PUBLIC HEARING
IN THE MATTER OF:

KENDA C. HESS, THERESA ADAMS, LORI SHIELDS, JOHN AND JOYCE BORCHERS,

Petitioners,

-vs- PCB 2027-002 (Third-Party Pollution Control Facility Siting Appeal)

AREA DISPOSAL SERVICE, INC., and VILLAGE OF RANTOUL,

Respondents.

November 4, 2026
9:00 AM
Rantoul Village Hall
333 Tanner
Rantoul, IL

Reported In Person By:

Deann K. Parkinson: CSR 84-002089
Area Wide Reporting & Video Conferencing
301 West White
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(800)747-6789

HEARING OFFICER:

MS. CAROL WEBB
60 E. Van Buren St. Suite 630
Chicago, IL 60605
312-814-3669
Carol.Webb@illinois.gov

APPEARANCES IN PERSON:

FOR THE PETITIONERS:

MS. MARGARET GALKA
COLLINS LAW GROUP PC
1770 Park St. #200
Naperville, IL 60563
mgalka@collinslaw.com

FOR THE RESPONDENTS:

MS. JANAKI NAIR
ELIAS, MEGINNES & SEGHETTI PC
416 Main Street Suite 1400
Peoria, IL 61602-1611
jnair@emrslaw.com

AND

MR. RYAN RUDICH
TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
111 E. Wacker Drive #2600
Chicago, IL 60601
rrudich@taftlaw.com

FOR THE VILLAGE OF RANTOUL:

MR. DAVID WESNER
EVANS, FROELICH, BETH & CHAMLEY
44 Main Street Suite 310
Champaign, IL 61820
217-359-6494
dwesner@efbclaw.com

INDEX

WITNESSES:

THERESA ADAMS.....page 13
JOHN BORCHERS.....page 15
LORI SHIELDS.....page 16
KENDA HESS.....page 18
SAMUEL HALL III.....page 20
MIKE GRAHAM.....page 107
REGINA CRIDER.....page 139
TERRY WORKMAN.....page 149
JANET GRAY.....page 159

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

JOHN BORCHERS.....page 167
LORI SHIELDS.....page 169
RANDY MCKAUSKY.....page 173
BILL SHAFFNER.....page 174
KIMBERLY TAYLOR.....page 176
RICK SHIELDS.....page 178
KENDA HESS.....page 181
JUAN DAVILA.....page 184

INDEX OF EXHIBITS REFERENCED;
(NOT INCLUDED IN THE TRANSCRIPT)

VILLAGE EXHIBIT LIST

Village No. 1.....page 92
(Village email)

Village No. 2.....page 57
(certified copy of Ordinance 2813)

Village No. 3.....page 87
(Board meeting notice)

Village No. 4.....page 89
(thumb drive)

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Respondent Exhibit 2.....page 158
(transcript of the December 9, 2025, meeting)

PETITIONER EXHIBIT LIST

Petitioner No. 1.....page 50
(Ordinance 2796)

Petitioner No. 2.....page 61
(Area Disposal affidavit)

Petitioner No. 3.....page 56
(Ordinance 2813)

Petitioner No. 5.....page 68
(Area Disposal application cover letter)

Petitioner No. 6.....page 40
(interrogatories)

Petitioner No. 7.....page 71
(Foth Infrastructure letter)

Petitioner No. 9.....page 112
(comprehensive plan)

Petitioner No. 11.....page 82
(video of meeting)

Petitioner No. 12.....page 158
(transcript of 6-16-26 special meeting)

Petitioner No. 13.....page 102
(property map)

(The time is 8:58 a.m.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Good morning, my name is Carol Webb and this is the hearing for PCB27-2, Kenda Hess, Theresa Adams, Lori Shields and John and Joyce Borchers, versus Area Disposal Service Inc. and the Village of Rantoul.

It is November 4th, and we are beginning at nine AM. Public comment will be taken at the end of the hearing if time permits. Written public comment may be filed with the clerk of the board in our Chicago office by November 25th, 2026.

In this case, the Petitioner allege that Area Disposal's proposed Rantoul transfer station does not meet the criteria of Section 39.2 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, and that the proceedings may have been fundamentally unfair pursuant to Section 40.1 of the Act. The Pollution Control Board members will make the final decision in this case.

My purpose is to conduct the hearing in a neutral and orderly manner so that we have a clear record of the proceedings. The decision deadline is January 21, 2027.

This hearing was noticed pursuant to the Act and the Board's rules, and will be conducted pursuant to Sections 101.600 through 101.632 of the Board's procedural rules.

At this time I will ask the parties to please make their appearances on the record.

MS. GALKA: Good morning. Margaret Galka on behalf of the Petitioners.

MS. NAIR: Janaki Nair, accompanied by Ann Schwick and Ryan Rudich for the applicant, Area Disposal Service.

MR. WESNER: David Wesner for the Village of Rantoul.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: All right. Thank you. Are there any preliminary matters to discuss on the record? No? Okay. Would the Petitioners like to give an opening statement?

MS. GALKA: We would. And I'm just going to make it sitting. Good morning everybody. Sorry that most of you are sitting behind me. I represent the Petitioners in this matter who have brought this appeal for the reasons the hearing officer stated.

The first set of reasons being that

Petitioners feel that Area Disposal has not met its burden to provide enough evidence to show that they have met the statutory criteria that are applicable to this matter. And you're not going to hear a lot about those criteria today. Mostly because today's hearing is, from Petitioners' perspective about their authority, Petitioners' authority, to bring this appeal. In other words, their standing. And the fundamental fairness of how the process unfolded before the Village.

However, I did want everyone to know that if you want to know more about Petitioners' arguments that Area Disposal has not met their burden on the criteria, I invite you to look at the post hearing briefs that will be filed in this matter and Petitioners' original petition, which started this matter.

You are also going to hear today from Petitioners, again, they are going to talk about are their standing and you are going to hear from the members of the Village Board that voted in favor of approving Area Disposal Waste Transfer Station with conditions. I'm just going to let the witnesses and evidence speak for themselves

from here. So, that's all.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Would you like to make an opening statement?

MS. NAIR: Yes, if I could briefly. Sure. I'm Janaki, J-A-N-A-K-I; Nair, N-A-I-R. And again, I represent applicant, Area Disposal Inc. We have Bill Lewis here also, who is Area's director of operations.

On June 16th of 2026 the Village of Rantoul approved Area Disposal's request for siting of a waste transfer station subject to two conditions. On July 21, 2026, Ms. Galka's clients filed a petition challenging the Village of Rantoul's siting decision.

The only evidence that will be introduced at this hearing is evidence related to this fundamental fairness of the proceeding before the Village and evidence relating to the Petitioners' standing to bring the petition.

In the petition, Ms. Galka's clients claim that there is a concern that certain Rantoul elected officials and staff prejudged the facts and the law, rendering the siting proceedings fundamentally unfair.

During the pendency of this appeal, the Petitioners served written discovery on Area Disposal and on the Village, which proved that there were no improper contacts between Area Disposal on the one hand, and any of the trustees or the mayor who voted to approve the application on the other hand. In fact, the Petitioners have never explicitly said that any specific trustee or the mayor was actually biased and prejudged the application.

Therefore, at this point it is not clear what the Petitioners are alleging was the fundamental unfairness in the proceedings before the Village. Regardless, the record of all available evidence demonstrates that Area Disposal's application established that all nine of the criteria required for siting approval are satisfied.

The trustees and the mayor decided to approve the application based on the evidence that was presented to them in the record. They did not make their decision prematurely or based on any personal bias or any other improper considerations.

The facts are as follows: The application was filed on December 22nd, 2025. Prior to the application being filed, Area Disposal went through an extensive pre-filing review process with the Village's hired engineering expert, Foth Infrastructure and Environment LLC. At the conclusion of that pre-filing review, both recommended that the Village approve the application in its letter to the Village dated December 12th, 2025.

Also prior to the application being filed, Area Disposal served pre-filing notices on every land owner within a thousand feet of the boundary of the proposed facility.

One thousand feet is 2.5 times the 400 foot maximum distance for pre-filing notices that's required by the Environmental Protection Act.

The application was set for an in-person hearing on April 17th, 2026, in this very room. During the public hearing, and prior to the public hearing, Area Disposal sent out notices and published notices in accordance with the statute and the Village's ordinance. During the hearing,

Area Disposal presented four expert witnesses, and the Village asked questions of many of those witnesses.

Then members of the public were given an opportunity to speak. Nine people provided public comment, of whom six opposed the application. No one who asked to speak was denied an opportunity to speak.

No person in opposition to the application offered any expert testimony contravening any of Area Disposal's witnesses or any expert testimony suggesting that any of the statutory criteria for siting approval had not been met.

After the public hearing, the Village continued to accept written public comment through May 18th of 2026. All of the comments that were received by the Village were made part of the record.

After considering all of the evidence in the record, including the oral and written public comment, the Village's independently hired hearing officer prepared an exhaustive 27 page report as required by the ordinance.

The hearing officer found that the procedures used by the Village regarding the application were fundamentally fair. He also recommended that the Village Board approve the application because it satisfied all of the required criteria.

Finally, on June 16th, 2026, the Village Board met here to consider the application. After deliberations, the trustees and mayor voted to approve the application with two conditions. At no point during this process did Petitioners or anyone else claim that any of the trustees or the mayor was biased or prejudged the application, or that any of them should have been barred from voting on the application, as was required for Petitioners to challenge the siting approval on fundamental fairness grounds before the board.

Under the law, the members of a siting authority are presumed to have made their decisions in a fair and objective manner. There is nothing in the record, and nothing has been adduced in discovery that would call this presumption into question.

Area Disposal will present further and

more detailed argument regarding why the petition should be denied in its post-hearing briefing, and looks forward to the conduct of this hearing today. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. Ms. Galka, you may call your first witness.

MS. GALKA: All right. Is Theresa Adams here yet? Petitioners would call Theresa Adams.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Theresa Adams please come up here.

THERESA ADAMS,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good morning, Theresa.

A. Good morning.

Q. Can you please state and spell your first and last name?

A. Theresa, T-H-E-R-E-S-A. Adams, A-D-A-M-S.

Q. And what is your current address?

A. 145 Shady Lawn Drive, Rantoul.

Q. How long have you lived there?

A. Approximately ten years.

Q. Approximately how far is your residence from Area Disposal's proposed waste transfer station?

A. Two miles.

Q. Did you attend the April 17th, 2026, hearing related to Area Disposal's application?

A. I did.

Q. That's all I have for you. Thank you.

MR. WESNER: I don't have any questions.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Miss Nair, any questions?

MS. NAIR: No questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you, Ms. Adams.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Ms. Galka, you may call your next witness.

MS. GALKA: Petitioners will now call petitioner John Borchers.

JOHN BORCHERS,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good morning, Mr. Borchers. Could you please state and spell your first and last names.

A. Sure. First name is John. J-O-H-N. Last name Borchers, B-O-R-C-H-E-R-S.

Q. And what is your current address?

A. 1537 Gates Drive, Rantoul.

Q. How long have you lived there?

A. 42 years.

Q. And approximately how far away is your residence from Area Disposal's proposed waste transfer station?

A. It is under three miles.

Q. Could you just repeat that for our court reporter here?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Could you repeat how far away you live?

A. Under three miles.

Q. Okay. Did you physically attend the morning session of the April 17th, 2026, public

hearing?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And did you attend the afternoon session of the April 17th, 2026, public hearing via the Village of Rantoul on-line live stream?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. That's all I've got for you, Mr. Borchers. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Any cross?

MR. WESNER: I have no questions.

MS. NAIR: No questions.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you, Mr. Borchers.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Call your next witness, please.

MS. GALKA: The Petitioner would like to call Petitioner Lori Shields to the stand.

LORI SHIELDS,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good morning, Ms. Shields. Can you

please state and spell your first and last name for the record.

A. First name is Lori. L-O-R-I. Last name, S-H-I-E-L-D-S.

Q. And what is your current address?

A. I live at 350 West Champaign Avenue.

Q. Approximately how far is your residence from Area Disposal's proposed facility?

A. Less than a mile.

Q. Do you also own a business in the Village of Rantoul?

A. Yes, we own Shields Auto Center, which is across the street at 850 Broad Meadow Road.

Q. And did you attend the April 17th, 2026, hearing related to Area Disposal's application?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. That's all I have for you, Ms. Shields. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Any cross?

MR. WESNER: No questions.

MS. NAIR: No questions.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay.

(Witness excused.)

MS. GALKA: Petitioners would like to

call Petitioner Kenda Hess to the stand.

KENDA HESS,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Can you please state and spell your first and last name for the record?

A. First name Kenda, K-E-N-D-A. Last name is Hess. H-E-S-S.

Q. And what is your current address?

A. 340 West Champaign Avenue in Rantoul.

Q. How long have you lived there?

A. 31 years.

Q. Did you attend the April 17th, 2026, hearing related to Area Disposal's application?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you attend the June 16th, 2026, special meeting of the Village Board concerning the application?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make an oral public comment at the June 16th, 2026, meeting?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did the opportunity that the Village gave you to make an oral public comment at the June 16th, 2026, special meeting, occur at the beginning of the meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Did your oral public comment take place prior to the Village Board's discussion about whether to approve the application?

A. Yes.

Q. That's all I have for you.

A. Okay, thanks.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Wait. Any questions?

MR. WESNER: I have no questions.

MS. NAIR: One question. Miss Hess, did you ask to make additional public comment at the end of the June 16th public hearing?

MS. HESS: No, I did not. I was unaware that was even an option.

MS. NAIR: And you did not request that opportunity, correct?

MS. HESS: No, I did not.

MS. NAIR: Nothing further.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Anything further

for you?

MS. GALKA: Nothing.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. You may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MS. GALKA: At this time Petitioners would like to call the mayor and village president, Samuel Hall III, and I would like to make a motion to call him as an adverse witness.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. Yes to both.

SAMUEL HALL III,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good morning, Mayor Hall.

A. Hi, good morning.

Q. Excuse me while I sit up this easel here. I think it might help us with a little visual aid this morning. But in the meantime, can you please state and spell your name for the record?

A. Absolutely. My name is Samuel Hall.

Spelled S-A-M-U-E-L. Last name H-A-L-L. And I'm the third.

Q. And you are the mayor and the Village president of the Village of Rantoul, is that right?

A. That is correct.

Q. And you've been serving in that role since May 6th of 2025, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. As mayor and village president, you only have a vote on matters that come before the Village Board under certain circumstances, is that right?

A. That's correct. Yes.

Q. Is one of those circumstances when the rest of the Village Board votes and there's a tie?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you generally aware that Area Disposal filed an application with the Village of Rantoul to site a waste transfer station within the Village?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Do you know Mr. Scott Eisenhauer?

A. I do.

Q. Had Mr. Eisenhauer been serving at the Village administrator since before you were sworn in as mayor?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. Is it true that Administrator Eisenhauer served as the liaison between the Village and Area Disposal for the purpose of the waste transfer station application?

A. Yes.

Q. As the liaison, did Administrator Eisenhauer report to you and the board about his activities as it related to Area Disposal's application?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Administrator Eisenhauer ever share with you any written communications between him and Area Disposal concerning the waste transfer application?

A. Written communications in regards to --

Q. Anything related to the waste transfer station?

A. I would have to say, I don't recall.

Q. Okay. You were involved in overseeing Mr. Eisenhauer's administrative activities with

respect to Area Disposal's application, is that right?

A. That's correct. Yes.

Q. Did you ever learn that Administrator Eisenhauer thought that a waste transfer station would be appropriate for the Village of Rantoul?

A. Repeat the question, please.

Q. Did you ever learn that Administrator Eisenhauer thought a waste transfer station is appropriate for the Village of Rantoul?

A. I'm not sure that -- I'm not sure what you're asking. Are you asking -- repeat it one more time.

Q. Sure. Did you ever learn that Administrator Eisenhauer thought that a waste transfer station would be appropriate for the Village of Rantoul?

A. Yeah, it's tough to recall. We've many conversations. Probably even more after the decision. So, I can't recall whether or not, right. So, I'll say, I don't recall.

Q. Sure. What was the nature of your conversations with Administrator Eisenhauer after the Village approved the waste transfer station?

A. Well, some of the conversations were about the conditions, right? So, let me back up. Initial conversations were about the process, right? Understanding, you know, what the applicant would have to -- what steps they would have to complete, right?

Where the board and myself fit in to that process, I remember those discussions. I remember discussions regarding "what ifs", right? So what if the board approves. What if the board does not approve. I remember those discussions.

After, after the decision, we discussed next steps, right? Yeah. Next steps.

Q. And I'll follow-up with you on some of that in a bit.

A. Sure.

Q. Is it fair to say you relied on what Administrator Eisenhauer told you in terms of the procedural steps the Village would need to take?

A. Yes.

Q. In order to consider Area Disposal's application?

A. Yes, that's fair to say.

Q. Okay. Did you ever learn that

Administrator Eisenhauer thought that the Village Board should approve Area Disposal's waste station application because the criteria had been met?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. When did you learn that?

A. That, I don't -- I can't remember that. I don't recall that. Yeah, it would have had to have been after the hearing. After, right, after the hearing, and the hearing officer presented his findings.

Q. And just so we can get some dates in the record. It would have -- let me ask it this way. Is it your testimony that sometime after the April 17th, 2026, hearing, where the hearing officer presided and the Area Disposal's experts gave testimony, and you received the hearing officer's findings, Administrator Eisenhauer shared with you that he thought that the Village should approve Area Disposal's application because all of the criteria had been met?

A. After the hearing, after report, yes.

Q. And that would have been before the June 16th, 2026, vote, right?

A. Now, see, that's difficult to say, to

recall. Again, I have talked to him quite a bit over the last year and a half and beyond. Or previous.

In order to pin that down, I can't say yes or no; whether it was, you know, in between that, the special board meeting, and/or prior to.

Q. Okay. And if Administrator Eisenhauer told you that he thought the Village should approve the application because the criteria had been met, would he have been sharing that with you because you were about to vote?

MR. RUDICH: Objection. Hypothetical. States facts not in evidence.

MS. GALKA: Just trying to get around asking about the dates.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. You may answer.

A. So, ask that question again, please.

Q. Sure, sure. Is it true that Administrator Eisenhauer told you at some point before you voted that he thought that the Village should approve Area Disposal's application because all of the criteria had been met?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, asked and answered.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled.

A. So that means I have to answer?

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Yes.

A. Okay. Mr. Eisenhauer shared the results with me, and the fact that the results of the hearing officer's findings. I don't recall exactly when we had those discussions. Again, pertaining to when it happened in relation to that special board meeting. Could have very well have been after, which I would anticipate because then we have to set up a plan to, well, what's next.

Q. Okay. But, you did testify a few minutes ago that at some point Administrator Eisenhauer told you that the Village should approve the waste transfer station because the criteria had been met, is that fair?

A. Should is a -- right? I don't recall verbatim what Mr. Eisenhauer said. I did say previously, yes, we've talked about it. But, I don't know if -- nobody tells me what I need to vote on, right? I take the objective information, I look at what's best for the Village. I have

never, in the nine plus years I've been on the board, been told how to vote.

Q. Sure. Sure. Is it true, your testimony a few moments ago, that at some point he told you that he thought the Village should approve the waste transfer station because the criteria had been met?

A. Yes. Yes. I'll say that.

Q. Okay. Is it true that the Village consulted with Village Administrator Eisenhauer regarding the options for whether the Village could impose conditions on Area Disposal's waste transfer station?

A. The Village, meaning trustees? Or what exactly are you --

Q. Sure.

A. So, there were conversations about whether or not conditions could be placed on there. And obviously that would have been had with -- some of those discussions would have been with Mr. Eisenhauer.

Q. And what was his role in those discussions?

A. I'm not sure what his role would have

been. Other than we talk about, we as a board, talk about lots; policies, procedures. Those sorts of things. So his role typically is to, in general, to offer additional information from the Village operations point of view.

Q. Okay. So then is it fair to say that he offered information to the Village trustees about how the conditions would or would not impact the Village from the operations point of view?

A. I was not privy to discussions with the trustees. I know when he and I spoke about the conditions, it was really about, well, what conditions are there? And how that would work out. Particularly what I recall is the discussion about road access. And there's not many options out there. And so I remember that discussion.

But what he talked about with the trustees, I couldn't say. I can't say for sure.

Q. Sure. That's fair. I'll ask what he told you, stick with that.

So, is it fair to say that you and Administrator Eisenhauer discussed whether there were conditions that the Board could include when they voted to approve or deny Area Disposal's

application?

A. No. Yeah, yeah, it's fair to say. Again, I don't -- I don't recollect exact conversations. That's, you know, I barely remember what I said yesterday.

Q. Sure. Did Administrator Eisenhauer provide any feedback on options for what those conditions could be as you were considering your vote?

A. That, I don't recall.

Q. Who determined what conditions the Village would impose on Area Disposal when they voted to approve the application?

A. There was discussion about what conditions were with the board. What conditions the board may want, should that, you know, should that become an option. I can't say 100 percent.

Q. When did that, or when did those conversations with the board happen concerning what conditions the board may be able to impose?

A. It would have happened after the hearing officer's decision.

Q. But before the vote, of course?

A. Yeah.

Q. Where did those conversations occur?
A. There was a, if I recall, a board meeting. Like I said, I talk to him every day, so it probably happened, he and I, daily. But, if I recall correctly, there was a board or study session where those topics -- where that topic was brought up.
Q. Was that study session solely devoted to Area Disposal's application?
A. No. There were -- I believe there were other topics.
Q. Do you recall the date of that study session?
A. If I have my phone I could pull it up. It would have been the first Tuesday in June. 'Cuz -- wait. My dates may be off. So, I'm going to say no, I don't recall. I don't want to guess.
Q. Okay.
A. Our study sessions are first Tuesday, and board meetings second Tuesday.
Q. So it sounds like what you're saying is it would have been the study session that occurred prior to the June 16th meeting, is that correct?
A. That is correct. Yeah.

Q. Did the public get notice of that study session?

A. Yes. We post those, that notice, at least 48 hours; a little bit more.

Q. Would it surprise you to learn that there's no information about that study session on the Village's website?

A. It would surprise me to learn that, yeah.

Q. Do you think it would be a problem if the residents of Rantoul weren't able to attend that study session to hear the discussion the board was having about the vote?

A. Oh, absolutely, yes.

Q. Why would that be a problem?

A. Well, it's a public meeting. And the public is -- that's who we serve. So it's important that they're able to participate in matters pertaining to decisions that may affect, that will affect the residents. So having due time to attend, and whether it be in person or on-line, is huge. Hugely important, yeah.

Q. Do you think it's important that the board's discussion about Area Disposal's

application that occurred at that study session be made part of the record concerning the board's vote to approve the waste transfer station with conditions?

A. Ask me that -- I don't -- should the -- restate that for me, please. I'm sorry.

Q. Sure. I will. I can't even remember my question, so I'm happy to do it.

Would it be -- let me ask this: Do you think that whatever the board was discussing at that study session, in terms of the minutes of that meeting, that those should be included in the record of the board's decision for why they voted to approve the waste transfer station?

A. So, for that I would have to defer to whatever the protocols call for. So --

Q. So if the protocol said that the board's discussion should be included in the record, you would say yes, they should be in the record?

A. I sure would, yeah.

Q. If the protocol didn't say that those discussions should be a part of the record, you think that it would be okay that they're not a part of the record?

A. For the most part, yeah. Yeah, I lean more towards -- I lean more towards whatever the policy or the standard would be. You know. If it doesn't state, if it doesn't state no, right? Then there's probably option for discussion.

Q. Is it fair to say you don't know what the policy is on whether that should be included in the record?

A. Yeah, I don't recall that.

Q. Is it true that you relieved Administrator Eisenhauer of his duties as administrator?

A. Yes.

MR. WESNER: Object as to relevance.

MS. GALKA: I think my next question will speak to relevance.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Is it true that you relieved Administrator Eisenhauer of his duties as administrator?

A. That's correct.

Q. When did you do that?

A. Monday. This Monday.

Q. Okay. So, Administrator Eisenhauer is no longer serving as administrator as of Monday, is that fair?

A. Monday. That's fair.

Q. Did Mr. Eisenhauer's performance of his duties related to Area Disposal's waste transfer station contribute in any way to your decision to relieve him of his duties as village administrator?

A. At this time I'm not going to share. I can't share. It's a personnel matter. I'm not going to share what were the cause of it.

Q. Respectfully, Mayor Hall, unless I hear an objection from your counsel, I am going to demand an answer to my question. So I'll repeat it for you.

Did Mr. Scott Eisenhauer's performance of duties related to Area Disposal's waste transfer station contribute in any way to your decision to relieve him of his duties as village administrator?

MR. WESNER: At this time I will object, again, to the nature of the question. Because I don't think while she's tying the question to Area

Disposal, there's no indication that any relationship with Scott Eisenhauer to the decision on the application relates in any way to the decision of the board with respect to fundamental fairness. So I don't think the issue of Mr. Eisenhauer's relieving of his duties actually pertains to the discussion and testimony that's required for the fundamental fairness issue.

MS. GALKA: And I would just respond by saying that as certainly the attorneys know, Petitioners have not been able to get discovery on that matter. And that's what the hearing today is for --

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I'm going to go ahead and overrule the objection and ask you to answer the question, please.

A. There were a number of reasons that went into the decision that I made to relieve Mr. Eisenhauer of his duties. It was not specifically one item. He was charged with managing the day-to-day operations, financials and so forth. And after, after some time, there were -- there were discrepancies, mismanagement of various items.

So, there was more than just one.

Q. Sure. And I won't ask you about some of those other things. I'm sure your attorney would agree with me maybe those aren't relevant.

But my question was, did Mr. Administrator's performance of duties related to Area Disposal's waste transfer station contribute in any way to your decision to relieve him of his duties as administrator?

A. In any way. In some way.

Q. And in what way was that?

A. There were some inconsistencies with, maybe not inconsistencies, but -- one of the challenges that I feel Mr. Eisenhauer exhibited was, I'll just say communication, you know. Effective communication on matters.

It wasn't one particular matter as it pertains to what we're here today about. But, there were some inconsistencies.

Q. Okay. Do you recall any of the inconsistencies as they relate to Area Disposal's waste transfer station?

A. I don't. I don't.

Q. Did you feel that Administrator

Eisenhauer gave you the impression that the Village had to go along with the process?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, vague.

MS. GALKA: I can restate.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Can you ask it again.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Did you feel that Administrator Eisenhauer gave you the impression that the Village had to follow the procedures with respect to Area Disposal's waste transfer station?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, still vague.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: What procedures? The word procedures, that's kind of unclear.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Sure, sure. I'm going to return to that. I will actually show you the procedures. Did you feel that Administrator Eisenhauer gave you the impression that the Village could not deny Area Disposal's waste transfer station?

MR. WESNER: Object as asked and answered. I think Mr. Hall testified earlier that no one tells him how to vote.

MS. GALKA: I would just object to that

speaking objection.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Well, overruled. You can ask it.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. I'll repeat it for you. Did you feel that Administrator Eisenhauer gave you the impression that the Village could not deny Area Disposal's waste transfer application?

A. So, as I said, I don't -- in this particular matter, I took the record of the hearing officer, his recommendation, as well as the independent engineers. Mr. Eisenhauer explained the process to me. But, he as -- he knows that I don't -- he can't tell me how to vote. So, I can't say that he did in this particular case.

We talked about the criteria. And what those different items meant. But, he didn't -- I don't recall him saying, hey, you got to vote this way, or this needs to be approved because of, dot, dot, dot. It's, you know --

Q. When you said that there were inconsistencies, in terms of what Mr. Eisenhauer was telling you, what did those inconsistencies

relate to?

A. What I said was that they were inconsistencies in his communication. There were times where communication was delayed for no -- no apparent reason, right? Missed deadlines. Those sorts of things. Not necessarily as it pertains to the subject we're here to discuss.

As I said, there were more than one thing, more than one item, that was troubling with his situation.

Q. Okay. I'm sure you can understand that what I'm interested in is how your decision to relieve him of his duties related to what he was doing with respect to Area Disposal's application only.

A. Sure. I understand.

Q. So, do you recall any of those inconsistencies with respect to deadlines or communications and the waste transfer station?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Okay. I am going to hand you what is marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 6.

MS. NAIR: Do you have copies for counsel?

MS. GALKA: I do not. We were providing them digitally.

MR. RUDICH: Can you identify those?

MS. GALKA: Sure. These do follow the disclosure numbers. So, it's the --

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: You can have my notebook if you want.

MS. NAIR: It's okay. I can pull them off the computer.

MS. GALKA: It's the Village of Rantoul answers to plaintiff's first set of interrogatories.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. I'm going to borrow the Village's podium. Really just establishing a deadline, not creating a master piece here.

All right. So you have Petitioner's Exhibit 6 in front of you, which is Respondent Village of Rantoul's answers to plaintiff's first set of interrogatories to respondent Village of Rantoul, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you reviewed this document prior to Petitioners getting a copy of it, is that right?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Okay. And Exhibit 6 contains a series of written questions called interrogatories, as well as the Village's answers to those questions. Is that right?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. And on the second to last page of Exhibit 6 the Village's attorney signed those responses, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And on the very last page, Administrator Eisenhauer provided a verification that the statements contained therein are true, is that right?

A. That's correct. Yes.

Q. Okay. As it relates to the inconsistencies with communications you were describing, do you have any concern about whether Administrator Eisenhauer was truthful in responding to these interrogatories?

A. Do I have any concerns? Should I? I guess by the nature of you asking, it makes me wonder if I should. When I reviewed this document, no, I did not.

Q. Okay. Interrogatory number one asks the Village to state when and describe how Rantoul first became aware that Area Disposal planned to submit an application for approval of a recycling and/or waste transfer station. Is that right?

A. Correct. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then the answer to interrogatory number one is that on June 2nd, 2024, during a meeting with the Village administrator and two village staff members, representatives of Area Disposal indicated an intention to seek a recycling/waste transfer station. Is that what it says?

A. That's what it says, yes.

Q. Okay. Use my little timeline now.

I'm just going to mark that date here. June 2nd, 2024. I'm just going to call it first, Village's first awareness. How about that? I can show you if you want. It's just a little timeline. But let me know, counsel, if you can't see.

Let me take you to interrogatory number eight on Exhibit 6.

And in its answer to interrogatory

number eight, there's an objection, and then if you turn to the next page there's a paragraph that begins with, "subject to the objections noted above". Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So then it's answer to interrogatory number eight, the Village states that on May 20th, 2025, the mayor and trustees visited the proposed site for the Rantoul transfer station with representatives of Area Disposal. The site visit included meetings between Area Disposal representative and groups of two of the mayor and trustees to discuss the proposed transfer station. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Is that an accurate statement of what happened on May 20th, 2025?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, foundation.

Q. Did you attend the May 20, 2025 meeting, Mayor Hall?

A. Yes, I did. Well, yeah. Yeah, if that's what it says. I attended, I don't recall the date. So --

Q. Do you recall that in the spring of 2025

you visited the site?

A. Uh-huh. I do.

Q. Okay. Would you have any reason to think that it wasn't May 20, 2025?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Is it -- let me ask you this: To your knowledge, is what the Village wrote there in response to interrogatory eight, that on May 20, 2025, the mayor and trustees visited the proposed site for the Rantoul transfer station with representatives of Area Disposal, the site visit included meetings between Area Disposal's representative and groups of two of the mayor and trustees to discuss the proposed transfer station. To your knowledge, is that accurate?

A. That is accurate. Yes.

Q. Okay. And when you attended the site visit in May, there were representatives of Area Disposal that also attended, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember how many representatives of Area Disposal were there?

A. No, I don't.

Q. To the best of your recollection, was

Administrator Eisenhauer present at the May 20, 2025, site visit?

A. I don't recall if he was there.

Q. Okay. Did representatives of Area Disposal provide you with any information about the operations of its proposed waste transfer station at that May meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Did they provide some sort of presentation about the waste transfer station at that meeting?

A. I seem to recall a presentation, yeah.

Q. Approximately how long did that presentation take?

A. Oh, goodness. It wasn't long. Five, ten minutes, you know, maybe. Maybe a little more. I don't recall exact time.

Q. Okay. Do you recall about how long you were at the site in total?

A. No. So, I remember -- it wasn't long. We showed up. You kind of greet and introduce each other. Presentation, we kind of walked around the facility. And then we left. So, yeah, it wasn't -- maybe 30 minutes. Probably wasn't

even that long.

Q. Okay. Did the site visit assist you in any way as you were considering Area Disposal's application?

A. No.

Q. What was the purpose of the site visit?

A. My purpose was to be introduced to one of our local businesses who had recently reinvested in a new facility. I recall, I was new, a couple weeks in, and I was meeting a lot of, you know, the businesses I was not aware of. So, that's -- that was my purpose.

Q. Okay. And did you know prior to attending the site visit that the waste transfer station was going to be discussed, or did that come up organically?

A. I don't recall if I knew if it was. I don't recall if I knew. If it were on my calendar as that, then yeah. But, again, that's 18 months ago.

Q. Sure. Do you recall if any of Area Disposal's engineers spoke to you at the May 2025 meeting?

A. I don't recall that, no.

Q. You are generally familiar with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, is that correct?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Is it your understanding that unless it's an open meeting, the Village Board can not be together in groups of more than two if you're discussing Village business or there's a potential to discuss Village business?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the reason the trustees and yourself attended the site visit in pairs of two, instead of all together?

A. That's typically how we move. Yes.

Q. On this occasion for the May 2025 visit?

A. Sure, absolutely.

Q. Is that the reason you met in pairs of two, instead of all together?

A. True. Yeah.

Q. Was it Administrator Eisenhauer's idea to form out the meeting so that yourself and trustees would attend in pairs instead of all together?

A. I'm not sure whose idea it was. He was obviously involved as we already stated, that he

was kind of the liaison in this process.

So, I don't know. It was on my calendar and I attended.

Q. Okay.

A. I don't know who set it up.

Q. So, fair to say it wasn't your idea?

A. It was not.

Q. That that would be the format?

A. No. I recall it being something, you know, during the transition into office that was one of the items that, that and a handful of other -- well, more than a handful of other things, that was put on, it was like hey, we got this coming up. So --

Q. Okay. The May 2025 site visit was not open to the public, is that correct?

A. Not that I -- not that I think it would be, no.

Q. Do you know if the public got any advanced notice of the May 2025 site visit?

A. I don't recall if they did or not.

Q. I'll just, I'll add that date to our little board here. This is a reminder. Do you see that I just wrote May 20, 2025-site visit?

A. Yeah, and your handwriting is not that bad. I'll tell you that.

Q. It's legible, but it's not beautiful. But thank you. I can actually go ahead and take that exhibit back from you there.

Thank you. Would you agree with me that it's important to have some sort of procedures governing the process for how the Village would consider an application like the one Area Disposal filed for a waste transfer station?

A. Yes.

Q. And would you agree with me that the procedures governing the consideration of Area Disposal's application in this matter are important for insuring that the process is fair to the Village and the parties?

A. Yes. Yes.

Q. I'm going to hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 1, which is Ordinance 2796.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Please silence your phones, people.

Q. Okay. Mayor Hall, do you have Petitioner's Exhibit 1, the Village of Rantoul Ordinance 2796 in front of you?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And Ordinance 2796 is an ordinance amending Chapter 28 solid waste of the Rantoul code in connection with pollution control facilities, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it correct that you approved Ordinance 2796 based on the Village's vote to pass it?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Okay. I'm going to move for admission of Petitioner's Exhibit 1, Ordinance 2796.

MS. NAIR: No objection.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Petitioner's Exhibit 1 is admitted.

MS. GALKA:

Q. Ordinance 2796 was passed and approved on June 10th, 2025. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Going to mark that here on our timeline.

And do you see that I've added June 10, 2025-ORD2796 to our timeline here?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. One reason that the board passed

Ordinance 2796 is that they found it was necessary to amend Chapter 28 to include a process for approval of a pollution control facility desiring to locate in the Village. Is that right?

A. That's correct. Yes.

Q. And the pollution control facility desiring to locate in the Village, that's Area Disposal's waste transfer station, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Ordinance 2796 contains the process and procedures for approval of the waste transfer station; is that right?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Okay. Are you aware that Area Disposal asked the Illinois Pollution Control Board to throw out this appeal because according to Area Disposal the procedures laid out in Ordinance 2796 take away Petitioner's right to appeal?

A. No, I'm not aware of that.

Q. Okay. You didn't personally draft Ordinance 2796, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Was it Administrator Eisenhauer that proposed Ordinance 2796 to the board at a study

session?

A. I don't recall who proposed it.

Q. But, is it true that somebody would have proposed it to the board at a study session?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know if Area Disposal had any role in drafting Ordinance 2796?

A. No, I don't know.

Q. Do you know if Area Disposal provided advice to anybody at the Village about what Ordinance 2796 should contain?

A. No, I don't know that.

Q. Ordinance 2796 contained a section 28-103 concerning pre-filing notice. Is that right?

A. Yes. It's titled pre-filing notice.

Q. And that's on page seven, right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Section 28-103 requires that no later than 14 days prior to filing an application the applicant must provide written notice of the application by mail to certain property owners. Is that true?

A. That is correct. Yes.

Q. Is it true that under Ordinance 2796, Section 28-103, the property owners entitled to written notice are those within five hundred feet in each direction of the lot line, provided that the number of all the occupied by all public roads, streets, alleys and other public ways shall be excluded in computing the five hundred feet?

A. Yes.

MR. RUDICH: Object to the relevance of this questioning and line of questioning. It also calls for a legal conclusion. The document has been admitted into the record. I don't know that we need to be questioning the witness about his views of what it says.

MS. GALKA: It's a little different.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I'll give you some leeway.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Thank you. Would you agree with me that one reason to require pre-filing written notice is so that property owners near the proposed facility have ample time to participate in the approval decision if they wish?

MR. RUDICH: Object to relevance of that

question as well.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled.

A. Ask me again.

Q. Sure. Is one reason to require pre-filing written notice so that property owners near the proposed facility have time to participate in the approval decision process if they wish?

A. I would believe that that was the intent of that. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then would you agree with me that one reason to require pre-filing written notice is to make the approval process more fair to property owners in the Village?

A. Yeah, I would assume so, yeah.

Q. Area Disposal provided pre-filing written notice of its application on December 4th, 2026, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Mark that on our timeline here. I just lied, I made a bit of an error in my question so I'm going to reask it. I think I said 2026. Area Disposal provided pre-filing written notice of its application on December 4th, 2025, is that

correct?

A. Yeah, that's correct.

Q. Okay. Can you see that I wrote here on our timeline December 4, 2025-written notice to property owners?

A. Yes.

Q. I'm going to leave you with a copy of that exhibit and hand you what I've marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 3, which is Ordinance 2813.

You have before you Petitioner's Exhibit 3, Ordinance 2813, an ordinance amending Chapter 28, solid waste of the Rantoul code in connection with pollution control facilities, is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. You approved Ordinance 2813, is that right?

A. Yep. Yes.

MS. GALKA: At this time Petitioners move to admit Exhibit 3, Ordinance 2813.

MS. NAIR: No objection.

MR. WESNER: No objection. Just for the record, Respondent Village of Rantoul have on their exhibit list as well a certified copy of this particular ordinance, which would be labeled

as Village Exhibit No. 2 just for purposes of certified copy, so it is the accurate copy of that ordinance.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Do you want to admit his or yours or both?

MS. GALKA: Let's admit both, only because Petitioners did ask for that in discovery.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Petitioner's Exhibit 3 is admitted and we will admit your certified copy later.

MS. GALKA: Perfect. Thank you.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Ordinance 2813 was passed and approved on December 9th, 2025, is that correct?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. Okay. Add that to our timeline here. Do you see that I've added to the timeline December 9th, 2025, ORD 2813?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. The Village Board passed Ordinance 2813 in part because on June 10th of 2025, the Village Board adopted Ordinance 2796, which established regulations pertaining to pollution control facilities, is that right?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, foundation.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Foundation? To what exactly?

MR. RUDICH: Why the board took certain actions.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. Would you like to ask why?

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Sure. Mayor Hall, can I direct your attention to page two of Petitioner's Exhibit 3.

A. Yes.

Q. And is it true that it says there in Ordinance 2813, whereas on June 10th, 2025, the Village Board adopted Ordinance 2796 which established regulations pertaining to pollution control facilities?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. Ordinance 2813 amends Section 28-103 of Ordinance 2796, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Under Ordinance 2813, Section 28-103 continues to require that no later than 14 days prior to filing an application the applicant must provide written notice of the application by mail

to certain property owners, true?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. And is it also true that under Ordinance 2813, Section 28-103 continues to require that the property owners entitled to written notice are those within 500 feet in each direction of the lot line, provided that the number of all feet occupied by all public roads, streets, alleys and other public ways shall be excluded in computing the five hundred feet.

A. That's true, yes.

Q. But the difference between the previous version of Section 28-103 in the first ordinance we looked at, and Ordinance 2813, is that the amended version also includes the sentence that, in no event shall this requirement exceed one thousand feet, including public streets, alleys and other public ways. Is that right?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that Ordinance 2813 caps the distance of the area in which property owners are entitled to written notice to no farther than one thousand feet from the lot line?

A. Yes.

Q. And is it fair to say that that one thousand foot cap is included in Ordinance 2813, but it wasn't included in Ordinance 2796?

A. That's correct. Yeah.

Q. Okay. Ordinance 2813 tightens the area in which property owners are entitled to written notice of an application, isn't that true?

MR. RUDICH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

Q. I don't know that it does.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I don't think it does. You can answer. Do you want her to ask the question again?

A. No, I'm just reviewing it again. It gives a one thousand feet -- with some exclusions, yes.

Q. Is it true that just a few days before the Village passed Ordinance 2813, Area Disposal had already provided written notice to only property owners under the one thousand foot cap?

MR. RUDICH: Objection, foundation.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Foundation to?

MR. RUDICH: As to the basis of his

knowledge of notice that was provided by Area Disposal.

MS. GALKA: It is in the record, but I can happily show him the record if we'd like.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. All right. Mayor Hall, I will hand you now what I've marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 2. I will let you keep those up there just in case you need to refer to them.

And for counsel, Petitioner's Exhibit 2 is Area Disposal's appendix 2G pre-filing affidavit, the first page of which appears in the record at C894.

Do you see Exhibit 2 in front of you, Mayor Hall?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And if you turn to paragraph three of Exhibit 2, do you see that -- let me start this way. On the very last page of Exhibit 2, do you see that the attorney for Area Disposal signed this affidavit we're looking at?

A. Yes.

Q. Now I'm going to turn your direction

back to that paragraph three and ask you this.

Do you see that in paragraph three, Area Disposal's attorney attests that on December 1st, 2025, she caused written notice of Area Disposal's request for local siting approval in this matter to be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, on the owners of all property within the subject area, not solely owned by Area, and on the owners of all property within one thousand feet in each direction of the lot line of the subject property.

A. Yes, I see that here.

Q. Does that remind you that Area Disposal only sent written notice of its application to property owners within one thousand feet of the lot line of its proposed facility?

A. Yes. That's what it says.

Q. Okay. I'll leave you with the ordinances.

Isn't it true then that when you approved, and the Village Board passed Ordinance 2813, Area Disposal had already provided written notice days before?

A. Based on the document we just reviewed,

yes.

Q. Okay. Is it true that the Village passed Ordinance 2813 to help Area Disposal achieve its goal of submitting an application for a waste transfer station?

MR. WESNER: Objection to the nature of the question on what his decision making was, and whether or not it was caused by anybody other than the Village Board actually just discussing words.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: And whether it was caused by what?

MR. WESNER: Whether it was caused by anyone outside of the Village Board at that meeting.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: What was the question again?

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. The question was, is it true that the Village passed Ordinance 2813 to help Area Disposal achieve its goal of submitting an application for a waste transfer station?

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled. You can answer.

A. I'm going to ask you to ask your

question again.

Q. I'd be happy to. Is it true that the Village passed Ordinance 2813 to help Area Disposal achieve its goal of submitting an application for a waste transfer station?

MR. WESNER: I'll object at this time. It calls for speculation. Because I don't think there's been any foundation laid for the mayor's knowledge about the idea of the pre-filing notice until a review of the record would have indicated that was what they did.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Well, if he doesn't know, he can say, I don't know.

A. Yeah, I don't -- no. I don't know.

Q. Okay. Do you have any idea why the Village would pass Ordinance 2813 at the time that they passed it?

A. There was a discussion. I do remember a discussion about the -- I'll say the open endedness of the first ordinance, 2796. And the depth of how far letters could be sent. The 27 -- I'm sorry, 2813 sought to bring that into, I guess reality, right? But not to limit what the state statute calls for, which is just 400 feet. So we

wanted to provide more, but not go all the way down I-57 to Effingham.

Q. Is there any reason the Village did that after Area Disposal had already provided written public notice?

A. That, I don't know.

Q. Okay. Do you have any idea whether there were property owners in the Village of Rantoul that didn't get written notice under Ordinance 2813, that would have gotten notice under Ordinance 2796?

A. I do not know.

Q. Was Administrator Eisenhauer the person that introduced Ordinance 2813 to the Village Board?

A. This would have been an item, yes, under his section, yes.

Q. If he's the one introducing Ordinance 2813, is it also fair to say that it's his idea to pass Ordinance 2813?

A. That's not necessarily true, no.

Q. Okay. What is the process by which agenda items come before the board generally?

A. Generally, they are -- either items are

brought to myself, right? And then vetted, right? Or brought to Mr. Eisenhauer in terms of its validity, and those sorts of things; something that's needed. I guess I'll put it that way.

Q. And did you feel that Ordinance 2813 was needed for the Village?

A. Well, I recall in the board meeting study session, as the discussion it made sense, right? To kind of hone in on an area, as opposed to leave it open to essentially all of Interstate 57.

Q. Okay. So, it sounds like one reason you felt that Ordinance 2813 made sense was to account for the interstate, is that fair?

A. Yeah. Yes, yeah. To a certain extent, yeah.

Q. To what extent?

A. Yeah, what extent? Yeah, I knew that was coming.

Understanding that there are other -- that it also limits, right? So, not just Interstate 57. But that is the major interstate, the major roadway that I felt, me personally, feel would have been affected. Yeah.

Q. Okay. But, please do correct me if I'm wrong. But it sounds like what you're telling me is one reason you felt Ordinance 2813 was appropriate was so that communities other than Rantoul down Interstate 57 didn't need to get written notice of this application, is that --

A. That's fair to say, yeah.

Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that when you thought that Ordinance 2813 was appropriate, that you didn't think that it affected residents of Rantoul?

A. That's tough. Yeah. That's tough to say yay or nay.

Q. So, do you recall one way or the other, or you don't know?

A. My, I recall -- well, I recall thinking, okay, well, what's a thousand feet, right?

Q. Do you know if Area Disposal asked Administrator Eisenhauer to pass Ordinance 2813?

A. I don't know that. No.

Q. Would you be concerned about the fairness of the siting procedures if Area Disposal had asked the Village to pass Ordinance 2813?

A. I would have some questions.

Q. Okay. What questions might you have?
A. Why, right? Mainly why. And then whatever the response would probably generate a few more questions.
Q. And I won't ask us to go down that road.
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you think of any person or entity that benefits from the Village passing Ordinance 2813 other than Area Disposal?
A. That benefits? No. No.
Q. Do you know who drafted Ordinance 2813?
A. I do not.
Q. All right. I can take those exhibits back.
A. You want all of them?
Q. Yes. But if you need them back, I'm happy to provide them if you want to take a look.
So, Area Disposal actually filed their application on December 22, 2025, is that right?
A. December --
Q. 22nd, 2025?
A. Sound about right. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Well, I'll just make sure we get it right. I'll hand you Exhibit 5. I'm handing

the witness Exhibit 5, which is the cover letter of Area Disposal's application.

Looking at Petitioner's Exhibit 5, does that remind you that Area Disposal filed their application to site a waste transfer station in the Village of Rantoul on December 22nd, 2025?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. I'll let you keep that up there. I'll put it on my timeline. Do you see that I've added to our timeline down here, December 22, 2025, application filed?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. Looks like I do want to ask you more about these, so I'm going to hand these back up to you. For the record, I just handed the witness Ordinance 2796 and 2813.

So, turning back to the procedures contained in Ordinance 2796, isn't it true that Section 28-107 allows for review of a filed application?

A. 28-107 you said?

Q. Yes. I can ask my question again once you get there.

A. I'm here. 28-107.

Q. All right. So, is it true that Section 28-107 of Ordinance 2796 allows for review of a filed application?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Okay. And it states, review of filed application. The director of public works shall have the authority to coordinate the review of the application by Village staff and retained consultants, as well as to render such reports, advice or recommendations to the mayor and Village Board as the director shall deem prudent to assisting the mayor and the Village Board in making their decision. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. Okay. You are aware that Administrator Eisenhauer retained Foth Infrastructure and Environment LLC on behalf of the Village to review Area Disposal's application, right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. Is it your understanding that the Village retained Foth Infrastructure to provide you and the trustees with an independent analysis of whether Area Disposal's application met all of the applicable statutory criteria?

A. Yes.

Q. And I'm going to hand to you now what I've marked as Exhibit 7, which appears in the record filed by the Village as C1574 to C1581. Okay. Mayor Hall, do you have Petitioner's Exhibit 7 in front of you?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And the first page of Exhibit 7 is a letter from Foth Infrastructure to village administrator Scott Eisenhauer, do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And the letter reads, Dear Scott Eisenhauer, at your request Foth Infrastructure and Environment LLC, Foth, has completed a review of the application submitted by Civil and Environmental Consultants Inc. on behalf of Area Disposal Service Inc. for a solid waste transfer station, Rantoul, RTS. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay. And then the results of Foth's -- let me say that again.

The final results and conclusion of Foth Infrastructure's review are attached to this cover letter in Exhibit 7, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. The section on the last page of Foth's review, can I turn your attention to that? It's page seven, or C1581. Do you got that in front of you?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And that section is titled, conclusion and recommendations, do you see that?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And in that section Foth recommends approval of the application, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. You used Foth's recommendation, as well as the hearing officer's report when you are making your decision to vote to approve the waste transfer station application, is that right?

A. That's correct. Yes.

Q. And you ended up following Foth's recommendation, right? That the Village should approve Area Disposal's application?

A. Yeah.

Q. And Foth's letter and review is dated December 12th, 2025, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you see I added December 12th, 2025, Foth's letter, to our timeline here?

A. Yes.

Q. So, fair to say that Foth's letter and recommendation came before Area Disposal filed its application, is that true?

A. Based on your timeline, yes. What you have there.

Q. I'm going to turn our attention to the first page of the attached Foth review in Exhibit 7.

The section starting, introduction. Do you see that?

A. Yes. I have it.

Q. Okay. And do you see that in the introduction section, Foth Infrastructure states an application was submitted by Civil and Environmental Consultants Inc., CEC, on behalf of Area Disposal Service Inc. to site a solid waste transfer station at 896 West Champaign Avenue Service Road, Rantoul.

The application was received in separate reports by November, 2025. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Obviously, November, 2025, is before December 22nd, 2025?

A. Yes, obviously.

Q. So Foth received the November 2025 reports prior to the application being filed, is that correct?

A. That's what that says, yes.

Q. Did you ever see the November 2025 separate reports that included the application that Foth Infrastructure is describing in this letter?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Do you know whether the materials in the application that was received by Foth Infrastructure by November 2025 were the exact same as those submitted to the Village on December 22nd, 2025?

A. You asked if I know? If I knew?

Q. Yes.

A. No.

Q. Okay. And I'm just going to ask again, just to get sort of a clean record.

But, do you know whether the materials in the application that were received by Foth

Infrastructure by November 2025 were the exact same as those submitted to the Village on December 22nd, 2025?

A. Not 100 percent, no.

Q. Okay. When voting to approve or not to approve Area Disposal's application for a waste transfer station, would it have mattered to you if the application that Foth had reviewed and recommended approving was different than the one before the Village?

A. Would it have mattered? Yes, it would have mattered.

Q. Why would it have mattered?

A. I would -- as I stated earlier, I use the recommendation, I reviewed the material in front of me, given to me. And I would expect that that would be consistent throughout the process. Or notified of any differences.

Q. I'm going to turn your attention back to the cover letter of Exhibit 7.

And do you see that a John Hock received a copy of this December 12th, 2025 letter?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. Do you recall that John Hock was one of

Area Disposal's experts that testified in connection with the application?

A. I do recall the name.

Q. Do you know if John Hock coordinated with Foth Infrastructure for the purpose of reviewing the application?

A. That, I do not know.

Q. If anyone from Area Disposal had coordinated with Foth for the purpose of reviewing the application, would that call into question whether the review was independent?

A. I would like to know the nature of what the involvement was.

Q. Okay. So, you're not sure one way or another whether that would call it into question?

A. Yeah, that's fair. I'm not sure.

Q. But you would be wondering whether the review was truly --

A. Sure.

Q. -- independent, is that fair?

A. Sure; yeah, yeah.

Q. Do you know who sent the November 2025 application materials to Foth for review?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Do you have any idea whether Area Disposal recommended that the Village retain Foth Infrastructure for the purpose of reviewing the application?

A. I don't recall that ever being a discussion on my part. So, no, I don't know.

Q. Has anybody else ever told you that Area Disposal recommended Foth Infrastructure to the Village?

A. No, no.

Q. Am I correct that the Village did not present any of its own witnesses at the April 17th, 2026, public hearing?

A. That's correct. We did not.

Q. Okay. Am I correct that the Village did not present any evidence of its own at the April 17th, 2026, public hearing?

A. Yeah, that's correct too.

Q. Okay. So, it was Area Disposal that entered Foth's recommendation into the record, is that true?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did you know that the Village could have presented witnesses at the April 17th,

2026, hearing if it wanted to?

A. I believe that I did.

Q. Okay. Do you know why the Village elected not to present any of its own witnesses?

A. We relied on the documents we've discussed, Foth's information particularly. I can't say 100 percent why we did not. But, I know from my, from me, you're asking me, the Foth material, that's why they were hired, was to give us a recommendation.

Q. Okay. Just move on from there.

You're aware, of course, that you appointed a hearing officer to provide over the April 17th, 2026 hearing concerning Area Disposal's application, right?

A. Yes.

Q. And the hearing officer you appointed was Mr. William Andrichik, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Hearing Officer Andrichik issued a hearing officer's report with his findings and recommendations related to Area Disposal's application, right?

A. Correct, yeah.

Q. And I'm sorry if I already asked you this, this morning, but is it fair to say that when you voted, you relied on the hearing officer's report and findings?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And Hearing Officer Andrichik recommended that the Village approve the waste transfer station, right?

A. Correct. He did.

Q. Did Hearing Officer Andrichik rely on Foth Infrastructure's review of the application when making that finding to your recollection?

A. In part, yes, to my recollection.

Q. Is it true that you're not sure how Mr. William Andrichik was selected to be the hearing officer?

A. Not 100 percent, no. I have ideas, but not 100 percent. Which we talked about.

Q. Yes, and I will not ask you to speculate on that.

Did you personally do anything to verify whether Mr. Andrichik was an appropriate choice to serve as hearing officer?

A. No, his name and credentials were

brought to me. And as I said earlier, I expect to have the proper information.

Q. Do you recall if it was Mr. Eisenhauer that brought Mr. Andrichik to your attention as a hearing officer?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. Okay. And do you know if Foth Infrastructure recommended to Administrator Eisenhauer that he be selected as hearing officer?

A. That, I don't know. I don't recall.

Q. Okay. I will turn us back to one of our exhibits here. One second.

Sorry, I'm skipping over some questions you've already answered on your own in the testimony this morning.

Are you aware of anyone at the Village doing anything to determine whether Mr. William Andrichik could be biased in favor of Area Disposal?

A. Do I remember -- ask me that again.

Q. I will. Are you aware of anyone at the Village that did anything to determine whether Mr. Andrichik could be biased in favor of Area Disposal?

A. I don't remember, no.

Q. And you don't know for certain if Area Disposal played a role in recommending Mr. Andrichik to serve as hearing officer, is that true?

A. No. No. I know he was brought to us by, like I said, by my former administrator. And recommendations from him.

Q. And just to make sure that what you intended to say is clear for the record.

Your answer there was no, I'm not sure whether anyone at Area Disposal played a role in recommending Mr. Andrichik?

A. Correct.

Q. And you ultimately voted to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you had to vote on that because the trustees that voted before you were tied, is that right?

A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And the Village Board's vote to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions

occurred at the June 16th, 2026, special meeting, is that right?

A. Yes, it did.

Q. Okay. And you were at that meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. And that meeting was live streamed, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And that live stream video is put up by the Village of Rantoul on the Village of Rantoul's live stream?

A. Uh-huh, uh-huh, yes.

Q. At this time, I'm going to move to admit Exhibit 11, which is the video of that meeting. I can also show him if you want.

MS. NAIR: You pulled it right off the Village's website?

MS. GALKA: I did.

MS. NAIR: We have no objection.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Petitioner's Exhibit 11 is admitted. And tell me what it is again exactly.

MS. GALKA: It is the live stream video of the June 16th, 2026, special meeting pulled

from the Village's website.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. 11 is admitted.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Okay. Ultimately, the Board's decision to vote to approve the application was codified in a written ordinance, is that right?

A. Yes. It was.

Q. Okay. Prior to the start of the June 16th, 2026, special meeting, did you receive a copy of that proposed ordinance approving the application with conditions?

A. I recall that day, at my seat up here, there were -- that was one of the documents I had, yeah.

Q. Just nail down the timing there. It sounds like when you started the meeting, that proposed ordinance was sitting in front of you at your seat, is that right?

A. Yeah. So, I usually get here about 10, 15 minutes prior.

Q. Do you know who placed that ordinance at your seat?

A. Yeah, it would have been Mr. Eisenhauer.

Q. Okay. Had you seen a copy of that ordinance prior to that day?

A. I don't believe I did, no.

Q. Okay. So you personally didn't draft that proposed written ordinance, right?

A. No. No.

Q. Is it true that you don't know if Area Disposal contributed to drafting that ordinance in any way?

A. That is correct. I do not know.

Q. Is it true that keeping the Village out of legal trouble from Area Disposal factored into your decision to vote to approve the waste transfer station with conditions?

A. That was not necessarily a factor for that particular, you know -- my job is not to get us into legal, in part, right, along with my counsel. The determining factors for my ultimate "yes" vote was what was presented by Mr. Andrichik and Foth Engineering.

Q. And you received copies of written public comments submitted to the Village in connection with Area Disposal's application, is that correct?

A. That's correct, yeah.

Q. Did you read all of the written public comments when you received them?

A. I don't recall if I read every single one. I went through the entire packet. I know that. But, did I read every single one? Every single word? Most of them, the public comments were, speaking of those particularly, were of the same nature and same format. So, I probably didn't read every single word on every single one.

Q. Okay. That is all the questions that I have for you at this time, Mayor Hall. Thank you for your time this morning.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Who would like to go first?

MR. WESNER: I can. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY

MR. WESNER:

Q. Thank you, Mayor, for your time today. I know it's been a little bit where you're in the hot seat there. But a little longer here.

So what I want to do is kind of go back a little bit, and step through a few things. So I know you testified earlier about the site visit

that you attended. After the site visit concluded, did you make up your mind to approve the application at that time?

A. No. No.

Q. Is that because you were aware there was a process, there was going to be a hearing and evidence and testimony presented and the report provided?

A. That's correct. And there were no -- there was nothing for me to look at to approve, you know.

Q. After that site visit in May of 2025 did you attend any other meetings with Area Disposal representatives?

A. No. They came and spoke here at a study session, kind of presented. And maybe even came to talk about their service, their local waste hauling service. But not a meeting like at their location or somewhere else, no.

Q. So anything that would have happened, would have happened during a public meeting here at the Village hall?

A. That is correct.

Q. I know you've touched on Ordinance 2813

previously. But, I'm going to hand you what I've marked as Village Exhibit No. 3. Just going to ask you to take just kind of a quick look at that.

What I'd like to do, I guess, as a preface is, with regard to meetings of the Village Board, are there generally agendas prepared of what is going to be discussed at the meetings?

A. Yes, there is.

Q. All right. And so with respect to village Ordinance 2813, which I know exhibits have been presented already, would that, in order to pass that, would that have been on an agenda for the board to discuss and vote on?

A. Ask that again.

Q. In order to pass Ordinance 2813, would that have happened, would that have been required to be a part of a Village Board agenda?

A. Yes.

Q. So I'm going to direct your attention then to Village Exhibit No. 3. You see it's an indication for Rantoul Village Board of Trustees, regular board meeting for December 9th, 2025. Is that correct?

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. If you look through that particular exhibit, would that look, and is that the agenda then for that December 9th, 2025, meeting?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. All right. And if you look on to page two of that exhibit, it indicates identified as 15, it indicates motion to approve Ordinance 2813, an ordinance amending Chapter 28 solid waste of the Rantoul code in connection with pollution control facilities. Is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. So this is the board meeting where Ordinance 2813 would have been discussed and potentially approved?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And are those meetings, I think you testified earlier but you want to generalize. Are all the Village Board meetings live streamed?

A. They're supposed to, yeah. Barring any technical difficulties. So, yes.

Q. Would that have been the case for the December 9th, 2025, meeting, that would have been live streamed?

A. Yes.

Q. Review again, not playing it, but it's identified as Village Exhibit No. 4, which is a thumb drive basically of the live stream video of the December 9th, 2025, meeting? And again, it was pulled directly from the Village of Rantoul website, so I would be asking at this time I'd like to admit Village Exhibit No. 3 and Village Exhibit No. 4.

MS. GALKA: No objection.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Can you give me the date of that Exhibit 4 live stream again?

MR. WESNER: Yes, it is December 9th, 2025. Rantoul Village Board meeting.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Is Exhibit 3 already in the record? Do you know?

MR. WESNER: I think it was touched on by counsel, but I don't --

MS. GALKA: I don't think I admitted it.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: It's not in the administrative record. Well, I'll admit both of them.

MR. WESNER: I think what was admitted before would have been labeled as village Exhibit No. 2, which is the certified copy of Ordinance

2813. If that's what you're referring to about a previous exhibit.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Well, no. In the record that you filed with the board, it's already in there or no? It is not already in there?

MS. GALKA: No.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. I was looking at the page numbers. All I was going to say, any item that is already in the record I just need the page numbers.

MR. WESNER: Yes, it's not part of the original record of the proceedings.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: 3 and 4 are admitted.

MR. WESNER:

Q. Thank you. And what I'm going to do is I'm going to hand you, and I know, I think you looked at this previously, but I'm going to hand you what I've labeled as Village Exhibit No. 2. Just ask you to take a look at that. That is the Village's exhibit of Ordinance 2813. And what I'm going to direct your attention to the whereas clauses. Do you see the third whereas clause of Ordinance 2813?

A. Yes.

Q. And just again, to clarify and confirm. Does the third whereas clause state Section 28-103 should be amended to clarify such notice requirements?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And would that really be the reason that Ordinance 2813 was adopted by the Village Board?

A. Yes.

Q. And you previously testified some of that lack of clarity was related to how to treat I-57 that runs north and south along the Village?

A. Yes, uh-huh.

Q. Then did you make up your mind to approve the application at any time prior to the hearing held by the Village on the application?

A. No.

Q. And you would have been aware, again as I think I asked earlier, you would have been aware there would have been a hearing and a record created of that hearing on the application?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall when you would have

received the hearing officer's report?

A. It was first part of June. Maybe June first. June 2nd. It was early. It was early in the month if I recall.

Q. I'm going to hand you what I've marked as, I apologize, this has a sticker on it, it's labeled Defendant's Exhibit, but I hand wrote underneath it Village. So treating this as Village Exhibit No. 1.

MS. GALKA: I'm just going to object to this exhibit because it wasn't provided to Petitioners in discovery, even though Petitioners made discovery requests that it would be responsive to.

MR. WESNER: As counsel understands, the Village objected to many of the requests, in terms of the nature of discovery. But, in terms of as we stepped forward -- in terms of the nature of this particular case, felt that this particular exhibit would be necessary for the presentation of the Village's case

MS. GALKA: If I could just respond once further. Petitioners don't believe it's fundamentally fair that the Village can cherry

pick which responsive discovery it gets to give Petitioners, and use whatever it thinks is relevant for this hearing.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I will go ahead and accept this as an offer of proof. And your line of questioning about this document as an offer of proof. And you can argue it in your post-hearing brief.

MR. WESNER: All right. Thank you.

BY MR. WESNER:

Q. Okay. So you have what's labeled as Village Exhibit No. 1 in front of you. Is it fair to say that is an e-mail?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. And the "to" area of that is labeled as elected officials. Are you a part of an e-mail group labeled "elected officials" for the Village?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Would you then have received this e-mail from the administrator?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you see how it says, sent here on Tuesday, June 2nd of 2026, is that right?

A. Yeah.

Q. So it's fair to say you were thinking that you received the hearing officer's report at the beginning of June. Is this an e-mail that suggests that the hearing officer's report is attached to this e-mail?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. Does the e-mail also indicate that the record of the local hearing proceedings was going to be posted on the Village's website because of how extensive the record was?

A. Yes, it was, yes.

Q. And did you take that then to understand that you could go to that link on the Village website to review the record of the proceedings?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. So, is it fair to say that -- apologize. Let me step back.

Was the meeting at which the Village Board voted to make its decision on the application, was that on June 16th of 2026?

A. Yes. The special meeting, yes, it was.

Q. So, is it fair to say that you had between June 2nd and June 16th to review the hearing officer's report, as well as the record of

the proceedings?

A. Yes. That's correct.

Q. I think you testified under counsel's question that you were aware that written public comments were going to be submitted in part of the record?

A. Yes. I did.

Q. And so I think you indicated you did review those written public comments?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. And then as I just indicated, the board meeting at which the application was going to get discussed and a decision made was June 16th of 2026, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And was that a regular board meeting or was it a special board meeting?

A. It was a special board meeting.

Q. All right. And so as a special board meeting, would there have been anything relative to the application on any other meeting during June of 2026?

A. I'm not sure I understand.

Q. I think you were testifying earlier

about a study session that occurred, that may have involved the application.

And I just want to confirm, I guess, so you can testify or answer about the board meeting where the application was voted on was a special board meeting on June 16th?

A. That's correct. Yes, it was.

Q. So, and special meeting, that's not a regular board meeting of the Village Board?

A. That's right.

Q. And it was not a study session of the Village Board, is that right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. It was a full board meeting classified as a special meeting, is that right?

A. That's correct. Designed to address this, that we're talking about today.

Q. And was anything else on the agenda for that special meeting on June 16th, 2026?

A. Not that I can recall, no.

Q. All right. And so taking a step back to my generalized questions about agendas. If there's nothing on an agenda heading into a meeting, that would indicate that nothing is going

to get discussed outside of what's on the agenda?

A. For the most part, yeah.

Q. So if there was going to be any meeting to discuss by the board this application, an agenda would have shown that, is that right?

MS. GALKA: Objection, leading.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Overruled.

A. That's correct.

Q. I think you testified earlier about your decision making on the application. So did you take into consideration the hearing officer's report and findings in making your decision on the application?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And you indicated, is that the basis for your vote to approve the application with conditions?

A. That, along with Foth Engineering's letter of approval.

Q. And so was Foth's letter and report included in the record of the proceedings of --

A. Yes, it was.

Q. So, did you take into considering anything outside of the record when you ended up

voting "yes" on the application?

A. No. No. Not anything.

Q. In your review of the hearing officer's report, did you have any reason to disagree with his findings?

A. No. After reading it, no.

Q. If the hearing officer's findings had indicated that the application did not meet the criteria, would you still have voted yes to approve the application?

A. If it -- ask me again.

Q. If the hearing officer said the application does not meet the criteria, would you still have voted yes on the application?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. I think you indicated that you relied on the hearing officer's report and Foth's report in your decision making, is that right?

A. Yeah.

Q. Did you have any reason to believe that Foth had reviewed something different than the application that was part of the hearing?

A. No, no. I want to say of course not. No.

Q. So, at any time did anyone tell you, you had to approve the application?

A. No. I get told a lot of things, but not how to vote.

Q. At any time did anyone force or coerce you to approve the application?

A. Goodness no. No.

Q. At any time did anyone promise you anything in exchange for approving the application?

A. No, no, absolutely.

Q. Do you believe the hearing officer's findings and the record of the proceedings supported your approval of the application?

A. Yes.

Q. And I think you testified earlier about had you reviewed the ordinance that was ultimately adopted by the Village Board prior to the June 16th, 2026, meeting, and you said that when you got to the meeting there were things on your desk?

A. That's correct.

Q. Is it fair to say that the ordinance that was approved or adopted by the board was one of the items at the dais?

A. Yes, that's fair to say.
Q. Were there other items at your dais as well?
A. I have plenty of items, yes.
Q. So you indicated that you understood there were options that the board could exercise on the application?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Would the other items have been related to those other options?
A. Yes. Could have been. Obviously there was an agenda and the announcements. And then like I said, the documents we're discussing now.
Q. Sure. I don't think I have any other questions.
MS. NAIR: No questions.
MS. GALKA: Short recross.
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY
MS. GALKA:
Q. Mayor Hall, sorry to do this to you, but I do have a few more questions.
A. That's fine.
Q. Do you recall the Village's attorney asking you some follow-up questions about

Ordinance 2813?

A. Just now?

Q. Just now.

A. Yes.

Q. Not asking you to go back.

A. Yeah, 'cuz I just needed to clarify. Most of today has been about a year ago.

Q. Yes. And you discussed with your counsel just now a little bit about the clarification of that ordinance, in terms of how far notification has to go as it relates to Interstate 57; do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. When you were considering whether to pass Ordinance 2813, did you know that that would exclude certain property owners within the Village of Rantoul from getting written notice that they were previously entitled to?

A. No, not necessarily. No.

Q. Okay. And I'm going to hand you part of the record here to refresh your memory on that a little bit.

I just handed the witness a copy of pages of the record, C168 to C169. Do you see

that, Mayor Hall?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay. Do you see that the first page of what I've just handed you, and I'll just call it Petitioner's Exhibit 13, just for our records so we have something to call it.

Do you see on Exhibit 13 that there is a black dotted line surrounding a, quote, "subject property"?

A. Like the oval?

Q. Yes.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. The subject property is the site of the proposed waste transfer station, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. And that oval dotted line around the proposed facility, do you see that that's indicating a one thousand foot offset from the property line?

A. Yes. I do.

Q. Okay. So if you look to the eastern part of that oval there, you can see that it sort of butts up to Murray Road at one point. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay. And do you see that falling outside of that one thousand foot setback from the property line is the Rantoul Hospitality Inc.?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know if they got written notice of the application?

A. I do not know. But based on what we've discussed, if they're outside of that line, I would assume they did not.

Q. And is it true that Macs Convenient Stores LLC falls outside of that line?

A. I apologize. This is tiny print. Yes. It takes me a minute to find it. Yeah, I see Macs.

Q. Okay. I'm not going to ask you about all these properties here. But moving south, do you see that the Rantoul Church of Christ falls just outside of that one thousand foot line?

A. Yes.

Q. And moving a little bit back to the east, do you see that the Shields Family Development LLC falls outside of that one thousand foot line?

A. Yes. Yes.

Q. And turning to the second page of what I just handed you, which is the record marked C169. That page also has that same one thousand foot setback oval. Do you see that?

A. Uh-huh, I do.

Q. And then sort of to the southeast, there's an arrow pointing, and it kind of goes from the facility site line boundary across that one thousand foot line, and points into a neighborhood. Do you see that?

A. Yes. Yes, I do.

Q. And that arrow is indicating that it is 1,390.2 feet to the zoned multi-family residential. Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. So that multi-family zoned residential space falls outside of that one thousand foot boundary, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that Ordinance 2815 was intended to make sure that residents in that area didn't get notice of the written application?

MR. WESNER: Objection, argumentative.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Can you repeat the question?

Q. Sure, I'm happy to rephrase it also.

Do you know whether the Ordinance 2813's cap on written notice of an application was intended to make sure that that residential zone didn't get written notice of the application?

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Go ahead. You can answer that.

A. Okay. I do not know that.

Q. I can take that back from you. It's in the record already, but I don't think I handed you a copy.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Do you have one that's labeled, if you're going to use it as like a demonstrative or something? Or do you want me to just put P13 on it?

MS. GALKA: You can just put P13 on it. Thank you.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Do you recall just now as you were talking with your counsel some discussion about the June 16th, 2026, special meeting?

A. I do.

Q. And when I was asking you questions, it sounded to me like there was some sort of discussion you had with board members about the application prior to the start of that meeting. Is that right?

A. Prior to the start of that meeting on that day? No. No.

Q. Thank you for clarifying that. I have no further questions.

MR. WESNER: Nothing else.

MS. NAIR: No questions.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: All right. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Let's take a break before the next witness. Should we take ten minutes.

(A break was taken at 11:06 a.m.)

(The time is 11:18 a.m.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We will go back on the record. You may call your next witness.

MS. GALKA: Thank you. Petitioners would like to call trustee Mike Graham, and I would like to move at this time to call him as an

adverse witness.

MIKE GRAHAM,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good morning, Trustee Graham. We met before on Zoom.

A. Yeah.

Q. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.

A. My name is Michael P. Graham. Spelled M-I-C-H-A-E-L. "P" as in Paul. Graham, G-R-A-H-A-M. Which in Scotland and Ireland means gray house.

Q. Thank you. Your most recent election to the Village of Rantoul Board of Trustees was in April 2025, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you've served as a trustee prior to that as well, is that right?

A. 2003 to 2007, yes.

Q. Is it correct that on June 16th, 2026, you voted to approve Area Disposal's application

for a waste transfer station with conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. The Village Board's June 16th, 2026, decision to approve Area Disposal's waste transfer station with conditions was ultimately codified in an ordinance, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell me about the process behind how the conditions that are in that ordinance came to the Village Board for consideration?

A. Well, after the public hearing there were people that stood up in opposition of the facility. And then the hearing officer said they would accept written -- written commentary for 30 days. And then the hearing officer would pull that together and provide us with a report.

And so after the report was issued, then we had a study session meeting, regular study session meeting on June 2nd. And this was not on the agenda. At the study session we talk about what's on the agenda, and then the mayor or the president of the Village Board, official position, would ask the trustees if there's consensus to move it forward to the voting meeting, which would

be June 9th. And that wasn't on the agenda. Then it was decided by the mayor and the president of the Village Board and the administration that the ordinance for approving Area Disposal's application would be June 16th. And then we voted on it. And it was passed. And that's where we stand.

Q. Do you know how it was that at that June 16th, 2026, meeting, there was an ordinance in front of you that contained conditions that you could vote to approve?

A. Well, prior to the meeting we were sent three different ordinances. One ordinance would approve it as is. One ordinance would disapprove it. And one ordinance, we were queried about that. We could pass an ordinance with conditions. And the administrator asked or said that we could pass the ordinance with conditions. Did we have any conditions to provide?

I, because some of the people at the April 17th meeting said well, it's going to be the first thing you see when you drive into Rantoul. Well, the auto salvage companies here in town have to have a fence around their salvage yard. So I

said, I thought that they ought to have a ten foot fence completely around the perimeter with two gates open during operating hours. And those gates be locked with a security system at night to protect their equipment, and also protect the juvenile delinquents we have in town that would hop the fence and try to burn the place down. And so that's the condition I proposed.

And then you asked me in the deposition on October 19th, I think Trustee Crider provided something about road use. So there were two conditions attached. They would have to build a ten foot fence around the perimeter with security. And that they would set up a road use agreement after it was approved, they would negotiate a road use agreement after it was approved. And sent to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for final approval.

Q. Okay. I think I understood from what you said there that at some point somebody asked you whether you had any conditions you would like to propose, is that right?

A. Well, the administrator sent out an e-mail that said that we could pass an ordinance

with conditions. And did we have any conditions to provide? That was the impetus for putting the conditions. And the corporate counsel was copied on that.

And so I wrote that down. And then I think Trustee Crider provided some. I don't know if any other trustee provided anything. I can't recall.

Q. And then outside of that e-mail communication, and the June 16th, 2026, meeting itself, did you ever discuss those conditions with any of the other trustees?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Prior to the June 16th, 2026 special meeting, did you ever discuss with the mayor or any of the other trustees what the options were for how you could vote on whether to approve or deny Area Disposal's application?

A. No. I don't talk to the trustees. They talk to me. 'Cuz I've been here for 55 years, Maggie. So I'm the old man here.

Q. Okay. When you put it that way, let me ask you this. Did any of the other trustees or the mayor talk to you about --

A. No, no, nobody talks to me.
Q. About what could be --
A. 'Cuz they don't want to listen to me.
Q. Fair. You don't talk to anyone, no one talks to you?
A. It's like my wife. Everything I say is wrong. Everything I don't say is wrong. So I just hide under the bed like a black alley cat and hope she can't find me. So I just keep quiet.
Q. Fair enough. I believe you. You're under oath.
A. She's a wonderful lady. We've been married 53 years October 20th.
Q. Good. I believe that too.
A. I have to say that, or I'd be in big trouble.
Q. Well, moving on from that, I want to hand you what I've marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 9. That's the comprehensive plan.
A. You can just tell me what it is. I know what they are.
MR. WESNER: At this time I will object to the presentation of this exhibit and any line of questioning relative to it as we understand, I

believe counsel understands too, any zoning related concept or issues are not part of the process of whether or not to approve or disapprove a siting application.

MS. GALKA: My line of questioning has to do with the ordinance passed by the Village related to the procedures involved in this matter.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. I'll allow it.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. So, Trustee Graham, Exhibit 9 in front of you is the official comprehensive plan for the Village of Rantoul, Illinois, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. And you were on the Board of Trustees when the comprehensive plan was originally passed, is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Are you familiar with the Village's comprehensive plan in front of you?

A. Yes, I am.

MS. GALKA: At this time, Petitioners would like to move for the admission of Exhibit 9, the official comprehensive plan.

MR. WESNER: Going to renew my objection as to the idea of anything related to the zoning or zoning related matters are not part of a consideration to approve or disapprove a siting application.

MS. GALKA: And where I'm going next is how they are related to the Village's procedures. But I can ask those questions first.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Why don't you ask those questions first.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Okay. To your knowledge, is Petitioner's Exhibit 9 in front of you the comprehensive plan that is still applicable to the Village today?

A. Yes.

Q. And now I'm going to -- I will let you keep that one. But I'm also going to show you what has already been admitted and marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 1, which is Ordinance 2796.

You voted in favor of passing Ordinance 2796, is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. But you don't know who drafted

the actual language that appears in Ordinance 2796, is that right?

A. No, I don't know that. I presume the corporate counsel was a big part of that.

Q. The Village Board's vote in favor of passing Ordinance 2796 was a vote to pass some procedures that the Village Board would use to determine whether or not to approve Area Disposal's application, is that right?

A. Yeah. I think it had to do with the provisions for a solid waste management transfer station and congruent with the Champaign County ordinance for solid waste management, and probably a boiler plate with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency had for villages and municipalities to use.

Q. Other than voting to approve it, and reviewing it, did you have any role in determining what the procedures in Ordinance 2796 would be?

A. No.

Q. Would you agree with me that it's important to have some sort of procedures for the board to follow when considering an application for a waste transfer station?

A. Yeah. It's mandated by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in the application. They file the application. And then you have to go through a set of procedures. That was discussed on May 22, 2025, when Trustee Wilson and I and the administrator met with Area Disposal at their facility. They went through a power point presentation. And then 45 minutes into it we discussed what they needed from the Village of Rantoul.

And so they discussed that. They discussed the hearing process. And it would be a long drawn out procedure. And I asked, who would oppose it? They said well, one of their competitors down in Urbana would oppose it. One of the four largest waste management companies in the United States of America. Because they don't want any competition.

Q. Fair enough. And I'll get back to that. I may have some questions for you on it. But I appreciate your answer.

What is your understanding of, beyond the May 2025 meeting, what is your understanding of just the logistics for how Ordinance 2796 came

before the Village Board?

A. Well, like I said, I believe it's a boiler plate ordinance that has to do with solid waste management facilities within the Village of Rantoul. So, it's an ordinance that needs to be in place to even consider the application. And the procedures that would follow, which are mandated by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in the application process.

Q. And Ordinance 2796 contains a section 28-102. Do you see that in the ordinance? Let me see if I can find the page number.

A. What page is it on?

Q. Let me see here. It's on page four.

A. Yeah. I got it.

Q. Okay. And I'm not going to read all of Section 28-102. It's long. But I want to point you to a couple pieces of it and ask you some questions.

Section 28-102 B state that each application must address the nine criteria set forth in the act (415ILCS5/39.2). Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And Section 28-102B goes on to state, those nine criteria and the minimum documentation to be submitted by the applicant in support of its application as to each criteria are as follows: And then it goes on to list the nine criteria. Do you see that?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Section 28-102B, number three, which is on page five, starts on page five; that number three states that one of those criteria is that the facility be located so as to minimize incompatibility with the character of the surrounding area and to minimize the effect on the value of the surrounding property. Right?

A. That's what it says.

Q. Okay. And then if you keep going in Section 28-102(B)3, there's a sub list, numbered A, B, C, D. Which state the minimum documentation an application must include with their application, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. So Section 28-102(B)3C requires that the application include as minimum documentation the Village's comprehensive plan

showing projected land uses of the site and within 2,500 feet of the perimeter of the site. Is that right?

A. Where do you see the 2,500 feet?

Q. Sorry. It's the second clause of 3C.

A. It says a map shows boundary of all hundred year flood plains within five hundred feet. I don't see the 2,500 feet.

Q. Let me just logistically direct you to what I'm looking at. I'm looking at page five of the ordinance?

A. I was on six.

Q. If you go to the very bottom of five. You can see that there's a section three. And then it lists A, B, C, D. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And number 3C there, which is part of Section 28-102, states that one of the things that the application should contain as far as documentation is the Village's comprehensive plan showing projected land uses of the site and within 2,500 feet of the perimeter of the site. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And the Village's comprehensive plan is the plan we were just discussing, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. At this time Petitioners would like to move to admit Exhibit 9, which is the official comprehensive plan.

MR. WESNER: Again, renew my objection on this, and understand obviously a significant amount of questioning about this, but I will renew it on the standpoint that anything related to zoning or zoning-related matters are not up for consideration. And if this is related to criteria, the idea of what meets or doesn't meet the criteria is limited to the record of the local proceedings, and no new evidence can be admitted relative to that particular --

MS. GALKA: I would state that this isn't about the criteria and what meets the criteria. It's about whether the procedures that govern this proceeding were followed in this case. And whether that rendered the hearing unfair.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I'm going to admit it.

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. Did you review Area Disposal's written application?

A. Yes.

Q. Isn't it true that Area Disposal's written application does not include the comprehensive plan marked as Exhibit 9?

A. I'm not exactly sure of that. So, I can't address that.

Q. But fair to say that the record of what was included in that application or not is what you would rely on to answer that question?

A. That's correct. Now, if you ask me about the original comprehensive plan, I could tell you what was in the original comprehensive plan and why it was changed.

Q. Okay. I just might do that. But first, I want to ask you a little bit about the written comments in this matter. So, you're aware that the Village received written public comments concerning Area Disposal's application, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. You didn't look at all of the written public comments, did you?

A. I did after October 19th. I reviewed the whole record of all 1,900 pages.

Q. Okay. I understand. So, prior to October 19th, you didn't look at all of the written public comments, is that correct?

A. I, as I stated on October 19th, they were submitted by the Village clerk through various e-mails. And we get a lot of e-mails through the Village e-mail system. I check it about three times a day. So, I scanned through a number of them. But, after October 19th I read them all.

Q. Okay. Just to get sort of a clean record here; prior to October 19th, 2026, is it your testimony that you did not read every single written public comment?

A. No. I didn't notice your letter until I read everything.

Q. Okay. When voting to approve the application, did you take into account Mr. Steve Komubist's oral public comment where he stated he was in favor of Area Disposal's application?

A. Yes.

Q. And in that oral public comment, do you

recall that he said that he got to meet with Area Disposal to discuss with --

A. Yes.

Q. Discuss the application?

A. He looked over the application and he looked -- I presume he got the same presentation we got, which was a power point presentation showing what they were going to do. And he's one of the neighbors, and he's also been in the waste management business. He and his father Mark Komubist had C&S Sanitary at that site 55 years ago when I came to Rantoul.

Q. So, some history there.

A. Yeah.

Q. I think you testified that you assumed he saw the same presentation that you did. But do you know for sure whether he saw the same presentation?

A. No, I don't know for sure what he saw. But he said they presented their presentation to him and he didn't see any problem with it. And Steve was very soft spoken, and I recall the hearing officer said you're going to have to speak up because he was very soft spoken about it. And

you couldn't hardly hear him in the back row there.

Q. Okay. Do you think it's fair to the rest of the residents of the Village of Rantoul that Steve Komubist got a private meeting with Area Disposal?

A. I wouldn't have any opinion on that. He is right next door to the facility. And he's been in the waste management business prior to that. And he bought Mike Flessner's Rantoul truck center, which was there 55 years ago. And that truck center puts on dump truck beds and modifies chassises, and Steve started carrying new and used garbage trucks because that's what he was familiar with.

And so Steve would know more about the waste hauling business than anybody in this room, I think.

Q. To your knowledge, did Area Disposal promise anything to Steve Komubist in exchange for coming and giving his oral public comment?

A. I have no knowledge if they promised him anything or not.

Q. Turning back to the May 2025 meeting you

were so kind to tell me about; at that May 22nd, 2025 meeting, you visited Area Disposal's site for the proposed facility, is that right?

A. Right.

Q. And I think you said that there was another trustee that attended with you, is that right?

A. Yeah, trustee Wilson was there. I was there. You can only have two trustees in a meeting at once or you violate the Open Meetings Act. The administrator was there. And then representatives from Area Disposal/GFL was there. And the engineer conducted the meeting.

Q. And when you say the engineer, that's Area Disposal's engineer?

A. Yeah, their hired engineer.

Q. Do you recall his name?

A. I think it was the same engineer that came to the public hearing, I believe.

Q. Okay. If I told you that that person's name was John Hock, does that refresh your recollection?

A. Yeah.

Q. Was that him?

A. Yeah.

Q. How many other representatives of Area Disposal were there?

A. Three for sure. I think there was a fellow by the name of Mark Colter. Who was the grandson of the fellow that started Area Disposal in Peoria, Illinois. And was an employee of GFL. There was some operating people that worked at the facility in Rantoul. And another fellow. So I think there were three for sure. I can't remember. They filled up the conference room.

Q. And I think you said that Area Disposal's expert gave a presentation at the meeting?

A. Right. He went through what they were going to do with the facility, which included diagrams of the buildings, and what they proposed to do, and how they were going to do it. And the waste transfer building and what advantage it would be. And how they were going to segregate the waste from recyclable once it was in the Village. Once it was in their facility. Then they would push the trash into one trailer. Push the recycles into another trailer.

The advantage would be instead of driving the whole truck over to Clinton, which is where their waste dump would be, they could drive five or six trucks and one trailer. And so there was a lot of diagrams about the site and the control process that they would go through, in accordance with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's requirements.

Q. And you said that that presentation was about 45 minutes?

A. That's correct.

Q. Did you rely on anything you learned at the May 2025 site visit in forming your decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application?

A. Not at that time. It was just an initial meeting. And he coulda' gone the other way too. They could have decided not to move forward with it.

Q. Trustee Crider (sic), I believe that you remember that you gave a deposition in this matter on October 19th?

A. Yeah.

Q. And you were under oath during that deposition just as you are now, is that right?

A. Yeah.

Q. I want to show you some of your testimony from that. I'm handing you a copy of the transcript of that deposition.

A. Okay. I didn't bring my copy. It's easier to read.

Q. I got the mini. I'm sorry about that. I want to direct your attention to page 37 of the transcript. Which is on page ten of the overall document. So number ten in the top right corner.

A. Okay.

Q. On October 19th, 2026, I asked you, did you rely on anything you learned at that May 2025 site visit in forming your decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application. And you testified, May 22nd meeting; yes, I did. Is that right?

A. Well, I relied on the initial presentation. I didn't make a decision about it.

Q. Okay. So, just to restate our -- that question just fresh here at the meeting.

Did you rely on anything you learned at the May 2025 site visit in forming your decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application?

A. Okay. What question are you looking at? 35?

Q. Yeah, let me better direct you to it.

A. There's four squares there.

Q. I know. Give me one second. If you go to the bottom right square, which just the top right corner of that square. It says 37. And then if you go to the line 21, that's where I'm going to start my question.

So if you would be so kind, Trustee Graham, let me know when you're there at that bottom right square, line 21.

A. Well, I guess I answered yes.

Q. This is harder on you than it needs to be. Okay. One page back. Oh, yeah. So I'll flip from the page before to that page so you can follow.

All right. Is it true that while you were under oath on October 19th, 2026, I asked you, did you rely on anything you learned at the May 2025 site visit in forming your decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application? And your answer was, May 22nd meeting; yes, I did. Is that accurate?

A. Yes, that was the initial presentation. But, it went in total to June 16th. I mean everything in totality. I mean, that was the initial presentation that we were given. And so -- I would say we said yes, and they proceeded with their application. And they indicated that it would be a public hearing probably in January. And that their competitor from Urbana would probably be there to object with their lawyers. And then everything got moved back, thank God, because I'm a CPA and we for 59 and a half years have been doing tax law. And so April 15th is a pretty bad day for me. Well, the whole year is actually.

Q. I can see that. Do you recall telling me on October 19th that after the meeting and the presentation, it generally looked like something that would be acceptable to the Village of Rantoul, something meaning the waste transfer station?

A. Yeah, any business that comes to town that has to be licensed has to consult with the Village Government and ascertain whether or not they're welcome or not. And ascertain what the

fees are going to be. And what the restrictions are. And whether they want to do this or not. So, that's a pretty common procedure.

Q. Fair enough. Just have one last question for you, Trustee Graham.

Do you feel that the waste transfer station is a bad deal for the Village of Rantoul, economically speaking?

A. Do I feel it's a bad deal economically?

Q. Yes. That's my question.

A. No.

Q. No further questions. Thank you for your time today.

A. Do you want to hear about the comprehensive plan?

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We're not done with you quite yet, sir. Mr. Wesner.

EXAMINATION BY

MR. WESNER:

Q. So I guess just because counsel ended there, I think I'll start there as well. And so under counsel's questions, you ended up saying with regard to any comments you would have made relative to the May 2025 site visit, that you

considered everything in totality when it came to voting on the application, is that fair?

A. Yes, that was the initial meeting. And then it proceeded from there.

Q. All right. And so although you may have obviously had the presentation on your mind, did you make up your mind to absolutely approve the application after that site visit?

A. No.

Q. And is that because you understood there would be a process involved if they moved forward with the application?

A. Yes, they explained the process that they would have to prepare the application, and submit it to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, and that there would be a public hearing probably in January. But then like everything, things get moved back. And so I don't know whether they accommodated me with April 17th or not.

But, that's -- a lot of these things that are proposed to the Village of Rantoul sometimes never happen.

Q. Okay.

A. And with respect to a comprehensive plan, if you want to get into that, in 2003 to 2007 --

Q. We don't need to dive down that road, not at all. That's not a question I'm asking about right now.

A. I can tell you what was in the original comprehensive plan.

Q. All right. So, after the site visit of May of 2025, did you attend any other meetings with Area Disposal's representatives?

A. No.

Q. Did you make up your mind to absolutely approve the application at any time prior to the hearing in April on the application?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall when you received the hearing officer's report that came from that hearing?

A. I think it was sometime in June or July. Can't remember the exact date.

Q. I'm going to hand you what's marked as --

A. I have it here.

Q. Classified as Village Exhibit No. 1. And ask you to take a look at that.

A. Yeah. June 2nd. I was close.

Q. So that appears to be an e-mail from the Village administrator, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And in the "to" area it's labeled as elected officials. Do you see that?

A. Yeah.

Q. Are you a part of the e-mail group labeled elected officials for the Village?

A. Yeah, there's seven elected officials. Six trustees, and the president of the Village Board would be seven.

Q. So do you recall receiving that e-mail from the administrator?

A. Yeah.

Q. And do you see that the e-mail indicated that the report of the hearing officer was attached?

A. Yes.

Q. And it also indicates that the record, which was extensive, was put on the Village's website for you to access and review?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And so is that consistent with your memory about when you received the hearing officer's report, and you indicated it was maybe in June?

A. Absolutely.

Q. All right. And so in your heading, obviously I understand you needed to make a decision on the application to review the hearing officer's report with regard to your voting on the application in June 2026?

A. Yeah.

Q. Did you review the hearing officer's report?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you review the record of the proceedings from the April hearing?

A. Yes.

Q. And you understood that that record included written comments that were submitted?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you review the written comments?

A. Yes. Scanned through 'em.

Q. And so when you voted on the

application, did you consider the hearing officer's report and the record when you did that?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall what the hearing officer's findings were relative to the application?

A. He said that it met all the requirements of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, and all nine requirements. And the public hearing he said that the Village Board of trustees was like a jury. That if it met all nine requirements of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, then we should vote yes.

Q. Did you have any reason to disagree with the hearing officer's findings and report?

A. No. No.

Q. Did you consider anything outside of the hearing officer's report and the record of the proceedings from the April 2026 hearing when you voted to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone tell you that you had to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone force or coerce you to approve the application?

A. No. Only people that coerce me is my wife.

Q. And did you believe the hearing officer's findings in the record supported your approval of the application?

A. Yes, his report was extensive and very detailed and went into a lot of things that I didn't remember from the public hearing.

Q. I have no further questions for Trustee Graham.

MS. NAIR: Very, very briefly.

EXAMINATION BY

MS. NAIR:

Q. In voting to approve with conditions, did you consider the public comment that was in the record as well the record that existed in April, plus the hearing officer's report?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you -- in talking about your May 2025 meeting at Area Disposal; did you learn anything at that meeting that wasn't contained in the record as prepared by the clerk in June of

2026?

A. Well, at the meeting on May 22nd, 2025, they went through the process towards the end of the meeting. And everything that they said was going to happen, did happen.

Q. So there was nothing that you learned in May of '25 that wasn't in the actual record --

A. That's correct.

Q. -- before the Village?

A. That's correct.

Q. Nothing further. Thank you.

MS. GALKA: Just a couple follow ups.

RECROSS EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Do you know for sure that everything that was presented to you at the May 22nd, 2025, site visit, were the exact -- was the exact same as what was presented in the Area Disposal's application?

A. No, I don't know that. They presented the concept. And when they perfected the application with the IEPA, I wasn't given a copy of the application, so I wouldn't need the application.

Q. Okay. That's all.

MR. WESNER: Nothing further.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you, Mr. Graham.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Let's go off the record.

(The time is 11:59 a.m.)

(The time is 12:31 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We will go back on the record, and Petitioners may call their next witness.

MS. GALKA: At this time Petitioners call trustee Regina Crider, and would make a motion to call her as an adverse witness.

REGINA CRIDER,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good afternoon, Trustee Crider. My name is Maggie Galka, we met before on the Zoom.

A. Yes.

Q. Thanks for your time this afternoon and

this morning.

Can you state and spell your name for the record?

A. Regina Crider. R-E-G-I-N-A. C-r-i-d-e-r.

Q. And you've been serving as a trustee for the Village of Rantoul for about six years, is that right?

A. Yeah. Approximately.

Q. And you attended the June 16th, 2026, special meeting where the Village Board voted to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And is it true that you voted in favor of approving Area Disposal's waste transfer station with conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. At the June 16th, 2026, special meeting, did you have in front of you a written copy of the proposed ordinance that would reflect the Board's decision about Area Disposal's waste transfer station?

A. There were three, I think, different

options. Yes.

Q. And was one of the options the ordinance that ultimately did get approved? The one that approves the waste transfer station with conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did you do anything other than review those proposed ordinances to determine how you would vote?

A. Did I do anything -- what do you mean?

Q. Just, other than reviewing the language in the proposed ordinances, did you do anything else to determine how you would vote?

A. I reviewed the material that was provided for me. The material that was provided for, through the criteria from the hearing officer to help me to determine. But other than that, no.

Q. Okay. Did you read Area Disposal's application for a waste transfer station prior to the June 16th?

A. Not the entire application, no.

Q. Is it correct that you did not attend the April 17th, 2026 hearing about Area Disposal's application?

A. That's correct.

Q. Did you ever review the transcript from the April 17th, 2026, hearing?

A. No, I did not.

Q. And you didn't hear the oral public comments at that hearing, right?

A. No.

Q. And you never read the part of the transcript that contained those public comments, is that right?

A. Correct.

Q. So is it fair to say that you didn't consider the oral public comments at the April 17th meeting when you voted on the application?

A. Correct.

Q. Did you ever read the hearing officer's report with his findings and conclusions about Area Disposal's application?

A. I read over it. I didn't read it in depth. But I've skimmed it.

Q. Trustee Crider, do you recall that on October 19th of 2026, I took your deposition in this matter?

A. Yes.

Q. I'm going to hand you the transcript, written transcript from that deposition.

And I would like to direct you to the page 24 of the transcript, which are the little numbers in the top right corner of the boxes. So, it would be page seven of the overall transcript of this physical document. I'm on page 24 of the transcript.

A. In the right-hand corner of the little box? I think I found it.

Q. Okay. I'll just make sure we're on the same page here.

A. Right here.

Q. Yeah. And you were under oath during that deposition, is that right?

A. Correct.

Q. And is it true that at your deposition -- give me one second.

Just realized I directed you to the wrong page. I'm going to ask you to go to page 13 of the transcript.

And I'll direct you also to --

A. Wait a minute; 13 in the little box?

Q. Little box 13. Big page four.

A. Okay. And the what?

Q. And then I'll just turn your attention to line 14. When you're there, I'll ask you a question about it.

A. Okay.

Q. Is it true that at your deposition I asked you, did you ever read the hearing officer's report with his findings and conclusions about Area Disposal's application? And you answered no.

A. Correct.

Q. Did the --

MR. RUDICH: I'm going to object. That is improper impeachment. I think her testimony is consistent with the testimony given in the transcript on that page and continuing through to the top of the next page.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Didn't she testify to that?

MS. GALKA: Just now or in the --

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Just now.

MS. GALKA: She did. I think my point is that there's inconsistent testimony about whether she did.

A. Misunderstood. I thought you were

referring to the report, not the transcript thingee. I was conflating the two.

MR. RUDICH: In any event, in her testimony on that same page in the deposition she makes clear that she read at least portions of that report and references reading it. So, I don't think her testimony here was inconsistent with the deposition. So I'd ask that that be stricken.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Can we redo the question? Do you want to reask the question?

BY MS. GALKA:

Q. No, we can just let the prior testimony stand. That's all right. I definitely don't want to confuse the record here.

Did the possibility that Area Disposal might take some sort of legal action if the Board denied the application factor into your decision to vote to approve the waste transfer station with conditions?

A. No.

Q. Did the possibility that Area Disposal might sue you if the Board denied the application factor into your decision to vote to approve Area

Disposal's waste transfer station?

A. No.

Q. We were just talking about this a moment ago, but you know that the Village's decision to approve the waste transfer station did take a form of a written ordinance, right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know who drafted that ordinance?

A. No.

Q. Do you know if Area Disposal helped draft that ordinance?

A. No.

Q. That's all the questions I have for you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Mr. Wesner.

MR. WESNER: If I could just have a minute.

EXAMINATION BY

MR. WESNER:

Q. Thank you, Trustee Crider. I'm going to have just a few questions for you.

Do you recall when you would have received the hearing officer's report?

A. When we received the e-mail from the administrator in June.

Q. So hand you what I've marked as, labeled Village Exhibit No. 1. Just ask you to take a look at that.

Would that be the e-mail you're referring to?

A. Yes.

Q. And it's indicated to be to, what appears to be a group address of elected officials. So are you a part of that e-mail group of elected officials?

A. Yes.

Q. So that e-mail just confirms your testimony that you received the hearing officer's report in the beginning of June?

A. Yes.

Q. And I think you testified that you reviewed some of the hearing officer's report in making your decision to approve the application with conditions. Did you have any reason to disagree with the hearing officer's report on the application?

A. No.

Q. Did you take into consideration anything outside of the hearing officer's report or the

record that was created of the hearing when you voted to approve the application with conditions?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone tell you that you had to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone force or coerce you to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone promise you anything in exchange for approving the application?

A. No.

Q. Do you believe the hearing officer's findings supported your approval of the application?

A. Yes.

Q. I have no more questions for Trustee Crider.

MS. NAIR: No questions.

MS. GALKA: Nothing further.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Petitioners may call their next witness.

MS. GALKA: Petitioner would like to

call Trustee Terry Workman at this time. And I would just make a motion to call him as an adverse witness.

TERRY WORKMAN,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION BY

MS. GALKA:

Q. Good afternoon. Could you please state and spell your name for the record?

A. My name is Terry Workman. T-E-R-R-Y. W-O-R-K-M-A-N.

Q. And is it correct that you started your most recent term as trustee about three years ago?

A. That's correct.

Q. And have you served as a trustee before this most recent term?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you personally read Area Disposal's application to site a waste transfer station?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you do that?

A. I don't recall.

Q. At the June 16th, 2026, special meeting

that the Village Board had, you made a motion to authorize and approve with conditions Area Disposal's siting application, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then you voted to approve Area Disposal's siting application with conditions, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Why did you vote to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions?

A. Because of the information that was given to me.

Q. Do you recall that at your October 19th, 2026, deposition, telling me that you don't remember why you voted to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. What did you base your decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application on?

A. All of the information that was given to the Board.

Q. Do you recall telling me at your October 19th, 2026, deposition, that you don't remember what you based the decision on?

A. That's correct.
Q. And now you do remember?
A. Whatever information was given to the Board at that meeting and those proceedings. That's what I used.
Q. What happened between now and October 19th, 2026, that you remember more about what you based your decision on?
A. Between now and then? Nothing.
Q. Did you do anything to prepare to give your testimony today at this hearing?
A. Did I do anything to prepare for it?
Q. Yes.
A. No. Should I have?
Q. You tell me. Do you think you should have done anything to prepare to give testimony at this hearing today?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any documents before giving your testimony today?
A. No.
Q. Did you discuss Area Disposal's application with any of the other Village Board of Trustee members prior to the June 16th, 2026

meeting?

A. No, I don't recall if I ever did. Don't think so.

Q. Did you discuss the application with the mayor before the June 16th, 2026, meeting?

A. Nope.

Q. Can you tell me anything about what you were thinking when you voted to approve the waste transfer station application?

A. I was thinking I looked at all of the information, and I thought it was a positive thing for the Village. And so I voted for it.

Q. When you say, all of the information; can you tell me a little bit more about what you're talking about?

A. I don't recall all of the information at this time.

Q. The Board's decision to vote to approve Area Disposal's application with conditions eventually made its way into a written ordinance. You're aware of that?

A. Yes.

Q. Prior to the June 16th, 2026, special meeting where the board was discussing the vote on

the application, did you ever see a draft of the written ordinance reflecting the Board's decision?

A. State that question again.

Q. Sure. Prior to the June 16th, 2026, special meeting where the board voted on Area Disposal's application, did you ever see a draft of the written ordinance reflecting the Board's decision to approve the transfer station?

A. The trustees always get an e-mail with the information about what's going to be at the board meeting. So, probably. A couple days before that or whatever.

Q. Prior to voting to approve the transfer station with conditions, did you ever consider what conditions that you might mandate that Area Disposal comply with?

A. No.

Q. Do you know whose idea it was to suggest that conditions be imposed on Area Disposal beyond what was included in their application?

A. No, I don't know whose idea that was.

Q. And do you know who drafted the ordinance that reflects the Board's decision to approve Area Disposal's waste transfer station

with conditions?

A. That's not my job. I don't know who did it.

Q. Did you ever talk with Village Administrator Scott Eisenhauer about Area Disposal's application?

A. I don't recall.

Q. That's all the questions I have. Thank you, Trustee. Thank you for your time.

EXAMINATION BY

MR. WESNER:

Q. Trustee, I'm going to hand you what I have marked as Village Exhibit No. 1. Ask you to take a look at that.

As you can see, that's an e-mail that was sent to what appears to be an e-mail group labeled elected officials from the Village administrator. Do you see that at the very top of the document?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Are you a part of that e-mail group of elected officials for the Village of Rantoul?

A. Yes.

Q. So you would have received that e-mail?

A. I probably received it, yes.

Q. All right. And you see that that e-mail indicates that the hearing officer's report is attached to the e-mail?

A. Yes.

Q. And does the e-mail also indicate that the record of the proceedings from the April 2026 hearing were put on the Village's website to be available for you for review?

A. Yes.

Q. At any time did anyone tell you that you had to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. At any time did anyone force or coerce you to approve the application?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone promise you anything in exchange for approving the application?

A. No.

Q. And do you believe that the record supported your decision to approve the application with conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. That's all I have.

MS. NAIR: Nothing from us. Thank you.
MS. GALKA: Nothing further.
HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you.
(Witness excused.)
HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Do the Petitioners have anything else they would like to present?
MS. GALKA: No, Petitioners have no more witnesses.
HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. And you're not introducing any more exhibits, is that correct?
MS. GALKA: That is correct.
HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. And Area Disposal, you are not calling any witnesses, is that correct?
MS. NAIR: That is correct. If we could take a moment just to review which exhibits have been admitted, I think that might be useful.
HEARING OFFICER WEBB: You want to do that on the record here or off?
MS. NAIR: Before we close our case.
MR. WESNER: I've got one witness. I don't know if you want to wait until the very end.

MS. NAIR: That would be fine too.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: So, we're ready for the Village.

MR. WESNER: I was going to indicate to you, Madam Hearing Officer, that my witness is the Village clerk and she has some health condition that makes it difficult for her to walk. I didn't know how long two trustees were going to last. So I had indicated to have her make her way down by 1:30. It's going to take us a little bit to make our way down here.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We'll go off the record for a minute while we get our next witness.

(At this point there was an off the record discussion.)

(The time is 12:52 p.m.)

(The time is 12:58 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We are back on the record. And we are ready for the Village to call their witness.

MR. WESNER: I think if we could just take a moment right before we do that. I think Area Disposal and Petitioner's attorney want to admit each transcript of particular meetings into

evidence as well. And I will let them comment on which ones those are.

MS. GALKA: This is by agreement. Petitioners would like to admit Petitioner's Exhibit 12, which is the unofficial transcript of the June 16th, 2026, special meeting.

MS. NAIR: And Area Disposal would like to admit their Exhibit 2, which is the unofficial transcript of the December 9, 2025, meeting. And just for clarity in the record, these are transcripts that are generated by the software that holds the live stream. So they are very unofficial. I think it's just phonetic transcription with time stamps.

MS. GALKA: That's my understanding as well.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. Both of those will be admitted.

MR. WESNER: The Village would call Janet Gray.

JANET GRAY,

called as a witness, after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

MR. WESNER:

Q. If you could state your name and spell it for the court reporter.

A. Janet Gray. J-A-N-E-T. Gray. G-R-A-Y.

Q. What is your occupation?

A. I'm the Village Clerk.

Q. And how long have you been the Village Clerk for Rantoul?

A. Starting seven years.

Q. And in a sense, if you can just briefly describe what your duties are as Village Clerk for the Village of Rantoul.

A. Attending and recording minutes of all official board meetings. Keeping the records and the freedom of information officer.

Q. So in the broader sense, because you're the Village Clerk, does that mean you are the "record keeper", quote, unquote, for the Village? That you are actually overseeing all of the records that are Village records?

A. Correct. It's my responsibility to know

where they are and to be able to find them for the public.

Q. What I'm going to do is direct your attention to kind of the reason that we're all here today, which is Area Disposal's application for a waste transfer station in the Village. Were you aware of the application that was submitted by Area Disposal?

A. Yes.

Q. And if you could kind of, again, describe the nature of what your role was in relation to the application an the process relative to the application.

A. I gathered documents and made sure that they were given to our administrator, who passed them forward as they were to go.

Q. And if you recall, was there a hearing on the transfer station application?

A. Yes, there was.

Q. And if you can recall, was that in April of this year, 2026?

A. Correct.

Q. And so did you attend the hearing?

A. I did. It was an official board

meeting, and therefore I was there in that capacity recording.

Q. Okay. And kind of after the hearing was concluded, did you have a role also at that stage?

A. At that point it was my job to collect any letters that came in from citizens speaking to the transfer station.

Q. Okay. And so is your testimony related to the idea that you were aware that there was a period where individuals could submit written public comment regarding the application?

A. Yes.

Q. And so after the hearing, do you recall about what the time period was that people were able to submit?

A. 30 days.

Q. Okay. And during that period, were you really the one that those written public comments needed to be submitted to?

A. Yes.

Q. And once you got to the end of that period of the public comments, what was your role at that point?

A. I gathered all of those letters. I

forwarded them to the administrator, who I believe forwarded them to the trustees. I sent them to Ms. Nair and I sent them to the hearing officer.

Q. So all of the written comments that were submitted to you within that time period were submitted to the hearing officer who oversaw the hearing?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall, or do you know, what his function was after you submitted those public comments to him?

A. He was compiling the official report, and they were part of the report.

Q. All right. So you understood that the hearing officer was to compile all of the material relative to the hearing, including those written public comments?

A. Correct.

Q. And after that was all done, did you get anything from the hearing officer about the hearing and the record of those proceedings, including the written public comments?

A. I believe we got an official written record, as well as a thumb drive.

Q. And were those sent to you?
A. Sent directly to me. And again, I forwarded it to the administrator.
Q. And in terms of the written public comments, was there a particular way that they were supposed to be submitted to you?
A. They could be submitted in writing. They could bring them in. They could send them by e-mail. Just had to be in writing.
Q. And do you recall, were they all kind of e-mails? Were they all just handwritten letters that came in?
A. The majority were e-mail. A few were written letters that came in.
Q. So however --
A. -- by mail. Sometimes some dropped into my office directly.
Q. So no matter how they came to you, you were compiling them all together, whether they were e-mailed to you or whether they were dropped off or whether they were actually sent in US mail to you?
A. Correct.
Q. And all of those were what you testified

that you actually sent off to the hearing officer for him?

A. Yes.

Q. And you said that what came back to you was a report from the hearing officer and then a thumb drive. Do you remember what the thumb drive had on it?

A. I did not check. I believe the cover letter said that it was the report. The compiled report that he was giving.

Q. Okay. So your understanding was he was giving you all that he was supposed to be aware of relative to the hearing?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall about when that would have come in to you? The thumb drive that came from the hearing officer?

A. Not exactly. I do not, no.

Q. It would certainly have been after the 30 day period of the written public comments?

A. After the -- I do know that the reason that the meeting was held on the 16th for the trustees to review this was because it did not come in before our study session. And the board

wanted to give -- have enough time to review it.

Q. So do you recall when the study session would have been for June of 2026?

A. Would have been the first Tuesday.

Q. So, in your mind was the record or the thumb drive provided to you somewhere right around that first Tuesday in June?

A. Prior. Prior to the Tuesday.

Q. And I think you indicated that you sent that thumb drive to the administrator?

A. I did.

Q. And are you aware of what you did with what was on the thumb drive or the thumb drive itself?

A. Forwarded it to either, I believe via link, to the trustees.

Q. So in your mind -- your understanding was that the record was provided to the trustees?

A. Correct.

Q. Did you ever receive any indication from either the mayor or any of the trustees that they had not received the report or record of those proceedings?

A. No.

Q. I have no other questions for Miss Gray.

MS. GALKA: No questions from Petitioners. Thank you.

MS. NAIR: No questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Do the Respondents have anything else to present?

MR. WESNER: I don't have any additional witnesses obviously from my list. And I think I admitted all of the exhibits that I wanted to. I think I had more, but I think because Area Disposal was admitting the transcript of that one meeting, I didn't need to introduce that either. So I just have the four. But I think we may have to confirm all of the exhibits at this stage. I don't have anything else to present outside of that.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Do you have any more?

MS. NAIR: Nothing further for us.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: We will move on to some public comment. Please raise your hand if you are here to make a public comment. One, two,

three, or four people. Come on up. I'd like to limit public comment to three minutes, if possible. There will be a written public comment period if you need more time than that. So please state your name and spell your name for the court reporter.

JOHN BORCHERS: Sure, my name is John Borchers. J-O-H-N. B-O-R-C-H-E-R-S.

I'm here to publicly oppose the construction of this GFL transfer station.

Having lived in Rantoul for almost 70 years and a home owner for 42 years, this has an impact on me. Yes, it's about three miles away. But it still has an impact on me. The trash that lingers after the end of the day. I know for a fact that not all trucks get into the depot at five o'clock. Sometimes our trash doesn't get picked up until 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock. The odors that are going to waft across town. It's already bad. Possible and probable impact on the Mahomet Aquifer that supplies drinking water to millions of people. Central Illinois up to Chicago. All around the area. I have a 25 page study from the University of Illinois, if anyone would like to

look at it.

The increased population of the mice, the rats, and any other animals that decide to inhabit that area. Because it's going to be an open area, right?

The impact on our Village and state highways. All of these heavy trucks coming in and out all day long, seven days a week, 24 hours a day; who knows?

This is an absolute ghastly experience for the Village of Rantoul.

How can anyone, the Board of Trustees, the Village administrator, think that this, for lack of a better term, dump is a good idea for Rantoul? It's not.

When the Base closed in September of '93, this town took a hit on property values. Huge hit. And they're just starting to come back up. Did anybody think about what is going to happen to the values when the dump comes back in? No. Not at all.

It's a pittance that GFL is going to provide to the Village of Rantoul for something that could be a huge impact on people coming to

our sports center. Even in town to shop. Are we willing to risk all of that?

The so-called expert on real estate said oh, there's no impact because he was comparing it to Bloomington and Springfield. This is a farming community. We don't have billion dollar businesses, state offices, Universities, to protect us on the property values.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Sir, if you have a lot more, could I ask you to do that in a written public comment?

JOHN BORCHERS: Yes. I most certainly will.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you so much. I appreciate it. Ma'am, were you going to make a public comment? Why don't you come up. And sir, why don't you go sit in that chair over there. You're on board next. I will get to everybody, I promise. Please state and spell your name for the court reporter, although I think she already has it.

LORI SHIELDS: Hi. I'm Lori Shields. L-O-R-I. Last name, S-H-I-E-L-D-S.

I live in town, very close to where this

proposed site is located. I also have a building straight across the street. We own a car dealership there. We just spent a very large sum of money building our new dealership. And I can tell you, since they came in, this summer we had a tent sale. It was in June. It was only 77 degrees that day. I tried calling our mayor. I left an e-mail. I sent a text. I asked for somebody to come out and smell the stench coming from across the street. We were having a tent sale. We had customers that wanted to leave because it smelled so bad. And it was only 77 degrees. My employees have to have the doors up because they're technicians. We don't have air conditioned shops. I wish I could afford that, but I can not.

I'm extremely concerned of the amount of business it's going to drive away from my business, because they can go to Champaign and they don't have to put up with that. It is ridiculous, the amount of smell that we have had to deal with already. And we don't have a waste transfer center there yet.

I also would like to mention that the

day of the meeting, trustees were talking about how much, and this was at length, how much money GFL has spent for this project before voting. Then they discussed, could they be sued if they didn't approve it? Then a stickie note was passed from one attorney to the other giving us all the impression that, you know, something else was going on. It was very, very misleading. Very underhanded. I am extremely upset with this.

My other question is, or my other comments deal with property tax values. Their quote, "expert" used Bloomington and Springfield as a comparison for Rantoul.

We are in no way, shape or form comparable to Bloomington or Springfield. I have searched the Internet trying to find anywhere that I could find a town that had a waste transfer center on their main highway coming into our main area of town. The only area of town that we have had any growth and economic growth, and I can not find one. Everybody else has them at their back door.

Why would we want to put this at our front door? Right next door to where all our

economic growth has been? Right next door to where the properties are also available to be sold for more economic growth? How are we ever going to get another hotel that's going to face a waste transfer station and smell it all day long? I would not stay at that hotel.

We already had people complaining at the sports complex that they can smell it. Who wants to sit at the ball games? I know, I'm from Mattoon, Illinois. They built Emerald Acres. Their facility is absolutely gorgeous. There is no waste transfer station around there, nor will Mattoon ever allow something like that to happen. They are getting tournaments that we would be having in Rantoul because people have been to our Rantoul and they don't want to come here again because they have had to deal with the stench coming from across the street.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Ma'am, could I ask you to please put the rest of your comment in written comment?

LORI SHIELDS: Sure.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you so much. I appreciate it. Thank you. Sir, come on

up. Please hold your applause. Please state and spell your name.

RANDY MCKAUSKY: Randy, R-A-N-D-Y. M-C-K-A-U-S-K-Y.

I just want to go back to April 17th, and the meeting that they had. All day meeting. Long, long day. These folks got to present their power point presentation. Their expert witnesses as they called 'em. And then at the end, the opposition got a couple minutes to come up here and talk.

We were never informed ahead of time that this meeting was going to be about power point presentations. And we didn't have a chance to put together our presentations and get our expert witnesses.

Along another line, I'm here representing Westlin Meadows. We are a condo association that is the closest to the proposed site. We have over seven million dollars in condos.

Businesses around, as Lori said, has spent millions of dollars building their businesses in that area. The gas station, strip

mall, Shields, the Fringe, the Village has spent over 30 million dollars on a sports complex. Do we want that stink in that area? I don't think so.

We used to have two softball diamonds on the east side of town located next to our sewage plant. They were called Stinky Stadium. Do we want our place to be called Stinky Sports Complex? It's garbage. It's going to stink. I've never been around one of those transfer stations that didn't stink.

So, there's a much better place from an environmental impact for this, and not there where they want to propose to put it. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. Would you please state and spell your name, sir.

BILL SHAFFNER: My name is Bill, B-I-L-L. S-H-A-F-F-N-E-R. I live at 321 Woodland in Rantoul. I want to address basically one thing. And it's kind of the elephant in the room here today I think from my perspective, okay?

When this proposal was put together, and put in front of the Village, it's obvious today in listening to the mayor and the three trustees that

they took 100 percent, pretty much 100 percent, of what the engineering firm and what the hearing officer presented to them. Although, they all admitted today, they have no idea who hired the engineering firm, no idea who hired -- who put together the -- picked the hearing officer. They all admitted that today on the record. They also, to certain degrees, admitted that they didn't even read it, okay? They might have skimmed it. They might have looked at it. They're not sure when they got it.

And all those things to me come down to one thing. The Village administrator put this together. By the way, the Village administrator that was let go from this Village 48 hours ago. Now, I'm not much in believing in coincidences, but this thing, no pun intended, smells. Okay? It smells on how this was put together. How it was pushed through.

And if anybody in this room thinks that that transfer station is an economic benefit to this town, that's absolutely ridiculous, okay? Absolutely ridiculous.

So, I understand that it's your job to

review the facts of this case, and what I'm giving you probably doesn't have a lot of fact associated with it. But understanding the fact that the people that voted for this had no idea how this was put together, no idea who put it together, no idea how they were hired, and then the person that orchestrated this whole thing, put it -- and he's the one that had to put all this together and put it on the agenda, got let go 48 hours before this hearing. I think that in itself speaks to why we are here today. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. Please don't applaud. Ma'am, please state your name and spell it for the record.

KIMBERLY TAYLOR: Sure Kimberly Taylor. K-I-M-B-E-R-L-Y. T-A-Y-L-O-R. I'm the president of Westlin Meadows, along with Randy who sits on our board.

I think some of you will remember I got emotional last time I talked in front of you guys. We are the subdivision that's right outside that boundary. And the fact that 47 units didn't get notified about meetings until we were verbally told is a complete disrespect to the community. I

love this community. I love the people who run this community, and that broke my heart.

And the fact that I have to take a day off of work to stand here in front of everybody, and even talk about this, again, breaks my heart. So please take in all of the facts that you've heard today. Take into consideration the homes, the people that this is going to affect. Understand that people came from outside of our community, into our community, to judge the statistics of our community, without living here, and maybe take into consideration that they didn't actually have all the facts.

Some of the research that was done was done on a Tuesday, I believe. Which was a low traffic day for this community. Especially at Murray and 136, I think, am I saying that right, guys? There is no way that the traffic reports were done in a proper way.

And that was one of the things that really stuck out to me, other than the rodents and the smell and the other things that persist and will come towards our area.

I'm also a -- I work at the U of I, so I

travel on 45 every day. And I get the smell from the Lincoln transfer station, the -- am I saying that right? Lincoln Avenue? The Lincoln Avenue transfer station? When those doors are open, you can smell it all the way over to 45.

So when you tell me that we're not going to have some sort of smell, some sort of -- it's going to be perfect? It is not going to be perfect. I don't care how up to date, up to standard, up to code your building is. If those doors are open, we're going to get it. So please take that into consideration. Thank you for your time today. And I hope you make the right decision.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. Is there anybody else here? Anyone else wants to make a comment? Please state and spell your name for the report.

RICK SHIELDS: Rick Shields. R-I-C-K. S-H-I-E-L-D-S.

My wife already spoke. I'm the general manager of Shields Auto Center across the street from the proposed location. I don't necessarily have an issue with a transfer station in this

town. But, it is absolutely in the wrong place. I think it needs to be out by the industrial park, or a much better location. This is the entry point to our town. And if you go to the closest transfer station that I know of in Urbana, if you drive along that road, it is just loaded with litter and trash all the way down the road.

This is going to be the entrance to our town. I think when they did the nine points, like I said, you can knock them off, how many of them it doesn't meet. You can say all day long you're not going to have trash, you're going to put covers over the tractor trailers, but they break. And they're still going to run their deal. Trash is going to come out. It's an entrance to our town. It's going to tear up that road.

Just I know for us, like my wife said, during our tent sale, strangely enough after we have the meeting, all of a sudden we start smelling it much more than we did before. It didn't smell so much before. It did after that meeting. And I don't know if they had some trucks broke down or what the deal is. But there isn't even a transfer station out there right now and

you can smell it.

And like she said, there's a lot of people coming into this town. Their impression of Rantoul would be, it would smell. And that's a detriment to this town. That would drop our real estate values. That would hurt my business. And like I said, I think it could be put in a better location. I would not have an issue with that. Far away from residential. Far away from the economic development area in this town. But, maybe I'm being a little self centered with that because I know it will affect my business, but I'm afraid it's going to. And I don't want that.

And like I said, there's multiple cases here where I don't feel it meets the nine criteria. And I do think that the Board was afraid they were going to get sued by a note that was given to the attorneys during that process when they're about ready to vote. And I think they pretty much decided, hey, we don't want to get sued. And I even heard one of them mention that well, we want to keep from getting sued. And look, we got sued anyway. That's what I kind of heard.

So, that's why I have to say, please stop it. It has not met the nine criteria, in my opinion.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. Anybody else? Please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

KENDA HESS: I'm Kenda Hess. K-E-N-D-A. H-E-S-S. I've spoken before a couple times. But I would just like to share some of the things that I've heard from people since they became aware that I was involved in this appeal.

People to address the unfairness of how this has happened. But, one thing to a person that everybody says to me is, how did we not know about this? How did it get this far, and we did not know about this?

And I would like to point out that every meeting has been on a week day in the middle of the day. Most people are at work. The first meeting in April, that hearing, we were unaware of how it was going to work, in terms of we showed up at 8:30. We waited more than five hours to speak. There were probably a couple dozen people here, almost all of them left because they couldn't stay

the whole day. They didn't know they weren't going to get to speak. So we were at the bottom of the totem pole on that one. We were not allowed to ask any questions.

And the June meeting, the public comment was first. And then the trustees had their discussion. We were not allowed to ask questions. Also, regardless of the amnesia that is occurring around here, we all heard that they were oddly concerned, several of them were oddly concerned, that they were going to be sued if they voted against this. I think that if they felt that way, why did they feel that way? Who was putting that in their head?

It should be somebody's job to know their responsibilities. And their protection, the legal protection for doing their job.

And the strange thing is after the April meeting, we were told not to speak to the trustees. So, they're our representatives. They work for us. How are they -- how are we supposed to communicate how we feel when we were told oh, you can't ask any questions. You can't talk to them about this. They have to be independent.

But, they don't work for these guys. They work for us.

And then the other thing that came about with the appeal is the community plan that was developed almost ten years -- or no; 20 years ago. Almost 20 years ago, to map out where the growth in this town would be allowed. Then the west side, this is where our commercial is going to be, commercial development and new business, and it's happened. It's brought us back from the -- and then in that plan, specifically by name, it prohibited trash transfer stations. Isn't it like your job and the trustee's job to know that? Wouldn't that have been a good thing to know?

You know, the planners for this community, trying to plan for our future, make us successful, bring more people here and more businesses, you know, they make a point to mention those things by name. We need to pay attention to that.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Ma'am, could I ask you to please make the rest of your comment in written comment?

KENDA HESS: Of course.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Appreciate so much. Is there anybody else here who would like to speak? Please state your name and spell it for the court reporter.

JUAN DAVILA: My name is Juan Davila. J-U-A-N. D-A-V-I-L-A.

I'm a nurse, I've been in this community for 14 years. I moved to Rantoul seven years ago because for a better price. I got a really nice home in a really nice neighborhood. And I'm grateful to live there. My friends come visit me from Champaign, Savoy, Bloomington, things like that.

And the way they always take is the interstate. So, I've seen the area of growth. I was a little concerned becoming a Rantucky -- sorry. But, it's been a really nice area, really nice place. We've been growing a lot. And I hate to see something like the transfer center being built nearby.

Like Mr. Shields said, I don't disagree that it would be beneficial economically, but not where it is proposed. I think if GFC -- GFL, if they are really invested in this community, I

propose that they work with us to move it somewhere else. I'm not disagreeing to it. But I think a lot of businesses will be affected.

Just one last thing, I like -- we have a lake right by the veteran's park? And I like walking by it. The trash dumpster and the wind was so strong and that's all I could smell while he was picking up trash. And I was just like, oh, I was like, I just need to leave. I was walking around, I was praying. It was my time to meditate. And just to think that something that I hold, you know, not sacred, but something that calms me down, and relaxing, that is now, just smell a dump. To have such a nice area as we come in through the highway, and to be brought down by that smell. And the Shields and the Starbucks and all these things that we really value and love, to be dampered by that smell, I completely disagree with that.

So I hope that we all come to a conclusion that is fitting for everyone. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Anybody else? Okay. I do not see any other hands going up. So,

that concludes our public comment portion.

I will say, I will set the public comment deadline for the day before Thanksgiving. Which is November 25th. So please get written public comment to the Pollution Control Board clerk by the day before Thanksgiving, November 25th.

Also, please make sure you mail or e-mail that to our clerk in our Chicago office. Please do not send that to me. Please send that to the clerk in our Chicago office.

Okay. So November, did I just say the 25th?

A VOICE: Is it possible to get that address?

HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Yes. I will announce it now. But it's on our website. The address is 60 East Van Buren Street, Suite 630, Chicago, Illinois, 60605. The clerk's name is Don Brown. If you have any questions, please reach out to him.

Public comment also must be filed in accordance with Section 101.628 of the Board's procedural rules. We have decided ahead of time

that Petitioners' brief is due by November 30th. And Respondent's briefs will be due by December 18th.

Is everybody holding their closing argument for brief? Okay. Great. At this time I will conclude the proceedings. We stand adjourned and I thank you all for coming today. The transcript will be posted on the website around November 9th or 10th or 11th. Probably November 10th.

(The time is 1:34 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN)

I, DEANN K. PARKINSON, do hereby certify that the foregoing hearing was taken on November 4, 2026.

That said hearing was taken down in stenographic notes and afterwards reduced to typewriting under my instruction and said transcription is a true record of the testimony given.

I do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person in this cause of action; that I am not a relative of any party or any attorney of record in this cause, or an attorney for any party herein, or otherwise interested in the event of this action, and am not in the employ of the attorneys for either party.

_____
DEANN K. PARKINSON, CSR