

CITY OF PEORIA – LANDFILL – SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY JULY 12, 2023 MEETING MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Stephen Morris, Rick Fox, Sharon Williams, Stephen Van Winkle (4)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lester Bergsten, Timothy Riggerbach, Zachary Oyler (3)

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.

NONE

CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

ANYONE WISHING TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT CAN DO SO BY SENDING THOSE COMMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS, BY WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23RD, 2023. PUBLIC COMMENTS CAN BE SENT TO THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, IN WRITING, AT PUBLICWORKS@PEORIAGOV.ORG OR VIA FAX AT 309-494-8855. THE EMAIL OR FAX SHOULD BE LABELED "PUBLIC COMMENT FOR WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23RD, 2023 PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL COMMITTEE MEETING," AND WE ASK THAT YOU INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.

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

- Joyce Blumenshine- Below is a public comment I wish to make and have as part of the record for today's Peoria City County Landfill Committee meeting. Thank you.

Morris- Well see that it gets included in the minutes, Thank you.

MINUTES

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE PEORIA CITY/COUNTY LANDFILL
July 12, 2023, Regular Landfill Meeting Minutes

Van Winkle motioned to approve, seconded by Williams;
Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

AGENDA ITEMS

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

A. Monthly Update

Tara- Starting with our budget: The total amount billed through May 31st was about 168,000 but this does not include Phase Five though. We will withhold that, that is the landfill through the transition phase. We're working on a change order for that so we just withheld that until we can figure it all out. But besides that, phase for our budget (which is good). We were under through May if we don't include that phase so great news there. We were a little over on Phase 6 as well; that's unanticipated or that is unplanned. We had some issues with the flare in May, we had a little time up there but overall, the budget is looking good.

So, updates on compliance activities: We did have four shutdowns since the last meeting. We had one on May 22nd due to a site phase loss; one on May 24th due to electrical issues. That was quite a few hours there, 139 hours. On May 30th we had to replace the blower starter motor and test the

wiring to diagnose the source of the May 24th shutdown and then on May 31st, the flare was shut down to do further diagnostics.

Any questions about that?

None.

For May Gas methane content was 41.8% and a little lower in June than typical at 33.3% which is still within the expected range. We pulled off about 5000 gallons of Leachate since the last meeting. General MSW was higher than in 2022 by almost 9000 tons. Total tonnage was over the 2022 waste receipts by 12,200 tons. Host fees will be looking better for May.

Any questions?

Fox- Why were the total receipts for May greater than last previous year?

Ian-I'm not sure but I will be sure to follow up with more information regarding that.

Tara- Looking at landfill 3 updates; So, the City Manager, County Administrator, Public works Director, Assistant States Attorney, and FOTH did meet to review the next steps for Landfill 3 and speak with the IEPA and IDNR. They did indicate that the permit is not terminated, but that more information will be required regarding the location and extent of underground mine activities before any other development began. The IDNR did reach out to federal oversight partners and confirmed that the investigation and potential remediation would be covered under the existing program and the IDNR has staff on hand to lead the exploration efforts and would cover the cost of the field activities, but they are looking for a few things. They want a significant permit modification outlining the proposed exploration of the potential next steps. After the field investigation is completed, they would need another significant permit modification showing the exploration results and proposed remediation or other changes accordingly. If the IEPA approves the plans or changes, other permit modifications would be submitted demonstrating the effectiveness of the remediation and approval from IDNR. So, the first step going forward would be verification of abandoned underground mines in the footprint of Landfill 3. IDNR has indicated they could move forward relatively quickly and could be completed by the end of the year.

Added input from Josh- So for the IEPA to do so we would need to submit a bug location department that says yes there is a mine and here is what we will do, what IDNR needs is what are your methods? How will you proceed so the IEPA will be able to determine mine that is there or what's there, determining how deep or how far out because nobody knows that? The next step is to go through all the data, and we must submit another permit Mod IEPA says okay, here's our findings. So hopefully this year we can roll with it quickly with just needing the permit mods of IEPA approved so they can start on their process. They do have the person that will do it, they've done it before. They did say something about the federal government being really like this because it was an effective community with something called a landfill and helping this community, so they want to give us that viable help as far as funding.

Questions

Rick Fox- So the next step is this coordination between the IDNR and IEPA and getting this permit application set submitted. I assume that's GFL's responsibility.

That would be the next step, someone would have to submit the idea through GFL. So yes, that is correct.

Rick- Any line of site?

Not yet, Josh is working on it.

Tara- Next topic is the landfill Entrance Dam and other Abandoned Mine Lands Updates. So, the IDR did reach out to FOTH and requested access agreements for the property and contact information for the adjacent property owners to continue to work on the entrance dam and other projects that we discussed, but there's no update at this time.

Morris- I recollect that there was a easement between PDC or maybe it wasn't? Maybe PDC wasn't the grantor or the grantee of the easement, but I remember the PDC presented us with an access easement with the neighbors if it was reciprocal.

I don't expect you to remember, you weren't involved at the time. But maybe ask Josh about that because I know that we already voted on an Access easement with the adjacent neighbors or the exit. And I apologize, I don't recall the specifics of whether it was from us to the neighbors or from PDC to the neighbors...But we should follow up on what's already been. But I bring it up because I hesitate to call the dangers without knowing the fact. Because they're going to say "Well, wait a minute, we already gave you permission to do this, why are you asking for permission again?". So, let's address that issue before we call the neighbors, please. Thank you.

Solar update- Foth and Director Powers spoke with the city attorney about the Procurement process for solar and it sounds like if the solar vendor is a developer, a full bidding process would not be required; however, the city attorney did recommend getting some proposals going out to get a couple of different options. He did say he can help. He has experience with that, and it could assist with the process.

Van Winkle- I don't quite understand what the difference will be between the solar developer versus the vendor or whatever it is.

Tara - I'm not sure about the intricacies of that or the difference between those two.

Van Winkle- Just a side comment, since it is obvious now that we're not going to be able to expect Landfill 3 to be open; when Landfill 2 closes unless something unexpected happens, things usually take longer than shorter. It seems to me that the committee and therefore the city and the county's exposure to cost over and beyond which we have a revenue is in Jeopardy because Landfill 1 is still our obligation from the standpoint of post-closure cost requirements, therefore the solar may be an opportunity for us to be able to get some coverage in that area if we were able to be successful in committing. I think we need to keep an open mind about that.

Good point. Thank you! Any other questions or comments about that?
; None

Tara- Next final statement on the financial impact. So, through May were right around the planned budget excluding Phase 5. We're tracking Phase 5 spending and will put out that change order and have it ready for review at the next meeting.

Profiled Waste Approvals

Morris- Did I get this correct that all the waste profiles were pre-approved?

Tara- Correct, 9 pre-approved.

Signature Approvals

Morris- Requesting a motion for signature approvals that might come up now and in between the next meeting.

Van Winkle motioned to approve, seconded by Fox;
Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

Tara- So we've got some miscellaneous cardboard bulk sacks and cut-up packaging and totes. So, it is Marshall County.

ITEM NO. 2 REPORT FROM PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Tara- Did we want to do approvals for the signatures on the CAP forms for that?

Morris- Yes, requesting motion to approve, Williams motioned to approve, seconded by Van Winkle; also mentioned some groundwater ones as well.
**Also, a request to extend the ultimate source demonstration at 7S and 26S through the fourth quarter of 2023. 7S has dissolved ammonia and chloride and 26S is acetone.

Fox- My question on this one is it seems from the description, when I looked at it, the sort of stuff any manufacturing facility would just have going into the dumpsters on a day-to-day basis. Any idea what makes this on our special waste list?

Mark- This covers manufacturing facilities and is not like the original packaging as far as soil but it's a non-hazardous waste.

A. Landfill Monthly Budget Report

Tara Van Hoof reviewed the financial figures for May 2023. Revenue for this month was approximately \$42.3K in revenue. With the budget being \$39.8k that put us above budget. Expenditures were \$55.4k for the month versus a budget of \$39k. A reminder that this is work done in April. We had a lot of reporting going on that month. We had several days of leeches pumping and falling so were also above on phases five and six as we discussed. Expenses exceeded revenues by \$13.1K for the month. Year to date, our revenues are at \$181.4k which pretty much comes in according to budget. Our expenditures are \$181.6k so were right about budget for the year to date.

ITEM NO. 3 REPORT FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT-Ian Johnson

A. Monthly Activity Reports

Ian- Our weekly random load checks were completed and no issues were noted and were also asking to obtain any signatures prior to the next committee meeting as needed obviously with review by Foth.

Addressing Mr. Fox's question on the tonnages says it looks like you got an extra day in there which is equivalent to 800 tons per day. Also, there were 4800 tons of special waste in May versus 823 tons in June. So that's a 5000-ton differential.

Mike- We had three projects come in. Western Asphalt in May, Starks Excavating along with Phoenix Corporation brought in about 4500 tons between the three of them which was kind of an anomaly that they all happened in the same month. It's unusual and that's what triggered that.

B. Signature Approvals

Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Solar Discussion.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Morris is requesting to go into executive session for profitable litigation and not to return other than to adjourn the meeting.

Van Winkle motioned to approve, seconded by Williams;

Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, August 23, 2023 at 3PM

ADJOURNMENT

4:24 PM

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

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