of overbank flooding and basement flooding adjacent to the waterways, and will improve movement in the waterway systems.

- Land. The amount of land needed for construction of works is different for each alternative.

- Sewer service benefits. A system of tunnels will reduce the cost of auxiliary outlet sewers; benefits would be attributable to MOD's 2 and 3 and, due to small storage capacity, no benefits for improved sewer service would be credited to MOD 4 projects.

- Water supply. Alternatives which include major project features sited in the underground aquifer systems, will include recharge systems for aquifer protection.

- Navigation and surface traffic. Benefits from navigation and surface traffic are limited to MOD 4 for all alternative projects; the estimated equivalent annual benefit accruing to these projects is $15 million.

- Other factors. Flexibility of phasing, expansion, and construction were considered in the evaluation.

4.2.3 Recommendations and Further Studies

A technical advisory committee was organized by the FCCC to prepare a detailed report on the proposed alternative plans. The committee issued an interim report, entitled "Evaluation Report of Alternative Systems," which the FCCC reviewed and then unanimously agreed that the final plan for flood and pollution control in the Chicago metropolitan area "...should be in the form of the Chicago Underflow plan (Alternatives G, H, J, and S) with MOD 3 level of storage. These alternatives are less costly and more environmentally acceptable to the community than any of the other plans presented. Detail studies along the lines of these alternatives should proceed to develop the final plan layout."

The advisory committee presented the MOD 3 reservoir storage level of 50,000 ac-ft in the interim report and recommended to the FCCC the adoption of the MOD 3 subsystem. The committee concluded that the modification will:

- Provide flood protection for the recurrence of the heaviest storms of record without the need of releasing flood waters to Lake Michigan

- Capture 99.7 percent of BOD substances in the combined-sewer overflows and provide subsequent treatment before discharging this water to the waterways, for all but the largest storms of record (75 percent net BOD removal)

- Overflow a substantial quantity of water only during a recurrence of the three worst storms of record

- Reduce overflow events so that fish and other aquatic life will not be harmed by short-term DO depletion

- Provide the least costly plan, as compared to the MOD 2 and MOD 4 plans, with the least disruption to the urban community.

In August 1972, the FCCC published a report[1] presenting a final recommendation. The report, including seven technical appendices, recommended a consolidation of Alternatives G, H, J, and S, which ultimately resulted in the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP). The committee then initiated a detailed environmental assessment study to compare TARP with five selected alternatives, including the "no-action" alternative. Alternatives A_P, D, E, and F were selected based on the previous comparative analysis (see Section 4.2.2). Fifteen environmental parameters and five regional goal factors were identified as significant impact items. The impacts on these parameters and factors and the implications of the "no-action" alternative were assessed to determine the degree to which each alternative met the overall project objectives. Table IV-2 summarizes the results of this assessment. The final plan selection, which was revealed in a detailed report,[2] was based on this assessment.

4.2.4 Plan Selection

The results of the detailed assessment of the six selected alternatives showed negative construction impacts for all alternatives. In four of the alternatives, the impacts range

1 Flood Control Coordinating Committee, August 1972.

2 MSDGC, "Environmental Assessment of Alternative Management Plan for Control of Flood and Pollution Problems Due to Combined-Sewer Discharges in the General Service Area of the MSDGC," November 1973.

Table IV-2
Summary of Detailed Assessment[1] (Ranking)

ALTERNATIVES	WATER						LAND				AIR			RESOURCES						REGIONAL GOALS						
	Water Quality	Urban Flooding	Water Supply	Flow Regulation	Sedimentation	Category Rank	Land Use	Land Reclamation	Geology	Category Rank	Air Quality	Noise Vibrations	Category Rank	Human	Mineral	Energy	Technological	Transportation	Category Rank	Economic	Aesthetic	Recreational	Ecosystems	Health & Safety	Category Rank	Overall Rank
No Action	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	NA	5	NA	NA	-	5	NA	NA	NA	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Ap	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	2	1	*	5	*	*	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	2
D	*	*	*	*	5	5	6	6	*	6	5	1	1	6	6	1	5	5	5	*	5	5	5	5	5	5
E	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	3	2	*	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	4
F	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	1	*	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	3
Tun-Res	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	*	*	*	*	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1

* Shares equal rank with other alternatives

NA Not applicable

1 A point system method was used in the original assessment in which the magnitude of the impact was measured on a scale of 0 to 3 with 0 indicating no effect and 3 indicating highest effect. Negative impacts were indicated with a minus (-) and beneficial impacts with a plus (+) in the original study.

from negative to beneficial, depending on whether rock and overburden are disposed on-site, in a nearby landfill site, or used in one of the proposed Lake Michigan landfill developments (e.g., lakefront peninsulas or islands and the central area air-rights development). If the material is utilized in lakefront development, construction impacts will probably be beneficial instead of negative for any of the alternatives evaluated. Other negative construction impacts may include: localized degradation of air quality, construction and traffic noise, construction-related vibrations, energy consumption, and traffic congestion. The magnitude of these impacts will cover a wide range, depending on what abatement procedures will be routinely applied, as well as on what construction procedures will be used. Overall, the alternatives with more subsurface systems will have less construction impact than surface-system-oriented alternatives.

The short-term and long-term impacts assessed for each alternative will be beneficial. Alternative D ranks lowest in this respect, primarily because of the plan's surface reservoir feature which will cause a substantial negative impact on adjacent land uses. Although Alternatives A_p, E, and F, which were given a rank in the assessment analysis, are essentially equal with respect to short-term and long-term impacts. They will achieve overall project objectives on a nearly equal basis.

TARP ranks slightly higher than the other alternatives with respect to construction, short-term, and long-term impacts. The plan's greater reservoir capacity reduces the untreated overflows to waterways. In addition, the plan ranks high in short-term land reclamation because existing sludge beds will be removed.

In summary, the FCCC concluded and stated that very few negative impacts are expected for any of the alternatives with tunnels, and adverse impacts will occur if the "no-action" alternative is selected. The negative impacts of construction activities on the environment will most likely be transitory, relatively short-term, and localized, regardless of alternative. Finally, the beneficial impacts of Alternatives Ap, D, E, F, or TARP will far exceed the negative impacts. Within the scope of the analysis, TARP has the highest ranking and was, therefore, selected as the most suitable plan to solve the flood and pollution problems of the Chicago metropolitan area.

4.3 WASTE DISPOSAL ALTERNATIVES

Construction and operation of the tunnel system will generate waste materials that must be disposed of in an environmentally sound manner. The large volumes of spoil material generated during tunnel excavation should be removed from the tunnel and conveyed to waste treatment facilities. Drainage flow through the tunnels from groundwater infiltration and from grouting operations should be treated at appropriate facilities before discharging into existing waterways. Wastes generated during normal operation of the tunnels will consist largely of sludge solids which would impede proper operation of the tunnel's system if the material is not removed.

The available alternatives for disposal of these wastes and the estimated cost of required disposal operations, are discussed in the following sections.

4.3.1 Drainage Flow From Tunnel Construction

Inflows of groundwater during tunnel construction and operation can be expected, especially in fault zones and places where the groundwater table is high. Where infiltration is high, grouting operations will be carried out to limit the flow to approximately normal sewer infiltration levels (roughly 500 gpd/in. diam./mi). Water from the grouting operation will add little to the tunnel drainage flow. Maximum flow expected in the Phase I Calumet Tunnel will peak at about 3.83 MGD over the length of the tunnel due largely to groundwater infiltration.

Current MSDGC construction specifications require holding effluent from tunnel dewatering until most rock, mud, grout material, and other solids settle. A turbidity test should be performed to determine the extent of settling. The MSDGC specifications further require the tunnel contractor to dispose of settled solids in an environmentally safe manner.

Should further treatment be necessary, drainage flow could be pumped from the construction shaft to the nearest treatment plant. However, the anticipated quality of the infiltrating water is such that necessary treatment beyond settling is unlikely. The 3.83 MGD maximum drainage flow represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the average flow through the Calumet plant. For this reason, the cost of treating the drainage flow is most likely a minor factor in deciding the proper disposal method for tunnel drainage. For settled solids, the waste material could be conveyed to the appropriate waste treatment facilities for processing. This waste will contain deleterious substances such as: concrete particles grout waste, and other construction waste material. Another alternative for the settled solids is to transport the material to approved disposal sites.

4.3.2 Ultimate Disposal of Sludge

The capture of combined-sewer overflows during storm events will require the eventual disposal of sludge solids flushed into the tunnels. Several alternatives are available for the disposal of sludge solids captured by the tunnel system and conveyed to the West-Southwest plant for treatment. The major options open to the MSDGC presently are:

- Land reclamation program in Fulton County
- NuEarth program
- Sludge sales to a broker as fertilizer
- Sanitary landfill
- Incineration with landfilling of ash residue.

These alternatives are discussed more fully in the sections below.

(1) Land Reclamation Program in Fulton County

The application of stabilized sludge to soil as a fertilizer in either liquid or solid form completes the recycling of the waste products. The MSDGC currently practices spreading of stabilized sludge on strip-mined land in Fulton County, Illinois. Reintroducing organic material to the depleted soil by recycling sludge has been shown to be effective for land reclamation. The MSDGC is still researching various aspects of land application of sludge including rates and methods of application and rates of vegetation uptake for various elements. The basics of the program are well established and understood, however.

At the Fulton County site, a monitoring program samples soil, plant, and runoff components of the ecological cycle for the presence of various elements and compounds. Agricultural crops are regularly sampled for nitrogen and heavy metal concentrations. Also, runoff from the area is tested for compliance with applicable standards. The MSDGC is capable of recycling the runoff if water quality is found to be unacceptable.

(2) NuEarth Program

The MSDGC currently makes available air-dried sludge from its West-Southwest treatment plant for area residents to use as fertilizer for gardens. Air-drying of digested sludge is done by spreading it on sandbeds for about two weeks, which dewaters the sludge so it can be bagged as fertilizer. The positive initial public response indicates that this method of recycling wastes may find long-term acceptance. Unfortunately, climatic factors limit the use of this method of sludge disposal to approximately eight months of the year.

(3) Sale of Sludge to Brokers for Fertilizer

Sludge that has been dried under heaters, retains a higher nitrogen content than digested sludge and makes an acceptable soil-builder and fertilizer. Heat-dried sludge is sold by the MSDGC to a broker who sells it as fertilizer, so that a portion of the cost of drying the sludge is recovered. This process constitutes a significant means of sludge disposal for the MSDGC. Costs of various disposal options are compared later in this section.

(4) Sanitary Landfill

Placing digested sludge in a sanitary landfill is another approved method of sludge disposal. Wastes placed in a landfill are covered at the end of each day with a layer of soil so that potential contaminents are sealed up each day in a "cell". Precautions are taken to protect groundwater supplies from contamination by leachate near the disposal site. This is usually done by installing a drainage collection system beneath the site. Also, gases generated in the waste decomposition must be dispersed to eliminate the possibility of an explosion.

The MSDGC plans to utilize sanitary landfills as one component of its sludge disposal program. In so doing, they will adhere to land disposal practices recommended by EPA.[1]

1 Brunner, D.R., and Keller, D.J., "Sanitary Landfill Design and Operation," U.S. EPA, Washington, D.C., 1972.

(5) Incineration With Landfilling of Ash Residue

Incineration of raw sludge reduces substantially the volume of material that must ultimately be disposed of. The combustion process converts the volatile fraction of the sludge solids largely to carbon dioxide and water vapor, leaving the nonvolatile component for landfill disposal, which comprises about 30 percent of total sludge solids.

Incineration was a relatively inexpensive means of reducing the volume of sludge to be disposed of until the advent of strict air pollution regulations. Requirements to add costly emission control devices have caused many municipal incinerators across the country to close down. Chicago is presently an air quality maintenance area (AQMA) and compliance with established ambient air quality standards is required.

Landfill disposal of ash residue is subject to the same restrictions that cover land disposal of digested sludge.

4.3.3 Disposal Costs

Disposal costs have been developed by the MSDGC for sludge produced at the treatment facilities, including sludge from the TARP Mainstream/Calumet Tunnel operations, for various combinations of the disposal alternatives identified above. The cost analysis of sludge disposal systems presented here does not include a discussion of alternative sludge stabilization systems examined by the MSDGC for the treatment plants. The interested reader is referred to the MSDGC "Facilities Planning Study - Overview Report" for detailed descriptions of these alternatives and their potential interfaces with the various disposal schemes.

By the year 2000, the MSDGC expects the plants to be processing an average of 1,266 tons of sludge daily (dry weight), including the tonnage contributed by the TARP Mainstream, Calumet, and Des Plaines tunnels. Sludge collected by TARP is expected to contribute about 25 percent of the volume handled by the treatment facilities. Since using certain stabilization processes, such as anaerobic digestion, can reduce the amount of sludge to be disposed of, disposal costs are presented in terms of the actual volumes of sludge to be handled. These costs are summarized in Table IV-3.

Table IV-3
Summary of Sludge Disposal Costs*

Disposal Method	Sludge Volume (dt/d)†	Planning Period (Years)	Total Cost (X $10^6)	Annual Cost (X $10^6)		
				Capital	M&O	Total
Sanitary landfill	991	25	176.7	1.12	12.54	13.66
Land application as dry fertilizer	991	25	416.4	9.34	22.71	32.05** 29.68††
Land application as liquid fertilizer	991	25	348.8	5.95	21.01	26.96
Broker sales after heat-drying	1,266	25	212.7	2.63	13.81	16.44
Incineration and landfill of ash	1,266	25	161.3	2.55	9.91	12.46
Disposal by:						
Landfill and	800					
Broker sales	466					
Total	1,266	25	216.4	2.19	14.50	16.69
Land application as:						
Dry fertilizer and	800					
Broker sales	466					
Total	1,266	25	329.2	5.73	19.68	25.41
Land application as:						
Liquid fertilizer,	439					
Landfill,	127					
NuEarth, and	93					
Broker sales	346					
Total	1,005	25	280.4	1.29	20.39	21.68

* 1975 dollars
† Dry tons per day
** Max.: Assuming truck transportation of sludge 200 miles to Fulton County site.
†† Min.: Assuming rail transportation of sludge 200 miles to Fulton County site.

4.3.4 Spoil Material

For the ten-year construction period, excavation of the Phase I TARP tunnels will produce a solid measure of approximately 11,747,000 cubic yards (roughly 26 million tons) of earth and rock that must be disposed of in an environmentally acceptable fashion. For comparison purposes, the total solid measure of spoil produced by the construction of TARP (including reservoirs) is 183 million cubic yards. Peak spoil production from tunnel excavation is expected to be approximately 2.2 million cubic yards (4.9 million tons) at the midpoint of the ten-year construction period. Construction of the Calumet tunnel will account for approximately 3,042,000 cubic yards (solid volume) of spoil material including excavation of the pumping stations. The duration of constructing this segment is approximately 7 years. MSDGC has indicated that disposal of the excavated spoil material will be the responsibility of the construction contractor for each tunnel section. Since each contractor's proposed disposal plan and criteria will not be identified until the preconstruction meetings with the MSDGC, we present here only those alternatives most likely to be implemented by the contractors. These disposal options are discussed briefly in the following sections and include:

- Sale of spoil to quarry operators
- Throw-away to operating quarries
- Disposal in defunct quarries
- Sale to other parties.

(1) Sale of Spoil to Quarry Operators

Direct sale of the marketable portion of excavated material to the operators of area quarries may be an alternative method for disposing of a small portion of the tunnel rock. The large portion of the excavated material will be low grade rock spoil usable only as select fill for such uses as road base material and site grading. Although such applications are not typical of the uses of materials currently extracted from area quarries, quarry operators may be receptive to marketing the low grade material.

Two major quarries are actively operating in the metropolitan area: the McCook quarry operated by Vulcan Materials, Inc. and the Thornton quarry operated by Material Service, Inc. These quarries currently furnish approximately 5,000,000 cubic yards per year of dolomitic rock. This rock is used mostly as concrete aggregate. Some of the material is used as select fill material by the area's construction industry.

(2) Throw-Away to Operating Quarries

In exercising this option, the contractor would merely transport the spoil to either McCook or Thornton quarries, and provide the material free for subsequent sale by the quarry operators. This action would discharge the contractor's obligation to dispose of the material in an environmentally acceptable manner although it would not enable the contractor to defray his transportation costs through sale of the spoil.

(3) Spoil Disposal in Inactive Quarries

Disposal of nonsaleable spoil in the commercially inactive Stearns quarry is attractive because of the possibility of upgrading land use in that area. The quarry has a capacity of about 6.5 million cubic yards to street grade. Once filled to this grade, the site could be designated for recreational or other valuable land uses because of its central location. The city of Chicago is currently disposing ash waste in this site.

(4) Sale to Other Parties

Contractors may find it to their advantage to sell some portion of the spoil products to users other than the quarry operators. This is expected to be an acceptable disposal alternative because of the existing system of permits and licenses regulating uses of spoil material. The permit system, enforced by the city of Chicago, has been effective in avoiding abusive disposal practices in previous tunnel projects.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

5.1 THE SELECTED PLAN

TARP was selected among all alternatives as the most feasible plan to solve the flooding and pollution problems of Chicago. The plan is a composite of several alternatives (G, H, J, and S) modified to provide optimum benefits for the lowest cost and minimum adverse environmental impacts. TARP was first described in the FCCC's report of August 1972. Refinements were incorporated as field studies and subsurface exploration programs were completed. The studies and programs, however, did not change the original TARP concept, but only incorporated design revisions to optimize overall system effectiveness.

Essential to full utilization of the design capacity of TARP and, therefore, to the realization of maximum benefits of TARP is the full participation of the combined-sewer communities that are tributary to TARP. This participation means not only connecting excess overflows to TARP but also upgrading combined-sewer systems to transport flows from a five-year storm to TARP connecting structures, a condition assumed in the design of TARP and in subsequent analyses of ultimate water quality benefits.

TARP was developed to enable collection of storm runoff from urban communities within the MSDGC's combined-sewer service area. The polluted runoff water will be diverted and conveyed to storage reservoirs. When favorable dry weather conditions prevail, the wastewater will be pumped from the reservoirs into conveyance tunnels and transported to appropriate sewage treatment facilities. Based on rainfall records of the past 21 years, the plan is designed to have the capability of handling runoff volumes equivalent to all except three of the severest storms recorded.

The four systems that are part of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan are: Mainstream, Calumet, Lower Des Plaines, and O'Hare, which are described in the following sections. Each system is a completely independent operating unit with collection, storage, conveyance, and treatment capabilities. Although this chapter summarizes the entire TARP, the objective of this EIS is to assess the effects of those tunnel portions of the plan directly related to water pollution

FIGURE V-1
Tunnel and Reservoir Plan
System Layout and Routes



control. For the purposes of the impact analysis, this statement describes and evaluates the conveyance tunnels system and its subsystems only. Figure V-1 shows the present routes and layout of the TARP systems relative to the MSDGC combined-sewer service area, the MSDGC overall service area, and Cook County.

5.1.1 TARP Systems

Each of the TARP systems (Mainstream, Calumet, Lower Des Plaines, and O'Hare) consists of three component systems: reservoirs, conveyance tunnels, and sewage treatment plants. For the TARP project as a whole, the planned component systems include three storage reservoirs, approximately 120 miles of conveyance tunnels, and four sewage treatment plants. McCook, the main storage reservoir, will have a capacity of about 84,000 ac-ft and will be located at McCook Quarry, which is adjacent to the Sanitary and Ship Canal and the Des Plaines River. One of the other two reservoirs, will be located near the northwest boundary of O'Hare International Airport and the other approximately six miles south of the existing Calumet Sewage Treatment Works. The O'Hare reservoir will be a small surface storage reservoir with a capacity of 2,700 ac-ft and Thornton Quarry, the Calumet reservoir will have a much larger storage volume of about 39,000 ac-ft.

The conveyance tunnels, located 150 to 325 feet below ground level, will be constructed under existing waterways or public rights-of-way, and within, for most of the route, the silurian limestone (dolomite) geologic formation. Mining machines or "moles" will be used to excavate most of the tunnels, which presently range from 10 to 30 feet in diameter.[1] .The tunnels will be concrete-lined as required in certain areas. The lining thickness will range from 7 to 23 inches, based on one-half inch per foot of tunnel diameter and two additional inches. For the entire 120-mile length, the total wastewater capacity of the conveyance tunnels is approximately 9,200 ac-ft.

The combined-sewer wastewater collected in the tunnels (and later the reservoirs) of the three TARP systems, O'Hare, Calumet, and Mainstream are transported to their respective treatment plants, O'Hare, Calumet, and West-Southwest, for complete treatment. Capacity equal to approximately 0.5 average dry weather flow of each plant will be available during dry weather for continuous treatment of TARP flows, as

---

1 The diameter expressed is an equivalent diameter, since tunnels will be somewhat oval-shaped and not a true circle.

summarized below (the plant capacities are future design, not existing capacities):

	Nominal ADWF, MGD	Available for TARP, MGD
West-Southwest	1358	679
Calumet	354	177
O'Hare	72	36
	1784	892

A water reclamation plant, the John F. Egan plant is presently under construction and will have a capacity of 30 MGD.

5.1.2 TARP Subsystems

The subsystems common to all TARP systems include collecting structures, drop shafts, and pumping stations. In addition, the groundwater protection program and the tunnel grouting program are considered common subsystems. This section presents a brief description of these subsystems.

(1) Collecting Structures

New intercepting structures to collect existing combined-sewer overflows are shown in Figure V-2. The collecting structure consists of a diversion unit at the overflow point and a connecting pipe to the entrance chamber of the drop shaft. Most of the new structures will be located near curbs or low points of major public thoroughfares. For collecting flows from existing interceptors, the structure consists of an overflow weir in addition to the diversion unit. The weir will allow the flow from existing interceptors to pass through the connecting pipe along with the flow from the new structure.

(2) Drop Shafts

The drop shaft accepts the flow from the collecting structures and diverts this flow to the conveyance tunnel. Figure V-2 illustrates the type EM15 drop shaft which is one of the two drop shaft designs proposed for the TARP systems. The EM15 drop shaft will have a dividing wall with slots to aerate the incoming water. Since the fall distance of the incoming water is expected to range from 200 to 280 feet, aeration of the water will reduce the impact at the bottom of the

FIGURE V-2
EM15 Drop Shaft
and Collecting Structure



drop shaft. The dividing wall of the shaft allows air to enter or to escape on one side and water to flow in on the other, larger side.

The other drop shaft design is the DW4 type which features a separate air vent shaft instead of a dividing wall. Although the concept and design features of both drop shaft types are similar, the purpose and the physical dimensions are different. The EM15 drop shaft has a finished inside diameter of 4 to 9 feet and will be used for low flow rate areas. The DW4 has a 10 to 17 foot diameter and will be used for high flows.

(3) Pumping Stations

Pumping stations will be constructed underground at the end of all conveyance tunnels and adjacent to all storage reservoirs. These stations permit dewatering of the tunnels and reservoirs at a rate which will allow a full tunnel or reservoir to be emptied within two to three days. If dewatering can be accomplished within this time, the need for aeration facilities is eliminated, thus saving some treatment costs. In addition to dewatering, the pumping stations will be used to transport bottom sludge dredged from reservoirs to treatment facilities.

The capacity of each pump installed in a station is rated at 265 cfs, or 171 MGD. The number of pumps necessary for each station depends on the expected maximum water inflow rate of a particular tunnel or reservoir. The pumps are driven by variable-speed electric motors powered by Commonwealth Edison substations located in the vicinity of the stations. The lift-height (static head) requirements of the pumps, which provide an indication of pump depth, is expected to range from 60 to 300 feet. The actual requirement will depend on operating conditions encountered when the TARP systems are implemented.

(4) Groundwater Protection Program

Groundwater infiltration into the component systems (tunnels and reservoirs) may occur at rates significant enough to deplete aquifers used as water supply resources. To protect these resources, an aquifer protection program has been incorporated in TARP. The program consists of grouting, installation of recharge wells, and tunnel lining as required to limit groundwater inflow rates to a maximum of 1.5 MGD, or 2.3 cfs.

This maximum rate limit is based on the established 500 gallons per inch of tunnel diameter, per mile of tunnel, per average day. In tunnel segments requiring a number of recharge wells, they will be constructed approximately 1,000 feet apart. The areas where recharge wells may be needed are described in Section 8.1.2, Part (2). The wells will be used as a means of injecting potable water or water of equivalent quality into the aquifer to increase the piezometric or hydraulic pressure level. Thus, the aquifer will be replenished to its original level. In addition, wastewater exfiltration or outflow from the conveyance tunnels will be prevented. To monitor the extent of groundwater infiltration and wastewater exfiltration, observation wells will be installed, and the sampling program to be followed is described in Section 10.1.4, Part (2).

(5) Grouting Program

The objective of the grouting program is to achieve maximum penetration and a uniform grout spread for the purpose of effectively reducing groundwater infiltration and wastewater exfiltration. The pattern and orientation of grout holes in the TARP conveyance tunnels will depend on the observed amount of groundwater infiltration. In areas with relatively high inflow rates, an impermeable zone at least equal to the tunnel diameter will be provided around the perimeter of the tunnel.

Cement grout, which is a mixture of cement and water, will be injected under pressure into a drilled hole that intersects a source of seepage such as an open joint, fault, or bedding plane. The grout mix will be composed of cement, sand, and water in varying proportions. Liquifiers will also be used as required to counteract normal grout shrinkage, to retard grout setting time when pumping at low rates, and to increase flowability of thick grout mixes used at high inflow areas. The water-cement ratio of the grout to be used will vary from location to location within the tunnel and may even vary at a given location. The range in water-cement ratio by volume is about 0.6:1 to 10:1.

5.2 THE CALUMET SYSTEM

The components of the TARP Calumet system include: one waste treatment plant, over 44 miles of conveyance and relief tunnels, and a proposed storage reservoir. The Calumet system layout, Figure V-1, shows a conveyance tunnel extending from Crawford Avenue, under the Calumet-Sag Channel to the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant (CSTP). At this point the system essentially branches out in two directions, a "double-barrel" trunk following Indiana Avenue extending south to Thornton and the Little Calumet-Grand Calumet River extending to the boundary of the MSDGC combined-sewer service area. Four branch-lines intercept two of the three Calumet system segments. Three of these branch-lines connect to the Indiana Avenue trunk and the other line connects to the Little Calumet-Grand Calumet segment. The branch-lines have been designated by the MSDGC as follows: Dixmoor, Markham, Torrence, and Lansing. Figure V-3 provides an overall profile view of the Calumet system and shows major streets, river system segments, and tunnel elevations.

The over 41 miles of conveyance and relief tunnel will be constructed in two phases. Phase I involves construction of about 37 miles of tunnel which will be the main waste-water conveyance system. The remaining 4 miles will be constructed in Phase II, parallel to the Indiana Avenue route, to be used primarily as a relief system. The Calumet conveyance tunnel will have 59 drop shafts and a storage volume of approximately 2,000 ac-ft.

The treatment facility associated with the Calumet system is the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant located near Lake Calumet has an existing capacity of 220 MGD and a plan to expand the capacity to 354 MGD has been proposed. This plant will process wastewater from all Calumet trunk-lines and branch-lines.

The combined-sewer overflow conveyed by the system's tunnels may be stored in the proposed Calumet system reservoir, which may be located at Thornton Quarry. The storage capacity planned for this reservoir is 39,000 ac-ft and the projected wastewater conveyed by the Calumet tunnels can be stored for periods up to nine months. Aeration systems will be installed in the main storage reservoir to control odor and septicity if storage must exceed the three day limit.

The portion of the Calumet system addressed by this environmental impact statement is described in detail in the following sections: Component System and Component Sub-systems. The component system described is the main Calumet conveyance tunnels only and does not include reservoirs, waste treatment and the relief tunnel segment. The sub-systems described are associated with the conveyance tunnels and include drop shafts, collecting structures, and pumping stations.

FIGURE V-3
Calumet System Profile



5.2.1 Component System

The total design area of the Calumet conveyance tunnel system is 90.8 square miles within the MSDGC "South Facility Area." The system will ultimately serve an area of 293 square miles which is presently using local combined-sewer systems. Approximately 21 of the total square mile design area is within the Chicago city limits. The remaining 70 square miles include all or parts of the following suburban communities: Blue Island, Burnham, Calumet City, Calumet Park, Dolton, Harvey, Phoenix, Riverdale, Robbins, South Holland, and Thornton.

The overall length of the Calumet tunnel is 37.2 miles and the total number of subsystems include 59 drop shafts, 7 construction shafts, 25 access shafts, and 2 pumping stations. The tunnel segment will be excavated using full-faced, diesel driven, mechanical boring machines, or moles, and the inside diameters will range from 9 to 30 feet. Most of the tunnel length will be unlined. The lined portion of the tunnel will have a 12 inch concrete wall. The average excavation rate for the Calumet tunnels is 45 feet per day (net), based on a 24-hour work day and a six-day work week. In the unlined portions, rock bolting and grouting will be done to assure rock bed stability and to minimize infiltration of groundwater or exfiltration of wastewater.

Until the capacity of the Calumet sewage treatment plant is expanded to 354 MGD, the dewatering rate of the Calumet conveyance tunnel is restricted to the treatment plant's existing capacity of 220 MGD, or 340 cfs. The 220 MGD dewatering rate results in a tunnel flushing velocity of 6.7 feet per second or greater for a period of about four and one-half hours. Thus, the dewatering cycle provides self-cleaning for the tunnel system and minimizes accumulation of bottom sludge, debris, and other benthal deposits.

Several features are characteristic of specific tunnel segments within the Calumet system. To describe these features, the system has been divided into four segments; Crawford-to-plant, plant-to-Thornton, plant-to-Calumet City, and Torrence Avenue.

(1) Crawford Avenue to Calumet Plant Tunnel

This tunnel has an overall length of 48,570 feet (9.2 miles). Figure V-4 is a map showing the proposed tunnel route in relation to the area's major thoroughfares, rail lines, and communities. The tunnel will have finished diameters of 9',12', and 21' and slopes

FIGURE V-4
Calumet System - Crawford
Avenue to Calumet Plant Tunnel



ranging from 0.5 to 8.0 feet per 1,000 feet. The upstream and downstream tunnel-bottom elevations are 225 CCD (Chicago City Datum) and 325 CCD, respectively. In terms of Mean Sea Level (MSL), the corresponding elevations are 354 feet and 254 feet.

Based on the geologic and hydraulic characteristics of the area, the conveyance tunnel will be aligned primarily within the dolomite (Joliet and Kankakee formations) deposits of the area with an overall rock cover of 220 feet minimum. The crown area of one section of tunnel will be in the Racine dolomite formation. This section is approximately 4,000 feet long and located between the Penn Central Railroad Tracks and Indiana Avenue.

One 33-foot diameter construction shaft will be located on the Crawford-to-plant segment of the Calumet tunnel route. The shaft will be at the end of the tunnel segment on Crawford Avenue. Construction equipment, machines, and material will be transported into the tunnel through these shafts. During the tunnel construction phase, rock and spoil material will be removed through one of these shafts.

(2) The Calumet Plant to Thornton Quarry

The plant-to-Thornton tunnel section will have finished diameters of 30 feet for a length of 22,750 feet (4.3 miles) and 9 feet for a length of 1,112 feet (0.21 miles). The route of this tunnel section and its relationship to major thoroughfares, rail lines, and waterways of the area are shown in Figure V-5. Three tunnel branches; Indiana Avenue to Markham, Indiana Avenue to Dixmoor, and Indiana Avenue to Lansing, are a part of the plant-to-Thornton tunnel segment or trunk. The Indiana-Markham branch extends westward from Indiana Avenue, between 159th St. and Taft Dr., toward the community of Markham and is 13,300 feet in length (2.5 miles). The Indiana-Dixmoor branch also extends westward from Indiana Avenue, but starts farther north where the Little Calumet River crosses under Indiana Avenue. This branch is approximately 16,000 feet long (3.05 miles) and parallels the Little Calumet River, ending at the Dan Ryan Expressway near the community of Dixmoor. For the Indiana-Lansing branch, the 25,700-foot long (4.87 mile) branch extends eastward toward the community of Lansing. The tunnel branch starts at a point on Indiana Avenue near Thornton Junior College and parallels the Little Calumet River to the intersection of 170th St. and Burnham Avenue.

FIGURE V-5
Calumet System - Calumet Plant to Thornton Quarry Tunnel



The slope of the trunk and branch tunnels range from 0.9 to 3.0 feet per 1,000 feet of tunnel. Between the Tri-State Tollway and 139th Street, the trunk tunnel slope will be 0.9 feet per 1,000 feet and between 139th Street and the Calumet Plant, 3.0 feet per 1,000 feet. The elevation range reflecting these slopes is -291 CCD (288 MSL) and -316 CCD (263 MSL), respectively. For the branch tunnels, the slopes will be either 1, 2, or 3 feet per 1,000 feet of length and the elevations will range from -176 CCD (403 MSL) to -303 CCD (276 MSL).

The tunnels will be aligned predominantly within the Racine and Joliet dolomite formations. However, a short 5,500-foot section will be in the Kankakee dolomite formation between 144th Street and 139th Street. This alignment was based on the area's present geologic and hydraulic features and provides a rock cover of 160 to 290 feet above the crown of the tunnels.

Excavation moles and other construction machines as well as equipment and material will be transported through three 25-to-30 foot diameter construction shafts. The construction will be located as follows: between Taft Drive and 162nd Street, at the end of tunnel segment near 139th Street adjacent to the St. Paul's School, and where the Little Calumet River crosses under Indiana Avenue. Construction equipment and machines for excavating the Markham tunnel branch will be introduced in the Taft Drive-162nd Street shaft. For the Dixmoor branch, equipment and machines will enter through the Little Calumet River-Indiana Avenue construction shaft. As stated for the Crawford-to-plant tunnel segment, rock and spoil material will be removed through these construction shafts.

(3) Calumet Plant-to-Calumet City Tunnel

This tunnel segment has a total length of 20,900 feet (5.1 miles). Figure V-6 is a map showing the proposed plant-to-Calumet City tunnel route in relation to the area's major thoroughfares, rail lines, and communities. The tunnel will have finished diameters of 12, 15, and 30 feet and slopes ranging from 0.7 to 2.0 feet per 1,000 feet. The upstream and downstream tunnel-bottom elevations are -277 CCD and -316 CCD, respectively. In terms of MSL, the corresponding elevations are 302 feet and 263 feet.

Based on the geologic and hydraulic characteristics of the area, the plant-to-Calumet City tunnel segment will be aligned primarily within the dolomite

FIGURE V-6
Calumet System - Calumet Plant
to Calumet City Tunnel



(Racine and Joliet formations) deposits with an overall rock cover of 265 feet minimum.

One 30-foot diameter construction shaft will be located on the plant-to-Calumet City segment of the Calumet tunnel system routes. This shaft will be at the intersection of Bensley Avenue and 138th Street in the community of Burnham, just south of the Chicago city limit. Construction equipment, machines, and material will be transported into the tunnel through this shaft. During the tunnel construction phase, rock and spoil material will be removed through the same shaft.

(4) Torrence Avenue Tunnel

The Torrence Avenue tunnel segment and it's branches will have a finished diameter of 25 feet for a length of 32,400 feet (6.14 miles) and 15 feet for a length of 9,600 feet (1.82 miles). The route of this tunnel section and its relationship to major thoroughfares, rail lines, and waterways of the area are shown in Figure V-7. Two tunnel branches; E. 106th Street and Calumet River-E. 122nd Street, are a part of the Damen-to-Addison tunnel. One branch extends eastward toward Lake Michigan and the other also extends eastward under the Calumet River and parallel to E. 122nd Street.

The slope of the main trunk and branch tunnels range from 0.9 to 2.0 feet per 1,000 feet of tunnel. The main trunk line slope will be 0.9 feet per 1,000 feet and the slope of the two branches is 2.0 feet per 1,000 feet. The elevations of the Torrence tunnel and it's branches range from a minimum of -267 CCD (312 MSL) to a maximum of -299 CCD (280 MSL).

The tunnels will be aligned predominantly within the Racine and Joliet dolomite formations. This alignment was based on the area's geologic and hydraulic features and provides a rock cover of 240 to 275 feet above the crown of the tunnels.

Excavation moles and other construction machines as well as equipment and material will be transported through one 25-to-30 foot diameter construction shaft. The construction shaft will be located at the end of the Torrence Avenue tunnel segment, where the segment intersects the plant-to-Calumet segment. As stated for

FIGURE V-7
Calumet System - Torrence
Avenue Tunnel



for other construction shafts, rock and spoil material will be removed through this shaft for disposal.

5.2.2 Component Subsystems

The subsystems of the Mainstream Conveyance Tunnel system include drop shafts, access shafts, pumping stations, and surface collecting structures. In this section, the sizes, locations, and number of these subsystems are described in the four tunnel segments identified in the previous section.

(1) Crawford Avenue to Calumet Plant Tunnel

Seventeen drop shafts to intercept and transfer wastewater overflows to the tunnel system and four access shafts will be constucted along the tunnel route. The finished diameters of the drop shafts will vary and range from 5'8" to 15'0" as summarized below. The access shafts, however, will all have a finished diameter of 3'6".

No. of Shafts	Finished Diameter
3	15'0"
4	12'0"
6	9'0"
2	7'2"
2	5'8"

Total: 17

Figure V-4 shows the location of the 17 drop shafts and four access shafts along the conveyance tunnel route and Table V-1 summarizes the MSDGC identification numbers, locations and sizes of the shafts.

The pumping station for this segment of the tunnel system will be constructed underground near the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant, which is at the downstream end of the conveyance tunnel route. Four pumps will be installed approximately 40 feet below the tunnel bottom elevation and each pump will have a rated capacity of 265 cfs or about 170 MGD. For removing any infiltrated groundwater from the tunnel, a 5,000-GPM capacity pump will be installed at the station.

The Crawford-to-plant tunnel segment will consist of 37 collecting structures to intercept combined-sewer overflows. Twenty-two drop shaft connections will intercept the overflow points directly, 6 drop shafts will be connected to existing interceptors for relief, and 9 overflow connections lead to existing interceptors. The collecting structures for the 9 existing interceptors will consist of conduits of sufficient size to allow the full capacity of the existing sewer to flow to the tunnel without any overflow to surface water systems. Therefore, the existing interceptors will be relieved at 9 points.

(2) Calumet Plant to Thornton Quarry

The plant-to-Thornton segment will have 24 drop shafts constructed to intercept the overflows and convey them to the tunnels and the access shafts. The finished diameters of the drop shafts vary from 4 feet to 18 feet and the access shafts are all 3'6" finished diameters. The numbers and sizes of these shafts are as follows:

No. of Shafts	Finished Diameter
1	18'0"
1	15'0"
4	12'0"
4	9'0"
6	7'2"
3	5'8"
5	4'0"

Total: 24

The location of the shafts along this segment of the Calumet tunnel route is shown in Figure V-5. A summary of drop shafts and access shafts is presented in Table V-1 and includes the Dixmoor and Lansing branches of the tunnel segment or trunk line.

This portion of the tunnel system will not have a separate pumping station. All wastewater overflows will be conveyed by gravity to the main pumping station located near the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant.

The tunnel segment design includes a total of 38 collecting structures intercepting the combined-sewer overflows. Thirty-six of these drop shaft connections will intercept overflows directly, and two will connect directly to existing interceptors. All existing overflow connections will be maintained to enable relief of the combined-sewer system when the tunnels become filled.

To eliminate direct overflow discharge to waterways, two existing combined sewerlines will be connected directly to interceptors, providing conduits of sufficient size are installed to allow maximum flow to the interceptors in the event the existing sewer lines are filled to capacity. Therefore, two relief points are provided for the existing interceptors.

(3) Calumet Plant to Calumet City Tunnel

The plant-to-Calumet City tunnel will have 8 drop shafts to intercept the overflows and 4 access shafts. The finished diameters of the drop shafts will vary from 7'2" to 12 feet. The access shafts will all be 3'6" finished diameters. The number and size of these drop shafts are as follows:

No. of Shafts	Finished Diameter
5	12'
1	9'
2	7'2"

Total: 8

The location of the shafts along this segment of the tunnel route is shown in Figure V-6 and summarized in Table V-1.

This portion of the tunnel system will not have a separate pumping station. All wastewater overflows will be conveyed by gravity to the Calumet pumping station.

The tunnel segment design includes a total of 13 collecting structures to intercept combined-sewer overflows. Ten of these drop shaft connections will intercept overflows directly, two will connect existing interceptors nearby, and one will connect directly to existing interceptors for overflows.

To eliminate three overflow discharge outfalls to waterways, three existing combined sewerlines will be connected directly to the interceptors, providing conduits of sufficient size are installed to allow maximum flow to the interceptors in the event existing sewer lines are filled to capacity.

(4) Torrence Avenue Tunnel

Ten drop shafts to intercept and transfer wastewater overflows to the tunnel system and six access shafts will be constructed along this tunnel branch. The finished diameters of these drop shafts will vary as shown below:

No. of Shafts	Finished Diameter
1	15'0"
6	12'0"
1	9'0"
2	7'2"

Total: 10

Figure V-7 shows the location of the ten drop shafts and six access shafts along the conveyance tunnel route and Table V-1 summarizes the number, locations and sizes of these shafts.

A dewatering pumping station for this segment of the tunnel system will be constructed underground near the intersection of this tunnel branch with the plant-to-Calumet City segment, which is at the downstream end of the tunnel route. In order to remove water from the tunnels, should rain continue to fall after the tunnels have filled, a 5,000-GPM pumping capacity will be installed at the station.

The Torrence Avenue tunnel will consist of 13 collecting structures intercepting combined-sewer overflows. Ten drop shafts will intercept overflow points directly, two drop shafts will relieve new adjacent interceptors, and one overflow connection will lead to an existing interceptor. The structure for the existing interceptor connection will consist of a conduit of sufficient size to allow the full capacity of the existing sewer line to flow into the interceptor. Therefore, the existing interceptor will eliminate any overflow to surface waters.

Table V-1
Calumet Tunnel System -
Summary of Drop & Access Shaft ID, Location, and Size

Type	Shaft ID No.	Location	Fin. Dia.
Drop Shaft	CDS 2	Central Park (North Bank)	12'-0"
	CDS 4	Sacramento Ave. (South Bank)	5'-8"
	CDS 5	Francisco Ave. (North Bank)	9'-0"
	CDS 6	California Ave. (South Bank)	9'-0"
	CDS 7	Irving Ave. (North Bank)	12'-0"
	CDS 8	Division St. (South Bank)	12'-0"
	CDS 9	Division St. (North Bank)	9'-0"
	CDS 10	Laflin St. (North Bank)	15'-0"
	CDS 11	Throop St. (North Bank)	15'-0"
	CDS 12	Normal Avenue (North Bend)	12'-0"
	CDS 13	125th Street Pumping Station	15'-0"
	CDS 14	Indiana & 130th Street	7'-2"
	CDS 15-1	Penn. Central R.R. & State St.	9'-0"
	CDS 15-2	C.W.I. R.R. & 138th Street	5'-8"
	CDS 16	Vernon Ave. (North Bank)	7'-2"
	CDS 17	Park Ave. (South Bank)	9'-0"
	CDS 18	Little Calumet River & Dorchester Avenue	12'-0"

Type	Shaft ID No.	Location	Fin. Dia.
Drop Shaft	CDS 19	Michigan Central R.R. and S.B. Little Calumet River	12'-0"
	CDS 20	Torrence Avenue and Grand Calumet River	7'-2"
	CDS 21	138th Street Pump Station West Side	9'-0"
	CDS 22	138th Street East Side Grand Calumet River	12'-0"
	CDS 23	142nd Street East Side Grand Calumet River	7'-2"
	CDS 24	Calumet City Pump Station	12'-0"
	CDS 25	130th St. West of Ellis Ave.	9'-0"
	CDS 26	130th Street West of Torrence Ave.	12'-0"
	CDS 27	126th Street and Torrence Avenue	9'-0"
	CDS 28	122nd Street Pumping Station	12'-0"
	CDS 29	122nd Street and Torrence Avenue	12'-0"
	CDS 30	116th Street and Torrence Avenue	12'-0"
	CDS 31	110th Street and Torrence Avenue	12'-0"

Table V-1
Continued

Type	Shaft ID No.	Location	Fin. Dia.	Type	Shaft ID No.	Location	Fin. Dia.
Drop Shaft	CDS 32	100th Street and Avenue "O"	12'-0"		------	Cal-Sag Channel & Crawford Ave.	------
	CDS 33	South Chicago Avenue and Harbor Avenue	7'-2"	Access Shaft	AS 1	Pershing(?) and Cal-Sag(?)	5'-0"
	CDS 34	95th Street Pumping Station	15'-0"		AS 2	[illegible] Halsted and Cal. River	"
	CDS 36	Harbor Avenue and Avenue "O"	7'-2"		AS 3	130th St. and State St.	"
	CDS 38	CID Land Fill 138th & Calumet River	12'-0"		AS 4	E. 130th and C&WI R.R.	"
	CDS 39	Wood Street (Ashland Ave.)	12'-0"		AS 5	Russell(?) [illegible] near Lancoln School	"
	CDS 40	144th Street	12'-0"		AS 6	[illegible] near Educational Service Center	"
	CDS 41	Center Avenue	9'-0"		AS 7	End of [illegible] Paxton	"
	CDS 42	Union Street	12'-0"		AS 8	Calhoun Ave. and 135th St.	"
	CDS 43-1	Clinton Street	4'-0"		AS 9	E. 107th St. and CRI&P R.R.	"
	CDS 43-2	Park Avenue	4'-0"		AS 10	S. Commercial and E. 103rd St.	"
	CDS 44	Sibley Blvd.	5'-8"		AS 11	E. 99th St. and S. Houston Ave	"
	CDS 45	149th Street	5'-8"		AS 12	E. 106th St. near Calumet River	"
	CDS 46	Ninth Avenue	9'-0"		AS 13	S. Carondolet Ave. near E. 122nd St.	"
	CDS 49	South Park Avenue (south)	7'-2"		AS 14	Grand Calumet River near Calumet R.R. yard	"
	CDS 50	South Park	7'-2"		AS 15	114th St. and Indiana Ave.	"
	CDS 51	Ellis Avenue	18'-0"		AS 16	149th St. and Indiana Ave.	"
	CDS 52	Paxton Avenue	7'-2"		AS 17	159th St. and Indiana Ave.	"
	CDS 53	River Drive	4'-0"		AS 19	Indiana Ave. near 165th St.	"
	CDS 54	Woodview Avenue	7'-2"		AS 20	Woodlawn Ave. near Little Calumet River	"
	CDS 55	Green Bay Avenue	7'-2"		AS 22	158th Pl. and Penn Central R.R.	"
	CDS 56	Burnham Avenue	15'-0"		AS 23	Little Calumet River near Torrence Ave.	"
	CDS 58	(future)	12'-0"		AS 24	Clinton St. and 161st St.	"
	CDS 61	Riverview Drive	4'-0"		AS 25	161st St. near Lathrop St.	"
	CDS 62	(future)	7'-2"		AS 26	161st St. near Catlin St.	"
	------	Crawford Ave.	------		AS 28	Little Calumet River near Calumet Expwy.	"
	------	Crawford Ave & Cal-Sag Channel	------				

5.3 CALUMET TUNNEL SYSTEM OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND MANAGEMENT

This section describes the important operation, maintenance, and management steps necessary to maintain and assure that the tunnel system is functioning properly. This section also provides estimates of operation and maintenance costs, which are treated separately in the following sections.

5.3.1 Operation Steps

The operation of the Calumet tunnel system has one basic step during wet weather conditions. This step is the dewatering of the tunnel at rates which do not overburden the treatment capacity of the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant (CSTP). In other words, the flow rate of water pumped from the tunnels plus the flow rate of water from other sewers which connect to the CSTP must not exceed the allowable peak flow through the CSTP. The operator of the pumping station uses two or more of the four variable speed pumps simultaneously to set the dewatering rate so that normally, total flow through the Calumet treatment plant will be less than or equal to design flow. When required, such as during periods of extremely wet weather, and during subsequent full tunnel flow, the dewatering rate can be increased so that total flow through the treatment system is at allowable peak flow. Thus, in order to properly control the dewatering pump rate, the operator must constantly monitor the allowable flow rate through the treatment plant. This allowable rate will depend on three variables: the extent of "downtime" for scheduled maintenance, the frequency of malfunctions, and the extent of capacity to be added to the plant.

Another controlling factor for setting pump rates is the maximum tunnel inflow rate. Since the tunnels can become pressurized in the beginning of a large storm event, the dewatering rate must be slightly greater than the maximum inflow rate to prevent pressurization.

During the heaviest storms, when some overflow to waterways is unavoidable, gates at selected drop shafts at downstream locations will be closed by the operator to force the occurrence of overflows at locations along the Calumet-Sag Channel and Calumet River systems. Such action will maintain sufficient capacity in the upstream portions of the tunnel to eliminate overflows close to the Lake Michigan shoreline.

High dewatering rates are necessary to achieve velocities of tunnel water which will scour most of the sediment from the tunnel floor. Some sediment will remain, however, and to assure complete removal, the operator would have to increase dewatering time from about four and one-half hours to eight hours by directing about 240 cfs of canal water to a drop shaft upstream of the pumping station. The operator would then pump this canal water to the Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant for processing.

During dry weather periods, only infiltrating water from aquifers will flow into the tunnel. To rid the tunnel of this water, the pumping station operator will use a separate pump with a capacity of about 5,000 gpm to lift the water to the treatment system. This dewatering of infiltrating groundwater could probably be made automatic if necessary. To perform the dewatering manually, the operator must shut the pump off when there is not enough water to warrant its use as well as shut it off in wet weather when the main dewatering pumps are in use.

A routinely required step that is critical to the system is checking and testing the power sources to the pumps. Lack of power or loss of power during wet weather could result in polluting overflows at interceptor connections, drop shafts, and outfalls.

5.3.2 Maintenance Steps

Maintenance of various components in the Calumet system can be divided into four categories:

(1) Equipment Maintenance

Pumps, pump controls, and power supply equipment must be checked and maintained routinely. Preventive maintenance procedures should be applied to equipment used for emergencies or other needs critical to the proper functioning of the tunnel system.

(2) Repair to Tunnel Lining

Those areas of the tunnels which are lined, bolted, grouted, or otherwise stabilized, will require periodic checking for leaks and structural faults, and repaired as necessary. In addition the possibility of monitoring and recharge well plugging as a result of grouting should be assessed during the inspection.

(3) Maintenance of Surface Structures

Permanent surface structures will be built at construction shaft, drop shaft, and pumping station locations. These structures will require routine maintenance to assure aesthetic appeal, structural soundness, and safety for workers and the public. Access roads must be kept in repair as well.

(4) Tunnel Sludge Cleaning

The tunnels will be designed so that dewatering will scour the tunnel floor. However, some sludge may accumulate over a period of several years and may eventually require removal. If removal becomes necessary, the deposits will be gathered with a dragline, lifted to the surface through construction shafts, and transported by truck to appropriate disposal areas. The material is not expected to be odiferous or difficult to dispose of in an environmentally sound manner, because it will probably be composed mostly of sand, and partly of silt and benthal deposits.

5.3.3 Operation and Maintenance Costs

The best estimate of operation and maintenance costs at the time of publication of this report is an annual equivalent cost of $2.5 million. This estimate is based on the one given in the environmental impact statement prepared for the MSDGC in November 1973.[1] The total TARP equivalent annual cost was given as $13.6 million, which included total equivalent annual operating and maintenance costs, replacement of equipment costs, and water costs for aquifer protection. The estimate of $2.5 million for the Calumet Tunnel system was derived as the product of the ratio of tunnel volume for this segment to total TARP tunnel volume times the total cost of $13.6 million.[2] The ratio of tunnel volumes was used because pumping station operation

---

1 "Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement: A Plan for Control of Flood and Pollution Problems Due to Combined Sewer Discharges in the General Service Area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago," MSDGC, November 1973.

2 $$\frac{\text{Tunnel volume (Calumet)}}{\text{Tunnel volume (TARP)}} \times \text{TARP O\&M Costs} = \text{Calumet O\&M Costs}$$

or $$\frac{1{,}690 \text{ ac-ft}}{9{,}200 \text{ ac-ft}} \times \$13.6 \text{ million} = \$2.5 \text{ million.}$$

and maintenance costs are proportional to dewatering or tunnel volumes, and these pumping costs far outweigh any other operation and maintenance costs. The derived estimate is somewhat conservative, because the total estimate includes the water costs for aquifer protection by recharge wells. MSDGC has determined that recharge wells will not be required for most of the Phase I tunnel length, based on results from a recent study they conducted.

5.3.4 Management Steps

The reliability of the tunnel system will depend heavily on the development of suitable management plans and on their routine effective execution. Important requirements of such management plans are discussed below.

(1) Pump Operation

A standard procedure will be required for controlling starting time, pumping rate, and duration of pumping. This procedure will allow for maximum possible dewatering rates to be kept within the constraints of maximum tunnel inflow and of treatment flow capacity. The first constraint is use of accurate, timely information on the maximum inflow rate and water depth in the tunnel. The second constraint is consideration in the plan of allowable flows at the treatment plant. Since treatment capacity is likely to be increased at the Calumet plant, increases should be reflected in the pump operation plan.

(2) Canal Water Flushing

The proposed use of canal water to flush the tunnels would necessitate treatment of the water at the CSTP. Since treatment capacity at the Calumet plant can be regarded as a scarce resource, canal water flushing should be monitored and evaluated carefully. For example, sediment build-up on the tunnel floors could be measured periodically in the cases where no canal water is used for flushing. The difference in sediment removal could then be calculated and evaluated against the costs of diverting the canal water to the tunnel and treating it at the Calumet plant.

For the proposed flushing operation, a procedure should be developed to control the timing of addition of canal water to the tunnel so that the handling capacity of the tunnel is not exceeded.

(3) Drop Shaft Gate Operation

To minimize the potential for overflowing at upstream interceptor connections and drop shafts during the heaviest storms, a procedure should be developed for the pump station operator to control the timing of closing downstream drop shaft gates. The procedure would rely on tunnel inflow rate data, tunnel water level data, and upstream drop shaft water level data. Experience under operating conditions might be necessary to perfect this procedure. Similarly, a procedure should be developed to control the duration of the gate closings to minimize the resultant overflow at downstream drop shafts.

(4) Infiltration Monitoring

Routine inspection of the tunnels and recording of groundwater dewatering rates and dry weather tunnel water level would allow for strict control of infiltration. Any significant increase in recorded infiltration could be followed up by tunnel inspection to investigate possible causes. Experience under operating conditions could be used to develop procedures for determining norms and variations from norms in dry weather tunnel flow. This might warrant investigation for leaks in tunnel lining and grouting.

(5) Training of Operators and Maintenance Crews

The management plan should make provisions for adequate training of operators. While the tunnel system itself is not complicated, the decision criteria which control the system are rather complex. It is important that all operators be both knowledgeable in the fundamentals of the decision criteria and well equipped to execute the management plan. Maintenance crews should require adequate technical training and should be well practiced in any safety procedures which the management plan might recommend.

VI. EFFECTS OF CONSTRUCTION ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

VI. EFFECTS OF CONSTRUCTION ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Construction of the conveyance tunnels, in the Phase I construction period, is expected to be spaced over a ten-year period, although construction times for individual tunnel segments will be shorter than ten years. This chapter describes construction impacts upon the water, land, and air resources of the Chicago area and continues the discussion of Chapter II, Existing Natural Environment, and is, thus, divided into the same five main sections:

- Water Resources
- Land Resources
- Atmospheric Resources
- Biological Resources
- Commitment of Natural Resources.

In the water resources section, the effects of tunnel construction upon surface water and groundwater supplies are identified and evaluated. Impacts examined include those associated with dewatering of the tunnels during construction and interactions with other area water management programs.

Under land resources, construction impacts related to the geologic and seismic regimes are evaluated. The land resources section also addresses spoil disposal problems and effects upon flood-prone areas.

The section discussing impacts upon atmospheric resources includes an evaluation of the air quality impact of emissions from construction equipment, as well as impacts from noise and dust during construction activities.

The remaining sections identify and discuss the possible impacts of TARP construction on the biological resources of the project area and describes the expected commitments of natural resources.

6.1 WATER RESOURCES

The effect of tunnel construction on area water resources is examined in the following sections. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 evaluate construction impacts on surface water and groundwater supplies, respectively. Anticipated effects related to the disposal of water pumped from the tunnels during construction are addressed in Section 6.1.3. Foreseeable impacts on other water management programs are described in Section 6.1.4.

In general, impacts on water resources during the tunnel construction phase are expected to be minor since most of the construction activities will be carried out underground. In addition, impacts would probably be amenable to mitigative measures, should their application prove necessary. Measures for ameliorating potential construction impacts are described in Chapter X.

6.1.1. Surface Water

Impacts on surface water quality and quantity caused by construction of the Calumet Tunnel and it's branches are discussed in this section. Effects on water quality from effluent discharged in tunnel dewatering operations during construction are treated separately in Section 6.1.3. The Calumet Tunnel system has been divided into four segments for further discussion:

- Crawford Avenue to Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant
- Calumet Plant to Thornton Quarry
- Calumet Plant to Calumet City
- Torrence Avenue Branch.

(1) Crawford Avenue to Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant

This tunnel segment runs parallel to the Calumet-Sag Channel and is approximately 9.2 miles in length. One construction shaft, 17 drop shafts, and 4 access shafts will ultimately be excavated along its length (see Figure V-4). These shafts generally will be placed in paved or otherwise impervious areas which will result in construction runoff and additional sedimentation loading of the Cal-Sag Channel, Calumet River system, and existing sewer systems during construction. Several shafts are cited in a location with high erosion potential and the construction of a berm around the site will be required to prevent soil from washing into the Calumet-Sag Channel, Little Calumet River, and adjacent sewers during rainstorms. Stockpiles of spoil materials at the construction shaft are expected to be small, but the potential for sedimentation of the waterways exists if a berm around the pile or other suitable controls are not provided.

Dewatering operations during construction are expected to contribute a minor amount of flow to the Calumet-Sag Channel after appropriate treatment (see Section 6.1.3). The Crawford Avenue-to-Calumet STP segment of the Calumet Tunnel system is expected to yield a maximum flow of about 1.1 MGD of infiltrated groundwater after construction of this system, which will eventually be discharged into the Calumet-Sag Channel. Since the average annual flow rate in the Channel from 1966 to 1975 was in excess of 1,000 CFS or about 650 MGD,[1] the flow added during construction dewatering operations will be insignificant. The augmentation of flow to the channel is beneficial, since it will enhance navigation along the waterway.

(2) Calumet Plant to Thornton Quarry

This tunnel segment generally follows Indiana Avenue south to Thornton Quarry and has three connecting branches; the Dixmoor branch, the Markham branch, and the Lansing branch (see Figure V-5). Total length of this segment including the branches is about 15 miles. As shown in Figure V-5, three construction shafts, 24 drop shafts, and 12 access shafts lie along its length. As on the Crawford Avenue-to-Calumet STP segment, many of these shafts are also expected to be located in paved areas and the problems of sedimentation to the Little Calumet sewer and existing sewers will arise. As noted before, berms to control the runnoff of soil, and spoil materials will be required at shaft sites. No adverse impact to area waterways is expected, however, because of the developed nature of the selected shaft sites and the anticipated rapid removal of spoil material to a disposal site.

Construction dewatering operations are expected to yield a maximum flow of about 1.8 MGD over the 15 mile length of the tunnel segment and it's branches. Since the average yearly flow along the Little Calumet River over the years 1971 to 1975 averaged in excess of 320 CFS or 200 MGD, the effect of the flow from tunnel dewatering operations is not likely to be negative. On the contrary this augmentation of flow along the waterways is expected to be beneficial to navigation.

---

1 USGS, Surface Water Supply of the United States, "Water Supply Papers Corresponding to Upper Mississippi River Basin Below Keokuk, Iowa," 1971.

(3) Calumet Plant to Calumet City

The Calumet plant-to-Calumet City segment runs parallel to the B&O railroad tracks, Chicago Terminal line, for approximately 0.5 mile. The segment continues in a straight course to the confluence of the Calumet rivers, then bends southward and ends near the intersection of State Street and Stewart Avenue. The overall length of this segment is approximately 5 miles and consists of one construction shaft, 8 drop shafts, and 4 access shafts which will be excavated along its length as shown in Figure V-6. Some of these shafts will be placed in paved or otherwise impervious areas which will result in runoff and additional sediment loading of the river and existing sewer systems during the construction phase. Several shafts are located in high erosion potential areas and construction of a berm around the shaft site will be required to prevent soil runoff into the Little Calumet River and adjacent sewers during rainstorms. Although stockpiles of spoil material at the construction shaft sites are expected to be small, the potential for sedimentation still exists if a berm is not constructed or other controls are not applied.

Dewatering operations during construction are expected to contribute a small amount of flow to the Little Calumet River after treatment. The plant-to-Calumet City segment of the Calumet Tunnel system is expected to yield a maximum groundwater infiltration rate of about 0.7 MGD, which will eventually be discharged into the river. The average annual flow rate measured during the period of 1971 to 1975 was greater than 20 CFS or about 10 MGD. This additional flow may be beneficial and could improve navigation in the waterway.

(4) Torrence Avenue Branch

The Calumet Tunnel system branch generally follows Torrence Avenue, which parallels the Calumet River. As shown in Figure V-7, this tunnel branch has two offshoot tunnels, the East 122nd Street branch and the East 106th Street branch. The tunnel branch, including its offshoot branches, is about 8 miles long and has one construction shaft, 10 drop shafts, and 6 access shafts. Most of these shafts are expected to be located in paved areas and sedimentation to the river and existing sewers will result. As specified for the other three tunnel segments, berms will be required to control runoff of soil and spoil material at the appropriate sites. The effect of this runoff on the river, however, is not expected to be adverse.

Dewatering operations to remove infiltrated groundwater are expected to result in a maximum flow of about 1.1 MGD over the entire length of the tunnel segment. The average annual flow of the Calumet River, based on stream gaging data for the period of 1971 to 1975, is approximately 330 CFS or almost the same as for the Little Calumet River. The contribution of this flow from tunnel dewatering operations to the waterway will most likely be insignificant.

6.1.2 Groundwater

During construction, infiltration of groundwater into tunnels will necessitate dewatering. Since all of the tunnel sections will be in the upper aquifer, construction should have negligible effects on the lower aquifer. Extensive inflow studies to measure piezometric or hydraulic pressure levels have been carried out by HEC in boreholes along the tunnel route, and inflow studies have been carried out in existing tunnels. Based on these data, estimates can be made of dewatering which will be required during construction, and of the effect of this dewatering on the groundwater system.

(1) Infiltration Projections

Infiltration results when the aquifer pressure level exceed pressure level in the tunnel, except during severe storms. In this case, runoff water conveyed by the tunnels will raise pressure levels to a point greater than the aquifer's level. When this occurs, exfiltration will result rather than infiltration. In view of the geohydrologic character of the upper aquifer, as discussed in Section 2.1.2, most inflow to the tunnel will occur along joints, faults, and bedding planes.

Studies of existing tunnels have indicated two significant factors concerning infiltration:

- Notable inflows in existing tunnels were generally associated with the upper and lower contact of the Romeo member of the Joliet Formation.

- Inflows through faults, bedding planes, and joints decrease with time as dissolved carbonates precipitate at leak points and seal openings.

Inflow via the contacts of the Romeo member in the proposed tunnels may not differ significantly from inflow through joints in adjacent rocks.[1] The primary solution proposed for the inflow problem will be a grouting program. Grouting should limit infiltration of groundwater to 500 gal./inch of tunnel diameter/mile/day and will be widespread to assure that no concentrated leakages will occur.

Due to the heterogeneous nature of aquifer permeability, it is difficult to predict groundwater inflow to tunnel segments. HEC[2] used water pressure test data from boreholes as input to a computer simulation to predict inflow to sections of the TARP Tunnel systems. Two different approaches were evaluated to approximate the secondary permeability of the rock mass for use with the finite element analysis. One approach expresses permeability as a function of equivalent porous rock, and the other approach expresses it as a function of only the openings between the intact rock. Using the first approach, permeability can be obtained easily from results of water pressure tests performed in drill holes. Using the second approach, difficulty is encountered in assessing the complex geometry of natural fracture systems with sufficient accuracy.

Inflows were computed using a finite element computer program developed by Taylor and Brown.[3] This program solves problems of steady state flow through porous media. It can accommodate zones of different permeabilities in both horizontal and vertical directions. This program was easily applied, and the results were believed to be as reliable as any available method. These results, however, were found to be sensitive to variations in assumptions and the input data had to be screened carefully and in a meticulous manner.

---

1 Harza Engineering Company, "Geotechnical Design Report, Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Mainstream Tunnel System," Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

2 HEC, 1975.

3 Taylor, R.L., and Brown, C.B., Darcy Flow Solutions With a Free Surface, Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, Vol. 93 No. HY2, March 1967.

The inflows calculated provided a range of K_h/K_v values (ratio of horizontal to vertical permeability). The pre-grouting inflows tabulated by HEC in their 1975 report represents K_h/K_v values in the range of 10 to 500.

Inflow projections for a section of the Calumet Tunnel system indicated that pre-grouting total inflows at $K_h/K_v = 10$ would be about 1.0 MGD. The reported pre-grouting inflow estimate after construction of the Calumet section was about 0.7 MGD. Comparing predicted and observed inflow, HEC states "... the water pressure test results combined with the finite element computer program used give an accurate estimate of relative tunnel inflow and a reasonable, but generally low estimate of actual inflows."[1] Inflow estimations were also completed for other sections of the TARP Tunnel systems and included the southwest intercepting sewer and the Mainstream Tunnel system.

By studying the geohydrologic cross sections and analyzing the pressure test data, the following was concluded:

- On the average, sections of tunnels which penetrate the Brainard shale exhibit an infiltration rate of about 0.001 MGD/mile or less.
- Infiltration from the Edgewood is approximately 0.012 MGD/mile; from the Joliet and Kankakee formations collectively, about 0.033 MGD/mile; and from the Racine formation, about 0.030 MGD/mile.
- Where the tunnel is near the top of the bedrock, the permeability probably increases, therefore, the infiltration rate for the Racine is estimated to be 0.040 MGD/mile.

The appropriate rock formation infiltration rate estimates were applied to each segment or branch of the Calumet Tunnel system in order to estimate potential infiltration. Where the tunnel penetrated several formations, the highest infiltration rate was used to calculate inflow for that segment. Post-grouting maximum infiltration rates of 0.50 MGD/mile were

---

1 HEC, 1975.

used as an upper limit. It should be stressed that due to aquifer variability, the calculated infiltrations should be considered only rough estimates of what may actually be encountered during construction. Based on this analysis, inflow into the Calumet Tunnel system following grouting should be approximately 1.35 MGD (930 gpm) average per tunnel segment.

Due to the heterogenous nature of the aquifer, it is virtually impossible to predict specific locations and quantities of leakage that may be encountered during construction. Consequently, the exact dewatering requirements will only be found as construction proceeds.

(2) Dewatering

In view of the relatively low transmissivity (movement between two points) of the aquifer, dewatering at rates of several hundred gpm could result in minor temporary declines in local water levels. Average transmissivity values reported from tests in the upper aquifer range from about 16 gpd/ft to 30,150 gpd/ft. In areas of low transmissivity, the cone of depression that would result from dewatering would characteristically be deep, but of small diameter and steep sided. Conversely, in areas of higher transmissivity, cones of depression associated with dewatering operations would be of large diameter but shallow (small drawdowns) and with flat side slopes.

Pumping tests conducted by HEC[1] did not include data for a sufficient number of observation wells to enable construction of distance versus drawdowns graph; however, semi-quantitative evaluation of the data indicates that the radius of influence of pumping at 400 gpm for 156 hours (6.5 days) is probably less than 2,000 feet where calculated transmissivity is about 34,700 gpd/ft. In addition, the EPA reports that in the area of the Des Plaines-O'Hare System, "two pumpout tests performed in the course of the subsurface investigations failed to reflect any effect on observation wells as close as 75 feet away."[2] Due to the fractured nature of the bedrock and resulting heterogeneity, the cone of depression will most likely be asymmetrical. From this data it appears that dewatering of the tunnel during construction will have a minimal, temporary effect on the local groundwater regime.

1 HEC, 1975.

2 EPA, "Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Des Plaines-O'Hare Conveyance System," Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

(3) Water Quality

Tunnel grouting operations may result in clouding of groundwater drawn from nearby wells. If this occurs, alternative measures will be required to provide users of these wells with another water supply source. For the Calumet Tunnel system and it's branch tunnels there are no water supply wells located near the proposed tunnel route, and the clouding effect is not expected to occur.

6.1.3 Effluent Disposal From Tunnel Dewatering Operations

Infiltration of groundwater during tunnel construction can be expected, especially along fault zones and along the boundaries between different rock types. Where the infiltration rate is high, grouting operations will be carried out to limit the flow to the amount of conventional sewer infiltration, i.e., roughly 500 gallons per inch of tunnel diameter per mile per day. Water from grouting operations will add little to tunnel drainage flow. Maximum flow due to groundwater infiltration expected for the entire Phase I Calumet Tunnel system will be about 4.6 MGD after grouting.

Drainage water present in the conveyance tunnels may contain clay, concrete particles, grout waste, and other deleterious substances. Current MSDGC construction specifications[1] forbid the discharge from a construction site of drainage water containing these substances. Thus, drainage flow pumped from the tunnels will be held in settling tanks until rock, mud, grout material, and other solids settle and a water quality test has been performed prior to discharge to waterways. The tunnel contractor is required to dispose of settled solids in an environmentally safe manner although the method of disposal will not be identified until the preconstruction meetings with MSDGC.

The disposal of effluent from dewatering operations during tunnel construction is expected to have a negligible impact upon the environment.

1 MSDGC, General Specifications - Construction Contracts, Section 19, March 1974.

6.1.4 Water Management Programs

Construction impacts upon water management programs, identified in Section 2.1.4, are expected to be minimal. Most of the programs anticipate that construction of the tunnels and related facilities will avoid adverse interactions through proper planning.

The only water management program identified as having some potential for adverse interaction with tunnel construction is the 208 planning program currently underway. A major part of this program will be in-stream monitoring of water quality parameters at 45 locations on the three major river systems. Inadvertent placement of a monitoring station in the immediate vicinity of a construction site could produce misleading data because of the discharge from tunnel drainage. This is not expected to occur, however, since the construction shafts for each tunnel segment have been identified clearly on reports available to the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC), the designated 208 planning agency.

Tunnel construction is not expected to interfere with navigation of the affected waterways since precautions will be taken to avoid discharge of sediment to these waterways. Therefore, tunnel construction is not expected to necessitate an increased frequency of waterway dredging by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

6.2 LAND RESOURCES

The construction impacts of TARP on the land resources of the project area are discussed in detail in this section and divided into the following topics:

- Flood-Prone Areas
- Geology
- Seismicity
- Spoil Disposal.

6.2.1 Flood-Prone Areas

Construction of the Calumet Tunnel system is not expected either to aggravate or to relieve problems in areas subject to overbank flooding. Construction of the tunnels, drop shafts, and collecting structure need to be completed before an effect is realized. Tunnel dewatering operations will be postponed during rainfall episodes which may cause flooding.

6.2.2 Geology

Throughout the Chicago metropolitan area, an extensive program of subsurface exploration has been performed. After analyzing the information obtained, the conclusion has been drawn that the geological formations underlying the area are well suited to construction of underground conveyance and storage systems. The impact of construction on the Chicago area's seismic and subsurface geologic conditions should be negligible. The effect of the geologic conditions on construction is dependent on a number of interrelated factors and can be controlled by careful design and construction. The following effects are described based on the information presented in reports issued by Harza Engineering Company:[1,2,3] DeLeuw, Cather, and Company;[4,5,6] and Bauer Engineering, Inc.[7]

---

1 Harza Engineering Company (HEC), "Evaluation of Geology and Groundwater Conditions in Lawrence Avenue Tunnel, Calumet Intercepting Sewer 18E, Extension A, Southwest Intercepting Sewer 13A," Chicago, Illinois, 23 p., 1972a.

2 HEC, Geology and Water Supply, "Technical Report Part 4, Development of a Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area," Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSDGC), Chicago, Illinois, 1972b.

3 HEC, Geotechnical Design Report, "Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Mainstream Tunnel System," MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

4 DeLeuw, Cather, and Company, "Southwest Side Intercepting Sewer 13A, Report of Tunnel Inspection," MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 1971.

5 DeLeuw, Cather, and Company, Geotechnical Report on Upper Des Plaines Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Vol. 1, "Bedrock Geologic Investigation," MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 196 p., 1974a.

6 DeLeuw, Cather, and Company, Geotechnical Report on O'Hare Underground Storage Reservoir, MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 123 p., 1974b.

7 Bauer Engineering, Inc., Environmental Assessment, MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 237 p., 1973.

A variety of factors control the interrelated impact of geology and construction. The geologic factors include: engineering properties of the rocks, rock structure variability, bedding attitude, presence of geologic structures (faults, folds, and joints) within each rock unit, and other occurrences such as the presence of natural gas.

(1) Geological Constraints

The physical aspects of the individual rock units define the impact that construction will have on subsurface geology and, conversely, the impact geology will have on construction. The engineering-geology aspects of the rock units are summarized in Table VI-1 and the following sections discuss the potential impacts of the relevant geological formations on TARP.

1. Racine Formation

Tunnel excavation and support conditions are expected to be variable but satisfactory within the Racine formation, especially in the reef core facies.

Intensely fractured and faulted zones may require steel supports. The upper portion of the Racine is generally more permeable and less competent than the lower portion. Structures such as shafts may encounter weathered rock as they penetrate the upper portion of the formation. The interreef facies contains shale partings which crumble or disintegrate on exposure. The following possibilities should be considered in design and construction planning:

- Overbreakage may be fairly high in reef flank areas where the beds strike (trend) parallel to the tunnel line and dip at higher angles.
- Overbreakage will occur in unstable areas which normally are found with more frequency in fractured, weathered, and thinly bedded zones than in the more massive reef core facies.
- In the interreef facies the chert beds and nodules might create difficult local conditions of variable hardness.

Table VI-1
Engineering Geologic Characteristics of Rock Formations

Formation	Average Thickness (Feet)	RQD	Unconfined Compressive Strengths (PSI)	Tensile Strength (PSI)	Laboratory Drillability (feet/hour) 10' tunnel dia.	Laboratory Drillability (feet/hour) 30' tunnel dia.	Special Features
Racine (Reef) Dolomite — Racine (Inter-reef) Dolomite	117	>85%	1,770 - 24,230 35% > 10,000 53% = 5,000 - 10,000 — 3,390 - 28,050 55% > 10,000 40% = 5,000 - 10,000	590 - 24,230 Avg. 1,460 82% = 1,000 2,000 — 190 - 3,210 Avg 1,650 33% > 2,000 56% = 1,000-2,000	5.1 - 11.0	1.9 - 4.7	Minimum thickness near O'Hare increasing to maximum thickness near Lake Calumet. Occasional fracture zone. Deep weathering in upper 10-20 feet. Occasional zones with slaking shale partings
Joliet (Romeo Mem.) Dolomite	11	>95%	5,770 - 37,920 92% > 10,000 53% > 20,000	730 to 3,420 60% = 2,000 to 3,000	5.7	2.3	Accumulation of water at contact with Racine.
Joliet (Markgraf Mem.) Dolomite	30	>95%	4,930 to 25,580 36% 10,000 to 25,000	600 to 2,940 80% 1,500 to 2,500	6.3	2.6	Lower zone with closely spaced shale partings, bedding plane parting, occasional fracture zone.
Joliet (Brandon Bridge Mem.) Dolomite & Shale	7	>95%	4,620 to 20,990	700 = 2,590	Not Available		Frequently absent but generally present in Des Plaines Valley. Deterioration of exposed units
Kankakee Dolomite	43	Gen. >95%, some 53-75%	3,570 to 28,270 60% > 10,000	65% 1,500-2,000	6	2.5	Deterioration of shale partings. Some thin bedded zones.
Edgewood Dolomite	50	Commonly 95% Some 80-90% Rare 59-80%	2,800 - 25,580 65% >10,000 19% >15,000	1,070 - 2,710 93%: 1,500-2,500	6	2.5	Cherty with variation in chert hardness, some prominent shaley zones. Thin bedded in lower portion.
Neda Shale Brainard Shale Shale	5 59	>80%	1,760 - 8,650*	340 - 1,150*	10	4	High tendency to slake, least satisfactory rock. Brainard absent in portions of Calumet section. Neda frequently absent.
Fort Atkinson Dolomite w/Shale	17		9,130 - 14,430	890 - 2,160	5	2	Deterioration of occasional shale interbeds.
Scales Shale	96		8,520*	600 - 1,320*	10	4	Slaking & stress release breakage. Becomes soft & plastic when wet

* Considered not representative of in situ properties. Not useful for predictions of actual construction conditions.

- Differences between the unconfined compressive strengths of reef and interreef rock could also create local conditions of variable hardness.

- Zones containing numerous shale partings will slake.

2. <u>Joliet Formation - Romeo Member</u>

The uniform, tough, dense character of the Romeo member should make it good material for underground construction, except in fractured zones where excessive groundwater may be encountered and where steel support and/or concrete lining may be required.

One potential problem associated with the Romeo member is the possible accumulation of groundwater at the upper contact where the Racine overlays the unit.

The consistency of engineering-geology characteristics would indicate generally satisfactory tunneling conditions. Rockfall and overbreakage should be minimal except in intensely faulted or jointed areas.

3. <u>Joliet Formation - Markgraf Member</u>

Aside from fractured zones where concrete lining and/or supports may be necessary, and where greater quantities of groundwater may be encountered, the Markgraf should prove to be a satisfactory rock for underground construction.

The soft condition of the chert in the upper zone may be slightly troublesome for machine tunneling. The shale partings of the lower zone do not appear to slake badly.

The Lawrence Avenue, Southwest, and Calumet intercepting tunnels have been constructed principally in the Joliet formation. Although little short-term support has been required to stabilize these unlined tunnels, the rock has a tendency to break along its flat bedding planes which will affect future tunnels in the Joliet formation, under the projected operating conditions.

4. Joliet Formation - Brandon Bridge Member

This member is absent from most of the project area and, therefore, is not considered as a subsurface site for underground features. If it is found, the shale content of the rock will detract from the suitability of the Brandon Bridge member for construction of underground facilities. Although this member is uniformly thin-bedded, overbreaks were rarely reported in previous tunneling projects.

5. Kankakee Formation

Preliminary study of the Kankakee formation suggests that the rocks may have a number of properties that would detract from their suitability as a medium for underground construction. The potential difficulties include overbreaks and groundwater control problems, which could become important where rocks are severly fractured. Most difficulties will be associated with the numerous green shale partings characteristic of the formation, especially in its lowest 15 to 20 feet. The formation has several thin-bedded zones.

6. Edgewood Formation

Wherever the Edgewood formation is badly fractured, groundwater inflow may be heavy. This formation, however, is good rock for tunneling. The upper part is less argillaceous, less laminated, and has softer chert, thus, it will be better than the lower part which is more argillaceous, contains harder chert, and is more closely laminated.

Machine tunneling through the lower parts of the Edgewood may be impeded by the chert nodules and lenses, which are up to four inches thick, combined with the increasing frequency and thickness of shale partings and the gradation of the rock to dolomitic shale.

Another significant problem which will be encountered tunneling through the Edgewood formation and the underlying Brainard shale is the irregularity of the contact between the two formations. The contact is somewhat more irregular than it is shown on the geologic sections. Thus, predicting conditions at elevations or levels near the contact will be variable and subject to a large error.

7. Neda and Brainard Formations

Together with the Neda shale above and the Scales shale below, the Brainard shale has a tendency to slake, which makes it the least satisfactory rock of the project for underground construction. No portion of the Calumet tunnel system will be constructed in the Brainard shale.

The Brainard and Neda exhibit pronounced slaking and crumbling in rock core samples which are exposed to the atmosphere or placed under water. There may also be some stress-relief phenomena present. Pronounced slaking will lead to serious impairment of rock strength. The dolomite interbeds are not subject to slaking or disintegration.

Since shale has a tendency to slake, and possibly to swell with the atmosphere, it will be necessary to take remedial actions as soon after exposure as possible to control these phenomena. In these rocks, plastic strain is expected to occur throughout significant lengths of excavation. It would be extremely difficult to position a significant length of tunnel in the Brainard formation because of its variable thickness.

The geologic constraints on construction are only partially related to rock type. Additional impediments which have some impact on construction include faults, folds, and joints.

1. Faults

A number of fracture, or fault, zones have been mapped (Figures II-22 through II-26). Within the Mainstream Tunnel area, these zones are found near Chicago Avenue, Roosevelt Road, and Lawndale Avenue. Along the Des Plaines Tunnel system faults have been mapped near 26th Street, Roosevelt Road, North Avenue, and Irving Park Road (not located in drilling). Additionally, the Des Plaines Tunnel will pass through the southern and western sections of the Des Plaines structure, a zone of multiple and complex faulting. The Calumet Tunnel systems are expected to encounter faulting near Little Calumet Creek and State Street, Little Calumet Creek and Cottage Grove, Dalton Avenue, Torrence, 118th Street, 109th Street, 107th Street, and Burnham Avenue. Additional faults have been mapped in recently constructed tunnels. As stated in Section 2.2.3, faulting with small vertical displacement is common in the Chicago area and numerous small faults should be expected throughout the proposed tunnel systems.

Faulting is expected to have several types of impact on tunnel construction. Fault zones may be accompanied by brecciation of the rock or may be marked by the presence of fault gouge or mylonite. These zones, as zones of inherent weakness in the tunnel roof and walls, pose a concomitant danger of an increase in rock fall. The faults are planes of movement which may cause abrupt rock structure changes during tunneling operations. Such abrupt strata changes may alter tunnel excavation rates as well as increase (or decrease) the potential of overbreakage and rockfall.

2. Folds

The folds in the Chicago region are quite gentle and generally have east-west trends. Folding should have only indirect impact on construction. The structural characteristics involved in folding have raised or depressed various rock layers in relation to a horizontal plane or line. The tunnels will, thus, pass through different rock layers because of folding. Within the Calumet Tunnel system, prominent rock layer changes due to folding are expected to occur only between 79th Street and 87th Street since the tunnel system lies predominately in the Racine Formation.

3. Joints

Joints are widespread throughout the rocks in the Chicago area and may have an impact on construction where:

- The tunnel is parallel to the joint orientation
- Complimentary joint sets or joints of varying orientation intersect
- Intense weathering or alteration has occurred along joint planes
- Joints abruptly change dip angle or horsetail in passing from one lithologic unit to another.

The above features of joints would result in local instability and would increase the potential for rockfall and overbreakage during tunneling.

Another possible hazard would be encountering natural gas. If ignited, the resulting fire or explosion could damage equipment and cause loss of life. Such gas accumulations could be found in the glacial drift or in the rock mass itself. In the Chicago area, the presence of gas has been reported in drilling operations in the glacial drift; and asphaltum, a solid petroleum residue, has been found in rock strata of the Racine formation. Such conditions indicate the possibility of encountering accumulations of gas, though the probability is believed remote. Gas detection devices, of course, must be used during construction as a safety precaution.

(2) Construction Constraints

In addition to the effects of geologic phenomena on construction, various facets of construction may have an impact on geologic features. These effects are considered to be negligible or easily mitigated by sound design and construction procedures.

Those operations which could affect the geology of the area are: subsurface exploration, either core drilling or seismic; drop or access shaft construction; mined or machine excavation for tunnel or underground storage; and surface excavation. Except for subsurface exploration by seismic means, all of these operations would entail material removal.

Seismographic exploration of subsurface soils and strata utilizes sound waves to detect varying densities of material. Sound is reflected at those levels or strata where change occurs. This procedure would have negligible effect on the geologic features. For core drilling exploration, drill holes are filled after tests have been completed to prevent interflow between aquifers.

The effects of construction activities on the geologic conditions may include the following:

- Subsurface collapse
- Joint or fault weathering and alteration
- Induced motion along faults or fault zones
- Rockfall or overbreakage
- Surface landsliding or erosion.

While subsurface collapse through rockfall is possible, machine-excavated tunnels may require support to prevent such failure of the surrounding soil or rock. For much of the tunnel lengths, the rock cover over the tunnel crown is considered to be sufficiently thick and structurally sound to preclude widespread collapse.[1]

Weathering or alteration along joint planes or faults, due to the introduction of fluids or exposure to the atmosphere, is expected to be a minor phenomena during the construction stage. Such alteration is further dependent on the characteristics of the rock layers traversed by the tunnels. The excavation stages are probably short enough so that alteration along the joints will be locally restricted in the susceptible shale units.

Fault motion induced by tunneling operations (blasting, moling, etc.) which includes rockfall or overbreakage, is considered possible but unlikely.

Surface excavation for reservoirs and construction of drop and access shafts could lead to subsidence of adjacent lands, as well as pronounced erosion.

Under carefully controlled conditions and proper construction procedures, the construction phase of the project should have no pronounced impact on the geologic conditions in the Chicago area.

---

1 Bauer, 1973.

6.2.3 Seismicity

Seismic characteristics of the Chicago area, found in the historical earthquake record, include frequency, magnitude and probability of occurrence, and potential seismic events. These characteristics have been described in detail in Section 2.2.4.

The risk of the tunnel construction being impaired by earthquakes is judged to be small, based on an evaluation of this historical record. As Figure II-29 of Section 2.2.4 shows, the recurrence rate for a Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) VIII event is about once for every 100 years with longer intervals for higher intensities. Insofar as the record can be relied upon to indicate the level of future seismicity, these higher intensities would not be expected to occur during construction.

Considering the record of local seismicity, however, the faults in the project area should be assumed to be potentially active. In a seismic event, two types of potential tunnel damage could result:

- Dislocation of the tunnel along a fault
- Rock falls along faults or joints.

General rock fall, which is unrelated to existing breaks, or the formation of new cracks is unlikely.

As discussed in Section 2.2.4, ground motion producing an MMI of VIII can be expected from a local earthquake with a recurrence period of about 100 years. This local earthquake will be generated by small movements on a fault (a few centimeters). If the causative fault intersects the tunnel system, the minor dislocation may offset the tunnel alignment. Rock fall in the vicinity of such a dislocation may be extensive. Ground motion from a local earthquake may also cause extensive rock fall in the tunnel wherever multiple joints or faults are present. Both the impact of tunnel dislocation along a fault, with the likely associated local rockfall, and general rockfall along joints throughout the tunnel system caused by vibratory ground motion depend greatly on the distribution and nature of faults and joints. Insufficient information is available on these subjects to make a valid judgment of potential damage. The assessment of impacts depends on a slight upward revision in the possible intensities of past local earthquakes and cognizance of the imprecision of epicentral locations. The occurrence of a large earthquake, however, during the construction phase of the tunnel systems is not likely.

The probability of fault motion or seismic events being caused or controlled by construction procedures, based upon experience from the already existing tunnels, is also considered to be small. No seismic events associated with faults exposed to blasting, water influx, or rock falls have been reported during previous tunneling projects.

6.2.4 Spoil Disposal

This section outlines the environmental impacts associated with the disposal of rocks and spoil material excavated from the proposed tunnels and reservoirs. The amounts of spoil material involved and the likely methods of disposal are identified for the TARP system as a whole and separately for the Calumet Tunnel system. Spoil volumes produced by reservoir construction are discussed here to provide a proper perspective to the spoil disposal problem and to indicate the full extent of the impacts associated with the spoil disposal.

In general, rock excavated from the McCook and Thornton quarries, to form the proposed storage reservoirs, is expected to be equal to rock presently excavated for commercial purposes at the two sites. This material could be used for such purposes as concrete aggregate and as fill for such projects as the "Ski Mountain" plan.

Rock excavated from the tunnels, however, is only expected to be suitable for low-grade commercial uses and for fill. This assumption is based on past experience with spoil produced from the MSDGC's Lawrence Avenue Tunnel, a deep tunnel situated in the same rock formation as the proposed tunnels. Moled rock from the Lawrence Avenue Tunnel was not considered suitable for use as concrete aggregate because the material contained a sufficient quantity of shale, fines, and other constituents not compatible for aggregate use.

It is the MSDGC's stated policy that construction contractors shall be responsible for the disposal of material excavated from each Phase I tunnel segment. The MSDGC's expectation is that the contractors will either find markets for excavated materials or will utilize suitable, environmentally acceptable waste disposal sites. Since actual disposal plans will not be identified until the preconstruction meeting between the contractor and the MSDGC, the disposal schemes outlined in this section are only speculative. It is assumed for the purpose of this analysis that the contractors will sell marketable spoil as fill material whenever possible and dispose of nonsaleable spoil at area landfills. The marketability of the spoil is affected by the amount of shale and other non-dolomite constituents present in the material.

(1) Tunnel and Reservoir Plan

Excavation of the Phase I tunnels and the proposed reservoirs at McCook and Thornton quarries will produce a bulk measure of approximately 275,000,000 cubic yards (183 million cubic yards solid measure) of spoil material. About 165,000,000 cubic yards of the total will be generated in the excavation of the reservoirs at McCook while about 92,000,000 cubic yards will be produced at the Thornton quarry excavation site. Construction of Phase I tunnels will generate roughly 17,620,000 cubic yards (bulk volume) of spoil material for disposal. A detailed plan for the disposal of this considerable amount of material has not yet been developed. However, the general disposal scheme which will be adopted is likely to be as follows:

1. Reservoirs

Rock excavated from either McCook or Thornton quarry is likely to have much the same commercial value as rock currently quarried, because the excavation will be done by conventional methods rather than by mole machines. It is expected, therefore, that a large portion of the excavated rock will be stockpiled in another area of the quarry for eventual sale. Unuseable rock will be either stored in a separate stockpile on-site, as planned for McCook quarry, or stockpiled at Lincoln quarry or a MSDGC-owned site, as proposed for Thornton quarry.

Sufficient room for stockpiling or reservoir spoil exists at the McCook quarry and neighboring sludge lagoons. The required acreage varies with the allowable height of the stockpile. Alternatives considered to date for stockpile size range from 298 acres for a 600-foot-tall pile, which could be entirely contained by the quarry site, to 770 acres for a 100-foot-tall stockpile. A 770-acre site is presently not available in the Chicago area. The existing sludge lagoons, which could be a possible site if expansion is allowed, are not expected to be expanded for storage purposes. The Federal Aviation Agency has indicated recently that the maximum elevation of stockpiles in the McCook area should be limited to about 200 feet above street grade. To limit stockpile height to 200 feet, approximately 600 acres would be needed for spoil storage. This acreage would be available at designated disposal areas of the McCook site, assuming some utilization of neighboring MSDGC sludge lagoons for a small amount of additional storage.

2. Tunnels

Spoil generated by tunnel construction is expected to be disposed of by landfilling. However, the landfill sites and storage capacities have not been identified as yet. The chemical composition of the spoil material, largely dolomitic limestone with some shale is not likely to cause groundwater contamination as a result of leachate from the spoil.

Excavation of all Phase I tunnel systems over the ten-year period from 1976 through 1985 will produce approximately 12,000,000 cubic yards of rock and soil for disposal, weighing about 26 million tons. Peak production of spoil material is expected to occur in 1980 when approximately 2,162,000 cubic yards (solid measure) of rock will be excavated. Assuming a bulking factor (ratio of volume of spoil produced to the volume of rock mined) of 1.5, at the peak of construction, contractors must dispose of roughly 3,243,000 cubic yards of material. By assuming that the volume of spoil material produced is roughly proportional to construction expenditures over the ten-year period[1] for the Phase I tunnels, one obtains the spoil production rates shown graphically in Figure VI-1.

---

1 See Table III-11, p. III-21.

FIGURE VI-1
Spoil Production Rates -
Phase I Tunnel Plan and Calumet
Tunnel System



The environmental effects associated with such a plan are primarily emissions to the atmosphere from truck traffic and truck noise. These atmospheric effects are evaluated in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, respectively, of this chapter. Other potential impacts on the natural environment, such as groundwater contamination by leachate, are not likely to occur due to both the stable nature of the spoil and the degree of isolation from the environment provided by landfill operations.

(2) Calumet Tunnel System

Excavation of the Phase I Calumet Tunnel system over the ten-year period from 1976 through 1985 will produce approximately 4,560,000 cubic yards (bulk volume) of spoil for disposal weighing about 6,770,000 tons. Peak generation of spoil material is expected to occur over the period from January 1981 to January 1982 when the rate of spoil generation will reach 970,000 cubic yards per year. This figure assumes the excavation of 631,000 cubic yards (solid volume) per year and a bulking factor of 1.5. Spoil production rates were calculated from the MSDGC's construction schedule for the Calumet Tunnel system shown in Figure VI-2. Spoil production rates for the Calumet Tunnel system are compared with production rates for all the Phase I tunnels in Figure VI-1. In the absence of information concerning the contractor's specific disposal plans, it is assumed that spoil material from the Calumet Tunnel system will be disposed of as landfill. One potential site for the disposal of a significant amount of spoil from the Calumet Tunnel system is Thornton Quarry. The disposal sites at the quarry has an available annual capacity of at least 2.5 million cubic yards, which is the amount of rock removed for commerical sales at this quarry. A comparison of the volumes involved shows that the Thornton Quarry could easily accept all of the spoil generated by construction of the Calumet Tunnel system. Possible truck routes to the Thornton Quarry from the Calumet Tunnel construction shafts are shown in Figure VI-3. Other potential sites include the Techny landfill, the Septon landfill, MSDGC property south of Lake Calumet, and the Lincoln Stone Quarry near Joliet, Illinois. Capacities for these sites are not known at the present time.

FIGURE VI-2
Construction Phasing for
Phase I - Calumet Tunnel
System



LEGEND

TUNNEL SEGMENT	SPOIL VOLUME (CUBIC YARDS, BULK)
1–CRAWFORD TO PLANT	931,500
2–PLANT TO CALUMET CITY	706,500
3–TORRENCE AVENUE	1,084,500
4–PLANT TO THORNTON	1,027,500
5–LANSING & DIXMOOR	333,000
P–PUMPING STATIONS (2)	477,000
TOTAL	4,560,000

FIGURE VI-3
Disposal Truck Routes to Thornton Quarry From Construction Shafts



The significant impacts associated with spoil disposal from the Calumet Tunnel system are:

- Land use implications of filling in the Thornton Quarry
- Emissions to the atmosphere from truck traffic
- Noise from trucking operations.

Section 7.2.2 evaluates the impact on land use resulting from filling in the Thornton quarry. Impacts on air quality and noise levels resulting from truck disposal operations are detailed in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, respectively, of this chapter. Other potentially serious impacts upon the natural environment, such as groundwater degradation by leachate, are not likely to occur due to both the stable nature of the spoil and the degree of isolation from the environment provided by landfill operations. Marketability of the spoil will be limited because of the amount of shale and other undesirable constituents present in the material.

6.3 ATMOSPHERIC RESOURCES

The effects of construction on air quality and noise are discussed in the following sections.

6.3.1 Air Quality

Construction of the proposed tunnel would have a minor impact on ambient air quality. The impact would result from air pollutants emitted by construction-related vehicles and equipment and would occur at the construction and drop shaft sites and along the vehicle routes. The impacts at the various locations are discussed below.

(1) Construction Shaft Site

The principal source of air pollutants at a construction shaft site would be exhaust from trucks used to haul rock and spoil material from the site to disposal sites. In addition to an estimated three to five truck trips per hour, construction workers would add approximately 54 car trips per day and concrete trucks may make one trip per hour. Diesel-engine-operated equipment may also emit air pollutants at the site. They include the trolley used for transporting rocks inside the tunnel, air compressors for supplying air to the tunnel, and the crane used for raising the muck carts to the surface. The total emissions from the above sources would be very small, and would have negligible impact on ambient air quality.

Another potential source of air pollution would be dust generated when loading the muck from hoppers into trucks and when driving the trucks on unpaved roads. However, with appropriate mitigating measures as discussed in Chapter X, the dust problem can be controlled.

(2) Drop Shaft Site

The sources of air pollutants at the drop shaft site would be similar to those at the construction shaft site. However, because of the fewer number of vehicles involved, there would be less impact. Also, the impact would be relatively short-term, since the construction of a drop shaft is not likely to last for more than three months.

(3) Vehicle Routes

The construction-related vehicles would emit pollutants when traveling to and from the construction sites. While the routes taken by the commuting workers would vary, the hauling trucks would follow well-planned routes. The most likely truck routes for the Calumet system are shown in Figure VI-3.

Vehicle emissions would generally depend upon the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and can be estimated by multiplying the VMT by suitable emission factors.

For the Calumet Tunnel system, the average daily number of truck trips originating from all the construction shaft sites and traveling to the proposed disposal sites is estimated at about 250, with an average round trip length of 8.0 miles. Therefore, the average daily VMT by the haul trucks to be used in the Calumet system would be about 2,000. The number of truck trips during the peak construction period in 1980 is expected to be twice the average number. The truck emissions are estimated using the peak year VMT and emission factors, and are shown in Table VI-2.

Table VI-2
Estimated Emission From Rock and Spoil Disposal Trucks, 1980

Pollutant	Emission Factor[1] (gm/mi)	Estimated Emissions (kg/day)
CO	28.7	57.4
HC	4.6	9.2
NO_2	20.9	41.8
SO_2	2.8	5.6
TSP[2]	1.3	2.6

1 For heavy-duty diesel trucks from, Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Supplement No. 5, AP-42, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, April 1975.

2 Total suspended particulates.

The estimated truck emissions are very small compared to those occurring from normal vehicular traffic on the proposed routes. Therefore, their impact on ambient air quality is likely to be insignificant. Similarly, the incremental and cumulative impacts from the concrete truck trips and worker trips are not likely to be significant. The cumulative impact from vehicle trips originating from the other two tunnel systems is also likely to be minor.

6.3.2 Noise

Adverse noise impacts during construction of the proposed project would occur primarily during surface excavation at the construction and drop shaft sites and during transportation of the rock and spoil material along the routes to the disposal sites. Since most of the construction and drop shaft sites in the Calumet Tunnel system would be located in industrial areas, noise impact at the construction site is not likely to be significant. Similarly, noise impact of rock and spoil disposal trucks would not be significant, because the number of truck trips generated by the proposed project generally would be small compared to the existing traffic volume on the most likely truck routes to the disposal sites.

In this section, noise impact is discussed as follows:

- Noise at the Construction Shaft Sites
- Noise at the Drop Shaft Sites
- Noise Along the Truck Routes.

(1) Noise at the Construction Shaft Sites

Construction activities at the site of a construction shaft can be divided into three phases.

Phase 1 consists of excavating the soil to the depth of the bedrock, which is generally 20 to 25 feet below the surface. This operation typically lasts for two to three months. This operation uses conventional excavation equipment, such as a clam bucket. The spoil material would be hauled by trucks to suitable disposal sites at a frequency of one to two trucks every two hours.

Phase 2 involves blasting the rock with dynamite to the depth of approximately 300 feet. Approximately 400 feet of the initial section of the tunnel would also be blasted. This operation may last for about six months. Rocks would be removed by trucks in the same manner as the soil.

Phase 3 involves finishing the shaft walls and excavating the tunnel by mole. The rock from the tunnel would be brought to the surface and taken in trucks to suitable disposal sites at a frequency of about three to five trucks per hour. This operation would last 4 to 5.5 years at the construction shafts of the Calumet system.

Assuming that two trucks and one loader operate simultaneously at the construction site, and that their maximum noise levels, at 50 feet, are 86 dBA in accordance with the Chicago noise ordinance, the cumulative noise levels near the construction site would vary from 91 dBA at 50 feet to 61 dBA at 1600 feet.

If exhaust fans are used for tunnel ventilation, the exhaust noise is likely to vary from about 75 dBA at 50 feet to about 50 dBA at 1600 feet.[1] The noise from the mole and from blasting are not likely to be heard at the surface. Since all of the construction shafts are located in areas which are relatively isolated from the general public, the construction noise impact at the construction shaft site is not likely to be significant.

(2) Noise at the Drop Shaft Sites

The construction period at the site of a drop shaft is shorter than that at the construction shaft site. The soil is excavated in a manner similar to that at the construction shaft site. A small pilot hole is then bored to the depth of the tunnel, which is already excavated. The entrance from drop shaft to tunnel is excavated by blasting. The drop shaft is then bored by means of a raise drill, which is raised from the bottom to the surface. The muck is collected at the bottom of the tunnel and transported internally to a construction shaft. Only soil, no rocks, would be transported from the drop shaft site.

The construction at a drop shaft site would probably last for only three months. However, surface noise would be produced primarily during surface excavation. Surface excavation is not likely to last for more than a few weeks. Thus, the noise impact would be short-term at the drop shaft sites.

As previously stated, most of the drop shaft sites in the Calumet system are located in business/commercial and industrial areas where noise impact is not as severe a problem as it is in residential areas. Appropriate measures to mitigate the noise at sites near all public areas are discussed in Chapter X.

(3) Noise Along the Truck Routes

On probable truck routes to the rock and spoil disposal sites, the existing traffic volumes range from 6,100 vehicles per day to 22,900 vehicles per

---

1 Based on the noise from ventilating fans used in a traffic tunnel. Environmental Research and Technology, Inc., Noise Level Analysis for Interstate 95 Fort McHenry Harbor Crossing and Approaches in the City of Baltimore, Maryland, prepared for the State Highway Administration, November 1974, p. F-12.

day. The number of truck trips generated at each construction shaft site is likely to be between 72 to 120 per day. The number of truck trips generated during the peak construction period, involving construction of the three tunnel systems, would be approximately 575 per day. However, these trips would be spread over several routes. Thus, the incremental truck trips resulting from tunnel construction would be very small compared to existing traffic volume on the haul routes. Consequently, the noise impact from additional truck trips is not likely to be significant.

6.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Several drop shafts and access shafts will be constructed near or just inside the boundary of forest preserves in the Calumet Tunnel system project area. On the plant-to-Calumet City segment, one drop shaft will be constructed adjacent to the Little Calumet River across from the forest preserve surrounding Flatfoot Lake. An access shaft and a drop shaft will be constructed near forest preserves associated with the Crawford-to-plant segment and the Lansing branch. These preserves are located near S. Halsted Street, adjacent to Forestview Avenue and Jackson Street, and Reitveldt Road, adjacent to 159th Street, respectively. The Dixmoor branch will have two drop shafts constructed near a forest preserve located between 141st and 143rd Streets near S. Halsted Street. Some vegetation will be removed from the preserves during surface construction activities, but the amount will be insignificant with respect to the total available, or less than several hundred square feet. Wildlife abundance in the project area preserves is low and not diverse, since each preserve is small in area and surrounded by man's activities (i.e., golf courses, railroad tracks, residential development, and commercial establishments). Drop and access shaft construction activities are expected to have a minor, short-term impact on the wildlife and vegetation of these forest preserves.

6.5 COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Approximately 11,750,000 cubic yards (solid measure) of dolomitic rock will be removed from several geologic formations within the Silurian system during the Phase I construction period of TARP. This volume is equivalent to 26,200,000 dry tons, assuming an in-place rock density of 165 pounds per cubic foot (4,455 pounds per cubic yard). The distribution of this total amount between the three tunnel systems is: 5,750,000 cubic yards (12,800,000 dry tons) from the Mainstream Tunnel system, 2,960,000 cubic yards (6,590,000 dry tons) from the Des Plaines Tunnel system, and 3,040,000 cubic yards (6,770,000 dry tons) from the Calumet Tunnel system. The average removal rate of rock throughout the ten-year construction period will be 1,175,000 cubic yards (2,620,000 dry tons) per year for all systems of TARP.

VII. EFFECTS OF CONSTRUCTION ON THE MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

VII. EFFECTS OF CONSTRUCTION ON THE MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

The effects of various activities related to the construction of the proposed tunnel project on the man-made environment are discussed in this chapter. Only primary and significant effects are assessed and evaluated. To present these effects, this chapter is divided into six main sections:

- Socioeconomic
- Land Use
- Financial Resources
- Transportation
- Major Projects and Programs
- Commitment of Man-Made Resources.

7.1 SOCIOECONOMIC

The socioeconomic section describes effects of the projected construction activity evidenced by public annoyances and incoveniences, worker safety, construction income, and economic multiplier effect within the community, description of business activity and impact on the area labor force.

7.1.1 Public Annoyances

Major construction projects in urbanized areas usually generate conditions which are considered annoying, and which can create public inconvenience. Tunnel construction involves major activities which will necessarily reach disparate parts of Cook County unlike single-site construction projects. These activities include:

- Construction of surface collection facilities
- Removal of pavement
- Excavation of trenches
- Blasting

- Replacement of necessary sewer lines

- Construction of access, drop, and construction shafts

- Haulage of debris and spoil material

- Exhaust and air support system operations.

The major annoyances and public inconvenience that are associated with the above construction activities include:

- Noise and vibration effects
- Dust and dirt
- Traffic congestion and disruption
- Glare from night lighting.

Since much of the tunneling is performed by machines at depths of up to 290 feet below ground, the annoyances to the general public are temporary and, to a great extent, can be lessened through application of mitigating measures. Effects of noise and fugitive dust have been discussed in detail in Chapter VI and effects of construction traffic congestion are discussed in Section 7.4.

(1) Glare From Night Construction Activity

Glare from night lighting at construction access points can be annoying to surrounding residents. This annoyance can be reduced by properly positioning the lights away from surrounding properties.

(2) Vibration Effects

Construction of the construction access and drop shafts will require some blasting operations. The vibration effects of blasting can potentially cause structural damage to residential homes if the velocity exceeds 4 inches per second. Engineered structures can generally withstand 10 to 20 inches per second.

The blasting operations while creating vibrations also create noise. The average person's psychacoustic response to the combined vibration and noise generally intensifies the import of the blast without making the important distinction between motion and sound.

In addition to the reaction to motion and sound effects, people are sensitive to the duration of a project and the frequency and time of blasting. More complaints and/or claims will be made the longer the project lasts, the more often blasting takes place, and if there is blasting during the night or quiet hours.

Because of their concern over possible property damage, people are more sensitive to blasting when they are in their own homes. They are less interested and less concerned when occupying buildings in which they have no financial interest but are still annoyed by the noise. Possible exceptions would be those persons engaged in especially delicate work.

With a well-planned operation, there is no need for blasting effects to be either damaging, frightening or of an unacceptable tolerance level. First of all, the MSDGC can make certain that no structural damage will occur by placing blasting limitations in the project's construction specifications. Secondly, further reductions in the allowable limits can be made to make the blasting less noticeable (usually not very cost effective) or take steps to keep the public sufficiently informed so that observers of the blasting will have no cause for alarm and will be willing to accept some minor irritation in return for the benefits which the project will bring to the community.

The blasting need only occur during the day and will be of a short duration. Estimated duration periods for both construction and drop shafts are stated below:

Construction Shaft - 2 blasts per day, 10 seconds per blast for 90 to 120 days.

Drop Shaft - 3 blasts per day, 10 seconds per blast for 3 to 5 days.

The blast vibrations and noise generated during the construction of the Calumet Tunnel system may be annoying to the public within 250 to 500 feet of the shaft locations, but should not cause any structural or physical damage to properties nearby.

(3) Construction Locations Which May Cause Public Inconvenience

Review of the proposed locations for construction access shafts and drop shafts in connection with the Calumet Tunnel plans indicates several locations of potential conflict with public convenience. The construction access shafts have purposely been placed in areas where there should be no conflict with surrounding properties. Generally, the sites are vacant, already owned by the MSDGC, and surrounded by vacant or low-utilization industrial areas.

Several drop shafts, shown in Table VII-1, have been identified as potential locations of conflict with local vehicular and pedestrian traffic because of their proximity to a surface street or intersection. The shaft diameters range from 4 to 18 feet, and additional maneuvering space will be required for equipment and workers, as well as for the erection of safety barriers and equipment. This might mean that portions of the shoulders and possibly traffic lanes temporarily would be blocked to traffic. A few drop shafts appear to be located in parking or storage lots which would mean loss of some parking spaces or rearrangement of stored items. Of the 59 drop shafts reviewed, 7 appear to present potential conflicts . This will require exercising particular care in the placement of equipment, materials, and safety barriers, as well as a well-coordinated traffic control plan. Since precise locations of shafts are not known at this time, it is difficult to predict the amount of inconvenience to the public.

7.1.2 Worker Safety

Worker safety and prevention of accidents during TARP construction and throughout maintenance and operation of the completed systems requires adherence to all applicable regulations of the OSHA Act. Much of the system construction involves underground drilling, moling, and blasting; therefore, the establishment of surface support and communications systems for workers underground are critical. Scheduling of underground work must also be sensitive to weather conditions.

Table VII-1
Drop Shaft Locations Posing Potential Conflict Conditions[1]

Drop Shaft Number	General Location	Shaft Diameter	Comment
15-2	Chicago & Western Indiana RR and 138th Street	5'8"	May block a lane and shoulder
26	130th St. West of Torrence Ave.	12'0"	May eliminate some parking spaces
27	126th St. and Torrence Ave.	9'0"	May use public right-of-way
31	110th ST. West of Torrence Ave.	12'0"	May eliminate parking spaces
32	NW Corner 106th St. & Avenue "O"	12'0"	May block a lane and sidewalk
42	Calumet Park (Union St.)	12'0"	Will requre portion of park
59	SE Corner Indiana Ave. & 166th St.	4'0"	May block a lane and portion of right-of-way

1 MSD Tunnel and Reservoir Preliminary Plans - "Photo Plan Maps From Aerial Photographs Taken January 25, 1973," Photo Control From USGS 7 1/2 Foot Quadrangle Sheets, March 1974.

The MSDGC construction specifications include an extensive section regarding safety requirements found in the general specifications for their construction contracts. In addition to compliance with OSHA, the contractor must comply with the following regulations:

- Safety Rules - Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago of March 1, 1970 and as amended

- The Illinois Health and Safety Act of March 16, 1936 with all amendments thereto and all rules and standards implementing said act.

Safety engineers must approve and maintain the following safety equipment for tunnel and excavation work:

- Adequate stretcher units convenient to work locations

- Oxygen deficiency indicators

- Carbon monoxide testers

- Hydrogen sulfide detectors

- Portable explosimeter for the detection of explosive gases such as methane, petroleum, and vapors

- An adequate number of U.S. Bureau of Mines approved self-rescuers in all areas where employees might be trapped by smoke or gas

- An explosimeter at each heading to monitor continuously the presence of explosive gases; it must automatically provide visual and audible alarms.

The contract specifications also require all power equipment used underground to be certified and operated according to OSHA regulations.

Even with strict safety precautions during the construction period, accidents and injuries will occur. Table VII-2 shows the incidence of injuries which could be expected based on national injury frequency rates for 1974 within the construction industry. These rates are somewhat conservative when applied to specific construction projects, but can provide a minimum scale of expectation. As shown, the Calumet system construction potentially could experience a minimum of 90 disabling injuries and one fatal or permanent disability case during its nine years of construction.

Table VII-2
Potential Work Injuries and Disabilities Related to Calumet Tunnel Construction[1]

Total Man-hours of Exposure for Calumet Tunnel*	Potential Disabling Work Injuries†	Potential Fatal and Permanent Disabilities††
6,360,000	90	1

* Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

† Frequency rate of 14.18 per million man-hours of exposure.

†† Frequency rate of .16 per million man-hours of exposure.

1 Frequency rates from Accident Facts, 1975 Edition, National Safety Council, Chicago, Illinois, p. 35.

A less conservative estimate can be made by reviewing the safety statistics of other tunneling projects. The Washington, D.C. Metro (subway) construction project has had 45 miles of tunnels and 41 stations under construction since 1970. They also have been using moles for most of the tunneling work. Based on 45 million total construction man-hours, they have experienced eleven (11) fatalities and 1,829 cases of lost time due to injury. They have not broken out injuries, disabilities, and deaths for tunneling *per se*. While the man-hour estimates are not comparable, the miles of tunnels give a relative measure; approximately one death for every 4.09 miles, and approximately 41 injuries every mile. Using these measures for Calumet's 37.2 miles of tunnels would yield a speculative maximum of 9 fatalities and 1,525 work-related injuries. This level of incidence is certainly too high for Mainstream Tunnel construction alone, and is only mentioned an an example of an underground construction project's safety record. Worker safety during the maintenance and operation phase will also involve adherence to OSHA and State of Illinois safety standards, particularly as they pertain to underground inspection and repair work.[1]

7.1.3 Construction Income

The construction of the Calumet Tunnel system will inject construction employment income into the Chicago area economy. Estimates of this income and of the secondary effect of this income or economic multiplier effect can also be calculated. The income injected into the Chicago area economy due to construction employment on the Calumet Tunnel system will generate a direct demand for goods and services resulting in additional employment opportunities. (See Table VII-3).

This impact is commonly referred to as nonbase or secondary employment and it is generated through the salaries and profits derived by the employees and the business created in response to the identified direct demand. The extent of secondary impacts that will occur in any given situation is dependent on a complex set of factors concerning the local economy. Essentially, the extent of secondary impact is effected by the proportion of dollars that remain in the economy under examination. Dollars would not remain in the economy, for example, if the products purchased through direct demand had been manufactured outside of the subject economy. In this example, the dollar cost of the product would escape generating employment elsewhere; only the value added in the local economy would generate local employment.

Given the diverse economy of the Chicago area, it is quite possible that a high proportion of goods and services will be purchased locally. Thus, the dollars spent for construction could potentially circulate in the local economy two to three times. We have attempted to estimate this secondary impact through the selection of an economic multiplier which is then applied against direct construction employment income. We have used a multiplier of 1.8 which indicates that a significant proportion of direct expenditures will remain within the local economy.

---

1 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, "Accident Experience Summary," December 1975.

Table VII-3
Estimated Jobs Generated By Industry[1]

Fiscal Year	Calumet Construction Cost in Millions	Manufacturing*	Wholesale Trade and Transportation, Services*	Mining and Other*
1976	$17.9	200	93	47
1977	$45.6	510	238	120
1978	$45.6	510	238	120
1979	$45.6	510	238	120
1980	$45.6	510	238	120
1981	$41.9	468	219	110
1982	$16.1	180	84	42
1983	$11.2	125	58	29
1984	$ 8.9	100	46	23
1985	-	-	-	-

* Derived by utilizing the following jobs per billion dollars of contract construction: 40,523 total, 11,180 for manufacturing, 5,220 for wholesale trade transportation and services, and 2,623 for mining and other.

1 "BLS Unpublished Data," Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, February 1975.

Table VII-4 presents construction and labor cost estimates for tunnel construction only by segment of the Calumet system. Table VII-5 presents construction employment income estimates by segment by year during the construction period and the secondary effect of the income in the local economy.

The assumption inherent in the calculations are that one man-year equals 2,000 man-hours. Man-hour costs ranging from $13.28 to $14.62 based on January 1976 cost levels were used for Calumet system projections. The economic multiplier used is 1.8. As shown, the peak construction man-loading would occur in the years 1980 and 1981. Construction income would reach $19.1 million with a secondary economic effect of $34.3 million within the Chicago area economy. Contract construction earnings in the Chicago region in 1971 totaled $2,055.4 million, or $2.0 billion.[1] The Calumet Tunnel project, at its peak, would represent less than 2 percent of total area construction earnings based on the 1971 reported earnings level. Construction employment earnings from this one project are not considered overly significant in the perspective of the Chicago region's economy.

Related to construction earnings is the number of construction jobs which would be generated by the Calumet tunneling project. Table VII-6 shows job generation by year based on the construction and man-hour estimates previously established by segment by year. Job generation would range from 302 jobs in 1977 to a peak of 679 in 1981, thereafter declining to 195 in 1984, the last year of construction. The low level of job generation is due to the use of boring machinery (moles) in tunneling. Should the moles prove inefficient or ineffective during the construction period, it is quite likely that additional jobs would be generated when conventional blasting and cutting methods are employed as partial backup.

Construction projects also generate jobs in other industries; primarily manufacturing, wholesale trade, transportation and services, mining, and others. Table VII-3 shows the generation of jobs in other industries based on total cost of construction of the Calumet system. These jobs can be located anywhere depending upon the materials and services bought and the natural chain of production.

---

1 Table III-5, Chapter III, p. III-6.

Table VII-4
Construction and Labor Cost Estimates By
Segment of the Calumet System[1]

Calumet Segment	Total Construction Estimate*	Estimated Labor Cost*	Estimated Man-Years Needed	Estimates of Construction Duration (years)
Cal-Sag	$61.5	$20.3	695	5.0
Dixmoor	$21.8	$ 7.3	265	4.0
Lansing	$26.2	$ 8.6	316	4.0
140th & Cal. City	$33.7	$10.9	391	4.5
Torrence	$53.7	$17.4	601	5.0
Markham	$70.1	$22.1	80	4.5
Indiana	$32.5	$10.1	365	4.5
Pumping Stations	$41.6	$12.4	469	3.5
Total**	$278.4	$89.5	3180	-

1. Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

* Expressed in millions of dollars of construction labor.
** Detail may not add to total due to rounding.

Table VII-5

Calumet System Estimated Construction Income By Year (in thousands)

Calumet Segment	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Cal-Sag	4,063.6	4,063.6	4,063.6	4,063.6	4,063.6			
Dixmoor					1,848.5	1,848.5	1,848.5	1,848.5
Lansing					2,165.2	2,165.2	2,165.2	2,165.2
140th & Cal City	1,211.5	2,423.1	2,423.1	2,423.1	2,423.1			
Torrence	3,486.6	3,486.6	3,486.6	3,486.6	3,486.6			
Markham				492.8	492.8	492.8	492.8	246.4
Indiana				2,252.6	2,252.6	2,252.6	2,252.6	1,126.3
Pumping Stations		2,963.1	3,555.7	3,555.7	2,370.5			
Total	$ 8,761.7	$12,936.4	$13,529	$16,274.4	$19,102.9	$ 6,759.1	$ 6,759.1	$ 5,386.4
Secondary Effect*	$ 15,771	$23,285.52	$24,352.2	$29,293.9	$34,385.2	$ 12,166.4	$ 12,166.4	$ 9,695.5

* A multiplier of 1.8 has been used.

Table VII-6
Calumet Construction Job Generation

Year	Construction Income	Construction Man-Hours*	Construction Job Generation[1]
1977	$ 8,761,700	605,187	302
1978	$ 12,936,400	915,102	457
1979	$ 13,529,000	959,725	480
1980	$ 16,274,400	1,157,134	578
1981	$ 19,102,900	1,358,440	679
1982	$ 6,759,100	487,962	244
1983	$ 6,759,100	487,962	244
1984	$ 5,386,400	389,024	195
Total	$ 89,509,000	6,360,536	-

* Based on estimated average wage rates ranging from $13.28 to $14.62 which reflect January 1976 cost levels.

1 Based on one man-year = 2000 man-hours. Estimates provided by Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

7.1.4 Business Disruption

Construction site activity and attendant truck traffic in densely developed commercial retail areas can disrupt operations of local businesses. If public traffic flow is impacted, business deliveries and services can be hurt. This has varying degrees of effect on sales depending on the business's response to adverse conditions.

Table VII-1 in Section 7.1.1 identified those construction access points where potential conflict with public traffic flow is most likely to occur. Of those points, there are several located in or near commercially and industrially developed areas.

The following locations potentially could cause inconvenience to surrounding business operations. However, the disruption would be temporary and should not cause significant negative impacts on business activity and retail sales volumes.

Shaft Number	Shaft Diameter	General Location
32	12'0"	NW Corner 106th Street and Avenue "O"
15-2	5'8"	Chicago & Western Indiana RR & 138th St.
59	4'0"	SE Corner Indiana Ave. & 166th St.

Estimates of the land needed surrounding a drop shaft are as follows:

- 150' x 150' for average drop shaft of 7'2" or less in diameter
- 200' x 200' for larger drop shafts up to 13' in diameter.

Construction of the drop shafts may take approximately three months. When built, the shaft will have a concrete cover, flush with grade, with a metal grate for access by workers (similar to a manhole). Both the grate and cover can bear pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The trucks servicing the construction sites have been purposely routed along major surface streets to expressways to minimize traffic flow interruption. The impact of these additional trucks in the downtown area is not considered significant enough to create permanent adverse impacts on business activity. No business structure will have to be acquired or demolished.

The only relocation needs are related to piles of material in certain industrial yards which may have to be moved. Thus, the effects are considered temporary and insignificant.

7.1.5 Spoil Disposal

This section addresses the potential impact of disposal of spoil from the tunnel construction and reservoir excavations on the local markets for high quality rock products (e.g., concrete aggregate, siluminous aggregate, etc.) and low quality rock products (primarily landfill).

(1) Tunnel Spoil

It is estimated that the construction of the Phase I TARP tunnels will produce almost 12 million cubic yards (approximately 26 million tons) of excavated material from the Mainstream, Des Plaines, and Calumet Tunnel systems over a ten-year period. The potential impacts of disposing of this volume of spoil critically depends on the quality of the material removed. The focal point of the quality assessment is a comparison of the geological characteristics of the TARP tunnel spoil with those characteristics of the spoil generated from the construction of the Lawrence Avenue Sewer system.[1]

The tunneling technology which is planned for the Tunnel Plan was also employed by the city of Chicago in the recent Lawrence Avenue Sewer project. Approximately 350,000 tons of dolomite limestone containing some shale rock were excavated during the course of the project. Similarly, the material that will be excavated from the TARP tunnels and drop shafts will also be dolomite limestone with shale. As shown in Figure V-3, the Lawrence Avenue material comes from the same geological formation and would yield rock spoil identical to that which will be excavated for the construction of the TARP tunnels.

---

1 This system was recently constructed to accommodate combined-sewer overflows and to act as an interceptor for the proposed Mainstream Tunnel system.

Utilization of the mole (mechanical mining machine) produces rock spoil which is thin and elongated rather than cubical in shape. Typical sizes of excavated rock range from fine dust particles to laterally split rocks which are about two to five inches in cross section and 1/2 to 3/4 inches in thickness. In the case of the Lawrence Avenue project, it was initially assumed that the rock spoil could be marketed as concrete aggregate and/or road base material. It was discovered, however, that the excavated rock material contained shale and failed to meet Illinois standards for use in these categories. As a consequence, this material was primarily used as low quality landfill. Shale and rock fines present in the material tends to lower the quality and thus, limit the marketability or uses.

Experience with the Lawrence Avenue system strongly suggests that the primary use for excavated materials from the TARP tunnels will be for landfill. This conclusion is further supported by the experience of a major quarry operator in the Chicago metropolitan area who had to abandon efforts to market this type of material because it could not be crushed and refined in a manner that would meet industry standards for high quality rock products.

Since there are no reliable current estimates of the demand for landfill in the local area over the period 1976 to 1986, it was not possible to develop reliable expected sales estimates of the excavated material from the TARP tunnels. Therefore, although there will be no significant economic impacts on the markets for high quality rock products, a definite conclusion concerning the market for landfill cannot be reached at this time.

In the worst case, where the demand for landfill is satisfied by the existing supply, the excavated material may have to be stored or simply disposed of. However, proposed plans, such as the Lakefront and Ski Mountain plans, can utilize the material should these plans be implemented. Storage and disposal of rock spoil is analyzed in Section 6.2.4.

(2) <u>Reservoirs</u>

As described in Section 6.2.4, spoil produced during excavation of the reservoirs is likely to be retained in stockpiles at the McCook and Thornton quarries under the ownership of the quarry operators. Release of this material on the market will probably be at the discretion of the quarry operators. Thus, no significant socioeconomic impacts are expected.

7.2 LAND USE

The proposed tunnel system would make efficient use of land resources for several reasons. First of all, the chief structural components, which are the tunnels and pumping stations, would be located underground. Second, maximum use has been made in the plan of existing combined sewers and interceptors, minimizing the need for interceptor connections and drop shafts in the plan. Third, MSDGC property has been utilized for shaft locations wherever possible to lessen the need for access easements and purchase of private properties. Fourth, the system would convey overflows to existing treatment and sludge handling facilities, at the Calumet Sewage Treatment Works plant, which also uses MSDGC-owned land. Fifth, rock and spoil from construction would be disposed of at approved sites. Sixth, requirements for new access roads to surface construction sites have been minimized by locating shaft sites close to existing roads. Finally, all shafts would be located as close to the river bank as possible, so that nearly all of the shafts would make use of land which is prone to overbank flooding. This land is of relatively low value.

Because of the tunnel system's efficient use of land, the potential impacts on land use during construction are few. Analysis of land use impacts follows under the following subsections:

- Alterations Near Surface Construction
- Rock and Spoil Disposal
- Archeological and Historical Sites
- Cultural and Recreational Sites.

7.2.1 Alterations Near Surface Construction

The construction of 59 drop shafts, 22 access shafts, and 5 construction shafts would require adequate space around the shafts for maneuvering trucks and construction equipment, for storing of equipment, and for mobile offices where required. The area needed at drop shaft and access shaft sites would be a maximum of about 15,000 square feet, or about one-third of an acre for the largest shaft, which is 18 feet in diameter. Space requirements for smaller shafts would be less. Each of these areas would be used over a period of about three months.

Construction shafts would be located on MSDGC land and would each require several acres of land during construction, over periods of from four to five and one-half years.

The construction drop shafts are primarily located at a waterway edge rather than at street edges. Surrounding land uses are predominately industrial with at least five shafts on already MSDGC-owned land. The shaft sites are also located in open and vacant land areas, some of which appear to be park or potential recreation areas, but the majority of which are unutilized vacant spaces in industrial zones.

The access shafts tend to be adjacent to street edges to provide flexible access. The majority are located, again, in industrial areas and on vacant or open land. At least five are also located adjacent to a waterway edge. Only one access shaft appears to be located in a residential area—access shaft 17 looks to be sited on a corner lot (with house) at Indiana Avenue and Wabash Avenue. The small single family housing development is across from Thornton Junior College. This site location could cause conflict with existing land use and become a nuisance to surrounding residents.

All of the land use effects are temporary and do not actually change land use, but comprise minor interruptions to the utilization of land at the drop shaft and access shaft sites.

Generally, the impacts on land use would be temporary during surface construction of the Calumet Tunnel system. These impacts are primarily consumption of a small amount of valuable industrial property and reduction of traffic capacity for periods of about three months at each of a few drop shafts.

7.2.2 Rock and Spoil Disposal

The active and inactive quarries in the area may be used to store and dispose of rock and spoil materials excavated during construction. No other possible storage and disposal sites have been identified. Excavated material from the Calumet system should not change or interfere with the current use of these quarries.

7.2.3 Archeological and Historical Sites

(1) Archeological Sites

The lands which have the highest potential for containing material of archeological value to be disturbed during construction are the banks of the Little Calumet, Calumet and Grand Calumet rivers. Although no archeological sites or materials are known to exist there, these areas have been actively used for commerce since the late 1700's and earlier by the Potawatomi Indians who hunted, traded furs, and occasionally camped in these areas. Because little is known about the use of the area prior to settlement by Europeans, any archeological finds in the lands along the Little Calumet, Calumet and Grand Calumet rivers, on which shafts will be constructed, could have high potential value.

Fortunately, the conventional methods of surface excavation planned for shaft construction would probably allow adequate recovery of any archeological finds. In fact, the net impact is likely to be favorable, because more archeological material of value would likely be recovered than destroyed. The mitigating measures in Chapter X would help to ensure this result.

The storage and handling of rock at Thornton quarry would have no impact on archeological resources, because the land there has already been disturbed.

Construction of shafts along the Cal-Sag Channel would not be likely to result in archeological finds or losses, because the lands along these waterways have been extensively disturbed during river straightening and canal excavation.

(2) Historical Sites

There are no sites which have been designated as historically significant and none under consideration. Therefore, there are no impacts anticipated in this area of environmental concern.

7.2.4 Cultural and Recreational Sites

No interference with any cultural sites is expected, because all proposed surface construction is at least 100 feet away from any existing or planned site. The several park and recreational facilities which border the waterways and Calumet Tunnel route were identified in Section 3.2.6 in Chapter III. The construction of drop shafts and access shafts will cause temporary interference with public usage of some portions of these park areas. The disturbance should last between three to five years during construction. As precise shaft locations are not known at this time, it is difficult to define to any greater extent the location and amount of space that may be required for construction related activities.

7.3 RESOURCES

The financial and labor resources which will be effected by the construction and operation of TARP, and, where applicable, the Calumet Tunnel system, are discussed in this section.

7.3.1 Financial Resources

This section addresses the potential impact of allocating approximately $1.03 billion to the funding of the Tunnel Plan construction over the period 1976 to 1986. The alternative uses for these funds at the local, State, and Federal levels are considered. This section also addresses the significant potential for the loss of approximately $300 million of FWPCA funds to the State of Illinois which could be precipitated by failure to implement the Tunnel Plan. Table III-13 on page III-28 displays the allocation of total costs among the three levels; local, State, and Federal.

(1) Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSDGC)

If the District's share of the Phase I tunnel construction cost, $181.6 million, was not applied to the

TARP tunnel systems, the District could finance instream aeration to the waterway system receiving plant effluents from the Calumet, North-Side, and West-Southwest Treatment facilities and expand the treatment plants at the Calumet and W-SW facilities.[1] These two components of the MSDGC's Flood and Pollution Control plan have an estimated construction cost (in 1975 dollars) in excess of $1.1 billion. From a broader perspective, project alternatives can be addressed in context of the total budget of Chicago. Data supplied by the MSDGC indicate that the city's FY 1976 budget consists of appropriations totaling $1.15 billion. The major categories of appropriation include:

- Public safety — 369 million
- Health — 41 million
- Environmental
  - Water — 102 million
  - Sewer and waste disposal — 97 million
- Transportation — 221 million
- Housing and community improvement — 39 million
- Human development, recreation, and culture — 33 million
- Economic satisfaction and consumer protection — 23 million.

In view of the multiplicity of the city's needs and the complexity of the budget formulation process, it is difficult to assess realistically the potential alternative uses of the $181.6 million (average of $14 million per year) of district funds targeted for the Phase I tunnel systems.[2] On a relative size basis, however,

1 These projects follow the tunnels in the District's priority scheme, as stated in the Facilities Planning Study MSDGC Overview Report.

2 In terms of population, Chicago represents approximately two-thirds of the MSDGC. In terms of assessed valuation, Standard and Poor's Municipal Bond Selector, December 31, 1975, indicates that Chicago comprises approximately 61 percent of the District.

the average annual dollar volume is significant in comparison with several of the major budget appropriations. In terms of tax rate effect, however, the funding of the TARP will increase the construction portion of the MSDGC tax rate from $.118/$100 of assessed valuation to only approximately $.171/$100 in 1986.[1] This increase is relatively small in comparison to the overall city of Chicago rate ($8.557/$100 assessed valuation) and other tax rate figures such as:

	Tax Per $100 Assessed Value
Board of Education	$3.47
City General Fund (fire, police, health, etc.)	$2.929
Chicago Park District	$ .774
Junior College Funding	$ .268
County Government Services	$ .65
Forest Preserve District	$ .096

In summary, it does not appear that the MSDGC's portion of the TARP funding would cause any significant reallocation of resources at the local level.

(2) State of Illinois

At the State level, the alternative use of the $300 million currently targeted for the Tunnel Plan is funding of the MSDGC instream aeration project and the expansion of the Calumet and West-Southwest Treatment facilities. These funds, however, would be obligated later than the FY 1976-77 time frame because the development of detailed plans for these facilities will not be completed until FY 1979 and, therefore, the proposed facilities will not be eligible for construction funding until FY 1979-80, according to recent

1 In FY1975, the MSDGC's tax rate was 40.05¢/$100 of assessed valuation (25.23¢/$100 for operations and maintenance; 11.75¢/$100 for construction bonds). The 5.32¢/$100 increase in the tax rate due to the Tunnel Plan was depicted in Table III-12.

estimates supplied by the MSDGC. The non-MSDGC alternative uses for the State funds include some 400 projects (approved by EPA for FWPCA funding) on the Illinois prioritized list of some 1,173 water pollution control projects. It must be emphasized, however, that traditionally half of the State of Illinois funds have been allocated to the MSDGC. The current portion of funds (available from the State) targeted for the MSDGC for TARP will not cause any significant or discernable disallocation of resources.

(3) Federal

At the Federal level, the question of alternative uses of the FWPCA funds targeted for TARP is more complex and has very serious ramifications. If the Plan is not implemented, there is a very high probability that approximately 90 percent of the current $323.6 million targeted for the MSDGC will be used for other projects.

The potential redirection of these funds stems from the fact that the Calumet Sewage Treatment facility expansion project, while high enough in the priority list for FWPCA funds, will not meet the September 30, 1977 deadline for Step 3 funding eligibility. The Step 2 grants were obligated in May and June of 1975, and the construction design and specifications necessary for Step 3 funding are currently scheduled to be completed in January of 1979.[1] Step 3 funding for these two treatment facilities is estimated at $261 million.[2] Assuming this project did not qualify in time for existing FWPCA funds, it is estimated that only approximately 10 percent of the $323.6 million could alternatively be allocated to other MSDGC prioritized pollution control projects.

1 Construction design and specifications required for Step 3 funding for the West-Southwest Treatment facilities are scheduled to be completed December 1979.

2 These funds would be employed specifically to provide treatment capacity to provide for nutrient removal by nitrification and to provide plant capacity for tertiary level of treatment by filtration.

In terms of a statewide reallocation of the FWPCA funds, Illinois EPA has indicated a very low probability that any of the funds could be obligated to non-MSDGC projects before the September 30, 1977 deadline. According to recent estimates by the Illinois EPA, some 31 non-MSDGC projects are in jeopardy of not being ready by September 30, 1977 for Step 3 FWPCA funding. Failure to meet the September deadline would mean that the State of Illinois would have to request a reallocation of $165 million of Federal funds currently targeted for these projects. This request, therefore, requires a comparable allocation of FY 1977 funds to initiate Step 3 funding.

According to Region V EPA, any funds not obligated within the appropriate deadline (September 30, 1977) would probably be reallocated by EPA headquarters among the other states according to the current allocation formula. These funds would thus be apportioned among projects (within these states) which are "next in line" in terms of State/EPA priority.

In terms of non-FWPCA alternatives for the funds, the question is as complex as the Federal budgeting process itself; at this time in the political process, however, it is possible that any unobligated funds would not be reassigned but rather indirectly passed back to the tax-payers via an extension, beyond June 30, 1976, of the current tax cuts and/or a further reduction in the tax liabilities of businesses and individuals.

7.3.2 Labor Resources

Effects on the labor force in the Chicago area due to construction of the Calumet system should be slight. As shown in Section 7.1.3, the job generation in any one year will probably not exceed 700. Unemployment within the construction field in the Chicago metropolitan area for 1972 averaged a total of 5,910 out of an approximated labor supply of 114,000 persons. Unofficial estimates of the construction labor force in the Chicago metropolitan area for 1975 were 119,000 persons with an unemployment rate approaching ten percent yielding a labor pool of

11,900. Less than one percent of the construction labor force would be involved in the Calumet project. Therefore, there should be no strain upon the labor force supply with respect to other construction projects.

7.4 TRANSPORTATION

Construction of the proposed project would generate additional truck and other vehicle traffic, causing short-term traffic disruption in some areas. Other transportation resources are not likely to be affected by project construction. Traffic impacts would occur near the construction and drop shaft sites and along the routes used by construction-related vehicles.

The traffic generated by construction activities primarily includes workers' commuting trips, as well as truck trips for rock and spoil disposal. The number of trips generated at the construction and drop shaft sites are discussed below.

7.4.1 Construction Shaft

An estimated 18 persons per shift would be required for tunnel excavation. Since there would be three shifts per day, assuming an occupancy rate of one person per car, the daily number of workers' trips to and from a shaft would be about 54. In addition, about three to five trucks per hour would be transporting rock and spoil material from the construction shaft to the disposal sites. Thus, the average number of daily trips generated at a construction shaft would range from 125 to 175. While workers' trip routes would vary, truck routes would be well-planned and constant. The most likely truck routes to the disposal sites are shown in Figure VI-4 in Section 6.2.4. It is estimated that construction activities at a construction shaft site would last from 4 to 5.5 years, 312 days a year, and 24 hour a day.

7.4.2 Drop Shafts

Assuming ten persons per shift would be working at a drop shaft site for one shift per day, and assuming an occupancy rate of one person per car, the daily number of workers' trips to and from the shaft site would be ten.

No rock would be disposed of from drop shaft sites. However, an initial layer of soil would have to be excavated and disposed of. Depending on the drop shaft size, the estimated volume of excavated soil from one shaft would range from 4.5 to 315 cubic yards.[1] Assuming a truck capacity of 13 cubic yards, the total number of trips generated would range from 1 to 25 for the entire excavation of a drop shaft. The construction at a drop shaft site is expected to last for about three months, but the excavation would probably last only a few weeks. Assuming two weeks for the excavation, the daily number of truck trips would be less than three.

In addition to the above estimated trips, there would be truck trips for transporting construction equipment and material. These trips would generally occur at the beginning and the end of the construction period. The largest number of such trips would result from trucks transporting concrete for lining tunnels to construction shaft sites. This would add approximately one trip per hour to the above estimates.

Comparison of the total daily number of trips, as estimated above, with the normal traffic volume on affected roads given in Section 3.4, indicates that impact of the additional construction-related traffic on the traffic flow would be insignificant. During the peak construction year, in 1980, when all three tunnel systems would be under construction, the estimated total number of construction-related trips would be approximately 2,000 per day, including 650 truck trips. These trips would be scattered over many routes, however, and would have negligible impact on the existing traffic flow.

7.5 MAJOR PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

The effects of the proposed surface and subsurface construction on other major projects and programs in the area would be negligible. Major projects and programs associated

---

1 Based on the smallest drop shaft diameter of 3.5 feet and the largest of 17 feet, and assuming 25 feet of soil cover, the loose excavated soil is conservatively assumed to occupy a 50 percent greater volume than its in-place volume.

with the communities in the Calumet system project area include: street improvement, truck and rail terminal improvements, acquisition of a public energy corridor, public buildings, and residential land development.

7.5.1 Transit Improvements

While currently available maps showing the alignment of proposed CTA subway improvements do not depict the final routes design, any potential interferences of the proposed Calumet system with the routes are not expected to present any potential conflicts.

7.5.2 Streets and Expressway Improvements

All proposed shafts would be outside the proposed alignments of all road improvements. No significant interference to these road improvements is expected from construction of the Calumet Tunnel system.

7.5.3 Rail and Truck Terminal Improvements

The amount of land consumed during construction of the proposed system is too small to have any impact on plans for rail and truck terminal improvement, including plans for reallocating storage space and rerouting vehicular traffic.

7.5.4 Public Acquisition of Energy-Utility Corridor

During shaft construction along the Calumet-Sag Channel, Calumet River, and Little Calumet River, construction contractors would be required under contracts with the MSDGC to survey all access routes to determine whether any pipeline crossings would need structural reinforcement prior to use. The contractors would also be required to make the necessary reinforcements. Therefore, no interference with pipeline operation is expected. Moreover, the amount of land consumed by the Calumet system shafts in the proposed energy corridor is minor compared to the area of the corridor, and the shaft locations would not preclude further utility development of the corridor.

7.6 COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Construction of the proposed project would require about 450,000 cubic yards of concrete and undetermined quantities of other construction materials. Construction vehicles and equipment, as well as vehicles used by construction workers would consume approximately 186,000 gallons of gasoline and 100,000 gallons of diesel fuel during project construction.

Electrical power needed for constructing the TARP conveyance tunnels will be purchased rather than generated on site. All underground construction activities will rely heavily on electricity for power generation, whereas surface construction will use predominantly internal combustion engines. Tunneling machines or moles will be the principal consumers of electrical power, and they will account for much of the energy used in this project. The amount of power which may be consumed during construction is expected to be less than one percent of total energy consumed in the region. The demand that this would place on the metropolitan power grid depends on the number of tunnels being constructed at the same time, and the extent of other construction operations that are underway. Each tunnel system is expected to consume a maximum of two to five Megawatts of electrical power (MW_e). Assuming a worst case situation of all three tunnel systems being constructed at the same time, and coal is used to generate a maximum amount of 15 Megawatts (5 MW_e per system), approximately 70,000 tons of coal will be consumed during each year of construction. This estimate is based on a 8,500 Btu/lb heating value–20 percent ash coal resource. This consumption rate represents approximately 0.06 percent of the total coal production rate for the Illinois, Indiana, western Kentucky, and Michigan regions in 1969.[1]

1 "Potential Pollutants in Fossil Fuels," Esso Research and Engineering Company, Report prepared for the U.S. EPA, Office of Research and Monitoring, June 1973.

VIII. EFFECTS OF OPERATION ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

VIII. EFFECTS OF OPERATION ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

The significant effects of implementing TARP on the natural environmental features of the Chicago metropolitan area are discussed in this chapter and presented in five sections:

- Water Resources
- Land Resources
- Atmospheric Resources
- Biological Resources
- Commitment of Natural Resources.

8.1 WATER RESOURCES

The operation of the proposed tunnel system will have a significant beneficial effect on the water resources of the Chicago area. Water quality conditions the past 20 years have been poor, and aquatic life has dwindled to only pollution-tolerant species. Implementation of the tunnel system will improve conditions so that a wider diversity of aquatic life can be reestablished and existing aquatic life can proliferate. This section describes the impact of tunnel operation on surface water and groundwater supplies of the affected area, as well as on wastewater and water management programs. This discussion addresses the following topics:

- Surface water quality and use as a resource
- Groundwater quality
- Impact on wastewater
- Interaction with other water management programs.

8.1.1 Surface Water

The deep tunnel system proposed by the MSDGC will affect surface water resources of the Chicago area in a variety of ways. Discussion of the impacts will follow the structure of Chapter II; the description of the existing natural environment.

(1) Water Quality

Completion of the Mainstream, Calumet, and Lower Des Plaines tunnel systems will reduce spills to area waterways, caused by combined-sewer overflows, from approximately 100 occasions per year to about 10 occasions per year. The tunnel systems will capture for treatment approximately 51 percent of the annual volume of overflow from combined sewers, thus reducing discharges to area waterways from the present level of 113,500 acre-feet per year to a level of 55,800 acre-feet per year. Because the tunnel systems will capture the most heavily polluted portion of the overflows, the percent reduction in the pollutant load in general will exceed the percent reduction in overflow volume. After treatment, the amount of biological oxygen demand (BOD) released to the waterways is expected to be reduced by about 78 percent (net) from present releases (approximately 38,700,000 lbs/yr to roughly 8,500,000 lbs/yr). Discharges of suspended solids will drop from a current level of about 180,500,000 lbs/yr to roughly 45,125,000 lbs/yr (a net reduction of about 75 percent). Currently, overflows from the combined sewers occur 17.4 percent of the time, releasing, untreated, the equivalent of 8.7 percent of the yearly average dry weather flow to area waterways.[1] Implementation of the tunnel system alone will limit overflow episodes to approximately 1.5 percent of the time, reducing releases of untreated sewage to less than 2 percent of the yearly average dry weather flows. The statistics on pollutant reduction cited above and their sources are summarized in Table VIII-1.

By reducing the number of yearly combined-sewer overflows from 100 to 10, a significant result will be that the average duration of nonoverflow periods will be increased from the current 3.1 days to 24 days. This means that the quality of the waterways will be governed, in general, by dry weather flow conditions. Dry weather flow conditions, in turn, are strongly influenced by effluent discharges from area treatment plants and by BOD released through the accumulated benthal deposits.

As described in Section 2.1.1, the hot summer months are the time of greatest strain on area water quality. During this period, decomposition of organic material in the deposits, retarded during the cooler months, is accelerated. Decomposition results

1 Hearing on the Proposed Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Chicago, Illinois, March 28, 1974.

Table VIII-1
Pollutant Discharges to Area Waterways
Before and After Operation of Phase I Tunnel System

Parameter	Existing Conditions	After Phase I	Percent Reduction
Volume of Sewer Overflow Released	113,500 acre-feet[1]	55,800 acre-feet[1]	51
BOD	38,700,000 lbs/yr[2]	8,500,000 lbs/yr[1]	78[3]
Suspended Solids	180,500,000 lbs/yr[1]	45,125,000 lbs/yr[1]	75
Untreated Sewage	8.7% of annual dry weather flow[2]	1.75% of annual dry weather flow[1]	80

1 Value calculated from information by the MSDGC in private communication, February 10, 1976.

2 Hearing on the Proposed Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Chicago, Illinois, March 28, 1974.

3 Net reduction after treatment.

in consumption of dissolved oxygen (DO) and creation of anaerobic conditions in the deposited material. Presently, under dry weather flow conditions (late summer months), water quality along major sections of the area's three primary waterways fails to meet minimum Illinois standards for restricted waters. This situation was documented in the Chapter II discussion of existing water quality in terms of simulated DO concentrations along the length of the major waterways. That discussion is continued and updated here.

The upgrading of DO concentrations along area waterways as a result of tunnel operation is shown graphically in Figures VIII-1, 2, and 3. These figures compare DO concentrations under existing dry weather flow conditions with concentrations expected with the Mainstream and Calumet Phase I tunnels on line. For the Des Plaines River, this system will be modeled in the Section 208 planning currently underway. For these simulations, average 1974 treatment plant effluents were used, along with flows from Lake Michigan representing average lockages (Lake Michigan water used in lock operations) and leakages (lake water leaking through lock gates). The simulations of conditions with tunnels on line assume increased discharges from the West-Southwest and Calumet treatment plants to reflect the expected dewatering of the tunnel system in post-storm periods. In addition, the benthic oxygen demand (part of the total BOD) for the simulation of Phase I conditions was assumed to be reduced by 80 percent of that used for modeling existing conditions (see Part (5) below.) The assumptions used in the simulations are summarized in Table VIII-2.

In general, the simulations show that with the Phase I tunnels on line, an improvement in DO concentrations averaging about 1.7 mg/l above existing conditions can be expected over the approximately 80 miles of waterways modeled. However, as is evident from the figures, the 4 mg/l dissolved oxygen standards will not be met over 70 percent or about 60 miles, of the waterway during dry weather flow conditions (mostly during late summer months). This is in addition to those ten occasions during the year on which most standards will not be met because the combined-sewer overflows will exceed tunnel storage capacity, causing overflow to the waterways.

FIGURE VIII-1
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Along North Shore Channel and North Branch of the Chicago River[1]



1 Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

FIGURE VIII-2
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Along the Main Channel From Lake Michigan to Lockport[1]



1 Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

FIGURE VIII-3
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Along the Calumet River System[1]



1 Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

Table VIII-2
Simulation Model Inputs[1]

Dry Weather, Existing Conditions

	North-Side Plant	West-South-West Plant	Calumet Plant	Lake Michigan
Flow (cfs)	505	1274	332	278
BOD (mg/l)	10	8	20	0
DO (mg/l)	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0

Benthic Demands - Same as previously used by the MSDGC as a result of calibration of computer with measured instream DO.

Dry Weather, First Phase TARP

	North-Side Plant	West-South-West Plant	Calumet Plant	Lake Michigan
Flow (cfs)	505	1460	366	278
BOD (mg/l)	10	8	20	0
DO (mg/l)	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0

Benthic Demands - Twenty percent of those used for existing conditions.

1 Westfall, D.E., Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to the MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

In addition, it is expected that Illinois restricted use standards will not be met under dry weather flow conditions without additional measures because of the quality of effluent from area treatment plants. Although detailed information is lacking, it appears that restricted use standards for ammonia are not likely to be met without upgrading of treatment facilities. With respect to phosphorus, the tunnel system is expected to intercept and capture a significant portion of the 1,350 tons per year of phosphorus currently discharged to combined-sewer overflows by treatment plants. Only about 20 percent[1], however, will be removed at the plant with current levels of treatment. The remaining 80 percent of the phosphorus will be released to the waterways until additional treatment is provided.

Likewise, until the MSDGC's large plants are upgraded to provide tertiary-level treatment, restricted use standards for ammonia are not likely to be met even with the implementation of the tunnel system. Currently, the North-Side, West-Southwest, and Calumet treatment plants will not be able to meet Illinois EPA standards, which go into effect by December 31, 1977. Ammonia in the effluent from the Calumet plant in particular is likely to cause violations of the Illinois Standards for Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life along the Calumet River system. Effluent concentrations of ammonia from area treatment plants are shown in Table II-7, page II-37.

Construction of instream aeration stations, 75 percent funded by an Illinois EPA grant, is imminent. Operation of these facilities will have considerable benefit to DO levels. A recent study by the Harza Engineering Company[2] simulates DO levels in the North Shore Channel at Wilmette downstream in the Sanitary-Ship Canal to Lockport and the Calumet River, O'Brien Locks downstream in the Cal-Sag Channel to the junction with the Sanitary-Ship Canal, before and after operation of nine instream aeration stations. The effect on the modeled streams of instream aeration alone is

---

1 MSDGC Testimony, Hearing on the Proposed Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Chicago, Illinois, March 28, 1974.

2 Harza Engineering Company, "Evaluation of Water Quality of Chicago Area Streams," March 1976.

very positive. Although instream aeration is far from adequate to bring DO levels in "summer existing conditions" (dry weather flow) to standards, almost all zero DO levels are eliminated and many reaches are elevated from substandard concentration to meeting or exceeding the standards concentration.

The Harza study discusses briefly the effect on the Des Plaines/Illinois River Lockport to Chillicothe of three stages of development of MSDGC pollution control facilities: 1) Phase I TARP, 2) Phase I TARP plus nitrification at the major MSDGC plants, and 3) "Ultimate," i.e., all proposed MSDGC pollution control facilities, including all of TARP. These simulations show that, although each stage improves the DO of the Lockport to Chillicothe reach, violations of the DO standard will not be completely eliminated during the critical summer low flow, high temperature condition. The reasons for continuing problems are ammonia from MSDGC plants, reduced by nitrification but not eliminated, and benthic oxygen demand. The need for additional flow by Lake Michigan diversion would need to be evaluated further after several elements of TARP are operational and more accurate water quality data is collected.

In summary, implementation of Phase I tunnels will limit combined-sewer overflows to about 10 occasions per year. Dry weather flow conditions will then be the influencing factor in water quality in the area. Under such conditions, Illinois Standards for Secondary Contact and Indigenous Aquatic Life will not be met for DO and probably not for ammonia. For these reasons, implementation of the Phase I tunnels will not enable an upgrading in water uses along large reaches of the major Chicago area waterways. Rather it is clear that other programs for pollution control must also be undertaken to attain state standards on these river systems. Other programs being considered toward this end are: upgrading of existing treatment plants, use of instream aeration, and implementation of TARP Phase II. The water quality implication of these programs are discussed briefly below.

The increment of oxygenation provided by an in-stream aeration system in addition to the increment provided by the tunnel and reservoir system and the upgrading of MSDGC treatment plants would allow Illinois Secondary Contact and Indigenous Life Standards to be met over the entire 80-mile length of the modeled rivers. The computer simulations of DO shown in Figures VIII-4, 5, and 6 assume 11 aeration stations over the modeled lengths of the Main Channel and Calumet River systems.

Upgrading of area treatment plants in conjunction with operation of the tunnels and reservoirs could have a significant beneficial effect on water quality during dry weather flow conditions. Upgrading to tertiary treatment with nitrogen and phosphorus removal would enable attainment of Illinois standards for ammonia and phosphorus in area waterways. In addition, DO concentrations would increase due to the absence of ammonia, although the improvement would still not be enough to meet DO standards along approximately 24 of the 80 miles, or 30 percent of the modeled waterways. Results of MSDGC computerized simulations of the impact of this combination on DO concentrations are portrayed in Figures VIII-4, 5, and 6. The extremely high ammonia removal efficiency called for by a recent report[1] (98 percent) will probably not be needed in order to meet water quality standards proposed by the MSDGC assuming the addition of the in-stream aeration system.

The addition of storage reservoirs to the tunnel system would virtually eliminate release of combined-sewer overflows to surface waterways. With the tunnels and reservoirs on line, the MSDGC expects overflow events to be limited to three or fewer occasions over a 27-year period.[2] This would prevent violation of Illinois standards under wet weather flow conditions. State standards will still not be met, however, under the critical summer dry weather flow conditions, because of high ammonia concentrations in the effluent discharged from treatment plants, and because of the depletion of DO concentrations in the waterways. Implementation of the tunnels and reservoirs will still not enable attainment of the 1977 DO standard over roughly 40 of the 80 miles of waterways. The impact of the combination of the tunnels and reservoirs on DO concentrations is shown in Figures VIII-4, 5, and 6.

---

1 Illinois State Water Survey, "A Waste Allocation Study of Selected Streams in Illinois," February 1974.

2 MSDGC, "Facilities Planning Studies - MSDGC Overview Report," Revised January 1975.

FIGURE VIII-4
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Combination of Tunnels and Reservoirs[1]

North Shore Channel
And
North Branch Chicago River



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

FIGURE VIII-5
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Combination of Tunnels and Reservoirs[1]

Calumet River and Cal-Sag Channel



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

FIGURE VIII-6
Simulation of Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations Under Combination of Tunnels and Reservoirs[1]

Main Channel - Lake to Cal-Sag



1 J. Irons, MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

The DO characteristics of the Des Plaines River system is currently being modeled in the Section 208 planning effort and will be described in the Lower Des Plaines EIS.

Information relating to the impact on water quality of the various pollution control options described above is summarized in Table VIII-3.

(2) Water Quantity

Implementation of Phase I of TARP is not expected to have a significant impact on annual flow rates and water levels along the major river systems. The tunnels themselves are too limited in capacity to reduce noticeably the flood stages attained during the largest area storms. Flooding will still occur at nearly the same existing frequency until the storage reservoirs are implemented or the storage capacity is increased.

(3) Flow Regulation

Capture of 51 percent of the combined-sewer overflow volume with subsequent treatment and release to area waterways will have some impact on flow regulation. As noted in Table VIII-2, operation of the tunnel system is expected to increase the average flow of water from the West-Southwest and Calumet plants by about 13 percent and 9 percent, respectively. This modest increase will allow a smoothing out of flow rates in the Mainstream and Calumet River systems except for those occasions when large storms occur. In short, the effect of tunnel operation on flow regulation throughout the Chicago area is expected to be minor.

(4) Domestic Water Supply

The capture, treatment, and release of combined-sewer overflows is expected to have little, if any, impact upon domestic water supplies. Plant effluent may eventually be upgraded to the point where it can substitute for a portion of that direct diversion from Lake Michigan used for maintenance of water quality. Until then, it is unlikely that the additional flows provided by TARP Phase I will enable the reallocation of high quality Lake Michigan water for domestic uses.

Table VIII-3
Summary of Pollutant Concentration Ranges in Chicago's Surface Water Systems

Pollutant	Chicago River — Sanitary and Ship Canal System	Calumet River System	Des Plaines River System	Applicable Illinois Standards*	
				Secondary Contact	General Use
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	1.2 to 7.7 mg/l	3.9 to 9.0 mg/l	6.0 to 10 mg/l	5.0 mg/l[1] 4.0 mg/l (1978)[2] 3.0 mg/l 4.0 mg/l min.[1] 2.0 mg/l min.	6.0 mg/l 5.0 mg/l min.[3]
Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)	5.2 to 9.2 mg/l	4.1 to 7.3 mg/l	5.0 to 6.7 mg/l	4-20 mg/l[4]	4-20 mg/l[4]
Ammonia (as N)	0.8 to 6.2 mg/l	1.3 to 13 mg/l	0.3 to 1.2 mg/l	4.0 mg/l (winter) 2.5 mg/l (summer)	2.6 mg/l[3]
Suspended solids (SS)	19 to 54 mg/l	12 to 73 mg/l	29 to 68 mg/l	5-25 mg/l[5]	5-25 mg/l[5]
Fecal coliform	477 to 12,700 (counts/100 ml)	152 to 738 (counts/100 ml)	411 to 8,700 (counts/100 ml)	1000/100 ml[1]	200/100 ml[2]

* Effluent discharge standards apply if water quality standard is not designated.

1 North Shore Channel Standards

2 Chicago River-Sanitary and Ship Canal System and Calumet River system.

3 General Use Standard applicable to Des Plaines River system.

4 4 mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare Sewage Treatment Plants
10 mg/l-WSW and Calumet Sewage Treatment Plant
20 mg/l-Lemont Sewage Treatment Plant

5 5mg/l-Hanover, Egan, and O'Hare STP
12mg/l-WSW and Calumet STP
25mg/l-Lemont STP

(5) Benthal Deposits

Implementation of the tunnel system will reduce releases of suspended solids to the waterways by about 75 percent.[1] It is expected that only a thin layer of sludge will be deposited on the river bottom after an overflow event once the tunnels have been placed in operation. Because of this, the number of instances in which anaerobic decomposition occurs should be reduced significantly.

A significant reduction in benthic oxygen demand is predicted as a result of Phase I TARP. The tunnel will capture all but the largest overflows, expanding the average duration of nonoverflow conditions from 3.1 to 24 days. Because of this, benthic oxygen demand will be reduced to about 20 percent of current levels.[2] Dredging of existing sludge deposits from the waterways should further reduce the oxygen demand from organic sediment.

8.1.2 Groundwater

The operation of the tunnel system and associated subsystems is expected to have two types of effects on the natural environment. Wastewaters conveyed by the system may have an impact on groundwater resources caused by exfiltration. Conversely, these resources may have an impact on the tunnels because of groundwater infiltration.

Although concrete linings and rock grouting will be used to control infiltration and exfiltration (see Section 5.1.2 of Chapter V), no combination of lining and grouting can completely eliminate the inflow and outflow of water between the tunnel and the surrounding rock. Should the grouting program fail, infiltration or exfiltration will most likely occur and will cause a significant impact on tunnel operations. The inflow or outflow rates are expected to be at the tunnel maximum level, as indicated in Section 6.1.2 and illustrated in Figures VI-1, VI-2, and VI-3. The extent

---

1 Westfall, D.E., Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

2 Ibid.

of grouting failures, however, can be monitored by: routine and frequent tunnel inspections, water level fluctuations in observations wells, and chemical analysis of the observation well water.

Assuming that the number of grouting failures are kept to a minimum, the impacts of groundwater infiltration and wastewater exfiltration during operation of the tunnel system are not expected to be significant. The effects of these impacts which are unique to infiltration and exfiltration, are discussed in the following sections.

(1) Infiltration

During dry weather conditions, the pressure inside the tunnel will generally be low because of the nearly dry tunnel conditions. During normal storm events, the tunnels will be partially full, and the pressure will still be lower than the groundwater inflow pressure. Therefore, when the tunnels are either dry or partially full, groundwater infiltration will take place. If the tunnel is grouted according to specifications, inflow is not expected to exceed 0.05 MGD/mile. For the Calumet tunnels, groundwater infiltration may be as low as 0.01 MGD/mile. Although the infiltration rate to the tunnel is small, the pressure will still be high enough to prevent exfiltration of wastewater from the tunnel into the aquifer.

As revealed in Chapter V, the grouting program is designed to limit overall infiltration to 0.05 MGD/mile or less. To achieve a rate lower than this, chemical and epoxy grouts may be required in addition to cement grouts. This requirement is dependent on nature and density of fracturing and on seepage or infiltration conditions encountered during construction which dictate what grouting method should be employed.

Without the tunnel grouting and/or lining programs, maximum infiltration of groundwater can occur at the rates specified in Section 6.1.2. The impact, therefore, is expected to be significant with respect to tunnel operations and their associated systems. The flow rate can be as high as 40 MGD total for the Calumet Tunnel system and represents over 18 percent of the system's treatment capacity.

The results of tests conducted in two tunnels completed to date confirm that the grouting program is effectively limiting groundwater infiltration to less than half of the figure of 500 gallons per day per inch of tunnel diameter per mile considered acceptable for sewer performance. If groundwater infiltration is controlled by the grouting program in Phase I tunnels as well as has been done in the two demonstration tunnels, then the effects on groundwater due to infiltration would be even less than is stated in this EIS.

(2) Exfiltration

During major storm events, the hydraulic or outward pressure in the tunnel may exceed the inward pressure of the aquifer. Exfiltration will then occur until tunnel pressure and aquifer pressure achieve equilibrium. This would result in adverse effects on groundwater quality in the vicinity of the tunnel, and would necessitate an aquifer protection system. Preservation of the aquifer can be achieved by establishing or preserving two physical conditions throughout the project area:

- Maintenance of a high piezometric level within the aquifer in relation to hydraulic grade levels in tunnels and shafts by a system of recharge wells

- Limitation of exfiltration as well as infiltration by a combination of grouting and tunnel lining, as discussed previously.

Although data was not available to indicate the expected maximum tunnel pressure during a simulated flood condition, studies have identified general areas in which aquifer recharge will be necessary to sustain potentiometric levels and thus to avoid exfiltration.[1] Figure VIII-7 shows areas which may require installation of recharge wells. These areas correspond to existing or imminent low potentiometric surface areas. The need for future recharge wells was based on projected water level declines. The recharge system, if required, would consist of wells spaced approximately

---

1 Harza Engineering Company, "Development of a Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area: Geology and Water Supply," Technical Report, Part 4, MSDGC, 1972.

FIGURE VIII-7
Aquifer Protection
Needs[1]



LEGEND:

AREAS IN WHICH INITIAL RECHARGE WELL INSTALLATION IS NECESSARY

AREAS IN WHICH FUTURE RECHARGE WELL INSTALLATION MAY BE NECESSARY

---

1 HEC, 1972

1,000 feet apart.[1] The system is designed to allow a water injection rate of 100 gpm which would result in an equivalent recharge amount of 0.73 MGD per mile of tunnel. Due to the variability of the aquifer, additional testing will be necessary during construction to delineate specific locations for recharge wells and to determine appropriate injection rates.

According to present plans, the proposed tunnel system will be situated beneath existing potable water main systems at a minimum vertical distance of 70 feet. In order to determine the potential for pollution of the potable water from exfiltration of the combined sewage, a "worst case" analysis was performed.[2] This analysis was based on the following assumptions:

- The sewage tunnel is unlined, and only major open joints have been grouted
- Pressure head in the sewage tunnel is the same as at land surface
- Ratio of horizontal to vertical permeabilities is one, $K_h/K_v=1$, and permeability rate is 0.001 ft/min
- The water main is empty
- The concrete lining of the water main is damaged to the extent that it does not function as a seepage boundary.

The analysis indicated that even under such critical and unlikely circumstances, it would take approximately 280 days for the exfiltrated seepage to reach the water main, and the rate of seepage in the main would be about 0.07 gpm per foot of water main line affected (or 0.5 MGD/mile).

It is extremely unlikely that this situation will occur. Based on the projected rate of flow of the sewage effluent, there would be sufficient time to implement mitigative measures in the event exfiltration occurs, providing observation wells are installed.

---

1 HEC, 1972.

2 Ibid.

A "worst case" situation would necessitate the emptying of the water main for repairs to damaged lining. Monitoring efforts (i.e., water level and water quality movements) in nearby observation wells will reveal any adverse or potentially adverse changes before they could become manifest in non-test wells located farther away. These observation wells should be located along the entire length of the tunnel route. Figure VIII-8 shows the locations of existing observation wells as revealed in a 1975 report by HEC.

*   *   *   *

In view of the heterogeneous nature of the aquifer system, the observations and conclusions presented herein should be considered as estimates or relative assessments. The distribution of observation wells along the Calumet Tunnel system appears inadequate for effective monitoring. In addition, the potentiometric surfaces and tunnel pressures of this system will have to be more fully defined to adequately calculate exfiltration potential and to design the proper exfiltration control systems.

8.1.3 Wastewater

Treatment of captured overflows from the combined sewers is the ultimate goal of the proposed deep tunnel system. The dewatering of intercepted flows from the tunnels is designed to be completed within about 2.5 days to avoid the possibility of septicity in the tunnels. Implementation of the tunnel system will increase dry weather flows from the West-Southwest and Calumet plants by roughly 13 percent and 9 percent, respectively.[1] Increased flows through these two plants and changes in selected effluent characteristics relative to 1973 levels are shown in Table VIII-4.

1 Westfall, D.E., Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

FIGURE VIII-8
General Location of Existing
Observation Wells



Table VIII-4
Comparison of Anticipated Effluent Flows and Characteristics Resulting From Phase I Tunnel Dewatering With 1973 Average Operating Parameters[1]

	North-Side STP		West-Southwest STP		Calumet STP	
	Phase I	(1973)	Phase I	(1973)	Phase I	(1973)
Flow (cfs)	505	(505)	1460	(1340)	366	(325)
DO (mg/l)	7	(7)	7	(7)	7	(7)
BOD (mg/l)	10	(10)	8	(7)	20	(15)
NH_3 (mg/l)	5	(5)	7	(7)	18	(18)

1 Westfall, D.E., Kieffer and Associates, Memorandum to MSDGC, February 3, 1976.

As is evident from the table, the effect of Phase I tunnel dewatering operations on treatment plant effluent quality is not expected to be significant. The likely dilution of intercepted flows and the modest increases in flow to the treatment plants from dewatering form the basis for this finding.

Effluent flows and chemical characteristics are indicated in Table VIII-5, assuming addition of the storage reservoirs and expansion and upgrading of the MSDGC's large plants to provide tertiary treatment including nitrification of ammonia.

Table VIII-5
Effluent Flows and Chemical Characteristics Resulting From Addition of Reservoirs and Upgrading of MSDGC Plants[1]

	North-Side STP		West-Southwest STP		Calumet STP	
	TARP	(Upgrading)	TARP	(Upgrading)	TARP	(Upgrading)
Flow (cfs)	505	(505)	1587	(1587)	391	(391)
DO (mg/l)	7	(7)	7	(7)	7	(7)
BOD (mg/l)	10	(8)	8	(8)	20	(8)
NH_3 (mg/l)	5	(2.5)*	7	(2.5)*	18	(2.5)*
		(4.0)**		(4.0)**		(4.0)**

* Summer months.
** Winter months.

1 Irons, J., MSDGC, Personal Communication, February 10, 1976.

Ammonia concentrations of 2.5 mg/l (summer) and 4.0 mg/l (winter) for the upgraded plants represent the minimum level that must be attained by December 31, 1977, to meet Illinois Effluent Discharge standards for plants treating in excess of 50,000 population equivalents of load. In addition, under these standards, BOD levels from MSDGC plants must be limited to no more than 10 mg/l by December 31, 1977. The projected improvement in BOD levels beyond the mandated limit due to plant upgrading is a result of MSDGC's companion effort to meet DO standards in the waterways by limiting BOD releases from MSDGC treatment plants. Currently, Illinois has no BOD standards specifically for waterways and the limitation that must be met is the effluent discharge standard.

At this time, information on the design and operation of the reservoir storage systems is insufficient to enable a determination of the effect of variable dewatering rates on the quality of treatment plant effluent.

8.1.4 Water Management Programs

Improvements in water quality resulting from operation of the tunnel system are, in general, consistent with the aims of other area water management programs. The tunnel system, in conjunction with a water storage system, is widely recognized in virtually all area plans as a necessary component to control pollution and flooding problems in the Chicago area. Although the tunnels alone would not attain fully the goals of the various programs identified in Section 2.1.4, operation of the tunnels without the reservoirs would enable pollution control aims to be at least partially accomplished.

A decision to construct the tunnel system prior to the completion of the 208 Planning Program would certainly reduce the options open to the 208 planning agency (Northern Illinois Planning Commission) in developing an areawide waste treatment management plan. With the commitment to a significant component of the TARP system, the potential utility and impact of the waterway monitoring and modeling to be undertaken as part of the 208 program will necessarily be reduced. However, the 208 Planning Program is still expected to provide significant data affecting the design and implementation of other components of the TARP project, including reservoir storage of combined-sewer overflows, upgrading and expansion of area treatment plants, and the use of instream aeration.

No major conflicts could be identified between implementation of the tunnel system and other water management programs in the Chicago area.

8.2 LAND RESOURCES

The effects on land resources of implementing TARP are discussed in this section of the EIS. The assessment focuses mainly on the Calumet Tunnel system and is presented under the following land resource categories:

- Flood-Prone Areas
- Geology and Seismicity
- Land Disposal of Sludge.

8.2.1 Flood-Prone Areas

The flood-prone areas within the MSDGC combined-sewer service area are expected to be beneficially affected as a result of Calumet Tunnel system operation. The effect will be very small, however, since the combined-storage capacity of the Calumet Tunnels is only 1,690 ac-ft, which is equivalent to approximately 0.4 inches of runoff water. The drainage basins and areas susceptible to overbank flooding associated with the Calumet Tunnel route have been described in Section 2.2, Land Resources, of this EIS. Although some flooding as well as overflow relief can be expected within certain portions of these drainage basins and flood-prone areas, the amount will be insignificant unless a larger storage system is incorporated as part of the tunnel plan. For the Calumet system, there will be 101 overflow relief points and 59 drop shafts for collecting runoff wastewaters. Most of these relief points and drop shafts will be located within flood-prone areas. Table VIII-6 presents the number of drop shafts and relief points for all the Calumet Tunnel segments as compared to all the TARP systems combined. This table provides an overview of the incremental, beneficial effects which the Calumet Tunnel system is expected to have on the MSDGC flood-prone areas.

Table VIII-6
Comparison of Calumet Tunnel Segments to All TARP Systems - Drop Shafts and Overflow Relief Points

Component	Calumet	All Systems*	Percent (%) of Total**
Drop Shafts	59	341	17.0
Overflow Relief Points	101	644	15.7

* Mainstream, Calumet, and Lower Des Plaines.[1]
** Fraction of Calumet with respect to total for all systems.

8.2.2 Geology and Seismicity

Many of the geologic constraints placed on the construction procedures (Chapter 6.2.2) are also applicable to the long-term operation of the tunnel systems. Remedial measures taken to decrease the geologic impact during the construction phases will further add to the long-term stability of the systems operations. The impact of operations on the gross subsurface geologic and seismic characteristics of the Chicago region is considered to be negligible. Some impact of operations within a localized or restricted geologic area can be expected, and this impact could have a further impact on the operation of the system.

1 Bauer Engineering, Inc., November 1973.

The interplay of operations and geologic or seismic conditions is directly dependent upon a number of physical aspects of the various strata, or geologic structures, to be traversed by the tunnels and associated systems. These geologic constraints, discussed in detail in Chapters 2.2.3 and 6.2.2, consist of the engineering properties of the rocks, rock structure variability, bedding attitude, and geologic structures such as faults, folds, and joints within each rock unit. Awareness of specific problems posed by these geologic constraints and remedial measures taken to secure short-term stability during the construction phase of the project should be sufficient to ensure the long-term (operational) stability of the system.

(1) Geologic Effects

A number of geologic conditions would appear to have a unique impact on long-term operation of the tunnels and associated systems. These conditions do not necessarily pose a problem during the construction phase. Among these constraints are: stress changes induced by system operation or by progressive yielding of the rocks with time, the erosive or corrosive effects on the rocks of waste materials and flood waters carried by the tunnels, weathering or corrosive effects at joints or fracture zones with time, the erosive effects of rock falls moved along the length of the tunnels during periods of flooding, and the effects of a seismic event or earthquake on the tunnel and related features.

The degree of maintenance required will be a direct function of the long-term effectiveness of the rock anchoring system applied to certain segments of the tunnels.[1] Although the anchoring system can be

---

1 Harza Engineering Company (HEC), Geotechnical Design Report, "Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Mainstream Tunnel System," MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

relied on during tunnel excavation, tunnel operation and a progressive yielding over time resulting from stress relief will induce stress changes in the vicinity of the tunnel periphery, and the long-term reliability of the anchoring system will diminish. In these instances, rock falls would be expected, and these falls would require clean-up, rebolting, regrouting, and patching of the rock fall zones. The frequency of these occurrences can become so great that future lining of the tunnel could be warranted even after start-up of operation. This provision should not be discounted. In this sense, operation of unlined tunnel segments should be regarded by the MSDGC as an "experimental," pilot venture. Most of the Calumet Tunnel system will be unlined (over 90 percent) and the rock fall impact could be significant during the operation of this system.

The materials carried by the tunnel systems may have an erosive or corrosive effect upon the rocks. Wetting and drying laboratory tests have indicated that almost all the rocks (with the exception of shale) have a low chemical reactivity with sewage.[1] However, the rocks may be highly reactive to certain industrial wastes expected to enter the tunnels and the long-term effects will not be known until further tests are conducted.

It appears probable that for an unlined and unsupported tunnel, over a period of time, the thin shale partings and interbeds found in the Interreef facies of the Racine, in the Markgraf and Brandon Bridge members of the Joliet and in the Kankakee dolomites will be subject to deterioration. Deterioration would be especially rapid when the shale interbeds are subjected to alternate wetting and drying. Wherever a shaley parting or interbed occurs near the crown of a moled tunnel, it will act as a weak plane to which the crown portion will tend to break back with time, forming a flat roof. Structural weakening and fallout from the

1 Harza Engineering Company (HEC), Geotechnical Design Report, "Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Mainstream Tunnel System," MSDGC, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

rock surrounding the tunnels would also be expected with time wherever closely spaced shale partings and joints intersect.[1]

Rock falls would cause a decrease in the hydraulic efficiency of the tunnel. Further, irregularities in tunnel shape caused by a rock fall will be subject to more concentrated attack by erosional forces associated with flowing water. Hence, the tunnel condition could worsen rapidly in the absence of remedial measures. Moreover, the fallen rock could damage downstream tunnel sections as it is transported by the flowing waters. Additionally, since the diameter of the proposed tunnels will be greater than the approximately 17-foot diameter of existing tunnels, the, crown areas of the proposed tunnels will be somewhat less stable.

(2) Seismic Effects

The seismicity of the Chicago area has been described in detail in Chapter 2.2.4 and the construction phase-seismicity interrelations have been discussed in Chapter 6.2.3. The recurrence rate for an MMI VIII earthquake is about once for every 100 years and the last VIII earthquake was in 1909. This recurrence rate is well within the 30-to-40 year funding life span of the tunnel system.

A local earthquake can be generated by small (a few centimeters) movements on a fault. If the causative fault intersects the tunnel system, the minor dislocation may offset the tunnel alignment. This may alter the tunnel support systems as well as destroy the integrity of the nonstructural tunnel lining, thus exposing the surrounding rocks, especially shales, to deterioration. Rock fall in the vicinity of such a dislocation may be extensive, especially along joints or other fractures in unlined tunnels.

The impact from earthquakes generated by faults at some distance from the tunnel and associated systems is expected to be slight. Rock falls can be expected

1 Harza Engineering Company (HEC), "Evaluation of Geology and Groundwater Conditions in Lawrence Avenue Tunnel, Calumet Intercepting Sewer 18E, Extension A. Southwest Intercepting Sewer 13A," Chicago, Illinois, 23 p., 1972 a.

along some pre-existing joints or fracture zones. General rock fall, unrelated to existing breaks and the formation of new cracks is unlikely in light of the particle velocities required to cause breakage compared to the peak vertical velocities for all but the largest earthquakes (MMI VIII).

8.2.3 Sludge Waste

Sludge solids from combined-sewer overflows will be captured by the Calumet Tunnel system operation. Sludge from this system will be processed at the Calumet Treatment plant and then will be disposed of in a variety of ways.

The MSDGC estimates that sludge generation from the Calumet system will increase the sludge load of the Calumet plant by 19 to 27 tons per day (tpd), or by about 16 percent over the current sludge-handling rate. Ultimate disposal of the sludge solids is expected to be as follows:

Disposal Method	Sludge Production From Tunnels (tpd)*	1973 Sludge Disposal Rate From Calumet Plant (tpd)
Fulton County site	12.0	45
Landfill disposal	3.5	20
NuEarth Program	2.4	20
Broker sales	9.1	42
Total	27.0	127

The disposal impact of the increment of sludge produced by the Calumet system upon sludge handling and disposal practices at the Calumet plant is not expected to be significant.

---

* Calumet Tunnels and Branches.

8.3 ATMOSPHERIC RESOURCES

The impact of tunnel operation on atmospheric resources is discussed in the following sections:

- Air Quality
- Odor
- Aerosols
- Noise.

8.3.1 Air Quality

Operation of the proposed tunnel system is not likely to have any direct effects on the ambient air quality. However, there may be an indirect impact on air quality because of the use of electrical power to operate the tunnel dewatering pumps. If the required electricity is generated in a fossil fuel power plant, the pumps would require additional fuel to be burned, causing emission of air pollutants at the power plant site.

The entire tunnel system would require about 107.1 million kilowatt hours (kWh) per year to operate the pumps and aerators[1], of which about 10.4 million kWh would be required by the Calumet system.[2]

---

1 Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Environmental Impact Statement," Preliminary Draft, prepared for the MSDGC, November 1973.

2 Environmental Assessment Statement for Calumet Tunnel System, MSDGC with assistance from Bauer Engineering, Inc., January 1976.

If the energy for the entire system is purchased from the Commonwealth Edison system, it would amount to approximately 0.03 percent of the utility's net energy generation in 1980[1]. The relatively small amount of additional fuel required to supply this energy is not likely to have significant adverse effect on the region's air quality.

Instead of purchasing it from a utility, the required power may be generated using gas turbines. The turbines could be owned and operated by the MSDGC, however, such operation would not be economical based on the present high cost of fuel oil. Therefore, the use of gas turbines is unlikely to be the choice for the proposed project. Hence, the air quality impact of gas turbine operation has not been evaluated.

8.3.2 Odor

If combined-sewer overflows are stored in the tunnels for a long period of time, anaerobic conditions may develop, resulting in odor generation. Typically three to ten days of storage are required for anaerobic conditions to develop. The tunnels are planned to be dewatered within two days of receiving combined-sewer overflows, thus eliminating the possibility of anaerobic conditions developing. Therefore, no odors should be generated during the storage of combined-sewer overflows.

If the tunnels are used to transport dry weather flows, the drop shafts would provide ample ventilation to maintain aerobic conditions and prevent generation of odor.

8.3.3 Aerosols

Aerosols are fine airborne liquid particles. These may be produced in the drop shafts when the wastewater falls at high velocity. If not properly controlled, these aerosols, made of polluted water, may escape into the atmosphere through the drop shaft opening. Since pathogenic organisms are present in the raw sewage flowing down the drop shaft, the aerosols would present a potential health hazard to nearby residents. The proposed drop shafts are designed to prevent the escape of aerosols into the atmosphere. Therefore, no adverse impacts are expected from them.

---

1 Op. cit., Bauer Engineering, Inc., November 1973.

8.3.4 Noise

Potential sources of noise during the tunnel operation include dewatering pumps and water falling down the drop shafts. The pumps will be located from 250 to 300 feet underground and noise from them is not expected to be heard at the surface. The water falling down the drop shafts will be aerated to cushion its impact. Thus, the noise will be minimized and will not cause significant adverse impacts. The velocity of the air leaving the drop shafts will be controlled so that no whistling sound will be produced.

8.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Operation of the Calumet Tunnel system and subsystems is not expected to have a negative effect on the natural vegetation, terrestrial and aquatic life, and avian life of the forest preserves in the project area. Surface structures, such as drop shafts and access shafts, will require a small amount of space (less than 150 square feet of area). Although several drop shafts will be located on lands owned by the Forest Preserve District, the effects will be beneficial rather than negative since the purpose of the drop shafts is to relieve flooding and remove point and nonpoint sources of pollution.

8.5 COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Operation of the Calumet Tunnel conveyance system,[1] will involve the yearly consumption of roughly 15 Megawatts of electric power. Assuming that coal will be burned to generate this amount of electricity, an estimate of the quantity of coal which will be consumed would be approximately 70,000 tons per year. This estimate is based on a heating value for coal of 8,500 Btu/lb and an ash content for coal of 20 percent. More typical values for coal produced in the Illinois region would be roughly 14,000 Btu/lb and 10 percent ash.[2] Thus, the consumption of 70,000 tons of coal per year is a worst-case estimate. The total amount of coal produced in the Illinois region (Illinois, Indiana, western

1 MSDGC, November 1973.

2 "Potential Pollutants in Fossil Fuels," Esso Research and Engineering Company, Report prepared for U.S. EPA, Office of Research and Monitoring, June 1973.

Kentucky and Michigan) in 1969 was 131,000,000 tons.[1] Generation of 75 Megawatts of electricity for tunnel operation would therefore involve consumption of about 0.06 percent of the total regional production of coal in 1969. For this reason, generation of electricity for tunnel operation is not expected to have a significant impact on area energy resources.

1 Op. cit.

IX. EFFECTS OF OPERATION ON THE MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

IX. EFFECTS OF OPERATION ON THE MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

The effects of operation of the Calumet Tunnel system on the man-made environment are described in the following sections:

- Socioeconomic
- Land Use
- Financial Resources
- Transportation
- Other Projects and Programs
- Commitment of Resources.

9.1 SOCIOECONOMIC

The socioeconomic effects of operation on the man-made environment are divided here into two sections; operation-related income and operation-related employment. They are discussed below.

9.1.1 Operation-Related Income

Operation and maintenance of the Calumet Tunnel system have been estimated as generating approximately $1.1 million per year in salaries and wages.[1] The maintenance and operation program is for both systems and cannot be separated out individually. This estimate assumes approximately 76 persons at an average annual salary of $15,000.

9.1.2 Operation-Related Employment

Operation and maintenance of the Calumet Tunnel system are estimated to require 76 persons on a full-time basis.[2] There should be no difficulty in filling these positions from the available labor supply.

---

1 MSDGC, "Facilities Planning Study - South Facility Area," Revised, January 1975.

2 Ibid.

9.2 LAND USE

The operation of the Calumet Tunnel system would have only slight impact on land use including permanent consumption of small amounts of industrial land of varying value, some reduction of riverbank flooding, required coordination of planned public facilities with shaft surface structures, and consumption of land for sludge disposal. These possible impacts are discussed in the following sections:

- Alterations Near Surface Structures
- Sensitive Resource Areas
- Sludge Disposal.

9.2.1 Alterations Near Surface Structures

The five construction shaft sites combined will consume 28.2 acres of MSDGC property, resulting in the permanent use of these sites for environmental protection. Environmental protection use would be compatible with surrounding land uses. The drop shafts and access shafts would each consume a portion of land measuring about 25 feet by 25 feet, or 625 square feet. About half of the land consumption of these 625-square-foot areas would be in MSDGC-owned, public-owned, and vacant land, resulting in their environmental protection permanent use. The next most common location of drop shafts and access shafts would be in railroad and industrial yards, causing some reallocation of industrial space. Even in the most intensively used industrial areas, this reallocation would probably only slightly interfere with operations and would not force any changes in use of industrial property. The remaining locations of drop shafts are along waterway and street edges. None of these land uses would be affected by system operation because the surface structure of each drop shaft can bear the loads of traffic and materials handling. Access to a drop shaft would be required so infrequently that it would cause no substantial interference with the surrounding land use. Therefore, the operation of the system can be regarded as compatible with land use near surface structures.

9.2.2 Sensitive Resource Areas

The cultural and recreation areas identified in Chapter III as sensitive resource areas, are not expected to experience any significant effects from the operation and maintenance functions related to the Calumet Tunnel system.

Forest preserves and park areas are also not expected to be affected, providing the areas are returned to their original state or revegetated after construction.

To some degree, the Calumet Tunnel system may help to alleviate the frequency of riverbank flooding and thereby could contribute to the feasibility of opening up these lands to broader development. However, insufficient data exists at the writing of this statement to determine just how much the system would alleviate the frequency of flooding. It can only be said that the quality of land along the riverbanks along the tunnel may be enhanced by such reduction in flooding, and that the enhancement could stimulate land use change.

The potential for land use change is similar for prime areas; from vacant or underutilized land to landscaped open space with pedestrian access. Industrial areas may also be encouraged to upgrade their facilities and waterway edges providing a more attractive environment.

9.2.3 Sludge Disposal

The disposal of sludge resulting from flows to the Calumet Sewage Treatment Works from the Calumet Tunnel system would require no new sludge disposal sites. The following existing sites would receive the sludge as divided below:

MSDGC Fulton County landspreading operation	44%
NuEarth Program (end use by consumer	10%[1]
Wholesaling to broker (end use by consumer	34%
Landfilling at sanitary landfills	12%
Total	100%

Thus, about 22 percent of the sludge would go to the NuEarth Program and landfilling, and would remain in the metropolitan area. The consequence, for land use, would be consumption of some sludge disposal capacity at a rate somewhat

1 Value is Imhoff sludge only. Program can be expanded to accept TARP sludge.

greater than that under existing conditions. The increase in the rate of consumption of sludge disposal lands is balanced directly by the resultant decrease in the rate of solids deposited in the waterways. Since these solids would ultimately be dredged from the waterways and disposed of on land, the Calumet Tunnel system would effect no change in the quantity of land used for sludge disposal.

9.3 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

This section addresses the potential economic impacts from the annual costs of operations and maintenance of TARP - Phase I (estimated at $13 million for all three tunnel systems). It addresses the impact of these costs on the household, commercial, and industrial sectors of the MSDGC. Economic impact is assessed in terms of its effects on the tax rate structure and the manner in which operations and maintenance costs are financed.

The current method for financing operations and maintenance costs of treatment facilities is an ad valorem tax. The MSDGC is authorized to levy an ad valorem tax for the District's operations and maintenance functions in an amount not to exceed $.37 per $100 of assessed valuation. The MSDGC's total tax levy for 1975 of $.4005 per $100 of assessed valuation included a $.2523 per $100 of assessed valuation rate for operations and maintenance and a $.1175 per $100 of assessed valuation rate for construction. In addition to the ad valorem tax, industrial discharges are subject to an MSDGC user charge imposed through the adoption of an "Industrial Waste Surcharge Ordinance" by the MSDGC Board of Trustees, December 10, 1970.

In view of the requirement for a user charge system under PL 92-500 and the authority of the State of Illinois to impose one, the potential economic effects of financing additional annual operations and maintenance costs of $13 million must be addressed on the basis of a user charge method of financing as well as an ad valorem tax method.

Table IX-1 illustrates the impact on the MSDGC tax rate of the annual operations and maintenance cost associated with TARP - Phase I (the portion applicable to the Calumet Tunnel system is $2.5 million annually). The projected incremental impact in FY 2000 is $.8522 per $100 of assessed valuation. Thus the MSDGC tax rate would increase to $1.2527 per $100 of assessed valuation in the the year 2000 from the 1975 rate of $0.4005 per $100 of assessed valuation.

For illustration purposes, the total ad valorem property tax for a $50,000 home is computed for 1981 (peak construction year), 1986 (end construction year), and 2000. The total ad valorem tax includes the tax rate attributable to operations and maintenance (Table IX-1), and the tax rate attributable to construction for the Phase I period (Table III-12). In 1981, the home owner's total ad valorem property tax would be $44.985; in 1986, it would amount to $48.05; and in 2000, it would reach $57.25. Without the Calumet Tunnel System, the home owner would only pay a total ad valorem property tax of $12.615 (1976).

Table IX-1
1976 Estimate of the Change in Property Tax Rate Attributable to the Operations and Maintenance Costs Associated with TARP - Phase I

Fiscal Year	Tax Base[1] ($ billion)	TARP Phase-I Annual O&M[2] ($ million)	Annual Adjustment to MSDGC Tax Rate (¢/$100)[3]	Total MSDGC Tax Rate (¢/$100)[3]
1976	24.06	14.04	5.835	8.358
1977	25.61	15.16	5.920	8.443
1978	27.04	16.38	6.058	8.581
1979	28.66	17.68	6.169	8.692
1980	30.38	19.10	6.289	8.812
1981	32.20	20.62	6.404	8.927
1982	34.13	22.28	6.528	9.051
1983	36.18	24.06	6.650	9.173
1984	38.35	25.99	6.777	9.3
1985	40.65	28.07	6.905	9.428
1986	43.09	30.31	7.034	9.557
--	--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--	--
2000	97.43	83.03	8.522	11.045

1 TAX BASE (22.7 billion) is escalated at 6 percent annually from 1975.

2 Operations and maintenance costs (13 million) are escalated at 8 percent annually from 1975.

3 Assessed valuation.

Economic impacts of operations and maintenance funding on a user charge basis as opposed to an ad valorem tax basis cannot be quantitatively addressed at this time. Region V EPA has awarded two grants to the MSDGC for the development of a user charge system to comply with the requirements of PL 92-500; however, the contractor has not yet made a definitive set of recommendations to the District concerning a viable user charge system. Historical experience indicates that the final user charge system will probably be based on water usage with several categories of user charge schedules. Tentative indications from the MSDGC suggest that the relative proportions of annual operations and maintenance costs currently financed by households as opposed to commercial and industrial users will be significantly shifted when the change from an ad valorem tax basis to user charge financing basis takes place. Under the current scheme (ad valorem tax), all property owners and properties pay the same MSDGC tax rate; however, assessments are divided into five major categories which include:

- Vacant land - assessed at 22 percent of market value
- Single family property - assessed at 22 percent of market value
- Rental income property - assessed at 33 percent of market value
- Commercial, industrial property - assessed at 40 percent of market value
- Miscellaneous property - assessed at 30 percent of market value.

Thus, industrial and commercial properties pay almost double the rate of households. The ultimate user charge system selected will very likely result in household/residential users paying a higher user charge (per gallon of water) than industrial and commercial users. Thus, the total portion of annual operating and maintenance costs financed by households will increase under a user charge system. In view of the relatively modest size of the operation and maintenance costs associated with TARP - Phase I, it is extremely unlikely that the additional cost burden (resulting from TARP - Phase I) shouldered by households under a user charge system would cause any significant impacts on household liquidable income. In terms of positive economic benefits, the user charge system will provide the financial incentive for water conservation and will slightly relieve the disincentive which ad valorem taxation presents to industrial and commercial expansion within the District.

9.4 TRANSPORTATION

Potential impacts of the proposed Calumet Tunnel system operation include: flood control on local streets, and flow regulation and sedimentation prevention in local waterways. However, the impacts of the tunnels alone, without the reservoirs, would not be significant.

Although the Calumet Tunnel system would capture overflows from small storms, it would not prevent overflows from major storms. Since flooding of local streets occurs only during major storms, the tunnels would have an insignificant effect on preventing traffic disruption during floods. Similarly, barge traffic on the waterways is slowed down or interrupted only during major storms. Therefore, the tunnels also would not have significant beneficial effects on barge traffic.

The Calumet Tunnel system is expected to capture approximately 75 percent of suspended solids from the combined-sewer overflows. Normally, these solids enter the waterways, and most of them eventually settle to the bottom. Continued discharge of suspended solids to the waterways would increase bottom deposits and decrease water depth. The Corps of Engineers is responsible for dredging the waterways to maintain adequate water depth for navigation, and control of suspended solids by the Calumet Tunnel system would slow down the sedimentation rate and help reduce dredging frequency. However, the present depth of the waterways is more than adequate, and frequent dredging is not required. Therefore, the potential benefit of reduced dredging frequency as a result of the Calumet Tunnel system would not be significant.

9.5 MAJOR PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

The only aspects of the operation of the Calumet Tunnel system which could possibly interfere with other projects and programs are inspection and maintenance of the shafts and tunnels. However, the frequency of such inspection and maintenance trips is too small to have any noticeable effect on future major projects and programs.

9.6 COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

The major electrical power consumer during the operational phase of TARP will be the pumping stations which pump wastewater from the tunnels to the reservoirs and from the reservoirs to the treatment plants. Approximately 100 million kilowatt hours per year is expected to be consumed in operating the eight 300-cfs and four 50-cfs pumps at the TARP planned reservoirs. In addition, the 150-horsepower aerators to be installed at the main reservoir will use approximately eight million kilowatt hours per year.

Peak power consumption, during TARP operation in 1980, is expected to be about one-half of one percent of peak requirements for the entire area in 1980. Pumping operations at the main reservoir will be the major cause contributing to the greatest peak load. Assuming the pumps at the reservoir operate at their rated capacity of 2,400 cfs, about 75 Megawatts of electrical power will be consumed during peak load periods for an average year.

X. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS AND MITIGATIVE MEASURES

X. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS AND MITIGATIVE MEASURES

Impacts on the natural and man-made environments are considered adverse if they cause a significant change or stress in areas such as natural and socioeconomic resources. These adverse changes or stresses would cause the applicable medium to be less safe, healthy, abundant, aesthetically or culturally pleasing, or productive. The degree of adversity is usually measured on a case-by-case basis and focuses on the critical environmental issues that are relevant to the applicable geographic area.

10.1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

This section of the EIS addresses the unavoidable adverse impacts of the TARP conveyance tunnels on the natural environment of the Chicago metropolitan area. In addition, possible measures to mitigate these impacts are described. Many of these measures will be implemented by the MSDGC or MSDGC contractors as indicated in Appendices H and I. The assessment of impacts, as well as descriptions of mitigative measures, are presented in terms of the following topics:

- Water Resources
- Land Resources
- Atmospheric Resources
- Mitigative Measures.

10.1.1 Water Resources

The unavoidable impacts on water resources associated with the TARP project area are expected to include alteration of both surface water and groundwater quality. A discussion of these impacts is presented in the following sections.

(1) Water Quality

Construction runoff will further degrade surface water quality, as well as increase existing sewer system loadings in the Calumet Tunnel system. Surface construction activities, such as excavating and stockpiling, introduce the potential for sedimentation or siltation of waterways and additional sedimentation loading of existing sewer systems, especially in areas which have high soil erosion characteristics. For the Calumet Tunnel system, most of the 59 drop shafts, 22 access shafts, and 5 construction shafts will be located along the tunnel route in paved, cemented, or otherwise impervious areas. Runoff carrying sediment from spoil material stockpiles and excavated areas potentially can enter the Calumet Sag Channel, the existing sewers, and the Calumet River system. This effect, however, is expected to be short-term.

Silt and other pollutants present in effluents resulting from tunnel dewatering operations have a short-term adverse impact on water quality if the effluent is discharged directly into surface water systems. The Calumet Tunnels are expected to yield a maximum total flow of approximately 4.6 MGD resulting from groundwater infiltration. If the infiltrated water is pumped out of the tunnel segment and discharged directly into the Calumet Sag Channel or the Calumet River system, water quality degradation of these surface water systems will temporarily be worse than existing conditions.

(2) Groundwater

Infiltration of groundwater from the upper aquifer into the tunnels will have a short-term adverse impact on the piezometric or hydraulic pressure of the aquifer, and a grouting program will be incorporated in the construction phase of the TARP tunnel systems to mitigate this effect. Without the grouting program, groundwater infiltration rates can be as high as 1.4 MGD per mile of tunnel, with the average infiltration rate of groundwater for the Calumet Tunnels approximately 0.7 MGD per mile of tunnel. These rates are sufficient to reduce the upper aquifer pressure to an undesirable low level. To monitor grouting integrity during tunnel operation, the MSDGC should install a number of observation wells spaced at appropriate intervals along the tunnel route. The monitoring program provides a means to determine the extent of infiltration early so that appropriate mitigative measures can be applied.

Exfiltration of wastewater, as it is conveyed by the tunnel system, may have a long-term effect on groundwater quality. The magnitude of the impact depends on how long the grouting program maintains its integrity during operation of the system. As indicated for infiltration, a tunnel grouting program will be incorporated and grouting integrity will need to be monitored. Although infiltration is expected to occur more often than exfiltration, exfiltration can become a serious problem when conveyance tunnels are nearly full. At this time, tunnel pressures will exceed inflow pressures and exfiltration will result. Pollutants present in the tunnel wastewaters, such as hazardous metals and coliform bacteria, may seep into the upper aquifer and degrade groundwater quality. To maintain surveillance and to enable timely application of remedial measures, observation or test wells should be installed, spaced appropriately along the Calumet Tunnel route.

Although tunnel dewatering will be necessary during construction, the amount of water to be disposed of is not expected to cause any adverse impact on the water system for receiving this effluent. The effluent resulting from dewatering operations could be disposed of in one of several ways:

- By discharge to existing waterways
- By discharge to existing combined-sewer systems
- By injection into the upper aquifer.

Although injection of the effluent into wells would serve to retain the groundwater in the study area, an extensive and costly recharge program would be required.

Regardless of which method is used, disposal will be preceded by effluent turbidity treatment to reduce suspended solid levels. This will be accomplished by retaining sediments in settling basins for a time sufficient to allow the sediments to settle. The quality of the effluent will be analyzed prior to discharge to determine if additional treatment is needed.

10.1.2 Land Resources

The Calumet tunnels are not expected to have an adverse effect on the land-related environment of the area south of Chicago. These features, such as the geologic and seismic characteristics of the environment, however, may affect tunnel construction and operation with varying degrees of severity. Descriptions of these impacts as well as discussions of their magnitude are presented in the following sections.

(1) Geology

Rockfall or partings may result when the Calumet Tunnel system tunneling operations enter shale formations or thin rock beds. During both construction and operation phases of the system, unstable conveyance tunnel conditions will prevail in these formations and beds. Stabilizing measures therefore will be incorporated and include such measures as rock bolting for short-term stability and concrete lining for long-term stability against shale partings.

Unstable conditions are caused by shale deterioration, which may occur in certain portions of the TARP tunnel systems. To show how adverse this condition can be, serious problems involving deterioration of shale have been encountered during underground natural gas exploration efforts conducted in northern Illinois. Contact of the shale with water or moist air appears to cause deterioration. Attempts to stabilize the beds and to seal the shale have largely failed in those projects for which reports are available. In a mined underground gas storage reservoir near Kankakee, Illinois, various methods were employed to stabilize the Brainard shale including rock bolts, timber shoring and wire mesh. The methods met with little success and deterioration continued after the supports were installed. The shale absorbed water around and above the rock bolts and shorings, and support from these elements was lost as raveling of the rock continued.

Similarly, attempts to use gunite to prevent or retard deterioration of the shale were unsuccessful. The small amount of water in the gunite appeared to cause the shale surface to soften so that the gunite spalled. Raveling of the shale at the Kankakee facility progressed so far that the openings were greatly enlarged, and the horizontal area of the pillars was reduced. Because of reduced bearing capacity, the pillars failed and caused further roof collapse.

Based on the problems encountered in this gas exploration effort, shale deterioration can be expected when tunnel systems are aligned within formations containing this rock material. Appropriate measures to mitigate these problems will be incorporated during construction of the TARP tunnels as necessary.

Rockfall may occur when tunnel construction activities enter fault zones, rock folds, or joints in which rock formations are weak and supportive characteristics are poor. Structural support or remedial measures will be installed by the MSDGC contractor to stabilize tunnel conditions. This effect is expected to occur during the construction phase only and, therefore, is considered short-term.

(2) Seismicity

The Calumet conveyance tunnels will intersect several joints and one identifiable fold along their route and will also traverse minor fault zones. These geologic features are susceptible to earth movement, and seismic events of significant magnitude will result in a shearing or opening-closing movement. Tunnel alignment, concrete lining, and all stabilization measures may be altered when these events occur, and an extensive tunnel inspection and maintenance program will be required.

Although stabilization measures such as rock bolting, grouting, and tunnel lining may have a tendency to reduce the impacts, the measures are not expected to eliminate them entirely.

10.1.3 Atmospheric Resources

Unavoidable impacts on the atmospheric resources of the Chicago area are expected as a result of TARP tunnel system construction activities. The impacts will be short-term, however, and can be mitigated by applying one or more available measures. Potential air pollution and noise resulting from construction are discussed below.

(1) Air Quality

Chicago is in an air quality maintenance area (AQMA) and overall air quality standards have been violated frequently. During worst case conditions (i.e., low wind speed and temperature inversion) hydrocarbon and nitrous oxide, as well as particulate standards were exceeded, and such instances have been frequent. With respect to air quality impacts related to the TARP tunnels, a short-term impact is expected during the construction phase. Gaseous emissions from construction vehicles and equipment with combustion engines will increase pollutant levels and degrade air quality further. Particulate content of the air during excavation activities is also expected to increase during this period. These particulate emissions will occur mostly in the vicinity of the construction shafts where rock and spoil are loaded into trucks by hoppers.

(2) Noise

Noise produced during the construction phase of TARP may affect the environment in the vicinity of construction and drop shaft sites and along the routes used by trucks transporting rock and spoil material to the disposal sites. For the Calumet Tunnel system, however, most of construction and drop shaft sites will be located in open space, commercial, or industrial areas, and the impact of noise at these sites is not likely to be adverse. Similarly, noise impact along the routes used by rock and spoil disposal trucks would not be significant. The number of truck trips expected will most likely be small compared to the existing traffic volume on the planned truck routes to the disposal sites.

10.1.4 Mitigative Measures

For each impact assessment described in the previous sections, several possible mitigating measures are available, some of which will be applied by the MSDGC contractors. This section describes the typical, possible mitigative measures and presents them under the appropriate impact category.

(1) Surface Water Quality

To prevent soil from washing into waterways and sewers, a berm (trench or ridge) will be constructed around sites that are susceptible to runoff. A berm will also be constructed around stockpiles of spoil material to minimize the potential for runoff and sedimentation.

Effluents from tunnel dewatering operations should be pumped to wastewater facilities for treatment prior to discharge into waterways. The amount to be treated is small and the added load to the applicable treatment plant is considered insignificant.

(2) Groundwater Quality

To detect any adverse water quality or quantity changes in the vicinity of the TARP Tunnel systems, observation wells will be constructed along the entire tunnel alignment. These wells will be installed at approximately one-half to three-quarter mile intervals. The minimum offset distance from the edge of the tunnel is approximately 30 feet to ensure that the well will be outside the grouted area. An adequate number of appropriately spaced observation wells have been installed along the Mainstream Tunnel route. However, for the Lower Des Plaines and Calumet Tunnel routes, additional wells need to be installed for monitoring purposes and spaced as specified above.

The MSDGC is not planning to monitor groundwater quality along the Calumet system. A routine program should be implemented in order to determine whether exfiltration or infiltration is occurring. The wells and the tunnel should be equipped with continuing water level recorders so that aquifer pressure can be correlated with tunnel pressure. In addition, the wells need to be sampled both weekly and after major storm events. The groundwater sampled should be analyzed for the following constituents on a weekly basis (minimum program):

- NH_3 (as N)*
- Total Bacteria Plate Count*
- Conductivity (or calculated TDS)*
- TOC (Total Organic Carbon).*

This monitoring program will provide sufficient data to detect any alterations in groundwater conditions (infiltration or exfiltration) and, thus to enable mitigation of any adverse effects. Modification of the well spacing criteria may be necessary as the heterogeneity of the rock material changes. This will be dependent upon actual conditions prevalent at the time of construction and operation.

While large quantities of exfiltration are not likely, exfiltration is not impossible, particularly if seismic incidents damage tunnel linings. To evaluate the effects on aquifer water quality as well as water level fluctuations, sampling will need to be performed for parameters and at locations, depths and times to be determined by agreement between the MSDGC, the Illinois EPA,

---

* Analyzed weekly (all other biweekly).

and the U.S. EPA. These monitoring design criteria will become conditions written into permits for construction and operation of the tunnels. In addition, the requirement for water quality monitoring will be a part of the special conditions for all grants made to the MSDGC for the Mainstream Tunnel system.

By monitoring the observation wells on a regular basis, potential for infiltration of groundwater into the tunnel system will be detected before it occurs. The primary measure used to prevent excessive groundwater inflow is the grouting program. Therefore, the grouting program must be extensive, and effective enough during the construction phase to limit the infiltration to a maximum allowable daily rate of 500 gal./in. diam./mile of tunnel. In addition, grouting integrity will be maintained throughout the operational phase of the tunnel. Grouting will be done at maximum pressures to ensure that each grout hole is properly filled. This will prevent groundwater from reestablishing seepage paths toward the tunnel. Precautionary measures will be taken during grouting to avoid plugging of observation wells, and precise records of grouting will be kept for future reference. In unlined tunnels, any future rock falls will affect the integrity of the grout applied during construction. Should these rock falls occur in zones where extensive grouting was done, infiltration/exfiltration problems may become critical. Precise grouting records will assist in ascertaining such problems.

(3) Geology

Rock bolting, grouting, and tunnel lining will be the measures applied to prevent slaking and shale parting. Concrete tunnel lining appears to be the best deterrent procedure for reducing shale deterioration and will be used in most of the TARP tunnels where alignment will be on shale formations. Tunnel alignment of the Calumet system will be predominately in stable dolomite formations and most of the system will be unlined.

A few published reports indicate that, for limited excavating operations, slaking of shale units can be controlled and even prevented by conditioning the ventilating air circulated through the underground chambers. Temperature must be maintained within a very narrow range and relative humidity must be high. While this procedure will be of great general assistance during construction, its effectiveness is not considered to be sufficiently proven for it to comprise a totally reliable scheme in itself.

Drop and access shafts will be concrete lined, and surface reservoir excavations will use the adequate control procedures common to construction or quarrying industries. Stable ground slopes for soil and rocks will be maintained during the construction period.

The need for rock reinforcement and support in the tunnel will be determined when actual conditions are established during tunnel excavation. Installation of more support or reinforcement than is needed could result when design and installation of rock reinforcement systems are specified prior to construction. If the design specifications for rock support and reinforcement are established prior to construction; they should only be used as an estimating procedure.

(4) Air Quality

Although air pollutant emissions from construction-related vehicles and equipment cannot be avoided, preventive maintenance done on a regular basis will reduce the emissions, as well as prevent exhaust-related odors.

Fugitive dust emissions, which will also occur at construction sites, will be minimized by following acceptable construction practices. For example, excessive dust emissions will be avoided by closing the bottom of the loading hopper before emptying rock and spoil from a muck cart into a disposal truck. After the muck cart is completely unloaded, the hopper gate will then be opened to let the rock and spoil material fall gradually into the truck. Spraying the excavated material with water would further reduce dust emissions. Roads at construction sites should be paved or frequently wetted to minimize dust.

(5) Noise

Noise from construction vehicles and equipment can be minimized by using the new construction equipment and trucks which have lower emission levels and by operating them in accordance with the municipal noise ordinance.

Exhaust noise will be reduced by installing efficient exhaust silencers or mufflers and by erecting enclosures around the equipment. Erecting plywood enclosures around air compressors or a soundproof shed around exhaust fans could substantially reduce their noise levels. Noise caused by rock blasting can be minimized by using heavy mats on the surface above the blasting area to absorb the associated shock waves.

Overall, the impact of noise on a community can be minimized in several ways:

- Explain project benefits and mitigating measures practiced by the applicant to the affected community in public workshops and seminars.
- Notify residents in the vicinity of construction and drop shaft sites prior to a blasting operation. Explain duration and possible effects of blasting by leaflets distribution, signs, and public announcements.
- Restrict construction activities to daylight hours in sensitive public and residential areas.

10.2 MAN-MADE ENVIRONMENT

TARP is expected to result in some unavoidable short-term impacts on the man-made environment. However, the degree of adversity will change as local environmental conditions change and will vary widely during both construction and operation periods of TARP. The following sections assess the potential impacts in general and describe the possible mitigative measures which can be applied.

10.2.1 Socioeconomic

The unavoidable adverse impacts on the socioeconomic environment that will result from the construction and operation of the Calumet Tunnel system are described generally below.

(1) Light Glare

Construction schedules anticipate three shifts of labor on the tunneling efforts. This will require bright night lighting in construction shafts and drop shaft areas. This lighting may produce glare which will be annoying to the surrounding community, particularly in residential neighborhoods.

(2) Waste Spillage and Dispersion

The spillage of debris from trucks transporting waste from the construction sites to rock quarries or designated disposal sites will cause an adverse aethestic impact on the communities adjacent to the truck route. In addition, during wet weather conditions, the debris could enter sewer systems and nearby properties. Transport of debris and construction materials to and from the construction access points will also create noise and vibration annoyances, as well as add to traffic volumes.

(3) Traffic Congestion

While some locations of potential conflict between construction activity and traffic flow have been identified, the adverse impacts are likely to be short-term and relatively insignificant. During construction of sewer connections, drop shafts, and collecting structures, local traffic may have to be rerouted or may have to cross temporary planking or plates in areas where surface excavations are in progress. The extent of this impact can be measured by traffic volume. As stated in previous sections of this EIS average traffic volumes presently range from 15,500 to 81,100 vehicles per day on several of the major thoroughfares associated with the Calumet Tunnel system.

Traffic disruption will most likely occur in high-density areas of each community where construction activity is on or near public rights-of-way. Sidewalks and traffic lanes may be temporarily eliminated or blocked to provide enough room for erection of safety barricades and storage areas.

(4) Worker Safety

Tunnel construction projects will inevitably involve injuries, disabilities, and perhaps fatalities as a direct result of construction activity. For the

Calumet Tunnel construction the frequency rate should not be adverse when compared to any other construction project of similar type and magnitude. The potential number of disabling work injuries and fatal or permanent disabilities can be a minimum of 90 and 1, respectively.[1]

10.2.2 Land Use

The construction and operation of the Calumet Tunnel system is not expected to affect existing land use patterns or future land use plans established for historical, cultural, archeological, and recreational purposes. Land being used for public thoroughfares, however, will be affected during construction of drop shafts, connecting lines, and collecting structures. The impact is expected to be short-term and reversible if the thoroughfares are returned to their original condition. The major thoroughfares, which may be affected by the Calumet Tunnel system shaft construction are as follows:

- Leyden Avenue and 138th Street
- East 130th Street near South Greenwood Avenue
- Indiana Avenue near 154th Street
- Indiana Avenue and Taft Drive Intersection
- 161st Street and Damen Avenue
- Stewart Avenue near State Street
- South Torrence Avenue at E. 130th Street, E. 123rd Street, and E. 117th Street
- South Avenue "O" and E. 106th Street intersection
- 170th Street and Burnham Avenue intersection
- Wood Street near Ashland Road.

10.2.3 Financial and Labor Resources

Neither the construction or implementation of TARP is expected to have an adverse impact on present and projected financial and labor resources.

---

1 National Safety Council, "Accident Facts," Chicago, Illinois Office, 1975 edition.

10.2.4 Transportation

Trucks and automobiles associated with TARP construction activities may have an adverse short-term effect on normal traffic patterns in certain portions of the South Chicago area.

Additional vehicular traffic will be generated in the vicinity of construction sites. Up to 150 trucks and 54 other vehicles (i.e., automobiles, jeeps, etc.) per day would visit each construction shaft site 24 hours a day, 312 days a year, for a period ranging from four to six years. Traffic at drop shaft sites, however, is expected to be much less: up to a total of 25 trucks over a period of three months and 10 other vehicles per day during the same period.

10.2.5 Major Projects and Programs

The proposed drop shaft, construction shaft, and pumping station locations of the Calumet Tunnel system are not expected to result in short- and long-term adverse impacts on the Calumet area communities' projects and programs.

10.2.6 Mitigative Measures

Many measures and alternatives are available to mitigate the adverse impacts on the man-made environment. Examples of possible measures which can be used to reduce the impact are described in this section. Some of these measures will be applied by the MSDGC or MSDGC contractors.

(1) Light Glare

Proper positioning of light fixtures can minimize glare which would affect the surrounding community. The bright lighting, however, can serve a useful purpose in commercial areas as a crime deterrent. High intensity lighting has been used successfully by many cities as a crime deterrent in high-crime-rate districts.

(2) Waste Spillage and Dispersion

Excessive solid waste spillage resulting from loading disposal trucks within the construction site will be minimized. Trucks will not be overloaded and the waste material will be dampened as necessary to prevent fugitive dust emissions. Mud and grime from truck wheels will be removed at wheel washes at all truck exits to prevent the spread of these materials to the surrounding neighborhood streets.

As indicated in the MSDGC's General Specifications for sewer construction contracts (see Appendix I), the contractor is responsible for cleanup and restoration to preconstruction condition of the construction site and areas affected. During the construction phase, the contractor is responsible for maintaining the construction sites to ensure they are free from debris and spoil material and is also responsible for keeping equipment in orderly storage areas with minimum disruption to public activities.

(3) Traffic Congestion

Public traffic flow will be given priority, particularly emergency and public service vehicles. Careful routing and scheduling of trucks hauling equipment and debris will be done to avoid peak travel periods: 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 to 6:30 p.m. Appropriate visible and audible warning systems for construction points of activity will be installed and an overall traffic control plan employed by the contractor. This plan will be monitored and updated as necessary with contingent routes and strategies to accommodate changes in traffic and special events (parades, holidays, street closings, bridge and light malfunctions, etc.). Local jurisdictions should be alerted and approvals should be obtained for planned truck routes and traffic control plans.

(4) Worker Safety

Strict adherence to all safety regulations and employee training programs serves as the most effective means to minimize or prevent injuries to tunnel construction and operation employees. Safety specifications established by the MSDGC are presented in Appendix H.

(5) Land Use Alterations

Land owners (private, industrial, and commercial) should be contacted well before construction begins in their respective property areas. The owners should be informed of plans such as proposed shaft locations, truck traffic routes, access requirements, and possible impacts. Other measures which will be used to prevent or mitigate the expected impacts on the man-made environment include:

- Public thoroughfares excavated for installation of connecting pipes, collecting structures, and shafts will be repaved or rebuilt to their original condition.
- The MSDGC will notify the State of Illinois Historic Preservation officer to obtain appropriate approval of shaft locations prior to construction. Once approval has been obtained procedures will be established for halting shaft construction temporarily in the event important artifacts are found or uncovered.
- Excavation workers should be informed of potential value of finds and trained in the rudiments of identifying and preserving artifacts if the Preservation officer or designated representative cannot be present during construction of a particular shaft.

(6) Transportation

Although the number of truck trips during the peak construction period is expected to be a small fraction of the total traffic volume on most truck routes, these routes will be selected on the basis of the least impacts. The planned truck routes will avoid residential areas and other sensitive areas (i.e., hospitals, libraries), as well as congested streets, especially during rush hours. If feasible, railroad hopper cars can also be used along with trucks to transport rocks and spoil material to disposal sites since several construction shafts are near railroad yards with loading facilities.

CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of the principle conclusions of the Final EIS, as well as recommended and suggested mitigative measures.

1. Implementation of the Calumet Tunnel system will significantly reduce the pollutant load in the Chicago waterways. These loadings will be reduced further with the implementation of the Mainstream and Lower Des Plaines Tunnel systems. Water quality will be enhanced further with the upgrading of MSDGC's treatment facilities and the construction of the flood control aspects of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan.

2. Significant earthquake events could adversely affect tunnel alignment and tunnel lining. Smaller earth movements could also affect the lining and grouting of the tunnels. It is, therefore, essential that MSDGC's inspection and maintenance program be extensive enough to insure efficient operation of the system.

3. The rock spoil excavated from the Phase I tunnels is not expected to be marketable. Evaluation of various disposal alternatives leads to the conclusion that adequate environmentally acceptable landfill sites are available to handle the volume of rock which will be generated by the Phase I tunnels under consideration. We will rely on existing local, state, and Federal regulations to insure that disposal takes place in an acceptable manner. Additionally the MSDGC will be required to inform USEPA of their spoil disposal program as it is developed through discussion with the Contractor. This will be a condition of any grant awarded to the MSDGC for the Calumet Tunnel System.

4. Although an effective grouting program is proposed, it must be sufficiently flexible to respond to the actual conditions encountered during construction. Should the grouting not be sufficient, additional infiltration could adversely affect the hydraulic pressure of the upper aquifer. Additionally, under surcharged conditions, exfiltration will occur, resulting in adverse impacts on the groundwater quality of the upper aquifer. Observation wells to monitor grouting integrity during operation are necessary along the entire tunnel alignment. If pollutants are detected in the observation wells, additional mitigative measures must be implemented to protect the upper aquifer, including a groundwater recharge system. Chapter X discussed particular aspects of the monitoring program, which will be developed in conjunction with the MSDGC, IEPA and USEPA. This monitoring program will also be a grant condition.

5. Since the majority of the construction shafts and drop shafts are in close proximity to area waterways, runoff from these sites could adversely affect water quality. Berms will be constructed around stockpiles of construction materials and spoil materials to preclude runoff into the waterways.

6. It is presently proposed that water pumped from the tunnels during construction be discharged directly to the waterways after a period of settling. Since the possibility of silt and other pollutants still exists after settling, it is recommended that these dewatering flows be discharged to MSDGC's intercepting system for treatment, except during periods of combined sewer overflows. This will be a condition of any grant awarded for the Calumet Tunnel System.

7. Although no known historic, architectural, or archaeological resources will be affected by the proposed project, the possibility of finding archaeological resources must be investigated by the MSDGC. This must be accomplished by contacting the State Historic Preservation Officer.

8. Conformance with applicable regulation of the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior is essential for safety of construction workers.

9. There exists a wide range of potential adverse impacts which could develop during construction. This includes blasting, waste spillage, traffic congestion, light glare, and fugitive dust at construction and disposal sites. While these effects could be considered insignificant any measures taken to reduce their impact would aid in public acceptability of the project. These suggested mitigative measures are discussed in Chapter X.

APPENDIX A

WATER QUALITY MONITORING DATA

Table A-1
Chicago River - Sanitary and Ship Canal
Water Quality Parameters
Average Levels for 1973[1]

Station	BOD	Susp. Solids	D.O.	Temp. °C	pH Units	Cl^-	Dis. Solids	COD
County Line Rd., W. Fork N. Br.	10.2	38.7	7.35	13.32	7.54	139.0	628.2	84.7
County Line Rd., Md. Fork N. Br.	4.6	28.6	6.34	12.14	7.56	77.1	535.2	56.7
County Line Rd., E. Fork N. Br.	4.7	39.0	7.22	13.02	7.51	77.3	535.0	56.2
East Lake Ave., Md. Fork N. Br.	10.3	41.2	8.44	13.12	7.83	91.3	530.7	65.7
Dempster St., N.B. Chicago River	7.8	37.7	7.34	12.70	7.67	98.3	536.7	59.0
Central Rd., N. Shore Channel	5.2	54.1	7.65	15.51	7.94	18.2	215.4	36.2
Touhy Ave., N. Shore Channel	9.3	48.7	7.64	15.27	7.37	94.0	496.5	65.0
Wilson Ave., N.B. Chicago River	8.2	24.2	6.70	15.64	7.45	88.7	501.8	66.8
Ohio St., N.B. Chicago River	6.8	21.6	3.41	14.90	7.32	87.3	507.6	59.2
Madison St., S.B. Chicago River	6.4	20.4	5.53	13.43	7.47	59.0	376.9	40.7
Damen Ave., S.B. Chicago River	6.1	30.7	4.49	15.58	7.48	64.4	410.1	47.0
Harlem Ave., Chgo. San. & Ship Canal	5.5	27.3	4.80	20.19	7.30	94.5	490.2	55.0
Hwy. 83 & Chicago San. & Ship Canal	7.0	19.8	3.33	18.00	7.31	107.0	485.0	58.5
Lemont Bridge Stephens Street (Grab)	6.0	19.5	1.20	27.78	7.45	82.0	431.5	60.5

Results expressed as mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

1 Source: Appendix "C" of "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Second Revision, January 1975.

Table A-1
Continued

Station	Cd	Tot. Cr.	Cu	Fe	Ni	Pb	Zn	Hg (μg/l)
County Line Rd., W. Fork N. Br.	0.001	0.000	0.026	1.08	0.00	0.012	0.017	0.10
County Line Rd., Md. Fork N. Br.	0.001	0.001	0.015	1.00	0.02	0.007	0.008	0.11
County Line Rd., E. Fork N. Br.	0.000	0.001	0.015	1.00	0.00	0.011	0.000	0.12
East Lake Ave., Md. Fork N. Br.	0.000	0.001	0.012	1.00	0.01	0.008	0.017	0.11
Dempster St., N.B. Chicago River	0.001	0.002	0.010	1.08	0.00	0.007	0.000	0.33
Central Rd., N. Shore Channel	0.001	0.004	0.009	1.11	0.00	0.022	0.011	0.28
Touhy Ave., N. Shore Channel	0.002	0.017	0.030	1.00	0.03	0.008	0.083	0.23
Wilson Ave., N.B. Chicago River	0.000	0.009	0.022	1.00	0.02	0.002	0.025	0.09
Ohio Street, N.B. Chicago River	0.000	0.002	0.012	1.00	0.01	0.012	0.017	0.17
Madison St., N.B. Chicago River	0.000	0.001	0.010	1.00	0.01	0.005	0.008	0.08
Damen Ave., S.B. Chicago River	0.000	0.002	0.012	1.00	0.00	0.047	0.025	0.11
Harlem Ave., Chgo. San. & Ship Canal	0.000	0.016	0.011	1.00	0.06	0.012	0.025	0.17
Hwy. 83 & Chicago San. & Ship Canal	0.000	0.010	0.010	1.00	0.04	0.012	0.022	0.10
Lemont Bridge Stephens St., (Grab)	0.000	0.000	0.005	1.00	0.05	0.025	0.000	0.00

Results expressed as mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

Station	NH_3-N	NO_2+NO_3-N	Hex. Sol.*	SO_4^-	PO_4^-	CN^-	MBAS
County Line Rd., W. Fork N. Br.	6.29	1.92	14.7	85	4.48	N.S.	0.273
County Line Rd., Md. Fork N. Br.	0.86	1.11	15.2	79	1.67	N.S.	0.111
County Line Rd., E. Fork N. Br.	6.08	0.91	17.8	93	2.96	N.S.	0.220
East Lake Ave., Md. Fork N. Br.	2.66	1.36	14.3	88	2.06	N.S.	0.129
Dempster St., N.B. Chicago River	2.55	1.45	15.3	81	2.25	0.024	0.109
Central Rd., N. Shore Channel	0.84	0.53	15.0	31	1.07	0.080	0.095
Touhy Ave., N. Shore Channel	4.46	2.62	18.5	71	2.81	0.026	0.181
Wilson Ave., N.B. Chicago River	5.10	1.81	20.3	70	3.42	N.S.	0.233
Ohio St., N.B. Chicago River	5.49	2.30	10.2	70	3.26	0.034	0.225
Madison St., N.B. Chicago River	3.33	1.74	15.2	51	2.22	N.S.	0.190
Damen Ave., S.B. Chicago River	3.50	1.46	14.4	51	2.15	N.S.	0.212
Harlem Ave., Chgo. San. & Ship Canal	6.23	1.22	13.2	68	1.73	0.024	0.217
Hwy. 83 & Chicago San. & Ship Canal	5.47	0.91	12.9	71	1.10	0.042	0.221
Lemont Bridge Stephens St., (Grab)	6.45	1.13	15.0	102	1.65	0.040	0.099

Results expressed as mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

* Hexane Soluble Constituents.

Table A-2
Calumet River System
Water Quality Parameters
Average Levels for 1973*

Station	BOD	Susp. Solids	D.O.	Temp. °C	pH Units	Cl^-	Dis. Solids	COD
Wolf Lake Burnham Ave.	4.0	12.7	10.10	14.10	7.83	37.2	253.9	48.9
92nd & Ewing Ave., Calumet River	4.1	12.4	9.03	14.65	7.49	22.2	259.2	43.2
130th Street, Calumet River	4.0	22.3	7.52	15.25	7.63	80.0	383.5	57.7
IHB R.R. Bridge Grand Calumet River	15.2	60.7	2.72	16.35	7.36	116.7	591.4	98.3
Wentworth Ave., Little Calumet River	9.3	57.5	5.32	14.35	7.61	84.2	539.8	76.7
Wentworth Ave., North Creek	23.3	122.9	8.66	7.22	7.59	109.1	553.1	142.6
Joe Orr Rd., Thorn Creek	7.9	48.5	8.14	15.79	7.50	233.1	1,028.9	133.0
Indiana Ave., Calumet River	5.7	47.3	5.70	15.12	7.52	107.3	465.8	63.0
135th & Ashland Little Calumet River	8.8	73.2	5.12	13.72	7.58	206.0	912.6	97.7
Ashland Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	7.3	37.3	5.01	15.48	7.43	148.3	672.8	83.9
Cicero Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	6.6	39.7	4.18	15.43	7.37	139.7	651.8	78.5
Hwy. 83 & Cal-Sag Channel	6.2	42.3	3.89	15.22	7.48	127.3	622.1	71.0

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

* Source: Appendix "C" of "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Second Revision, January 1975.

Table A-2
Continued

Station	Cd	Tot. Cr.	Cu	Fe	Ni	Pb	Zn	Hg ($\mu g/l$)
Wolf Lake Burnham Ave.	0.000	0.003	0.006	1.00	0.00	0.012	0.000	0.13
92nd & Ewing Ave., Calumet River	0.000	0.004	0.017	1.00	0.00	0.007	0.000	0.17
130th Street, Calumet River	0.000	0.000	0.008	1.00	0.00	0.002	0.008	0.04
IHB R.R. Bridge Grand Calumet River	0.000	0.007	0.012	1.50	0.03	0.022	0.025	0.12
Wentworth Ave., Little Calumet River	0.000	0.004	0.007	1.45	0.00	0.014	0.000	0.11
Wentworth Ave., North Creek	0.000	0.000	0.007	2.00	0.00	0.016	0.100	0.50
Joe Orr Road, Thorn Creek	0.000	0.036	0.013	1.25	0.02	0.021	0.125	0.07
Indiana Ave., Calumet River	0.000	0.003	0.007	1.25	0.00	0.002	0.000	0.07
135th & Ashland Little Calumet River	0.000	0.002	0.007	1.25	0.01	0.007	0.000	0.12
Ashland Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	0.000	0.001	0.010	1.08	0.01	0.015	0.000	0.12
Cicero Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	0.000	0.005	0.008	1.17	0.01	0.020	0.000	0.05
Hwy. 83 & Cal-Sag Channel	0.000	0.001	0.008	1.17	0.01	0.010	0.004	0.17

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

Station	NH_3-N	NO_2+NO_3-N	Hex. Sol.*	SO_4^-	PO_4^-	CN^-	MBAS
Wolf Lake Burnham Ave.	0.24	0.18	9.3	42	0.14	N.S.	0.062
92nd & Ewing Ave., Calumet River	1.31	0.70	11.9	30	0.33	0.020	0.053
130th Street Calumet River	1.87	1.73	14.6	67	0.37	0.019	0.066
IHB R.R. Bridge Grand Calumet River	13.29	0.62	17.4	101	1.98	0.054	0.364
Wentworth Ave., Little Calumet River	2.66	1.34	14.3	111	0.80	N.S.	0.165
Wentworth Ave., North Creek	4.69	1.18	8.7	160	0.65	N.S.	0.526
Joe Orr Road, Thorn Treek	8.61	1.05	11.6	158	3.36	N.S.	0.279
Indiana Ave., Calumet River	5.48	1.24	9.7	84	0.50	N.S.	0.074
135th & Ashland Little Calumet River	4.20	1.66	17.0	144	1.49	N.S.	0.176
Ashland Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	9.08	1.43	15.1	127	1.19	0.034	0.145
Cicero Ave., Cal-Sag Channel	9.05	1.19	13.5	123	1.08	N.S.	0.158
Hwy. 83 & Cal-Sag Channel	8.65	0.94	8.5	106	1.42	0.028	0.165

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

* Hexane Soluble Constituents.

Table A-3
Des Plaines River System
Water Quality Parameters
Average Values for 1973*

Station	BOD	Susp. Solids	D.O.	Temp. °C	pH Units	Cl^-	Dis. Solids	COD
County Line Rd., Buffalo Creek	4.8	44.5	10.01	11.40	7.55	89.5	680.1	70.5
Hintz Rd., Wheeling Drain. Ditch	5.1	59.2	9.85	11.41	7.77	89.8	666.3	60.5
County Line Rd., Des Plaines River	6.7	68.3	9.35	12.22	7.82	74.2	652.8	63.5
Palatine Rd., Des Plaines River	6.7	67.9	10.24	11.84	8.05	73.8	640.3	60.7
Central Rd., Des Plaines River	6.1	53.9	10.09	12.06	8.04	72.7	632.1	60.5
Oakton St., Des Plaines River	5.8	55.3	8.96	11.90	8.04	78.5	630.7	61.8
Belmont Ave., Des Plaines River	5.4	36.6	6.67	11.83	7.75	80.0	604.8	58.1
Roosevelt Rd., Des Plaines River	6.1	37.0	6.02	12.46	7.69	81.8	593.9	57.5
Devon Ave., Salt Creek	3.3	44.3	10.47	7.96	7.93	79.4	722.3	58.6
Wolf Road, Salt Creek	7.6	36.2	6.74	12.27	7.54	157.1	832.2	75.4
First Ave., Salt Creek	6.1	34.6	6.54	13.03	7.70	146.5	783.2	68.7
Ogden Ave., Des Plaines River	5.2	28.6	7.61	12.92	7.66	104.7	660.3	64.1
Willow Springs Rd., Des Plaines River	5.0	44.1	7.23	12.46	7.71	101.1	636.6	65.6

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

* Source: Appendix "C" of "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Second Revision, January 1975.

Table A-3
Continued

Station	Cd	Tot. Cr.	Cu	Fe	Ni	Pb	Zn	Hg (μg/l)
County Line Rd., Buffalo Creek	0.002	0.001	0.008	1.0	0.03	0.002	0.027	0.22
Hintz Rd., Wheeling Drain. Dtich	0.000	0.004	0.008	1.27	0.02	0.002	0.036	0.17
County Line Rd., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.003	0.007	1.18	0.01	0.004	0.027	0.23
Palatine Rd., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.000	0.006	1.09	0.01	0.011	0.000	0.15
Central Rd., Des Plaines River	0.001	0.004	0.006	1.00	0.01	0.005	0.000	0.19
Oakton St., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.001	0.006	1.18	0.03	0.010	0.000	0.12
Belmont Ave., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.001	0.006	1.00	0.05	0.002	0.000	0.25
Roosevelt Rd., Des Plaines River	0.001	0.003	0.012	1.00	0.00	0.005	0.000	0.22
Devon Ave., Salt Creek	0.000	0.000	0.004	1.00	0.00	0.011	0.000	0.00
Wolf Rd., Salt Creek	0.000	0.002	0.009	1.00	0.02	0.011	0.000	0.19
First Ave., Salt Creek	0.000	0.002	0.010	1.09	0.01	0.010	0.000	0.10
Ogden Ave., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.002	0.009	1.00	0.01	0.006	0.000	0.11
Willow Springs Rd., Des Plaines River	0.000	0.004	0.012	1.18	0.02	0.020	0.000	0.18

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

Station	NH_3-N	NO_2+NO_3-N	Hex. Sol.*	SO_4^-	PO_4^-	CN^-	MBAS
County Line Rd., Buffalo Creek	0.81	1.94	13.3	106	0.61	N.S.	0.195
Hintz Rd., Wheeling Drain. Ditch	0.32	4.13	10.5	100	0.48	N.S.	0.141
County Line Rd., Des Plaines River	0.48	1.58	10.5	95	0.66	N.S.	0.068
Palatine Rd., Des Plaines River	0.41	1.40	11.0	94	0.49	0.004	0.071
Central Road, Des Plaines River	0.43	1.22	12.6	92	0.38	N.S.	0.074
Oakton St., Des Plaines River	0.39	1.35	12.7	91	0.38	N.S.	0.081
Belmont Ave., Des Plaines River	0.74	1.16	10.9	90	0.40	0.008	0.203
Roosevelt Road, Des Plaines River	0.59	1.15	11.4	88	0.50	0.016	0.191
Devon Ave., Salt Creek	0.34	0.61	8.3	123	0.19	N.S.	0.050
Wolf Road Salt Creek	2.92	2.10	12.0	105	1.49	N.S.	0.290
First Ave. Salt Creek	1.63	2.56	9.8	111	1.32	0.019	0.241
Ogden Ave., Des Plaines River	0.97	1.80	10.1	87	0.85	N.S.	0.229
Willow Springs Rd., Des Plaines River	1.21	1.59	13.3	95	0.62	0.009	0.197

Results expressed in mg/l unless otherwise indicated.

* Hexane Soluble Constituents.

Table A-4
MSDGC Survey of Bottom Deposits

Sample No.	Location	Waterway Data: Width A*	Waterway Data: Depth Water B*	Waterway Data: Depth Deposit C*	Field Observation	Laboratory Analysis:	Laboratory Analysis: Comments	Laboratory Analysis: Volatile Solids %
1.	Lake St. (U.S. 20) @ 25.0 mi. Salt Creek Trib.	10'	0.5'	N.A.	Bottom frozen, used power auger for sample	as recd.	Large rocks, sand, putrid, euximic** water	8.8
						Dry	Oil spot-grey	
						Ash	Brown color	
2.	S. Lake St. (U.S. 20) Bridge E-Pumping Sta. @ 23.5 mi. Salt Creek	20'	1.5'	N.A.	Bottom frozen, used hand auger sampler	as recd.	Brown, sand, mud mixture, stagnant odor	5.0
						Dry	Grey	
						Ash	Brown color	
3.	North Ave. (U.S. 64) Bridge @ 21.7 mi. Salt Creek	30'	2.25'	1.0'	Partly frozen	as recd.	Black, sand-mud mixture, putrid, large stones	4.3
						Dry	Black	
						Ash	Brown color	
4.	Roosevelt Rd. (U.S. 38) Bridge Frontage Rd. (N) @ 17.2 mi. Salt Creek	60'	4.0'	3.0'	Large amount deposit by piers, depth varies	as recd.	Black mud, plant debris, sulfide odor euximic	12.2
						Dry	Black	
						Ash	Brown color	
5.	York Rd. Bridge @ 11.8 mi. Salt Creek	45'	3.0'	2.0'	Ice very thin deposit same as sample 4	as recd.	Black mud, small pebbles, sulfide odor, euximic	9.2
						Dry	Black	
						Ash	Brown color	
6.	Brandon Rd. Bridge @ 13.1 mi. Des Plaines River	200'	4.0'	3.0'	Bottom varies	as recd.	Black mud, gravel putrid, plant debris, euximic	13.6
						Dry	Black	
						Ash	Brown	
7.	MSDGC North Side T.P. @ 24.0 mi. Chicago San. Ship Canal	35'	3.0'	2.5'	Very dark soft, strong odor	as recd.	Grey mud, plant debris putrid, euximic	6.1
						Dry	Grey	
						Ash	Brown	
8.	Pratt Rd. @ 11.0 mi. North Shore Channel	40'	5.0'	2.0'	Same as sample 7	as recd.	Grey mud, plant debris putrid, euximic	4.1
						Dry	Grey	
						Ash	Brown	

* See Typical Waterway Detail Table

** Black or brown in color, having a sulfide odor, and formed by or undergoing change by an anerobic process.

Table A-4
Continued

Sample No.	Location	Waterway Data: Width A*	Waterway Data: Depth Water B*	Waterway Data: Depth Deposit C*	Field Observation	Laboratory Analysis: Comments		Laboratory Analysis: Volatile Solids %
9.	2600' S.W. of Stickney T.P. @ 24.0 mi. Chicago San. Ship Canal	150'+	25'	N.A.	Too deep to probe. Large gravel	as recd. Dry Ash	Highly putrid odor, gravelly sand, euximic Black Brown	6.0
10.	Harlem Ave. @ 23.4 mi. Chicago San. Ship Canal	150'+	25'	N.A.	Too deep to probe. Sample oily	as recd. Dry Ash	Sandy mud mixture, plant debris, sulfide odor, euximic Black Brown	4.8
11.	U.S. 12 & 20 @ 19.0 mi. Chicago San. Ship Canal	150'+	25'	N.A.	Same as sample 10 Oily smell	as recd. Dry Ash	Large rocks, euximic water layer Black Brown	23.5
12.	106th St. @ 2.5 mi. Calumet River	125'+	30'	N.A.	Too deep to probe. Sample dark & oily	as recd. Dry Ash	Sand-mud mixture, putrid, euximic Black Brown	9.2
13.	Torrence Rd. @ 5.3 mi. Calumet River	125'+	30'±	N.A.	Same as sample 12 middle of River has clay & gravel sample taken 40' from east bank	as recd. Dry Ash	Sand, putrid, euximic Brown Brown	3.5

1 MSDGC - Alternative management plans for control of flood and pollution problems due to combined sewer discharges in the general service area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, November 1973, pp. 131-134.

Table A-5
Chemical Analyses of Ground Waters[1]
(Water Analyses Made By the Illinois State Water Survey)

Aquifer	Fe (ppm)	SiO_2 (ppm)	F (ppm)	Cl (ppm)	NO_3 (ppm)	SO_4 (ppm)	Alkalinity as $CaCO_3$ (ppm)	Hardness as $CaCO_3$ (ppm)	Total dissolved minerals (ppm)	Turbidity (ppm)	Odor
Silurian	78	12.1	1.4	31	0.6	16.0	296	134	408	1880	0
"	296	-	2.6	46	0.5	8.0	306	136	432	7980	0
"	0.7	-	1.6	4	0.3	43.6	222	62	318	2	0
"	0.7	-	1.4	8	1.8	172.6	206	68	480	6	0
"	0.1	-	0.4	13	0.3	11.9	132	114	180	1	H_2S
"	0.8	-	1.6	22	0.3	0.6	172	14	240	2	0
"	64	-	1.4	33	1.7	28.2	340	144	443	3080	0
Galena-Platteville	0.7	-	3.5	210	1.8	158.8	336	110	952	2	H_2S
"	6.4	-	1.4	385	0.2	661.5	208	576	1872	19	0
"	0.5	-	1.4	200	0.2	680.9	232	690	1561	2	0
"	8.4	-	1.2	380	0.9	643.6	216	548	1732	50	0
"	0.5	-	1.8	185	1.8	363.1	268	266	1111	3	0
"	6.2	-	1.8	420	0.8	885.7	214	795	2206	36	0
"	17	-	1.4	265	0.3	652.3	212	620	1567	50	0
St. Peter	0.5	-	1.2	275	0.2	736.2	218	745	1727	2	0
Prairie du Chien, Eminence, and Potosi	0.4	-	1.4	245	0.6	734.4	212	795	1680	3	0
Cambrian-Ordovician	0.4	-	1.6	230	1.4	725.7	214	750	1676	2	0
Franconia	0.3	-	1.6	240	0.2	729.0	208	760	1692	2	0
Ironton-Galesville	0.9	-	1.0	200	0.2	690.9	222	728	1572	3	0

1 Buschbach and Heim, 1972.

Table A-6
Chemical, Physical, and Biological Analyses of Water From Test Wells[1]

Constituent 1/	NW Side of McCook Quarry	NE Side of McCook Quarry				1 Mi. South of Thornton Quarry	1/2 Mi. West of Thornton Quarry	SE Corner of McCook Quarry
Date Sample Collected	11/1/74	9/13/74	9/19/74	9/20/74	9/21/74	9/5/74	10/4/74	11/10/74
I. General Data								
pH 2/	7.8	7.7	8.1	7.6	7.6	8.5	8.25	7.8
Color 3/	10	1167	2500	2500	3000	11	4.0	23
Turbidity 4/	-	600	40	40.5	45	73	-	-
Conductivity 5/	920	4190	4990	4000	4000	560	1100	1290
Temperature 6/	53.5	56	57.5	56	56	54	53.5	53
II. Cations - Heavy metal ions								
Iron (Fe) - total dissolved 7/	0.2	3.5	1.87	1.80	1.55	0.5	0.2	0.2
Iron (Fe) - total	0.3	18	2.11	2.00	1.60	6	0.2	0.6
Manganese (Mn) - total	-	-	0.10	0.09	0.06	-	-	-
Chromium (Cr) - total	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	-	-
Chromium (Cr) - hexavalent	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	-	-
Copper (Cu)	-	-	0.138	0.034	0.034	-	-	-
Lead (Pb)	-	-	0.27	0.08	0.19	-	-	-
Mercury (Hg) 8/	-	-	0.5	0.5	0.5	-	-	-
III. Cations - Alkali earths and metals								
Calcium (Ca)	148	135	158	156	167	80	202	185
Magnesium (Mg)	70	130	90.9	95.5	95.5	10	80	110
Sodium (Nc)	35	633	569	569	534	135	18.2	76
Potassium (k)	4	233	178	178	194	6	12.1	13
Ammonia Nitrogen (NH_4)	-	96	224	155	157	0.5	-	-
IV. Anions								
Sulfate (SO_4)	245	87.25	76.0	86.0	80	40	220	400
Chloride (Cl)	62	558	510	504	496	18	39	120
Nitrite (NO_2)	-	-	0.125	0.150	0.150	-	-	-
Nitrate (NO_3)	1	-	0.625	0.600	0.600	0.08	0.3	1
Nitrogen (N) - total dissolved	-	217.21	242	222.7	217.6	1.0	-	-
Orthophosphate (PO_4)	-	2.8	2.16	2.03	1.90	1	-	-
Phosphorus as PO_4	-	2.9 9/	2.36 9/	2.22 9/	2.46 9/	1	-	-
Cyanides as CN	-	-	0.04	0.038	0.032	-	-	-
V. Organic, nonionic, and calculated values								
Phenolic material as C_6H_5OH	-	-	0.004	0.006	0.005	-	-	-
Surfactants	-	7.13	1.26	1.14	1.20	0.04	-	-
Total suspended solids (TSS)	-	-	5	12	9	-	-	-
Total dissolved solids (TDS)	924	2656	2788	2730	2664	451	937	1420
Volatile suspended solids (VSS)	-	-	2	2	3	-	-	-
Hardness as $CaCO_3$ - total	659	878	582	590	572	242	834.1	916
Alkalinity as $CaCO_3$	377	1935	2078	2033	2010	260	377	422
Saturation index 10/	+ 0.4	+ 1.0	+ 1.5	+ 1.0	+ 1.0	+ 0.8	+ 1.0	+ 0.6
VI. Biochemical								
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	-	-	16	35	23	-	-	-
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	-	695	595	542	527	16	-	-
Sulfides (H_2S)	-	-	0.39	0.24	0.32	-	-	-
Total Coliform 11/	1	-	20,000	20,000	19,000	-	-	1
Fecal Coliform 11/	1	-	10	10	10	-	-	1
Fecal Streptococci 11/	-	-	10	10	10	-	-	-

1/ All values are reported as mg/l except as otherwise noted
2/ pH units
3/ Pt - Co units
4/ J T units
5/ umhos @ 25°C
6/ °F
7/ Filtered through 0.45 membrande filter.
8/ Values reported as ppb
9/ Values reported in mg/l as P
10/ Assume Temp. - 55°F
11/ Values reported as organisms/100ml.

1 HEC, 1975.

FIGURE A-1
Location of Sampling Sites
for Waterway Bottom Deposits[1]



1 The MSDGC, Environmental Assessment Statement for Mainstream Tunnel System, Damen Avenue to Addison Street, August 1975. p. v-40.

KEY TO FIGURE A-2
The Metropolitan Sanitary
District of Greater Chicago

R-X = Treated Runoff Plants
D-X = Domestic Waste Plants
I-X = Industrial Waste Plants (≥ 10,000 gpd)

Map Codes	Description of Plants
R-1	FISHER BODY DIVISION 79th Street & Willow Springs Road Willow Springs (Settling lagoons with oil separation)
R-2	INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER 10400 W. North Avenue, Melrose Park (Oil separation, aeration, filtration)
R-3	MATERIAL SERVICE CORP. YARD #19 47th Street & Plainfield McCook (Oil separation)
R-4	NORTH AMERICAN CAR CO. Off Old Sag Road Lemont (Oil separation)
R-5	O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (Oil separation systems and aeration)
R-6	FRITZ CARTAGE 138th & Ashland Avenue Riverdale
R-7	REYNOLDS METALS 1st Avenue & 49th Street McCook
D-1	CAR CARRIERS CORP. 13101 S. Torrence Avenue Chicago (Activated sludge and sand filter)
D-2	CECO FABRICATING CORP. Ceco Street Romeoville, Illinois (Activated sludge)
D-3	ELK GROVE MOBILE HOMES 941 W. Higgins Road Elk Grove Village (Activated sludge and sand filter)

Map Codes	Description of Plants
D-4	FRANCISCAN SISTERS 1210 Main Street Lemont, Illinois (Activated sludge system)
D-5	HOLY FAMILY VILLA 123rd Street & Will Cook Road Lemont (Imhoff tank, sand filter and polishing pond)
D-6	HOLY SPIRIT CONVENT Waukegan & Willow Road Northbrook (Imhoff tank and sand filter)
D-7	J.P. KENNEDY SCHOOL 123rd Street & Wolf Road Palos Park (Imhoff tank and sand filter)
D-8	LEHMAN TRAILER PARK 500 W. Touhy Avenue Bensenville (Activated sludge)
D-9	LEMONT MANUFACTURING CO. Ceco Street & Stephens Street Lemont (Activated sludge)
D-10	MATTERHORN SUPPER CLUB 123rd & Rt. 45 Palos Park (Aeration, oxidation pond, sand filter)
D-11	MOUNT ASSISSI ACADEMY 1602 Main Street Lemont (Oxidation pond)
D-12	OASIS MOBILE HOMES 7500 N. Elmhurst Road Bensenville (Activated sludge)
D-13	PARADISE TRAILER COURT Rt. 83 & Rt. 30 Chicago Heights (Activated sludge)

KEY TO FIGURE A-2
Continued

Map Codes	Description of Plants
D-14	PLEASANTDALE SCHOOL 75th Street & Wolf Road Pleasantdale (Trickling filter unit)
D-15	ST. VICENT DePAUL SEMINARY 127th & Rt. 171 Lemont (Imhoff tanks, oxidation pond)
D-16	SPRING LAKES MOBILE HOMES 100 First Street Bartlett (Activated sludge)
D-17	STANDARD OIL (O'HARE TERMINAL) 2201 S. Elmhurst Road Des Plaines (Activated sludge and filtration)
D-18	TOUHY MOBILE HOMES, INC. 400 W. Touhy Avenue Des Plaines (Activated sludge)
D-19	TRAILER RANCH, INC. 573 S. Milwaukee Avenue Wheeling (Activated sludge)
D-20	VILLA WEST SUBDIVISION 135th Street & 86th Avenue Orland Park (Activated sludge)
D-21	COG HILL COUNTRY CLUB 119th & Archer Lemont
I-1	CLOW CORPORATION 1050 E. Irving Park Road Bensenville, Illinois (Holding pond with oil separation)
I-2	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, CALUMET 3200 E. 100th Street Chicago (Settling basins)

Map Codes	Description of Plants
I-3	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, CRAWFORD 3501 S. Pulaski Chicago (Settling tanks and filtration)
I-4	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, FISK 1111 W. Cermak Chicago (Settling pits)
I-5	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, RIDGELAND 4300 S. Ridgeland Stickney, Illinois 60405 (Settling pit and filtration)
I-6	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, ROMEOVILLE 135th Street & C.S.S. Canal Romeoville (Settling ponds and filtration)
I-7	ELECTRO-MOTIVE DIVISION, GENERAL MOTORS 9301 W. 55th Street McCook (Oil retention pond and separator with overflow)
I-8	INTERLAKE STEEL, CHICAGO PLANT 10730 S. Burley Avenue Chicago (Chemical precipitation with total recycle)
I-9	INTERLAKE STEEL, RIVERDALE 135th Street & Perry Riverdale (Settling and sand filters)
I-10	LEMONT MANUFACTURING Ceco Street & Stephens Street Lemont (Settling tanks and filtration)
I-11	REPUBLIC STEEL CORP. (CHICAGO DIST.) 116th Street & Burley Avenue Chicago (Chemical flocculation & settling with filtration)
I-12	REYNOLDS METALS 1st Avenue & 49th Street Brookfield (Chemical flocculation and clarification)

KEY TO FIGURE A-2
Continued

Map Codes	Description of Plants
I-13	UNION 76 OIL REFINERY 135th Street and New Avenue Romeoville (Activated sludge, oxidation ponds)
I-14	UNITED STATES STEEL CORP. 3426 E. 89th Street Chicago (Oil separation chemical flocculation with clarification and filtration)
I-15	WISCONSIN STEEL CORP. 106th Street and Torrence Avenue Chicago (Solids, oil and cyanide oxidation systems)
I-16	WILLIE BROS., CO., INC. 4930 W. 159th Street Oak Forest
I-17	COMMONWEALTH EDISON, STATE LINE GENERATOR

Industrial and Privately-
Owned Treatment Plants
Within the MSDGC Service
Area[1]



1 Industrial Waste Loadings and Industrial and Private Treatment Plant Locations, Appendix B of "Facilities Planning Study - MSDGC Overview Report," Revised, Jan. 1975.

APPENDIX B

STRATIGRAPHY DESCRIPTION
FOR THE
CHICAGO AREA

APPENDIX B

STRATIGRAPHY DESCRIPTION FOR THE CHICAGO AREA

1.1 QUATERNARY SYSTEM

The Quaternary System comprises all rocks and sediments younger than the Tertiary. The Pleistocene deposits underlie the surficial soils and any artificial fill materials in the project area. These materials are almost entirely Wisconsinan in age and are generally divided into five substages: (1) The Altonian, which includes till and outwash buried by younger drift and found mainly in the northwestern part of the area; (2) the Farmdalian, which includes local deposits of peat, organic silts, and lake deposits; (3) the Woodfordian, which includes most of the Wisconsinan till, outwash, and lake deposits in the area; (4) the Twocreekan, which includes local lake and swamp deposits in the Lake Chicago sediments; and (5) the Valderan, which includes lake deposits in a small part of the Lake Chicago plain and part of the youngest sand and gravel deposits in the Des Plaines and Illinois Valleys.[1]

The Altonian substage has but one subdivision; the Winnebago formation. The Winnebago consists of silty and sandy tills, and a silt member with peat. It is found to the northwest and west of Chicago. The Farmdalian substage consists of the Robein silt which has been encountered in borings in the northwestern part of the area.

Sediments of the Woodfordian substage or of Woodfordian-Valderan age comprise the vast majority of sediments in the Chicago area. Because of the complexity of glacial sedimentation, the deposits of the Woodfordian glaciers are also classified into morphostratigraphic units called drifts. Each drift or moraine contains parts of all of the Woodfordian formations. There are 27 named moraines and at least 19 stands of ice front are required to account for the Chicago moraines.

The Wedron formation of Woodfordian age averages 100 feet thick throughout the area but may be as thick as 300 feet. There are five till members that range from sandy and silty tills to clay tills and all have particles the size of pebbles, cobbles, and boulders. The tills also contain beds of waterlaid sand, gravel, or silt.

---

[1] Willman, H.B., "Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area", Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 460, 1971.

The most important of the morphostratigraphic moraines of Woodfordian age are the Valparaiso drifts, Tinley drifts, and the Lake Border moraines. The Valparaiso drifts are clayey, silty, and sandy tills with intermixed gravel and sand deposits. The Tinley drift is large clayey till with interbedded silts and clays. The Lake Border drifts are clayey tills with some fine sandy gravels.

Several Woodfordian age formations continued to be deposited during Twocreekan and Valderan time. The prominent units are the Henry formation and the Equality formation. The Henry formation is predominately sand and gravel with local beds of silt and till. The Equality formation is composed of silt, sand, gravel, and clay deposits that accumulated in glacial lakes. Much of the eastern section of the Chicago area is surfaced with Equality sediments.

A number of Wisconsinan sediments are found as small deposits throughout the region and include the Richland loess, Parkland sand, the Grayslake peat, and floodplain deposits collectively called the Cahokia Alluvium.

Natural gas has been encountered on rare occasions in the glacial drift during drilling operations in the Chicago area. One soil-boring for a building foundation encountered a gas flow which is reported to have continued for 24 hours. No gas was found in any holes drilled during the 1968, 1971, or 1974 exploration programs.

2.1 PALEOZOIC

- Silurian. The Silurian forms the bedrock surface in much of the Chicago region. The Silurian present in the area falls into the Niagaran and Alexandrian series. The uppermost Cayugan series is not present.

- Niagaran series. The Niagaran series is composed of four formations; the Racine, Sugar Run, Waukesha, and Joliet.

- Racine formation. The Racine formation, the youngest, most lithologically variable, and stratigraphically highest of the bedrock formations of the Chicago area (except for some rocks in the Des Plaines disturbance), consists of dolomite with some chert. North and west of Chicago the thickness of the formation thins to zero feet. Drill hole data indicate that the thickness increases toward the south and east, reaching 70 feet in Wilmette, 213 feet at Roosevelt Road and Lake Shore Drive, and a maximum of about 360 feet in the Thornton area. The thickness of the formation, as found in drill holes, ranges from zero to 358 feet with the thickness in the majority of holes ranging from 100 to 175 feet.

The lithologic variability of the Racine dolomite can be traced to its origin. During its deposition, the Chicago area was occupied by a large complex of coral reefs, which were as large as several miles in diameter. Three varieties, or facies, of the Racine are recognized in the area: the reef, reef-flank, and interreef facies. Some zones within the Racine display thin alternating layers of both the reef and interreef facies within a short vertical distance.

- Reef. This facies is a light to medium gray, exceptionally pure (non-argillaceous), massive, porous, medium to coarsely crystalline dolomite. Petrographic analyses show the crystals to be interlocking and from 0.1 to 0.2 mm in size.

Irregularly shaped vugs, to a 0.25 foot maximum dimension, are abundant in the reef facies. Most of the vugs are unlined, but a few are lined with secondary calcite, pyrite, or quartz. A black asphaltic residue is found locally in the uppermost part of the formation.

Reef facies constituted approximately 66 percent of the Racine drilled along the Mainstream Tunnel System, and it constituted the basal portion of the Racine formation in all but three holes drilled during the subsurface exploration programs. Widespread and relatively thick sections of interreef rock are found, overlying the basal reef in some areas.

- Reef-flank. The reef-flank deposits are transitional between the massive reef facies and the thinner and finer grained beds of the interreef facies. The reef-flank facies is found on the margins of some of the larger reefs and is characterized by beds that dip as much as 45 degrees away from the central reef core. Dipping beds crop out and also occurred in cores in the Thornton and the McCook areas.

- Interreef. This variety of the Racine formation is composed of argillaceous, silty dolomite. Locally, it contains chert in the form of scattered, porous nodules and as thin beds. Sporadic thin partings and lenses of green shale also occur.

  Rock in the Racine, as seen in the cores, is generally fresh. In a few holes, however, the upper few feet of rock is weathered. The weathered zone is generally limited to the upper 10 feet, but locally extends to a depth of 20 feet. Staining on joint surfaces occurs in a few holes to greater depths. Weathered zones of a foot to a few feet in thickness occur at depth in a few holes.

  Core recovery is usually very high in the Racine, on the order of 95 to 100 percent, and the Rock Quality Designation (RQD) is uaually higher than 85 percent. Core recovery and RQD are both reduced at the bedrock surface where the rock is weathered and closely fractured.

- Sugar run formation. In 1973 the Illinois State Geological Survey designated a well-bedded dolomite comprising the basal 25 feet of the Racine formation as the Sugar Run formation. The unit is lithologically similar to many interreef deposits, and although readily observed in outcrop in the Chicago area, it is difficult to identify in cores, and may be locally absent.

- Waukesha formation. The Waukesha formation is a slightly silty, dense to finely vuggy, fine grained dolomite that occurs in smooth surfaced beds that commonly are 2 to 8 inches thick but are locally as much as 3 feet thick. It is light brownish gray and weathers brown. It is exposed at Joliet, in the Des Plaines River bluffs northward from Joliet and in deep quarries at Elmhurst and Hillside. The formation is 20 to 30 feet thick in the outcrop areas, but it is locally missing in the subsurface in the eastern part of the area. The Waukesha formation was not recognized in exploratory holes drilled for the tunnel excavations.

- <u>Joliet formation</u>. The Joliet Dolomite is 40 to 60 feet thick and has 3 distinct units; the Romeo member, Markgraf member, and Brandon Bridge member.

  - <u>Romeo member</u>. The Romeo member is a persistent, fairly uniform, pure, white to cream, very dense, very fine grained dolomite, generally about 14 feet thick, that underlies the Racine Dolomite and grades downward into the Markgraf member. In exposures the Romeo member is locally mottled pink and exhibits poorly developed thick bedding. The formation provides a distinctive stratigraphic marker which is especially useful in determining possible displacement along faults.

    The Romeo, found in tunnels and drill holes, is uniformly fresh rock. Core recovery is commonly 100 percent and RQD is usually 95 percent or higher.

  - <u>Markgraf member</u>. The Markgraf member is a widespread, distinctively light bluish gray dolomitic unit that underlies the Romeo member. The upper contact is defined as the uppermost cluster of shale partings. The minimum thickness is 9 feet; the maximum is 51 feet; and the average is 23 feet.

    The member consists of an upper zone which is fine-grained and dense and which contains a few thin clustered shale partings and soft, porous chert nodules; a middle argillaceous zone; and a silty lower zone in which closely spaced dolomitic shale laminae become increasingly common. The shale partings do not appear to slake badly. In addition to interlocking dolomite grains averaging 0.04 mm in diameter, petrographic analyses report thin, opague streaks or organic matter.

    The Markgraf, found in tunnels and drill holes, is uniformly fresh rock. Core recovery is commonly 100 percent and RQD is usually 95 percent or higher.

- Brandon bridge member. The Brandon Bridge member is absent in most of the Chicago area.

. Alexandrian series. The Alexandrian Series is composed of two formations; the Kankakee and the Edgewood.

- Kankakee formation. The general characteristic feature of the Kankakee formation is wavy beds of fine-to-medium grained, greenish-gray, locally pinkish, dolomite layers, one to three inches thick. The bedding is often separated by numerous thin wavy partings of green shale. The upper contact is marked by a thin lamina of bright green shale which occurs on a distinctive smooth, but deeply pitted, surface.

  Four zones of slightly differing lithologies have been identified within the Kankakee formation in the literature. These zones have been named the Plaines, Troutman, Offerman, and Drummond members of the Kankakee formation.

  The uppermost zone, the Plaines member, is a distinctive, porous, pure, white dolomite unit. Its thickness is two to three feet. The thickest zone of the Kankakee, underlying the Plaines member and comprising over half of the formation, is the Troutman member. Its description fits the generalized description of the Kankakee, greenish to pinkish gray dolomite containing wavy green shale partings. A few sporadic chert nodules occur in this unit.

  A thin zone, only a few feet thick, of slightly argillaceous, thin bedded dolomite comprises the Offerman member. The basal unit, the Drummond member, is a thicker-bedded, fossiliferous dolomite which contains thin shale partings, scattered glauconite, and rounded quartz grains.

  The shale partings of the Plaines and Drummond members, usually one-eighth inch thick (but up to one-half inch thick) and one inch apart have shown signs of deterioration in cores exposed to the atmosphere. All laboratory tests were performed on freshly waxed samples so that shale deterioration prior to testing was prevented.

The Kankakee dolomite, as found throughout the Chicago area, usually has a thickness of 35 to 45 feet, but was found to range in drill holes from 10 to 79 feet. The contact with the underlying Edgewood formation is conformable. The Kankakee, found in drill holes, is uniformly fresh rock. Core recovery is generally in the 95 to 100 percent range and RQD is commonly above 95 percent. The RQD values are slightly more variable than in the overlying units, however, and scattered values in the 53 to 75 percent range are reported.

Edgewood formation. The Edgewood formation is the oldest unit of the Silurian system. Its thicknes range varies widely because it was deposited on the underlying erosional surface developed on the top of the Maquoketa group (generally the Brainard Shale). The thickness ranges from about 10 feet, where the Brainard was little eroded, to over 100 feet, where the Brainard was deeply eroded.

The Edgewood is a light gray to gray and fine-to-medium grained dolomite slightly argillaceous in the upper 30 feet but very cherty. Its upper contact is marked by the first chert nodule below the top of the Kankakee formation. The chert occurs in the form of interbeds and nodules to 0.3 foot thick at an average spacing of one foot. The chert is white, soft, and porous.

The lower portion of the Edgewood may be divided into an argillaceous, slightly cherty colomite unit underlain by a very argillaceous, noncherty dolomite unit. The chert nodules decrease in frequency and size with depth, but become harder. Conversely, the argillaceous content and frequency and thickness of shale and dolomite shale partings increase with depth through the formation. The base is marked by laminated, crinkled beds. Where the Edgewood formation is very thick the lowest beds consist of dolomitic shale with a basal layer of dolomitic siltstone, and containing brownish-black pebbles in a dolomitic shale matrix.

It has been proposed that the formation be divided into two parts, each of which is to be elevated to the rank of formation. The upper, very cherty unit, described in the first paragraphs of the Edgewood description, would be called the Elwood formation, and the lower argillaceous, slightly cherty unit, described in the second paragraph, would be called the Wilhelmi formation. The Wilhelmi formation would then be divided into two members; the Birds member, an argillaceous and slightly cherty dolomite overly the non-cherty Schweizer member, a very argillaceous dolomite to dolomitic shale.

The Edgewood found in drill holes is uniformly fresh rock. Core recovery is generally in the 95 to 100 percent range and RQD is commonly above 95 percent. A few RQDs in the 80 to 90 percent range and an occasional RQD of 59 to 80 percent is reported.

- <u>Ordovician</u>. The Ordovician is subdivided into 3 series; the Canadian, Champlainian, and the Cincinnatian. These series, in turn, are subdivided into groups. The Middle Ordovician Champlainian series has three groups; the Galena, Platteville, and Ancelli; while the Canadian series has one group, the Prairie du Chien; and the upper Ordovician Cincinnatian has one group, the Maquoketa. Only the Maquoketa group falls within the range of the drop shafts and tunnels.

- <u>Cincinnatian</u>. The upper Ordovician is predominately gray and green shale, but includes brown, red, and black shales. It has a persistent limestone formation in the middle and hematite oolites at the top.

- <u>Maquoketa group</u>. The Maquoketa group consists of four formations; the Neda formation, Brainard shale, Fort Atkinson, and the Scales Shale.

  - <u>Neda formation</u>. The Neda formation, the uppermost formation of the Maquoketa group is an iron-oxide-bearing, brick red shale, zero to 15 feet thick (5 feet average) of restricted distribution. It is found only where the Brainard formation is very thick. Much of the Neda was probably removed by pre-Edgewood erosion.

Characteristics of the Neda formation, other than color, are similar to those of the underlying Brainard Shale.

- Brainard formation. The Brainard formation is a dark greenish gray, thin bedded, fossiliferous, silty claystone to shale with interbedded dolomite. The upper contact is sharp.

  As a result of pre-Edgewood erosion, as described previously, the Brainard Shale varies in thickness from one to 136 feet depending on the configuration of the Brainard-Edgewood unconformity. In many holes the formation is less than 50 feet thick. It is locally absent.

  In general, the Brainard is lithologically uniform. Interbedded dolomite occurs as 3-inch-thick layers spaced about one foot apart; generally more numerous where the Brainard is thin. Petrographic analyses report 90 percent clay and 10 percent scattered dolomite grains 0.01 to 0.02 mm in size, with scattered clusters of pyrite. X-ray analyses indicate 3 parts illite clay to one part chlorite intermixed with dolomite.

  The Brainard, found in drill holes, is uniformly fresh rock. Core recovery is generally above 90 percent and RQD is commonly over 80 percent.

- Fort Atkinson formation. The Fort Atkinson varies considerably in composition. It consists of gray, fossiliferous, shaly limestone; tan and pink, crinoidal coarsely crystalline limestone overlying fine grained dolomite; and mostly fine grained limestone with shale partings. In borings in the Chicago area, it is a very hard, brownish-gray medium grained, fossiliferous dolomite with some shale beds. It varies in thickness from 6 feet to 40 feet, averaging 17 feet.

Petrographic analysis reported granular interlocking grains of dolomite, 0.02 to 0.4 mm in size elongated paralled to bedding, and fossil fragments.

Scales Shale. The Scales Shale is largely gray shale, but the lower part is locally dark brown to nearly black in the southern part of the area. Much of the shale is dolomite. Thin beds with small black phosphatic nodules and small pyrite fossils occur near the base and locally near the top. As observed in borings, this formation is a soft, dark gray, very uniform thin-bedded shale, averaging 100 feet in thickness.

Petrographic and x-ray analyses show 5 to 10 percent scattered dolomite grains in a matrix of clay that is three parts illite to one part chlorite. Disseminated pyrite is also present.

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF FAULTS LOCATED IN THE CHICAGO AREA

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF FAULTS LOCATED IN THE CHICAGO AREA

1.1 FAULT CHARACTERISTICS

By definition, a fault is a fracture along which displacement has occurred. In the three recently completed tunnels, much of the fault displacement was seen to be horizontal, or strike-slip, as shown by slikensided fault surface (scratched surfaces showing the direction of movement). As there is no vertical movement along a strike-slip fault and as joint and fault fillings are very similar, it is likely that some faults were mapped as joints.

As bedding is horizontal or very gently inclined, and as the fault movement appears to have been largely strike-slip (horizontal), substantial horizontal movement is required to produce a vertical displacement of as little as one foot. Since the identification of faults in flat-lying strata, by means of seismic surveys or core drilling, depends primarily on observations of vertical displacement of beds, strike-slip faulting, prevalent in the Chicago area, would be expected to be undetected by these methods, unless core drilling disclosed a zone of disturbed rock attributable to faulting.

The fault surfaces are generally slickensided and often have fluted or washboard structure. All striations noted were horizontal or near-horizontal. The faults are invariably filled with grey, black or green clay and lesser amounts of breccia. Fault widths are largely in the range of a fraction of an inch to 2 or 3 inches, however, a few of the faults obtain locally a width of 6 inches, and a maximum width of 12 inches was noted on a fault in the Southwest Tunnel. Apparent stratigraphic offsets vary normally from a fraction of an inch to 6 inches, and reach a maximum of 8 inches.

2.1 SURVEY RESULTS

Most of the fault dips in the Chicago area were found to be vertical or near-vertical. A few of them varied from the vertical by as much as 15 degrees. The seismic survey delineated 30 faults in the area surveyed, omitting the Des Plaines disturbance and its boundary faults.

In the area north of Irving Park Road, along the North Shore Channel, and along the North Branch of the Chicago River, only one seismically mapped fault was actually crossed by the line of explorations. Displacement at this fault was indicated to be only about 10 feet. The eastern end of another fault came within 1,000 feet of the North Branch section. Although slight undulations were interpreted from the core borings in the beds in the areas of these two faults, they are no greater than in other areas along the North Branch where no faults were mapped. Furthermore, the rock in the holes drilled to explore these faults revealed no disturbance. Although no fault at this location has been shown, a fault having predominantly horizontal movement and little vertical displacement cannot be excluded.

One fault was mapped by the seismic survey as crossing the Chicago River between Polk and Harrison Streets. A group of holes were drilled to confirm the existence, nature, and extent of any fault at this location. The drilling confirmed the fault, and indicates a displacement of 25 feet on the top of the Galena between Taylor Street and Roosevelt Road. The southern side was found to be lower. It appears now that the zone of possible fault disturbance is limited in extent.

There is a disturbed and faulted zone in the area between Chicago Avenue and Lake Street. No fault was mapped in this area by the seismic survey. Nevertheless, drilling in this area encountered extensive lengths of hole in rock that was closely fractured, fragmental, and gouged. Joints showing slickensides were also common. In one drill hole the Maquoketa shales were sheared and showed signs of remolding.

To further delineate this zone of disturbance, two additional holes were drilled. One drill hole contained considerable sections of fragmental core and had a Galena top 30 feet higher than that in the hole, 1,300 feet to the south. A core loss, perhaps due to poor quality rock, of 13 feet was reported in the latter boring. The displacement of beds in this area would seem to indicate a fault or fault zone between these holes. It is possible that an additional fault of lesser displacement could occur between Randolph and Ohio Streets. It is in this area where a proposed short feeder tunnel intersects the main tunnel.

Additional evidence of faulting in this area is found in reports of the Des Plaines Street and Chicago Avenue

Tunnels. The former, excavated in 1938, encountered a zone with clay slips or faults carrying large quantities of water. The main fault was reported as nearly vertical with a northeast-southwest orientation. This broken zone is located south of Erie Street at the tunnel elevation of approximately -160 CCD (Chicago City Datum). Clay slips which were very wet and which required timbering were also described in the Des Plaines Street Tunnel report.

Seepage in the Chicago Avenue Tunnel, driven in 1930, was reported to have increased greatly when the tunnel reached distances of 600 feet east and west of a shaft at the Chicago River. At that point two 300 gpm pumps were required to control the leakage. One pump was operated 16 hours per day, six days per week and the other pumped about 24 hours per week.

In another reach of the Chicago Avenue Tunnel, numerous faults were mapped and were reported to form a graben 820 feet wide, extending east and west of a shaft at the Lake Shore. The faults in this area are nearly vertical and contain clay filled, brecciated zones up to three feet wide. Displacements greater than 13 feet are reported in six faults, two of which had displacements of 36 and 48 feet. These faults were very troublesome to tunneling, because of large water inflows and a need for support of the roof rocks. Joints showing solutioning and filled with clay pockets up to 100 feet wide were reported. Some of these required timbering and one necessitated the use of concrete lining.

The faulting, close jointing, and disturbance observed in the 1971 exploration program, in the Des Plaines Street Tunnel, and in the two reaches of the Chicago Avenue Tunnel are very likely interrelated. A more detailed evaluation of the areal and vertical extent of the zone, the magnitude of the displacement, brecciation, leakage, and solution phenomena will require further drilling in the design phase.

Seven faults crossing the line along the tunnel, along the Des Plaines River, and south of the Des Plaines complex were mapped by the seismic survey. Subsequent drilling has not confirmed the presence of three of these faults.

Of the remaining four faults, three have been substantiated by the 1971 explorations. These have apparent displacements of 25 feet, 50 feet, and 10 feet. Displacement of the fourth fault was measured at 20 feet in the drilling. However, no fault of such large displacement was observed in the Southwest Intercepting Sewer 13A Tunnel, which crosses this same seismically mapped fault.

Rock in the vicinity of the 25 foot and 10 foot faults displayed unusually severe fracturing or gouge. In particular, one boring north of the 25 foot fault followed for 20 feet a joint filled with clay and broken pieces of dolomite. In some cases, the joint filling was wider than the core diameter. A core loss of eight feet was also reported in this hole, and slickensided joint surfaces were found in another drill hole south of the fault. A core sample from a boring north of 10 foot fault contained gouged sections and the Platteville section was closely fractured.

3.1 FAULTS AFFECTING TARP

Two feeder tunnels, which will intersect the proposed Tunnel from the west, may cut by a 50 foot fault, based on the seismic survey. This fault may cross the more northern of the feeder tunnels and a 20 foot fault may cross the southern tunnel.

Data mapped by the seismic survey on the geologic structure and on faulting in the Lake Calumet area has not been substantiated by drilling. In this area ten faults were mapped by the seismic method. All of these are shown in the area east of the Calumet Tunnel. No faults were mapped along the tunnel alignment from the Calumet Tunnel northwest to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.

The proposed tunnel may cross one fault having a displacement of 20 to 30 feet, and another fault with a displacement of about 30 feet. The tunnel is close a fault of unknown displacement near its intersection with the 30 foot fault.

The Calumet River branch of the tunnel may cross five east-west trending faults. These faults, located from south to north, have a displacement of about 20 to 25 feet. The short feeder tunnel which intersects this tunnel segment follows or closely parallels a 20-to-25 foot fault throughout the length of the tunnel.

The Little Calumet River branch of the system parallels one fault for a considerable distance and may cross another fault as well, depending on the exact location of the tunnel. The displacement on the former fault ranges from a few feet to about 30 feet and the latter is about 20 feet.

APPENDIX D

AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

APPENDIX D

AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

Air quality is measured in terms of time-averaged pollutant concentrations in the air, usually at ground level, where people and property are most often exposed to the pollutants. For various substances which have been identified as air pollutants, air quality standards for them have been set at the Federal and state levels.

The air quality standards can be divided into the following classes:

- Ambient air quality standards
- Nondegradation criteria
- Standards for hazardous air pollutants
- Occupational Safety and Health Act regulations.

The first two classes of standards apply to pollutant concentrations in the outdoor air, whereas the third, standards for hazardous air pollutants, applies to the emission of such pollutants. These standards are discussed below. The fourth class, the Occupational Safety and Health Act regulations, apply to pollutant concentrations inside industrial plants and other job areas where workers are likely to be exposed to pollutants. Therefore, they are not discussed here.

1.1 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act of 1970, the U.S. EPA has established national ambient air quality standards for six pollutants: sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen dioxide, and photochemical oxidants. These standards are shown in Table D-1. They consist of both primary standards, which are intended to protect public health, and secondary standards, which are intended to protect public welfare, including protection against damage to property and vegetation, and aesthetic damage.

The State of Illinois has also established ambient air quality standards. The state particulate standards are the same as the Federal standards. However, for carbon monoxide, oxidants, hydrocarbons, and nitrogen dioxide, the state has only one set of standards equivalent to the Federal secondary standards.

Table D-1
National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Primary Standards	Secondary Standards
Sulfur Dioxide	80 $\mu gm/m^3$ (aam) 0.03 ppm 365 $\mu gm/m^3$ 0.14 ppm (24 hr.)[1]	1300 $\mu gm/m^3$ 0.50 ppm (3 hr.)[1]
Total Suspended Particulate	75 $\mu gm/m^3$ (agm) 260 $\mu gm/m^3$ (24 hr.)[1]	60 $\mu gm/m^3$ (agm) 150 $\mu gm/m^3$ (24 hr.)[1]
Carbon Monoxide	10 mgm/m^3 (24 hr.)[1] 9 ppm 40 mgm/m^3 (1 hr.)[1] 35 ppm	10 mgm/m^3 (8 hr.)[1] 9 ppm 40 mgm/m^3 (1 hr.)[1] 35 ppm
Photochemical Oxidants	160 $\mu gm/m^3$ (1 hr.)[1] 0.08 ppm	160 $\mu gm/m^3$ (1 hr.)[1] 0.08 ppm
Non-methane Hydrocarbons	160 $\mu gm/m^3$ [1,2] 0.24 ppm	160 $\mu gm/m^3$ (3 hr.)[1,2] 0.24 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	100 $\mu gm/m^3$ (aam) 0.05 ppm	100 $\mu gm/m^3$ (aam) 0.05 ppm

1 - Not to exceed more than once a year
2 - 6 a.m. to 9 a.m.
aam - annual arithmetic mean
agm - annual geometric mean
μgm - microgram
mgm - milligram
ppm - parts per million
m^3 - cubic meter

2.1 NONDEGRADATION CRITERIA

The intent of the nondegradation criteria, established in December 1974, is to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in areas with currently clean air. These criteria apply to increments in the existing ambient concentration of particulate matter and of sulfur dioxide.

Three classes with different allowable increments in the above concentrations have been established: Class I represents the cleanest areas in which a small increment may cause significant deterioration, Class II represents the areas in which an increment associated with moderate urban growth may not significantly affect the air quality, and Class III represents the highly developed urban areas in which degradation of air quality up to the national ambient air quality standards may not be considered significant. Table D-2 summarizes the nondegradation criteria.

Table D-2
Significant Deterioration Criteria

Pollutant	Allowable Increments	
	Class I $\mu g/m^3$	Class II $\mu g/m^3$
Particulate matter		
Annual geometric mean	5	10
24-hour maximum	10	30
Sulfur dioxide		
Annual arithmetic mean	2	15
24-hour maximum	5	100
3-hour maximum	25	700

For Class III, the above concentrations could increase until the air quality degrades up to the national ambient standards.

Initially, all areas in the U.S. were designated as Class II, but the states have the option of reclassifying any area to suit local community needs. Illinois has not reclassified any areas in the state.

3.1 HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

Those air pollutants with no applicable ambient air quality standards are included in the hazardous air pollutant category. The EPA has also established emission standards for such pollutants. At present, asbestos, beryllium, and mercury are designated as hazardous air pollutants. The EPA has the authority to include other substances in this category if they are found to pose a threat to public health and welfare.

APPENDIX E

NOISE: UNITS AND STANDARDS

APPENDIX E

NOISE: UNITS AND STANDARDS

1.1 NOISE UNITS

Noise is often defined as unwanted sound. A complete noise description includes magnitude, frequency distribution, direction of propagation, variation with time, and operating conditions of the noise generator.

Urban noise is a mixture of sounds produced by a variety of sources including vehicles, industrial plants, construction activity, sirens, appliances, power equipment, and conversation. Although noise is generally uniform in all directions, it varies in magnitude and frequency with time. It is possible to describe urban noise in terms of its magnitude for each frequency and at each instant. However, such description would be too voluminous and difficult to compare with other noise. Various noise units have been developed to describe urban noise in terms of a single number, which can account for its magnitude, frequency, and duration. This section describes the basic unit of noise: the decibel (dB), the A-weighted decibel (dBA), and the day-night sound level (L_{dn}).

1.1.1 Decibel (dB)

The magnitude of noise is generally measured by its sound pressure level referred to a standard pressure level. The reference pressure level is generally taken to be 0.0002 microbar, which is the threshold of audible sound. Because of the vast range of sound pressure levels that can be heard by the human ear, noise is expressed in terms of a logarithm of the ratio of measured to standard sound pressure levels. The resulting unit is termed as decibel (dB). Thus, dB = $20 \log_{10} P/P^*$, where P = measured sound pressure; P* = reference sound pressure, generally taken to be 0.0002 microbar (2×10^{-5} Newton/m^2).

1.1.2 A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level (dBA)

Human response to noise varies with noise frequency. The response is approximately constant for frequencies between 500 and 10,000 Hz, but drops off sharply below 100 Hz and above 20,000 Hz. To account for this variation in human noise response, the measured noise signal is weighted, giving less importance to the low and high frequencies and more importance to the midrange frequencies. There are several internationally approved noise weighting scales designed for different purposes. For community noise, the A-scale is used, and the resulting unit is called dBA.

1.1.3 Day-Night Sound Level (L_{dn})

Many attempts have been made to describe the time-varying noise in terms of a single index. The U.S. EPA has recommended the day-night sound level (L_{dn}) as an index for community noise. It is based on the Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq}). The L_{eq} is defined as "the constant sound level which if lasted for the actual total duration of the noise signal, would yield the same value of energy average as the actual sound level over the total duration of the noise."[1]

The L_{dn} represents the average L_{eq} over 24 hours, with a 10-dB nighttime weighting. Mathematically, L_{dn} is expressed as follows:[2]

$$L_{dn} = 10 \ \text{Log}_{10} \left(\frac{15}{24} \times 10^{L_d/10} + \frac{9}{24} \times 10^{(L_n + 10)/10}\right)$$

where L_{dn} = weighted noise level for 24-hour period

L_d = average of hourly L_{eq}'s between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m.

L_n = average of hourly L_{eq}'s between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

2.1 NOISE STANDARDS

Various Federal, state, and local governmental agencies have established noise control regulations and guidelines.

---

1 Bolt, Beranek & Newman Inc., Noise in the Urban Environment, for city of Chicago, Department of Environmental Control, November 1970.

2 Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite To Protect Public Health and Welfare With an Adequate Margin of Safety, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report 550/9-74-004, March 1974.

At the Federal level, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the EPA have noise standards or guidelines in effect. The State of Illinois and the city of Chicago also have established noise control regulations. These standards and guidelines are discussed below.

2.1.1 EPA Guidelines

In response to the Noise Control Act of 1972, the EPA identified long-term noise levels considered necessary to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety. These identified noise levels do not represent EPA standards, but are considered necessary by the EPA both to protect the most sensitive segment of public from any measurable hearing loss and to minimize feelings of annoyance, both with an adequate margin of safety. The EPA findings are given in terms of L_{eq} over 24 hours; Table E-1 shows the EPA findings in terms of L_{dn}. The conversion factor is shown at the bottom of the table.

Table E-1
Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite To Protect Public Health and Welfare With an Adequate Margin of Safety[1]

Effect	Level	Area
Hearing Loss	$L_{dn} \leq 74$ dB	All areas
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \leq 55$ dB	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis for use.
	$L_{dn} \leq 59$ dB	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school yards, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \leq 45$ dB	Indoor residential areas.
	$L_{dn} \leq 49$ dB	Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

NOTE: All L_{eq} values converted to L_{dn} for ease of comparison (L_{dn} equals L_{eq} (24) + 4 dB).

1 U.S. EPA, March 1974.

2.1.2 HUD Noise Criteria

The Noise Abatement and Control Standards established by HUD are intended to remove uncontrollable noise sources from residential and other noise-sensitive areas and to prohibit HUD support for new construction on sites having unacceptable noise exposure. The HUD noise criteria for funding new residential construction are given in terms of Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) values. The NEF values can be converted into L_{dn} by using the equation, L_{dn} = NWF + 35 dB. The criteria in terms of L_{dn} are as follows:

Noise Levels, L_{dn}	HUD Policy
Less than 65 dB	Acceptable
65 to 75 dB	Discretionary
More than 75 dB	Unacceptable

2.1.3 FHWA Noise Standards

The FHWA of the Department of Transportation has established noise standards and procedures to be used in highway planning and design. These standards have been established in terms of the L_{10} values, which represent the noise level in dBA exceeded 10 percent of the time. The FHWA standards are summarized in Table E-2.

Table E-2
FHWA Noise Standards

Land Use Type	Design Noise Level, L_{10}
Parks and areas requiring special qualities of serenity and quite	60 dBA (Exterior)
Residential, business and commercial	70 dBA (Exterior) 55 dBA (Interior)
Uses other than those mentioned above	75 dBA (Exterior)

2.1.4 OSHA Noise Regulations

OSHA, of the Department of Labor, has established noise standards to protect the health and safety of industrial workers. According to OSHA standards, a worker may not be exposed to noise levels greater than 90 dBA for eight hours per day. For shorter durations, exposure to higher noise levels is allowed as follows:

Duration Per Day (Hours)	Sound Level (dBA)
8	90
6	92
4	95
3	97
2	100
1.5	102
1	105
0.5	110
0.25 or less	115

The EPA has recommended a limit of 85 dBA for eight-hour exposure with higher limits for shorter durations.

2.1.5 State of Illinois Noise Standards

The Illinois noise standards apply to noise levels measured beyond 25 feet from a property-line noise-source. The standards vary with types of land use, which are divided into three classes: A, B, and C. The standards depend not only on the class in which the noise level is measured, but also on the class in which the noise source is located. For example, a noise source located in Class C may emit higher noise to an adjacent Class B area than Class A area.

The Illinois noise standards are given in terms of octave band sound pressure levels and can be found in the Environment Reporter.[1]

---

1 Illinois Noise Pollution Regulations, Environment Reporter, Noise Control Regulations, October 1975, p. 81:4921.

2.1.6 City of Chicago Noise Standards[1]

The city of Chicago promulgated a comprehensive noise control ordinance in July 1971. This ordinance established limits on noise from motor vehicles, construction equipment, power tools and equipment, and recreational vehicles sold, as well as operated in the city of Chicago. Standards for noise from buildings were also established.

The maximum allowable noise levels measured at 50 feet from new construction vehicles and equipment sold in Chicago are shown in the following table.

	Noise Limit (dBA)	
Manufacture Date	Vehicles (8,000 lbs. or more gross weight)	Construction Equipment*
After Jan. 1, 1968	88	N/A
After Jan. 1, 1972	88	86
After Jan. 1, 1973	86	84
After Jan. 1, 1975	84	80
After Jan. 1, 1980	75	75

* Does not include pile drivers.

The noise responsibility does not end with manufacturers. The user must maintain the product so that it will not emit more noise than the manufacturer intended. For vehicles with gross weight 8,000 lbs. or more, the following noise restrictions apply during operation:

	Noise Limit (dBA) at 50 feet For Posted Speed Limits	
Date	35 mph or Less	Over 35 mph
Before Jan. 1, 1973	88	90
After Jan. 1, 1973	86	90

1 City of Chicago Noise Ordinance, Chapter 17 of the Municipal Code of Chicago, as amended in 1971.

The noise ordinance also prohibits use of noisy construction equipment in residential areas between 9:30 p.m. and 8:30 a.m. except for work on public improvements and work for public service utilities.

In the case of noise from buildings, the restrictions apply to noise levels measured at the property line or at the boundary of zoning district as follows:

Type of Land Use	Location of Noise Measured	Noise Limit (dBA)
Residential	Property Line	55
Commercial	Property Line	62
Industrial	Zoning District Boundary	58 to 66

APPENDIX F

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA BY COMMUNITY FOR THE MAINSTREAM, CALUMET, AND DES PLAINES TUNNEL SYSTEMS

APPENDIX F

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA BY COMMUNITY FOR THE MAINSTREAM, CALUMET, AND DES PLAINES TUNNEL SYSTEMS

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA - MAINSTREAM AREA COMMUNITIES[1]

Community	1970 Population	Percent Change From 1960	Median Family Income-1970
Bedford Park	583	-20.9	-
Bellwood	22,096	6.6	13,008
Bensenville	12,956	41.7	13,394
Berkeley	6,152	6.2	13,708
Berwyn	52,502	-3.2	11,836
Bridgeview	12,522	70.7	11,910
Broadview	9,623	12.1	12,553
Brookfield	20,284	-0.7	12,993
Burr Ridge	1,637	447.5	-
Chicago	3,369,357	-5.1	10,242
Cicero	67,058	-3.0	11,265
Countryside	2,864	-	12,976
Des Plaines	57,239	64.1	14,056
Elmwood Park	26,160	9.6	13,028
Evanston	80,113	1.0	13,932
Forest Park	15,472	7.1	11,941
Forest View	927	-11.0	-
Franklin Park	20,348	11.1	12,833
Glencoe	10,675	1.9	29,565
Glenview	24,880	37.2	19,137
Golf	474	15.9	-
Harwood Heights	9,060	59.3	13,208
Hillside	8,888	14.0	14,079
Hinsdale	215,918	23.8	19,185
Hodgkins	2,270	101.6	-
Hometown	6,729	-10.0	11,118

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA - MAINSTREAM AREA COMMUNITIES[1]
Continued

Community	1970 Population	Percent Change From 1960	Median Family Income-1970
Indian Head Park	473	22.9	-
Justice	9,473	238.0	11,745
Kenilworth	2,980	0.7	34,573
LaGrange	17,814	16.5	16,552
LaGrange Park	15,459	12.1	15,237
Lincolnwood	12,929	10.1	21,365
Lyons	11,124	12.0	11,998
Maywood	29,109	6.5	11,573
McCook	333	-24.5	-
Melrose Park	22,716	1.9	12,121
Morton Grove	26,369	38.4	16,488
Niles	31,432	54.1	14,159
Norridge	17,020	20.8	13,996
Northbrook	27,297	134.6	19,994
Northfield	5,010	25.1	21,268
Northlake	14,212	15.4	12,561
North Riverside	8,097	1.4	13,219
Oak Park	62,511	2.3	12,949
Park Ridge	42,614	30.5	17,472
River Forest	13,402	5.6	21,236
River Grove	11,465	35.5	12,480
Riverside	10,432	7.0	16,389
Rosemont	4,360	345.8	12,824
Schiller Park	12,712	123.5	12,695
Stickney	6,601	5.8	12,060
Stone Park	4,429	45.8	12,013
Summit	11,569	11.5	10,281
Westchester	20,033	10.7	15,812
Western Springs	13,029	20.2	19,502

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA - MAINSTREAM AREA COMMUNITIES[1]
Continued

Community	1970 Population	Percent Change From 1960	Median Family Income-1970
Willow Springs	3,318	41.3	12,713
Wilmette	32,134	13.7	21,809
Winnetka	13,998	4.7	28,782
Skokie	68,322	15.1	16,423

1 Suburban Fact Book - 1973, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA - CALUMET AREA COMMUNITIES[1]

Community	1970 Population	Percent Change From 1960	Median Family Income-1970
Alsip	11,141	195.5	12,687
Blue Island	22,958	17.0	11,470
Burnham	3,634	46.7	11,262
Calumet City	33,107	32.4	11,823
Calumet Park	10,069	19.2	12,546
Chicago	3,369,357	-5.1	10,242
Dixmoor	4,735	53.9	10,565
Dolton	25,937	38.4	13,282
Evergreen Park	25,921	7.2	13,903
Harvey	34,636	19.1	11,035
Lansing	25,805	42.6	13,069
Markham	15,987	36.6	12,045
Oak Lawn	60,305	119.5	13,824
Phoenix	3,596	-14.4	9,800
Posen	5,498	21.7	11,866
Riverdale	15,806	31.6	12,520
Robbins	9,641	28.4	8,192
South Holland	23,931	129.8	14,495

1 Suburban Fact Book - 1973, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA - DES PLAINES AREA COMMUNITIES[1]

Community	1970 Population	Percent Change From 1960	Median Family Income-1970
Broadview	9,623	12.1	12,553
Brookfield	20,284	-0.7	12,993
Des Plaines	57,239	64.1	14,056
Elmwood Park	26,160	9.6	13,028
Forest Park	15,472	7.1	11,941
Franklin Park	20,348	11.1	12,833
LaGrange	17,814	16.5	16,552
LaGrange Park	15,459	12.1	15,237
Lyons	11,124	12.0	11,998
Maywood	29,019	6.5	11,573
McCook	333	-24.5	-
Melrose Park	22,716	1.9	12,121
North Riverside	8,097	1.4	13,219
Park Ridge	42,614	30.5	13,472
River Forest	13,402	5.6	21,236
River Grove	11,465	35.5	12,480
Riverside	10,432	7.0	16,389
Rosemont	4,825	345.8	12,824
Schiller Park	12,712	123.5	12,695
Western Springs	13,029	20.2	19,502

1 Suburban Fact Book - 1973, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.

APPENDIX G

CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS - 1954 THROUGH 1975

APPENDIX G

CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS - 1954 THROUGH 1975

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1954	-	Leffler Plan proposed (Alternative K*).	-
1958	August	Meissner Plan proposed (Alternative L).	Meissner, John F., "Flood Control - A Report for the Metropolitan Sanitary District," Engineers, Inc.
1959	February	Ramey-Williams Channel Improvement Plan proposed (Alternative M).	Ramey, H.P., "Floods in the Chicago Area," A Report for the MSDGC.
1960	March	-	McCarthy, R.L., "Supplement to Proposed Flood Control Project for the MSDGC."
1961	-	-	State of Illinois, "Report on Plan for Flood Control and Drainage Development, Des Plaines River, Cook, Lake and DuPage Counties," Dept. of Public Works and Buildings.
			______________, ____________ Appendix G.
1964	-	Original Deep Tunnel Plan with Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet Area proposed (Alternative A).	-
		Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Flood Control Studies resulted in proposed plan (Alternative P).	-

* Flood Control Coordinating Committee designations.

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1965	-	Flood Control Coordinating Committee (FCCC) formed and members appointed by Governor of Illinois.	-
1966	-	Commenced investigations on mining machines (MSDGC).	-
	May	-	Harza Engineering Co. and Bauer Engineering, Inc., "A Deep Tunnel Plan for the Chicagoland Area," A Report for the MSDGC.
	October	-	Harza Engineering Co. "Appraisal Report on Storm Drainage by Alternative Open-cut and Tunnel Sewers for the Eastwood Wilson Auxiliary Outlet Sewer System," report for Department of Public Works.
1967	January	Original Chicago Underflow Plan for Flood and Pollution Control proposed (city of Chicago).	City of Chicago, "The Chicago Underflow Plan for Flood and Pollution Control," Dept. of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering.
	November	The FCCC appointed members for a technical advisory committee (TAC).	-
		Lawrence Avenue underflow sewer system construction commenced (city of Chicago).	-
		MSDGC initiated feasibility studies on Chicago tunnel plans.	-
		Drilling and testing of deep aquifer test and specific capacity wells commenced (MSDGC).	-

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1967	November (Continued)	Seismic survey of 5 locations commenced to determine efficacy of vibrosis (MSDGC). Drilling and testing of 36 shallow and deep holes commenced to determine general subsurface conditions (MSDGC).	-
1968	February	-	Harza Engineering Co. and Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Pollution and Flood Control: A Program for Chicagoland," a report for the MSDGC.
1968	May	Seismic survey completed	Seismograph Service Corp., "Reports on a Vibrosis Survey, Chicagoland Deep Tunnel Plan for Pollution and Flood Control, Phases I-III Mobilization and Reconnaissance," for the MSDGC.
	May	-	Harza Engineering Co., and Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Chicagoland Deep Tunnel System for Pollution and Flood Control - First Construction Zone Definite Project Report," for the MSDGC.
	July	-	McCarthy, R.L., "The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago Flood Control Report."

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1968	July (Continued)	-	Harza Engineering Co. and Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Chicagoland Deep Tunnel System for Pollution and Flood Control - First Construction Zone Definite Project Report Appendices."
	September	Composite Plan proposed (Alternative E).	City of Chicago, "Composite Drainage Plan of the Chicago Area," Dept. of Public Works for the TAC.
1968	November	-	Harza Engineering Co. and Bauer Engineering, Inc. "Design, Construction, and Financing Schedule for the Composite Drainage, Flood and Pollution Control Plan for the Combined Sewer Portion of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago."
	November	State of Illinois, Division of Waterways Plan proposed (Alternative D).	State of Illinois, "Chicago Drainage Plan," Dept. of Public Works and Buildings.
	November	Drilling and testing completed.	Seismograph Service Corp., "Report on Borehole Logging Services, Chicagoland Deep Tunnel System for Pollution and Flood Control," for the MSDGC.
	-	Deep Tunnel Plan with Pumped Storage Power proposed (Alternative A_p).	-
	-	City of Chicago Underflow Plan revised.	-
	-	Sheaffer Plan proposed (Alternative N).	-

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1968	November (Continued)	Deep Tunnel Plan with Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet and Stickney Areas proposed (Alternative B).	-
	-	Deep Tunnel Plan (Calumet, Stickney Storage) with Pumped Storage proposed (Alternative B_p.)	-
	-	Deep Tunnel Plan with Mined and Surface Storage in the Calumet, West-Southwest and North-side Sewage Treatment Plant Areas proposed (Alternative C).	-
	-	Deep Tunnel Plan (Storage in Three Locations) with Pumped Storage Power Proposed (Alternative C_p).	-
1969	January	Report on effects of deep tunnel storage upon MSDGC's sewage treatment capacity presented to MSDGC.	Bauer Engineering, Inc., "The Effect of Deep Tunnel Storage upon District Sewage Treatment Capacity."
	January	-	Anderson, A.G., and Dahlin, W.Q., "Project Report No. 100 - Supplement No. 1 - Effect of Air and Detergents on Flow Pattern." University of Minnesota.
	February	-	Harza Engineering Co., and Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Report on the Impact of the Deep Tunnel Plan on the Water Resources of Northeast Illinois," for the MSDGC.

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1969	April	-	Koelzer, V.A., Bauer, W.J., and Dalton, F.E., "The Chicago Area Deep Tunnel Project - A Use of the Underground Storage Resource," JWPCF.
	July	-	Bauer Engineering, Inc., "The Role of Storage in Sewage Treatment Plant Design," for the MSDGC.
	September	-	City of Chicago, "Combined Underflow-Storage Plan for Pollution and Flood Control in the Chicago Metropolitan Area," Dept. of Public Works.
1969	October	-	Papadopulos, I.S., Larsen, W.R., and Neil, F.C., "Groundwater Studies - Chicagoland Deep Tunnel System," Groundwater Journal, Vol. 7, No. 5.
1970	May	Chicago Underflow Plan-Lockport proposed (Alternative F).	State of Illinois, city of Chicago, MSDGC, "Underflow Plan for Pollution and Flood Control in the Chicago Metropolitan Area."
	June	Chicago Underflow Plan - Single Quarry proposed (Alternative G).	-
	-	Chicago Underflow Plan - Two Quarries proposed (Alternative H).	-
	-	Chicago Underflow Plan-Three Quarries proposed (Alternative J).	-
	-	Four Storage Plan proposed (Alternative Q).	-

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1970	June (Continued)	Four Storage Plan with Pumped Storage Power proposed (Alternative Q_p).	-
	-	McCook, Calumet, and O'Hare Storage Plan proposed (Alternative R).	-
	-	McCook, Calumet, and O'Hare Storage Plan with Pumped Storage Power proposed (Alternative R_p).	-
	-	Chicago Underflow Plan, McCook and O'Hare Storage proposed (Alternative S).	-
	November	The FCCC reactivated.	
		Work program prepared for development of a flood and pollution control plan.	
		Additional subsurface analysis initiated.	
1971	January	-	DeLeuw, Cather, and Co., "Southwest Side Intercepting Sewer 13A, Report of Tunnel Inspection Performed, November 1970," for the MSDGC.
	February	-	Metcalf & Eddy, "Application of Storm Water Management Model to Selected Chicago Drainage Areas - Phase I," report to city of Chicago, Dept. of Public Works.
	April	Separate System of Sanitary Sewers proposed and evaluated (Alternative T).	City of Chicago, "Estimate of Cost To Provide a Separate System of Sanitary Sewers for the city of Chicago," Dept. of Public Works.

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1971	May	The Technical Advisory Committee re-established.	-
	May	-	MSDGC, "Position Paper Concerning Combined Sewer Overflows."
	September	-	Consoer, Townsend and Associates, "Chicagoland Flood and Pollution Control Program Second Interim Report on Treatment to the city of Chicago," a report for the MSDGC.
	September	-	Harza Engineering Co., "Chicagoland Flood Control and Pollution Abatement Program, Interim Report, Geology and Related Studies."
	October	-	Bauer Engineering, Inc., "Final Report - Drop Shaft Investigation for Crosstown Expressway (I-494)."
	October	-	Harza Engineering Co., "Evaluation of Geology and Groundwater Conditions in Lawrence Avenue Tunnel. Calumet Intercepting Sewer 18E, Extension A, Southwest Intercepting Sewer 13A."
1972	-	Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (TARP) proposed.	-
	January	-	MSDGC, "Evaluation of Alternative Systems."
	August	-	MSDGC, "Summary of Technical Reports."

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1972	August	Additional boring tests completed.	Seismograph Service Corp., "Borehole Logging Report for North-Side Rock Tunnel Project."
	October	TARP adopted by FCCC Board.	-
	November	-	DeLeuw, Cather, and Co., "Preliminary Plans for O'Hare Collection Facility," conventional intercepting sewers and TARP.
	December	-	MSDGC, "Technical Reports - "Development of a Flood Control Plan for the Chicagoland Area," Part I - Data Collection; Part II - Computer Simulations Programs; Part III - Treatment; Part IV - Geology and Water Supply; Part V - Alternative Systems; Part VI - Power Generation; Part VII - Benefit-Cost-Financing-Scheduling.
1973	July	Issued "Environmental Assessment" and "Environmental Impact Statement" for TARP for Corps. of Engineers (MSDGC).	-
	-	Preliminary plans and designs for Upper Des Plaines system and O'Hare collection facility prepared (MSDGC).	-
	-	Hydraulic model studies of drop shafts and collecting structures, computer services, refinement of TARP, and preliminary designs of drop shafts initiated (MSDGC).	-

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1973	July (Continued)	Preliminary plans for second phase Calumet tunnels, administration of subsurface exploration, and preparation of geotechnical design report for Calumet system initiated (MSDGC).	-
	-	Preparation of geotechnical design for Mainstream tunnels and two reservoirs initiated (MSDGC).	-
1974	April	Mapping of Mainstream, Calumet and Lower Des Plaines systems commenced (MSDGC).	-
	-	Subsurface exploration of Lower Des Plaines, Calumet, Upper Des Plaines, Mainstream and reservoir systems commenced (MSDGC).	-
	-	Reservoir sites proposed for O'Hare and Calumet areas (MSDGC).	-
	March-September	Drop shaft modeling studies completed and reports issued (University of Minnesota).	Anderson, A.G. and Dahlin, W.Q., Status Reports No. 1 through 6, for the city of Chicago.
1975	January	Drop shaft modeling study completed (University of Minnesota).	Anderson, A.G. and Dahlin, W.Q., "Model Studies of Drop Shafts, Final Report," University of Minnesota, for the city of Chicago.
	July	Hearings conducted by MSDGC pertaining to EPA construction grant for tunnels and shafts of Addison to Wilmette and O'Hare systems.	

Year	Month	Description of Events	Reports Issued
1975	September	Hearings conducted by Illinois EPA for design grants of all first phase tunnel systems.	-
	November	Public hearing conducted by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.	-

APPENDIX H

METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT
OF GREATER CHICAGO

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS—CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

INDEX

THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS

(CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS)

Definitions.

(1) Whenever the following terms in quotations appear in the contract documents, they shall be interpreted as follows:

"Sanitary District" or "District" – The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, party of the first part.

"Contractor" spelled with a capital "C" – The Contractor under this contract, party of the second part.

"Chief Engineer" or "Engineer" – The Chief Engineer or Acting Chief Engineer of The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, or any other Engineer designated by him.

The Purchasing Agent is the duly authorized Officer of the District, carrying out the functions assigned to him by the Purchasing Act (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1963, Ch. 42, Sec. 11.1–11.23) and the Board of Trustees.

"He", "him", "his", "it" or "it's" designating the "Contractor" – The individual, firm or corporation awarded the contract for the work hereunder.

"The work" – The work to be performed hereunder, including all material, labor, tools and all appliances and appurtenances necessary to perform and complete everything specified or implied in the contract or shown on the plans and specifications furnished by the Sanitary District, and the additional plans and information furnished by the Contractor under Section (3), in full compliance with all the terms and conditions hereof.

"Site" – The location described in the Agreement where the work under this contract is to be performed.

"Plans" – The contract plans listed in the Agreement and the additional plans, prints and drawings furnished by the Contractor in accordance with the requirements of Section (3).

"Written Order" – A written order signed by the Chief Engineer of the Sanitary District, a duly appointed Acting Chief Engineer or an Assistant Chief Engineer designated by said Chief Engineer, mailed to the Contractor at the address designated in his proposal or to such other address as he may designate in writing as his official place of business.

"Or equal" or "or equal thereto" – Wherever a particular process, material, device, detail or part is specified herein followed by these words or by similar or equivalent expressions, such words or expressions shall be understood to mean and permit the use of another process, material, device, detail or part that the Engineer shall determine is fully equal in suitability, quality, durability and in all other respects, to the process, material, device, detail or part herein specified for such use and shall approve for such use in the work hereunder.

"Designated", "ordered", "permitted", "approved" – These words or others of similar import, unless specifically modified, shall be taken to mean, designated, ordered, permitted or approved by the Engineer.

Powers of the Engineer.

(2) It is covenanted and agreed that the Chief Engineer and his properly authorized agents shall measure and calculate the quantities and amounts of the several kinds of work performed under this contract and on whose inspection all work shall be accepted or condemned. The Chief Engineer, or other Engineer designated by him, shall have full power to reject or condemn all materials furnished or work performed under this contract, which in his opinion do not conform to the terms and conditions herein expressed.

To prevent all disputes and litigations, it is further agreed by and between the Sanitary District and the Contractor that the Engineer shall in all cases decide every question of an engineering character which may arise relative to the execution of the work under this contract.

on the part of the Contractor, and his decision shall be final and conclusive on both parties hereto; and such decision, in case any question may arise, shall be a condition precedent to the right of the Contractor to receive any money or compensation for anything done or furnished under this contract.

Contractor's Plans, Data and Samples.

(3) Within thirty days after the approval of the bond of the Contractor by the Board of Trustees of the Sanitary District, the Contractor shall submit to the Engineer for approval, plans in duplicate of the equipment, material and apparatus included under this contract and the foundations for same (other than those for which details are given in the plans attached hereto by the Sanitary District), as listed under the Detail Specifications, together with all other information in such detail as may be necessary to permit the Engineer to inform himself whether the same will comply with the specifications, and to determine the character of the various equipment, material and apparatus which the Contractor proposes to use. The time for submitting Contractor's plans may be extended by the Engineer at his discretion, if in his opinion such extension will not delay the progress of work under the contract.

All such plans shall be of sizes to be designated or approved by the Engineer and shall be clearly identified by item number, if any, and location of the equipment, material and apparatus in the work. The general character and arrangement of the shop and working plans shall be subject to the approval of the Engineer and before commencing such plans the Contractor, if requested, shall confer with the Engineer regarding the character, scale, arrangement, and completeness of such plans. The detailed shop plans shall give views, dimensions, instructions and references so that duplicate parts for repairs can be ordered and made from the drawings at any time in the future. The assembly and working plans shall show necessary details, and plans and elevations with dimensions, instruction and references for proper erection, installation and adjustment of the equipment.

The Contractor shall furnish to the Engineer a tabulated list of the minor equipment for which plans may not be required, showing the name of the manufacturer and the catalog number and type of equipment proposed, together with such dimensions, specifications, samples, or other data, as may be required to permit intelligent judgment of the acceptability of the same.

Machinery, equipment, accessories or parts to be furnished under this contract must be of current manufacture unless otherwise specified. Such material, whose manufacture has been discontinued or is scheduled to be discontinued within the life of the contract or duration of the maintenance bond, will not be accepted unless otherwise specified.

The contractor shall upon request furnish a certified statement from the manufacturer that any equipment, accessories or parts being furnished under the contract are in current production and that there are no present or near future plans to discontinue production of the item or items in question.

Approval of Contractor's Plans.

(4) The plans submitted by the Contractor for approval, as specified in Section (3), will be examined by the Engineer and it is understood by the Contractor in submitting the plans, that a reasonable amount of time will be necessary for their examination by the Engineer before they can be approved by him or returned for correction.

"All plans requiring structural design submitted by the Contactor shall be accompanied by the calculations for the work or design and shall be stamped by a registered structural engineer having a license to practice in the State of Illinois."

Unless otherwise instructed, the Contractor shall submit to the Engineer for examination three prints of each plan, and, as far as possible, all plans of any particular part of the structures or equipment, and of parts connected therewith, shall be submitted at the same time. After the plans have been examined as above mentioned, one print of each plan will be returned to the Contractor by the Engineer with his approval thereon, or marked with notations or corrections and changes that may be required. All plans not approved by the Engineer shall be corrected or revised by the Contractor as the Engineer shall direct and shall be resubmitted in the same routine as before. No orders for any work, materials, or equipment shown on any plans shall be given by the Contractor without the written consent of the Engineer.

No orders for any work, materials or equipment shown on any plans shall be given by the Contractor without the written consent of the Engineer prior to the time when such plans or equipment have been approved by him as specified. Prior to the approval of any such plans, any work which the Contractor may do on the structures or equipment covered by the same shall be at his own risk, as the Sanitary District will not be responsible for any expense incurred by the Contractor in changing structures or equipment to make the same conform to the plans as finally approved. No alterations of any plans shall be made by the Contractor after they have been approved except by the written consent of the Engineer.

The Contractor shall furnish the Sanitary District, as requested, and without extra charge therefor, such number of complete sets of prints of all plans, as approved, as the Engineer shall request and in general not less than eight, for office files and for use in the field. Erection plans shall have all match marks shown thereon.

After the work has been completed, the tracings of all plans for any and all work hereunder, made by or for the Contractor, shall be corrected by him so as to show all work as actually completed.

Prior to the issuance by the Chief Engineer of the final certificate specified in Article 35 of the General Conditions, the Contractor shall furnish to the Engineer, record prints, in duplicate on linen, of such drawings as have been submitted by the Contractor as specified in Section (3), as he may request.

Upon approval of the plans, lists, samples and other data submitted by the Contractor, the same shall become a part of this contract, and the equipment furnished shall be in conformity with the same; provided, that the approval of the above plans, lists, specifications, samples or other data shall in no way release the Contractor from his responsibility for the proper design, installation and performance of any material or equipment, or from his liability to replace the same should it prove defective.

Additional Sanitary District Plans.

(5) The Sanitary District will, for conditions noted in the Detail Specifications, prepare working plans supplementary to the plans previously listed herein, showing such additional and revised details for construction purposes not shown on the contract plans or which are shown as typical only and require revision and additions for construction purposes, as are required for furnishing and erecting the structures and equipment required under this contract. These working plans will be furnished to the Contractor by the Sanitary District within a reasonable time after approval by the Board of Trustees of the Sanitary District of the bond of the Contractor, and as required from time to time for the prosecution of the work.

The Contractor shall advise the Engineer in writing sufficiently in advance of the time when such plans will be required for the orderly progress of various portions of the work to permit their preparation and shall make no claims for damages for delays that may result from his failure to so notify the Engineer. These plans will include such details as are not shown on the contract plans and which the Contractor is not required to furnish, as specified in Section (3).

Checking Plans.

(6) The Contractor shall check all plans furnished by the Sanitary District and by himself for dimensions, quantities and co-ordination with other parts of the work under this contract, and shall notify the Engineer of all errors or omissions which he may discover by examining and checking the same. He will not be allowed to take advantage of any error or omission on the plans, as full instructions will be furnished by the Engineer should such error or omission be discovered, and the Contractor shall carry out such instructions as if originally specified. The work is to be made complete and to the satisfaction of the Engineer, notwithstanding any minor omissions in the specifications or plans.

Keeping Plans and Specifications on the Work.

(7) The Contractor shall keep on hand at the work for reference a complete copy of these specifications and a complete set of all plans of the work, and also copies of all plans furnished by the Contractor, all revised plans furnished by the Sanitary District and all orders issued to the Contractor by the Engineer that relate to the work under this contract.

Lines and Grades.

(8) A surface horizontal and vertical control system as required for the layout of the work under this contract shall be given by the Engineer. This horizontal and vertical control system must be verified by the Contractor and the Contractor will be entirely responsible for its correctness. All other horizontal and vertical control required for the complete layout and performance of the work under this contract shall be done by the Contractor at the Contractor's expense, and approved by the Engineer. The Contractor must verify and will be completely responsible for the correctness of all lines and grades, including any given by the Engineer.

In tunnel construction, each shaft shall be "plumbed" (line and grade transferred from the surface into the tunnel section) by the Contractor, and approved by the Engineer. The Contractor shall inform the Engineer, a reasonable time in advance, of the times and places at which he intends to do work.

At the Engineer's discretion, the Engineer will make occasional field checks of control work done by the Contractor. The Contractor shall correct any mistakes due to errors or omissions at his own cost and expense as ordered by the Engineer. Unless otherwise noted, all elevations shown on the plans and mentioned in the specifications are referred to Chicago City Datum (C.C.D.). The Sanitary District considers Chicago City Datum to be at Elevation 579.48 above New York Mean Sea Level, USC&GS 1929 adjustment (MSL-1929 adj).

Inspection and Testing of Materials and Equipment.

(9) All material and equipment furnished under this contract shall be subjected at all times during manufacture, fabrication and erection to such inspection and tests by the Engineer or his authorized representatives, as will give due assurance that the terms of the specifications are being complied with in all respects. Such inspection and tests shall be performed at the points of manufacture or fabrication, or in the field, as are herein specified therefor or as otherwise designated by the Engineer. Where inspections or tests are to be made at the point of the manufacture or fabrication, the Contractor shall in all cases give ample notice to the Engineer to permit such inspection and tests to be performed before painting is done and shipment is made and shall furnish to the Engineer copies, in triplicate, of all mill orders and invoices covering the same, to facilitate the identification of the material inspected.

All inspecting and testing of materials furnished under this contract will be performed by the Engineer or his duly authorized inspection engineers or inspection bureaus without cost to the Contractor unless otherwise expressly specified herein.

When inspection of materials and equipment is authorized in writing by the Engineer, it shall be the sole responsibility of the Contractor hereunder to keep the Engineer, or such duly authorized inspection engineers or inspection bureaus, fully informed as to when and where the material or equipment is to be inspected. All approved subcontractors shall be appropriately advised of this requirement. If any material or equipment is shipped to the site of the work without authorized inspection, it may be subject to rejection. Any additional expense to the Sanitary District for inspection of such material or equipment at the site of the work shall be borne by the Contractor.

All machining and preparation of test samples, required by the ASTM or other specifications and cited as standard for this contract, shall be done by the Contractor at his own expense.

All specifications of any society, institute or association hereafter referred to are hereby made a part of this contract the same as if written in full.

The following societies, institutes and associations will be hereinafter designated, by their initials, as follows:

Name	Designation
American Association of State Highway Officials	AASHO
American Institute of Electrical Engineers	AIEE
American Institute of Steel Construction	AISC
Air Moving and Conditioning Association, Inc.	AMACA

American Petroleum Institute .... API
American National Standards Association ANSI
American Society of Mechanical Engineers .... ASME
American Society for Testing Materials .. ASTM
American Welding Society .... EEI
American Water Works Association .... AWWA
Edison Electric Institute .... EEI
Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction of the Department of Public Works and Buildings, Division of Highways, State of Illinois .... IDH
Illinois Environment Protectional Agency. IEPA
Insulated Power Cable Engineers Association .... IPCEA
Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago .... MSD
National Electrical Manufacturers: Association .... NEMA
National Fire Protection Association .... NFPA
Occupational Safety & Health Administration .... OSHA
Steel Structures Painting Council .... SSPC
U.S. *Environmental Protection Agency* . USEPA

Where reference is made to standard specifications of any of the above societies, institutes or associations, these references refer to the latest Standards and Tentative Standards of said society, institute or association in force on the date when bids on this contract were received; except that, if a revised specification is issued by said society, institute or association before completion of a part of the work affected by said specifications, the Contractor may, if approved by the Engineer, perform the part of the work affected in accordance with the revised specifications. In interpreting said standard specifications, the "Purchaser" shall be understood to mean the Sanitary District, and the "Manufacturer," the Contractor hereunder of any person or persons or corporation furnishing materials for or performing work under this contract.

For any material not covered by the designated specification of some designated society, institute or association, appropriate methods of testing and inspection to be designated by the Engineer shall be followed.

All samples for analysis and tests shall be taken in such manner as to be truly representative of the entire lot under test and shall not be worked on in any way to alter the quality before testing. Where expressly permitted by the Engineer in the case of materials taken from stock or for use in minor parts, certified analysis and tests of the manufacturer, furnished in triplicate, may be accepted in lieu of the tests prescribed above. In case the records of physical and chemical tests of stock materials are not available a reasonable number of tests shall be furnished to the Engineer free of charge as required by the Engineer to satisfy himself as to its quality.

Inspection and tests of fabricated parts and manufactured articles shall be made by such methods and at such times as to insure compliance with the specifications in all respects. Inspection of all metal work shall be made before painting.

Should the preparation of the material be at far distant or inaccessible points, or should it be divided into unreasonably small quantities, or widely distributed to an unreasonable extent, or should the percentage of rejected material be unreasonably large, the additional cost of extra inspection resulting therefrom shall be borne by the Contractor, the Engineer being sole judge of what is to be deemed extra inspection.

The Engineer or his authorized representative shall have full power to reject any and all material or equipment which fails to meet the terms of the specifications and such material or equipment shall be promptly removed from the work hereunder. All material or equipment which develops defects during the life of the contract, either before or after erection, shall be removed and replaced, notwithstanding that it may have passed the prescribed inspection and tests.

Inspection and Tests of Workmanship.

(10) It is the intent, under this contract, to secure high class workmanship in all respects and that structures be substantially watertight. By substantially watertight is meant concrete structures with no appreciable leaks from cracks, porous places, holes, expansion or construction joints, and metal structures or pipe lines with no leaking or sweating joints or leaks through defective pipe materials.

Any imperfect work that may be discovered before the final acceptance of the work shall be corrected immediately. The inspection of any work shall not relieve the Contractor of any of his obligations to perform proper and satisfactory work, as herein specified, and all work, which, during its progress may become damaged from any cause, or fails for any reason to satisfy the requirements of the specifications shall be removed and replaced by good and satisfactory work without extra charge therefor.

The Contractor shall perform all tests which are specified under the various items of the contract. Any changes or repairs necessary to put all work and equipment in satisfactory adjustment and operating condition (except for changes of repairs of equipment furnished by the Sanitary District), whether due to defective material, design or construction, shall be done by the Contractor at no additional cost to the Sanitary District. In general, all mechanical and electrically operated equipment furnished and installed under the various items of the contract shall be given such operating tests as are necessary to demonstrate that it is in satisfactory operating condition and adjustment.

The Contractor shall furnish all tools, materials, labor and equipment, except as otherwise specified, necessary for performing all tests specified under this section and under the various items of the contract and for making all necessary repairs and adjustments (except for repairs and adjustments of equipment furnished by the Sanitary District), at no additional expense to the Sanitary District other than that specified to be paid under the various unit and lump sum prices of the contract. Power for testing equipment will be furnished by the Sanitary District, to the extent permitted by the Engineer, if Sanitary District power is available at the site of the work.

Measurement for Payment.

(11) When unit prices are specified, all measurements of quantities for payment under the unit price item or items of this contract shall be made by the Engineer in the manner specified, and the price or prices paid shall include the furnishing, delivering, erecting and connecting up of all tools, materials, equipment, apparatus and appurtenances; the furnishing of all labor and performance of all work required for the installation; and all plans, testing, painting, Contractor's bond, maintenance bonds where required, and collateral work necessary to complete the work as specified in the Detail Specifications. The cost of performing all work specified in the General Specifications and General Conditions, shall be included in the unit and/or lump sum price or prices specified in the Agreement (unless otherwise directly specified) and no additional payment will be made by the Sanitary District to the Contractor for performing said specified work. No "extra" or "customery" allowances for payment will be made under any item, unless directly specified therein, and no additional payment for work included under any item of this contract will be made under other items unless directly so specified.

Where payment by scale weight is specified under certain items, the Contractor shall provide suitable weighing equipment which shall be kept in accurate adjustment at all times. The weighing of all material shall be performed by the Contractor in the presence and under the supervision of the Engineer or his authorized representative.

Intent of Specifications and Plans.

(12) The specifications and plans are intended to cover the complete installation. It is not the intent to give every detail in the specifications and plans. The Sanitary District will not be responsible for the absence of any detail the Contractor may require, or for any special construction work, equipment, material or labor which may be found necessary as the work progresses. No additional compensation will be allowed the Contractor for any such special construction work, equipment, material or labor which may be found necessary for performing or completing any work hereunder unless it can be clearly shown, to the satisfaction of the Engineer, that such special construction work, equipment, material or labor is beyond the intent and scope of the plans and specifications, or is not included under the lump sum or unit prices specified in the Agreement. If this is shown, the payment for such special construction work, equipment, material or labor shall be made under Articles 7 and 8 of the General Conditions, after the additional cost has been agreed upon and a written order by the Chief Engineer has been issued.

Ground Surface and Underground Conditions.

(13) Where profiles of the ground or cross

sections showing typical elevations of the present ground and of the finished surfaces of cuts and fills adjacent to the structures to be built under this contract are shown on the plans hereto attached, the elevations are believed to be reasonably correct but are not guaranteed to be absolutely so, and together with any schedule of quantities, are presented only as an approximation. The Contractor shall satisfy himself, however, by actual examination of the site of the work, as to the existing elevations and the amount of work required under this contract.

Where test pits and borings have been dug on the site of the work, the results supplied to the District by the soils engineer may be given on the plans or are in file in the Engineer's Office for the information of the contractor. The District does not guarantee the accuracy or correctness of this information. If the contractor desires any additional information relating to the soils investigation, he should contact the soils consultant to obtain such information. The District does not guarantee the accuracy or correctness of any such information supplied by the soils consultant to the prospective bidder. The contractor must satisfy himself by making borings or test pits or by such other methods as he may prefer to determine the character, location and amounts of water, peat, clay, sand, quick sand, gravel, glacial drift, boulders, conglomerate, rock, gas and other material to be encountered and work to be performed.

Existing and Future Structures.

(14) Various underground, and overhead utilities and other structures are shown on the plans hereto attached. The location, material and dimensions of such structures, where given, are believed to be reasonably correct, but do not purport to be absolutely so. All known structures both under and above ground, either existing or under construction, except contractors' plants, are plotted on the plans and profiles for the information of the Contractor or are on file in the office of the Chief Engineer, but information so given is not to be construed as a representation that such structures will be found or encountered as plotted, or that no other such structures will be found or encountered. Other structures may also be encountered which may be built under existing or future contracts, or by other parties, which are not shown on the plans. All structures encountered shall be protected and supported, and, if damaged, repaired by the Contractor without charge therefor to the Sanitary District. The Contractor shall arrange with the owners of said structures for the shifting, temporary removal and restoration and protection of same where necessary for the prosecution of work under this contract, at no additional expense to the Sanitary District except as otherwise specified herein.

Where all or part of the site on which work is to be performed has been utilized under former contracts for the storage of Contractor's materials and for Contractor's temporary roadways and tracks, the Contractor shall make no claim for extra cost of his work due to encountering debris or other obstructions resulting from such use.

Space for Material, Equipment and Plant.

(15) The Contractor shall have the use of such available areas on unoccupied and unused property of the Sanitary District adjacent to or near the site of the work, for the storage of material and for field erection of plant and equipment as are not needed for other structures to be built under existing or future contracts, or for delivery of material and equipment under existing or future contracts, or for other purposes of the Sanitary District. All areas on Sanitary District property shall be used under conditions to be approved by the Engineer, and in no case will the Contractor be permitted to block access to other parts of the work under construction or to the treatment plant. The Contractor shall submit drawings showing the proposed layout of his plant to the Engineer for approval, if required. All other necessary or additional storage facilities shall be provided by the Contractor.

When considered necessary and ordered by the Engineer, the Contractor shall immediately remove or relocate any of his tracks, equipment, buildings or other structures which, in the opinion of the Engineer, constitute an obstruction or interfere with the proper carrying on of any other work, without additional charge to the Sanitary District.

Where the Sanitary District has prepared areas at the site of the work for use as parking spaces for the Contractor's forces, the parking of the cars of the Contractor's forces in locations other than in such parking areas will not be permitted.

Cleaning Work and Sites.

(16) The Contractor shall keep the site of the work and adjacent premises as free from material, debris and rubbish as is practicable and shall remove from any portion of the site, if, in the opinion of the Engineer, such material, debris or rubbish interferes with the operation of the existing plant or other contractors, constitutes a nuisance, or is objectionable in any way to the public. The Contractor further agrees to remove all machinery, materials, implements, barricades, staging, false-work, debris and rubbish connected with or caused by said work immediately upon the completion of the same and to clean all structures and work constructed under this contract to the satisfaction of the Engineer; regrade all areas which have been rutted or disturbed so that the areas will drain without pockets; and to leave the premises, upon completion of the contract, in at least as good condition as when he entered upon them.

Provisions for Delivery at Site.

(17) The Contractor shall make his own arrangements for delivery of materials and equipment to the site, except as may be otherwise stated in the Agreement.

Where the Sanitary District has railroad connections serving the site, the Contractor will be permitted the use of such tracks only to the extent that it does not interfere with the Sanitary District's operations. Any damage to plant tracks due to the Contractor's use other than normal wear shall be promptly corrected by repair or replacement to the satisfaction of the Engineer.

The Contractor, subject to the approval of the Engineer, will be allowed a reasonable use of any existing roadways that are under the jurisdiction of the Sanitary District. Any repairs or maintenance made necessary by the Contractor's use of any such roads shall be done by the Contractor without expense to the Sanitary District. The Contractor's use of the roads shall be strictly in conformity with conditions to be prescribed by the Engineer and shall not interfere with their use by the Sanitary District or other contractors. The Contractor shall so conduct his work as to keep all existing roads in continuous service, except as otherwise specified.

The Contractor shall provide and maintain at his own expense such other roadways or other means to obtain access to the work as he may require. Such roadways and other means of access may also be used by the Sanitary District or other contractors now or hereafter engaged upon work on this site.

Procedure and Methods.

(18) The attention of the Contractor is particularly called to the time allowed for the completion of the work included under this contract. To avoid delay in the completion of work hereunder, he shall submit the names of all sub-contractors and suppliers of material and equipment for approval within 10 days after the date of approval of his bond and shall place all orders for material and equipment within 5 days after receiving the approval of the Engineer. The Contractor's attention is further called to the fact that the Sanitary District may take over certain parts of the work under this contract for permanent operation as rapidly as completed in advance of the completion of the contract as a whole.

The Contractor shall determine the procedure and methods and also design and furnish all temporary structures, sheeting, bracing, tools, machinery, implements and other equipment and plant to be employed in performing the work hereunder, and shall promptly submit layouts and schedules of his proposed methods of conducting the work to the Engineer for his approval. The use of inadequate or unsafe procedures, methods, structures or equipment will not be permitted, and the Engineer may disapprove and reject any of same which seem to him to be unsafe for the work hereunder, or for other work being carried on in the vicinity, or for work which has been completed or for the public or for any workmen, engineers and inspectors employed thereon, or that interferes with the work of the Sanitary District or other contractors, or that will not provide for the completion of the work within the specified time, or that is not in accordance with all the requirements herein specified.

The Contractor shall employ and assign to work on this contract only, a qualified technical engineer, satisfactory to the Chief Engineer of the Sanitary District, to act as contact man with the Engineer.

Before starting construction, the Contractor shall submit his proposed order of procedure to the Engineer for approval. The construction of the various parts of the work shall be performed in such sequence that interference with operations of the Sanitary District or other contractors will be kept to a minimum.

The acceptance or approval of any order of procedure, methods, structures or equipment submitted or employed by the Contractor shall not in any manner relieve the Contractor of any responsibility for the safety, maintenance and repairs of any structure or work, or for construction, maintenance and safety of the work hereunder, or from any liability whatsoever on account of any procedure or methods employed by the Contractor, or due to any failure or movement of any structures or equipment furnished by him. When constructed, even though in accordance with the approval of the Engineer, should any structure or equipment installed hereunder afterwards prove insufficient in strength or fail on account of poor workmanship or any procedure or methods employed by the Contractor, such failure shall in no wise form the basis of any claim for extra compensation for delay, or for damages or expenses caused by such failure, or for extension of time for completion of this contract, or for material, labor or equipment required for repairing or rebuilding such structure or equipment, or for repairing or replacing any other work that may be damaged in any way by the failure or movement of any structure or equipment or by any other happening.

The Contractor shall, at his own expense, provide any necessary temporary blocking, supports or protection for all structures already constructed or now hereafter under construction, with which his work comes in contact, to prevent injury to the same, and shall make good at his own expense any damage done by him to any part of said structures or their appurtenances in unloading and installing any of the work, material, apparatus or equipment included under this contract, or in removing plant or other property or in cleaning up.

The Contractor shall furnish such protection as may be necessary against damage in any way to the work, material, apparatus or the equipment included under this contract before and after the same have been installed (including all necessary protection for structures and equipment which may be damaged by winter conditions), and shall be fully responsibile for such equipment until its final acceptance.

Handling Water at Treatment Plant Sites.

(19) The Contractor shall make all arrangements for handling and disposing of water entering the work to maintain safe, dry and satisfactory working conditions. He will be permitted a reasonable use of existing drainage ditches and the drains and appurtenances constructed under various items of this contract for the disposal of water under conditions satisfactory to the Engineer, except as otherwise specified. In using the drainage ditches and drains, the Contractor shall keep them free from concrete, clay or other deleterious substances, and if such substances are allowed to enter the drains, their use may be forbidden altogether by the Engineer. The discharge of water containing clay or other solid matter into the drainage system will under no circumstances be allowed. The Contractor shall be responsible for the care of all drains and appurtenances constructed under this contract during its entire life, and just prior to its completion, all drains and appurtenances shall be thoroughly cleaned of all debris, deposits or other substances which will interfere with their proper operation and all broken or damaged parts shall be replaced or repaired without cost to the Sanitary District.

Openings and Cutting and Fitting.

(20) The Contractor shall provide all openings and recesses in the concrete, brickwork and other parts of the work, that may be required for any class or part of the work to be furnished or performed hereunder, or that are ordered by the Engineer. He shall do all drilling, cutting, fitting, patching and finishing that may be required to make the various classes and kinds of work hereunder go together in a proper, workmanlike and finished manner.

All such work shall be performed with proper and suitable tools in a workmanlike manner. No cutting will be allowed except by the permission of and subject to the direction or approval of the Engineer. Where holes are to be cut through concrete walls or floor slabs, a core drill or saw shall be used to prevent spalling of the concrete.

The Contractor shall cut all openings required for setting inserts in concrete or brick masonry placed under other contracts. All cutting shall be confined closely within the limits required for installing the inserts. Any concrete or brick masonry removed beyond the required limits and any damage to existing structures or equipment resulting from the cutting of concrete or brick masonry, shall be promptly replaced or repaired by the Contractor at his own expense in such a manner as ordered by the Engineer. Inserts shall be grouted in, and the cutting shall be done so that the grout can be thoroughly bonded and keyed to the existing structure. Grout shall be so placed as to make watertight joints and shall be neatly finished off flush with the surface of the adjoining structure. Reinforcement steel which may interfere with the setting of inserts shall be removed from all openings cut in the concrete, unless otherwise specified or ordered.

The cost of making all pipe connections to work performed under other contracts shall be included as part of the work under the appropriate unit and lump sum items of this contract unless otherwise specified.

Water, Power and Sanitary District Equipment.

(21) The Contractor shall arrange for his own water supply, which shall be of quality to be approved by the Engineer, free from contamination.

The Contractor, if he so desires, will be permitted to use water from the Sanitary District mains where it is available and does not interfere with the work of the Sanitary District or the requirements of other contractors on the site. The Sanitary District, however, will not be responsible for any interruption of service, or possible inadequacy of the supply. The Contractor will be required to pay for the water so used from the Sanitary District mains at the current rate paid by the Sanitary District to the various municipalities for purchase of water, and shall, at his own expense, install a meter or meters of approved type for the measurement of the water so used. He will be required to make such temporary connections as he may need, subject to the approval of the Engineer, and to restore all existing facilities prior to the completion of the work at no additional expense to the Sanitary District.

The Contractor shall arrange for his own supply of power.

The Contractor will be permitted the use, without charge, of washrooms and toilets in existing Sanitary District buildings, as approved by the Engineer.

The Contractor will not be permitted to use any Sanitary District equipment or facilities except in case of emergency or as specified herein. If such equipment or facilities are used in case of emergency, the Chief Engineer shall first give his permission and shall determine the cost of such use.

The cost for use of its facilities shall be paid to the Sanitary District on bills rendered monthly.

Safety.

(22) The Contractor shall be responsible for the safety of the Contractor's employees, Sanitary District personnel and all other personnel at the site of the work. The Contractor shall have a competent safety engineer (s) on the job at all times while work is in progress. He shall be provided with an appropriate office on the job site to maintain and keep available safety records and up-to-date copies of all pertinent safety rules and regulations.

A resume of the qualifications of the Safety Engineer must be submitted to the District and approved by the Engineer prior to the start of any field work. This resume shall include such items as; experience, education, special safety and first aid courses completed, and safety conferences attended.

The safety engineer shall:

Be completely familiar with all applicable health and safety requirements of all governing legislation and ensure compliance with same.

Schedule and conduct safety meetings and safety training programs as required by Law.

Post all appropriate notices regarding safety and health regulations at locations which afford maximum exposure to all personnel at the job site.

Post the name, address and hours of the nearest medical doctor; name and address of nearby clinics and hospitals, and the telephone numbers of the fire and police departments.

Post appropriate instructions and warning signs in regard to all hazardous areas or conditions.

Have proper safety and rescue equipment adequately maintained and readily available for any contingency. This equipment shall include such applicable items as; proper fire extinguishers, first aid kits, safety ropes and harnesses, stretchers, life savers, oxygen breathing apparatus, resuscitators, gas detectors, oxygen deficiency indicators, explosimeters, etc.

Make inspections at least once daily to ensure that all machines, tools and equipment are in a safe operating condition; that all work methods are not dangerous; and that all work areas are free of hazards and submit to the Engineer each day a copy of his findings on an inspection check list report form.

Also submit to the Engineer copies of all safety records along with all safety inspection reports and certifications from regulating agencies and insurance companies.

The Contractor shall report to the Engineer all accidents involving injury to personnel or damage to equipment and structures. In addition, the Contractor shall furnish to the Engineer a copy of all accident or health hazard reports prepared for OSHA.

All personnel employed by the Contractor or his Subcontractors whenever entering the job site, any shaft, or tunnel headings shall be required to wear approved safety hats.

The Contractor shall comply with all requirements relating to noise levels as specified in OSHA.

When the work is located on or close to roadways, the Contractor shall provide all necessary traffic control for protection of the traveling public.

The Contractor shall comply with the provisions of "State of Illinois Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices" or other pertinent governing regulations for traffic control.

Where work is in tunnel or for excavations more than 10 feet in depth, the Contractor shall also provide the following safety equipment, all subject to the approval of the Engineer:

Adequate stretcher units placed in convenient locations adjacent to the work;

Oxygen deficiency indicators;

Carbon monoxide testers;

Hydrogen Sulphide detectors;

Portable explosimeter for the detection of explosive gases such as methane; petroleum, vapors, etc.

An adequate number of U.S. Bureau of Mines approved self rescuers in all areas where employees might be trapped by smoke or gas.

In tunnel work an additional explosimeter shall be provided at the heading at all times which will continuously monitor for the presence of explosive gases. This explosimeter shall be the type that automatically provides both visual and audible alarms.

No employee will be allowed to work in areas where concentrations of airborne contaminants exceed Federal threshold limits. Respirators shall not be substituted for environmental control measures and shall be used only as prescribed by OSHA.

Internal combustion engines other than mobile diesel powered equipment shall not be used underground. All mobile diesel powered equipment used underground shall be certified by the Bureau of Mines as prescribed in OSHA.

All internal combustion equipment shall be operated in such a manner as to prevent any health hazards to personnel from exhaust fumes.

All haulage equipment such as hoists, cages and elevators operating in excavations and shafts shall conform to all requirements described in OSHA.

In addition to the safety requirements herein set forth, the Contractor shall comply with the health and safety laws, rules and regulations of federal, state and local governments, including but not limited to:

Safety Rules — Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, dated March 1, 1970 and as subsequently amended;

The Illinois Health and Safety Act approved March 16, 1936, together with all Amendments thereto and all rules and standards implementing said Act;

The Federal Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, which includes "Safety and Health Regulations for Construction", together with all Amendments thereto and all rules and standards implementing said Act.

As-Built Drawings.

(23) Upon completion of the work under this contract, the Contractor shall furnish to the Sanitary District one complete set of As-Built drawings.

The original reproducible Contract Drawings will be made available to the Contractor by the Engineer upon which the Contractor shall make the necessary additions and corrections to show the As-Built conditions. The changes shall be made by using opaque black ink and standard drafting techniques. Each drawing changed or unchanged shall bear the notation AS-BUILT near the title block and shall be signed as to its correctness by the Contractor and submitted to the Engineer for approval.

The Contractor shall include in the appropriate pay items of this contract, all engineering and drafting costs required to produce these As-Built drawings.

Open Burning.

(24) The Contractor shall not dispose of any material, debris or rubbish by open burning on the site of the work or on any other site, and shall comply with all rules and regulations of the Illinois Pollution Control Board (IPCB) in effect and as may be amended during the course of the contract.

Equipment Manuals.

(25) In addition to the requirements specified in Section (3) of the General Specifications, the Contractor shall provide 9 copies of an Equipment Manual for all equipment furnished. The Manual shall consist of bulletins, certified manufacturers' prints, as-built drawings of equipment, and other pertinent data which provide all information necessary to install, service, maintain, repair, and operate each piece of equipment, and shall include parts lists, service and maintenance instructions, and performance data.

The Manual must be submitted and approved prior to the beginning of the Operation Test as specified under Section (10) and of the Operating Personnel Training as specified in Section (27) of the General Specifications. Only 2 copies of the Manual will be required for purposes of review by the Engineer with 9 approved copies to be delivered to the Engineer prior to operation testing and personnel training.

The Manuals shall be bound in vinyl multi-ring binders bearing the contract title and number on the cover and in the window on the binder backbone. The inserts shall be 8½" x 11" in size, with any larger sized inserts folded to 8½" x 11". The Manuals must include an index and tabbed sheets, which will contain item numbers and descriptions in sufficient detail for easy reference to any particular piece of equipment included in the Manual.

Posting of Project Signs.

(26) Prior to the start of construction, the Contractor shall erect two 4' x 8' signs on the job site for public viewing at locations designated by the Engineer. These signs shall be erected in accordance with regulations of the USEPA and IEPA for grant funded projects. These signs will be furnished to the Contractor by the Sanitary District at storage locations on District property.

For each sign, the Contractor shall furnish and install (2) 6" x 6" x 14' long dense structural grade Southern Pine mounting posts which are to be set 4 feet into the ground and 5 feet apart (center line to center line). The bottom of the signs shall be 6-feet above ground. The Contractor shall also furnish (4) 3/8" x 10" long mounting bolts with nuts and washers for each sign.

These signs shall be maintained by the Contractor for the duration of the contract. Upon completion of this contract and acceptance by the Sanitary District, the Contractor shall dismantle the installed signs and deliver them to a place to be designated by the Engineer. All material furnished by the Contractor shall become his property and the site shall be restored to its original condition.

Operating Personnel Training.

(27) It shall be the Contractor's responsibility to furnish necessary training and instruction to make supervisory and operating personnel completely familiar with the operation and maintenance of all equipment installed under this contract. This training and familiari-

zation shall include coordination of new with existing control.

Such time as is necessary shall be devoted to this requirement and a log shall be kept up to date by the Contractor of such training including date, duration, equipment and/or systems covered and party or parties conducting and attending the instructions. When all Operating Personnel Training is completed the Contractor shall submit the certified log to the Engineer.

Proprietary Designations.

(28) When proprietary specifications are used in the contract documents followed by an "or equal" clause, they are intended to establish a standard of quality and not to inhibit the use of products of other manufacture.

Therefore, all processes, materials, devices, details, or parts specified by proprietary name shall be understood to mean and permit the use of other processes, materials, devices, details, or parts that the Engineer shall determine to be fully equal in suitability, quality and durability to the processes, materials, devices, or parts herein specified. The Engineer shall be the sole judge in determining equals of proprietary specifications and his decision shall be final and binding to both parties.

The foregoing shall be adhered to unless specifically noted to the contrary in the Detail Specifications. Such note will refer to this section.

Fire or Other Emergency.

(29) In the event of fire or other emergency occuring at or about the site of the work, the Sanitary District, at its option, may summon such aid as it deems necessary. The Sanitary District reserves the right to pay any third party for emergency services so rendered, and the Contractor shall promptly reimburse the Sanitary District for the amount of such payment. No liability on the part of the Sanitary District for cause of damage shall be inferred as a result of such aid being summoned, nor as a result of payment being made for such aid, and the Contractor hereby agrees to indemnify, keep and save harmless the Sanitary District from all claims, judgments, awards and costs which may in anywise come against the Sanitary District by reason of its summoning such aid and/or paying charges therefor. In the event that the Contractor summons emergency aid, the Sanitary District, at its option, may pay any party for emergency services rendered, and the Contractor shall promptly reimburse the Sanitary District for the amount of such payment. No liability on the part of the Sanitary District shall be inferred as a result of such payment being made, and the Contractor hereby agrees to indemnify, keep and save harmless the Sanitary District from all claims, judgment, awards and costs which may in anywise come against the Sanitary District by reason of its paying for emergency services rendered.

APPENDIX I

METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT
OF GREATER CHICAGO

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS—SEWERS

INDEX

THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS – SEWERS

(1) INTERFERENCE WITH OTHER CONTRACTORS

The Contractor shall so conduct the work that there shall be no interference with work which may be in progress under contracts with other contractors. In case of dispute between the Contractor and other contractors employed by the Sanitary District, the decision of the Engineer shall be final and binding on both the parties hereto.

The Contractor shall at his own expense repair any damage to machinery, equipment, masonry, buildings or other property of the Sanitary District or other owners or work under construction by other contractors occasioned by the Contractor in the execution of this contract. The disposal of tools, material, machinery and other supplies and appurtenances during storage and erection on the property of the Sanitary District or other owners shall be subject to the approval of the Engineer. The Contractor shall assume all responsibility for the security and safety of everything he may have on the property of the Sanitary District or other owners.

(2) EXAMINATION OF SITE

The Contractor is required to examine the site of the work and adjacent premises, the means of access to the site, and to make all necessary investigations in order to inform himself thoroughly as to the character and magnitude of all work involved in the complete execution of this contract; also as to the facilities for delivering, handling and installing the construction plant and other equipment and the conditions, and the difficulties that may be encountered in the performance of the work specified herein. No plea of ignorance of conditions that exist or that may hereafter exist, or of difficulties that will be encountered in the execution of the work hereunder, as a result of failure to make necessary examinations and investigations, will be accepted as a sufficient excuse for any failure or omission on the part of the Contractor to fulfill in every detail all the requirements of this contract, or will be accepted as a basis for any claim whatsoever for extra compensation or for an extension of time to complete the contract.

(3) LIMITS OF WORK

In order to prevent interference between contractors on adjoining sections, it is hereby agreed that the occupation of the space and the performance of work within a distance of fifty (50) feet on either end of the limits herein specified or shown on the plans, shall be such as the Engineer may direct. The Contractor shall perform any work ordered by the Engineer in writing, that is included within a distance of fifty (50) feet beyond either end of said limits, and such work shall become a part of this contract, and the Contractor shall be paid for said work performed by him at the unit prices herein specified for each class of work performed. In the event that the Contractor is ordered by the Engineer, in writing, he shall omit the doing of any work designated by the Engineer which is included within a distance of fifty (50) feet in either direction, from either of the end limits of this contract, and the Contractor shall not be paid for any work omitted and not performed by him, or for any anticipated profits on work omitted, and the work omitted may be performed by the Sanitary District or by any other of its Contractors. In any event, the Sanitary District shall not be liable to the Contractor for any damages or extra expenses for any decrease in the work to be performed hereunder, or for any expense that may result from any increase of the quantities of work, or from the performance of any work by the Contractor within a distance of fifty (50) feet beyond either end limit of this contract, in excess of the unit prices herein specified for work actually performed, nor shall the Sanitary District be liable for damages on account of the occupation by another contractor of the space within a distance of fifty (50) feet inside of either of the end limits of this contract.

(4) UNACQUIRED RIGHT-OF-WAY

All of the permanent structures to be constructed under this contract are located within the limits of public streets and highways and in right-of-way on private property which, if not now acquired, will have been acquired by the Sanitary District prior to the date of commencement of construction.

In case the Sanitary District fails to acquire any part of the right-of-way included within the limits of the work specified under this contract, as shown on the accompanying plans, on or before sixty (60) days after the approval of the Contractor's bond, and if, in the opinion of the Engineer, such failure to acquire such part constitutes or causes a delay in the commencement or prosecution of all or any part of the work under this contract, then the time of completion of the work to be performed under this contract shall be extended for such period of time as the Engineer may determine that the work under contract has been delayed by such failure to acquire the same, and such extension of time shall begin at the time of completion as specified in Article 23 of the General Conditions.

If such unacquired right-of-way is not acquired within nine (9) months after the approval of said bond, then this contract, insofar as it relates to work to be performed within the property where said right-of-way is unacquired, shall be null and void at the option of either party hereto, and the Sanitary District shall claim no damages against the Contractor for not performing any work on right-of-way which is unacquired, nor shall the Sanitary District be responsible for or pay any damages to the Contractor by reason of interference with his work due to the fact that all of said right-of-way has not been acquired, nor on account of anticipated profits on work of any kind not performed.

The Contractor will not be allowed to construct the work on private property until the easement has been obtained.

(5) LINE PIPES ON TUNNEL CONSTRUCTION

The Contractor shall place line pipes along the route of the work at such times and places as directed by the Engineer. The number of line pipes to be placed shall be determined by the length of the tunnel. Installation is to be at a rate of one (1) line pipe per one thousand (1,000) feet of tunnel on a straight line and one at each point of curvature and one at each point of tangency on a curve, all at locations designated by the Engineer. The size of line pipes shall be determined by the depth of the sewer tunnel to be constructed. The size shall be ten (10) inches finished diameter or smaller where the invert of the tunnel is one hundred (100) feet or less below the top of ground and ten (10) inches finished diameter or larger where the invert of the tunnel is more than one hundred (100) feet below the top of ground. The line pipes shall be made of steel. Line pipes shall be driven or placed by other methods in a vertical position from the surface of the ground to a point inside the structures to be built under this contract so that a plumb bob can be threaded through the pipe without contact with the pipe at any point. The top of each line pipe shall be provided with a standard screw cap, drilled and tapped for and furnished with a 11/2 inch plug. In addition, two (2) standard screw caps shall be furnished for use in checking the line. Each of the additional caps shall have holes drilled at locations ordered by the Engineer in order that a ~~plub~~ plumb bob wire may be threaded through any of the holes. If compressed air is used, each of the additional caps shall be drilled and tapped for and furnished with a 1/2 inch stopcock. The top of each line pipe shall be capped at all times, except when such pipes are being used for checking the line. The Contractor shall obtain any permits necessary for this work and shall repair all pavements damaged. The line pipes shall be removed for a distance of at least five (5) feet below the ground surface when not under pavement and at least two (2) feet below the top of any pavement. Where the line pipes project through the tunnel, the Contractor shall cut off the pipes to the outside neat lines of the tunnel and fill the opening with concrete and the balance of the pipe or the hole left by the removal of the pipe shall be filled with sluiced sand before the surface of the ground is restored.

(6) STRUCTURES ENCOUNTERED

Various underground, surface and overhead structures are shown on the plans hereto attached. The location and dimensions of such structures where given, are believed to be reasonably correct, but do not purport to be absolutely so. These structures are plotted on the plans and profiles for the information of the Contractor, but information so given is not to be construed as a representation or assurance that such structures will be found or encountered as plotted or that such information is complete or accurate.

The Contractor therefore shall satisfy himself by such means as he may deem proper as to the location of all structures that may be encountered in the construction of the work.

The plans do not show the location of underground or overhead utilities serving the properties adjacent to the sewer to be constructed, nor highway drainage systems.

All structures or obstructions encountered during the performance of the work under this contract, whether shown on the plans or not, shall be relocated or protected from injury by the Contractor, except as hereinafter provided.

(7) CARE OF STRUCTURES AND PROPERTY

All poles, trees, shrubbery fences, pavements, sewer, water, gas or other pipes, wires, conduits, culverts, drainage ditches and manholes, tunnels, tunnel shafts, buildings and all structures and property along the route of the sewer to be constructed shall be supported and protected from injury by the Contractor, during the construction and until the completion of said sewer and appurtenances. The Contractor shall be liable for all damages to such structures and property and shall save and keep the Sanitary District harmless from any liability or expense for injuries, damages or repairs to the same.

In open cut work, wherever sewer, gas and electric pipes or conduits cross the sewer trench without cutting through the section of the sewer to be built under this contract, the Contractor shall support said pipes and conduits without damage to them and without interrupting their use during the progress of work under this contract.

Where said pipes or conduits cross the trench cutting through the section of the sewer to be constructed under this contract, the Contractor shall notify the private individuals, utility company, city, village or township who owns the pipes or conduits in order to move or rearrange them and shall cooperate with said utility company, city or village, or township in preserving service through said pipes or conduits, and all in accordance with the provisions of the ordinances, easements and permits of the contract documents.

The Contractor shall conduct the work so that no equipment, material or debris will be placed on or allowed to fall upon private property in the vicinity of the work unless he shall have first obtained the owner's written consent thereto and shall have shown his written consent to the Engineer.

All streets, pavements, roadways, parking lots, sidewalks, parkways and private property shall be thoroughly cleaned of all surplus materials, earth, and rubbish placed thereon by the Contractor, and such streets, pavements, sidewalks, parkways and private property shall be restored to as good condition as before the commencement of the work. Where sod has been removed or killed, new live sod shall be relaid as hereinafter provided. Where the areas have been seeded, top soil equal to that removed shall be placed, fertilized, seeded and rolled to the satisfaction of the owner of the land, as hereinafter provided. All trees, shrubs, and plants damaged shall be replaced at the proper season of the year with live growing stock of the same kind and variety of reasonable size ordinarily used for planting purposes.

The Contractor shall make such changes in the location of all electric power conduits and cables and police and fire alarm electrical wires of the municipalities as may be rendered necessary by the performance of the work specified under this contract. Such changes shall be made at the places and in the manner designated by and be subject to the approval of the proper municipal officials, and the provisions of the ordinances, easements and permits of the contract documents.

The Contractor shall arrange with all persons, partnerships or corporations for the support, removal, relocation and/or maintenance of any conduits, wires, poles, pipes, gas mains, cables, or other structures within any portion of the streets, public alleys and highways and easements to be occupied or used during the performance of the work specified under this contract, and shall do all work necessary for such support, removal, relocation and/or maintenance of such conduits, wires, poles, pipes, gas mains, cables, or other structures encountered, as may be rendered necessary by the construction of said intercepting sewer and appurtenances.

The Contractor shall furnish all material and supplies, plant, staging and falsework, machinery, tools and implements, vehicles, cars and railroad tracks; in fact, all material and appliances of every sort or kind that may be necessary for the full and complete performance of this contract, and shall furnish and maintain, subject to the approval of the Engineer, all necessary barricades, and other protections, lights and signs, necessary for the proper protection of the public. The Contractor shall also furnish watchmen not only to protect the public, but to protect all materials, tools, machinery and equipment and all work performed by the Contractor until said work has been completed and accepted by the Engineer.

On all connection items, the Contractor shall make a preliminary trench excavation to locate the existing sewers and other utilities before he begins the actual work of excavation for the connection to be built at each location.

(8) WATER PIPES

Wherever, in the performance of the work specified under this contract, it shall be necessary to remove, alter or repair water mains in the streets, public alleys and highways of the municipalities, the Contractor will arrange for the removal, alteration or repair of such water mains, without extra charge to the Sanitary District, and in accordance with the rules, regulations and ordinances of the municipalities, under which this work is performed, subject to the approval of the proper municipal officials.

Wherever, in the performance of the work specified under this contract, it shall be necessary to remove, cut off or damage water service pipes in any way, the Contractor shall alter, repair or replace such water service pipes and connect the same to the water mains and shall in the meantime install and maintain temporary service in place of that interrupted, without extra charge to the Sanitary District. The Contractor shall perform all work on water service pipes in accordance with the rules, regulations and ordinances of the proper municipal officials.

Wherever it has been necessary to alter, repair or replace water mains or service pipes, the Contractor shall take adequate measures to disinfect the new section in accordance with AWWA standards. All work performed by the Contractor shall have the approval for standards and quality of the local public health agency having jurisdiction and shall be approved by them before placing the section in service.

(9) PUMPING, BAILING AND CLEANING

The Contractor shall at all times during construction provide and maintain ample means and devices with which to promptly remove and properly dispose of all water or sewage entering the tunnels, trenches, or other parts of the work, and keep said excavations as dry as possible until the structures to be built therein are completed. All water pumped or drained from the work shall be disposed of in a suitable manner without damage to adjacent property, or to sewers, pavements, electrical conduits, or other work or property. Until the acceptance of the work, the Contractor shall, if so ordered by the Engineer, keep the entire work pumped free of water and sewage and before the acceptance of any part of the work shall clean the entire length of such finished part of the work, to the satisfaction of the Engineer.

The Contractor shall make provisions to dispose of all accumulated surface water at the site. The Sanitary District does not and will not provide an outlet for or handle the disposal of any such accumulated surface water.

The Contractor shall place and maintain any temporary dams, flumes, bulkheads, or other structures, necessary to prevent water, from adjacent sections of the sewer or adjacent structures, from entering the work under this contract, and shall completely remove the same when ordered by the Engineer where emergency by-passing of sewage is required into either a receiving ditch, waterway or storm sewer, the Contractor shall chlorinate such flows as approved by the Engineer.

All expense incident to or caused by said water conditions or by such interruption of the work shall be included in the unit or lump sum prices herein specified.

(10) PLANT FOR TUNNEL CONSTRUCTION

Fireproof materials shall be used in all above ground tunnel plant structures, within 100 feet of the shaft. On all shafts, steel bracing and tight wood lagging will be required. In the tunnel construction, steel ribs and wood lagging will be permitted. The electrical service buildings may be constructed of either wood, steel or other material which, in the opinion of the Engineer, is acceptable.

An adequate ventilation system shall be provided to properly ventilate all sections of the tunnel in a manner satisfactory to the Engineer.

The Contractor shall have in operation in each heading at all times an audible automatic gas alarm. The alarm shall be Model No. 700 J–W Sentinal, Audible Combustible Gas Alarm as manufactured by Johnson & Williams, Inc., Mountain View, California, or an approved equal. In addition, the Contractor shall have on the job site approved portable testing equipment to measure for carbon monoxide and hydrogen sulphide gases and oxygen deficiency.

Sanitary conveniences for the use of all persons employed on the project shall be constructed and maintained by the Contractor in sufficient number in accordance with the State of Illinois Health and Safety Rules, and in such manner, and at such places as shall be approved by the Engineer.

Hoisting in shafts may be done by means of a crane upon written approval of the Engineer.

Cranes and other gasoline or diesel powered equipment must be kept 20 feet away from the shaft with the exhaust at least 30 feet away in order to keep the contaminated air away from the shaft area. However, in the event the Contractor elects to perform construction operations out of a single central shaft, cages must be used exclusively for hoisting men and materials during construction of the tunnels except during the construction of the shaft. Hoisting equipment shall be provided with all recognized safety devices including landing dogs at all landings, effective devices to prevent over-winding, and down speed regulators. Cages shall be of metal, fitted to metal guide bars running from top to bottom, safely constructed and properly equipped with strong metal covers, screens and automatic devices for the protection of persons riding in them.

An emergency exit shall be provided adjacent to each main shaft, in a manner satisfactory to the Engineer.

(11) PLAN OF TUNNEL FROM A CENTRAL SHAFT

If the headings exceed 1,000 lineal feet in length, the Contractor shall furnish a glass covered steel case at least thirty (30) inches by forty (40) inches of a type approved by the Engineer and shall mount the same in a conspicuous place near the top of shaft as soon as the shaft is constructed. The Contractor shall prepare a detailed plan on linen showing all parts of the shafts, plant and tunnels in the vicinity of the shafts and keep this plan complete and correct at all times, the Contractor shall keep this plan displayed in the above mentioned case.

(12) PROTECTION OF STREETS AND TRAFFIC

The Contractor shall make provisions, so far as is practicable, at all cross streets and private driveways for the free passage of vehicles and foot passengers by bridge or otherwise. Where bridging is impracticable or unnecessary, in the opinion of the Engineer, the Contractor shall make arrangements, satisfactory to the Engineer and the proper authorities, for the diversion of traffic and shall provide all material and signs and perform all work necessary for the construction and maintenance of roadways and bridges for the diversion of traffic. Where openings are made in or adjacent to any street, alley or public place, the Contractor shall at his own expense, furnish such barricades, fences, lights and danger signals, shall provide such watchmen, and shall take such other precautionary measures as are necessary for the protection of persons or property. All material excavated and the materials or plant used in the construction of the work shall be so placed as to safeguard the work and allow free access to all fire hydrants, water valves, gas valves, manholes or electric, telegraph and telephone conduits, and fire alarm and police call boxes in the vicinity. After completion of the work the Contractor shall remove all equipment, falsework, buildings, temporary protections, barricades, rubbish and unsightly materials that were created by his operations, and shall leave the work area and the adjacent premises in a clean and orderly condition.

The Contractor shall comply with the provisions of "State of Illinois, Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices" and any regulations for all traffic control devices erected on Sanitary District construction projects.

(13) REPAIRING OF PAVED STREETS AND SIDEWALKS

Roads or pavements, storm ditches, culverts, gutters, curbs, crosswalks and sidewalks destroyed or damaged by the Contractor, either in the construction of the work under this contract or by the hauling and storing of material other than that incidental to vehicular traffic on public streets and highways, shall be repaired or replaced by the Contractor without extra charge therefor.

If the destruction or damage is due to settlement caused by work in tunnel, the ground surface shall be brought to its original elevation and the pavement, storm ditches, culverts, gutter, curb, crosswalk or sidewalk shall be replaced immediately with new material by the Contractor.

If the destruction or damage is due to work in open cut, immediately after the trench or pits have been refilled, the paving, storm ditches, culverts, curb, gutter, crosswalk or sidewalk shall be temporarily restored and maintained by the Contractor, in as near the original condition as possible, using old materials at hand or such new materials as are necessary to keep the street safe for traffic, until it is repaved or the curbs, gutters, crosswalks or sidewalks are reconstructed.

(14) NEW PAVEMENTS, GUTTERS, CURBS AND WALKS

The Contractor shall obtain the consent of the Engineer and the appropriate Municipal, County or State authority having jurisdiction thereover, before constructing the permanent pavements, gutters, curbs, crosswalks and sidewalks in place of those destroyed or damaged. The Contractor shall construct the new pavements, gutters, curbs, crosswalks and sidewalks in a careful and thorough manner of like character to that destroyed or damaged, or of such other material as the Engineer shall order, provided the use of such other materials will involve no greater expense to the Contractor

The use of old material removed from the work shall be subject to the inspection of the Engineer, and any material rejected shall be replaced with new material. Any deficiency shall be supplied with new material of approved quality. The materials used and the manner in which pavements, gutters, curbs, crosswalks and sidewalks are restored shall conform to the requirements and specifications of the municipality or governmental agency under whose jurisdiction the work is done, and shall be subject to the approval of the Engineer. See Ordinances, Easements and Permits from the State of Illinois, County of Cook, Municipalities and other governmental agencies.

(15) HISTORICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SPECIMENS

The Contractor shall preserve and deliver to the Engineer any specimens of historic or scientific value encountered in the work as directed by the Engineer

(16) PLACING MATERIAL FURNISHED BY THE DISTRICT

The Contractor shall install in the work at locations to be indicated by the Engineer, any materials not included in this contract, or herein specified to be installed by the Contractor, which may be necessary to complete the work. All materials thus installed will be furnished at the site of the work by the Sanitary District at its own expense, but the Contractor shall perform such extra work in accordance with Article 7 of the General Conditions, "Extra Work". The Contractor shall carefully inspect all materials furnished by the Sanitary District at the time of delivery, shall reject and set aside all cracked, broken or otherwise defective pieces discovered by him, and shall notify the Engineer in writing of the same within twenty-four (24) hours after the inspection. The Contractor shall be responsible for all materials furnished by the Sanitary District, after they have passed the Contractor's inspection as being sound, until they have been accepted in the completed work. Any cracked, broken or otherwise defective pieces discovered after inspection by the Contractor shall be replaced at his own expense.

EARTH EXCAVATION–TUNNEL

(17) Work Included – Tunnel

Earth excavation in tunnel shall include the loosening, loading, removing and disposing in the specified manner of all materials, wet or dry, necessary to be removed for purposes of construction, the furnishing, placing and maintaining of all sheeting, bracing and lining, the pumping, bailing and cleaning, the protection of existing structures and utilities from injury, the protection and repair of street surfaces and sidewalks and all incidental and collateral work necessary to complete the entire work as specified.

(18) Lighting and Ventilation in Tunnel

All tunnel work shall be lighted with a sufficient number of electric lights to insure proper work and inspection. A supply of fresh air sufficient for the health, safety and efficiency of the workmen and engineers shall be provided at all times throughout the length of the tunnel and especially at the headings. Additional lights and ventilation shall be provided whenever the Engineer may direct.

(19) Shafts

The Contractor shall make all arrangements necessary for the location, construction and operation of the shafts.

The Contractor shall so excavate and support the surrounding earth so that at no time is there more than five feet, measured vertically, unsupported by bracing as approved by the Engineer.

In case the shaft is built outside the line of the tunnel, the tunnel connecting the shaft with the line of the finished work shall be constructed as provided in Section 7 of the General Specifications–Sewers.

The shaft shall be constructed of proper size and shape and in no case be less than 12 feet in diameter and shall be suitably equipped to allow the work to be carried on expeditiously.

An approved ladder as shown on the plans in a separate well lighted compartment shall be constructed in each shaft so as to provide safe entrance and exit. Suitable protection shall be installed at bottom of shaft to properly protect the men.

Hoisting in shafts may be done by means of a crane as described in Section 10 of the General Specifications–Sewers.

Upon the completion of the work, the Contractor shall remove any concrete as directed by the Engineer, and shall completely backfill all shafts, drifts and tunnels not part of the finished work.

Backfilling shall be done as specified herein under Sections 33 and 41 of the General Specifications–Sewers.

(20) Excavation In Tunnel

The tunnel shall be excavated and trimmed to such size and shape as will allow the placing of the full masonry section of the sewer to the specified tolerances of line and grade as shown on the plans after all lining is in place.

The Contractor shall so excavate the tunnel and support the surrounding earth that no movement of the earth over or adjacent to the work shall occur at any time and at no time will there be more than five feet, measured horizontally, unsupported by bracing as approved by the Engineer.

The Contractor shall use extreme care in excavating and trimming to insure that the full masonry section will be placed within the specified tolerances of the correct lines and grades of the finished structure.

If steel bracing is used, the full masonry section shown on the plans shall be placed inside any indentations in the body of the plates used to support the earth. Flanges or shapes may extend into the body of the masonry a distance not to exceed two (2) inches. If wooden bracing is used, no part thereof shall extend into the sewer section shown on the plans No additional payment or allowance of any nature will be made for the use of steel plates or shapes for supporting the earth.

If permission is given the Contractor to excavate the tunnel for a specified distance without immediately placing the concrete lining, the proposed method of bracing the tunnel and the extra bracing necessary shall be submitted for approval

In case, due to unforeseen conditions or otherwise, any movement of the earth over or adjacent to the work occurs, the Engineer may order any or all work under this contract stopped except that which assists in making the work secure and in preventing further movement of the ground over or adjacent to the work. The Contractor shall resume tunneling at the place at which movement of the earth over or adjacent to the work has occurred only when, in the opinion of the Engineer, he has taken all necessary precautions to prevent further movement.

The Engineer will keep a record of the elevation of all sewer, water and utility lines to detect any settlement of or damage to such utilities, and the Contractor shall immediately upon verbal notification from the Engineer, perform such work or make such arrangements that will restore any such damaged utilities and will insure against further settlement or damage.

(21) Sheeting, Bracing And Lining In Tunnel

The Contractor shall furnish, place and maintain all sheeting, bracing and lining required to support the sides, floor and headings of the excavation in tunnel.

On all shafts, steel bracing and tight wood lagging will be required. If the sewer is constructed with or without the use of compressed air, steel ribs and wood lagging will be permitted. Bracing in place supporting the earth shall not be removed except by permission of the Engineer.

A drawing showing the method and sizes of lining and bracing proposed to be used shall be submitted to and approved by the Engineer before the necessary materials or equipment is ordered by the Contractor.

Special care shall be exercised to insure that full bearing is obtained between the lining and sheeting and the earth.

If at any time the method being used by the Contractor for supporting any material or structure in or adjacent to any excavation is not reasonably safe, in the opinion of the Engineer, the Engineer may require and the Contractor shall provide additional bracing and support necessary to furnish the added degree of safety required by the Engineer. The Contractor shall provide such added bracing and support by such method approved by the Engineer as he may elect to use, but the taking of such added precautions shall in no way relieve the Contractor of his sole and final responsibility for the safety of lives, work and structures.

(22) Breasting

The Contractor shall at all times keep available near each heading sufficient breasting and bracing to secure the heading against soil movement.

(23) Unauthorized Excavation in Tunnel

Wherever excavation is performed outside of the specified outside dimensions of the masonry section to allow the placing of the sheeting, bracing or lining and whenever the Contractor is allowed to excavate beyond the lines of the finished work for his convenience, and whenever material outside of the specified outside dimensions of the section, caves or breaks into the tunnel, then the Contractor, without extra payment therefore, shall completely fill the remaining space with concrete of the quality specified for the sewer section or such other material outside of the lines of the finished work as the Engineer shall order.

(24) Disposal of Excavated Material – Tunnel

All excavated material, except that required for backfilling in open cut elsewhere on this work, and, except as stated in Section 15, of the General Specifications–Sewers, shall be removed from the site of the work as soon as excavated and shall be disposed of by the Contractor without additional charge therefor.

EARTH EXCAVATION–OPEN CUT

Sections 25 to 30 of the General Specifications–Sewers, inclusive, apply to the excavations for work in open cut shafts, pits or connections or excavations necessitated by cave-in.

(25) Work Included – Open Cut

Earth excavation in open cut shall include clearing the site of the work, the loosening, loading, removing and disposing in the specified manner all materials, wet or dry, necessary to be removed for purposes of construction; the furnishing, placing and maintaining of all sheeting, bracing and timbering; the pumping, bailing, fluming, cleaning, and care of existing structures and utilities; the protection and repair of street surfaces and sidewalks; backfilling and all incidental and collateral work necessary to complete the entire work as specified.

(26) Excavation – Open Cut

The excavation between the lines of sheeting shall be of sufficient width to permit the work to be constructed in the manner and of the size specified.

In all streets improved with any type of paving the Contractor shall, unless otherwise ordered by the Engineer, so excavate, sheet and brace the trench or pits that the maximum horizontal dimensions of the trench or pit at the surface of the ground shall not exceed the outside horizontal dimension of the structure plus one-tenth (1/10) of the distance from the street surface to the top of the masonry.

Top soil shall be stripped off separately and stored for replacement of top surface over the backfill.

(27) Sheeting, Bracing and Timbering

The Contractor shall furnish, place and maintain all sheeting, bracing and timbering required to properly support trenches and other excavations in open cut and to prevent all movement of the soil, pavement, or utilities outside of the trench or pit. Sheeting, bracing and timbering shall be so placed as to allow the work to be constructed to the lines and grades shown on the plans and as ordered by the Engineer.

All sheeting in contact with the concrete or masonry shall be cut off as directed by the Engineer and left in place.

If at any time the method being used by the Contractor for supporting any material or structure in or adjacent to any excavation is not reasonably safe in the opinion of the Engineer, the Engineer may require and the Contractor shall provide additional bracing and support necessary to furnish the added degree of safety required by the Engineer. The Contractor shall provide such added bracing and support by such method approved by the Engineer as he may elect to use, but the taking of such added precautions shall in no way relieve the Contractor of his sole and final responsibility for the safety of lives, work and structures. The use of such additional bracing and support shall be without additional cost to the Sanitary District. The failure of the Engineer to order the aforementioned additional bracing shall in no way relieve the Contractor of his sole and final responsibility.

(28) Backfilling

All backfilling of excavations in open cut on paved roads shall be done as specified in Sections 33 and 41 of the General Specifications–Sewers. All excavations in open cut shall be backfilled to the line and grades shown on the plans or to the ground surface as found where no lines or grades are shown on the plans. The backfilling shall be done as compactly as possible, and the material shall be well tamped in such a manner as to allow as little after-settlement as possible.

After the sewer or structure has been constructed and the concrete has hardened to the satisfaction of the Engineer, the Contractor shall backfill the trench in such a manner that will cause no damage to the sewer or structure by the shock of falling earth or otherwise. The backfill shall be deposited in such a manner as to prevent eccentric loading and excessive stress on the sewer or structure. Top soil stripped in excavation shall be replaced on top of the backfilled material.

All backfilling operations shall be accomplished as speedily as possible, the trench being filled as soon as the concrete is sufficiently set. In streets and in other places when the Engineer shall so order, the backfilling shall not be left unfinished more than four hundred (400) feet behind the completed masonry or pipe work.

Where existing structures have to be removed and backfilled or where additional fill or mounds are placed around manholes or ~~structures;~~ top soil equal in depth to that in surrounding area shall be placed in the backfilled section and fertilized, seeded and rolled to the satisfaction of the owner of the land.

Structures

All fill slopes shall be not steeper than 3 horizontal to 1 vertical, unless otherwise directed by the Engineer.

(29) Disposal of Excavated Material

All excavated material except that required for backfilling in open cut, and except that stated in Section 15 of the General Specifications–Sewers shall be removed from the site of the work and shall be disposed of by the Contractor without additional charge therefor.

As far as possible, all excavated material, except that required for backfill, shall be removed from the site of the work as soon as excavated.

(30) Unauthorized Excavation

Wherever excavation in open cut is performed without authority, beyond the lines and grades shown on the plans or as directed by the Engineer, the Contractor shall refill without extra payment therefor, all such excavated space beyond such lines and grades with concrete or other material as the Engineer may direct.

ROCK EXCAVATION IN OPEN CUT AND TUNNEL

(31) Description

All rock excavation shall be performed by the Contractor in accordance with Sections 17 to 30, of the General Specifications–Sewers, inclusive, as far as they apply and supplemented by the specifications for each excavation.

(32) Blasting

Extreme care shall be exercised in connection with all blasting necessary under this contract. Signals of danger shall be given and displayed before the firing of any blasts; and the Contractor shall conform his acts to and obey all rules and regulations for the protection of life and property that may be required by law or that may be made from time to time by the Engineer relative to the storing and handling of explosives and the firing of blasts. Whenever it becomes necessary to blast in tunnel, the amount of air used for ventilation shall be increased and the amount of explosive used at any one time shall be kept to a minimum and shall be so placed as to minimize the amount of rock breaking outside of the lines of the finished work. No blasting shall be done adjacent to any part of the completed sewer or other structure and the material surrounding or supporting the same shall not be damaged by blasting. In case injury occurs to any portion of the sewer or other structure or to the material surrounding or supporting same, due to explosions or blasting, the Contractor, without extra payment therefor, shall rebuilt the sewer or other structures and shall replace the material surrounding or supporting same, and shall furnish such material and perform such work or repairs and replacements as the Engineer may order.

The Contractor shall employ only experienced and qualified dynamite workmen to handle all powder and caps. Only licensed dynamite workmen detailed to dynamite magazines shall have access to these buildings.

The Contractor shall comply with the provisions of An Act Regulating the Manufacture, Possession, Storage, Transportation, Use, Sale or Gift of Explosives (Illinois Rev. St. Ch. 93, Section 143-156, approved July 12, 1939, and as amended). The Contractor shall obtain an Explosives License from the Department of Mines and Minerals, State of Illinois, in compliance with said Act, and submit a reproduced copy to the Engineer before proceeding with the storage of dynamite on this contract.

In addition, the Contractor shall comply with all the provisions relating to explosives of the State of Illinois Health and Safety Act and all requirements of authorities having jurisdiction in the area.

The Contractor agrees to indemnify and save the Sanitary District harmless against all claims for damages to real or personal property or for injuries to persons, or deaths caused in any manner whatsoever, by explosions, blasting, handling or storing of explosives for the work hereunder.

SAND, GRAVEL OR LIMESTONE BACKFILL

(33) Description

All excavations under or adjacent to any type of pavement, including concrete, concrete base, bituminous, gravel or crushed stone, shall be backfilled as follows:

Sand, gravel, limestone screenings or crushed limestone backfill shall be used from the bottom of the sewer trench or excavation up to a point where the distance to the top of the natural ground surface equals the distance from the nearest edge of the sewer trench or excavation to the pavement. ~~The sand, gravel, limestone screenings or crushed limestone shall be either torpedo, lake, bank, or mine run sand, sand and gravel.~~ It may contain material passing a No. 200 mesh sieve not to exceed ten percent by weight, but shall contain no organic matter. Material passing a No. 16 mesh sieve shall not exceed eighty-five percent by weight. [Not less than] Eighty-five percent of the material shall pass the one inch sieve and shall not contain stone larger than four inches. Backfill shall not contain any frozen or cemented material.

Sand and gravel material shall be obtained from an approved sand and gravel pit or limestone screenings or crushed limestone from an approved material yard or quarry.

Material removed from the excavated trench will not be allowed as backfill, unless it is approved by the Engineer as meeting the above specifications.

Cinders will not be approved as backfill.

PIPE SEWER

(34) Gasket Specifications

Gasket stock shall be a synthetic rubber compound in which the elastomer is Neoprene, exclusively. Said compound shall contain not less than 50% by volume of Neoprene and shall contain no factice, reclaimed rubber or any deleterious substances. The stock shall be extruded or molded and cured in such a manner that any cross-section will be dense, homogeneous and free from porosity, blisters, pitting and other imperfections. The stock shall be extruded or molded with smooth surfaces to the required diameter within a tolerance of $\pm$ 1/32" at any cross-section. The Compound shall meet the following physical requirements when tested in accordance with the appropriate ASTM standards.

TEST REQUIREMENTS

Tensile strength – 1500 psi minimum, ASTM Test Standard D412.

Elongation at Break – 425% minimum, ASTM Test Standard D412.

Shore Durometer Type A-45 ± 5 for pipe diameters less than 90" (55± may be used for pipe diameters over 90"), ASTM Test Standard D2240.

Compression Set – 20% maximum when compressed 22 hours at 158° F. ASTM Test Standard D395 Method B.

Accelerated Aging – 20% maximum tensile, 40% maximum elongation deterioration, 15 points maximum increase in hardness, all determined after oven aging for 70 hours at 212° F. ASTM Test Standard D573.

Liquid Immersion, Oil – 80% maximum volume change after immersion in ASTM Oil No. 3 for 70 hours at 212° F. ASTM Test Standard D471. Test specimens shall have a height or thickness of 0.08" ±0.005". The test specimens shall be circular discs cut from the gaskets. The specimen diameter shall be that of the cross-section of the gasket.

Liquid Immersion Water – 15% maximum volume change after immersion in water for 7 days at 158° F. ASTM Test Standard D471. Test specimens shall have a height or thickness of 0.08" ±0.005" (See note 4 under Section 7 of ASTM D471). The test specimens shall be circular discs cut from the gaskets. The specimen diameter shall be that of the cross-section of the gasket.

Ozone Cracking – no visible cracking at 2 times magnification of the gasket after 100 hours exposure in 3 ppm ozone concentration at 100° F. Testing and inspection to be on a gasket loop mounted to give approximately 20% elongation.

Durometer "A" – Hardness increase after 48 hours at + 14° F. + 15 points maximum.

The Contractor shall furnish certified copies of laboratory reports from his gasket supplier indicating conformance with the above requirements for each shipment of gaskets. A minimum of 2 tests for each pipe diameter shall be performed at the Contractor's expense on gaskets selected at random by the Engineer. Tests shall be performed by an independent testing laboratory and shall include all the tests listed above.

Each gasket shall be permanently marked with the manufacturer's trademark or name, date of manufacture, and the initials of the Metropolitan Sanitary District. All gaskets shall be stored in a cool place, preferably at 70° F. or less and in no case shall the gasket for joints be exposed to direct rays of the sun for more than 72 hours.

No more than two (2) vulcanized joints will be permitted on any one gasket.

(35) Laying Concrete Pipe in Open Cut

(a) Excavation

The trench shall be excavated in accordance with the depths and widths shown on the plans. Trench widths in excess of those shown on the plans will not be permitted.

Steel or wood sheeting shall be furnished and installed as required and its use shall be determined by the ground conditions encountered, easement agreements as specified or as directed by the ENGINEER and as shown on the plans.

Dewatering operations sufficient to maintain the water level at or below the surface of trench bottom or base of the bedding course shall be accomplished prior to placement of pipe or concrete, if not performed prior to excavation and placing of the bedding as called for on the contract plans. The dewatering operation, however accomplished, shall be carried out so that it does not destroy or weaken the strength of the soil under or alongside the trench. The normal water table shall be restored to its natural level in such a manner as to not disturb the pipe and its foundation.

(b) Laying Pipe

The concrete pipe shall be laid to the lines and grades shown on the plans.

Where practicable, pipe shall be laid with the bell or groove end at the advancing end of the pipe. Before laying, the joint surfaces shall be clean and free of all dirt and other foreign material. The gasket and the joint surfaces of the pipe to be laid shall be lubricated and the gasket properly placed in the groove on the spigot or tongue end. The pipe shall then be laid and pulled firmly into position. Care shall be exercised to see that the pipe is straight and level as the spigot enters the bell. The position of the gasket shall be checked with a feeler gauge to see that it is properly positioned.

If adjustment in the position of a length of pipe is required after it has been laid or if the gasket is found to be out of place, the length of pipe shall be removed, cleaned and rejointed as for a newly laid pipe.

Concrete cradle as shown on the plans shall achieve a compressive strength of 2,000 pounds per square inch prior to backfilling of the trench over a level as shown on the plans above the top of the pipe. Backfill below a level as shown on the plans above the top of pipe may take place after the concrete has achieved a sufficient initial set so that no damage to the concrete will occur when placing the backfill.

(36) Pipe Grade for Sewer in Open Cut

The tolerance in the grade of installed reinforced concrete pipe shall comply with the following:

The invert of the sewer after the pipe is in place shall be such that after flooding, the flood water will drain off so that no remaining puddle of water will be deeper than 1/2" on pipe 36 inches internal diameter or smaller, and 3/4" on pipe larger than 36 inches internal diameter. Any section of pipe that does not comply with this requirement shall be replaced at the Contractor's expense.

(37) Pipe Grade in Tunnel and Jacking

The tolerance in the grade of installed reinforced concrete pipe shall comply with the following: Departure from established grade – 2", Departure from established line – 3".

The return to established line and grade shall be at a rate no greater than 3" per 100'.

Any pipe placed which does not comply with this requirement shall be replaced at the Contractor's expense.

(38) Setting Line and Grade

The Contractor is responsible for setting line and grade from the information included in the Plans and Contract Documents, and in accordance with Section 8 of the General Specifications (Construction Contracts,) "Lines and Grades." No payment in addition to the price bid for the respective items will be allowed for setting line and grade.

The control of vertical and horizontal alignments shall be accomplished by the use of a laser beam instrument. The Contractor shall comply with the provisions of "an Act to Require Registration of Laser Systems . . ." Approved August 11, 1967, by the Illinois State Legislature and shall submit to the Engineer a reproduced copy of the acknowledgement of registration from the State Department of Public Health.

(39) Clay Sewer Pipe

The Contractor shall furnish and lay clay sewer pipe in accordance with the provisions for concrete pipe. See Sections 35,36,37 and 38 of the General Specifications–Sewers and as shown on the plans.

All pipe and specials shall conform to Specifications ASTM C13 or ASTM C200, as shown on the plans. Joints shall conform to ASTM Specification C425, type 3.

(40) Concrete Sewer Pipe

All reinforced concrete circular pipe shall be provided with bell and spigot or tongue and groove type joints for use with rubber gaskets as hereinafter specified. Excessive shrinkage cracks in the bell and spigot or tongue and groove ends or excessive bleeding at form ends which expose aggregates or create voids, or other defects or damage to the end of the pipe which would prevent making a satisfactory joint, as determined by the Engineer, shall be deemed reason for rejection of the pipe. The pipe shall have a preformed groove on the tongue or spigot face of each pipe section to properly position and confine the rubber gaskets in the annular space.

All reinforced concrete pipe shall conform to ASTM Specification C76. The pipe joints shall conform to ASTM Specification C361. All reference to a specific class of pipe and wall thickness shall conform to the requirements of that specified under ASTM Specification C76. The reinforcement steel in the joint shall be tied to the pipe barrel steel as called for in ASTM C361.

Gaskets for concrete pipe shall conform to "Gasket Specification", Section 34 of the General Specifications–Sewers. The gaskets shall be circular in cross section and shall be of sufficient cross-sectional area and volume so that when the joint is assembled, the gasket will be compressed to form a water-tight seal. Gaskets shall be extruded or molded and cured in such a manner that any cross-section will be dense, homogenous and free from porosity, blisters, pitting and other imperfections. The gaskets shall be molded or extruded to the tolerance as specified.

Any foreign material which adheres to the pipe and interferes with the proper seating of the gasket shall be removed. No cracked, broken or otherwise defective gaskets shall be used in this work. As the work progresses, the interior of the pipe shall be cleaned of all dirt and all other superfluous material.

Lubricant for use with the gasket shall be equal to the vegetable oil soap as manufactured by Davis Young Corp., Fort Wayne, Indiana, or a Bentonite Slurry diluted to a paste of consistency satisfactory to the Engineer. No petroleum product shall be used as a lubricant.

The Contractor shall submit to the Engineer for approval, detailed drawings of the pipe and pipe joint to be furnished and placed under this contract, including the dimensions of the rubber gasket and the joint in the assembled pipe position.

A tapered lifting hole in concrete pipe 36" in diameter and larger as indicated on the plans, if used, shall be filled with a fitted precast tapered concrete plug, coated with mastic and driven into place with wooden mallet. For concrete pipe placed in open cut the top of the plug shall be covered with cement mortar and hand trowelled so as to cover at least an area three inches greater than the opening. No lifting holes shall be placed in concrete pipe less than 36-inches in diameter.

The supplier of reinforced concrete sewer pipe shall submit for approval the design of pipe sizes not listed in the tables of ASTM C76. The information submitted shall show wall thickness, concrete strength, and the area, type, placement and strength of the steel reinforcement and shall meet the D-load strength test requirements as called for in the ASTM tables.

Reinforced concrete sewer pipe delivered to the job site shall be not less than ten (10) days old from date of manufacture and except for closure pieces, shall be not less than 6-feet nor more than 12-feet long unless otherwise approved by the Engineer.

On each reinforced concrete pipe manufactured, the following items shall be clearly marked on the interior surface of the pipe: (1) class and size of pipe; (2) Date of manufacture; (3) Name or trademark of the Manufacturer.

No reinforced concrete sewer pipe shall be delivered to the job site without the M.S.D. inspector's stamp affixed thereon, and shall be subject to re-inspection upon delivery to the job site.

(41) Backfill

In locations where the Permits, Easements, Ordinances or the Detail or the General Specifications require sand or other granular backfill, material shall be as specified in Section 33 of the General Specification - Sewers.

Where sand or other granular backfill is not required, regular backfill may be used. Regular backfill shall be a uniformly divided material free from debris, stones larger than 6", objectionable organic matter and frozen materials and must be capable of compacting to a dense, stable backfill free of after-settlement.

Backfilling, unless otherwise specified, shall take place in accordance with Section 28 of the General Specifications–Sewers or in accordance with applicable easements, ordinances or permits. The Contractor's attention is directed particularly to the backfill requirements of the State Highway Permit.

In locations where it is not specified that sheeting must be left in place, sheeting shall be extracted.

Sheeting shall be extracted where practicable ahead of the backfilling where this procedure can progress without endangering the side of the excavation and in such a manner as to leave no voids in the space previously occupied by the sheeting.

Sheeting extracted after backfilling shall be removed in such a manner as to preclude leaving voids in the space previously occupied by the sheeting and in such a manner as to be consistent with Sections 26 and 27 of the General Specifications–Sewers.

IRON CASTINGS AND MISCELLANEOUS METALS

(42) Description

The Contractor shall furnish, deliver and place iron castings, including manhole frames and covers, and miscellaneous metal parts, and such other iron castings and metal parts as are shown on the plans or as ordered by the Engineer. All pieces shall be plainly marked with the piece mark as called for on the plans. Painting, if required, shall be performed as called for in the plans and specifications.

(43) Material and Workmanship

All castings shall be of tough, close-grained gray iron, free from blowholes, shrinkage cracks and cold shuts. They shall conform to a suitable grade of the "Tentative Specifications for Gray Iron Castings," ASTM A48. They shall be sound, smooth, clean and free from blisters and all defects. All castings shall be made by the cupola process. No plugging of defective castings will be permitted. Where malleable castings are required they shall be furnished and installed hereunder and shall conform to the "Standard Specifications for Cupola, Malleable Iron," ASTM A197.

All castings shall be made accurately to dimensions shown and shall be placed, chipped, filed or ground where marked or where otherwise necessary to secure perfectly flat and true surfaces. Allowance for shrinkage shall be made in the patterns so that the specified thickness shall not be reduced. Manhole covers shall be true and shall seat at all points. All drilling and tapping shall be carefully and accurately done.

All wrought-iron parts shall be made of genuine wrought-iron conforming to the requirements of the "Standard Specifications for Refined Wrought-Iron Bars and Wrought-Iron Plates," ASTM A189.

Steel parts shall be open hearth medium steel of quality conforming to the "Standard Specifications for Structural Steel for Buildings," ASTM A36.

All parts called for on the plans as galvanized shall be coated in accordance with "Zinc Coating on Standard Steel Shapes," ASTM A123. All galvanized metals whose coatings are damaged during shipment or installation, shall be touched up with MSDGC 117 Zinc rich primer paint.

Bronze bushings shall be of good quality phosphor-bronze. All parts called for as chromium-nickel steel shall be made of a ferrous alloy approved by the Engineer.

The Contractor shall notify the Engineer when castings and material parts are ready for inspection. See Section 9 of the General Specifications (Construction Contracts), "Inspection and Testing of Materials".

(44) Bolts and Nuts

Stud, tap and machine bolts shall be of specified wrought-iron or of specified structural steel of rivet quality unless otherwise specified. In general square heads and hexagonal close fitting nuts shall be used. All threads shall be clean cut of the U.S. standard sizes.

(45) Inserts

All inserts to be imbedded in the concrete shall be heavily galvanized malleable castings suitably normalized and of a type approved by the Engineer.

(46) Cast Iron Pipe

All cast iron pipe shall be furnished in accordance with ASA Specification A21.6 or A21.8 with the type of joint as specified in the Detail Specifications and/or shown on the plans. Pipe shall be furnished in full lengths except where shown on the plans in lesser lengths or where necessary to make closure. Wall thickness designated by a class number shall be based on ASA Manual of Design A21.1.

All fittings shall conform to ASA Specification A21.10 at the pressure rating as specified in the Detail Specifications and/or shown on the plans. Where ASA A21.10 specification is not applicable, the fittings shall conform to ASA B16.1 Specification.

All rubber gasket joints for cast iron pipe and fittings shall conform to ASA Specification A21.11.

Fittings for pipes over 12 inches in diameter shall be Class B. Fittings for pipes 12 inches in diameter or less shall be Class D.

Wall pipes and wall sleeves shall be furnished with intermediate wall collars and shall have end types as shown on the plans and shall be Class B except where they extend beyond the outside surface of the wall in which case they shall be Class D.

Pipe and fittings shall be furnished bituminous coated inside and outside unless otherwise specified in the Detail Specifications and/or shown on the plans.

Cement linings specified in the Detail Specifications and/or shown on the plans shall conform to ASA Specifications A21.4. Pipe furnished with cement lining shall be bituminous coated on the outside.

Ductile Iron Pipe specified in the Detail Specifications and/or shown on the plans shall conform to ASA Specification A21.51 with all other requirements as listed above for cast iron pipe, except for wall thickness which shall be designated by a class number based on ASA Manual of Design A21.50.

(47) RESTORATION WORK

The Contractor's attention is directed to Section 7 of the General Specifications–Sewers, Care of Structures and Property.

Restoration work shall follow construction work as the work progresses and be completed as soon as possible. Restoration work shall not be delayed and shall be completed no later than thirty (30) days after sewer or structure is in place. Any testing or further inspection necessary for final completion and inspection of the sewer or structure shall not be cause for any delay of restoration work required under this contract. This provision for restoration shall include all public and private property which was affected by the Contractor's construction operations. Such final restoration that cannot be performed within the thirty day period due to adverse weather conditions may, upon written request, including a proposed procedure and time schedule, be performed as approved by the Engineer. Any delayed restoration will be contingent upon providing suitable safe temporary facilities without inconvenience or nuisance in the interim.

The Contractor shall maintain existing surface and subsurface drainage conditions in all areas along the line of the work, including highway ditches, storm sewers, culverts, natural terrain, field tile systems, etc.

Whenever public or private property is so damaged or destroyed, the Contractor shall at his own expense, restore such property to a condition equal to that existing before such damage or injury was done by repairing rebuilding, or replacing it as may be directed, or he shall otherwise make good such damage or destruction in a manner acceptable to the Engineer. If he fails to do so the Engineer may, after the expiration of a period of thirty (30) calendar days after giving him notice in writing, proceed to repair, rebuild, or otherwise restore such property as may be deemed necessary, and the cost thereof shall be deducted from any compensation due, or which may become due the Contractor under this Contract.

This provision for restoration work shall apply to all Items listed in the Proposal.

(48) TESTS

An infiltration test shall be made by the contractor in the presence of the Engineer after the first one thousand linear feet or less of sewer is completed, as ordered by the Engineer. Additional tests of the type ordered by the Engineer will be required for each succeeding one thousand linear feet or less, as ordered by the Engineer. A final test of the type ordered by the Engineer will be required prior to final acceptance of this contract. All tests will be conducted in a manner to minimize interference with the contractor's work or progress. No additional pipe shall be laid until the infiltration test on the section tested is satisfactory.

Where the depth of the ground water is not sufficient to completely submerge the section to be tested, an exfiltration test shall be used in place of an infiltration test when ordered by the Engineer. The Contractor shall be allowed additional payment for exfiltration tests in addition to the prices bid for sewer Items. The additional payment shall be the actual cost of the work to the Contractor and shall be determined on a time and material basis for labor, material and equipment.

No additional payment for infiltration tests in addition to the prices bid for Sewer Items to be tested as called for in the Detail Specifications will be allowed.

Personnel for reading measuring devices will be furnished by the Engineer, but all other labor, equipment, material and water, including gauges and meters, will be furnished by the Contractor.

Infiltration tests will be made by measuring the infiltrated flow of water over a measuring weir set up in the invert of the sewer a known distance from a limiting point of infiltration. Exfiltration tests will be made by bulkheading the section to be tested and admitting water to the lower end allowing air to escape at the upper end until the sewer is filled. The bulkheads must then be watertight and water will be added until a level of water four feet above the crown of the sewer in the manhole at the upper end of the section is attained. The rate of flow required to keep this required head will be the exfiltration. All tests will be carried on for a length of time and at intervals as ordered by the Engineer.

The infiltration or exfiltration shall not exceed 48-gallons per day, per inch of sewer perimeter per mile of sewer, and no individual leak will be permitted that in the opinion of the Engineer might endanger the pipe-line or the backfill around it. If the leakage exceeds the maximum permitted, the contractor shall immediately make all repairs and replacements that in the opinion of the Engineer are necessary to secure the required water-tightness.

After all repairs are made to the satisfaction of the Engineer, the Contractor shall again make an infiltration or exfiltration test and this procedure will be repeated until a satisfactory test is made, if and when ordered by the Engineer. The cost of any additional testing, as specified by the Engineer, will be at the Contractor's expense and at no additional cost to the Sanitary District.

The Sanitary District shall not be responsible for any damage to the pipe lines or otherwise due to testing.

(49) FLUMING AND BY PASSING

Flumes and by-passes shall be designed with sufficient capacity to carry the maximum storm flow without restricting the flow in the existing sewer. Plans and procedure shall be submitted to the Chief Engineer for approval before proceeding with the work.

(50) SIGNS

Project Construction Signs, if requested, will be furnished, erected and removed under a separate contract, at a location or locations as directed by the Engineer.

The general contractor may attach a tablet of his own to the signs at the place designated by the Engineer, of a size not larger than 9" x 36".

The cost of furnishing and erection of the signs shall not be included in the unit or lump sum price of the contract.

APPENDIX J

WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION INVENTORIES

Wildlife Found In The Calumet-Sag Channel Watershed

Key to Preferred Habitats

A. Open water on lakes or rivers
B. Ponds or sloughs
C. Shores of lakes, ponds or rivers
D. Marshes (not wooded)
E. Swamps (wet, wooded land)
F. Bogs
G. Open fields, meadows, pastures
H. Thicket, hedgerows, edges of woods, brushy abandoned fields
I. Woods
J. Parks, cemeteries, farms, orchards
K. Urban and suburban areas
L. Sand areas and hill prairies

Amphibians

	Habitat
Blue-spotted salamander[1/]	E
Spotted salamander	H
Eastern tiger salamander	FH-J
Central newt	BH
Mud puppy	A
American toad	G-I
Blanchard's cricket frog	B-F
Western chorus frog	G
Northern spring peeper	I
Eastern gray treefrog	I
Bullfrog	BCD
Greenfrog	BCD
Northern leopard frog	BCD
Wood frog	I

Reptiles

Common snapping turtle	ABCD
Musk turtle	AB
Blanding's turtle	AB
Painted turtle	AB
Red-eared turtle[3/]	A-C
False map turtle[4/]	A
Map turtle	AB
Eastern spiny softshell	AB
Western slender glass lizard[1/]	G
Six-lined racerunner	L
Eastern hognose snake	HIL
Western smooth green snake	GHK
Blue racer	H
Black rat snake[4/]	I
Western fox snake	G
Eastern milk snake	HI
Western ribbon snake[3/]	DEI
Eastern plains garter snake	G
Chicago garter snake	H
DeKay's snake	G-K
Northern red-bellied snake	G-I
Graham's water snake	A-D
Dirtland's water snake	BJ
Queen snake	AI
Northern water snake	AC
Eastern massasauga	DFG
Five-lined skink[4/]	GHI

Continued

Birds

	Habitat		Habitat
Pied-billed grebe	ABD	Upland sandpiper 2/	G
Great blue heron 4/	B-E	Spotted sandpiper 4/	BC
Green heron	B-E	Black tern 4/	ACD
Black-crowned night heron 1/	B-E	Rock dove	GJK
Yellow-crowned night heron 3/	B-E	Mourning dove	CG-K
Least bittern 3/	B-D	Yellow-billed cuckoo 4/	H-K
American bittern 1/	B-D	Black-billed cuckoo	H-K
Canada goose 3/	A-DG	Barn owl 1/	GJK
Mallard	A-E	Great horned owl	EH-J
Blue-winged teal	A-E	Screech owl	EG-K
Northern shoveler 3/	B-E	Long-eared owl 1/	I
Wood duck	A-EI	Whip-poor-will	EG-J
Cooper's hawk 2/	HI	Common nighthawk	G-K
Red-tailed hawk	GHJ	Chimney swift	ACDG-K
Red-shouldered hawk 2/	EHI	Ruby-throated hummingbird 4/	HIJK
Broad-winged hawk	HI	Belted kingfisher	BCDGJ
Marsh hawk 1/	DGHJL	Common flicker	EG-K
American kestrel	GHJK	Red-bellied woodpecker	HJ
Bobwhite 4/	G-J	Red-headed woodpecker	EG-K
Ring-necked pheasant	DGHJL	Hairy woodpecker	EH-J
Virginia rail 4/	CD	Downy woodpecker	EH-K
Sora	CD	Eastern kingbird	CDEGH
Common gallinule 4/	B-D	Great crested flycatcher	EH-K
American coot	A-E	Easter phoebe	CEG-K
Killdeer	CGJKL	Acadian flycatcher 4/	EHJ
American woodcock	CHIJ	Traill's flycatcher 4/	EHJ
		Least flycatcher	CH

Continued

	Habitat
Eastern wood pewee	EHIJ
Horned lark	GJK
Tree swallow	BCDG
Bank swallow4/	CBD
Barn swallow4/	A-K
Purple martin	B-DGJK
Blue jay	EG-K
Common crow	C-K
Black-capped chickadee	EH-K
Tufted titmouse	HIJ
White-breasted nuthatch	EH-K
House wren	EH-K
Carolina wren4/	H-J
Long-billed marsh wren4/	B-D
Short-billed marsh wren4/	B-D
Gray catbird	H-J
Brown thrasher	G-K
American robin	EH-K
Wood thrush	I
Veery1/	I
Eastern bluebird4/	G-J
Blue-gray gnatcatcher4/	H-J
Cedar waxwing	H-K
Northern shrike4/	GHJ
Starling	GHJK
Bell's vireo4/	H-J
Yellow-throated vireo	H-J
Philadelphia vireo	H-J
Warbling vireo4/	H-J
Red-eyed vireo	HJK
Prothonotary warbler4/	CE
Yellow warbler	GHJ
Ovenbird	HI
Common yellowthroat	GHJ
Yellow-breasted chat4/	H-J
Hooded warbler	EI
American redstart4/	C-K
House sparrow	CGHJK
Bobolink	DGJL
Eastern meadowlark	GJ
Western meadowlark	GJ
Yellow-headed blackbird	D
Red-winged blackbird	CDG
Orchard oriole	HJK
Northern oriole	HJK
Common grackle	EGHJK
Brown-headed cowbird	DEGHJK
Scarlet tanager3/	H-J
Cardinal	H-K
Rose-breasted grossbeak	H-K
Indigo bunting	GH-K
Dickcissel	G

Continued

	Habitat
American goldfinch	GH-J
Rufous-sided towhee	H-J
Savannah sparrow	GH
Grasshopper sparrow	H
Henslow's sparrow[3/]	DG
Vesper sparrow	GH
Chipping sparrow	GJK
Field sparrow	GJL
Swamp sparrow	DL
Song sparrow	EGHJK

Mammals

	Habitat
Opossum	G-K
Eastern mole	G-K
Masked shrew	HI
Short-tailed shrew	GHI
Least shrew	GH
Little brown bat	I-K
Keen's bat	H-K
Silver-haired bat	I
Eastern pipestrel	J-K
Big brown bat	G-K
Hoary bat	I
Red bat	HI
Evening bat	H-K
Raccoon	C-J
Long-tailed weasel	HJ
Least weasel	GHJ
Mink	CDEI
Striped skunk	G-J
Badger	G
Red fox	G-J
Gray fox	HI
Coyote[4/]	GH
Woodchuck	H
Thirteen-lined ground squirrel	GJ
Franklin's ground squirrel	GHJ
Eastern chipmunk	I
Eastern gray squirrel	I-K
Eastern fox squirrel	H-K
Southern flying squirrel	I
Beaver	B-F
Deer mouse	GJ
White-footed mouse	I
Meadow vle	GJ
Prairie vole	GJ
Pine vole	G-J
Muskrat	B-E
Norway rat	G-K
House mouse	G-K
Meadow jumping mouse	CG
Eastern cottontail	G-K
White-tailed deer	G-I

Plant Communities In The Calumet-Sag Channel Watershed

1. Floodplain Communities - Vegetation found in the floodplain areas along the streams of the watershed. Plant species must be able to withstand periodic flooding and wet soil conditions. Dominant plant species in this community are silver maple, willow, and cottonwood. Other species found in this community include green ash, slippery elm, and bur oak. Various forbs and grasses characteristic of hydrophilic soils are also included in this community.

2. Swamp Forest - Deciduous forest found in marshy areas which may or may not be adjacent to a floodplain or a Floodplain Forest Community. Tree species in this community must be able to withstand wet soil conditions, but not necessarily the periodic floods associated with a floodplain forest. One type of Swamp Forest Community has bur oak as the dominant species while slippery elm, green ash, and northern pin oak are the other species. The other type of Swamp Forest Community has green ash as the dominant species and also includes slippery elm, swamp white oak, and bur oak.

3. Midland Oak Forest - Deciduous forest of the midland areas in the watershed where oak trees are the dominant plant species. This community is found in the somewhat poorly drained to moderately well-drained soils that often occur along the terrace areas and relatively flat uplands adjacent to swamps or floodplains. It can also be found in depressions bordered by low hills. One type of Oak Forest Community identified has white oak and northern red oak as the dominant species with ash, basswood, sugar maple, and black walnut also present. In the other community, bur oak, red oak, northern pin oak, slippery elm, and black walnut are also present.

4. Midland Mixed Hardwood Forest - Deciduous forest of the midland areas in the watershed where hardwood tree species other than oaks are the dominant plant species. This community is found mostly along the outer margins of the terrace areas and flat uplands adjacent to wet areas and/or floodplains. It can exist on somewhat poorly drained to well-drained soils. Three different Midland Mixed Hardwood Forest Communities were identified within the watershed. One is a mixture of bur oak, hackberry, green ash, slippery elm, swamp white oak, black walnut, and basswood. In another sugar maple, northern red oak, and white oak are the dominant species while elm, ash, hackberry, and black walnut are the other species present. The third has sugar maple as the dominant species with ash, northern red oak, and white oak as the other species present.

5. Midland and Lowland Successional Communities - Transitional plant communities dominated by weedy forbs and grasses which are found in areas undergoing an ecological succession from a disturbed state, usually caused by man in this case, to a more stable natural state that contains plant communities able to survive the normal environmental conditions of these disturbed areas. These communities are often found in abandoned pasture and cultivated fields, or in areas that have been drained by man for agricultural use and then abandoned. Such disturbed areas are found in floodplains, terraces and flatlands adjacent to floodplains or other low areas, and in some upland areas. Midland and Lowland Successional Communities can exist on poorly drained to well-drained soils. In order for ecological succession to occur, however, these soils must be adjacent to areas of existing or pre-existing seed sources for the component species of the successional community. Three different Midland and Lowland Successional Communities were identified within the watershed. One type of community is entirely weedy forbs and grasses with no intrusion of woody vegetation.

*Dominant species in the context of this report are those species which are most prevalent in the plant community. These species are not necessarily dominant in the context of their effect on the environment of the community.

Continued

The typical plants of this community are goldenrod, red clover, fleabane, thistle, milkweed, timothy grass, Kentucky blue grass, fox tail, orchard grass, dock, and other weedy forbs and grasses. Another community has the same species of plants as the first but has an intrusion of woody plants such as elm, cottonwood, hawthorn, box elder, green ash, and black walnut. The third type of Midland and Lowland Successional Community has a dense community of successional woody vegetation. The dominant vegetation of these communities consists of the above mentioned trees. The difference between the two is that the trees have developed to the extent that one canopy touches another. This character gives the appearance of a successional forest.

Upland Hardwood Forest - Deciduous forest of the upland areas in the watershed where hardwood trees are the dominant species. This type of community is found on and adjacent to bluffs along the streams of the watershed or in the upland areas and/or outer margins of terraces behind such bluffs. It can exist on well drained soils. Three different Upland Forest Communities were identified in the watershed. In one the dominant plant species is white oak while shagbark hickory, bur oak, and northern red oak are the other tree species present. In another northern red oak is the dominant species with white oak, basswood, and white ash also present. Yet another has sugar maple, northern red oak, and white oak as the dominant species while white ash is also present.

7. Upland Successional Communities - Transitional plant communities dominated by weedy forbs and grasses which are found in upland areas of the watershed undergoing an ecological succession from a disturbed state caused in most cases by man's activities to a more stable natural state in which plant communities able to survive naturally under normal environmental conditions can exist. Upland Successional Communities are often found in abandoned pastures and fields in the upland areas of the watershed. They can exist on well drained to moderately well-drained soils, providing that these soils are adjacent to areas of existing or pre-existing seed sources of the component species of the successional community present. Three Upland Successional Communities were identified within the watershed. The plants of the first are composed of weedy forbs and grasses with no intrusion of woody vegetation. The difference between this community and the Midland and Lowland Successional Community is the upland character of the land. Another Upland Successional Community was found to consist of the weedy forbs and grasses of the first plus woody vegetation of hawthorn, cherry, oak, ash, and black walnut. The third community is similar to the successional forest character of the Midland and Lowland Successional Community but contains dense upland woody vegetation of oaks, cherry, hawthorn, and ash.

8. Cultivated Crops - Various types of plants cultivated by man primarily for use as food for himself and for animals. Cultivated fields are found in lowland, midland, and upland areas and on many different types of soils. The dominant plant species will vary from field to field depending upon the particular plant being grown in a field at the time.

Continued

9. Pasture - Grasslands used for grazing animals. Pastures are found in lowland, midland, and upland areas of the watershed and on many types of soils. The grasses found in a pasture must be hardy and are usually not native to the areas in which they grow. The dominant plant species will vary from pasture to pasture but the ones found most often in the watershed include orchardgrass, timothy, alsike clover, red clover, and tall fescue. A variant of this type in which oaks, often bur oaks, occur throughout the pasture may be designated an oak-savannah pasture.

10. Park - Lawn - Athletic Field - Golf Course - Cemetery - Airport - Communities dominated by grasses which are found in recreational areas and in areas where the scenic beauty of green plants is desired. These communities are found in lowland, midland, and upland areas of the watershed. The dominant species of grass involved will vary from area to area but the ones found most often in the watershed include rye, fescue, and Kentucky bluegrass.

11. Marsh - Plant communities usually dominated by forbs and grasses found in lowlands covered with shallow and sometimes temporary or intermittent waters. Three types of marsh communities were identified in the watershed. One has cattails as the dominant species. Another has reed canary grass as the dominant species. The third has prairie cord grass, sneezeweed, and Joe-pye weed as the dominant species. The wet prairie communities identified in the watershed have prairie cord grass, goldenrod, black-eyed Susan, sunflower, and prairie clover as dominant plant species.

12. Wet Prairie - Plant communities dominated by native prairie plants found in the floodplains and lowlands adjacent to floodplains. Plant species must be able to withstand wet soil conditions associated with these areas. The wet prairie communities identified in the watershed had prairie cord grass, goldenrod, black-eyed Susan, sunflower, and prairie clover as dominant plant species.

APPENDIX K

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS AND EPA RESPONSES

FOREST PRESERVE DISTRICT
of Cook County, Illinois

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS: 536 NORTH HARLEM AVENUE, RIVER FOREST, ILLINOIS 60305
COLUMBUS 1-8400 / FOREST 9-9420

Arthur L. Janura, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT

August 26, 1976

United States Environmental
Protection Agency
Region V
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Re: Tunnel Component of Tunnel and Reservoir Plan proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Calumet Tunnel System

Gentlemen:

In response to your July 1976 Environmental Impact Statement regarding the TARP proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the Forest Preserve District is vitally interested in the following:

1. Infiltration effects upon the Flora above the tunnel area are not indicated on any reports submitted to the Forest Preserve. This area in Cook County, Illinois is primarily an Oak, Hickory, Elm type forest. Changes in the upper water table shall have an adverse effect upon the Oak, Hickory and other species of Flora within the District's property. Temporary dewatering of the tunnels during construction shall also have a serious effect upon the Flora of the region. The District would appreciate receiving the answer to the effect upon the Flora by qualified experts.

2. What effect shall dewatering and infiltration have upon the District's recreation lakes that are fed by ground water? Shall this dewatering, due to infiltration during the life of the tunnel, and also during construction, have a deleterious effect upon the District lakes along the Des Plaines River by lowering the level of these lakes?

United States Environmental Protection Agency

3. The District serves the public in its use areas, primarily by drinking water wells which are constructed into the bed rock. Is it possible for these wells to become unusable after the construction of the tunnel, due to exfiltration? It should be noted that most of the length of the tunnel under Salt Creek and the Des Plaines River is under Forest Preserve District lands. Also, a large segment is under the North Branch of the Chicago River on District property. If city water is provided in the place of wells and fountains destroyed, who would construct the water mains, and maintain them, and pay for all the original and future costs?

4. Your statement on Page VIII-34 par. 8.4 Biological Resources, is not correct. Several drop shafts for the Calumet Tunnel are to be located on open space recreational lands of the Forest Preserve District. Many drop shafts and lateral sewers, also work shafts, would have to be located along Salt Creek, Des Plaines River and the North Branch of the Chicago River.

5. It should be noted that the stone mined from under the Forest Preserve District's land is owned as a mineral by the Forest Preserve District. The Forest Preserve District reserves the right to decide what the disposition of this mined material shall be.

This is to inform all parties concerned that the Forest Preserve District cannot make a proper assessment of this project until such time as the foregoing questions as to the effect the project shall have on District lands are answered.

Very truly yours,

Arthur J. Turek
Real Estate & License Engineer

AJT/lm

Response to Comments by the Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois

1. The depth of the tunnel is great enough (generally 200-300 feet) that only a minimal effect on the upper water table could be envisioned. A program of extensive subsurface exploration conducted by MSDGC has led to the conclusion that ". . . infiltration and exfiltration will not be a significant problem. Based on the results of water pressure testing, permeabilities of the dolomite were calculated and found to be extremely low."[1] Thus natural infiltration is calculated to be low and the grouting program will further reduce inflow. Any effect on water table height should be highly localized and would not be expected to impact surface vegetation.

   The effects on the biota of tunnel dewatering during construction are likewise anticipated to be minimal for the reasons indicated above.

2. Operation of the tunnel system is expected to have a beneficial effect upon the District's recreational lakes since the combined sewer overflows which currently threaten the quality of the lakes will be abated. Dewatering of the tunnels and infiltration are likely to have minimal effects upon the quantity and quality of the groundwater sources feeding the lakes for two reasons:

   - As noted above, infiltration rates are calculated to be very low and

   - Natural attenuation of pollutants in transport would minimize the harmful effect of any contaminants that should escape.

3. As stated earlier, the MSDGC-sponsored subsurface exploration program adequately demonstrated that ". . . exfiltration will not be a significant problem. . . The potential for exfiltration was examined using a computer model, under the conditions of the highest hydraulic gradient occurring with a repeat

---

1 Letter of 9/3/76 from Forest Neil, Chief Engineer of MSDGC to Henry Longest of USEPA, Region V, page 1, second paragraph. Letter is reproduced in this section.

of the largest recorded storm in the Calumet Area (1954 storm), the dolomite with the greatest permeability in the Calumet Area, and under a no tunnel grouting assumption. It was determined that exfiltration of pollutants would not be greater than 250 feet away from the ungrouted tunnels. Grouting would significantly reduce this distance. Any short-term exfiltrated water would return to the tunnel after the storm because of the positive inward pressure."[2] In addition, natural attenuation by soils would minimize the effect of any contaminants that should escape the tunnel.

An inventory of wells in the Calumet area conducted by the MSDGC showed that ". . . only one well, presently inactive, is located as close as 250 feet from the tunnel axis. Because of the lack of wells that may be affected by exfiltration and the very low permeability of the dolomite . . ."[3] it is highly improbable that city water will need to be provided to any residents of the area as compensation for well water contamination.

In the unlikely event that water mains need be constructed and city water provided, it is expected that the city government will bear the associated cost. Shared among the city's many taxpayers, this cost would be minimal.

4. This comment has been addressed by appropriate changes in the text.

5. MSDGC is aware of the rights of the Forest Preserve District to the rock mined from beneath its land and negotiations concerning the resolution of this potential problem are underway.

---

2 Letter of 9/3/76 from Forest Neil of MSDGC to Henry Longest of USEPA, pages 1 and 2.

3 Letter of 9/3/76 from Forest Neil of MSDGC to Henry Longest of USEPA, page 2.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SUBJECT: Review of Draft EIS for the Calumet Tunnel System

DATE: SEP 3 1976

FROM: Kenneth E. Biglane, Director
Division of Oil and Special Materials Control (WH-548)

TO: Regional Administrator
Region V

Attn: Planning Branch
EIS Preparation Section

The comments of the Office of Water Program Operations on the subject EIS are enclosed. If any of the issues raised by these comments require clarification, please contact John M. Hill, Chief, Environmental Evaluation Branch, 202-245-3054.

Project Description

Location: Chicago, Illinois

Project Action: The construction of a tunnel for the conveyance of combined sewer wastewater to a treatment plant. The Calumet system includes 37 miles of tunnel, 59 drop shafts, and 2 pumping stations. The system is part of the total TARP project, which includes the conveyance tunnels, storage reservoirs, and treatment plant upgrading and expansion.

Major Issues: Disposal of the excavated material from the tunnels may be a problem. The plans are not definite, but the proposal is to use existing quarries, private sales, and lakefront improvements. The construction of the reservoirs is questionable because of a lack of funding. The entire TARP project is estimated to cost $3. 54 billion, of which $378. 2 million is for the Calumet tunnel system.

Enclosure

EPA Form 1320-6 (Rev. 6-72)

Office of Water Program Operations
Comments on the Draft EIS
for the Calumet System of TARP

1. The TARP system includes three conveyance tunnel systems, one of them being the Calumet. A separate EIS is to be written for each of the three. Each EIS addresses the cumulative impacts of constructing and operating all three tunnel systems, and where appropriate, the effects associated with the specific tunnel section under consideration. From reading the first two EISs (Mainstream and Calumet), the large amount of duplication is evident. Apparently, a single EIS for both systems could have been written with no more than a 5% increase in pages. A clear rationale for segmenting the EISs was not provided. We suggest that consideration be given to either combining the EIS's or using the previous EIS as a reference.

2. The EIS is rather indefinite as to the disposal of the large amounts of excavated material. This is particularly apparent when consideration is given to the possible excavation of the reservoirs. Definite plans, which could provide for more than one disposal method, should be made prior to issuance of the final EIS. Space appears to exist for the material from the Calumet tunnel in Thornton Quarry, but the combined material from all three tunnel systems (and the reservoirs) could be a problem.

3. The Chicago Lakefront Plan depends on suitable material from the TARP project to construct the parklands, sheltered areas and islands that are mentioned as alternatives (p. III-13). The EIS should explain that, although the construction of the tunnel would make excavated material available, EPA is not explicity endorsing the Plan and that the Plan would be subject to environmental analysis by the sponsoring agency, particularly in connection with any required Federal actions such as COE permits etc.

4. The EIS is organized such that the proposed action, the Calumet tunnel, often receives less emphasis than the related actions. This is exemplified in Section 6.2.4 which discusses the disposal of excavated material from the reservoirs prior to that from the tunnel. We suggest that, for future EISs, the proposed action be more clearly identifiable and that descriptions of related projects and their impacts be addressed in separate sections. In this EIS, the pollution control purpose of the tunnel system is somewhat lost among the extensive discussions on the other portions of the TARP project--portions which will be constructed several years in the future, if at all.

5. More emphasis should be given to the beneficial effects of the tunnels on water quality, particularly in the summary. Although admittedly the tunnels alone will not allow standards to be met, they will improve the quality of the receiving waters.

6. Table IV-1 in the Summary shows no significant change in overflow reduction with the addition of the reservoirs. This should be corrected, since this would virtually eliminate the combined sewer overflows.

7. We understand that two tunnel demonstration projects including necessary grouting have been completed. The effectiveness of grouting for these projects should be presented in the EIS. This would help support the claim that the grouting program is expected to prevent extensive infiltration/exfiltration.

8. The impact of the Calumet tunnel on flood reduction is not expected to be significant and should be deleted from the summary (p. xxxvii).

9. The figure given on page VI-23 for the amount of excavated material from all Phase I tunnel systems is 17,620,000 c.y. (26 million tons). The figure given on page VII-15 is 12,000,000 c.y. (26 million tons). This discrepency should be corrected.

Response to Comments by Kenneth E. Biglane, Director of the Division of Oil and Special Materials Control, USEPA

1. The rationale for segmenting the environmental assessment into three parts was that the tunnel component of TARP was considered by EPA to be primarily for pollution control and the diverse impacts associated with the three major tunnel segments could best be addressed in three separate statements. It was felt that a unified EIS addressing all three tunnel sections in one document would prove incomprehensible to a lay reviewer. The present format, while involving a certain amount of duplication, nevertheless allows the reader to focus readily on impacts specific to his locale and to view these impacts in the broader perspective of the whole TARP project.

2. EPA is requiring as a condition of the grant that MSDGC identify and enforce disposal practices acceptable to EPA. This will include an identification by MSDGC of disposal sites and capacities as well as methods of transportation and disposal.

3. This comment has been addressed by appropriate changes in the text.

4. An attempt will be made in subsequent EISs to delineate more clearly the specific proposed action and its consequences while providing the necessary overview of the action.

5. The reduction of pollutants from overflow events is significant only to the extent to which it allows an upgrading in allowable water uses. While operation of the tunnel systems independent of the reservoirs will have a positive effect on water quality, as noted in the EIS, the reduction in pollutant loading will not be sufficient to enable an upgrading of water uses in the area. Only through implementation of the entire system, including tunnels, reservoirs, instream aeration and treatment plant expansion and upgrading will enhanced water uses be possible.

6. This comment has been addressed by appropriate changes in the text.

7. This comment has been addressed by appropriate changes in the text on pages VIII-18, 19.

8. On page xxxviii it is acknowledged that it is only through construction of the proposed reservoirs that the flooding problem will be ultimately solved.

9. Figures in the text have been corrected to read 12,000,000 cubic yards and 26,000,000 tons consistently.

217/782-3362

August 27, 1976

Mr. Kent Fuller, Acting Chief
Planning Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dear Mr. Fuller:

This is to follow up our oral comments on the Calumet TARP Environmental Impact Statement made at the public hearing in Chicago on the evening of August 24, 1976.

That hearing was an adequate opportunity for us to state our comments. We, therefore, do not intend to submit additional written comments.

I should mention that, after the hearing, Mr. Gray of my staff gave to the representative of your consultant, Mr. Moscati of Booz-Allen, Inc., a copy of informally prepared written comments. This was done to help Mr. Moscati use IEPA wording for suggested changes in the following items:

Table II-12 on State standards

Tax rate increases caused by TARP

Relationship between spoils disposal and reservoir planning

Grant eligibility for Phase II tunnels and reservoirs.

We enclose a copy of the informal comments given to Mr. Moscati.

Cordially,

Daniel J. Goodwin

Daniel J. Goodwin, Manager
Planning and Standards Section
Division of Water Pollution Control

DRG/mkp

Enclosure

August 23, 1976

Calumet TARP EIS

1. Page II-12, Table II-12.

   DO standards are incomprehensible. To indicate which waters are "secondary contact...", attach a map showing these streams (as listed IPCB Reg's, Section 302) shaded or cross-hatched. Also, revise Table II-12 as follows:

   Applicable Illinois Standards

Secondary Contact (1)	General Use (2)
3/2 (3) 5/4 (3) for N. channel	6/5 (3)

   (1) Secondary contact waters are shown on map, figure ________. All secondary contact waters change to a standard of not less than 4 mg/l at any time after 12/31/77.

   (2) All streams except secondary contact.

   (3) These standards shown in the form x/y mean not less than x mg/l 16 hours of any 24 hour period and not less than y mg/l at any time.

2. Page III-23, Table III-12. Still not clear. The decimal point has been moved over two places, apparently to change cents to dollars, but heading is still "¢/$100 Assessed Valuation. Table for O&M costs, p. IX-5, has heading "$/$100...". Are these headings right?

   These two tables should be explained better. They attempt to show economic impact on MSDGC area taxpayers, an item of great interest. But some terms are not adequately defined. For example, do the costs in Table III-12 include interest costs? If so, will those interest costs really be paid over a 10-year period?

3. Page III-28. Phase two tunnels should be discussed.

4. Page III-31 and other places: Reservoirs and Phase II tunnels are described as flood control projects, but MSD's modelling shows that the reservoirs and Phase II tunnels are necessary for water quality control. If these facilities are indeed necessary to meet stream standards, they should be eligible for USEPA grants, although when sufficient grant funds will become available is another question.

5. There is no clear description of how the reservoir will fit into the system. Will the "relief tunnel" slope to reservoir?

Also re reservoir: page VI-25 discusses disposal of spoils in Thornton quarry. How does this relate to using the quarry as a reservoir? What about future of commercial rock business at Thornton Quarry if it is to be used as a reservoir? Page VI-22 talks about excavating rock from McCook and Thornton Quarries to form storage reservoirs. Are they excavating Thornton Quarry for a reservoir or filling it with spoil?

6. Page VIII-25. Correction needed in statement about ammonia standard: 2.5 summer, 4.0 winter applies only to STP's PE $>$ 50,000.

7. Page X-7. EIS recommends groundwater monitoring. We should point out that IEPA will impose groundwater monitoring requirements in Permits. IEPA agrees. (Our statement on this subject was inserted; see page X-7.)

8. Possibility of using TARP spoils for lakefront fill discussed. Page III-13.

9. Re Fulton Co.: "The metropolitan area will probably continue to rely on the Fulton County site for disposal of sewage sludge...", page III-14.

10. Grant eligibility for "collecting structures" and drop shafts discussed on page III-20. Eighty-four percent eligible.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1. Comments have been addressed by appropriate changes in the text.

2. The necessary corrections have been made to both tables and text. The text in Chapters III and IX has been expanded to provide examples of tax impacts on homeowners. See pages III-22, 23 and IX-4, 5.

3. Phase II tunnels were not considered in the section referred to because they are not directly related to the attainment of water quality goals. However, the feasibility of including a brief discussion of the funding of Phase II tunnels as an overall part of TARP in the Des Plaines EIS is being considered.

4. The possibility of funding reservoir construction through the Corps of Engineers is currently being investigated by MSDGC in light of the fact that EPA funds will probably not be available when needed even if the reservoirs are judged to be grant eligible.

5. The tunnels slope downward to the reservoirs and at the lowest point the collected water is pumped upward into the reservoirs. Details of the system's design are provided in "MSDGC Facilities Planning Study", January 1975.

   Spoil disposal in Thornton quarry will be consistent with reservoir excavation plans since the quarry is large enough to allow disposal in a part of the quarry separate from the area to be excavated for a reservoir.

6. Comments have been addressed through appropriate charges in the text.

7. No response required.

8, 9 & 10 Comments have been addressed as appropriate in the text.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
219 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

NCCPD-ER

AUG 2 3 1976

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Region V Administrator
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dear Mr. Alexander:

In response to your letter of 23 July 1976, we have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Tunnel Component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago - Calumet Tunnel System, and have the following comments.

A supplement to this EIS should be prepared and circulated for comments when actual disposal plans for construction spoil are identified. The speculative disposal schemes outlined in this EIS do not present enough detail to adequately assess environmental impacts.

Statements on pages VI-2, VI-10, and X-2 indicate that sediments from tunnel shaft construction may runoff into navigable waters if proper sedimentation controls are not provided. If discharges are to be made, an Army Corps of Engineers permit may be required.

Since the proposed tunnel will be constructed in previously undisturbed sedimentary strata, protective or mitigative measures for any known paleontological resources should be discussed.

The source of water to be used in the recharge wells described on page VIII-19 should be given.

Results of specific studies that have been done to prove that there will be no exfiltration from the reservoirs to the groundwater supplies should be given in the Final EIS.

Scientific names should accompany the common names of all floral and faunal species listed in Appendix J to avoid confusion.

VANGUARD OF FREEDOM BICENTENNIAL 1775-1975 UNITED STATES ARMY

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

NCCPD-ER
Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.

AUG 2 3 1976

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review this statement. Please send us a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely yours,

Andrew C. Remson, Jr.

ANDREW C. REMSON, JR.
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY ANDREW C. REMSON JR,
DISTRICT ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

1. The identification of acceptable spoil disposal modes has been made a contingency of EPA's grant to MSDGC. The method for incorporating the public's review of disposal options has not yet been selected.

2. An Army Corps of Engineers discharge permit will be obtained if the situation indeed involves the release of sediment to any area waterways.

3. No paleontological resources are expected to be encountered during excavation activities at the planned depths of the tunnels.

4. The source of recharge water has not yet been specified since the need for recharge wells has not yet been clearly established. The amount of recharge water involved is not large at any rate.

5. The comments provided by MSDGC in the letter included in this section state that: "... The potential for exfiltration was examined using a computer model, under the conditions of the highest hydraulic gradient occurring with a repeat of the largest recorded storm in the Calumet Area (1954 storm), the dolomite with the greatest permeability in the Calumet Area, and under a no tunnel grouting assumption. It was determined that exfiltration of pollutants would not be greater than 250 feet away from the ungrouted tunnels. Grouting would significantly reduce this distance. Any short term exfiltrated water would return to the tunnel after the storm because of the positive inward pressure."

6. No confusion arises from the listing of floral and fauna as it is currently displayed.

THE
METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT
OF GREATER CHICAGO
100 EAST ERIE ST., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 . . . 751-5600

September 3, 1976

H.L. 9/7

Henry L. Longest II
Director, Water Division
United States Environmental
Protection Agency, Region V
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Subject: Draft of the EIS for the Calumet Tunnel System dated July, 1976

Dear Mr. Longest:

Some of the conclusions and recommendations in our opinion are inappropriate. The danger of a significant earthquake in the Calumet area and subsequent damage to the tunnels are overstated in Conclusion #2. The results of the extensive program of subsurface exploration indicates that no significant faults are present in the Calumet area. What faults are present are minor features that are not presently active. Therefore, the likelihood of an earthquake centered in the area is very low. Substantial damage to the tunnels from an earthquake occurring outside the immediate area is not likely because of the high intact strength of the dolomite rock in which the tunnels will be built. The dolomite in the Calumet area is, in general, not highly jointed and thus large blocks of rock are not likely to fall out of the tunnel periphery. For a further discussion on earthquakes refer to the report "Geology and Water Supply" Technical Report Part 4, 1972.

In regards to the discussion in Conclusion #4 on the potential effects of infiltration and exfiltration, the subsurface exploration program conducted indicates that infiltration and exfiltration will not be a significant problem. Based on the results of water pressure testing, permeabilities of the dolomite were calculated and found to be extremely low. Natural infiltration will be much lower than stated in the E.I.S. (see attachment No. 1). Grouting will reduce the inflow even more. The potential for exfiltration was examined using a computer model, under the conditions of the highest hydraulic gradient occurring with a repeat of the largest recorded storm in the Calumet Area (1954 storm), the dolomite with the greatest permeability in the Calumet Area, and under a no tunnel grouting assumption. It was determined that exfiltration of pollutants would not be greater than 250 feet away from the ungrouted tunnels. Grouting would significantly reduce this distance. Any short term exfiltrated water would return to the tunnel after the storm because of the positive inward pressure.

An inventory of wells in the Calumet area was made. Only one well, presently inactive, is located as close as 250 feet from the tunnel axis. Because of the lack of wells that may be affected by exfiltration and the very low permeability of the dolomite, the installation of monitoring wells appears unnecessary for the Calumet area. Pumping tests confirm the low permeability of the dolomite. There will be no need for recharge wells because of the low natural infiltration. Therefore, dewatering of the aquifer will not occur. In addition, a recharge test was performed during the subsurface exploration program. The results showed that the dolomite could not be recharged at a substantial rate because of the low permeability of the rock.

Regarding Conclusion #6 concerning the possibility of discharging water pumped out of the tunnels during construction into MSDGC's interceptor system, the distance from the construction shafts to the interceptors is too great in most cases for this to be feasible. In addition, the following general comments are offered:

1. Depths of proposed Tunnels are given as varying between 150 and 290 feet below ground. The lower limit should be 325 feet.

2. The length of the Calumet Tunnel System is given as 37 miles for the entire Calumet TARP System while it actually is 41 miles.

3. The storage capacity of the tunnels including Phase II is approximately 2000 ac-ft, not 1690 ac-ft as presented in the discussion of the entire Calumet TARP System.

4. The storage reservoir will have a capacity of 39,000 ac-ft, not 40,000 ac-ft as presented.

5. There are 7 construction shafts in the Phase I Calumet TARP System. Of these, 2 are also drop shafts. This should be clarified in the text.

6. The slopes and diameters of the tunnels and locations of some of the construction shafts for the branches of the Calumet Tunnel System are incorrect in some instances. For correct data, see Attachment No. 2.

7. Table IV-1 indicates "no significant change" in water quality for the Phase II complete TARP System as compared to Phase I. This is not correct because Phase II will reduce overflows to only 4 in the 25 years of runoff simulated, and furthermore water quality standards will be met even during these overflows. It should be emphasized that these 4 overflow events are for storms having very rare frequencies of occurrence.

8. The O'Brien Locks Pumping Station is not used for dewatering the tunnels as stated on Page V-21. This pumping station is used to pump water from the tunnels into the Calumet River only after the tunnels are full and it continues to rain. In the Phase I TARP System, this pumping station will reduce overflows entering the waterway on the Lake side of O'Brien Locks from 10 per year to 1 in 5 years and will speed-up the elimination of the tunnel surcharge in the entire Calumet System, further reducing the time frame for potential exfiltration.

9. There are no 2 ft. diameter drop shafts in the Calumet System as stated in the footnote on page VII-26.

10. The Calumet Treatment Plant serves the Calumet TARP System, not the West-Southwest Plant as stated on page VII-17.

11. The pumping station at the Calumet Treatment Plant is not a storm-water pumping station as alluded to on page V-27.

12. The interceptor connections as described on page V-20 are not relief points for the interceptors. They are structures which enable the full flow from small existing combined sewers to enter the interceptor, thus increasing the discharge in the latter. The interceptors are then relieved at other locations to prevent excessive surcharging.

13. The tax tables III-12 and IX-1 in the text are unclear and apparently incorrect. They should be reviewed and clarified.

14. No tunnels of the Calumet TARP will be constructed in the Brainard Shale, and thus any problems associated with tunnel construction in shale do not apply.

Henry L. Longest II
September 3, 1976
page four

15. Shale will not be an important constituent of the rock spoil.

If we can be of any further service to you regarding this matter, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

FORREST C. NEIL
Chief Engineer

FED:JHI/pl

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY FORREST C. NEIL, CHIEF ENGINEER, MSDGC

General: Mr. Neil's comments are very useful in delineating further the complex picture of subsurface conditions and the expected performance of the tunnel system under various operating modes. With respect to his comments on the likelihood of disruption of the tunnel system by a major earthquake, time may indeed prove the EIS's conclusion to be overstated. However, given the speculative nature of the discussion and the significance of the consequences of tunnel disruption for groundwater quality, EPA feels that its findings on this matter stand without significant modification.

With regards to infiltration and exfiltration there is strong concurrence that an effective grouting program can reduce impacts due to these phenomena to negligable proportions. This has been borne out by MSDGC's experience with their demonstration tunnels in which the grouting has been effective in preventing significant infiltration.

Specific: Comments 1 through 15 have been addressed by appropriate changes in the text.

THE CITY OF DES PLAINES

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

MEMBER ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

RICHARD F. WARD
Alderman 8th Ward
1410 Miami Lane
Des Plaines, Illinois 60018
(AC 312) 827-8715

September 3, 1976

COMMENTS ON JULY, 1976 USEPA DRAFT EIS ON THE CALUMET TUNNEL SYSTEM

The TARP Plan selected by the 1972 Flood Control Coordinating Committee on page IV-25 is not the "separated" plan that is being considered in the draft EIS. The FCCC selected a Calumet system that was connected to the McCook-Summit Reservoir. In your response to this comment, please include a side-by-side layout of the 1972 selected version and the current version. The draft EIS fails to detail the cost effective analysis of these 2 alternatives and why the current version was selected.

It seems reasonable to start with the fact that the processing capacity of the existing Calumet plant is available and should be utilized. And the "connected" 1972 option should reflect the present worth of the Calumet plant in the cost analysis. This of course is a contrast to the O'Hare situation where there is no existing plant in that non-cost effective separation decision.

Please send me a copy of the final EIS on the Calumet system so that possible further comments can be forwarded to CEQ within the 30 day comment peroid. Region V failed to send me a copy of the final EIS on the Addison to 59th Segment which effectively eliminated my opportunity to comment to CEQ as per the EPA regulations.

Richard F. Ward

Richard F. Ward

RECEIVED

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR
S & A Division, EPA, Reg

Response to Comments by Richard F. Ward, Alderman, 8th Ward, City of Des Plains

In any project of the magnitude of TARP minor changes in system design inevitably are made as the proposed plan undergoes regulatory review. Such changes usually reflect the recommendations of detailed engineering and economic studies and generally result in a more cost-effective investment of funds. Modifications made in the 1972 version of TARP selected by the Flood Control Coordinating Committee do not, as far as EPA has been able to determine, significantly affect the cost-effectiveness of that version relative to competing alternatives. In general the changes noted by Alderman Ward, including the separation of the Calumet and Mainstream systems, have been justified on the basis of the resulting improvements in system performance, stability and cost-effectiveness. A detailed comparison of the 1972 version of TARP with the version presented in the EIS is best done by reference to the MSDGC Facilities Planning Study, January 1975, and other MSDGC engineering and planning documents as well as the 1972 report of the FCCC.

With reference to Alderman Ward's comments on the Calumet Treatment Plant, it is problematical whether the processing capacity of the plant can be considered to be "available." This plant is old and in response to increasing waste loads over the last decade its effluent has declined in quality. In fact it is for this reason that a key provision of TARP calls for significant expansion of this plant. Thus the present worth of the Calumet Plant was not a major consideration in the 1972 version.

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

PEP ER-76/748

OCT 4 1976

EPA REGION 5 OFFICE OF REGIONAL

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Thank you for the letter of July 23, 1976, requesting our views and comments on the draft environmental statement for Calumet Tunnel System, Tunnel Component of TARP Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Cook County, Illinois. We have both general and specific comments arranged by page or section designation.

General Comments

One of our continuing concerns regarding the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan has been effects on wetland recharge. Measures to insure wetland recharge from surface runoff should be indicated. The statement should describe the adverse impacts of collecting and controlling surface storm water, of ground infiltration, and wastewater exfiltration on surface water levels and water quality of wetlands. The subsequent impacts on wetland resources, if any, are not addressed in the draft statement. An adequate discussion of these impacts and effects on fish and wildlife from surface construction should be included in the final statement. The intense development of the area makes those few remaining undisturbed areas valuable for fish and wildlife resources. Highly developed park lands have little wildlife value. Adverse effects on fish and wildlife habitat and resources of all areas should be discussed, not just that of the forest preserve areas.

Specific Comments

In Section 6.1.3 and 6.2.4, it is stated that the contractor is required to locate disposal points and dispose of settled solids and excavated material in an environmentally safe manner. The method of disposal will not be identified until the pre-construction meetings have been held with the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. We request the opportunity for our Fish and Wildlife Service to review and comment on the proposed disposal sites at that time.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

Section VII, paragraph 6.2.4 Tunnel and Reservoir Plan reports that about 165 million cubic yards of rock will be mined in the excavation of the reservoirs at McCook quarry and about 92 million cubic yards will be produced at the Thornton quarry excavation site. A large portion of this rock will be stockpiled for eventual sale by quarry owners.

Paragraph 7.1.5(2) Reservoirs states that "Release of this material on the market will probably be at the discretion of the quarry operators. Thus, no significant socioeconomic impacts are expected." This conclusion is not supported by data or facts in the environmental statement. The entire section should therefore be expanded. It should indicate annual and projected consumption of stone in the Chicago area, the number and location of quarries that supply the stone, and what portion of the market each shares. There should also be a discussion of potential impacts on the stone industry, as well as stone supply and costs to the public caused by the planned stockpiles.

We note that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago does not plan to monitor water quality along the Calumet System (p. X-7-8). We believe that the water quality monitoring program which EPA proposes as a special condition for all construction permits and grants is essential for safe and proper operation of the proposed system. Reasons for omitting the monitoring of the Calumet System should be provided in the final statement.

On page IV-20 (last Par.) the following comment is made: "The level of the ground water aquifer in the Niagaran formation is above the proposed tunnels in most places, and infiltration of ground water into the tunnels will result. The water flow will be at a sufficiently high rate, however, to eliminate the probability of aquifer pollution." This statement should be reconciled with the following on page VI-5, part (1):

"Infiltration results when the aquifer pressure level exceeds pressure level in the tunnel, except during severe storms. In this case, runoff water conveyed by the tunnels will raise pressure levels to a point greater than the aquifer's level. When this occurs, exfiltration will result rather than infiltration."

In view of the current high frequency of overflow from storm runoff (p. 1-6), it would seem that the anticipated frequency of such excessive pressure levels in the tunnel should be mentioned here.

In IV(7) of the Executive Summary, page xxxvii, Effects of Operation on Land Use, it is stated that "the quality of land... may be enhanced by reduced flooding conditions." While we agree that the developable potential of the riverbank land may be increased by the project, we do not believe this necessarily reflects enhanced quality. Indeed, the opposite may well be true. Use of verbiage such as "this under-utilized land" in the companion paragraph also indicates a lack of objectivity. These terms, enhanced quality and under-utilized as used in the report refer to economic development, rather than wildlife habitat, recreation, or open space. We believe that the Summary and Section 9.2.2 Sensitive Resource Areas, should be revised and clarified to reflect their exact meanings.

In previous comments on the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, we have recommended that the assurances given in the statement that the project would have no effect on historic and archeological resources reflect consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). We renew this request for the subject document.

An intent to contact the SHPO in order to investigate the possibility of encountering archeological resources is expressed on page xxxx and again on page XI-2. This commitment should also be included on page III-14 in Section 3.2.3, Archeological Sites, which now gives the impression that no archeological investigations of areas to be disturbed are planned.

Determinations concerning the presence or absence of archeological resources within the project area should reflect consultation with the Illinois Archeological Survey, 137 Davenport Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

With respect to the provision (expressed on pages xxxx, III-14 and VII-9) that the contractor will preserve and deliver to the Engineer all specimens of historic or scientific value discovered, such a procedures would not afford sufficient protection to archeological values. An archeological site consists of more than just artifacts; it includes the context in which the artifacts are found, the surrounding stratigraphy, and the relationship among artifacts. Loss of any of these components results in a corresponding loss of scientific value. Therefore, it is important that provisions be made to stop all work in the immediate area at the first sign of historic or prehistoric occupation so that the site can be evaluated by a professional archeologist.

We hope these comments and suggestions will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley D. Doremus

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator, Region V
Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Response to Comments by the U. S. Department of the Interior

General Comments

The proposed project should not have any adverse impacts because surface stormwater itself is not being controlled. The Phase I Tunnels will only handle those flows which are now reaching the combined sewer system. Drainage patterns will not be altered. The short-term impacts of construction on forest preserve areas are discussed because it is these areas which will be the location of several drop shafts of the Calumet Tunnel System. No other fish and wildlife habitat areas will be disturbed.

Specific Comments

1. The quantity of rock produced by reservoir construction is only mentioned for the purpose of putting the Phase I Tunnel spoil into perspective. Of the total rock to be produced by TARP, only about seven percent will come from the Phase I Tunnels. The detailed discussion of rock disposal from the reservoirs should properly be addressed in any specific EIS for that project.

2. Monitoring of the Calumet System will be a requirement of any grant awarded to the MSDGC.

3. The two referenced statements are not inconsistent since they refer to two different tunnel conditions; the first with little or no flows in the tunnel, and the second with full or surcharged flow in the tunnel. Surcharged conditions will not result each time there are overflows to the system.

4. The MSDGC has been contacted concerning the need to consult with the SHPO. This requirement will also be a conditon of any grant for the Calumet Tunnel System.

The following comment letters did not require a response.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
NORTHEASTERN AREA, STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY
6816 MARKET STREET, UPPER DARBY, PA 19082
(215) 596-1671

8400
September 1, 1976

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region V
230 South Dearborn St.
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Refer to: Draft Environmental Statement, Tunnel Component, Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Chicago, IL

Dear Mr. Alexander:

We view the disposal of construction spoil as having the greatest potential for adverse effect on the environment. The reality of these effects is difficult to assess since decisions have not been made on locations or methods of disposal. Of the alternatives mentioned, the filling of quarries would probably generate the least impact and would have the beneficial side effect of restoring land for other uses.

If landfill sites are used for disposal, efforts should be made to reduce erosion. Sowing or planting vegetation would aid in erosion reduction and produce a pleasing appearance.

We suggest that the Illinois Department of Conservation be involved in the discussions and planning prior to final disposal site selection.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this Draft Statement.

Sincerely,

D. O. Van Denburg

DALE O. VANDENBURG
Staff Director
Environmental Quality Evaluation

9/3/76 orig. to Mr. Longest.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology
Washington, D.C. 20230

September 9, 1976

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dear Mr. Alexander:

This is in reference to your draft environmental impact statement entitled "Tunnel Component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Calumet Tunnel System." The enclosed comments from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are forwarded for your consideration.

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to provide these comments, which we hope will be of assistance to you. We would appreciate receiving five (5) copies of the final statement.

Sincerely,

Sidney R. Galler
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Environmental Affairs

Enclosure: Memo from NOAA, Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratories

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory
2300 Washtenaw Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

August 20, 1976

TO : Director
Office of Ecology and Environmental Conservation, EE

FROM : Eugene J. Aubert
Director, GLERL, RF24

SUBJECT: DEIS 7607.54 - Tunnel Component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Calumet Tunnel System

The subject DEIS prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, on construction of Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan has been reviewed and comments herewith submitted.

Discussion of the environmental impacts of the proposed construction of Chicago Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Calumet Tunnel System is limited to the effects on Lake Michigan.

Water quality in Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Chicago area is gradually being degraded by the highly polluted surface runoff and by releases of flood waters from the canal system in order to forestall overbank flooding. Construction of tunnel and reservoir system will largely alleviate these conditions. If the proposed reservoirs are not implemented, the releases into Lake Michigan will persist.

Construction contractors will be responsible for the disposal of material excavated from tunnels and reservoirs. Disposal schemes outlined in the Statement are only speculative (Page VI-21). It is expected that the tunnel spoil will be either sold as construction material or disposed of in land fill areas. No effects on Lake Michigan are foreseen from these disposal methods. Contractors, however, can elect to use the excavated rock material for Chicago Lakefront Plan. One alternative of the Plan (Page III-13) recommends landfilling along the Lake Michigan shoreline and constructing numerous islands about a mile off shore. In this case, extensive effects, both beneficial and adverse, can be expected on Lake Michigan shoreline and a separate Environmental Impact Statement would be required.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

SPRINGFIELD 62706

September 9, 1976

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency - Region V
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Tunnel Component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan Proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, EIS #76-07-272

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the established rules and procedures for its implementation and in accordance with OMB Circular A-95 (revised) and the administrative policy of the State, the Illinois State Clearinghouse has reviewed the referenced subject. There are no apparent conflicts between this plan and the programs and policies of any cognizant agency.

The implementation of this plan will improve water quality in the Chicago area and therefore is recommended as an environmentally sound undertaking.

Thank you for allowing us to comment.

Respectfully,

T. E. Hornbacker
State Clearinghouse Coordinator

TEH:mc

9/13/76 orig. sent to Mr. Longest.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

MAILING ADDRESS
U.S. COAST GUARD (G-WEP-7/73)
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590
PHONE: 202-426-3301

5922/9.a
2 SEP 1976

Environmental Protection Agency, Region V
Planning Branch/EIS Preparation Section
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Gentlemen:

The concerned staff and operating elements of the Coast Guard have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Tunnel Component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan proposed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Illinois. The Coast Guard has no objections to the proposed project and at this time offers no comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft statement.

Sincerely,

R. F. EIDEN
Commander, U.S. Coast Guard
Assistant Chief, Office of Environmental
Protection Division
By direction of the Commandant

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

P.O. Box 678, Champaign, Illinois 61820

September 2, 1976

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator
Attn: Planning Branch-EIS Preparation Section
U. S. Envrionmental Protection Agency
Region V, 230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Dear Mr. Alexander:

The draft environmental impact statement for the Calumet System of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago's Tunnel and Reservoir Plan, Cook County, Illinois, forwarded to this office July 23, 1976, has been reviewed as requested. The following comments are submitted for your consideration.

The Chicago Metropolitan Area River Basin Study, which the U. S. Department of Agriculture provided planning assistance in, was coordinated with the TARP Plan. We do not anticipate any conflicts with Soil Conservation Service activities planned. Both agency plans should complement each other.

Efforts should be continued toward discovering productive uses for the spoil material.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Daniel E. Holmes
State Conservationist

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION *
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr.
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Attention: Planning Branch - EIS Preparation Section

Dear Mr. Alexander:

This is in response to your letter of July 23, 1976, requesting that the Department of Labor review the Environmental Impact Statement of the Proposed Calumet System of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago's Tunnel and Reservoir Plan. The statement has been reviewed and we have no comments.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. HEWITT
Administrator
Policy, Evaluation and Research

*New Name: Employment and Training Administration

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
536 SOUTH CLARK STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60605

NCDPD-SS

5 August 1976

United States Environmental
Protection Agency
Region V
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Attn: Planning Branch - EIS Preparation Section

We have no comments to offer on your Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Calumet System of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago's Tunnel and Reservoir Plan. Our Chicago District is reviewing the DEIS concurrently and may have some comments which will be furnished to you by separate correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN V. WEISS
Chief, Planning Division

Copy furnished:
Chicago District

VANGUARD OF FREEDOM
BICENTENNIAL 1775-1975
UNITED STATES ARMY

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

August 5, 1976

NIPC No. 76-A-066

Mr. George R. Alexander, Jr., Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region V
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

SUBJECT: NIPC Project No. 76-A-066 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Review of Environmental Impact Statement of the tunnel component of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan (Calumet Tunnel System) proposed by MSDGC.

Dear Mr. Alexander:

This is to acknowledge receipt of the plan document referenced above. We have assigned the NIPC Project Number shown above to your proposal. Please use this number on any communication with us pertaining to the proposal.

We are interested in reviewing the proposal as it relates to the current regional comprehensive planning and programming activities of our agency.

We will begin our review immediately on this proposal and contact you if additional material is required. Upon completion of our review, we will submit our findings to you for your information. Normally, a review of this nature takes 60 days, since review of federal assistance projects must take priority.

If you have any questions on the above, or need our comments sooner, please contact our Project Review Department.

Very truly yours,

W. S. Luhman

William S. Luhman
Associate Director

WSL:am

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS PLANNING COMMISSION
400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 454-0400

MATTHEW L. ROCKWELL
Executive Director

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976-760-506