

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	PCB No. 11-11
	)	(Enforcement)
CLINTON LANDFILL, INC.,	)	
an Illinois corporation,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

To: See Attached Service List


PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 26, 2010, I electronically filed with the Clerk of the Pollution Control Board of the State of Illinois, a MOTION TO CLARIFY SETTLEMENT, a copy of which is attached hereto and herewith served upon you.

Respectfully submitted,

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LISA MADIGAN,  
Attorney General of the  
State of Illinois

MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief  
Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos  
Litigation Division

BY:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas Davis, Chief  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Bureau

500 South Second Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62706  
217/782-9031  
Dated: October 26, 2010

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I did on October 26, 2010, cause to be served by First Class Mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, by depositing in a United States Post Office Box in Springfield, Illinois, a true and correct copy of the following instruments entitled NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING and MOTION TO CLARIFY SETTLEMENT upon the persons listed on the Service List.



---

Thomas Davis, Chief  
Assistant Attorney General

This filing is submitted on recycled paper.

**SERVICE LIST**

Brian Meginnes  
Attorney at Law  
416 Main Street, Suite 1400  
Peoria, IL 61602-1611

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

<b>PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Complainant,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>PCB No. 11-11</b>
	)	<b>(Enforcement)</b>
<b>CLINTON LANDFILL, INC.,</b>	)	
<b>an Illinois corporation,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**MOTION TO CLARIFY SETTLEMENT**

NOW COMES the Complainant, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, by its attorney, LISA MADIGAN, Attorney General of the State of Illinois, and pursuant to Sections 101.500 and 103.302, moves to clarify the applicability of the stipulation and proposal for settlement filed on September 9, 2010. In support of this clarification, the Complainant states as follows:

1. The contents of a proposed stipulation and proposal for settlement are governed by Section 103.302. The contents of the settlement documents filed by the Attorney General's Office also typically includes a summary of the violations alleged in the complaint pleadings in addition to the "material facts pertaining to the nature, extent, and causes of the alleged violations proposed to be settled," required by Section 103.302(a). This summary of alleged violations is not explicitly required by Section 103.302.

2. The complaint in this matter pleads three counts but the summary of alleged violations provided in the stipulation and proposal for settlement inadvertently omitted the permit violations alleged in count III of the complaint. After review of the filings, the Board

issued an order on October 21, 2010 stating that “there is an inconsistency between the complaint and the stipulation that must be reconciled” and directing that “either the People file an amended complaint or a statement that they wish count III to proceed to hearing, or the People and Clinton file an amended stipulation and proposed settlement, accompanied by another request for relief from the hearing requirement.”

3. The stipulation and proposal for settlement inadvertently omitted a summary of the violations alleged in count III of the Complaint but still complies with Section 103.302. The Board’s recent order does not reference this section of its procedural rules in expressing its determination of an “inconsistency” between the complaint and the settlement. This motion to clarify respectfully suggests that, unless the stipulation is actually found to be deficient regarding the requirements of Section 103.302, there is no need for an amended stipulation and proposed settlement. As stated in the settlement document, it is the intent of the parties that the stipulation be a final adjudication of this matter. The release of liability within the terms of settlement section of the stipulation and proposed settlement explicitly covers the violations “expressly specified” in the complaint, i.e. all three counts. The settlement’s release of liability pertains directly to the allegations of violation in the complaint; the scope of such release is determined by the complaint itself and not the conclusory language of the summary provided in the settlement. The perceived inconsistency is of no consequence.


4. There is no need for an amended complaint. The People do not wish to take count III to hearing. Count III is included in the settlement.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays that the Board adopt and accept the previously filed stipulation and proposal for settlement.

Respectfully submitted,

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,  
LISA MADIGAN,  
Attorney General of the  
State of Illinois

MATTHEW J. DUNN, Chief  
Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos  
Litigation Division

BY:   
THOMAS DAVIS, Chief  
Environmental Bureau  
Assistant Attorney General

Attorney Reg. No. 3124200  
500 South Second Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62706  
217/782-9031  
Dated: October 26, 2010