

PC#8

From: "Matt Varble" <mattvarble@hotmail.com>
To: TIPSORM@ipcb.state.il.us; FoxT@ipcb.state.il.us; CROWLEK@ipcb.state.il.us; THERRIAJ@ipcb.state.il.us
Date: 8/20/2008 7:29:31 AM
Subject: RE: Complaint about 8/18/08 IPCB Hearing in Peoria case AS08-10

8/20/08 Bloomington Pantagraph press coverage of IPCB hearing request made by WATCH:

<http://www.pantagraph.com/articles/2008/08/20/news/doc48ab90b375b7d920478572.txt>

RECEIVED
CLERK'S OFFICE

AUG 20 2008

STATE OF ILLINOIS
Pollution Control Board

>From: "John Therriault" <THERRIAJ@ipcb.state.il.us>
>To: "Matt Varble" <mattvarble@hotmail.com>,"Kathleen Crowley"
><crowleyk@ipcb.state.il.us>,"Tim Fox" <FoxT@ipcb.state.il.us>,"Marie
>Tipsord" <tipsordm@ipcb.state.il.us>
>CC:
><CAPITOLFAX@aol.com>,<dholt@cimedia.com>,<gwoods@clintondailyjournal.com>,
><newsroom@pantagraph.com>,<sjr@sj-r.com>
>Subject: RE: Complaint about 8/18/08 IPCB Hearing in Peoria case AS08-10
>Date: Tue, 19 Aug 2008 15:09:33 -0500

>Matt,

>We have received your email and docketed it as part of the AS 08-10 docket
>as Public Comment #6. It will be available in its entirety tomorrow for
>full text viewing and printing.

>>>> "Matt Varble" <mattvarble@hotmail.com> 8/19/2008 1:52 PM >>>>

>As an FYI I am also forwarding this email to the media. I have also
>contacted State Representative Bill Mitchell to also express my concerns to
>him about how this 8/18/08 IPCB hearing was conducted. What happened
>yesterday was extremely inappropriate and I expect something to be done
>about this.

>Thank You,

>Matt Varble, MBA, SPHR
>9966 Northridge Circle
>Clinton, IL 61727
>217-853-3836

>>From: "Matt Varble" <mattvarble@hotmail.com>
>>To: tipsorm@ipcb.state.il.us, foxt@ipcb.state.il.us,
>>crowlek@ipcb.state.il.us, therriaj@ipcb.state.il.us
>>CC: mattvarble@hotmail.com
>>Subject: Complaint about 8/18/08 IPCB Hearing in Peoria case AS 08-10
>>Date: Tue, 19 Aug 2008 09:49:21 -0500

>>To Whom it may concern:

> >

> >I was in attendance at the 8/18/08 IPCB hearing in Peoria regarding case
>AS

> >08-10. I have several procedural complaints about how the hearing was
> >conducted that need to be addressed:

> >1. ~~Peoria Disposal~~

> >The hearing officer Ms. Webb limited participation to no more than 10
> >minutes per person at the hearing and did not permit me to complete my
> >presentation yesterday. When I asked before I began speaking if I would
>be

> >permitted to make an oral motion, I was informed by Ms. Webb that I could
> >do so, and then in the middle of my presentation I was told that my
>motion

> >was going to be taken as a "request" instead. This was after the hearing
> >officer allowed the legal council representing Peoria Disposal to

>interrupt

> >and present arguments in response to my comments while I was speaking.

> >

> >2. The hearing officer allowed the legal council Ms. Clair Manning

> >(representing Peoria Disposal Company) to interrupt me when I was

> >presenting and allowed Ms. Manning to object and take control of the

> >situation and cut me off from speaking while I was making an oral motion

>at

> >the hearing and also discussing the needs and reasons for why a second

> >hearing needed to be scheduled in DeWitt County for this case.

>Additionally

> >Ms. Manning's interruption and objection took away the limited time that

>I

> >was allotted to speak. Additionally no time limit for people wishing to

> >speaking was announced at the beginning of the hearing and only happened

>after

> >Ms. Manning began objecting and attempting to obstruct me from making

> >public comments. Following my presentation there were several speakers

>that

> >exceeded 10 (uninterrupted) minutes of speaking that were allowed to

> >continue talking. Of the 27 people who made public comments I was the

>only

> >person who was interrupted. Additionally Ms. Webb stated time limits to

> >only those speaking in opposition to the proposed de-listing, but made NO

> >time limit reminder to Corporation Representatives from the Steel

>industry

> >that were speaking in favor of the delisting petition before the IPCB.

>This

> >had the appearance of bias on its face and must be addressed.

> >

> >3. The legal council for the IEPA that was present at the meeting began

> >knitting while the proceedings were occurring. Obviously this is a

>concern

> >I have as a citizen due to the apparent lack of seriousness that the

>State

> >IEPA has toward public comments at an IPCB hearing.

> >

> >Based on these above stated reasons I again assert that another hearing

> >should be scheduled and that a stricter adherence to rules and procedures

> >be followed during the public commenting process. I would appreciate

>these

> >concerns being looked into and addressed immediately.

> >

> >Thank You,

> >

> >Matt Varble, MBA, SPHR

> >9966 Northridge Circle

> >Clinton, IL 61727

> >217-853-3836

> >

> >

>

>

>

CC: sjr@sj-r.com; newsroom@pantagraph.com; gwoods@clintondailyjournal.com;
dholt@cimedia.com; CAPITOLFAX@aol.com



Decision likely Thursday on DeWitt County waste hearing

Wednesday, August 20, 2008 7:37 AM CDT

By Kevin Barlow

kbarlow@pantagraph.com

CLINTON -- The Illinois Pollution Control Board is expected to decide Thursday whether to hold a public hearing in DeWitt County on a plan by Peoria Disposal Co. to treat hazardous waste for storage at any of its Illinois landfills.

The hearing request was made Monday by state Rep. Bill Mitchell, R-Forsyth. The company says a hearing in DeWitt County is unnecessary since it has no plans to store any of the waste at Clinton and will amend the host agreement with the DeWitt County board as a guarantee.

Peoria Disposal is the parent company of Area Disposal, which owns and operates the landfill south of Clinton. Peoria Disposal plans to treat and de-list electric arc furnace dust waste.

The control board's only scheduled hearing was Monday in Peoria. Matt Varble, who leads Clinton-based WATCH (We're Against Toxic CHEMicals) was one of a half-dozen DeWitt County residents to attend and he filed his own request for a hearing.

"Peoria Disposal clearly does not want a public hearing in DeWitt County," Varble said. "While trying to address the reasons why a public hearing should be held in DeWitt County, I was continuously interrupted and obstructed from making my point by the legal counsel representing Peoria Disposal."

Varble believes the DeWitt hearing is necessary since paperwork filed with the control board identifies all of Peoria Disposal's landfills — including the Clinton facility.

Chris Coulter, vice president of Peoria Disposal, said his company has offered to amend the host agreement with the DeWitt County Board with a promise to not store any of the treated wastes in DeWitt County without the approval of the board.

Last week, the DeWitt County Board voted down a resolution in support of a public hearing. Instead, county officials will work on the amendment to the contract to give it control over the wastes stored at the facility.

"It is not our intention to store this waste in Clinton and we will put that in writing with the amendment to the host agreement," Coulter said. "We oppose a public hearing because it would cause a delay in promises we offer to our clients about the storage process. Any delays could mean layoffs or cutbacks. This waste will be stored at our Indian Creek landfill near Hopedale in Tazewell County and not in Clinton."

Varble said that isn't enough.

"A proposed agreement isn't a substitute for a hearing," Varble said.

The control board will accept public comment through Sept. 11. A final decision is expected in October.

Copyright © 2008, Pantagraph Publishing Co. All rights reserved.