

RECEIVED
CLERK'S OFFICE

MAY 27 2003

STATE OF ILLINOIS
Pollution Control Board

Pat O'Dell
1242 Arrowhead Dr.
Bourbonnais, IL 60914-4293

May 5 & 6, 2003

page 1

PCB 03-
125, 133, 134, 135
PC #2

To: Members of Illinois Pollution Control Board

Re: Criteria 3 (b) and Ms. Patricia Beaver-McGarr

At the public hearing in November 2002, I recall Ms. McGarr's smooth-flowing testimony. However, I was amazed at her "contrived" square-mile delineations, lack of inquiry, lack of consultation with experienced local realtors/appraisers.

Appalling to me was her aversion to doing real research into our county's history of residential sales and price fluctuations. Why didn't she communicate with local residents and business owners and try to really gauge our

ORIGINAL

Q-X-5

Criteria 3(b)
page 2

local economy and property values —
much less how those values would be
affected by the huge proposed
expansion?!

Ms. McGarr compared our situation
to another place in another time.

Ms. McGarr was quite certain her
diploma/degree was packed in boxes
still unopened from a move about a
year ago. However, she could "produce
her transcript."

According to testimony on May 6, 2003
from Mary Ann Powers, Ms. McGarr
knew she was 3 hours and an

Criteria 3(b)
page 3

application short of a degree at
Richard J. Daley College — both per
phone call and a personal consult-
ation in 2002.

Apparently, Ms. McGarr lied under
oath. She displayed limited research
tenacity. She compared apples with
baseballs. She was quite enthusiastic
about "windshield inspections." She was
not enthusiastic about consulting
local professionals nor local data.

Property valuation conclusions — per
Criteria 3(b) — by Patricia Beaver-McGarr,
were not sound, fair, or complete.

Criteria 3(b)
page 4

Her representation of her degree
was neither truthful nor fair.

Criteria 3(b) conclusions were
Fundamentally UnFair and Unmet!

Sincerely concerned,

Patricia R. O'Dell

Patricia L. O'Dell
1242 Arrowhead Dr
Bourbonnais, IL
60914

(815) 932-4197

May 5 & 6, 2003
page 1

To: Members of Illinois Pollution Control Board

Re: Lack of public involvement at all stages of the Landfill location siting and application process

The public and citizens of Kankakee County have NOT been INCLUDED in the process of deciding how to handle our county's solid waste — an ever more difficult and serious issue.

Public involvement would have brought many questions, concerns and much more information to the process:

① How can we minimize the residential trash being dumped?

② Examine and imitate community recycling programs that are effective and profitable (in villages/cities with a population less than 50,000.). Check out the feasibility of both pick-up and drop-off points.

③ Research and evaluate (in person) newer technologies dealing with disposal of solid waste (ie. gasification).

④ Explore options for composting yard waste and "mulchifying" the branches and limbs of trees and shrubs. Consider both pick-up and drop-off locations.



"Public"
page 3

⑤ Our county residents include folks who can give valuable information and insights, help research, ask probing questions, and bring creative problem-solving to this critical issue of dealing with various types of waste — while not damaging human beings nor polluting the larger environment either.

I strongly object that a decision was made to greatly expand the quantity of waste received daily — before hearings/meetings to ascertain our county needs, concerns for the public health and safety were fully addressed, much less

"Public"
page 4

considering the potential consequences of pollution, financial hardships not only of pollution but also of property values declining.

The lives and health of we residents is greatly compromised, considering our location above a major aquifer.

The pursuit of happiness is devastatingly curtailed by mountains of trash within the sight, sound, and smell of nearby residents. Does anyone seriously believe their property won't be tremendously devaluated? Would you want to lose

"Public"
page 5
the visibility of a beautiful sunrise
or sunset and instead gain sight of
the birth of a monster eyasore?

The greatest problem about

dealing with future county waste is

that we citizens were NOT INVOLVED

not for lack of interest but because

we were SHUT OUT.

I've talked to many county citizens

and the unanimous opinion is that they

do not want OUT-OF-COUNTY garbage

being hauled into our county - AT

ANY PRICE! Had there been citizen

involvement 1 1/2 - 2 1/2 years ago, the



"Public"
page 6

amendment to increase daily waste tonnage would not have happened! Many of us feel betrayed — sold out — by our supposed "public servants". If we had participated in the "need" process, location considerations, safety and health issues, property value concerns, traffic changes, and almost certain eventual pollution consequences to humans, environment, and economy — there would be NO desire for a huge expansion or a long-term contract with any company.

Why is the so-called "public

"Public"
page 7

hearing" held with only one company
"bidding" on a supposed plan/contract
that has not been formulated in
detail, nor with the involvement of
citizens/residents of the impacted area?
The public should have been heard
long ago. The "plan" should have first
assessed our county needs for waste
disposal. Investigation and research
would have led to reasonable conclusions
(reason requiring mental exercise).
The parameters of a detailed county
solid waste management plan would
address needs and requirements

"Public"
page 8

(a double-liner is virtually a "no-brainer"), and safety, traffic, pollution financial responsibility, property values, etc. THEN the county should let companies bid or make their case with public involvement - ie a public hearing to help make final decisions.

It seems to me that the "public hearing" process is both backwards and upside down, with too little public being heard too late!

People keep saying that it's all about money. Is that true? Whatever happened to our rights to "life"

"Public"
page 9

(health) "liberty" (input in decision -
making) and the "pursuit of happiness"
(pleasant view, serenity, property values
stable) ???

Public participation in the entire
process of locating and siting a
landfill has NOT happened! Criteria
2 and 3 - at least - have not been
dealt with fully or fairly!

In light of these and many
other issues, including all the
shortfall of testimony/research
techniques — will you acknowledge
that portions and entire criteria

"Public"
page 10

in this whole process have been
UNFAIR - both fundamentally
and specifically? I trust that
you will.

Thank you for listening /reading
my public comment.

Patricia R. O'Dell

Patricia L. O'Dell
1242 Arrowhead Dr.
Bourbonnais, IL 60914

(815) 932-4197