PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019
*******3:00 P.M.*******

DATES SET:

WEDNESDAY, October 16, 2019 @ 3:00 p.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at City Hall 419 Fulton Street - Room 404, Peoria Illinois 61602

WEDNESDAY, November 20, 2019 @ 3:00 p.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at City Hall 419 Fulton Street - Room 404, Peoria Illinois 61602.

WEDNESDAY, December 18, 2019 @ 3:00 p.m.
REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING – To be held at City Hall 419 Fulton Street - Room 404, Peoria Illinois 61602.

To access electronic Agenda & Minutes (only):
1. www.peoriagov.org/boards-commissions/
2. Choose Solid Waste Disposal Committee (Landfill)
3. Scroll to the bottom of the screen. Under "Agenda & Minutes" will be a list of the .pdf postings.
4. 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 AT THE BEGINNING 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 3:00 P.M. AT CITY HALL, 419 Fulton Street - Room 404, 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
Regular Meeting

City Hall – 419 Fulton Street - Room 404

September 18, 2019 @ 3:00 p.m.

Attendance

Announcements, Etc.

Citizens' Opportunity to Address the Committee

Minutes

Request for Approval of the Peoria City/County Landfill Minutes
Dated: August 21, 2019

Agenda Items

Item No. 1  Report from Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC
A. Special Waste Approvals as Needed
B. Permit Approvals as Needed
C. Updates Regarding Compliance Activities, Measures & Progress
D. Request to Approve Changes to the Waste Acceptance Procedures

Item No. 2  Report from Foth and City of Peoria
A. Request to Approve the Budget for PCCL for FY2020.

Item No. 3  Report from Public Works Administration
A. Landfill Monthly Budget Report

Item No. 4  Report from Waste Management
A. Monthly Activity Report
B. Permit Approvals as Needed

Item No. 5  Report from Peoria Disposal Co.
A. Request to Approve Proceeding with the Conceptual Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Action Plan

Unfinished Business

Item No. 1 - 2019  Update on Potential Land Use

Item No. 2 - 2019  Update on Construction Activities for Landfill No. 1

Item No. 3 - 2019  Update on Waste Trends for Landfill No. 2
NEW BUSINESS

REGULAR MEETING

OCTOBER 16, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT
Peoria, Illinois August 21, 2019, a Regular Meeting of the Peoria City/County Landfill Committee was held this date at 3:00 p.m., at City Hall, (Room 404), 419 Fulton Street with Chairman Morris presiding, and with proper notice having been posted.

CALL TO ORDER

Call to Order showed the following Landfill Committee Members in attendance:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Morris, Les Bergsten, Rick Fox, Patrick Nichting, Steve Van Winkle and Sharon Williams – 6.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Zach Oyler – 1.

CITY/COUNTY STAFF PRESENT: Emily Ambroso, Alex Kurth, Karen Raithel and Stephanie Stapleton.

OTHERS PRESENT: George Armstrong, Daniel Bacehowski, Joyce Blumenshine, Chris Coulter, Tracy Fox, Joyce Harant, Charles Hostetler, Steve Harenburg, Brian Rogers, Ron Welk, Mark Williams and Jerry Wyatt.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE.

CITIZENS OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

Chairman Morris opened the floor to any citizens who wished to address the Landfill Committee members. No one came forward to address the Committee.

MINUTES

Mr. Van Winkle moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Peoria City/County Landfill Committee held on July 17, 2019; seconded by Ms. Williams.

The minutes were approved by viva voce vote.
AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM NO. 1:REPORT FROM FOTH INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT

(A) SPECIAL WASTE APPROVALS AS NEEDED

Mr. Bacehowski stated that there were two (2) non-special waste profiles that required the Committee’s approval: Profile #62623614IL from Illinois Department of Transportation-D4 for soil from roadway reconstruction and maintenance projects; and, Profile #623687IL from ComEd for soil excavated during utility work. Based on this information provided, Mr. Bacehoswki stated that Foth had no technical objections.

Mr. Van Winkle moved to approve the special waste profiles #62623614IL from Illinois Department of Transportation-D4 and #623687IL from ComEd; seconded by Mr. Nichting.

The motion was approved by viva voce vote.

(B) SPECIAL WASTE APPROVALS AS NEEDED

Mr. Bacehowski explained that there were several shutdowns that occurred with the landfill flare system, which lasted longer than an hour. He explained that four (4) 405-CAAPP reporting forms would need to be submitted to the IEPA, which required Chairman Morris’ signature. He noted there were no excess emissions released during the shutdown events and the flare system operated as designed. He explained that the shutdowns were the result of either, utility power issues or due to shutdowns for the new flare control system installation. He further explained that the shutdown lasted 57 hours and 44 minutes for these four instances.

Further, Mr. Bacehowski stated that he did not anticipate any other reports that would require Chairman Morris’ signature, but he respectfully requested approval to obtain Chairman Morris’ signature, should the need arise prior to the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Van Winkle moved to approve securing Chairman Morris’ signature for the 405-CAAPP reporting forms including permits prior to the next scheduled meeting; seconded by Mr. Fox.

The motion was approved by viva voce vote.

(C) UPDATES REGARDING COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES, MEASURES & PROGRESS

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Mr. Bacehowski outlined the engineering services through July 30, 2019. He stated that the total amount billed to-date was $48,855.74.
UPDATES REGARDING COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES, AND PROGRESS

Mr. Bacehowksi gave a brief update regarding the compliance activities, measures and progress for the Landfill.

- Several shutdowns were scheduled and recorded during upgrades to the flare control system and utility power issues over the Fourth of July holiday. The signature approval memo outlines those shutdowns lasting longer than an hour requiring notification to IEPA via the 405-CAAPP form. Two unscheduled shutdowns were due to power failure at the flare skid, Ameren was called to resolve the issue, totaling 40 hours and 20 minutes. There was one scheduled shutdown the July 29th to install a battery backup for the new flare control system and the flare was down for 51 minutes during installation. The battery backup will allow the system to callout in power failure emergencies and remote diagnostics prior to responding to power failures.
- Landfill gas methane content was measured at 36.1% during the monthly monitoring at the flare. A decrease from last month’s reading but not unexpected and typical measurement during the late summer months.
- Wellhead repairs were completed in July and repairs will continue as they arise. Some typical repairs include replacing flex hose connections, sample ports, valve operation and sealing for air leaks.
- In July, 35,000 gallons of leachate were transported off-site for treatment.
- Solar sumps are running and minor repairs are made as needed. Liquid removal is continuing and the increase in leachate/condensate transport is expected to continue.
- A battery backup has been installed for the new flare control system and the VPN connection to the flare is working. The system appears to be functioning as intended.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Currently, the new contract for services total spent to date was 14.5% of the July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 contract period whereas the planned budget was projected at 15.9% complete. The attached monthly engineering services spreadsheet showed budgeted vs actual spends to date.

In discussion with Mr. Fox about the project status update, Mr. Williams explained that Mr. Gabehart would be able to provide this information at the next scheduled meeting.

ITEM NO. 2: REPORT FROM FOTH INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Ambroso gave a brief overview of the unaudited revenue and expense financial report for the financial transactions that occurred from January through July 2019. She
explained that two invoices were processed for Foth this month; however, one invoice was for expenses that occurred towards the end of 2018. She noted that the waste receipts were still down and that it would continue to be monitored.

No action required.

**ITEM NO. 3: REPORT FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**A. MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT**

Mr. Rogers gave a brief overview of the monthly activity report for July. He said that all weekly random load checks were completed and documented, with no issues to report.

**B. PERMIT APPROVALS AS NEEDED**

Mr. Rogers stated that he did not anticipate any other reports that would require Chairman Morris’ signature, but that he respectfully requested approval to obtain Chairman Morris’ signature, should the need arise prior to the next Committee, subject to review and approval in advance by Foth.

Mr. Fox moved to approve WM report and securing Chairman Morris’ signature for permits, subject to review and approval in advance by Foth; seconded by Mr. Bergsten.

The motion was approved by viva voce vote.

Mr. Rogers discussed the possibility of streamlining the approval process for submitted waste profiles. He explained that there were two (2) waste streams for non-contaminated soil that were recently approved by the Committee. Due to the approval process, these items were delayed until the Committee’s next scheduled meeting. He noted that the lag time between submittals could take up to 2 - 6 weeks before the application was approved. He said that he had reached out to Foth to discuss streamlining the pre-approval process by adding non-contaminated soil to the pre-approval list.

After a brief discussion, it was determined that consideration would be given to streamlining or expediting the approval process along with expanding the pre-approval list. Some expressed concern in regard to granting administrative approvals and felt, in the past, that this process had been abused. The purpose of the administrative approvals were based on emergency needs only; therefore, this process should be consistent with the current process.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Chairman Morris requested that this item be placed on the agenda for the next scheduled meeting for further discussion.
ITEM NO. 4: REPORT FROM PEORIA DISPOSAL CO.

A. LAKE REHABILITATION AND WETLAND ENHANCEMENT PLAN PRESENTATION

Mr. Coulter gave the Committee a brief overview of the presentation from PDC Technical Services, Inc. He pointed out that PDCTS had developed a plan to resolve the dam issue at the Peoria City/County Landfill Facility, as well as address its wetland mitigation needs on-site for the development of the Landfill No. 3 Facility. He noted that the plan had been reviewed with Foth, Waste Management and the Peoria Park District.

Further, Mr. Coulter noted the financial conditions had changed with the Park District. He said the Park District asked if PDC would give some consideration to establishing a Legacy Fund to assist with the long term care of Vicary Bottoms. He said that $50,000 had been designated for the legacy fund. Per the agreement, PDC would maintain the wetland project for five years then the wetland would be transferred back to the Peoria Park District once approved by the Army Core of Engineers. He said this process had been completed.

Mr. Coulter said this year was one of the wettest springs on record. Due to the additional rain, Vicary Bottoms had flooded. With that being said, Dr. Hostetler and Mr. Armstrong have identified ways to address the flooding at Vicary Bottoms and the entrance road, which would be addressed with following presentation.

B. REQUEST TO APPROVE PROCEEDING WITH THE CONCEPTUAL LAKE REHABILITATION AND WETLAND ENHANCEMENT ACTION PLAN

Presentation handouts were distributed to all Committee Members.

Mr. George Armstrong and Dr. Charles Hostetler presented the Conceptual Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Project Action Plan for Landfill No. 3. They reviewed the Landfill Development Schedule, Phase 1 Landfill Development Plan, Current Wetlands Mitigation Plan, Entrance Road Dam Considerations, Life-of-Site Surplus Soil Management Plan, Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Design Concept, Action Plan and Path Forward.

Discussions were held regarding the proposed Action Plan and Wetland Enhancement Project. Mr. Nichting questioned whether the Peoria Park District would be in a position to dispute the Committee’s authority and if there were any remediation clauses in place that would prevent Peoria Park District from challenging the Committee’s operation in the near future. He referenced a similar incident with the Greater Peoria Airport.
In response to Mr. Nichting, Mr. Coulter said this was a conceptual plan; therefore, he would need to have the Committee’s approval then move forward with discussions with Illinois Department of Resources, the Army Core of Engineers and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Once this had been approved, then an agreement would be prepared to release both parties mutually (PCCL and Peoria Park District) from the Vicary Bottoms Wetland Project. He noted that Mr. Nichting’s concerns would be covered through an amendment to the current agreement.

Mr. Fox raised some questions regarding the siting approval. He said he felt that clarification was needed as to who would be responsible for the approvals. He asked that the Committee’s legal counsel address this matter. He also questioned if the current siting agreement would need to be resubmitted with amendments to address the issues outlined in the presentation.

In response to Mr. Fox, Mr. Coulter stated that the proposed revisions would need to be approved by the County Board then submitted to the IEPA. He said the next step would be to address the IDNR and any questions that pertain to the siting agreement. Further, the host agreements with both governing bodies would need to be approved as well.

Mr. Fox stated that Vicary Bottoms Project was intended to be a public amenity with the current siting; however he no longer felt that this was a benefit for the community. He said that there were number of things that were not anticipated, which he said raised some questions about the overall project.

Mr. Coulter reiterated that he challenged his team to develop some viable options to address Vicary Bottoms and the entrance road. However, he pointed out that the Peoria Park District’s financial position had changed. He said that PDC agreed to establish a legacy fund in the amount of $50,000 to assist with these ongoing issues; however, he said that there was only so much that they could do. He noted that efforts had been made to solve some of the issues on site. He said that it was still a public facility.

Mr. Fox stated that this was a lot of information to take in and requested that the item be deferred for one month to allow ample time to thoroughly review the Plan. He would like to have more time to review the information before approving the Plan.

Chairman Morris questioned if there were any technical objections from the City of Peoria and Foth regarding this matter.

In response to Chairman Morris, Ms. Ambroso stated that the City had discussed this matter with another consultant and that Foth had reviewed this with their experts. From an engineering standpoint, she said it was exciting and interesting; however, there was not enough information to put a complete thumbs up on it. She believed that the City and Foth were comfortable with the Committee giving permission to PDC to start the
conversation with the IDNR, IEPA and Army Core of Engineers to see if this is something that would be useful.

Chairman Morris said that he realized that the numbers were not in place, but questioned if there was anything about this project, from an engineering standpoint, that needed to be re-evaluated.

Chairman Morris questioned what would happen if the various pieces were not approved, then what would be the next steps.

In response to Chairman Morris, Mr. Coulter stated that they would not eliminate the Vicary Bottoms Project. However, he noted that the Committee would need to be on board prior to meeting with the various entities.

Trustee Harant stated that she did not want to put the Peoria Park District at risk down the road. If the easements were not expanded then what would be the next step, she said. She emphasized that she didn’t want PDC to come back to the Park District, if these other permits were not allowed. She noted that she didn’t want the Park District to knowingly take something with the likelihood of it being destroyed.

Mr. Coulter explained that they had met with the Peoria Park District and the Board approved the addition of the expansion of the conservation easement. Unfortunately, it was a very wet spring. If we can’t get all three approvals, then the project would be built based on the original design to meet the siting requirements.

Mr. Nichting moved to proceed with Action Plan and meet with the necessary parties involved; seconded by Mr. Van Winkle.

Motion failed.

Mr. Van Winkle stated that consideration should be given to Mr. Fox’s comments as well.

Mr. Fox stated that he felt that this was a big decision; therefore, he moved that the item be deferred for one month; seconded by Ms. Williams.

Mr. Fox said he felt that this would allow ample time to review the information and to hear back from Mr. Kurth, the Committee’s legal counsel, on the implications before the Committee made a final decision to move forward.

Mr. Nichting questioned if the delay would hamper any time lines for PDC. He also questioned if the issues needed to be addressed by legal or engineering.

In response to Mr. Nichting, Mr. Fox stated that he would like to review the information and have an opportunity to ask a few more questions.
Chairman Morris encouraged the Committee Members to ask the necessary questions prior to the next scheduled meeting. In fairness, he felt that this was a big issue and supported the deferral.

The motion to defer the Conceptual Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Action Plan for one month was approved by viva voce vote.

Chairman Morris reminded the Committee to be mindful of the Open Meetings Act when discussing this matter.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 1 - 2019 Update on Potential Land Use
ITEM NO. 2 - 2019 Update on Construction Activities for Landfill No. 1
ITEM NO. 3 - 2019 Update on Waste Trends for Landfill No. 2

At this time, there were no updates on these items. An update would be provided at the next scheduled meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE.

REGULAR MEETING

October, 2019 at 3:00 P.M.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was determined that an Executive Session would not be needed at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

__________________________________
Chairman Stephen Morris
/ss
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Joshua Gabehart, P.E. and Mark Williams; Foth Infrastructure and Environment, LLC

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Committee approval required for one non-special waste profile (623813IL), receive and file one pre-approved waste profile (623766IL)

BACKGROUND:
1. Profile 623813IL from Optimum Ventures LLC is for contaminated soil from a leaking underground storage tank, expected quantity exceeds pre-approval amount.
2. 623766IL from Union Roofing Company, Inc was pre-approved per the Committee’s Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) Policy.

Please see attached memorandum, which reviews and includes information pertaining to the profiles. Based on the information provided, Foth has no technical objections for acceptance of the waste stream listed above.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: N/A
Waste Management has presented the following waste stream.

1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator/Profile</th>
<th>Waste Stream Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimum Ventures LLC</td>
<td>Soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 Tremont St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Bay, IL 61611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated: 08/22/2019</td>
<td>Contaminated soil from a leaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received: 08/22/2019</td>
<td>underground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Woodford County</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Non-Special</td>
<td>Quantity: 3,700 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile #623813IL</td>
<td>Frequency: One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to County Fee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Tested: 8/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: This waste stream is contaminated soil from a leaking underground storage tank. This waste stream has been certified non-special by the generator based on laboratory analytical testing. The anticipated quantity of 3,700 tons of soil exceeds the 2,000 tons pre-approved quantity and requires committee approval. There are no technical objections to the landfill receiving this waste based on information provided to Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC (Foth).
Waste Management has presented the following waste streams.

**Pre-Approved Waste Streams (No Action is Required. For Information Only)**

- Union Roofing Company, Canton, IL, Profile 623766IL, ACM Policy, 3 yards, one time

See attached profile sheets and laboratory analytical data reports.

Committee approval does not relieve the Generator or Landfill Operator from complying with all applicable laws and regulations. Committee approval is based on information provided by Generator and Landfill Operator.
Waste Profile: 62813IL
Source: Optimum Ventures, LLC
Soil contaminated with unleaded gasoline/diesel fuel due to a leaking underground storage tank subject to 40 CFR 280 Corrective Action Requirements. Waste meets the exclusion under 40 CFR Part 261.4(b)(10) and corresponding (if applicable) Requirements.
C. MATERIAL INFORMATION

Describe Process Generating Material (Continued from page 1):

If more space is needed, please attach additional pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Composition and Contaminants (Continued from page 1):</th>
<th>If more space is needed, please attach additional pages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total composition must be equal to or greater than 100% ≥100%

D. REGULATORY INFORMATION

Only questions with a “Yes” response in Section D on the EZ Profile™ form (page 1) need to be answered here.

1. EPA Hazardous Waste
   a. Please list all USEPA listed and characteristic waste code numbers:

   | Is the material subject to the Alternative Debris standards (40 CFR 268.45)? | Yes | No |
   | Is the material subject to the Alternative Soil standards (40 CFR 268.49)? | Yes | No |
   | Is the material exempt from Subpart CC Controls (40 CFR 264.1083)? | Yes | No |

   → If Yes, please check one of the following:
   - Waste meets LDR or treatment exemptions for organics (40 CFR 264.1082(c)(2) or (c)(4))
   - Waste contains VOCs that average <500 ppmw (CFR 264.1082(c)(1)) – will require annual update.

2. State Hazardous Waste

   Please list all state waste codes:

3. For material that is Treated, Delisted, or Excluded
   Please indicate the category, below:
   - Delisted Hazardous Waste
   - Excluded Waste under 40 CFR 261.4 Specify Exclusion: 261.4(b)(10)
   - Treated Hazardous Waste Debris
   - Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste

4. Underlying Hazardous Constituents
   Please list all Underlying Hazardous Constituents:

5. Industries regulated under Benzene NESHAP include petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, coke by-product recovery plants, and TSDFs.
   a. Are you a TSDF? If yes, please complete Benzene NESHAP questionnaire. If not, continue.

   b. Does this material contain benzene?
   → If yes, what is the flow weighted average concentration? ppmw

5. Industries regulated under Benzene NESHAP include petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, coke by-product recovery plants, and TSDFs.
   a. Are you a TSDF? If yes, please complete Benzene NESHAP questionnaire. If not, continue.

   b. Does this material contain benzene?
   → If yes, what is the flow weighted average concentration? ppmw

6. 40 CFR 63
   a. Does the material contain <500 ppmw VOHAPs at the point of determination? Yes | No |

7. CERCLA or State-Mandated clean up
   → Please submit the Record of Decision or other documentation with process information to assist others in the evaluation for proper disposal. A “Determination of Acceptability” may be needed for CERCLA wastes not going to a CERCLA approved facility.

8. NRC or state regulated radioactive or NORM Waste
   → Please identify Isotopes and pCi/g:
F. Additional Waste Stream Information

Profile Number: 623813IL

Generators Name: Optimum Ventures LLC

Generators SITE Address: 501 Tremont Street Spring Bay IL 61611
(The location where the waste is generated)

Waste Name: Excluded UST Contaminated Soil

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 exempt from Illinois Solid Waste Management Act fee? □ Yes ☑ No
Select option: ☑ Pollution Control Waste   ☐ Other

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) Frank Hickey   Title: contact
Signature: __________________               Date: 08/22/2019
August 19, 2019

Mr. Frank Hickey

**DYNAMIC ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**
216 Westridge Boulevard
Bartlett, IL 60103

Project ID: McCarty
First Environmental File ID: 19-4882
Date Received: August 13, 2019

Dear Mr. Frank Hickey:

The above referenced project was analyzed as directed on the enclosed chain of custody record.

All Quality Control criteria as outlined in the methods and current IL ELAP/NELAP have been met unless otherwise noted. QA/QC documentation and raw data will remain on file for future reference. Our accreditation number is 100292 and our current certificate is number 004598; effective 04/23/2019 through 02/28/2020.

I thank you for the opportunity to be of service to you and look forward to working with you again in the future. Should you have any questions regarding any of the enclosed analytical data or need additional information, please contact me at (630) 778-1200.

Sincerely,

Ryan Gerrick
Project Manager
Case Narrative

DYNAMIC ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Project ID: McCarty

Lab File ID: 19-4882

Date Received: August 13, 2019

All quality control criteria, as outlined in the methods, have been met except as noted below or on the following analytical report.

The results in this report apply to the samples in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory Sample ID</th>
<th>Client Sample Identifier</th>
<th>Date/Time Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-4882-001</td>
<td>WC-1</td>
<td>8/12/2019 8:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Batch Comments:

Sample acceptance criteria were met.
Case Narrative

DYNAMIC ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Project ID: McCarty

Lab File ID: 19-4882
Date Received: August 13, 2019

All quality control criteria, as outlined in the methods, have been met except as noted below or on the following analytical report.

The following is a definition of flags that may be used in this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Method holding time is 15 minutes from collection. Lab analysis was performed as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Analyte was found in the method blank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>Analyte not detected at or above the reporting limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sample received in an improper container for this test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Surrogates diluted out; recovery not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Estimated result; concentration exceeds calibration range.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Surrogate recovery outside control limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Analysis or extraction holding time exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Estimated result; concentration is less than routine RL but greater than MDL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>Routine Reporting Limit (Lowest amount that can be detected when routine weights/volumes are used without dilution.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>LCS recovery outside control limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>MS recovery outside control limits; LCS acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Chemical preservation pH adjusted in lab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Result was determined by a GC/MS database search.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Analysis was subcontracted to another laboratory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Result is less than three times the MDL value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Reporting limit elevated due to sample matrix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Analyte is not part of our NELAC accreditation or accreditation may not be available for this parameter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Analyte was not detected using a library search routine; No calibration standard was analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analytical Report

Client: DYNAMIC ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES  
Project ID: McCarty  
Sample ID: WC-1  
Sample No: 19-4882-001  
Date Collected: 08/12/19  
Time Collected: 8:00  
Date Received: 08/13/19  
Date Reported: 08/19/19

Results are reported on an "as received" basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>R.L.</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>pH @ 25°C, 10% solution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Date: 08/14/19 11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH @ 25°C, 10% solution</td>
<td>Method: 9045D 2004</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flash Point - Open Cup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Date: 08/14/19 13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Point - Open Cup</td>
<td>Method: 1010A-M</td>
<td>No Flash @</td>
<td>212 °F</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paint Filter Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Date: 08/19/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Filter Test</td>
<td>Method: 9095B</td>
<td>No Liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCLP Extraction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Date: 08/14/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCLP Extraction</td>
<td>Method: 1311</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCLP Metals Method 1311</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Date: 08/16/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Method: 6010C</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Method 3010A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Date: 08/15/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program
Laboratory Certification for Chemical Analysis

A. Site Identification

IEEMA Incident # (6- or 8-digit): __________ IEPA LPC# (10-digit): __________
Site Name: ________________________________
Site Address (Not a P.O. Box): ______________
City: ___________________ County: ___________ ZIP Code: __________
Leaking UST Technical File

B. Sample Collector

I certify that:

1. Appropriate sampling equipment/methods were utilized to obtain representative samples.

2. Chain-of-custody procedures were followed in the field.

3. Sample integrity was maintained by proper preservation.

4. All samples were properly labeled.

C. Laboratory Representative

I certify that:

1. Proper chain-of-custody procedures were followed as documented on the chain-of-custody forms

2. Sample integrity was maintained by proper preservation.

3. All samples were properly labeled.

4. Quality assurance/quality control procedures were established and carried out.
5. Sample holding times were not exceeded.

6. SW-846 Analytical Laboratory Procedure (USEPA) methods were used for the analyses.

7. An accredited lab performed quantitative analysis using test methods identified in 35 IAC 186.180 (for samples collected on or after January 1, 2003).

D. Signatures

I hereby affirm that all information contained in this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

**Sample Collector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company: Dynamic Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 216 Westridge Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Bartlett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP Code: 60103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laboratory Representative**

| Name: Bill Mottashed |  |
| Title: Project Manager |  |
| Company: First Environmental Laboratories |  |
| Address: 1600 Shore Road Ste D |  |
| City: Naperville |  |
| State: IL |  |
| ZIP Code: 60563 |  |
| Phone: (630) 778-1200 |  |
| Signature:  |
| Date: 8/19/19 |  |
Waste Profile:  623766IL
Source:  Union Roofing, Inc
A. GENERATOR INFORMATION (MATERIAL ORIGIN)
1. Generator Name: Union Roofing Company, Inc
2. Site Address: 20 West Walnut St
   (City, State, ZIP) Canton IL 61520
3. County: Fulton
4. Contact Name: Dwayne Leach
5. Email: dwayne@unionroofing.com
6. Phone: (815) 945-2141
   Fax: N/A
8. Generator EPA ID: N/A
9. State ID: N/A

B. BILLING INFORMATION
1. Billing Name: G & O Disposal dba Bubba Dump
2. Billing Address: 407 S Lilac
   (City, State, ZIP) Elmwood IL 61529
3. Contact Name: Margaret Beever
4. Email: mbeever@bubbadumpdumpsters.com
5. Phone: (309) 672-1879
   Fax: N/A
7. WM Hauled? Yes
8. P.O. Number: N/A
9. Payment Method: Credit Account

C. MATERIAL INFORMATION
1. Common Name: Asbestos-Non-Friable
   Description: To be used to describe the material.

D. REGULATORY INFORMATION
1. EPA Hazardous Waste? Yes
   Code: N/A
2. State Hazardous Waste? Yes
   Code: N/A
3. Is this material non-hazardous due to Treatment, Delisting, or an Exclusion? Yes
4. Contains Underlying Hazardous Constituents? Yes
5. From an industry regulated under Benzene NESHAP? Yes
6. Facility remediation subject to 40 CFR 63 regulations? No
7. CERCLA or State-mandated clean-up? Yes
8. NRC or State-regulated radioactive or NORM waste? No

E. ANALYTICAL AND OTHER REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION
1. Analytical attached Yes

F. SHIPPING AND DOT INFORMATION
1. One-Time Event Yes
   Repeat Event/Ongoing Business No
2. Estimated Quantity/Unit of Measure: 3
   Tons: N/A Yards: N/A Drums: N/A Gallons: N/A Other: N/A
3. Container Type and Size: 30 cubic yard roll-off
4. USDOT Proper Shipping Name: N/A

G. GENERATOR CERTIFICATION (PLEASE READ AND CERTIFY BY SIGNATURE)
By signing this EZ Profile™ form, I hereby certify that all information submitted in this and all attached documents contain true and accurate descriptions of this material, and that all relevant information necessary for proper material characterization and to identify known and suspected hazards has been provided. Any analytical data attached was derived from a sample that is representative as defined in 40 CFR 261 - Appendix 1 or by using an equivalent method. All changes occurring in the character of the material (i.e., changes in the process or new analytical) will be identified by the Generator and be disclosed to Waste Management prior to providing the material to Waste Management.

If I am an agent signing on behalf of the Generator, I have confirmed with the Generator that information contained in this Profile is accurate and complete.

Name (Print): Margaret Beever Date: 08/19/2019
Title: Contact
Company: bubba dump dumpsters

Certification Signature

THINK GREEN!

QUESTIONS? CALL 800 963 4776 FOR ASSISTANCE

Revised June 30, 2015
©2015 Waste Management
Only complete this Addendum if prompted by responses on EZ Profile™ (page 1) or to provide additional information. Sections and question numbers correspond to EZ Profile™.

C. MATERIAL INFORMATION
Describe Process Generating Material (Continued from page 1): If more space is needed, please attach additional pages.

products (specify in C.2.) DOES NOT include clean-up wastes, such as, soils that are contaminated with asbestos, lead-based painted debris, liquids and PCB containing building materials such as caulk/glaze/mastic/galbestos.

Material Composition and Contaminants (Continued from page 1): If more space is needed, please attach additional pages.

| 5. |
| 6. |
| 7. |
| 8. |
| 9. |

Total composition must be equal to or greater than 100%  \( \geq 100\% \)

D. REGULATORY INFORMATION
Only questions with a “Yes” response in Section D on the EZ Profile™ form (page 1) need to be answered here.

1. EPA Hazardous Waste
   a. Please list all USEPA listed and characteristic waste code numbers:

   b. Is the material subject to the Alternative Debris standards (40 CFR 268.45)?  Yes  No
   c. Is the material subject to the Alternative Soil standards (40 CFR 268.49)?  Yes  No
   d. Is the material exempt from Subpart CC Controls (40 CFR 264.1083)?  Yes  No
     If Yes, please check one of the following:
     - Waste meets LDR or treatment exemptions for organics (40 CFR 264.1082(c)(2) or (c)(4))
     - Waste contains VOCs that average <500 ppmw (CFR 264.1082(c)(1)) – will require annual update.

2. State Hazardous Waste  Please list all state waste codes:

3. For material that is Treated, Delisted, or Excluded  Please indicate the category, below:
   - Delisted Hazardous Waste
   - Excluded Waste under 40 CFR 261.4  Specify Exclusion: 
   - Treated Hazardous Waste Debris
   - Treated Characteristic Hazardous Waste  If checked, complete question 4.

4. Underlying Hazardous Constituents  Please list all Underlying Hazardous Constituents:

5. Industries regulated under Benzene NESHAP include petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, coke by-product recovery plants, and TSDFs.
   a. Are you a TSDF?  Yes  No
   b. Does this material contain benzene?  Yes  No
     1. If yes, what is the flow weighted average concentration?  ppmw
   c. What is your facility’s current total annual benzene quantity in Megagrams?  <1 Mg  1–9.99 Mg  \( \geq 10 \) Mg
   d. Is this waste soil from a remediation?  Yes  No
   e. Does the waste contain >10% water/moisture?  Yes  No
   f. Has material been treated to remove 99% of the benzene or to achieve <10 ppmw?  Yes  No
   g. Is material exempt from controls in accordance with 40 CFR 61.342?  Yes  No
     If yes, specify exemption:
   h. Based on your knowledge of your waste and the BWON regulations, do you believe that this waste stream is subject to treatment and control requirements at an off-site TSDF?  Yes  No

6. 40 CFR 63 GGGGG  Does the material contain <500 ppmw VOHAPs at the point of determination?  Yes  No

7. CERCLA or State-Mandated clean up  Please submit the Record of Decision or other documentation with process information to assist others in the evaluation for proper disposal. A “Determination of Acceptability” may be needed for CERCLA wastes not going to a CERCLA approved facility.

8. NRC or state regulated radioactive or NORM Waste  Please identify Isotopes and pCi/g:
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Mark Williams and Joshua C. Gabehart, P.E., Foth Infrastructure and Environment, LLC

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval for Chairman Morris’ Signature

- PCC LF1 – Significant Permit Modification Application regarding increase in AGQS value for the total and dissolved nitrate concentrations at upgradient groundwater monitoring wells
- PCC LF1 – Significant Permit Modification Application for alternate source demonstration for the total phenols concentration at groundwater monitoring well G12S
- PCC LF1 – 405 CAAPP Form for a flare shutdown on August 26, 2019, that exceeded one hour
- PCC LF1 – 405 CAAPP Form for a flare shutdown on September 1-3, 2019, that exceeded one hour

BACKGROUND: Groundwater monitoring results have been collected for the minimum time period to request a revised interwell applicable groundwater quality standard (AGQS) value for the total and dissolved nitrate concentrations from upgradient groundwater monitoring wells due October 15, 2019. Results of the alternate source demonstration to revise the interwell AGQS value show a higher value is acceptable per IEPA and USEPA guidance. The higher AGQS value will better indicate a landfill related groundwater impact instead of increased background increases. The increased value will reduce repetative sampling and return the groundwater monitoring wells to routine monitoring schedule for the total and dissolved nitrate concentrations.

Foth is requesting signature approval to submit to the IEPA the results of the alternate source demonstration for the total phenols concentration at groundwater monitoring well G12S due to IEPA October 3, 2019. The final quarter of data has been collected but analytical results have not been returned to Foth for inclusion and review yet. They are expected sometime in the coming two weeks and alternate source demonstration needs this information to make a final recommendation to the IEPA. To date, the groundwater results indicate that groundwater monitoring well G12S should return to routine semi-annual detection monitoring and no further action is required.

Any flare shutdown exceeding a one-hour duration requires a 405-CAAPP form to be submitted to the IEPA Division of Air. Two recent shutdowns exceeded the one hour duration. The shutdown on August 26, 2019, lasted for 5 hours and 53 minutes. A storm event in the early morning hours of August 26 with heavy rainfall extinguished the flame; the auto-restart attempted to relight the flare but was unsuccessful. The shutdown that occurred from September 1-3, 2019 lasted for 59 hours and 42 minutes. The PLC faulted, and there was not a callout for this type of failure in the system, which prevented Foth from knowing of the fault and the system auto-restart from taking place. The PLC was reset and the system restarted. A new call out alarm has been activated to alert Foth should a PLC fault occur again. The shutdown control equipment operated as designed, automatically shutting down the flow of landfill gas to the flare. There were no landfill gas emissions into the air during these two shutdowns as per system design.
Foth does not expect other reports requiring Chairman Morris or Interim Director Lewis’ signatures. However, we respectfully request approval to obtain Chairman Morris’ signature should the need arise prior to the next Committee Meeting. If the need does arise, a report will be brought before the board at the next scheduled meeting.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** These submittals are included as part of Foth’s professional consulting services contract with the Peoria City/County Landfill Committee.
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Mark Williams and Joshua Gabehart, P.E., Foth Infrastructure and Environment, LLC

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive and File Monthly Report

BACKGROUND: The following report details engineering items occurring since the last scheduled Committee Meeting.

Financial Information

The attached spreadsheet shows Foth engineering services provided through August 31, 2019. The total amount billed to date is $71,412.32.

Updates Regarding Compliance Activities, Measures, and Progress

- Two shutdowns occurred in the last month; one was due to the rainstorm the 26th of August for 5 hours and 53 minutes, the second was over Labor Day weekend due to a PLC fault for 59 hours and 42 minutes with no call out. The signature approval memo outlines those shutdowns lasting longer than an hour requiring notification to IEPA via the 405-CAAPP form. The PLC fault has been corrected to call out in the future, flare operation was restored Tuesday morning.
- Landfill gas methane content was measured at 35.7% during the monthly monitoring at the flare. A slight decrease from last month’s reading but not unexpected and typical measurement during the late summer months.
- Wellhead repairs were completed in August and repairs will continue as they arise. Some typical repairs include replacing flex hose connections, sample ports, valve operation and sealing for air leaks.
- In August, 19,000 gallons of leachate were transported off-site for treatment.
- Solar sumps are running and minor repairs are made as needed. Liquid removal is continuing and the increase in leachate/condensate transport is expected to continue.
- The pump in the N/S sump is no longer adequately pumping; a quote has been requested for replacement.

Foth met with Waste Management on September 5, 2019 to discuss ways to streamline the approval process for new waste streams. A separate memo outlines some potential changes to the approval process.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Currently, the new contract for services total spend to date is 21.1% of the July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 contract period whereas the planned budget spend was projected at 22.7% complete. The attached monthly engineering services spreadsheet shows budgeted vs actual spends to date.
Operational Notes:

July: Includes design engineering, routine operations and LF3 contract summary review. Contract summary on hold until 2020. Gas system and leachate management operations expenses up for July due to transducer replacement and installation cost. Remaining months have been prorated down to reflect high initial month.

August: Includes costs for semi annual Clean Air Act permit submittals (phase 1), routine gas and leachate operations costs and liquid disposal costs.
**Joint City and County of Peoria Landfill Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Phase 5</th>
<th>Phase 6</th>
<th>Phase 7</th>
<th>Phase 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Compliance and Guidance</td>
<td>$98,500</td>
<td>$98,500</td>
<td>$9,813</td>
<td>$11,428</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Support and Data Review</td>
<td>$105,500</td>
<td>$105,500</td>
<td>$9,813</td>
<td>$11,428</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$6,573</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill No. 1 Construction Engineering</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
<td>$5,899.33</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>$1,362</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill No. 2 and No. 3 Expansion/Transition</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Liquids Disposal</td>
<td>$10,250</td>
<td>$10,250</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$1,629</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leachate Extraction Improvements</td>
<td>$10,250</td>
<td>$10,250</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplanned GCCS Repairs/Emergency</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$337,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational Notes:**

- **July**: Includes design engineering, routine operations and LF3 contract summary review. Contract summary on hold until 2020. Gas system and leachate management operations expenses up for July due to transducer replacement and installation cost. Remaining months have been prorated down to reflect high initial month.
- **August**: Includes costs for semi annual Clean Air Act permit submittals (phase 1), routine gas and leachate operations costs and liquid disposal costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2013 Tonnage</th>
<th>2014 Tonnage</th>
<th>2015 Tonnage</th>
<th>2016 Tonnage</th>
<th>2017 Tonnage</th>
<th>2018 Tonnage</th>
<th>2019 Tonnage</th>
<th>5 Yr. Average by Month</th>
<th>3 Yr. Average by Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>14,610.96</td>
<td>14,531.08</td>
<td>12,592.84</td>
<td>13,255.78</td>
<td>16,148.43</td>
<td>11,730.59</td>
<td>12,199.76</td>
<td>13,409.7</td>
<td>13,359.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>11,401.56</td>
<td>11,689.56</td>
<td>11,134.61</td>
<td>14,992.00</td>
<td>11,959.48</td>
<td>12,244.04</td>
<td>9,746.12</td>
<td>11,961.0</td>
<td>11,316.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>15,541.87</td>
<td>17,911.20</td>
<td>16,961.56</td>
<td>15,881.57</td>
<td>14,204.13</td>
<td>14,516.49</td>
<td>12,533.33</td>
<td>15,334.7</td>
<td>13,751.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>17,520.91</td>
<td>20,643.72</td>
<td>17,815.96</td>
<td>16,231.71</td>
<td>14,883.60</td>
<td>14,573.51</td>
<td>15,014.76</td>
<td>16,527.2</td>
<td>14,824.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>20,317.50</td>
<td>21,031.20</td>
<td>17,917.75</td>
<td>17,708.52</td>
<td>18,306.44</td>
<td>17,568.27</td>
<td>16,560.81</td>
<td>18,182.2</td>
<td>17,478.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>18,499.18</td>
<td>20,827.22</td>
<td>19,736.45</td>
<td>17,890.95</td>
<td>19,901.95</td>
<td>16,896.60</td>
<td>15,267.88</td>
<td>18,420.2</td>
<td>17,355.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>18,609.20</td>
<td>21,915.44</td>
<td>23,147.79</td>
<td>15,088.31</td>
<td>17,685.91</td>
<td>16,116.44</td>
<td>15,569.30</td>
<td>18,253.9</td>
<td>16,457.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>21,574.24</td>
<td>18,623.82</td>
<td>22,247.53</td>
<td>17,744.07</td>
<td>20,548.26</td>
<td>16,445.70</td>
<td>16,690.04</td>
<td>18,716.6</td>
<td>17,894.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>19,379.80</td>
<td>17,722.38</td>
<td>16,520.05</td>
<td>18,890.92</td>
<td>18,155.15</td>
<td>14,809.20</td>
<td>17,219.5</td>
<td>17,285.1</td>
<td>17,285.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>17,710.37</td>
<td>20,212.83</td>
<td>17,158.59</td>
<td>16,091.54</td>
<td>17,772.77</td>
<td>16,235.75</td>
<td>17,494.3</td>
<td>16,700.0</td>
<td>16,700.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>21,043.51</td>
<td>14,511.80</td>
<td>16,349.64</td>
<td>14,459.79</td>
<td>17,273.03</td>
<td>13,895.01</td>
<td>15,297.9</td>
<td>15,209.3</td>
<td>15,209.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>32,699.22</td>
<td>14,951.07</td>
<td>16,504.84</td>
<td>13,168.40</td>
<td>12,764.20</td>
<td>12,208.30</td>
<td>13,919.4</td>
<td>12,713.6</td>
<td>12,713.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>228,908.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>214,571.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,087.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,403.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>199,603.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,239.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>113,582.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>194,736.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>184,345.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General MSW</td>
<td>209,441.95</td>
<td>198,971.42</td>
<td>191,767.47</td>
<td>182,787.68</td>
<td>187,239.69</td>
<td>173,804.02</td>
<td>108,109.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profiled Waste Tons</td>
<td>19,466.37</td>
<td>15,599.90</td>
<td>16,320.14</td>
<td>8,615.88</td>
<td>12,363.66</td>
<td>3,435.88</td>
<td>5,472.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waste Received by Month

Time (Month)

Waste Received (Tons)

3 Yr. Average by Month

2018 Tonnage

2019 Tonnage
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Joshua Gabehart, P.E. and Mark Williams; Foth Infrastructure and Environment, LLC

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve changes to Preapproved Waste Stream list outline in attached memo

BACKGROUND: Please see attached memorandum, which discusses potential changes to the preapproved waste stream list and waste approval process.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Faster approvals of profiled waste streams will increase the potential host fees the Landfill Committee receives from Waste Management. The extent of the increase is unknown.
September 18, 2019

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

CC: Emily Ambroso, City of Peoria
    Scott Sorrel, Peoria County

FR: Josh Gabehart, Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC (Foth)
    Mark Williams, Foth

RE: Consideration of Possible Changes to the Waste Approval Process

The Landfill Committee has requested Foth and Waste Management discuss ways to streamline or expedite the waste approval process for profiled wastes being disposed of at Peoria City/County Landfill 2 (PCCL2). Foth met with Waste Management on September 5, 2019 to discuss the approval process for submitted waste profiles and potential changes. Changes to the process need to maintain regulated and documented criteria of PCCL2, Landfill Committee and Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

Waste Management has discussed in the past that due to the lag time (2 to 6 weeks) between when a profile was submitted to Waste Management and the Landfill Committee meeting, some potential waste streams might not come to PCCL2 because the generator or transporter does not wish to wait for the process to be completed. Often times, the “event” project is completed before the approval process would have a chance to play out. The procedure for profiled waste acceptance is discussed in Procedures for General Refuse and Special Waste Received at the City of Peoria/County of Peoria Landfill No. 2 Near Brimfield, Illinois (Waste Procedures) document. The specific procedures for acceptance of non-hazardous special wastes and non-hazardous special waste that have been certified as non-special by the generator are in Section 3. The list of current preapproved waste streams are in Section 6.1 and as is the current process and as will be maintained in the future, if Foth believes a waste stream that falls under a preapproved category should be brought before the Landfill Committee for approval it can and will.

Per discussions with Waste Management, the following items are presented for consideration by the Landfill Committee:

1) The change of a current preapproved waste stream to include more items.

   Currently waste profiles submitted under the Contaminated Soil and Debris Policy are only for soil and debris contaminated by petroleum products or non-
hazardous herbicide/pesticide. It is proposed that this Preapproved waste stream be changed to Non-Special Contaminated Soil and Debris. With several transportation type construction projects slated to begin around the Peoria area in the coming years, this change would allow soil and debris from these DOT roadway projects to be pre-approved. The previous preapproved waste stream description is provided below with strikethrough. The new preapproved waste stream definition would read as below:

**Contaminated Soil or Debris**
- Soil or debris contaminated by petroleum products, some examples may include the following:
  - Unleaded Gasoline/Diesel Fuel
  - Heating/Fuel Oil
  - Kerosene
  - Non-PCB hydraulic oil
  - Non-recyclable Asphalt
- Non-Hazardous Pesticide/Herbicide Contaminated Gravel, Soil, Debris.
- Pre-approval for contaminated soil or debris only applies to a total volume less than 2,000 tons. The Landfill Committee must approve volumes in excess of this amount.

**Non-Special Contaminated Soil and Debris**
- Certified Non-Special Soil and Debris as per Illinois Administrative Code and Illinois Environmental Protection Act including, but not limited to, the following
  - Soil or debris contaminated by petroleum, including, but not limited to, unleaded gasoline/diesel fuel, heating/fuel oil, kerosene, non-PCB hydraulic oil, non-recyclable asphalt and used oil
  - Department of Transportation roadway non-special contaminated soil, gravel and debris
  - Non-Hazardous soil and debris typically generated from construction activities
  - Non-Hazardous pesticide/herbicide contaminated gravel, soil and debris
- Analysis provided must be representative of the presented waste stream

2) The addition of a new category to the pre-approved list. The category would be Non-Contaminated Soil and Debris. Currently only soil and debris contaminated with petroleum products or non-hazardous pesticide/herbicide is pre-approved and non-contaminated soil or debris needs committee approval. The addition of this category to the pre-approved list would allow non-contaminated soil and debris from various construction projects to be pre-approved.
Waste profiles submitted under the new non-contaminated soil and debris policies will still need to follow the acceptance procedures outlined in Section 6.1 of the Waste Procedures document.

- **Acceptance:** Both the Landfill Committee’s Consultant and the Facility Operator must concur in the acceptably of the Waste Stream.
- **Records:** Applicants for these Waste Streams shall continue to fill out a Generators Waste Profile Sheet. The Landfill Committee shall receive the Generators Waste Profile Sheet, Consultants comments, and appropriate analytical testing or safety data sheets (SDS).
- **Testing:** Testing requirements necessary for these waste streams are incorporated in the Facility Operator Permit and must be adhered to prior to acceptance.
- **Compliance:** Pre-approval does not relieve the Generator and Landfill Operator from complying with all applicable laws and regulations.

3) **Removal of the volume restriction** that volumes above 2,000 tons of non-special contaminated soil and debris requires Landfill Committee approval. Currently waste profiles below 2,000 tons are pre-approved. Removing the volume restriction would allow larger projects that meet the approved criteria to be approved for disposal quicker and potentially reduce generators from finding other disposal sites in short order. This no volume restriction would also apply to the new Non-Contaminated Soil and Debris Policy. For all projects, generators will need the appropriate number of samples tested to be representative of the entire volume to be disposed at PCCL2.

Foth and Waste Management discussed another option to expedite waste profile approval and it involves developing a subcommittee of two members from the Landfill Committee and City staff. These members would meet with Foth on a more regular basis to review profiles that are currently presented for approval at regularly scheduled Landfill Committee meetings, currently causing delays for generators. Procedures could be put in place to set standard review times and potentially reduce approval time periods to a week to two weeks instead of the current approval times of two to six weeks which cause some generators to find other disposal options. This review session can take place by phone or in person. All profiles discussed by the subcommittee would be presented to the full Landfill Committee at the regular scheduled meetings. In all cases, Foth or the subcommittee can recommend the full Landfill Committee approve any waste stream, even those currently on the preapproved list. Foth is requesting further guidance from the Landfill Committee on this matter on potential expediting the approval of waste profiles presented by Waste Management.
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members

From: Joshua Gabehart, Emily Ambroso, Janice Little

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Request to Approve the FY2020 Landfill Committee Budget

BACKGROUND:

FY2020 Draft Budget

A draft FY2020 budget is attached. The 2018 actual revenues and expenses, 2019 budget, and 2019 year-to-date expenditures are also included for reference.

On the expense side, operating line items have increased slightly to account for the necessary monitoring, reporting, and operating of the PCCL1 post-closure care system based on the needs of the current system and in preparation for activities at PCCL3. In addition, a request is being made to reauthorize the expenditure of $150,000 in funds that have been earmarked previously by the Committee for capital expenditures. These funds will be used for improvements to the gas collection and control system as required by the IEPA as part of ongoing corrective action. Foth continues to work with City staff to find a method by which a reasonable price for contractor work can be obtained to complete the required activities.

On the revenue side, waste disposal rates continue to trend downward. Staff and Foth have analyzed waste trends in recent years and are conservatively projecting receipts of 155,000 tons for 2020. This is a significant decrease from the projected 180,000 tons for 2019, but actual receipts are more likely to be closer to 160,000 tons based on the first half of the year. This results in a decrease of proposed revenue of $52,750 from 2019 to 2020.

The projected deficit of operating revenue v. expenditures for FY2020 is $29,400.00, plus a reduction of the capital reserve funds of $150,000 for corrective action projects. For a balanced operational budget, the Committee would need to receive host fees for an additional 11,500 tons (7.5% increase).

Staff understands that this is not a balanced budget but it does reflect the actual cost and projected revenue for 2020. Staff requests that the Committee provide direction as to how to handle the deficit. If expense reductions are made there is a high risk of regulatory noncompliance, which could result notices of violation and fines from the IEPA. Some efforts related to PCCL3 may be deferred but this could also open up risk for future issues that may be more costly.

Notes:

- Revenue reflects the increased LF2 host fee of $2.55 but reduced tonnage receipts
- City and County personnel costs have remained constant for 2020
- The 2020 budget includes funds for reauthorization for corrective action improvements in the vicinity of “T-line” and installation of new gas extraction well near GMD2. Historically $100,000 was approved in 2017 for the capital project for the reduction of positive gas wells and liquid management costs in the vicinity of the “T-Line”. This value has been
increased to $150,000 due to additional gas well installation approved by IEPA and increased costs of the project based on current market rates.

- FY2020 budget assumes receipt of 155,000 tons in 2020, down from 180,000 tons projected in 2019. With leases and other revenue, the total revenue estimate is $421,750.00. Total revenues may increase if waste receipts trend higher than estimated.

Also included with this memo is a long term budget projection worksheet. It includes several assumptions but it provides an estimate of the reserve fund allocation balances and projected increases overtime.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** If approved, the FY2020 budget projects a $29,400 deficit operating deficit for the year, and depletion of $150,000 of the Landfill Committee’s Capital reserve funds for corrective action improvements. The current cash on hand is estimated to be at $466,442.
# Landfill 2019 Budget

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2018 Actual (Unaudited)</th>
<th>2019 Budget</th>
<th>2019 Actual Through 07/31/2019</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Proposed 2020 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Fees</td>
<td>$426,830.66</td>
<td>$448,000.00</td>
<td>$228,904.13</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$395,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>$18,177.83</td>
<td>$20,918.00</td>
<td>$14,128.38</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$9,447.64</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$6,740.22</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>$18,177.83</td>
<td>$20,918.00</td>
<td>$14,128.38</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$9,447.64</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$6,740.22</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$454,456.13</td>
<td>$469,918.00</td>
<td>$279,772.73</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$421,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

### Municipal Reimbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Personnel</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Personnel</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Audit</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultant Guidance and Operational Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Guidance and Compliance Activities</td>
<td>$112,262.15</td>
<td>$96,000.00</td>
<td>$67,149.38</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Support/Reporting</td>
<td>$56,934.26</td>
<td>$35,500.00</td>
<td>$36,364.16</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF #1 Gas System &amp; Leachate Management Ogs.</td>
<td>$152,845.26</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>$47,461.06</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF #1 Construction Engineering</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF #2 to LF #3 Transition Activities</td>
<td>$8,606.50</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$12,141.84</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids &amp; Gas Replacement Materials</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off site Liquids Disposal</td>
<td>$8,189.61</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$4,773.90</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contracted/Capital Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Closure Care</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$11,400.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leachate Extraction Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$96.72</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCS Improvement Projects</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee’s Operational Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Leachate Transport &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>$6,812.85</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$3,976.52</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$628.18</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$413.36</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>$6,014.33</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$2,448.78</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unplanned/Contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Assessments/Contingency</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCS Contingency</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplanned Services and Repairs</td>
<td>$746.79</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$18,184.89</td>
<td>242%</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$440,040.09</td>
<td>$444,650.00</td>
<td>$204,410.61</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$601,150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</strong></td>
<td>$14,416.04</td>
<td>$25,268.00</td>
<td>$75,362.12</td>
<td>$179,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$346,207.83</td>
<td>$360,623.87</td>
<td>$360,623.87</td>
<td>$385,891.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>$360,623.87</td>
<td>$385,891.87</td>
<td>$435,985.99</td>
<td>$206,491.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2019 Budget Based off 190,000 tons @ $2.49/ton
** 2020 Budget Based off 175,000 tons @ $2.55/ton
3. Utilize Net Annual Surplus/Deficit for funding allocation.
Net Annual = Revenue - Expenses

5. Based on 2019 dollars, does not take into account interest/loss, etc.

Peoria City County Landfill Committee Estimated Long Term Budget Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Water/Wastewater</th>
<th>Solid Waste &amp; Contingency</th>
<th>Groundwater</th>
<th>Services/Repairs</th>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>Gas System</th>
<th>Leachate</th>
<th>Telecommunication</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Offsite</th>
<th>Leachate Disposal</th>
<th>LF#2 to LF3</th>
<th>Transition Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. IEPA inflation factor 2.30%
2. Expenses increased by IEPA annual inflation factor for Closure/Post Closure Cost Estimates. This changes each year and provided by IEPA
3. Estimated Closure of LF2 in 2024, may change due to waste disposal trends
4. Assume no City or County reimbursement at transition because City and County begin to receive host fees directly.
5. Transition period from 2024-2027 for LF1 operational expenses is an estimate. Transition of Post-Closure Activities with FDC to be determined.

Estimated Revenue Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Annual Revenue (Dec. 31)</th>
<th>Net Annual Expense</th>
<th>Net Annual Savings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$315,970</td>
<td>$2013</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2.208</td>
<td>$459,408</td>
<td>$2014</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2.375</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2015</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$2.570</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2016</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2017</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2.994</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2018</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$3.277</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2019</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$3.558</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2020</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$3.839</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2021</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$4.113</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2022</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$4.384</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2023</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$4.636</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2024</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$4.867</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2025</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$5.082</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2026</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$5.281</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2027</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$5.466</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2028</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$5.635</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$2029</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$5.788</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$2030</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. 2020 Revenue based on $35,000 tars per year acceptance rate, no annual increase/Decrease in disposals projections.
2. Per agreement, LF2 host fee increases 2.5% each year.
3. Estimated Closure of LF2 in 2024, may change due to waste disposal trends
4. LF3 host fee to be adjusted in conjunction with standard/gate rate percentage. Adjustment based on OP will not decrease, maximum annual increase of 0%
5. For the purpose of this long term projection, the LF3 host fee adjustment increased annually by 2%, rate to be adjusted by OP per agreement. Will not decrease and may increase 6% per year
6. 2019 extra revenue from sale of scrap engines $30,000 one-time revenue

Revenue in Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Net Expense</th>
<th>Net Savings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$235,970</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$459,408</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$337,174</td>
<td>$337,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$667,078</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
<td>$544,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$854,684</td>
<td>$122,234</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
<td>$732,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Capital reserve receives $100,000 first year and $50,000 per year added to fund
2. Maintain 25% or 3 months of operating expenses. For this projection, utilized 25% of 2016 annual expenses
3. 1/3 Net annual Surplus/Deficit for funding allocation, Net Annual = Revenue - Expenses
4. Estimated Closure of LF2 in 2024, may change due to waste disposal trends
5. Based on 2020 dollars, does not take into account interest/loss, etc.
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Mike Wiersema & Ian Johnson, Waste Management

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive and File Monthly Reports

BACKGROUND: Attached are the monthly activity reports for August 2019.

1. All weekly random load checks were completed and documented with no issues to report.

2. To allow sufficient time to respond to short-term submittal requirements that may arise prior to the next Landfill Committee meeting, we respectfully request authorization for the Committee chairperson to sign such documents, subject to review and approval in advance by Foth.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: NA
# Peoria City/County Landfill No. 2
## Waste Management of Illinois, Inc.
### Monthly Activity Report
#### August 2019

### Tonnage: General Refuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulers</td>
<td>14,579.68</td>
<td>106,572.18</td>
<td>115,105.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Res. Free Loads</td>
<td>188.41</td>
<td>1,306.29</td>
<td>1,191.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Res. $5 Loads</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>225.61</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td>14,769.78</td>
<td>108,109.82</td>
<td>116,334.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Wastes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Declassified)</td>
<td>1,920.26</td>
<td>5,472.18</td>
<td>3,757.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Exempt)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td>1,920.26</td>
<td>5,472.18</td>
<td>3,757.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL LANDFILL RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard Waste Receipts</td>
<td>16,690.04</td>
<td>113,582.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to City/County Committee</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>120,091.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to County</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>113,582.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to/Receivable From County</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>120,091.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payments: Payable to City/County Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Refuse</td>
<td>14,579.68</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste - Ind.</td>
<td>1,920.26</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Refuse</td>
<td>14,579.68</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waste - Ind.</td>
<td>1,920.26</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to/Receivable From County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 Loads</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fee on Free and $5 Loads</td>
<td>190.04</td>
<td>$220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tonnage: General Refuse & Special Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
<th>Landfill #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In county</td>
<td>10,422.66</td>
<td>62.45%</td>
<td>65,617.97</td>
<td>68,378.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of county</td>
<td>6,267.38</td>
<td>37.55%</td>
<td>47,964.03</td>
<td>51,712.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O T A L</td>
<td>16,690.04</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>113,582.00</td>
<td>120,091.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION
To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members

From: Chris Coulter, Vice President & Chief Operating Officer
Peoria City/County Landfill, Inc. (PCCLI)

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: September 18, 2019


BACKGROUND: Attached please find a power point presentation from PDC Technical Services, Inc. (PDCTS) that is titled “Conceptual Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Project Action Plan”. This presentation was delivered to the Peoria City/County Landfill Committee (Committee) on August 21. PDCTS has developed a plan to resolve the dam issue at the Peoria City/County Landfill Facility, as well as address its wetland mitigation needs on-site for the development of the Landfill No. 3 Facility. PCCLI and PDCTS did not object to the Committee deferring a decision on this matter until its meeting on September 18.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: N/A
Peoria City/County Landfill

PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL NO. 3

CONCEPTUAL LAKE REHABILITATION AND WETLAND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT ACTION PLAN
Peoria City/County Landfill

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

A. Landfill Development Schedule
B. Phase 1 Landfill Development Plan
C. Current Wetlands Mitigation Plan
D. Entrance Road Dam Considerations
E. Life-of-Site Surplus Soil Management Plan
F. Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Design Concept
G. Action Plan
H. Discussion - Path Forward
LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

- Landfill No. 2 is anticipated to reach capacity in mid- to late-2024
- Targeting receipt of Landfill No. 3 Operating Permit in mid-2024
- **Overall Landfill Construction Schedule:**
  - Limited Clearing: winter 2021 / 2022
  - Mass Grading (excavation and fills): 2022
  - Southeast Storm Water Detention Basin: 2022
  - Final Grading and Liner Installation: 2023
  - Leachate Storage Tank and Forcemain: 2023
  - Groundwater Monitoring Wells and Perimeter Gas Probes: 2023
  - Access Roads, Signs, etc.: 2024
Peoria City/County Landfill

PHASE 1 LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Peoria City/County Landfill

KEY FEATURES

- 1 million useable airspace cys
- Southern portions of Cells 1 and 2 (approx. 13 acres lined)
- Fill portions of Coal Hollow
- Improvements to LF No. 1 Storm Water Basin
- New (Southeast) Storm Water Basin
- Internal Storm Water Basin
- Landfill Access Road
- Leachate Storage / Load-Out
- 1 million cys surplus soil to stockpile
- Will require permit mod.
Peoria City/County Landfill

JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS

3.56-Acre Wetland

0.61-Acre Wetland
Peoria City/County Landfill

JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS

2.11 acres of wetland will be disturbed during Phase 1 Landfill development.
Peoria City/County Landfill

VICARY BOTTOMS PARK
ENTRANCE ROAD DAM CONSIDERATIONS

CONCERNS

- Undocumented dam core design and construction
- Unconventional outlet works, with no emergency spillway
- Classification and permit status is unknown
- Documented historical evidence of instability
- Poses unknown, but potentially dangerous risk of downstream flooding
- 2014 Settlement Agreement and Amendment to the Landfill Agreement includes obligations by Waste Management to address the entrance road issues.
- Little progress at solving this issue appears to have been made.
# Life-of-Site Surplus Soil Management

## Earth Balance Summary (bcy-cut)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th></th>
<th>Daily / Intermed. Cover</th>
<th>Final Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCAVATION</td>
<td>FILLS</td>
<td>BALANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Construction</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>1,024,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Cells</td>
<td>4,961,000</td>
<td>811,000</td>
<td>4,150,000</td>
<td>1,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,436,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,262,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,174,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,020,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stockpile Requirements:**
- Temporary: 1,210,000 bcys-cut
- Permanent: 2,444,000 bcys-cut
Peoria City/County Landfill

AVAILABLE STOCKPILES

Landfill 2
- 0.5 mm cys
- 1.2 mm cys
- 3.3 mm cys

Landfill 3
- 2.0 mm cys
- 9.7 mm cys
- 0.2 mm cys
CONCEPTUAL LAKE REHABILITATION AND WETLAND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

FEATURES

- Addresses dam permitting issues while reducing long-term liability
- Allows Coal Hollow wetland mitigation to occur on-site, which is a preferred and more sustainable option over the Vicary Bottoms location
- Provides additional area for surplus soil management and screening berm
CONCEPTUAL LAKE REHABILITATION AND WETLAND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

• Engineering studies needed to ensure performance as intended
• Permitting through Illinois EPA, Illinois DNR and USACE
• Revision to Siting Condition needed due to schedule constraints and revised location
• Potential agreement with adjacent property owner
• 2014 Settlement Agreement between WMI and PCC Landfill Committee
Peoria City/County Landfill

LAKE REHABILITATION PROJECT

Lake Rehabilitation Project Area

Landfill 2

Landfill 3
LAKE REHABILITATION PROJECT
LAKE REHABILITATION PROJECT

Normal Water Level - Current
Peoria City/County Landfill

CURRENT SECTION THROUGH DAM

A

Lake

Entrance Road

Dam

Property Line (approx.)

A'

A
Peoria City/County Landfill

PROPOSED SECTION THROUGH DAM

Entrance Road

Lake

Dam

Property Line (approx.)
WETLAND ENHANCEMENT

OPEN WATER

EMERGENT WETLAND (5.68 ACRES TOTAL)

EXISTING WETLAND (1.4 ACRES)
REVISION TO LOCAL SITING APPROVAL FINDINGS OF FACT

The wetlands impacted by the proposed Peoria City/County Landfill No. 3 will be mitigated prior to its disturbance, through the creation of a wetland on Peoria Park District property that is at least 50% larger than the proposed wetland disturbance area, and in conformance with all applicable USACE regulations, timelines and permit requirements.
ACTION PLAN

- Landfill Committee approval to proceed with the Lake Rehabilitation and Wetland Enhancement Plan as generally outlined herein (2019).

- PCCLI to retain consultant and begin design and permitting processes (2019). County of Peoria approves revision to the Local Siting Approval Findings of Fact relating to the schedule for and location of the wetlands mitigation (2020).

- Agreement between PCCLI and Waste Management regarding obligations related to the Entrance Road Dam (2020).
Peoria City/County Landfill

ACTION PLAN
(continued)

- PCCLI and Committee representatives meetings with local landowners (2020).
- Landfill Committee agreement with adjacent landowner, if necessary (2020).
- Permits issued (2021).
- Peoria Park District releases PCCLI from its agreement to develop a wetland at Vicary Bottoms (2021).
- Construction begins (2022).
REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION

To: Peoria City/County Landfill Committee Members
From: Joshua Gabehart, P.E., Foth Infrastructure and Environment, LLC; Emily Ambroso, City of Peoria

AGENDA DATE REQUESTED: August 21, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive and File Update for Peoria

BACKGROUND: The Landfill Committee requested Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC (Foth) and the City work with Waste Management of Illinois (WMI) and Peoria Disposal Company (PDC) to research declining waste trends of Peoria City County Landfill 2 (PCCL2). The research was focused on four areas:

- Impact of increased recycling in the city of Peoria
- Decreases in waste categories aside from MSW
- Customer counts
- Possible Committee actions

Please note, in all discussions below 2019 values are represented through June 30. Foth and City staff appreciate the willingness of both WMI and PDC’s in sharing information and helping in this inquiry of the Landfill Committee.

1. CITY OF PEORIA WASTE & RECYCLING

The city of Peoria (COP) entered into a new agreement with PDC Services, Inc. starting July 1, 2018. The contract is not a universal recycling program but it did remove the $50 deposit required to sign up for recycling service. The deposit had historically been a barrier for many residents to participate in the recycling program. With the new program, every residence is allowed up to two (2) 95 gallon recycling carts at no additional charge. The City also launched an education campaign about the new solid waste program focused on getting residents to sign up for recycling.

The education campaign and removal of the deposit has increased residential participation by 30-40% (Figure 1). As a result, more recyclable materials are being diverted from PCCL2, however the total tonnage is very small in comparison to total waste receipts at PCCL2. The 2018 recycling rate was approximately 2,200 tons, or 1.2% of the total waste receipts (177,000 tons) (Figure 2). Thus, even doubling the recycling participation rates would only decrease the total receipts by 1-2%. It is possible that other communities are also experiencing an increase in recycling, but these impacts were not investigated further due to the relatively low impacts of the largest market’s influence.

PDC Services Inc. has been attempting to remove glass and certain plastics from single stream recycling contracts throughout the region as markets are at historical lows. Glass is one of the heaviest recyclable materials and if removed, recycling tonnage would likely see a reduction. This is not taken into account for in this discussion because the impact is unknown.

It is the understanding of staff that it is outside the scope of this committee to influence recycling rates. Further, reducing options for recycling is counter to Peoria County’s Resource Waste Management Plan.
FIGURE 1
COP Recycling % vs COP Garbage

FIGURE 2
COP Recycling v. PCCL2 Tonnage
Figure 3 compares the city of Peoria municipal collection curbside contract disposal rate to the overall waste receipts at PCCL2. City values do not include MSW that is generated from apartment complexes and other commercial type collection programs. While the overall tonnage disposed at PCCL2 has decreased, the city of Peoria collection contract tonnages have remained relatively stable from 2010 through 2018. As discussed previously, the impact of diversion of additional recyclable materials is not fully known but simple projections indicate it will have a relatively minor effect overall.

2. **OTHER WASTE STREAMS**

Foth and the City met with WMI and PDC separately to discuss these topics and waste trends for the region. Both companies are seeing impacts at landfills in the following categories:

a) General Municipal Solid Waste
b) Clean Construction & Demolition Debris
c) Special/Certified Non-special Waste (Profiled Waste)

a. **MSW**

General Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) is the primary waste type disposed of at PCCL2 and other regional disposal sites. Per the USEPA, MSW consists of everyday items from homes, hospitals, and businesses that are used and disposed of. WMI has indicated MSW directly under their collection and control is remaining very consistent. The drop WMI is experiencing at PCCL2 is a loss of other MSW collection companies disposing at PCCL2. Many of the former MSW collection companies are either closing their businesses or being purchased by other waste collection companies. The waste generated by the customers of these businesses are finding other locations to dispose of MSW. During this time, PDC is gaining
MSW market share while WMI appears to be reducing. Many factors contribute to this but, acquisitions and closing of smaller companies that previously disposed of waste at PCCL2 is a major driving factor of reduced tonnage at PCCL2 as indicated by WMI and PDC. The fact that the gate rate at PCCL2 is substantially higher than other regional landfills may also contribute to other companies choosing alternate disposal locations (e.g. PCCL2 $71/ton vs. Knox County $37-45/ton).

b. **Clean Construction & Demolition Debris**
Clean construction and demolition debris (CCDD) is uncontaminated broken concrete without protruding metal bars, bricks, rock, stone or reclaimed asphalt pavement generated from construction or demolition. For several years, the Illinois Department of Transportation has allowed crushed concrete and crushed concrete sand in its coarse and fine aggregate material standards. More recently, equipment to provide this service in a central location or onsite has decreased in cost and increased in efficiencies. Locally, two firms provide concrete crushing and some of their listed projects include reuse of more than 10,000 tons of material that would have historically been hauled to a landfill. This diversion of CCDD is impacting PCCL2 tonnage receipts, and PDC reports a reduction in the waste stream at Indian Creek Landfill as well. Many companies are making the decision to reuse the CCDD onsite based on cost and sustainability goals.

The potential for the Committee to assist its Contract Operators in attracting this market share are limited but some things could be done. Excess CCDD and non-contaminated soil is still being generated in region but PCCL2 does not currently list this as a preapproved waste stream per its waste acceptance procedures. Often times, this “event” type work has a short project lifespan that may be over before committee approval is granted by the current procedures. If the Committee were to add Non-contaminated Soil and Debris to its preapproved list, the Contract Operators could provide faster response to potential customers. A separate memo discussing this and other improvements proposed by WMI and Foth to increase profiled waste disposal at PCCL2 is being presented this month.

c. **Special/Certified Non-special Waste**
Special/Certified non-special waste (profiled waste) has been decreasing in the last several years as shown in the monthly tonnage reports. Many factors can attribute to this but WMI has indicated their feedback from generators is the review process timeframe (2 to 6 weeks) hinders contractors of larger “event” projects from choosing PCCL2 for disposal of wastes. Additionally, like MSW, WMI may be losing some market share in the region when compared to PDC and other solid waste service providers.

Foth does not see waste streams that generators choose to dispose of elsewhere based on process wait times and does not have data to provide a financial impact to the Landfill Committee. It could be assumed there would be an increase in tonnages disposed of at PCCL2 and this is a major factor in WMI’s request to change the preapproved list and process.

The Committee could develop a method to speed up the approval process outside of the preapproved list that is acceptable to the Committee, WMI and ultimately PDC, or add additional preapproved waste streams to the current list. As previously stated, a separate memo discussing this and other improvements proposed by WMI and Foth to increase profiled waste disposal at PCCL2 is being presented this month.

3. **REGIONAL WASTE TRENDS**

PDC provided annual tonnages to three of their landfills, Indian Creek Landfill, Clinton Area Landfill, and Hickory Ridge Landfill in the region. Figure 4 below summarizes this data, including receipts at PCCL2. Hickory Ridge Landfill and Clinton Area Landfill have different customer bases and markets.
disposing of waste at the facilities and do not provide applicable comparisons. Indian Creek Landfill and PCCL2 support similar economies and populations and provide a reasonable comparison. Figure 5 (PCCL2 and Indian Creek Tonnages) shows only these two landfills. It is important to note per PDC that tonnage at Indian Creek Landfill will be significantly reduced (50,000 to 60,000 tons per year) beginning in 2020 and beyond due to loss of waste received from their treatment facility in Pottstown.
As previously discussed, PDC is seeing increases in market share (both residential and commercial) in the region and this is reflected in total tonnages at Indian Creek Landfill. Waste service providers that previously disposed of waste at PCCL2 have either been acquired or closed business. PDC and WMI are at different ends of business plans for the region as well. PDC is looking to gain revenue for future capital expansion of Peoria City County Landfill 3 and secure more contracts where WMI does not have a future landfill in the region. WMI has indicated on several occasions that their goals remain consistent and waste directly under their control are consistent with historical numbers. However, both PDC and WMI have seen reductions in overall “event” type work such as leaking underground storage tanks (LUST), large construction and demolition projects, and transportation projects. Some of these projects could contribute upwards of 10,000 tons at a time. Currently, many are on hold or canceled by firms in the region. As the economy has picked back up, some companies are resurrecting projects that were on hold and the near future may bring more of this “event” type work back.

4. CONCLUSION:

Regionally waste receipts have decreased over the last decade due primarily to the economic climate and sustainability efforts, but also marginally due to recycling. Locally PCCL2 has experienced decreases due to shifting market shares of disposal companies and those companies’ choice of disposal locations.

While the Committee cannot directly impact many of these factors, they may be able to add additional waste streams to the current preapproved list or adjust the approval process to gain a greater advantage in securing disposal of event-type disposal opportunities for construction and the like.