Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 04/18/2025

From: <u>mike-jem@consolidated.net</u>

To: <u>Hedges, Lynn</u>

Cc: "J Laurenzana"; Brown, Don; attorneygeneral@ilag.gov; mayor@taylorville.net; "Peter Chung";

contact@epa.gov; Fox, Tim; info@prairierivers.org; mayor@springfield.il.us

Subject: [External] RE: PCB 2025-043 Michael T. Laurenzana v. UNDESIGNATED BY COMPLAINANT

Date: Thursday, April 17, 2025 8:24:54 PM

Dear Mr. Hedges,

I respectfully challenge the reasoning set forth in the Board's April 17, 2025, order denying my motion for reconsideration. While the Board asserts that its procedural rules are not merely "bureaucratic process" but instead essential for providing notice to all parties, this justification does not fully account for the nature of the initial filing and the circumstances surrounding it.

Procedural rules exist to ensure fairness and due process; however, rigid application of these rules should not prevent legitimate claims from being heard, especially when the intent of the filer is clearly established. While my complaint may not have strictly adhered to every technical requirement at the outset, the Board's refusal to determine whether the complaint was frivolous or duplicative prior to dismissing it suggests an overly narrow interpretation of procedural compliance. The Board did not dispute the merits of the complaint itself—only its procedural execution.

Furthermore, requiring an amended filing while imposing a strict deadline, and then dismissing the case outright when that deadline was not met, overlooks potential substantive concerns that may remain unaddressed. If the framework is meant to ensure proper notice, why was there no flexibility granted to allow the claim to be properly adjusted within reasonable procedural bounds? The dismissal of the complaint does not facilitate fairness; rather, it prevents legitimate concerns from being assessed on their merits.

Most critically, the stakes of this matter cannot be ignored. The lives of many depend on the decisions made by a small board of five individuals, none of whom are personally at risk from the dangers posed by the alleged violations. If a hazardous release were to occur, the impact on the community would be devastating, potentially leading to mass casualties. The dismissal of this complaint is not just a procedural matter—it is a direct obstruction of efforts to protect the people who would bear the consequences of inaction.

I urge the Board to reconsider its stance, not just from a procedural standpoint, but from a moral perspective. This case presents an opportunity to act with foresight and compassion rather than regret after it is too late. Safety and responsibility must take precedence over rigid formalities. A paradigm shift is needed—one that prioritizes the well-being of the community and ensures that legitimate concerns are addressed before irreversible harm occurs.

Sincerely, Michael Laurenzana

From: Hedges, Lynn < Lynn. Hedges@Illinois.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2025 12:48 PM

To: mike-jem@consolidated.net

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 04/18/2025

Subject: PCB 2025-043 Michael T. Laurenzana v. UNDESIGNATED BY COMPLAINANT

By this e-mail, the Illinois Pollution Control serves you with the attached Order of April 17, 2025.

State of Illinois - CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged or attorney work product, may constitute inside information or internal deliberative staff communication, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Receipt by an unintended recipient does not waive attorney-client privilege, attorney work product privilege, or any other exemption from disclosure.