BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOAR PLERK'S OFFICE

PEOPLE OF WILLIAMSON COUNTY ex rel.) AUG 2 9 2008
STATE'S ATTORNEY CHARLES GARNATI, And THE WILLIAMSON COUNTY BOARD,) STATE OF ILLINOIS) Pollution Control Board
Petitioners,)))
v.) Case No. PCB 2008-93) Permit Appeal-Land
KIBLER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, MARION RIDGE LANDFILL, INC., and ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,)))
Respondents.	Ć

RESPONSE OF KIBLER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND MARION RIDGE LANDFILL, INC. TO WILLIAMSON COUNTY'S STATE'S ATTORNEY CHARLES GARNATI'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

NOW COME Respondents, KIBLER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and MARION RIDGE LANDFILL, INC., through their undersigned attorney, and for their response to the "Williamson County State's Attorney, Charles Garnati's Motion for Reconsideration," and the memorandum and other materials accompanying and supporting that motion, state as follows:

- 1. By Opinion and Order of the Board dated July 10, 2008, this Board dismissed the permit appeal brought by People of Williamson County *ex rel* State's Attorney Charles Garnati, and the Williamson County Board, seeking review of a permit **granted** by Respondent Illinois Environmental Protection Agency ("Agency"), concerning a non-hazardous waste landfill permit issued in favor of Respondents Kibler Development Corporation and Marion Ridge Landfill, Inc.
- 2. This Board's July 10, 2008 Opinion and Order of the Board dismissed the permit proceedings on the grounds that the statute, 415 ILCS 5/40(a)(1), makes no provision for any appeal of such a permit granted by the Agency, but only allows appeals from permit denials or from conditions unilaterally imposed by the Agency in granting a permit. Simply put, this Board specifically ruled that no statutory authority supported the unprecedented and meritless petition filed by the Petitioners in this case. "For the Board to allow this action to proceed as a permit appeal would amount to an unlawful extension of appeal rights by the Board." (Opinion, at 13).

- 3. Petitioner purports to have filed a motion for reconsideration electronically on August 14, 2008. (The Williamson County Board did not join in the motion).
- 4. Notably, the certificate of service is signed by one "Joan Lane," not identified as an attorney, but the signature is not notarized; moreover, it fails to comply with the provisions of verification by certification allowed by Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 735 ILCS 5/1-109. In addition, the Petitioner purports to have filed the document by electronic means, yet there is no indication in the record that leave to do so has been granted by this Board's clerk, nor by the hearing officer in this case. For these reasons, the documents should be stricken. See 35 Ill. Admin. Code 101.302(d); 35 Ill. Admin. Code Part 101, App. E Illustration B.
- 5. The motion for reconsideration correctly acknowledges that in order to seek reconsideration, the Petitioner must identify newly discovered evidence, changes in the law, or errors in application of existing law. Petitioner claims to rely upon only the third basis—that is, purported errors in application of existing law—and so Petitioner has waived any claim that newly discovered evidence or changes in the law warrant reconsideration. (See Motion for Reconsideration, paragraph 1).
- 6. Fully one half of the motion (pages 3-4), and of the memorandum supporting the motion (memorandum, pages 5-7), as well as all documents submitted in support, constitute "new evidence" which Petitioner attempts to argue to support this Board's reconsideration of its July 11 ruling. However, Petitioners do not assert that any of this supposed evidence is "newly discovered," and review of the materials reveals that virtually all of it, even if in any way relevant to any issues pending before this Board, could have and should have been submitted in Petitioners' response to the motions to dismiss that were dealt with by this Board's July 11 ruling. Petitioner does not even attempt to explain why this information, if relevant to its petition, was not submitted sooner. Accordingly, the second halves of Petitioners' motion and memorandum, and all documents submitted by Petitioner in support of the motion, should be stricken and completely disregarded by this Board.
 - 7. Petitioner also purports to argue that this Board misapplied the law. However, even

though this Board's ruling centered upon the statutory restrictions for appealing the type of permit

involved in this case, Petitioner is completely silent about the statute or its effect on the attempted

permit appeal. Indeed, Petitioner does not even cite 415 ILCS 5/40 in the entire motion for

reconsideration, or supporting memorandum!

8. At best, Petitioner's argument is no more than a re-hash of arguments Petitioner

previously advanced. No new cases are cited in Petitioner's motion for reconsideration, and

Petitioner's arguments repeat the arguments previously made. This Board has already considered

and rejected these arguments, and Petitioner's motion is no more than a waste of time.

9. Petitioner fails to explain why this Board's July 11 Opinion and Order was

an incorrect application of clear statutory requirements. Petitioner's motion for reconsideration is

as frivolous as the purported permit appeal itself, and it should be denied; to any extent this Board

does reconsider its opinion, the July 11 opinion must be reaffirmed, as a proper application of clear

statutory law.

WHEREFORE Respondents, KIBLER DEVELOPMENT CORP. and MARION RIDGE

LANDFILL, INC., request that this Board deny the motion for reconsideration filed by Petitioner

Charles Garnati, State's Attorney of Williamson County, or in the alternative if this Board

determines a basis exists to reconsider, that this Board reaffirm its July 11 Opinion and Order in

this case, and deny to Petitioner any further relief, but instead grant to Respondents all relief

available from this Board including the imposition of sanctions.

Respectfully submitted,

Kibler Development Corporation & Marion Ridge

Landfill, Inc., Respondents,

By their attorney,

HEDINGER LAW OFFICE

Ву

Stephen F Heding

Hedinger Law Office 2601 South Fifth Street Springfield, IL 62703

Telephone: (217) 523-2753

Fax: (217) 523-4366

3

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD CLERK'S OFFICE

PEOPLE OF WILLIAMSON COUNTY ex rel STATE'S ATTORNEY CHARLES GARNATI, And THE WILLIAMSON COUNTY BOARD,	AUG 2 9 2008 STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
Petitioners,)
V.) Case No. PCB 2008-93) Permit Appeal-Land
KIBLER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,)
MARION RIDGE LANDFILL, INC., and ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,)
Respondents.))

NOTICE OF FILING AND PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that an original and nine copies of the foregoing Response to Motion for Reconsideration and of this Notice of Filing and Proof of Service, were served upon the Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, and one copy to each of the following parties of record and hearing officer in this cause by enclosing same in an envelope addressed to:

John Therriault, Acting Clerk (via FedEx) Illinois Pollution Control Board James R. Thompson Center 100 W. Randolph St., Suite 11-500 Chicago, IL 60601

Melanie Jarvis Division of Legal Counsel Illinois Environmental Protection Agency 1021 N. Grand Ave. East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, IL 62794-9276

Jennifer Sackett Pohlenz Querrey & Harrow 75 West Jackson Boulevard Suite 1600 Chicago, IL 60604-2827 Michael J. Ruffley Assistant State's Attorney 200 Jefferson Williamson County Courthouse Marion, IL 62959

Carol Webb, Hearing Officer Illinois Environmental Protection Agency 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, IL 62794-9276

with postage fully prepaid, and by depositing said envelopes in a U.S. Post Office Mail Box in Springfield, Illinois before 5:30 p.m. on the ________day of August, 2008.

Stephen F. Hedinger

Hedinger Law Office 2601 South Fifth Street Springfield, IL 62703

Telephone: (217) 523-2753

This document prepared on recycled paper