PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2012
8:30 A.M.

DATES SET:

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2012 @ 8:30 a.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Building, 3505 N. Dries Lane, Peoria Illinois 61604.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2012 @ 8:30 a.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Building, 3505 N. Dries Lane, Peoria Illinois 61604.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2012 @ 8:30 a.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Building, 3505 N. Dries Lane, Peoria Illinois 61604.

PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE
AGENDAS AND MINUTES
ISSUED BY:
LESTER D. BERGSTEN, CHAIRMAN
via the PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
3505 N. Dries Lane
(309) 494-8800
INTERNET ADDRESS: www.ci.peoria.il.us

To access electronic Agenda & Minutes (only):
1. www.ci.peoria.il.us
2. Click "Government" tab @ top left.
3. Choose "Departments H-Z" for drop-down window to appear
4. Roll cursor over to "Public Works" for another drop-down window to appear
5. Roll cursor over to "Boards & Commissions"
6. Roll cursor over to "Landfill Committee"
7. Scroll to the bottom of the screen. Under "Agenda & Minutes" will be a list of the .pdf postings.
8. Select desired document and double click to open.

*CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA SHOULD CONTACT A COMMITTEE MEMBER PRIOR TO THE MEETING. ALL OTHER PUBLIC INPUT WILL BE HEARD UNDER PUBLIC COMMENT NEAR THE END OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING.*

NOTE: THE ORDER IN WHICH AGENDA ITEMS ARE CONSIDERED MAY BE MOVED FORWARD OR DELAYED BY AT LEAST 2/3 VOTE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT.

THE PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE MEETS IN REGULAR BUSINESS SESSIONS THE THIRD WEDNESDAY OF THE MONTH (JANUARY THROUGH NOVEMBER) AT 8:30 A.M. AT LESTER D. BERGSTEN OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FACILITY CONFERENCE ROOM, 3505 N. DRIES LANE, PEORIA, ILLINOIS.

DURING THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE WILL NOT MEET UNLESS A SPECIAL MEETING IS CALLED. NOTICES OF ANY SPECIAL MEETING ARE POSTED AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR.
PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE MEETING
DRIES LANE FACILITY CONFERENCE ROOM

MARCH 21, 2012
8:30AM

ATTENDANCE

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.

MINUTES

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL MINUTES
Dated: February 15, 2012

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM NO. 1  REPORT FROM FOTH INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT, LLC

A. Special Waste Approvals as needed
   • Illinois American Water Company
   • Osmose Railroad Services Inc.
B. Permit approvals as needed
C. Landfill Gas – Electricity Facility Update

ITEM NO. 2  DAM PROJECT UPDATE

ITEM NO. 3  LANDFILL BUDGET DISCUSSION

A. Increase of the Host Fee
B. Request for Audit of Waste Management

ITEM NO. 4  REPORT FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.

A. Monthly Activity Report
B. Permit approvals as needed

ITEM NO. 5  REPORT FROM PEORIA DISPOSAL CO.

A. Update on Siting Certificate from Peoria County
B. Update on Siting Approval Incorporation into Landfill Agreement
C. Update on Meeting with IEPA concerning Landfill No. 3 Permit Application
D. Presentation from Midwest Fiber Recycling
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

NEXT MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 2012 @ 8:30 A.M.

ADJOURNMENT

EXECUTIVE SESSION
A Regular Meeting of the Peoria City/County Landfill convened at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 15, 2012, at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Facility located at 3505 N. Dries Lane, Peoria, Illinois, and was called to order by Commissioner Van Winkle.

CALL TO ORDER

Call to Order showed the following Committee Members in attendance:

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Stephen Morris, Lynn Scott-Pearson, Steve Van Winkle, Ryan Spain, Tim Riggenbach and Bob Akers – 6; Absent – Chairman Les Bergsten.

CITY/COUNTY STAFF PRESENT: Dave Barber, Steve Giebelhausen, Stephanie Stapleton, Karen Raithel.

Others in attendance included Dan Erni, Jerry Wyatt, Simon Alwan, Pat Sloan, Steve Matheny, Chris Coulter, Mike Wiersema, Tracy and Rick Fox.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE.

MINUTES

Mr. Morris moved to approve the minutes of January 18, 2012; seconded by Mr. Akers.

Approved by viva voce vote.

ITEM NO. 1: REPORT FROM FOTH INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT, LLC

A. SPECIAL WASTE APPROVAL AS NEEDED

Mr. Alwan stated that there were no new profiles that required Committee approval. However, the memorandum included two profiles one that was approved administratively and one that was a pre-approved renewal: (1) Peoria Barge [Onsite cleanup materials]. The profile covers on site cleanup materials from Peoria Barge in Peoria that was generated from a collection of coal dust, road salt and dirt in cleanup activities. He stated that this was a one-time event, which they would dump approximately 50 tons. No technical objections and was administratively approved by Mr. Barber on February 3, 2012. No action required. (2) City of East Peoria [Municipal POTW Sludge]. Mr. Alwan stated that this was a pre-approved renewal. He stated that this would be a repeated waste stream, which would consist of approximately 1,000 tons per year. This waste stream is certified by the generator as non-special based on analytical data. No technical objections to this waste stream. He also pointed out that this generator is a FOTH client, but not related to this waste stream. No action required.
Mr. Matheny pointed out that it was a slow season; therefore, they requested administrative approval for Peoria Barge cleanup.

B. PERMIT APPROVALS AS NEEDED

Mr. Alwan stated that there were two reports that required Mr. Barber's signature:

- Title V – Clean Air Act Permit Program (CAAPP) Semi-Annual Air Monitoring Report for July – December (PCC1) due March 1, 2012
- Application to IEPA for approval to Decommission Gas Wells at Landfill #1

Mr. Alwan stated that the semi-annual report is one of the reports that are required to comply with the air permit that is issued to the site. He explained that the report summarizes the data that has been collected from the required monitoring events at Landfill No. 1 & 2 for the second half of 2011 and summarizes any deviations from the permit requirements. The report is due to the IEPA by March 1, 2012.

Mr. Alwan stated that this report was not submitted with the packet. He explained that Landfill #1 has approximately 151 gas wells, which based on standard engineering practices and site specific characteristics are spaced too close to each other. He stated the application is a request to the EPA to decrease the number of wells, which would assist with the monthly monitoring and with fine tuning of the system. Mr. Barber's signature is required on both applications.

In discussion with Mr. Van Winkle, Mr. Alwan explained that they are requesting approximately 80 wells be eliminated.

C. LANDFILL GAS – ELECTRICITY FACILITY UPDATE

Mr. Alwan had nothing to report, at this time.

D. APPROVAL ANNUAL AIRSPACE ANALYSIS

Mr. Alwan stated that an audit is conducted annually by Foth to verify that Waste Management was operating within the terms of their contract by maintaining sufficient airspace for Landfill #2 to continue to accept waste until 2014. He explained that the contract specifies that the average air space usage should be less than the 460,000 cubic yards. He stated this was put into the contract to make sure that Landfill #2 would last until 2014. Mr. Alwan pointed out that the Landfill used approximately 449,000 cubic yards between April 2010 and November 2011. He stated the total usage to-date is approximately 4.5 million cubic yards, which is approximately 61% of Landfill #2's capacity. He stated that if the Landfill would continue to accept waste as it did last year, the Landfill would reach capacity by November 2024. If the Landfill would accept waste at the maximum of 460,000 cubic yards, which equals approximately 376,000 tons then the remaining life would be seven years to 2019. The findings show that Waste Management is operating the Landfill within their contract limits based on the analysis that was provided. He stated that Landfill #2 is expected to reach capacity between 2019 and 2022.

In discussion with Mr. Morris, he questioned how capacity is determined and what factors are used to determine when the Landfill would reach full capacity. Mr. Sloan stated that it was a final grade of 7.5 million cubic yards. Mr. Sloan pointed that 460,000 cubic yards was not an annual limit set in the contract but instead an average over the life of the Landfill.
Mr. Morris stated that he has reviewed the Landfill Agreement, which did not reflect any specific numbers that would determine the life of the landfill. Mr. Sloan explained that the contract dates back to the mid-90's, which included tonnage; however, he felt that the total life of the Landfill should be reviewed. He stated that the 460,000 cubic yards would be approximately 15 years of total life of the Landfill.

In discussion with Mr. Morris, he questioned if there was a specific number of tons that would deem Landfill No. 2 as full, Mr. Sloan stated it would be a premature closure, which would require a permit application and would need approval from the IEPA.

Mr. Morris requested additional information that would clarify how much was waste is suppose to go into Landfill No. 2.

Mr. Akers moved to approve the semi-annual report; seconded by Mr. Spain.

Approved by viva voce vote

E. APPROVAL TO REIMBURSE FOR FENCING MATERIALS – OFF-PERMIT PROPERTY EROSION ISSUE

Mr. Alwan stated that he and Mr. Sloan were notified by Mr. Wyatt regarding a portion of the off-permit property was experiencing some erosion issues. He explained that a meeting was held on-site between Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Ehnlle and Mr. Beecher on January 27th. He further explained that the area in question was along the fence line at the southern central region of the off-permit property just north of the 17 acre farm field. He said the fence line separates the land that Mr. Beecher farms and the land where Mr. Ehnlle's cattle graze. He stated that Mr. Ehnlle's lease agreement is $2,300 per year and Mr. Beecher's lease agreement was is $2,625 per year.

Mr. Alwan stated that the fence was located on the top of a bank along a waterway. According to Mr. Ehnlle and Mr. Beecher, the bank had been slipping towards the water feature over the past couple years; and, now has slipped enough to reach a portion of the fence, which is compromising the integrity of the fence. Both Mr. Ehnlle and Mr. Beecher agree that not much can be done to remedy the erosion and the land may continue to erode until it finds its new natural alignment, explained Mr. Alwan.

Mr. Alwan stated that the proposal would consist of moving the fence a safe distance away from the eroding bank. He explained that this would require approximately 300 linear feet of new fencing and would cut into a portion of the farm land. He further explained that the proposal would include that the City/County purchase the new fence material (barb wire, fence posts, and a gate) and to have Mr. Ehnlle and Mr. Beecher install the fence. All parties were in agreement with the proposed arrangement.

Mr. Alwan stated that he received several quotes from Mr. Wyatt that ranged from $375 - $390. He is requesting approval from the board to reimburse Mr. Wyatt for the cost of the material not to exceed $500 and in return Mr. Ehnlle and Mr. Beecher would install the new fence.

Mr. Barber stated that in order to ensure payment, he would request that the receipt be submitted to the Public Works Department.

Mr. Sloan stated that the purchase should be tax exempt.
Ms. Scott-Pearson moved to approve the cost of the material not to exceed $500; seconded by Mr. Morris.

Approved by viva voce vote

Mr. Giebelhausen stated that a motion was needed to approve the permits that were previously outlined by Mr. Alwan.

Mr. Akers moved to approve the Semi-Annual Air Monitoring Report for Landfill #1 and #2; and, the application to decommission the Gas Wells for Landfill #1, as outlined, including securing Mr. Barber's signatures; seconded by Mr. Spain.

ITEM NO. 2  DAM PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Giebelhausen requested that an Executive Session be held after the regular meeting to discuss possible litigation.

ITEM NO. 3  LANDFILL BUDGET DISCUSSION

Mr. Barber gave a brief overview of the 2011 Budget. He pointed out that the County did not submit a request for payment in 2011; therefore, the City had not processed their payment in the amount of $35,700. He stated that this item was not listed on the report. He stated that the revenues for 2011 totaled $325,693.59, which included revenues from Host Fees, rental and interest earned. He stated that the revenue was below the budget of $379,440 by $58,431.40.

Mr. Barber stated that the expenses for 2011 were $507,801.73, which was $92,518.27 below the budget of $600,320.00. Overall for 2011, the expenses exceeded revenues by $182,108.14. He stated that the fund balance in 2011 dropped from $835,949.99 on January 1, 2011, to $653,841.85 as of December 31, 2011. This figure does not include the $35,700.

Mr. Barber stated in October 2011, the Committee discussed the projections for the budget for 2012 – 2016. He explained that staff recommended, at that meeting, to raise the Host Fee from $1.50 to $2.05 as of December 1, 2011. This did not occur as the Committee was interested in waiting to see if a decision on the entrance roadway/dam would be made in the next few months. At this time, no decision has been made to increase the Host Fee. He pointed out that staff supports increasing the Host Fee.

In discussion with Mr. Morris regarding whether the Committee would need Waste Management’s approval to raise the Host Fee, Mr. Matheny stated that the Committee would need their approval in order to increase the Host Fee. He stated that it would take approximately 90 – 120 days to amend and finalize the current Waste Management contract.

Mr. Barber pointed out that the contract would need to be approved by the City Council and the County Board.

Mr. Akers moved that the Host Fee be increased by $1.00 per ton.

Mr. Coulter expressed concern regarding the increased Host Fee and questioned how the increase would impact the current collection contract between the City of Peoria and Peoria
Disposal Co. (PDC). He stated that he felt PDC would seek to be reimbursed to cover the increased Host Fee.

Mr. Barber stated that the largest customer in the Landfill was Waste Management and the second largest was the City of Peoria this information was based on volume. He explained that the City of Peoria averages approximately 38,000 tons per year and the numbers are decreasing due to recycling. He further explained that there are approximately over 8,000 customers participating in the recycling program.

Mr. Morris stated that the County Board unanimously approved increasing the Host Fee up to $1.50.

Mr. Giebelhausen stated that this item would have to be placed on the Agenda for the next scheduled meeting and, at this time, the Committee would need to direct staff to take the necessary steps to approach this matter.

Mr. Akers moved to place the Host Fee on the Agenda for the next scheduled Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Meeting and direct staff to take the steps necessary to approach this matter; seconded by Mr. Spain.

Approved by viva voce vote

Mr. Akers questioned the consequences for the Landfill if they default.

Mr. Giebelhausen stated that this was a broad question and he felt that this matter should not be addressed in an open meeting. He stated that he felt legal advice should not be given in an open meeting.

Mr. Morris stated that he felt that the Committee needed some clarification from Waste Management as it pertains to the Host Fee. He felt that it was completely dishonorable that Waste Management feel that they should not be obligated to repair the access road and that they would not give the Committee the ability to fund the fix for the access road. He questioned the Committee’s relationship with Waste Management. He stated that Waste Management has indicated that the Committee would need their approval to amend the contract to increase the Host Fee, which is yet to be determined; therefore, he is requesting clarification regarding this matter.

Mr. Van Winkle stated that he felt that the Committee should initiate some discussion with Waste Management regarding this matter and that the item to increase the Host Fee by $1.00 per ton be placed on the Agenda for the next scheduled meeting. The Committee concurred.

ITEM NO. 4 REPORT FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.

Mr. Matheny gave a brief overview of the monthly summary report, profiled waste log, and year over year comparison chart for January 2012. No discussion.

Mr. Spain moved to approve Waste Management’s report; seconded by Mr. Morris.
Approved by voce vote

B. Permit Approvals as needed

Mr. Matheny stated that they have two permits that would require the Committee’s approval.

1) As part of the five-year renewal permit, the application document includes a section titled “Procedures for General Refuse and Special Waste Received at the City of Peoria/County of Peoria Landfill No. 2 near Brimfield, Illinois”. He explained that this document covers the regulatory details of how waste is to be received at the site along with some non-regulatory obligations per Waste Management’s contract with the Committee such as the Landfill Committee make-up, the Consultants role and Waste Management’s non-regulatory contractual obligations. He further explained that this, in turn, subjects the non-regulatory information to the scrutiny and interpretation of potentially over-zealous IEPA inspectors, which could create an unnecessary and avoidable risk to both the landfill Committee and Waste Management. To avoid this, we are requesting approval to hire FOTH to remove the non-regulatory information from the document, and submit the new document to IEPA for their consideration as part of the five year permit renewal. The original document would remain as a contract document with the Committee, with all of Waste Management’s contractual obligations unchanged.

2) The original PCC#2 design calls for rigid revetment mat to be used in select areas for erosion protection. Since this material is rigid, landfill settlement can result in cracking and failure of the mat. Several flexible erosion control products are available that were not on the market when PCC#2 was originally designed. We are requesting approval to modify aspects of the original surface water system design when better products or different procedures result in equal or better performance. Furthermore, if the use of a new product or different procedure requires a permit modification, we request approval for Mr. Barber to sign the appropriate IEPA forms, subject to review and approval in advance by Foth.

Mr. Morris stated that it was his understanding that the Landfill agreement allows for an audit of Waste Management’s operations and he questioned when was the last time Waste Management was audited by the Committee.

Mr. Matheny stated that Foth conducts an annual review; however, he was uncertain of the last official audit. Mr. Matheny pointed out that Waste Management conducts an audit, as well.

Mr. Morris moved to request that the Committee hire an outside entity specifically familiar with the audit of operations of landfills an independent third party auditor and that the Committee proceed with an action item to hire an independent auditor to audit Waste Management; seconded by Mr. Spain.

Approved by viva voce vote

Mr. Morris stated that Foth is the Committee’s consultant and he felt that it would be a conflict of interest for Committee to approve that Waste Management hire Foth to review permits. He stated that he would not be supporting this request.

Mr. Sloan stated that Foth would not recommend approval for this particular request, at this time. He explained that this proposal was presented to him by Waste Management and he directed Waste Management to submit this item to the Committee. He stated that item needs to be evaluated because it does not address the contractual and regulatory issues.
In discussion with Mr. Spain, Mr. Sloan stated that he could report back to the Committee next month regarding Item 1.

Mr. Spain moved to defer Item 1 for one month; Ms. Scott-Pearson.

Approved by viva voce vote

Mr. Spain moved to approve Item 2; seconded by Mr. Morris.

Approved by viva voce vote

ITEM NO. 5 REPORT FROM PEORIA DISPOSAL CO.

A. UPDATE ON PEORIA COUNTY PRE-FILING REVIEW REIMBURSEMENT

Mr. Coulter stated that PDC delivered a check in the amount of $450,000 each to the City and County of Peoria as part of the land acquisition costs under their contract for the Landfill Agreement. He stated that they did receive the siting approval and it was not appealed. He stated that PDC delivered payment to the County in the amount of $108,441.04 for the host agreement, which allows their staff to review the siting applications. He stated the siting application was completed and needs to be filed.

B. UPDATE ON SITING CERTIFICATE FROM PEORIA COUNTY

Mr. Coulter stated that he met with Karen Raithel regarding the siting certificate from Peoria County. He stated that he was waiting to receive the certificate from the County. Once the certificate is received then PDC will develop an amendment to the contract for the current Landfill Agreement.

In discussion with Mr. Giebelhausen, Mr. Coulter stated that PDC would draft an amendment to the agreement, which would incorporate the siting application and forward to Mr. Giegelhausen to be reviewed. The application would then need to be approved by the Landfill Committee, the City Council and the County Board.

C. UPDATE ON MEETING WITH FOOTH CONCERNING IEPA PERMIT APPLICATION

Mr. Coulter stated that a meeting was held with Foth representatives, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Alwan and Ms. Ambrosia regarding the development of the permit application. He stated that they plan to schedule a meeting in March with the IEPA before the next Landfill Committee meeting, which is scheduled for March 21st. He said that they would retain Shaw Environmental to develop the permit application and would work towards these efforts in April and May then in June the application would be forwarded to Foth for their review. He said that he would plan to present this item to the Committee in October and in November schedule for approval.

He recommended that the representatives from the Landfill Committee attend the meeting with the IEPA. The following Landfill Committee members will be attending the meeting: Chairman Bergsten, Ms. Scott-Pearson, Mr. Barber and Ms. Raithel.
D. **UPDATE ON MIDWEST FIBER RECYCLING PRESENTATION IN MARCH MEETING**

Mr. Coulter stated that Mr. Todd Shumacher with Midwest Fiber would be attending the next scheduled Landfill Committee meeting to provide additional information regarding recyclables.

Ms. Scott-Pearson moved to approve PDC’s report; seconded by Mr. Spain.

Approved by viva voce vote

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

NONE.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Barber distributed a handout to the Committee regarding the Open Meetings Act Training. He pointed out that all Commission members are required to complete the Open Meetings Act Training by December 31, 2012.

- **Foth and Waste Management Permit Process**

Mr. Sloan stated that Foth has always conducted non-engineering work for the contractor. He stated that Mr. Morris previously expressed his concerns regarding Foth working for Waste Management. He requested additional direction from the Committee as relates to how to process these types of request.

Mr. Morris felt that this was a conflict of interest. He stated that, in the past, the relationship with Waste Management did not have an adversarial feel to it like it has had recently with Waste. He stated that he would not vote to support this relationship. He explained that he would not support continuing a relationship with Foth, if Foth does not see this as a conflict of interest. He further explained that the he felt the relationship between the Committee and Waste Management has steadily gotten worse since the approval of Landfill #3 went to PDC.

Mr. Sloan stated that this is a benefit that Foth provides to the Committee because Foth is involved with various aspects of the City.

Mr. Matheny questioned whether the request should be made and approved by the Committee to have the permits reviewed and modified by Foth. He felt that there is information within these permits that he will need from time-to-time.

Mr. Morris stated that this would need to be reviewed on a case by case basis; however, he stated that as part of Foth’s consulting relationship with the Landfill Committee, he felt that Foth should provide this information to Waste Management without receiving payment from Waste Management.

Mr. Matheny stated that if Waste Management needed something technically he questioned if Waste Management should make their request to the Committee and request direction from the Committee.

Mr. Ernie stated that Waste Management would make their request to the Committee and avoid making a payment to Foth.
Mr. Morris reiterated that he would prefer that each request be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Committee.

Mr. Ernie stated that Foth did the original designs of the facility and they have been brought in as an operator of a particular design, which is often a challenge for them. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Morris and that they would submit their requests to the Committee.

**CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE**

Ms. Tracy Fox expressed concern regarding the compliance strategy for Landfill #1. She expressed concern regarding groundwater contamination.

**NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Bergsten stated the next regularly scheduled meeting would be held on Tuesday, March 21, 2012, at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Facility, 3505 N. Dries lane, Peoria, Illinois.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A MOTION FOR THE PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS 2(c)(11) LITIGATION, WHEN AN ACTION AGAINST, AFFECTING, OR ON BEHALF OF THE PARTICULAR PUBLIC BODY HAS BEEN FILED AND IS PENDING BEFORE A COURT OR ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, OR WHEN THE PUBLIC BODY FINDS THAT SUCH AN ACTION IS PROBABLE OR IMMINENT.

Ms. Scott-Pearson moved to adjourn the regular Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Meeting, to go into Executive Session to Discuss 2(c)(1) Litigation, not returning to Regular Session; seconded by Mr. Morris.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The regular landfill Committee meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

______________________________
Lester D. Bergsten, Chairman

/ss
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Simon Alwan, P.E., Environmental Engineer, Foth

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: March 21, 2012

ACTION REQUESTED: SPECIAL WASTE PERMIT APPROVALS

BACKGROUND: Memorandum attached. Two new profiles requiring Committee approval. Action is required.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: N/A
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joint City of Peoria - County of Peoria
Solid Waste Disposal Facility Board

FROM: Simon Alwan, P.E.

NUMBER: 012P001.00

DATE: March 9, 2012

SUBJECT: Special Waste Permits

Waste Management has presented the following waste streams.

New Profiles for Approval (Action is Necessary):

1. Illinois American Water Company
   2901 S.W. Washington
   Peoria, IL 61614
   Chlorosorb (Aluminum Oxide)

   Application
   Dated: 03/06/2012
   Received: 03/07/12
   Unused absorbent from gas scrubber system

   Source: Peoria
   Type: Non-Special
   Profile #: 112674IL
   Expected
   Quantity = 850 Cubic Feet
   Frequency = One Time Event

   Subject to County Fee = yes
   Last Tested = MSDS

Comments: This waste stream is certified by the generator as non-special based on MSDS and generator knowledge. We have no technical objections to this waste stream. Action is required.
2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Osmose Railroad Services, Inc. 955 Ernest Street Washington, IL 61571</th>
<th>Treated Wood - Weathered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>Demolition/dismantling uncontaminated, weathered wood products with preservatives (e.g. creosote, CCA, pentachlorophenol).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dated:</strong> 03/07/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong> 03/07/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> Tazewell</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Non-Special</td>
<td>Quantity = 30 Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profile #</strong> 112750IL</td>
<td>Frequency = One Time Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject to County Fee = yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Tested = NA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: This waste stream is certified by the generator as non-special based on generator knowledge. We have no technical objections to this waste stream. Action is required.

Notes:
- Committee approval does not relieve the Generator and Landfill Operator from complying with all applicable laws and regulations
Generator's Non-hazardous Waste Profile Sheet

Requested Disposal Facility: PCC
Profile Number: 112674IL

☐ Renewal for Profile Number:
Waste Approval Expiration Date:

☐ Check here if there are multiple generating locations for this waste. Attach additional locations.

A. Waste Generator Facility Information (must reflect location of waste generation/origins)

1. Generator Name: Illinois American Water Company
2. Site Address: 2901 S.W. Washington
3. City, ZIP: Pocahontas 61614
4. State: IL
5. County: Pocahontas
6. Contact Name/Title: Doug Tennis/Oper. Supt.

B. Customer Information ☐ same as above

P. O. Number:

C. Waste Stream Information

1. DESCRIPTION
   a. Common Waste Name: Chlorosorb (Aluminum Oxide)
   b. Describe Process Generating Waste or Source of Contamination:
      Unused absorbant from gas scrubber system
   c. Typical Color(s): white
   d. Strong Odor? ☐ Yes ☐ No Describe:
   e. Physical State at 70°F: ☐ Solid ☐ Liquid ☐ Powder ☐ Semi-Solid or Sludge ☐ Other:
   f. Layers? ☐ Single layer ☐ Multi-layer ☐ NA
   g. Water Reactive? ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, Describe:
   h. Free Liquid Range (%): ___ to ___ ☐ NA(solid)
   i. pH Range: ___ to ___ ☐ NA(solid)
   j. Liquid Flash Point: ☐ < 140°F ☐ 140°-199°F ☐ ≥ 200°F ☐ NA(solid)
   k. Flammable Solid: ☐ Yes ☐ No

1. Physical Constituents: List all constituents of waste stream - (e.g. Soil 0-80%, Wood 0-20%): ☐ (See Attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents (Total Composition Must be ≥ 100%)</th>
<th>Lower Range</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Upper Range</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aluminium Oxide</td>
<td>≤ 9%</td>
<td>g/ft³</td>
<td>≥ 9%</td>
<td>g/ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sodium Thiosulfate</td>
<td>≤ 9%</td>
<td>g/ft³</td>
<td>≥ 9%</td>
<td>g/ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ESTIMATED QUANTITY OF WASTE AND SHIPPING INFORMATION
   a. ☐ One Time Event ☐ Base ☐ Repeat Event
   b. Estimated Annual Quantity: 850 ☐ Tons ☐ Cubic Yards ☐ Drums ☐ Gallons ☐ Other (specify): Cubic Feet
   c. Shipping Frequency: ☐ Units per ☐ Month ☐ Quarter ☐ Year ☐ One Time ☐ Other
   d. Is this a U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Hazardous Material? (If yes, answer e.) ☐ Yes ☐ No
   e. USDOT Shipping Description (if applicable): goggles, dust mask, gloves, long sleeves
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D. Regulatory Status (Please check appropriate responses)

1. Waste Identification:
   a. Does the waste meet the definition of a USEPA listed or characteristic hazardous waste as defined by 40 CFR Part 261? Yes ☐ No ☐
   1. If yes, please complete a hazardous waste profile.
   b. Does the waste meet the definition of a state hazardous waste other than identified in D.1.a? Yes ☐ No ☐
   1. If yes, please complete a hazardous waste profile.

2. Is this waste included in one or more of the categories below (Check all that apply)? If yes, attach supporting documentation. Yes ☐ No ☐
   ☐ Delisted Hazardous Waste
   ☐ Excluded Wastes Under 40CFR 281.4
   ☐ Treated Hazardous Waste Debris
   ☐ Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste

3. Is the waste from a Federal (40 CFR 300, Appendix B) or state mandated clean-up? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Does the waste represented by this waste profile sheet contain radioactive material?
   a. If yes, is disposal regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission? Yes ☐ No ☐
   b. If yes, is disposal regulated by a State Agency for radioactive waste/NORM? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Does the waste represented by this waste profile sheet contain Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)?
   (If yes, list in Chemical Composition - C.1.1)
   a. If yes, are the PCBs regulated by 40 CFR 761? Yes ☐ No ☐
   b. If yes, is it remediation waste from a project being performed under the Self-Implementing option provided in 40 CFR 761.61(a)? Yes ☐ No ☐
   c. If yes, were the PCBs imported into the US? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Does the waste contain untreated, regulated medical or infectious waste? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Does the waste contain asbestos?
   a. If yes, is the waste friable? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Is this profile for remediation waste from a facility that is a major source of Hazardous Air Pollutants (Site Remediation NESHAP, 40 CFR 63 subpart GFGGFO)? Yes ☐ No ☐
   a. If yes, does the waste contain <500 ppmw VOHAPs at the point of determination? Yes ☐ No ☐

E. Generator Certification (Please read and certify by signature below)

By signing this Generator's Waste Profile Sheet, I hereby certify that all:

1. Information submitted in this profile and all attached documents contain true and accurate descriptions of the waste material to the best of my knowledge.
2. Relevant information within the possession of the Generator regarding known or suspected hazards pertaining to this waste has been disclosed to WM/the Contractor;
3. Analytical data attached pertaining to the profiled waste was derived from testing a representative sample in accordance with 40 CFR 260.40(c) or equivalent rules; and
4. Changes that occur in the character of the waste (i.e. changes in the process or new analytical) will be identified by the Generator and disclosed to WM (and the Contractor if applicable) prior to providing the waste to WM (and the contractor if applicable).

5. Check all that apply:
   ☐ a. Attached analytical pertains to the waste. Identify laboratory & sample ID #’s and parameters tested:
   ☐ # Pages:
   ☐ b. Only the analysis identified on the attachment pertain to the waste (identify by laboratory & sample ID #’s and parameters tested). Attachment #:
   ☐ c. Additional information necessary to characterize the profiled waste has been attached (other than analytical, such as MSDS). Indicate the number of attached pages:
   ☐ d. I am an agent signing on behalf of the Generator, and the delegation of authority to me from the Generator for this signature is available upon request.

Certification Signature: ____________________________  Title: ________________  Oper. Supt. Prod.
Company Name: ___________________________________________________________________
Name (Print): ____________________________  Date: ____________
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Profile Addendum: State of Illinois
GENERATOR'S NON-SPECIAL WASTE CERTIFICATION

F. Additional Waste Stream Information

Profile Number: 112674IL

Generators Name: Illinois American Water Co

Generators SITE Address: 2901 S. W. Washington, Peoria, IL
(The location where the waste is generated)

Waste Name: Chlorosorb (Aluminum Oxide)

The Illinois Environmental Protection Act allows a Generator to certify that their pollution control waste or industrial process waste, is not an Illinois Special Waste (Section 3.45). By completing the following questionnaire, you may certify that the waste stream represented by the Waste Management Profile referenced above is not an Illinois Special Waste as defined in the Act.

Is the waste referenced above any of the following:

1. A Potentially Infectious Medical Waste (PIMW)? □ Yes □ No
2. A Hazardous Waste as defined in 40 CFR 261 or in 35 IAC 722.111? □ Yes □ No
3. A Liquid Waste (fails the paint filter test as defined in 35 IAC 811.107)? □ Yes □ No
4. A regulated PCB waste as defined in 40 CFR 761? □ Yes □ No
5. A NESHAP regulated asbestos waste other than waste from renovation or demolition? □ Yes □ No
6. A waste resulting from the shredding recyclable metals (auto fluff)? □ Yes □ No
7. A delisted Hazardous Waste or Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste, subject to LDR requirements under 35 IAC 728.107? □ Yes □ No

In determining that this waste is not a liquid, I have used knowledge of the processes generating the waste and the attached supporting documentation: □ MSDS □ Analytical □ Other (explain below):

In determining that this waste is not RCRA hazardous, I have used knowledge of the processes generating the waste and the attached supporting documentation: □ MSDS □ Analytical □ Other (explain below):

8. Is the waste represented by this profile sheet subject to the Illinois Solid Waste Management Act fee? □ Yes □ No

By signing below, I certify my waste is NOT an Illinois Special Waste and that I understand that a person who knowingly and falsely certifies that a waste is not special waste is subject to the penalties set forth in subdivision (6) of subsection (h) of section 44 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

Name: (Print) □ Doug Tennis □ Oper. Sup’t

Signature: □

Title: Oper. Sup’t

Date: 3/6/12
A. Waste Generator Facility Information (must reflect location of waste generation/origin)

1. Generator Name: Omosose Railroad Services, Inc.
2. Site Address: 935 Ernest Street
3. City/ZIP: Washington, WA 98171
4. State: WA
5. County: King
6. Contact Name/Title: Danny Bell, Foreman

B. Customer Information (same as above)

1. Customer Name: Omosose Railroad Services
2. Billing Address: PO Box 2075
3. City, State, and ZIP: Madison, WI 53708
4. Contact Name: Rick Floyd
5. Contact Email: rick@mosose.com

C. Waste Stream Information

1. DESCRIPTION
   a. Common Waste Name: Treated Wood - Weathered
   b. Describe Process Generating Waste or Source of Contamination:
      Demolition/dismantling uncontaminated, weathered wood products with preservatives (e.g. creosote, CCA, pentachlorophenol).
   c. Typical Color(s): Any and all
   d. Strong Odor? Yes ☐ No ☐
   e. Physical State at 70°F: Solid ☐ Liquid ☐ Powder ☐ Semi-Solid or Sludge ☐ Other ☐
   f. Layers? Single layer ☐ Multi-layer ☐ NA ☐
   g. Water Reactive? Yes ☐ No ☐
   h. Free Liquid Range (%): _______ to _______
   i. pH Range: _______ to _______ NA(solid)
   j. Liquid Flash Point: < 140°F ☐ 140° - 190°F ☐ ≥ 200°F ☐ NA(solid)
   k. Flammable Solid: Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Physical Constituents: List all constituents of waste stream (e.g. Soil 0-80%, Wood 0-20%): ☐ See Attached
   a. Constituents (Total Composition Must be ≥ 100%)
      1. Wood (e.g. telephone poles, railroad ties)
         Lower Range Upper Range
         100 %
   b. Other (specify):

3. ESTIMATED QUANTITY OF WASTE AND SHIPPING INFORMATION
   a. ☐ One Time Event ☐ Base ☐ Repeat Event
   b. Estimated Annual Quantity: 30 Tons ☐ Cubic Yards ☐ Drums ☐ Gallons ☐ Other (specify):
   c. Shipping Frequency: Units per ☐ Month ☐ Quarter ☐ Year ☐ One Time ☐ Other
   d. Is this a U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Hazardous Material? (If yes, answer e.) Yes ☐ No ☐
   e. USDOT Shipping Description (if applicable):

3. SAFETY REQUIREMENTS (Handling, PPE, etc.): Normal landfill site personal protective equipment
D. Regulatory Status (Please check appropriate responses)

1. Waste Identification:
   a. Does the waste meet the definition of a USEPA listed or characteristic hazardous waste as defined by 40 CFR Part 261? □ Yes □ No
      1. If yes, please complete a hazardous waste profile.
   b. Does the waste meet the definition of a state hazardous waste other than identified in D.1.a? □ Yes □ No
      1. If yes, please complete a hazardous waste profile.

2. Is this waste included in one or more of categories below (Check all that apply)? If yes, attach supporting documentation. □ Yes □ No
   □ Delisted Hazardous Waste
   □ Excluded Wastes Under 40CFR 261.4
   □ Treated Hazardous Waste Debris
   □ Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste

3. Is the waste from a Federal (40 CFR 300, Appendix B) or state mandated clean-up? If yes, see instructions. □ Yes □ No

4. Does the waste represented by this waste profile sheet contain radioactive material?
   a. If yes, is disposal regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission? □ Yes □ No
   b. If yes, is disposal regulated by a State Agency for radioactive waste/NORM? □ Yes □ No

5. Does the waste represented by this waste profile sheet contain Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)?
   (If yes, list in Chemical Composition - C.I.D.)
   □ Yes □ No
   a. If yes, are the PCBs regulated by 40 CFR 781?
   b. If yes, is it remediation waste from a project being performed under the Self-Implementing option provided in 40 CFR 781.61(a)? □ Yes □ No
   c. If yes, were the PCBs imported into the US? □ Yes □ No

6. Does the waste contain untreated, regulated medical or infectious waste? □ Yes □ No

7. Does the waste contain asbestos?
   a. If yes, □ Pliable □ Non Pliable

8. Is this profile for remediation waste from a facility that is a major source of Hazardous Air Pollutants (Site Remediation NESHAP, 40 CFR 63 subpart GGGG)? □ Yes □ No
   a. If yes, does the waste contain <600 ppmw VOC/HAPs at the point of determination? □ Yes □ No

E. Generator Certification (Please read and certify by signature below)

By signing this Generator’s Waste Profile Sheet, I hereby certify that all:

1. Information submitted in this profile and all attached documents contain true and accurate descriptions of the waste material;

2. Relevant information within the possession of the Generator regarding known or suspected hazards pertaining to this waste has been disclosed to WM/the Contractor;

3. Analytical data attached pertaining to the profiled waste was derived from testing a representative sample in accordance with 40 CFR 261.20(c) or equivalent rules; and

4. Changes that occur in the character of the waste (i.e. changes in the process or new analytical) will be identified by the Generator and disclosed to WM (and the Contractor if applicable) prior to providing the waste to WM (and the Contractor if applicable).

6. Check all that apply:
   □ a. Attached analytical pertains to the waste. Identify laboratory & sample ID #’s and parameters tested:
   # Pages:

   □ b. Only the analysis identified on the attachment pertain to the waste (identify by laboratory & sample ID #’s and parameters tested). Attachment #:

   □ c. Additional information necessary to characterize the profiled waste has been attached (other than analytical, such as MSDS). Indicate the number of attached pages:

   □ d. I am an agent signing on behalf of the Generator and the delegation of authority to me from the Generator for this signature is available upon request.

Certification Signature: __________________________ Title: Senior Project Manager
Company Name: Georgia Power Services
Name (Print): Richard Floyd
Date: March 7, 2010
Profile Addendum: State of Illinois
GENERATOR'S NON-SPECIAL WASTE CERTIFICATION

F. Additional Waste Stream Information

Profile Number: 112750IL

Generators Name: Osmose Railroad Services, Inc.

Generators SITE Address: 955 Ernest Street - Washington, IL 61571
(The location where the waste is generated)

Waste Name: treated wood - weathered

The Illinois Environmental Protection Act allows a Generator to certify that their pollution control waste or industrial process waste, is not an Illinois Special Waste (Section 3.45). By completing the following questionnaire, you may certify that the waste stream represented by the Waste Management Profile referenced above is not an Illinois Special Waste as defined in the Act.

Is the waste referenced above any of the following:
1. A Potentially Infectious Medical Waste (PIMW)? □ Yes □ No
2. A Hazardous Waste as defined in 40 CFR 261 or in 35 IAC 722.111? □ Yes □ No
3. A Liquid Waste (fails the paint filter test as defined in 35 IAC 811.107)? □ Yes □ No
4. A regulated PCB waste as defined in 40 CFR 761? □ Yes □ No
5. A NESHAP regulated asbestos waste other than waste from renovation or demolition? □ Yes □ No
6. A waste resulting from the shredding recyclable metals (auto fluff)? □ Yes □ No
7. A delisted Hazardous Waste or Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste, subject to LDR requirements under 35 IAC 728.107? □ Yes □ No

In determining that this waste is not a liquid, I have used knowledge of the processes generating the waste and the attached supporting documentation: □ MSDS □ Analytical □ Other (explain below):

In determining that this waste is not RCRA hazardous, I have used knowledge of the processes generating the waste and the attached supporting documentation: □ MSDS □ Analytical □ Other (explain below):

8. Is the waste represented by this profile sheet subject to the Illinois Solid Waste Management Act fee? □ Yes □ No

By signing below, I certify my waste is NOT an Illinois Special Waste, and that I understand that a person who knowingly and falsely certifies that a waste is not special waste is subject to the penalties set forth in subdivision (6) of subsection (h) of section 44 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

Name: (Print) Richard Flege

Signature: [Signature]

Title: Senior Project Manager

Date: March 7, 2012
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

To: Members of the Landfill Committee
From: David Barber, Public Works Director

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: March 21, 2012

ACTION REQUESTED: REQUEST FOR AUDIT OF WASTE MANAGEMENT

BACKGROUND: At a previous meeting the Committee moved to proceed with an audit of Waste Management operations at the landfill per the contract for operation of the facility. Subsequent to the Committee's request, staff reviewed the contract and the section related to the Audit. Section 1.23 of the General Conditions of the Agreement reads as follows:

1.23 AUDIT
The Committee shall have the authority to call regular and special meetings in which the Contractor or his representative shall appear and present a report on the operation of the Facility, including specific and detailed information on the type, municipality of origin, county of origin, and quantity of municipal waste disposed at the Facility as directed by the Committee on a monthly basis. Special waste reporting will be monthly and shall include waste description, total quantities received (by month and year-to-date), be permit number and generator. The monthly report will provide a year-to-date comparison to the last year.

From our reading of the minutes, it appears that the Committee may have been looking for a more detailed Financial Audit of the operation at the landfill; however, we do not find the authority to do so in the Landfill Agreement and wanted to clarify the direction from the Committee before proceeding further on this matter.
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Steve Matheny Landfill Sales Waste Management

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: March 21, 2012

ACTION REQUESTED: RECEIVE AND FILE MONTHLY REPORTS

BACKGROUND: Attached are the monthly summary report, profiled waste log, and year over year comparison chart for February 2012.

Permit Requests and Notifications –

1. Waste Management requests Mr. Barber's signature on a permit application documenting and expansion of the leachate recirculation system, subject to approval in advance by Foth.

2. Waste Management does not anticipate any other permit requests but respectfully asks the committee to allow administrative approval of permits for signature by Dave Barber after review by Foth if permits are required prior to the April meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: NA
**Peoria City/County Landfill No. 2**

Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.

**Monthly Activity Report**

**February 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage General Refuse</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Landfill #2 Year to Date</th>
<th>Landfill #2 Year to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haulers</strong></td>
<td>11,624.11</td>
<td>24,371.13</td>
<td>23,280.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Res. Free Loads</td>
<td>122.86</td>
<td>265.21</td>
<td>273.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Res. $5 Loads</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11,747.89</td>
<td>24,640.02</td>
<td>23,555.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Special Wastes**     |               |                        |                         |
| Industrial (Declassified) | 939.49       | 2,288.44                | 971.21                  |
| Industrial (Exempt)    | 0.00          | 0.00                    | 0.00                    |
| **TOTAL**              | 939.49        | 2,288.44                | 971.21                  |

| **TOTAL LANDFILL RECEIPTS** |               |                        |                         |
|                            | 12,687.38     | 26,928.46               | 24,526.83               |

| **Yard Waste Receipts**  |               |                        |                         |
| City Contract -          | 0.00          | 0.00                    | 0.00                    |
| All Other               | 0.00          | 0.00                    | 0.42                    |
| **TOTAL**               | 0.00          | 0.00                    | 0.42                    |

| **Payment Payable to City/County Committee** |               |                        |                         |

| General Refuse | Tons 11,624.11 | Rate $1.50 | $17,436.17 | $17,436.17 | $36,556.70 | 34,921.22 |

| Special Waste - Ind. | Tons 939.49 | Rate $1.50 | $1,409.24 | $1,409.24 | $3,432.66 | 1,456.82 |

| **TOTAL** | $18,845.40 | $39,989.36 | 36,378.03 |
### Payable to County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Refuse</td>
<td>11,624.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>$14,762.62</td>
<td>$30,951.34</td>
<td>29,566.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste - Ind.</td>
<td>939.49</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>$1,193.15</td>
<td>$2,906.32</td>
<td>1,233.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$15,955.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,857.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,800.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payable to/Receive From County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loads</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5 Loads</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fee on Free and $5</td>
<td>123.65</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>($274.50)</td>
<td>($594.16)</td>
<td>($609.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($234.50)</td>
<td>($514.16)</td>
<td>($544.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payable to City/County Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loads</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Tarp Fee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tonnage General Refuse & Special Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Banked</th>
<th>CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In county</td>
<td>6,980.79</td>
<td>55.02%</td>
<td>14,843.50</td>
<td>12,719.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of county</td>
<td>5,706.59</td>
<td>44.98%</td>
<td>12,084.96</td>
<td>11,807.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12,687.38</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>26,928.46</td>
<td>24,526.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Airspace Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tons Used</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Banked</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airspace Calculations</td>
<td>26,928</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>174,900CY</td>
<td>763,837</td>
<td>174,900CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* calculated annual average that assures life from the 2011 airspace analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Name</th>
<th>PMT Name</th>
<th>Generator</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>2012 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>Tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113628IL</td>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>ABERCROMBIE, TODD</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113620IL</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>AMEREN</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM010289</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>ARTCO</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>95.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM5084</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>CANTON, CITY OF</td>
<td>179.64</td>
<td>386.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB001522</td>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>CATERPILLAR -TECH CENTER</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS192</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>CROMPTON CORP</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS187</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>DEGUSSA</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>68.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM284629</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>EAST PEORIA, CITY OF</td>
<td>157.61</td>
<td>316.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR 4040</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>EVONIK GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>384.21</td>
<td>1,121.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZWMI452972</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010151</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010153</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>46.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010154</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10155</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010156</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>GOLDSCHMIDT</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>41.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF1806</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>KRESS CORPORATION</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB25605</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>M &amp; O Environmental Comp.</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB25606</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>M &amp; O Environmental Comp.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB25607</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>M &amp; O Environmental Comp.</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB25608</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>M &amp; O Environmental Comp.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZW452675</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>PARSONS</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112509IL</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>PEORIA BARGE</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>40.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133233IL</td>
<td>Sp. Waste</td>
<td>PEORIA CITY COUNTY LANDFILL</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>939.49</td>
<td>2,288.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>