# ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD November 2, 1995

SPILL, MADISON COUNTY CONSERVATION ALLIANCE, SIERRA CLUB, NAMEOKI TOWNSHIP CLERK HELEN HAWKINS, KATHY ANDRIA, SHIRLEY CRAIN, GLENDA FULKERSON, JOHN GALL, THELMA ORR, RON SHAW and PEARL STOGSDILL,	) ) ) ) ) ) )
Petitioners,	) )
v.	) ) PCB 96-91 ) (Third Party-Landfill Siting
CITY OF MADISON and METRO- EAST, LLC,	Review)
Respondents.	) )

#### ORDER OF THE BOARD:

This matter is before the Board on an appeal filed pursuant to paragraph (b) of Section 40.1 of the Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/40.1] on October 30, 1995 by SPILL, Madison County Conservation Alliance, Sierra Club, Nameoki Township Clerk Helen Hawkins, Kathy Andria, Shirley Crain Glenda Fulkerson, John Gall, Thelma Orr, Ron Shaw and Pearl Stogsdill (Petitioners). They appeal the decision of the City of Madison (City) granting local siting approval to Metro-East, L.L.C. for the pollution control facility, located in the City of Madison, Madison County, Illinois.

The petition is deficient for failure to provide a copy of the City's decision. Without a copy of the decision, the Board cannot determine whether the petition was timely filed within 35 days of the date of the decision. If an amended petition curing this deficiency is not filed within 14 days of the date of this order, this matter will be subject to dismissal. The filing of an amended petition will restart the Board's decision timeclock, although the Board will look to the petitions' original filing dates in making any determination as to the timeliness of the filing of the appeal pursuant to section 40.1.

The cited section of the Act requires the Board to hear the instant petition if it has been filed by a third party other than the applicant if that party participated in the public hearing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Petitioner did not supply the date that the City of Madison rendered its decision.

conducted by the county board or municipal governing body which has granted siting approval, unless it determines that the petition is duplicitous or frivolous, or that the petitioner is so located as to not be affected by the proposed facility. An action before the Board is duplicitous if the matter is identical or substantially similar to one brought in another forum (Brandle v. Ropp, PCB 85-68, 64 PCB 263 (1985)). An action before the Board is frivolous if it fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted by the Board (Citizens for a Better Environment v. Reynolds Metals Co., PCB 73-173, 8 PCB 46 (1973)).

The petition indicates that the Petitioners participated in the previous public hearing. There is no evidence before the Board to indicate this matter is identical or substantially similar to any matter brought in another forum, nor is there any evidence that the Board cannot grant the relief requested. There is also no evidence before the Board to suggest that the petitioners are so located as to not be affected by the proposed facility. At this time, therefore, the Board finds that, pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 103.124(a), the complaint is neither duplications nor frivolous, that the petitioners participated in the prior public hearing and that the petitioners are or may be so located as to be affected by the proposed facility. Accordingly, this matter shall proceed to hearing.

## Record Before the City of Madison

P.A. 82-682, also known as SB-172, as codified in Section 40.1(a) of the Act, provides that the hearing before the Board is to "be based exclusively on the record before the county board or governing body of the municipality". The statute does not specify who is to file with the Board such record or who is to certify to the completeness or correctness of the record.

As the City of Madison alone can verify and certify what exactly is the entire record before it, in the interest of protecting the rights of all parties to this action, and in order to satisfy the intention of SB-172, the Board believes that the City of Madison must be the party to prepare and file the record on appeal. The Board suggests that guidance in so doing can be had by reference to Rules 321 through 324 of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules. The record shall contain legible versions of all documents, transcripts, and exhibits deemed to pertain to this proceeding from initial filing through and including final action by the local government body. The record shall contain the originals of all documents, shall be arranged as much as possible in chronological sequence, and shall be sequentially numbered, placing the letter "C" before the number of such page. In addition to the actual documents which comprise the record, the Clerk of the City of Madison shall also prepare a document entitled "Certificate of Record on Appeal" which shall be an index of the record that lists the documents comprising the

record and shows the page number upon which they start and end. Seven copies of the certificate, seven copies of the transcript of the City of Madison hearing and three copies of any other documents in the record shall be filed with the Board, and a copy of the certificate shall be served upon the petitioner(s). The City Clerk is given 21 days from the date of this Order to "prepare, bind and certify the record on appeal" (Ill. Supreme Court, Rule 324). If the record is not legible, is not sequentially numbered, or fails to include an appropriate index of record, the Clerk of the Pollution Control Board may refuse to accept the document for filing.

#### Waiver of Decision Deadline

Section 40.1(a) provides that if there is no final action by the Board within 120 days, petitioners may deem the site location approved.

The Board has construed identical "in accordance with the terms of " language contained in Section 40(b) of the Act concerning third-party appeals of the grant of hazardous waste landfill permits as giving the person who had requested the permit a) the right to a decision within the applicable statutory time frame (now 120 days), and b) the right to waive (extend) the decision period (Alliance for a Safe Environment, et al. v. Akron Land Corp. et al., PCB 80-184, October 30, 1980). The Board therefore construes Section 40.1(b) in like manner, with the result that failure of this Board to act in 120 days would allow the site location applicant to deem the site location approved. Pursuant to Section 105.104 of the Procedural Rules, it is each party's responsibility to pursue its action, and to insist that a hearing on the petition is timely scheduled in order to allow the Board to review the record and to render its decision within 120 days of the filing of the petition.

## Transcription Costs

The issue of who has the burden of providing transcription in Board site location suitability appeals has been addressed in Town of Ottawa, et al. v. IPCB, et al., 129 Ill. App. 3rd, 472 N.E.2d 150 (Third District, 1984). In that case, the Court ordered the Board to assume transcription costs (472 N.E.2d at 155). The Supreme Court denied leave to appeal on March 14, 1985. In cognizance of this ruling, the Board will provide for stenographic transcription of the Board hearing in this matter.

### Scheduling and Conduct of Hearing

The hearing must be scheduled and completed in a timely manner, consistent with Board practices and the applicable statutory decision deadline, or the decision deadline as extended by a waiver (the siting applicant may file a waiver of the

statutory decision deadline pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101.105). The Board will assign a hearing officer to conduct hearings consistent with this hearing, and the Clerk of the Board shall promptly issue appropriate directions to that assigned hearing officer.

The assigned hearing officer shall inform the Clerk of the Board of the time and location of the hearing at least 40 days in advance of hearing so that public notice of hearing may be published. After hearing, the hearing officer shall submit an exhibit list, a statement regarding credibility of witnesses and all actual exhibits to the Board within five days of the hearing.

Any briefing schedule shall provide for final filings as expeditiously as possible and, in time-limited cases, no later than 30 days prior to the decision due date, which is the final regularly scheduled Board meeting date on or before the statutory or deferred decision deadline. Absent any future waivers of the decision deadline, the statutory decision deadline is now February 27, 1996 (120 days from October 30, 1995); the Board meeting immediately preceding the due date is scheduled for December 21, 1995.

If after appropriate consultation with the parties, the parties fail to provide an acceptable hearing date or if after an attempt the hearing officer is unable to consult with the parties, the hearing officer shall unilaterally set a hearing date in conformance with the schedule above. The hearing officer and the parties are encouraged to expedite this proceeding as much as possible.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Board,	, Doroth hereby day of	certif	y that	the a	bove or	der v	was a	adopte	d on t	he
					Dorc			nn, C Poll		_

Control Board