

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/4/25 4:19 PM
Received: November 02, 2025
Status: Draft
Tracking No. mhi-8glh-17pt
Comments Due: November 03, 2025
Submission Type: Web

Docket: EPA-R05-OW-2025-1612

Marquis Carbon Injection

Comment On: EPA-R05-OW-2025-1612-0001

508_2 IL-155-6A-0001 Fact Sheet

Document: EPA-R05-OW-2025-1612-DRAFT-0077

Anonymous public comment

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

General Comment

From local observation and information available, Marquis Energy appears to operate multiple production wells in a rotation pattern — pumping one well until it runs dry, then moving to another, and repeating the process. When the first well partially recharges, it is used again. This cyclical drawdown-and-recharge process suggests that the total groundwater withdrawal from the Cambrian-Ordovician aquifer may be unsustainably exceeding the natural recharge rate from just the ethanol making so far. I ask that the EPA investigate whether this well-rotation pumping pattern has been disclosed or evaluated in Marquis water use reporting, and in the EPA draft permit, and whether cumulative aquifer impacts are being monitored.

I am asking about this rotating pumping pattern because even more water will be pulled out of the aquifer with this CO2 sequestration project.

2. The EPA holds individuals, farmers, and small businesses to strict standards when it comes to even the slightest potential for ground or water contamination. Any accidental spill, leak, or misstep must be reported and remediated according to a lengthy list of EPA regulations — often at great cost to the people involved. Yet when it comes to the Marquis BioCarbon Project, where the potential environmental impact is far greater and irreversible, the same level of scrutiny and caution appears absent. Where is that same stringent attention to possible groundwater contamination now?

How can the EPA justify taking a chance with the safety of our county's groundwater — our only source of drinking water — in approving a carbon sequestration project that injects CO₂ and industrial byproducts deep into the same geological system that sustains our wells? The EPA should apply its own standards consistently, regardless of the financial influence or size of the operator. Protecting our aquifer should take priority over accommodating corporate expansion.

3. I am concerned about what will happen if and when the super compressed CO2 compound meets the various acids and heavy metals in the J&L Pickling Solution's Well. What scientific research has been done and completed about the reaction that will happen when the two plumes meet?

I am requesting all reports, data, and studies the EPA or Illinois EPA used to decide the Marquis BioCarbon Project is safe for our groundwater.

Specifically, please send or make public:

- Any scientific studies or computer models showing what will happen if the injected CO₂ meets old industrial pollution, such as the J&L Pickling Solution waste.

4. What type of resources would Marquis be responsible to provide to the first responders for any CO₂ related incident?

I ask because around October 8th 2025 a five alarm fire occurred at the Marquis facility. To my understanding over 40 departments responded, one department all the way from a suburb of Chicago.

<https://www.wifr.com/2025/10/08/crews-battle-fire-chemical-manufacturer-hennepin-officials-say/>

This kind of multi agency response is at the tax payer's dollars. Why should the tax payers be responsible for Marquis' CO₂ Project if a catastrophe occurs and over 40 first responder departments have to respond to a CO₂ related incident?

Explain how the EPA will require Marquis to be responsible for the local and regional training, CO₂ specific equipment and safety of more than just Putnam County's first responders?

Thank you for your time and for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Anonymous