1	BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
2	
3	MACHE MANAGEMENT OF THE INOTIC THE
4	WASTE MANAGEMENT OF ILLINOIS, INC.,)
5	Petitioner,)
6	vs) No. PCB 03-104
7	COUNTY BOARD OF KANE COUNTY,) ILLINOIS,)
8	Respondent.)
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS held in the
12	hearing of the above-entitled matter, taken
13	stenographically by Maria E. Shockey, CSR, before
14	BRADLEY P. HALLORAN, Hearing Officer, at the Kane
15	County Courthouse, 100 South Third Street, Room 240,
16	Chicago, Illinois, on the 14th of April, A.D., 2003,
17	at 9:15 a.m.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, 100 West Randolph Street Suite 11-512
4	Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 814-6983
5	BY: MR. BRADLEY P. HALLORAN, HEARING OFFICER
6	PEDERSEN & HOUPT,
7	161 North Clark Street Suite 3100
8	Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 261-2149
9	BY: MR. DONALD J. MORAN
10	On behalf of the Petitioner;
11	QUERREY & HARROW, LTD.,
12	175 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 1600 Chicago, Illinois 60604
13	(312) 540-7000 BY: MS. JENNIFER J. SACKETT POHLENZ
14	On behalf of the Respondent;
15	on behalf of the Respondent
16	ANCEL GLINK DIAMOND BUSH DICIANNI & ROLEK, PC. 140 South Dearborn Street
17	Suite 600 Chicago, Illinois 60603
18	(312) 782-7606 BY: MR. DERKE J. PRICE
19	
20	On behalf of the Village of South Elgin.
21	
22	
23	
24	

```
1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Good
```

- 2 morning. My name is Bradley Halloran. I'm with the
- 3 Illinois Pollution Control. I'm also assigned to
- 4 this matter entitled Waste Management of Illinois,
- 5 Inc., the Petitioner, versus the County Board of
- 6 Kane County, Illinois, PCB 03-104. Today is April
- 7 14, 2003, approximately 9:15 a.m.
- Before we get started on the
- 9 hearing, the respondent filed a couple of motions, a
- 10 motion in limine and a motion to bar on April 9.
- 11 The petitioner was instructed to file its response
- 12 by noon on April 10; however, I just received his
- 13 response.
- 14 Any further argument, Ms. Pohlenz,
- 15 regarding your motion in limine and motion to bar?
- MS. POHLENZ: Just one matter. I
- 17 think that we've covered everything within the
- 18 motion and we'll stand on it. However, with respect
- 19 to the one aspect of our motion seeking to bar
- 20 petitioner from presenting any argument or evidence,
- 21 on the last two pages of legal citations, a
- 22 compilation of legal citations, that are pages 9
- 23 and 10 -- no, I'm sorry -- on pages 5 and 6 of the
- 24 December 10, 2002 Walter letter or memorandum, I

1 would like to submit the following case in support

- 2 of that.
- 4 Board decision, People of the State of Illinois
- 5 versus Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company, 99-191.
- 6 In this situation, the Board was faced with an
- 7 analogous argument, and they received a motion in
- 8 limine to bar an expert from testifying concerning
- 9 Board records, public information.
- 10 And they granted that motion and
- 11 barred it stating that all the factual information
- 12 of that which this particular expert is expected to
- 13 testify is public information contained in Board
- 14 records or the result of application of in this
- 15 circumstance it was math to such information. The
- 16 witness need not testify about this type of
- 17 information for it to be considered.
- We agree that it's just an
- 19 argument. And this circumstance is that it's public
- 20 information available to everyone and, therefore,
- 21 it's not a circumstance where it was needed to have
- 22 any testimony on it or needed to be presented as
- 23 evidence.
- 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,

- 1 Ms. Pohlenz.
- 2 Could you introduce yourself and
- 3 who you're representing?
- 4 MS. POHLENZ: Yes. My name is
- 5 Jennifer Sackett Pohlenz, and I represent the
- 6 Respondent, the Kane County Board in this matter.
- 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,
- 8 Ms. Pohlenz.
- 9 Mr. Moran, would you like to
- 10 introduce yourself, and do you have any further
- 11 argument on Ms. Pohlenz' motion?
- MR. MORAN: Yes. My name is
- 13 Donald Moran. I represent Waste Management of
- 14 Illinois, Inc., the Petitioner.
- I haven't had an opportunity to
- 16 review the case that Ms. Pohlenz cites. It sounds
- inapposite to the issue that's been raised in the
- 18 motion to bar. What we're simply asking to do is
- 19 that we include within this record the full
- 20 memorandum that was provided by Mr. Walter to his
- 21 fellow county board members on December 10.
- That memorandum included two pages
- of what appears to be a xeroxed copy of the Smith
- 24 Hurd Annotated Statutes or some other legal treatise

- 1 that had brief summaries of various siting cases.
- 2 There's also notations on these two pages, which
- 3 evidently were made by Mr. Walter and which are
- 4 appended or included in that document, presumably,
- 5 in support of his memorandum in his attempt to
- 6 persuade other members of the County Board.
- 7 So I think for purposes of
- 8 inclusion, for purposes of completeness, that entire
- 9 document aught be in this record.
- 10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
- 11 Ms. Pohlenz?
- MS. POHLENZ: I would just object to
- 13 the statement evidently made by Mr. Walter, because
- 14 I don't believe there's any evidence before the
- 15 Hearing Officer in support of that statement.
- 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I'm
- 17 going to deny your motion in limine, Ms. Pohlenz,
- 18 especially if we all know it's a drastic measure,
- 19 and I'll allow you to object during the hearing at
- 20 the appropriate time if you feel the need especially
- 21 based on Mr. Moran's representations.
- 22 Also, the motion to bar certain
- 23 allegations in evidence in the posthearing briefs,
- 24 I'm also going to deny that motion. And feel free

1 by all means to raise that in your posthearing brief

- 2 at the appropriate time.
- 3 Briefly, to continue, I want to
- 4 state that the Petitioner, Waste Management, alleges
- 5 in its petition that the siting decision was
- 6 fundamentally unfair and that several findings
- 7 regarding the statutory criteria was against the
- 8 weight of evidence.
- 9 This hearing has been scheduled in
- 10 accordance with the Illinois Environmental
- 11 Protection Act and the Pollution Control Board Rules
- 12 of Procedure. It will be conducted according to the
- 13 procedural rules found in Section 107.400 and
- 14 Section 101, Subpart F.
- 15 It does look like we have about
- 16 16 or 17 members of the public. Are you all going
- 17 to make a public comment or testimony subject to
- 18 cross-examination? If I could just see a show of
- 19 hands, please.
- 20 (No response).
- 21 In other words, you can step up
- 22 here and be subject to cross but you would be sworn
- 23 in or you can just stand up here and state your
- 24 peace if you so choose, and we'll do that right

- 1 after the close of the case in chiefs.
- 2 MR. PRICE: (Indicating).
- 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Your name?
- 4 MR. PRICE: My name is Derke Price.
- 5 I'm the attorney for the Village of South Elgin. I
- 6 will be making a comment. I won't be offering any
- 7 testimony.
- 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Your
- 9 last name again?
- 10 MR. PRICE: Price, P-R-I-C-E.
- 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Just
- 12 a little background, as most of you know, I will not
- 13 be making the ultimate decision in this case,
- 14 rather, the Pollution Control Board will decide it.
- They're going to review the
- 16 transcript of these proceedings and the remainder of
- 17 the record and the posthearing briefs. My job is to
- 18 ensure that the hearing is orderly and a clear
- 19 record is developed so that the Board can have all
- 20 the proper information before it while it makes its
- 21 decision.
- 22 After the hearing, the parties
- 23 will also have an opportunity to submit posthearing
- 24 briefs, and we'll discuss the posthearing briefing

- 1 schedule on a short break. Also, public comment,
- 2 written public comment, is accepted and that will be
- 3 taken into consideration as well by the Board.
- 4 We've already introduced the
- 5 parties, and it's my understanding that there's
- 6 going to be no witnesses, is that correct, Counsel?
- 7 MR. MORAN: (Indicating).
- 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: So, I
- 9 guess, Mr. Moran, if you choose to do an opening or
- 10 present anything, this is the time to do it.
- 11 MR. MORAN: Yes. Mr. Hearing Officer,
- 12 all we would do as previously indicated is formally
- 13 offer the respondent's responses to our request to
- 14 admit, to formally make those part of the record.
- 15 But other than that document, we have no witnesses
- 16 to present. We have no other evidence or any other
- 17 documents we wish to offer.
- 18 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
- 19 Thank you. Do you wish to offer those at this time?
- MR. MORAN: I have one copy of this.
- 21 I'm not sure why I don't have a couple. I'd like to
- 22 submit this and then ask for leave to submit
- 23 additional copies to make the record complete. I
- 24 don't have an extra copy.

- 1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
- 2 Ms. Pohlenz, any objection?
- 3 MS. POHLENZ: Yes, Mr. Hearing
- 4 Officer. We object to the submittal of it to the
- 5 extent it is an offer of factual information on
- 6 which no claim of fundamental fairness has been
- 7 made, for example, stating recitation of the dates
- 8 on which certain Board Members were sworn in office.
- 9 Additionally, we object to it as
- 10 it is the first response, I believe, and not the
- 11 supplemental response that was filed, that is, the
- 12 full response on behalf of the respondent.
- 13 And, lastly, we object to
- 14 admission of pages 5 and 6 of the December 10, 2002
- 15 memo as that is publically available information.
- 16 And that summarizes the objections.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any
- 18 response, Mr. Moran?
- MR. MORAN: Yes. The document that
- 20 we're seeking to have admitted should have been part
- 21 of the County record when it was assembled. And the
- 22 principle reason for our submission of it now is in
- 23 my review of what was being maintained by the County
- 24 Clerk, the Walter memorandum was not maintained by

1 the County Clerk in its entirety. All we're seeking

- 2 to do is to ensure that the entire memorandum is
- 3 made part of this record.
- 4 With respect to the responses to
- 5 the request to admit, it's certainly my intent to
- 6 submit whatever the final version of those responses
- 7 were that were provided by the respondent. I
- 8 thought that's what I gave you, if it isn't, then
- 9 I'm happy to submit whatever their final responses
- 10 are.
- 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you want
- 12 to take a look at this again and see if they're in
- 13 here?
- MR. MORAN: Well, I really can't tell
- 15 because both of them were titled Responses to
- 16 Request to Admit. And without actually going
- 17 through and comparing the first one with the second
- 18 one, it would not be easy for me to do it. Maybe
- 19 Ms. Pohlenz could do it more readily if she could
- 20 recognize which version was the last version.
- 21 MS. POHLENZ: I believe it was titled
- 22 Supplemental but -- may I approach?
- 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Oh, please
- 24 do.

1 MS. POHLENZ: This is the first one.

- 2 And I'll just point as evidence to that paragraph
- 3 Number 15 in which it says: Pursuant to the
- 4 April 7, 2003 agreement of counsel for petitioner,
- 5 no response is provided at this time, and respondent
- 6 will supplement its response to petitioner's request
- 7 to admit and provide a response to request
- 8 Number 15 on April 8, 2002.
- 9 And this document is dated also on
- 10 page 8, April 7, so that is -- additionally, it
- 11 appears as though the document contains an Exhibit B
- 12 with no Exhibit A, and the response itself did not
- 13 have any exhibits attached to it. It was actually
- 14 the request to admit that had exhibits attached to
- 15 it.
- 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: If there's
- 17 nothing further, I'm going to deny your objections,
- 18 Ms. Pohlenz. I will accept Petitioner's
- 19 Exhibit Number 1 into evidence, again, it's
- 20 respondent's responses to petitioner's request to
- 21 admit with an attachment entitled Exhibit B. But in
- 22 any event, they're all coming in as Petitioner's
- 23 Exhibit Number 1.
- MS. POHLENZ: Just for the record,

1 Mr. Hearing Officer, if I may, Exhibit B, there was

- 2 no exhibits attached to our responses.
- 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I
- 4 think you've made that clear for the record. Thank
- 5 you very much.
- 6 Anything else, Mr. Moran?
- 7 MR. MORAN: No. That's all we have,
- 8 Mr. Hearing Officer.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: So you rest
- 10 your case in chief then?
- MR. MORAN: We'll rest and present our
- 12 arguments in our briefs.
- 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay.
- 14 Thank you.
- MS. POHLENZ: Ms. Pohlenz, do you have
- 16 any opening or --
- MS. POHLENZ: No opening. I will
- 18 reserve it for a brief closing. However, I would
- 19 like to seek judicial notice of two documents. The
- 20 first is Kane County, Ordinance Number 01281
- 21 amending Section 11-100 through 11-107 of the Kane
- 22 County Code, Rules of Procedure for the Regional
- 23 Pollution Control facility site approval application
- in an unincorporated area of Kane County.

```
1 This is the siting ordinance of
```

- 2 Kane County, and I would ask the Hearing Officer to
- 3 take judicial notice of it and to admit it.
- 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I
- 5 probably won't take judicial notice. Mr. Moran --
- 6 MR. MORAN: I have no objection
- 7 putting it in.
- 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right.
- 9 I'll accept it as Respondent's Exhibit Number 1.
- 10 MS. POHLENZ: Okay. And then the
- 11 second is Resolution Number 98-52, again, of
- 12 Kane County adopting the updated Solid Waste
- 13 Management plan and attached to that is -- and it's
- 14 a certified copy.
- 15 Attached to it is Volume 1 and
- 16 Volume 2 of the Kane County Solid Waste Management
- 17 plan five-year update dated November 19, '97.
- 18 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
- 19 Mr. Moran?
- 20 MR. MORAN: I'm not sure why that
- 21 needs to be part of the record, but I don't have any
- 22 objection to submitting it.
- 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So,
- 24 Ms. Pohlenz, if you could mark those exhibits as

- 1 Number 1 and 2, please.
- MS. POHLENZ: And, Mr. Hearing
- 3 Officer, I would ask because of -- just a technical
- 4 leave on admission of these for less than the nine
- 5 copies required for the actual Solid Waste
- 6 Management plan given its volume and then for it to
- 7 be on nonrecycled paper.
- 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: That's
- 9 fine.
- 10 MS. POHLENZ: I'm going to submit an
- 11 original and three copies of the Solid Waste
- 12 Management plan and an original and nine copies of
- 13 the ordinance, and I will give you a box if you
- 14 want.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. That
- 16 would be great. Thanks.
- 17 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN:
- 18 Respondent's Exhibit Number 1 and 2, admitted into
- 19 evidence.
- 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Anything
- 21 further, Ms. Pohlenz?
- MS. POHLENZ: No, Mr. Hearing Officer.
- 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Moran,
- 24 I assume no rebuttal?

```
1 MR. MORAN: No rebuttal.
```

- 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So
- 3 this is closed as far as the case in chiefs with
- 4 respect the parties.
- 5 Mr. Price -- and before -- I just
- 6 saw a couple other members of the public walk in.
- 7 Again, you're more than welcome, in fact, we
- 8 encourage it if you want to stand up here and give a
- 9 public comment not subject to cross-examination or
- 10 if you want to come up here and give testimony
- 11 subject to cross-examination. In the latter, you
- 12 would be sworn in. So do I see any show of hands
- 13 that -- other than Mr. Price that would like to give
- 14 public comment?
- 15 (No response).
- Okay. Mr. Price, you're on.
- MR. PRICE: Thank you.
- 18 Again, my name is Derke Price for
- 19 the Village of South Elgin. Now that the record is
- 20 established and closed, our only comment at the
- 21 hearing stage is we'll be -- we have leave to submit
- 22 a written amicus curiae brief and at the end we'll
- 23 do that, is to note the absence of something in the
- 24 record, which is the State of Illinois requires all

1 documents relative to a facility to be submitted to

- 2 the decision-maker.
- In this case, Waste Management
- 4 failed to submit what was required about the
- 5 Woodland landfill on which the facility exists. And
- 6 I'm just going to quote from their application
- 7 things that they said that indicate they should have
- 8 submitted far more in the record for the
- 9 decision-maker to consider.
- 10 In 2.2. of their application, it
- 11 says: Currently, portions of the facility are used
- 12 to support the existing operations at the Woodland
- 13 landfill. Features of the facility include the
- 14 existence of a tension basin, the access road, the
- 15 scale house --
- 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: If you
- 17 could slow down a little please for the court
- 18 reporter. I'm sorry.
- 19 MR. PRICE: That's right. I'm sorry.
- 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
- 21 MR. PRICE: -- as shown on drawing
- 22 Number 2. Prior to development of the transfer
- 23 station building, existing structures will be raised
- 24 in the potable well and septic field for the

- 1 existing office building will be abandoned.
- 2 It is our position -- they have,
- 3 again, referenced the Woodland landfill facility;
- 4 second, in the hydrogeological overview at 2.3.5.,
- 5 they say: The hydrogeology for the Woodland
- 6 landfill is described extensively in the
- 7 December 1993 significant modification permit
- 8 application prepared for the existing Woodland
- 9 Management II landfill operation.
- 10 That document was never submitted
- 11 to the Kane County Board for their consideration,
- 12 their study, their review, our cross-examination.
- 13 It's not a part of this record.
- 14 In Section 3, 3.13.3.2, detention
- 15 basin: The existing detention basin is currently
- 16 used by Woodland landfill to manage surface water
- 17 runoff from portions of the landfill. After
- 18 development of the facility, storm water runoff from
- 19 the Woodland landfill will continue to be routed
- 20 through the detention basis.
- 21 The detention basin is proposed to
- 22 be expanded to meet the storm requirements of the
- 23 storm water ordinance and to accommodate storm water
- 24 runoff from the Woodland landfill and storm water

1 runoff from the facility. None of the backup

- 2 information for calculating the storm water runoff
- 3 for the entire Woodland landfill site was provided
- 4 by Waste Management as part of its application that
- 5 is now in this record.
- 6 That information needed to be
- 7 provided to the Kane County Board so that they can
- 8 consider all of that information in making their
- 9 decision. Waste Management chose not to do that.
- 10 We will detail further things
- 11 about how Waste Management, by locating this
- 12 building within the attenuation zone of the
- 13 landfill, has failed to provide the structural
- 14 calculations necessary to consider exactly how it is
- 15 that those structures, those three different mounds
- 16 might be affected by locating a building there in
- 17 addition to the storm water and the hydrogeologic
- 18 information that we pointed out from their
- 19 application. The rest will be in our brief.
- Thank you.
- 21 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,
- 22 Mr. Price.
- 23 Anything further? Any members of
- 24 the public wish to step up here and talk about

1 anything on their mind relevant to the situation?

- 2 (No response).
- With that said, we'll go off the
- 4 record and discuss the posthearing briefing
- 5 schedule.
- 6 (Whereupon, a discussion
- 7 was had off the record.)
- 8 We're back on the record. We just
- 9 finished discussing the briefing schedule, and,
- 10 again, no members of the public wish to make a
- 11 comment or testify, so we've established that the
- 12 record will be completed by April 17. Hopefully, it
- 13 will be on our web site by April 18. The opening
- 14 for Waste Management is due on or before April 30.
- The brief for Kane County is due
- 16 May 12, and the amicus is also due May 12. The
- 17 reply by Waste Management is due May 19, there's no
- 18 mailbox rule that applies to those dates. I also
- 19 set the public comment due on April 25, and the
- 20 mailbox rule applies in that situation.
- 21 If there's nothing else, I'm
- 22 going to conclude this hearing, and I thank the
- 23 counsels for their professionalism. Thank you very
- 24 much -- Ms. Pohlenz, do you have something?

```
1 MS. POHLENZ: May I have one moment?
```

- 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure.
- 3 MS. POHLENZ: Will there be any
- 4 closing statements by petitioner?
- 5 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm sorry.
- 6 I thought you -- sure.
- 7 MS. POHLENZ: I have a brief closing
- 8 to present.
- 9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I'm
- 10 sorry.
- Mr. Moran, do you have a closing
- 12 to make?
- MR. MORAN: I have no closing to make.
- 14 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. I
- 15 assumed you were saving it for posthearing briefs,
- 16 but go ahead, Ms. Pohlenz, with your closing.
- MS. POHLENZ: This proceeding concerns
- 18 Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.'s appeal and the
- 19 Kane County Board's decision to deny Waste
- 20 Management's June 14, 2002 application to cite
- 21 Woodland transfer station. Waste Management has
- 22 appealed alleging two categories of failures: The
- 23 first, fundamental fairness in a conclusory sense
- 24 and then the second, a decision -- that the Board's

1 decision as to whether certain criteria were met was

- 2 against the manifest weight of the evidence.
- Waste Management has presented no
- 4 substantive evidence, no sufficient evidence
- 5 concerning any alleged fundamental unfairness today.
- 6 Further, the record fully and factually supports the
- 7 decision of the Kane County Board and, therefore,
- 8 Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.'s appeal should
- 9 be denied. The Kane County Board decision affirmed.
- 10 At this hearing, Waste Management
- of Illinois, Inc., had an opportunity to present
- 12 evidence to support its fundamental fairness claim.
- 13 What is that claim? Well, I've been trying to
- 14 figure that out myself during discovery, and I'm
- 15 still not sure of what's being claimed. But the
- 16 allegation, apparently, rests on an argument that
- 17 the procedural and legal standard used by the Board
- in making its decision were allegedly the wrong
- 19 ones.
- Now, putting aside and not waiving
- 21 the issue as to whether either of these apparent
- 22 arguments are even fundamental fairness arguments,
- 23 I'll reserve that for the brief. The procedural
- 24 portion of this argument appears to be based on a

1 four-page memo or letter dated December 10, 2002 by

- 2 Dan Walter to his fellow Board Members.
- Waste Management, apparently, is
- 4 saying that the memo if factually inaccurate, but
- 5 how? Waste Management doesn't specify, so I'm
- 6 unable to defend such fundamental fairness
- 7 allegations today. I'm, therefore, at a
- 8 disadvantage since I don't know what they're alleged
- 9 to be.
- 10 And I submit to you that by not
- 11 identifying these, Waste Management has waived them.
- 12 Waste Management of Illinois, Inc., also, I believe,
- 13 is claiming that it didn't have the opportunity to
- 14 respond to Walter's memo. This is interesting as
- 15 the Walter document is no more than a written form
- 16 of deliberation statements that can and are
- 17 presented by Board Members orally.
- 18 Waste Management has no right to
- 19 respond to Board deliberation be it oral or written
- 20 during the period of time that they're making their
- 21 decision. Now, what about the legal standard
- 22 argument? Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.'s
- 23 apparent allegation is that the Kane County Board
- 24 applied the wrong one?

1 It's nothing more than a manifest

- 2 weight argument cloaked as fundamental fairness so
- 3 that Waste Management of Illinois, Inc., can try for
- 4 a different standard of review on appeal. So where
- 5 does that leave us? Unidentified alleged factual
- 6 inaccuracies, response to a document that there's no
- 7 right to respond to, and misapplication of a legal
- 8 standard argument.
- 9 And I submit to you that this is
- 10 nothing more than carrying a grudge after a loss,
- 11 and it's willfully inadequate to prove that anything
- 12 about the fundamentally fair procedure of the Kane
- 13 County Board was unfair. This local siting decision
- 14 was fundamentally fair and is supported by the
- 15 record, and I ask that it be upheld.
- 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,
- 17 Ms. Pohlenz.
- With that, thank you very much.
- 19 Have a safe trip home, and I'll see you the next
- 20 time around. Thanks.
- 21 (Which were all the proceedings
- 22 had in the above-entitled cause
- on this date.)

24

1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)) SS.
2	COUNTY OF DUPAGE)
3	
4	I, MARIA E. SHOCKEY, CSR, do
5	hereby state that I am a court reporter doing
6	business in the City of Chicago, County of DuPage
7	and State of Illinois; that I reported by means of
8	machine shorthand the proceedings held in the
9	foregoing cause, and that the foregoing is a true
10	and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so
11	taken as aforesaid.
12	
13	
14	Manufa E. Ghanlana GGD
15	Maria E. Shockey, CSR Notary Public,
16	DuPage County, Illinois
17	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
18	before me this day of April, A.D., 2003.
19	
20	Notary Public
21	
22	
23	
24	