

**LANDFILL SITING COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2005**

The January 18, 2005, Landfill Siting Committee meeting was called to order by Chairman Virgil Gentz at 1:35 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance preceded the meeting.

CITIZEN'S COMMENTS

Terry Tower, 4400 – 176th Avenue, wanted to give a personal opinion about his feelings of the landfill. We have lived here for almost 10 years and when we wanted to build, John Holloway asked if we knew that we were building next to the landfill. We decided to build and that the landfill is the 2nd best neighbor they have had; the first one being a cemetery. The landfill has been cooperative with them. Every time they call or stop, they are interested in listening to what they have to say. Over the last year and a half things have improved with the landfill. The siting committee has been giving a valuable service to the community and appreciates all the negotiating sessions. Also the town board has supported them as landowners and everyone has worked together. In the spirit of everybody working together, let's get going now; it's been a year and its time to get some negotiations done and get this over with.

David Poisl, 17715 – 38th Street, I live near Terry and we probably have the best view of the landfill on the east side. I would have to agree that the landfill has been a good neighbor, they are very consciousness and run a nice landfill. I would also like to thank the town board and the siting committee for all their efforts with the landfill. Most of us appreciate the lower real estate taxes because of the landfill income and we certainly don't want to say, "go away" and then pay \$1300-\$2000/year more on taxes. People that don't live too close to the landfill think it's a great deal and don't care what they do there because it helps us. The proposal calls for the garbage to be 300 feet from the road and the DNR guidelines say 1200 feet and obviously they will be looking for a waiver. I would suggest that the committee not relent any too much on this because 300' is pretty close to the highway. I built my house in 1996 and I knew that I was close to the landfill and that they would be using all the property that they owned. The Sabin property is a nice piece of property to expand the landfill because it's contiguous to it and has good clay. I would also ask the town board and the siting committee to insist on a "guarantee" of no further expansion at this site, across Hwy. N or anywhere else. If we don't do that, it will grow bigger and bigger and we'll be

doing this every 5 years. The land that I built on has been in the family since the 1842 and we should not suffer financial burden because of decreased property value. Perhaps something could be done for those people who are close by rather than the ones that are across town, that don't put up with the dust, noise, sights and the truck traffic. There are other sites within the town that could be used for future landfills and I would be happy to work on that committee, when this landfill is full.

Connie Bevry, 3900 – 200th Avenue, A group of residents in the community has meant and put together a binder of environmental concerns. I've given them to the town board members already, but since there has not been a siting meeting, I would like to give these to the rest of the committee today. I had the opportunity to add something in about air monitoring. It is an up and coming concern that even the state is looking into. We came up with a list of items that need to be reviewed before you move forward with any kind of expansion. We need to be aware of the buffer zones in areas around the landfill. We may not be here forever, but the garbage will be here forever. From the reading that I've done, and I hope you will take those binders and environmental concerns to heart, you will see that some sort of buffer zone needs to be maintained. According to the reading there is a mile of influence around the landfill which includes water, air and water tables. My concern as we move into this process, not only the air and water, but you look at the well situation where they are requesting to draw exemptions on privately owned wells with this proposal. They are asking people that have possibly vacant land to have a variance drawn upon them without their permission, which is put on their deed and damages their property permanently. If you allow them to put the garbage where they want to put it, all of our wells will have to have a variance. The proposal they have on the table is not acceptable to not only the well situation, but also the air. As far as the well and water monitoring - if the well goes bad, for any reason, we should have some assurance in the contract, without us having to sign an agreement. Everyone within one mile should have assurance on property value and assurance of air quality and water quality.

Ted Palmen – 3710 – 200th Avenue, I concur with the feelings of what the previous speakers brought to the floor. I have one other concern that perhaps can be addressed rather easily. It seems like the meetings aren't very well published. I would like to propose to the siting committee and Waste Management, that especially the neighbors adjacent, we would like a little better communication. The other concern is that the meeting is at 1:30pm and that many people are still working. The biggest concern is that we stay in the loop and maybe some meetings can be held in the evening. If people don't know what is going, they hear rumors and sometimes can get belligerent.

Virgil Gentz stated that he will address both of these issues later on in the meeting.

Ken Bevry, 3900 – 200th Avenue, I built my house around 1990 and I live across the street from this proposed expansion. We asked around before we built and we got the impression the landfill would not expand beyond its boundaries, but I don't have written documentation, just word of mouth. We decided we could put up with it for 10-15 years and then it would be done. We are $\frac{3}{4}$ mile away right now and with the expansion we would be across the street, which we are not in favor of. A comment was made earlier

about the real estate tax break because of the landfill; but I personally could do without it if the landfill is not here.

Judy Sommers, 4002 -200th Avenue, Could someone please tell me the date, of the offer to purchase, for the Sabin property? DECEMBER 17, 2002 At the end of 2000, we got the building permit for our house; the treasurer at that time, made a comment to me that now we won't be able to complain about the landfill. I wasn't sure if she knew something that I didn't know. I have never been a neighbor of the landfill, but I guess the way Waste Management wants it, I will be. To me, a good neighbor does not put garbage 300' from my lot line and make my well non-conforming. I am very much against this expansion. Our town should be asking for further setbacks than 1200 feet, not less.

Joe Tiso, 4200 – 200th Avenue, My concerns are about drainage. Also, I don't like that garbage will be 300' from my well. I would like to remind the committee there was a small petition circulated which requested the committee keep the setbacks of 1200 feet. I'm not totally against this, but I would like to see regulations being followed. Another concern is visibility at the corner of Hwy. 45 & N with the site being so close to the road. I know the garbage has to go someplace and like everyone else, we enjoy the tax benefit. The property has been in our family for a long time and we plan on staying here. Again, my main concern is about the wells.

There being no other citizen comments at this time. Virgil reported that Tom Gorlinski is out of town and has an excused absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 7, 2004 MEETING

On an Ashmus/Melcher motion and second, the minutes of the January 7, 2004 landfill committee meeting were approved. Motion passed on all yes votes.

VIDEO PRESENTATION BY WASTE MANAGEMENT

Lynn Morgan, from Waste Management, commented that the video was made per the request of the Siting Committee. Waste Management would like the proposed site closer to the road than the existing landfill. Actual photos of the proposed site were taken and then digitized to show what the proposed landfill would like with trees, shrubs and grass at various year time frames. (VCR tapes of this presentation are available at the town hall) Terry Tower asked how accurate the video is. Lynn stated that it is to scale in relation to the road, berms, height of the landfill, etc. Computer depiction is used for trees and those are approximation size.

QUESTIONS FROM RESIDENTS ON VIDEO

David Poisl – How high will the proposed landfill be on the Sabin property? Lynn answered, 180' above the current surface. The berm elevation varies along Hwy. N because of the topography levels. There was not a view from the distance of Hwy. N just west of the Des Plaines River when the landfill is full. Lynn was glad he asked because they do have some computer generation depictions showing those various views. (Many photos were shown to the residents).

Connie Bevry – As a community resident, you can see from some roads within the town that the current landfill is taller than any mature tree. How does this height compare to the proposal? Lynn replied, the current north 80 is about 170' above its surface. The

proposed site would be 180' above its surface, but the beginning surface is higher also. The current north 80 of the landfill is about 20' shy of reaching its 880' peak.

Judy Sommers – The video, which is not very good, shows us how the landfill will look in the first couple of years and then again when it is a green hill years down the road. It does not show us the years in between when we are seeing garbage. Lynn said it is too hard to show those years because of being day to day operating positions.

Connie Bevry – How tall is the Sabin house? Lynn is unsure of the height.

Matt Quinn asked Lynn questions about the elevations of the base of the berm, proposed height, etc. based on the height of the Sabin house.

Connie Bevry – I would again like to caution the siting committee about buffer zones and the quality of our air and wells.

Joe Tiso – He is still not getting an answer about drainage and channeling the water on his property. Lynn commented that when the design is finalized, it will include drainage issues.

George Melcher – Let me make a comment here that Supervisor Gorlinski, a year ago, asked for this particular concept. This is a depiction of what it will generally look like. It does not answer yet every question and it is not a final design.

Ken Bevry – I believe Mr. Gorlinski asked for a 3D model, not a video.

George Melcher – Supervisor Gorlinski has seen this video and he alluded to George that he was satisfied with what the video did. It wasn't exactly the way he originally wanted, as a scale model, but it would have been too difficult to show the proper positions of distance, from what he understands from Waste Management.

There was discussion of prior surface water agreements and the possibility of doing something like that again.

John Holloway, 15404 Burlington Road – Has consideration been taken of how close the berms should be to the road if Hwy. 45 ever had to be widened? If the proposal goes to the edge of the road on the east side, it would impact the people on the west side of the road.

Lynn Morgan introduced representative of Waste Management – Dennis Drephal, Gerard Hamlin, Mike Infusino, Tom Dixon, Greg Johnson, Casey Furlong, and Atty. Dave Stewart.

Atty. Dave Stewart commented that it has been a year and their goal is the same in negotiating a package. A handout was presented which listed items to be addressed with the proposed expansion.

- Build a screening berm to the north and west sides of the expansion area
- Provide full landscaping for the berm which plans have been provided to Town Board
- Have the screening berm and landscaping done before we start using the expansion area
- Offer property guarantees to all residential properties that are nearby the expansion
- Plant as many trees as we will have to remove during the expansion

- Will relocate some mature trees from the expansion area to nearby properties and provide berms for additional screening purposes on nearby properties if requested
- Ensure that the geology of the expansion area will prevent contamination of any wells
- Will provide free quarterly water sampling for the wells which are nearby the expansion if requested
- Waste Management will work with the Town to identify lands owned by Waste Management that could be permanently reserved for conservation purposes to offset the wooded acreage located in the expansion. The location of those acres to be mutually agreed upon with Town

Atty. Dave Stewart - The first three items above discuss screening. There are DNR regulations for setbacks and Waste Management will apply for exemptions from those setbacks. Hwy. N really does not have any applicable setbacks, except you must keep garbage 100' from someone else's property line. In regards to 1200' setbacks from wells, exemptions can be applied for depending if the wells are up, down or side radiant from the landfill.

Currently there are about 12 homes with property guarantee agreements and Waste Management plans to extend the property guarantee agreement to about 16 new homes. There is not a bullet above mentioning the continuation of payments to the town, but Waste Management and the town entered into another agreement last month. W/M will pay \$3.00/ton for the rest of the year and a 6% increase each year. This same language would be carried into the new agreement for the proposed expansion

George Melcher – Would like to see an aerial map showing the Level 1 and Level 2 Direct payment recipients as to where their property lies in relationship with the proposed expansion of the landfill. It was agreed to have this kind of map available for the next meeting.

Atty. Dave Stewart – W/M is continuing the Property Protection Agreement which they have been using for the past 20-30 years. If you try to sell your property and it does not sell after 60 days, you can come to W/M; get an appraiser at their expense to determine price. You then can ask W/M to purchase your property. They have not used it much because properties don't have any problems selling in the town of Paris. Some property owners have a problem with the clause "they won't oppose expansion of the landfill". W/M does not want to buy properties.

Jeff Ashmus – The facility will be here forever; will the agreement be forever too?

Atty. Dave Stewart – The agreement expires 60-90 days after the landfill closes its operation. When the landfill is capped and it is a green hill, the stigma of the landfill would fade.

Roger Beth - What about the possibility of contamination down the years after the landfill is closed? What protection does a property owner have then? Sooner or later it is going to leak.

Dennis Drephal - By Federal and State laws, after the landfill is closed, they continue to monitor and maintain the leachate extraction system for about 40 years.

Atty. Matt Quinn – Would you be able to extend the agreement for that period of time? I've seen it done in other agreements now.

Dennis Drephal – Anything is negotiable. Put the wording in and it can be discussed.

Harold Harper – The original contract used the appraised value of the home for the property agreement. The new contract will be for the market value of the home?

Atty. Dave Stewart – Yes, thank you for pointing that out—the market value will be used.

Harold Harper – If I sell in the next year, will the new owner get the same property protection agreement?

Atty. Dave Stewart – As currently worded, it does not go with the land or the sale, but it does go to personal representatives, trustees, guardians, or beneficiaries.

Virgil Gentz – In years past, W/M has agreed to pay for siting committee expenses, legal fees, etc. and we would like to know if you will continue to pay those.

Dennis Vorphal – yes we would

Atty. Matt Quinn –I would request a letter from W/M confirming those reimbursements.

Virgil Gentz – Is W/M aware of the petition that was circulated by residents within the town? They have seen the text of the petition, but not the signatures. Would W/M be willing to conform to the requests of that petition?

Atty. Dave Stewart – No, it would not be a landfill if we had to do that – it would only be about 18 acres then.

Virgil Gentz – The size of the landfill is dependent on health and safety issues, such as ground water and well water, per the residents concerns. As you get reports on ground water study, the committee would like to see those.

Atty. Matt Quinn – Made a request for the feasibility report from DNR and other reports as W/M receives it. We will be interested to know concerns or dangers that are reported pertaining to wells and/or ground water. W/M noted they will share that information with the committee.

Virgil Gentz – Wanted to confirm with W/M that we have a letter from Francis Koonce, DNR, where it states criteria for proximity to roads, design for environmental impacts, leachate lines and water supply, aircraft, etc. and this is something they will discuss and deal with.

Gerard Hamlin – Each of these constraints will be addressed by W/M per DNR guidelines. The leachate lines will be less than 1200 feet.

Virgil Gentz – W/M divided up landowners between two levels for direct payments. Level One people are impacted within 1200 feet of the landfill and Level Two people are further away. A dollar amount has not been decided upon yet, but could be \$3000 for Level 1 and \$1000 for Level 2. Virgil feels that some of the names on Level 2 should be on Level 1; such as, Beth, Harper, Klemens, Nikula and Callahan.

On the property guarantee agreements, parcels were added that are within about 1200' of the expansion and whose properties abut W/M.

Jeff Ashmus – In regards to the direct payments and property guarantee; he noticed that Steve Hrupka and two other homes on the west side of Hwy. D, south of the “S” curve, are not on the list.

Atty. Matt Quinn – The Gohlke property on the corner of Hwy. JB & Hwy. 45 is not on the list. They have a business and I notice they are not listed. W/M only picked out residential properties.

Virgil Gentz – Would W/M consider an annual increase for direct payment recipients? W/M stated they would consider it.

Harold Harper – Informed W/M that for mailing purposes, 38th is a Street not an Avenue.

Virgil Gentz – In developing the new landfill, will it be necessary to open any closed capped modules? This is an issue with some of the near by residents. W/M stated the only time would be for routine maintenance or to add a gas pipe, if one collapsed.

Virgil Gentz – Without the proposed expansion, what is the landfill site life? W/M responded about 2008-2009, approximately.

Virgil Gentz – How will the landfill handle odor problems for the proposed expansion?

Gerard Hamlin – New guidelines for regulating air and solid waste, ways of collecting gas before capping, and sampling of the surface be done more frequently, are a few. We are looking at ways of collecting the gas quicker to generate it into electricity.

George Melcher - Regarding the collection of leachate, are there plans on how that leachate will be taken away; a sewer line or something. There is still discussion on this W/M responded.

Virgil Gentz – Can the clause in the property protection agreement be changed?

Atty. Dave Stewart – It could be something we could talk about, but we are going through a property guarantee agreement at another landfill. The lady listed the property and by chance an employee of W/M was looking at the property to buy and she told him about all these terrible conditions and potentially killed any interest of the buyer wanting the house. We are trying to avoid being placed in a situation where we have to buy property because the seller deliberately killed the interest of any potential buyer.

Dennis Drephal – The agreement is not to keep people quiet or hold back their opinions; but when you go to sell your house and you bad mouth W/M, you are going to drive the buyers away.

Virgil Gentz – I want to address Ted Palmen's concerns regarding informing people of meetings and the time of day for the meeting. The time of day was chosen because some of the committee members have other evening obligations, but the next meeting will be in the evening, possibly 6:00pm. In regards to letting people know, the next meeting notice will be mailed to people that are on the guarantee payment list and it will continue to in the newspaper.

Atty. Matt Quinn – What is the density for tons per cubic yards that you use to get your converted calculations? The reason I ask that question is because I look at past reports from the DNR and W/M and they vary from .77 to 1.46. We hired an expert and he looked at the year 2002 and based on your numbers, came up with 3500 pounds per cubic yard. I looked at what was coming in to the landfill and there wasn't much of a difference from year to year as to the volume of things.

Gerard Hamlin – It's a good question and all the numbers are right and all the numbers are wrong. I don't mean to make light of that, but this is an issue that DNR and others who struggle with the waste industry. In the past garbage was handled loose and as people modernized, it's packed when it comes to the facility, so the densities increase. Different materials have different densities and it depends how it's packed. DNR wants to understand how cubic yards get to tons. They have looked at how we come up with accurate and representative numbers. The range from 500 pounds to 2300 pounds per cubic yard is a big difference when you start multiplying the tonnage fee that are applied. The average range is between 1500 pounds to 2000 pounds per cubic yard for MSW landfills. The bottom line is that all big landfills must have scales. All waste must go over the scale when it goes into the landfill, because a ton is a ton, is a ton. Calculations are based on the weight and the only time you really look at volume is when you are

trying to calculate the space associated with the design of the land you are proposing a facility.

Atty. Matt Quinn – On the reports from the DNR, was that space based on survey?

Gerard Hamlin – Yes, in the early years; probably not as much today.

Harold Harper – Do you record the weight and cubic yards of the vehicle that comes over the scale?

By law, they need to record the weight. They don't always know the cubic yards; whether the truck is full or not.

Atty. Matt Quinn – The exiting site – has its own saturation?

Yes, we treat it as such. The north 80 has a different liner and configuration and different depths of waste. It's constructed to operate its own saturation.

Atty. Matt Quinn - Will the proposed new site be its own saturation?

They are unsure; still gathering information.

Atty. Matt Quinn – My only other question – At the present time are we doing any leachate recirculation? I don't think the rules permit it, do they?

Gerard Hamlin - At the present time, no. The rules do permit it, but you need to request permission. Casey just applied possibly last week. The new rules going into effect right now, talk about standardizing leachate circulation. There are a couple of paragraphs on it and it is subject to comment. Some people have commented on it.

Virgil Gentz – We'll get a copy of that application right.

Yes.

Atty. Matt Quinn – The concern that I have for that is there was an article where a guy who runs a landfill would not do that because of the concern for odor.

Gerard Hamlin – You can not transfer leachate between modules.

Atty. Matt Quinn – I think the community concern would be the odor.

Virgil Gentz – We've heard many issues today. I know the committee is very concerned about ground water and drinking water, especially for people living close. We as a committee should meet with the citizen's before we have another meeting.

Virgil introduced the members of the committee – Tom Gorlinski (who could not attend), George Melcher, both appointed by the county, Roger Beth, Harold Harper, Jeff Ashmus and Virgil Gentz and clerk, Terri Fonk. Thank you to the citizens and W/M for coming today and we have another job to do. The committee agreed to meet with the citizens before meeting with Waste Management again. A date will be set and the meeting will begin at 6:00pm. George is to get back to Terri with dates that are good for the county members and we will get something set within the next couple of weeks.

Jeff Ashmus – What exactly are the powers and/or the duties of the Siting Committee, our eventual goal and how the Town Board's role plays a part? If Matt could explain it to the residents in order to clear up any misconceptions.

Atty. Matt Quinn – The Wisconsin Statutes call the Siting Committee a local committee. That committee by statute, once W/M gives notice that they want to develop a new landfill or expand an existing landfill site, there is a formal specific process by which a municipality has to adopt a resolution to negotiate. W/M gives the notice and the town has to adopt a resolution. The notice is given to both the town and the county. The host community is the town, but that's within the county. The county appoints two representatives and the town appoints four representatives. The representatives represent

the people, both for the county and from the town. They look out for the interest of all the people and for the people around the landfill. They are required to negotiate in good faith with W/M because they are part of the committee as well. The preamble to the siting laws say, the legislature recognizes the need for the landfill, but also recognizes the hardship it causes the people and the expense to the town. This negotiation has been going on for a long time. I started working for the town four years prior to the first agreement in 1982. We've run the gamut. We went to court and the appellate court fighting W/M and somewhere along the way we did come up an agreement subsequent to those proceedings and it's had a long history. Once this committee who has this duty and responsibility to negotiate in good faith with W/M – they either come up with an agreement or they don't. If they do, that agreement would be submitted to the town for approval or disapproval. However, if the town disapproved under normal circumstances, if the town doesn't really have an option, then what happens is it then goes to the Waste Facility Siting Board. If you have two opposing agreements, where there are no agreements; the town says they want "x" with a lot of conditions and the landfill says no we want "y". The Waste Facility Siting Board ultimately chooses one agreement or the other, but can not pick and choose from each of those two packages. This is borrowed from labor law and its methodology by which it forces parties to negotiate because of the fear of losing all if you lose. There are other things. There is the zoning issue – preexisting zoning that would have to be changed which existed more than 15 months prior to the negotiation and agreement, those provisions can still be enforced. There is the contract issue – our contracts have always included the paragraph that indicates, no further expansion, and Waste has agreed to this. No further expansion without the approval of the town board. Now the only thing is that it has never played out in court and it is not something that the Waste Facility Siting Board will consider, but that would be a separate court action. In other words, it would determine by the town that they did not want any expansion by the landfill and it would have to be litigated; that's a separate issue. I hope that explains it and I try to explain it at every meeting because there are always different people here. This is the short of it and it is a very complex process. In the negotiation, you can negotiate anything and the arbitration; you really don't get a shot at the environmental issues because that becomes something for the DNR. The need for the landfill can not be arbitrated when it gets to the Waste Facility Siting Board, it can be negotiated, the size and all that, but when it gets to the arbitration level that's different. Waste Facility Siting Board is in Madison and is composed of representatives, both government and appointees, and they are the judge in this case. They are an administrative agency, just like the DNR and you can appeal from their decision to the court for abusive discretion and that's about it.

Connie Bevy – I just wanted to clarify something that I thought I heard. Was it said that W/M owns property up to Hwy. 45 with the 1200 foot setback or they did not own the property on Hwy. 45 when they put the 1200 foot setback in the contract? The information that I have is that the 1200 foot setback was in agreement #3, in 1991.

Atty. Dave Stewart – I believe it was in the 1982 agreement as well, we didn't own the Coulter property then.

Connie Bevy – It wasn't in the '82 agreement, I have the contract right here.

Atty. Matt Quinn – Coulter, I think, was the only well that was within that 1200'

Connie Bevy – No, the setbacks from highways.

Atty. Matt Quinn – Coulter owned their property at the time we started negotiations and they bought them out afterwards. I really don't know why. I assume because the well was within 1200 feet? I think that was the only well within the 1200 feet of the active area of the site.

Connie Bevry – According to the documentation in our contract, I understand that there are a couple properties that go up to Hwy. 45 that they own, but that clause was added in 1991, well after they owned the properties. I just wanted to clarify that they did own property up to Hwy. 45 when the 1200 foot setback was put in the contract.

Atty. Matt Quinn – Which agreement was that in?

Connie Bevry – Agreement #3, 1991

Joe Tiso – The property protection agreement is in place if you want to sell, but I don't see agreements or anything if you want to stay. I would like to have the committee make sure that there's something in there for protection, if wells go bad and the septic is an issue for drainage in the area. If I want to sell, what do I do? Another question I have is about the direct payments. Is that per year? For the life of the landfill?

Atty. Dave Stewart – Yes, as its operating.

Dave Poisl – Question about the waiver for the 1200' or the 1000' as mentioned, the setbacks that DNR has. Who is in charge of granting waivers; if it's DNR, do you go to DNR first without negotiating with our committee or do ask our committee first if they agree with say 300' or 600' or 900'? What if our committee comes back to you and says we would like you to seek your waiver for no more than 900'; how does that work? Who goes first?

Atty. Dave Stewart – It's timing, depending how far we are along in negotiations with the negotiating committee vs. how far along in the preparation of the feasibility report. I would advise W/M to go ahead and apply for the exemptions for the whole 1200 feet. If it turns out later through negotiations that the feasibility report is ahead of the negotiations negotiating a reduction then DNR can be amended.

Dave Poisl – Are you stuck on the 300' or is there some way for a compromise?

Gerard Hamlin – The intension is based on the technical review materials that the DNR has. Arbitrarily, if someone wants to set a number; that's negotiable.

Atty. Dave Stewart – The 1200 was arbitrary if DNR didn't put it in the regulations as an arbitrary number, of course, but anything below that we have to seek an exemption.

Dave Poisl – Has there been any consideration, in the siting committee, can you at all try to get the landfill, W/M, to have a regulation on recycling, reusing or reducing the amount of waste that comes in here. Such as telling a hauler that he has a lot of cardboard in there and that could be recycled. Use stricter guidelines of what can be dumped and what should be recycled which would increase the lifetime of the landfill.

Dennis Drephal – State has the laws on recycling and certain items are banned and no matter where those items come from, can not be put in the landfill.

Lynn Morgan – The landfill does have its recycling facility for local people and on a broader scale we are operating recycling centers throughout the service area that we are serving. And we are aggressively promoting that option to customers.

Terry Tower – It is stated that the wells are checked, but not stated anywhere if the well is bad, what happens or who pays? My feelings on the property protection agreement I feel it should be for as long as you own the land, not for as long as the landfill is open. I don't know if the committee has the power to do it, but to control the amount of people

that are around the landfill. Perhaps if you had someone split land into ten parcels and then you had ten new property owners to deal with at the next meeting, that type of thing. Keep the parcels down around the landfill.

Connie Bevry – I have spoke with our DNR representative, Joe Lourigan, several times and he has reassured her that the protocol is that EPA sets guidelines. DNR can set stricter guidelines and the local people can supercede those guidelines. They encourage communities to be involved in protecting their community by seeking stricter guidelines than the DNR. I also talked with Tom Dixon and Greg regarding recycling partnerships. Since we host a landfill, I think we should be first and foremost to jump into a partnership with W/M looking into recycling, renewing and reusing materials rather than throwing garbage into the ground. In regards to not allowing new people to move in around the landfill; I believe that is backwards thinking. We need to make sure that anyone who buys property is protected. Why would we want to limit what a person can do with their property because of the landfill; shouldn't we require the landfill to own enough buffer that people who have property adjacent can do what they please with their property. They should not be able to limit or damage adjacent property owners.

Atty. Matt Quinn – There is a two fold process going on here right now and I want everyone to be aware of it. The next step for W/M is the filing of the feasibility report and I think it's to be sometime in February that you would be eligible to file. That feasibility report will have to meet what's called the minimum requirements of the DNR to be acceptable. If it isn't, the DNR will ask for more information. It's not unusual for them to do that. If they file an acceptable feasibility report the DNR will then notice them that it is an acceptable report from the standpoint of being the minimum requirements of the information that they need. At that point, the DNR will set a public hearing and people who have an environmental concern should be aware of that. The local committee will be very interested in those issues because the DNR will be deciding issues such as 1200 feet and whether there has to be a buffer and so on. The well issues, those will be decided based on factual information. I have every confidence in the DNR as far as them looking at that objectively. Everybody may have different opinions on that subject and you should be aware of the fact it is a separate proceeding that does go on. There are some things the local committee does not have control over as a bottom line. For purposes of negotiating, we hope that based on our past agreement and conditions that we have in that agreement, we have quite a bit of leverage on W/M and they accept that too.

Virgil Gentz – I want to thank the residents, the committee and W/M for coming today and you've sat a long time listening on a very important issue. Thank you to W/M for their proposal and we have a beginning point and our citizens will be involved in our next meeting.

A motion by Melcher and a second by Beth, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri Fonk
Clerk
Town of Paris