

# Kendall County Solid Waste Plan Update Table of Contents

Pages	Topic
2- 10	2005 Solid Waste Plan Recommendations and Schedule
11	Current plan implementation efforts
11-16	a. Which recommendations in the adopted plan have been implemented
17-19	b. Briefly describe which recommendations were not implemented and the reasons why these were not implemented.
19-23	c. Which recommendations have been adopted according to the plan schedule
23-25	New schedule for non-implemented recommendations
25	Recycling program status
26-29	New and Modified recommendations and implementation schedule.
Appendices	Appendix A “2010-2015 Recommendations”  Appendix B “Kendall County Site Approval Ordinance for Regional Pollution Control Facilities”.  Appendix C “Ordinance Adopting the Kendall County Solid Waste Transfer Station Generic Host Community Benefit Agreement”  Appendix D Transcript for Public Hearing XXXX, 2009

# Kendall County Five Year Update 2010

Local Government: Kendall County  
Contact person Marlin Hartman  
Address Kendall County Health Department  
811 W. John St.  
Yorkville IL. 60560

Telephone 630-553-9100 ext. 8068 Plan Adoption date: May 1995  
Re-adoption date: July 2000  
Re-adoption date: February 2005  
Re-adoption date: February 2010

**1. Recommendations and Implementation Schedule contained in updated adopted 2005 plan. Briefly describe the recommendations and implementation schedule for each item mentioned within the plan.**

Note: The Kendall County Solid Waste Plan followed a slightly different format in its original adoption and has continued with that format through plan updates. The plan included “Administrative Recommendations” as well as the mandatory IEPA hierarchy categories. The purpose of the additional category was to emphasize the organizational actions required to properly promote and execute the solid waste plan. Therefore, an additional section will be included in describing the recommendations and implementation of the adopted plan. The combustion category is now combined with Alternative Technology, which was not addressed in 2005. In 2005 Energy Recovery and Volume Reduction were combined in the Solid Waste Plan and were addressed as one category in this section as well. Appendices have been added to further identify actions taken by Kendall County to implement this Solid Waste Plan.

## Administrative

There were 5 (five) 2005 Administrative Recommendations that were scheduled to be addressed during this timeframe of the plan. These Administrative Recommendations are continuations of previous recommendations and are summarized individually below and includes original implementation schedule.

- A1. Create an Intergovernmental Agreement between the County and all municipalities to collectively respond to solid waste issues within the County.

This was first recommended in 1995 and its implementation was delayed for further review. The present schedule for this recommendation is to continue to reevaluate its value during each update.

- A2 Create and fill the position of a full time solid waste coordinator.

The county created a part-time solid waste coordinator position prior to the 1995 solid waste plan implementation. The county has continued to fund a part-time solid waste coordinator. The present schedule for this recommendation is to continue to reevaluate the need to create a fulltime-time solid waste coordinator.

- A3 Complete updates, revisions, and reviews of the plan as required

The county's first Solid Waste Plan was accepted in 1995 with 5-year updates occurring in 2000 and 2005. The submission of this 2010 update continues to meet the schedule of this recommendation. Preparations will continue to meet the county's solid waste management needs by reviewing and revising the plan as necessary.

- A4 State, Federal, and private funding should be sought to assist supporting waste education programs.

This recommendation was part of the first solid waste plan. Funding has been acquired through different funding sources since the plans original adoption. The present schedule for this recommendation is to continue to identify and procure funding made available for solid waste management activities.

- A5 Consider becoming an IEPA delegated county for enforcement and inspection activities.

This recommendation was adopted in the 2000 update due to increasing solid waste activities within the county. This recommendation has not been implemented and its present schedule is to continue to be evaluate the benefits to the county by becoming an IEPA delegated county.

### Source Reduction

- SR1 Conduct solid waste audits within municipal buildings and schools to promote source reduction and to serve as an example to the business community. Goals should be set and measured at intervals to monitor this program.

This was an original recommendation from 1995 and its implementation is an ongoing process. Since the recommendations adoption solid waste audits have occurred. The present schedule for this recommendation is to continue to perform these audits on an "as needed basis" with no formal schedule.

- SR2 The public education program should include close interaction with school districts. Create a timetable for the establishment of a structured public education that includes schools.

This recommendation was a 1995 adoption. The educational programs with some of the schools have been completed during each year. The number of schools within Kendall County has increased considerably over the years challenging the ability to formally schedule with each district. The present schedule is to continue to complete educational programs within the schools as opportunities present themselves.

- SR3 The County Board to provide public recognition to businesses and industries to stimulate source reduction.

This recommendation was a 1995 adoption. This recommendation is designed to motivate businesses to improve recycling actions in the commercial wastestream. No Recognition has occurred to date. The schedule is to begin recognition no later than 2010.

- SR4 Initiate programs to collect and properly dispose of household hazardous waste and promote non-toxic alternatives.

This recommendation was a 1995 original recommendation. The County has had multiple events since the last update to further collect HHW, tires and unused medications. It is continuing as a recommendation to ensure continued activities to accomplish these collections. Therefore, the schedule identifies this recommendation as an ongoing activity.

- SR5 Initiate a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator or some designated member of county government. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

This recommendation was an original 1995 recommendation. Its purpose was to stimulate specific types of solid waste activities to motivate source reduction and recycling. This recommendation will be omitted due to the redundancy with recommendation SR6.

- SR6 Continue a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

This recommendation is a continuance of SR5. This recommendation will be ongoing through the plans timeframe.

- SR7 The Solid Waste Coordinator to monitor new legislation regarding source reduction such as toxic materials and white goods.

This recommendation is to ensure the county is aware of proposed legislative changes that could modify solid waste management practices. This recommendation is ongoing as the legislative process is addressing solid waste issues as the environmental concerns increase within the state and nation.

### Recycling

- R1 Create an implementation schedule for commercial/industrial recycling ordinance.

This recommendation was a 1995 original recommendation. The County has considered this option but at this time this recommendation has not been implemented. The schedule identifies this recommendation as continuing to be considered with the potential to create this ordinance

- R2 The County should encourage local governments and special agencies to purchase products made from recycled materials.

This recommendation was a 1995 original recommendation. The County has made efforts to support local governments and special agencies in these eco-friendly purposes. The schedule is to keep this recommendation as ongoing.

- R3 Adopt a recycling goal of 45% for the year 2015.

This recommendation was a 2005 recommendation. The County had a 25% recycling goal within the 1995 Plan and modified in 2000 to achieve 30% and another increase in 2005 to 40% by 2010. The most recent data, 2008, shows Kendall having a 38% recycling rate countywide. The schedule is to continue increasing the recycle rate for future updates.

- R4 The Solid Waste Coordinator should maintain a public education program to promote recycling.

This recommendation was a 1995 original recommendation. The Solid Waste Coordinator had implemented this recommendation within the first five years of the plans acceptance. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation.

### Combustion for Energy Recovery or for Volume Reduction

COMB1 Monitor regulations relating to incineration such as siting and emission requirements.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. The Solid Waste Coordinator has completed this recommendation on an ongoing basis. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation.

COMB2 Monitor IEPA clean air attainment and non-attainment status for townships of the county relating to incineration siting.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. The Solid Waste Coordinator has monitored NAAQS on an ongoing basis. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation.

COMB3 As incineration becomes more economically feasible locations should be identified and evaluated.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. This recommendation has not been implemented due to the economics of incineration. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation.

### Transfer Stations

Most of the Transfer Station Recommendations were included within the solid waste plan in 2005 as transfer stations' popularity increased in northeastern Illinois.

Recommendations T2, T3, T4 and T5 reflect siting criteria that should be addressed during the siting process. Therefore, T2 – T5 will be addressed as 1 recommendation in regards to purpose and schedule. T1, T6 and T7 will be addressed individually.

T1 The County should consider development of a waste transfer facility(s) in the County.

This was an original recommendation from the 1995 plan. The purpose of the recommendation is to show the impact of a Transfer Station is less than that of other pollution control facilities. The impacts of pollution control facilities varies on the type of facility to be sited, therefore this recommendation is to reemphasize the priority by impact. This recommendation is an ongoing task.

T2 Ensure the Transfer Station is large enough to provide adequate buffering and screened from view by a barrier or natural object for safe traffic flow, lighting, landscape plan, vehicle and equipment storage, and other ancillary operations.

T3 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be compatible with adjacent land uses and will be located near major haul roads and railroad facilities, wherever possible. (2005)

T4 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be located, aesthetic designed, and operated to minimize dust, odor, and noise impacts to adjacent properties. (2005)

T5 Transfer Stations must be enclosed facilities. (2005)

T2 -T5 These 4 recommendations were designed to give general direction in some of the siting criteria to be addressed when considering these types of facilities. These recommendations will also be ongoing and implemented on as needed basis.

T6 During the development of any Host Community Benefit Agreement, consideration should be given to materials recovery as a component of Transfer Stations. (2005)

This recommendation was to support the recycling or other diversion techniques potentially implemented at transfer stations and to support those actions. This recommendation will also be ongoing and implemented on as needed basis.

T7 The siting criteria outlined within Kendall County Ordinance will be followed. (2005)

This recommendation was to support the “Ordinance Adopting the Kendall County Solid Waste Transfer Station Generic Host Community Benefit Agreement” passed in 2004. This recommendation will also be ongoing and implemented on as needed basis.

## Disposal in Landfills

- LD1 Negotiate long term contracts with municipal and privately owned out of county landfills to ensure adequate disposal space is reserved at landfills currently serving the County.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. This recommendation has not been implemented. This recommendation will be continued to consider this option at future times.

- LD2 Evaluate the factors of public versus private ownership of landfills.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. This recommendation has been implemented due to evaluations being completed during plan updates. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation.

- LD3 The County should consider development of a waste transfer facility(s) in the county.

This recommendation was a 2000 recommendation. This recommendation has not been implemented for the county has considered the development of a Transfer Station. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation as an ongoing recommendation for further recommendation.

- LD4 Source Reduction and Recycling efforts should be continued to be pursued to diminish needs for landfill disposal.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. The Solid Waste Coordinator has implemented this recommendation. The schedule is to discontinue this recommendation within the Landfill Section.

- LD5 The County should consider development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facility only after considering a Transfer Station within the County. This Municipal Solid Waste facility will adhere to all State and local regulations.

This recommendation was a 2000 recommendation. This recommendation has been implemented for the county has considered the development of a MSW disposal facility after considering a Transfer Station. The schedule will continue to have this recommendation.

## LD 6 Host Community Benefit Agreement

1. Any Pollution Control Facility must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the County, if the county is the siting authority. (2005)
2. If the County is not the appropriate siting authority a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the siting authority. (2005)
3. Each Host community Benefit Agreement should make considerations for facilities that include materials recovery. (2004)

Many siting requirements and agreements also include a Host Community Benefit Agreement. A host agreement is used as an incentive and compensates the host community and may compensate other affected communities for environmental, infrastructure, economic, aesthetics, and other impacts within its jurisdiction resulting from the development and operation of a new pollution control facility. It is understood that the impact of such facilities may not be limited to the Host Community.

Examples of host community benefits for consideration during the siting of a proposed pollution control facility include the following:

1. Lump sum or per ton payments to host community (per ton credits may be given to the facility for recyclables recovered from the wastestream).
2. Financial support of community departments / organizations (e.g. fire department training programs).
3. Financial support of community infrastructure improvements (e.g. construction and maintenance of roadways and public parks).
4. Guaranteed waste disposal

This recommendation is designed to give direction to the county in regards to incorporating a host benefit agreement when discussions occur regarding a landfill as a pollution control facility. This recommendation will also be an ongoing task.

## Compost

- CO 1 County to create education program to encourage residents to effectively mulch and compost yardwaste.

This recommendation was a 1995 recommendation. The Solid Waste Coordinator has implemented this recommendation. The schedule is to discontinue this recommendation within the Combustion Section.

CO2 Continue to monitor local compost facilities and notify the IEPA when potential violations are observed.

This recommendation gives direction to non-delegated county actions in regards to compost regulations. Kendall has had a permitted and non-permitted yardwaste handling processes in the county since the early 1990s. This recommendation is ongoing.

## 2. Current plan implementation efforts

### a. Which recommendations in the adopted plan have been implemented?

#### Administrative Recommendations

A2 Create and fill the position of a full time solid waste coordinator.

This recommendation has been partially implemented since 1995 with the first part-time solid waste coordinator for Kendall County. The county has continued to fund a part-time solid waste coordinator.

A3 Complete updates, revisions, and reviews of the plan as required.

This recommendation has also been completed/implemented with the submittal of this solid waste plan update.

A4 State, Federal, and private funding should be sought to assist supporting waste education programs.

This recommendation has been implemented. The Solid Waste Coordinator has applied and received State Grant Funding. The Grants received since last plan update include the following:

- a. Tire Recycling Event August 2006
  - i. Partners: Yorkville High School
  - ii. Cost funded unknown
- b. HHW event Submitted in 2006 for 2007 or 2008. (2008 an event was completed).
  - i. Partners: Kendall County Farm Bureau
  - ii. Cost funded unknown
- c. Unwanted Medication Collection
  - i. Partners: Yorkville Police Department
  - ii. Cost funded \$1500 for Color Brochures

Kendall County has also participated in supporting Grant Requests by working with other agencies or companies by way of Support Letters and aiding them in the Grant process as required. Three support letters have been included.

- Village of Oswego aid in "E-waste Grant"
- Vintage Tech Recyclers 2006
- Vintage Tech recyclers 2007

## Source Reduction Recommendations Implemented

- SR1 Conduct solid waste audits within municipal buildings and schools to promote source reduction and to serve as an example to the business community. Goals should be set and measured at intervals to monitor this program.

This was an original recommendation from 1995 and its implementation is an ongoing process. Since the recommendations adoption informal solid waste audits have occurred. Therefore the recommendation has been implemented but not to the level of the intent of the recommendation.

- SR2 The public education program should include close interaction with school districts. Create a timetable for the establishment of a structured public education that includes schools.

Public Education programs have occurred in the past 5-years. Presentations to classes and distributing literature through different school districts have occurred. Some of the schools completed are as follows:

Plano and Yorkville 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade in conjunction with Kendall County Nature and Environmental Tour (2009)

Yorkville Grande Reserve School 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> (2008)

Yorkville Middle School tour at Settlers Hill Landfill (2006)

- SR4 Initiate programs to collect and properly dispose of household hazardous waste and promote non-toxic alternatives.

One IEPA funded HHW event occurred since 2005 update and this was in 2008. The county has continued to direct residents to the Naperville Collection site which accepts HHW from residents for over 5-years. Although old medication has been part of the HHW wastestream, recently it has been identified as a greater threat. Kendall County implemented the first full-time residential medical collection in Illinois in 2007.

- SR5 Initiate a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator or some designated member of county government. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

This recommendation has been further implemented by the creation of a Green Pages Webpage on the Kendall County Health Department website. This program over the past 5-years has included TV appearances on WAUR TV-30 (local cable channel), radio appearances on WSPY (local radio station), and approximately 6-7 newspaper articles in the Kendall County Record.

Presentations have also been given to Government organizations such as Mayors and Managers meetings, Rotary Clubs and other local leadership groups. This recommendation will be omitted due to its similarity with SR6 and R4.

- SR6 Continue a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

This recommendation is reflective of SR5 and is considered implemented along with SR5. This recommendation will be omitted due to its similarity with SR5 and R4.

- SR7 The Solid Waste Coordinator to monitor new legislation regarding source reduction such as toxic materials and white goods.

The implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. Recent Illinois legislation being monitored includes E-Waste Bills, Medication Bills and Compost legislation. This recommendation is aided by membership to the Illinois Counties Solid Waste Management Association legislative updates.

#### Recycling Recommendations Implemented

- R2 The County should encourage local governments and special agencies to purchase products made from recycled materials.

The initial implementation of the solid waste program provided large improvements in recycling and solid waste awareness within local governments. The county had publicized within general education the need to purchase products from recycled materials. This effort will be improved during future education efforts.

- R3 Adopt a recycling goal of 40% for the year 2010.

This was implemented when the County Board approved the Solid Waste Plan update in 2005. The goal has not been achieved but improvements in the recycling rate have occurred. The most recent year for data collection is 2008. The following are a list of recycling rates by years generated.

2005	16.21%
2006	17.9%
2007	31.19%
2008	37.93%

The improvement in recycling rates from 2006 to 2007 was affected by commercial recycling programs and construction and demolition recycling

program expansions. These expansions occurred due to cost of disposal exceeding the cost of recycling.

- R4 The Solid Waste Coordinator should maintain a public education program to promote recycling.

This recommendation is mirrored by SR 5 as described in previous category. Therefore the response to SR 5 is copied within R 4. This recommendation has been further implemented by the creation of a Green Pages Webpage on the Kendall County Health Department website. This program over the past 5-years has included TV appearances on WAUR TV-30 (local cable channel), radio appearances on WSPY (local radio station), and approximately 6-7 newspaper articles in the Kendall County Record. Presentations have also been given to Government organizations such as Mayors and Managers meetings, Rotary Clubs and other local leadership groups.

#### Combustion for Energy Recovery or Volume Reduction Recommendations Implemented

- COMB1 Monitor regulations relating to incineration such as siting and emission requirements

Legislation is monitored by ILCSWMA newsletter and attendance at quarterly regional County Solid Waste coordinator meetings and seminars provided by the Solid Waste Agency of North America (SWANA). The annual state convention of solid waste coordinators is also attended which highlights source reduction, which includes reducing toxic materials being purchased and disposed. Also attended the 3-day North American Waste To Energy Conference in Philadelphia in 2008.

- COMB2 Monitor IEPA clean air attainment and non-attainment status for townships of the county relating to incineration siting.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for Kendall are met for all constituents.

#### Transfer Stations Recommendations Implemented

- T1 The County should consider development of a waste transfer facility(s) in the county.

This recommendation was implemented with Resolution No. 06-06 dated March 7, 2006 where the county considered development of a Municipal Solid Waste

disposal facilities only after considering a Transfer Station within the County and deems it appropriate to consider the development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facility within the county.

#### Disposal in Landfills recommendations implemented

LD2 Evaluate the factors of public versus private ownership of landfills.

The informal evaluation continues in regards to landfill ownership. Numerous factors including politics, economics, and operation are reviewed as other landfill sites are permitted and review the effects of those siting's in regards to ownership. No specific ownership plans have been identified.

LD4 The County should consider development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facilities only after considering a Transfer Station within the County. This Municipal Solid Waste facility will adhere to all State and local regulations.

The County has, by Resolution No. 06-06 dated March 7, 2006 considered development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facilities only after considering a Transfer Station within the County and deems it appropriate to consider the development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facility within the county. This Municipal solid Waste facility will adhere to all State and Local siting regulations. This resolution replaced the LD 4 recommendation and replaced it with text in new LD 4.

LD 5 Establish feasible locations for landfills within the County.

This recommendation was implemented by Resolution No. 06-11 dated May 4, 2006 the County Board has determined that landfills may only be located in the unincorporated areas of the county.

LD 6 Host Community Benefit Agreement

4. Any Pollution Control Facility must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the County, if the county is the siting authority. (2005)
5. If the County is not the appropriate siting authority a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the siting authority. (2005)
6. Each Host community Benefit Agreement should make considerations for facilities that include materials recovery. (2004)

Many siting requirements and agreements also include a Host Community Benefit Agreement. A host agreement is used as an incentive and compensates the host community and may compensate other affected communities for environmental,

infrastructure, economic, aesthetics, and other impacts within its jurisdiction resulting from the development and operation of a new pollution control facility. It is understood that the impact of such facilities may not be limited to the Host Community.

Examples of host community benefits for consideration during the siting of a proposed pollution control facility include the following:

5. Lump sum or per ton payments to host community (per ton credits may be given to the facility for recyclables recovered from the wastestream).
6. Financial support of community departments / organizations (e.g. fire department training programs).
7. Financial support of community infrastructure improvements (e.g. construction and maintenance of roadways and public parks).
8. Guaranteed waste disposal

This recommendation was implanted during the process of 4 Pollution Control Facility applications during the 5-year period of the plan.

#### Compost Recommendations Implemented

CO 1 County to create education program to encourage residents to effectively mulch and compost yardwaste.

Educational programs in the form of leaflets. Hauler literature and newspaper articles have been completed. Also the county sponsored a Compost Bin sale in 2008 and updated the Green Pages with 1 full page on backyard composting.

CO2 Continue to monitor local compost facilities and notify the IEPA when potential violations are observed.

This recommendation has been implemented. The county ahs continued to inspect yardwaste processing facilities and has had close interaction with IEPA as required through the inspection processes.

**b. Briefly describe which recommendations were not implemented and the reasons why these were not implemented.**

Administrative Recommendations Not Implemented

- A1. Create an Intergovernmental Agreement between the County and all municipalities to collectively respond to solid waste issues within the County.

The major municipalities within the county had already taken an aggressive stance in recycling and volume based programs. Since the county had no regional facilities or preferred out of county facilities the agreement to further control wastestreams to specific areas was considered unnecessary during the previous plan timeframe.

The opportunity for the county and the municipalities to work in unison for solid waste planning and implementation in the future does make this recommendation viable for review in the next 5-years.

- A2 Create and fill the position of a full time solid waste coordinator.

This position was first filled on a part-time basis in 1994. It has continued to be a part-time position till the present. The county's program has been successful in meeting state requirements as a part-time position. At this time a full-time position is not required. Full time attention (40 hours per week) is being accomplished through the supporting staff within the Environmental Department.

- A5 Consider becoming an IEPA delegated county for enforcement and inspection activities.

This recommendation has not been implemented. The number of facilities within Kendall County where a delegation agreement is viewed a beneficial asset is 2. The county feels the 2 facilities does not provide enough benefit to undertake the delegated responsibility.

Source Reduction Recommendations Not Implemented

- SR3 The County Board to provide public recognition to businesses and industries to stimulate source reduction.

The county was to recognize businesses and industries as it prepared to issue a formal “Commercial / Institutional Recycling Ordinance”. It was decided to observe other counties success with a Commercial Industrial Recycling Ordinances prior to implementation. No decision has been reached on whether to pursue this ordinance. The recognition of businesses and industries for excellence in recycling and source reduction activities will be continued to be evaluated.

### Recycling Recommendations Not Implemented

R1 Create an implementation schedule for commercial/industrial recycling ordinance.

The county is continuing to evaluate a “Commercial / Institutional Recycling Ordinance”. It was decided to observe other counties success with a Commercial Industrial Recycling Ordinances prior to implementation. No decision has been reached on whether to pursue this ordinance.

### Combustion for Energy Recovery or for Volume Reduction Recommendations Not Implemented

COMB3 As incineration becomes more economically feasible locations should be identified and evaluated.

The economics of incineration for volume reduction or energy recovery is not presently feasible for the county. Identification and feasible locations are criteria an applicant will provide.

### Transfer Stations Recommendations Not Implemented

Most of the transfer station recommendations were to be implemented if a transfer station were to be attempted to be sited within the county. The county has had no applications for a transfer station and therefore has not implemented most of these recommendations. Recommendations T2-T7, which are listed below, were not implemented due to no formal activities dealing with a transfer station.

T2 Ensure the Transfer Station is large enough to provide adequate buffering and screened from view by a barrier or natural object for safe traffic flow, lighting, landscape plan, vehicle and equipment storage, and other ancillary operations.

T3 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be compatible with adjacent land uses and will be located near major haul roads and railroad facilities, wherever possible.

T4 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be located, aesthetic designed, and

operated to minimize dust, odor, and noise impacts to adjacent properties.

- T5 Transfer Stations must be enclosed facilities.
- T6 During the development of any Host Community Benefit Agreement, consideration should be given to materials recovery as a component of Transfer Stations.
- T7 The siting criteria outlined within Kendall County Ordinance will be followed.

#### Disposal in Landfills Recommendations Not Implemented

- LD1 Negotiate long term contracts with municipal and privately owned out of county landfills to ensure adequate disposal space is reserved at landfills currently serving the County.

This recommendation has potential flow control issues, therefore, this recommendation has not been implemented. The haulers of the waste presently handle the counties solid waste final disposal locations.

- c. Which recommendations have been adopted according to the plan schedule?

The Kendall County Solid Waste Plan has been in place since 1995 and updated three times since its first acceptance in 1995. The responses in this section will be a list of the recommendations completed according to the most recent 5-year update plan schedule and previous plans. A statement following the recommendation will clarify if the recommendation was a current plan implementation or previously implemented and still functioning successfully.

#### Administrative Recommendations implemented on schedule

- A2 Create and fill the position of a full time solid waste coordinator.

Previously partially implemented and presently partially implemented.

- A3 Complete updates, revisions, and reviews of the plan as required.

This recommendation has been implemented on schedule with the submittal of this solid waste plan update.

- A4 State, Federal, and private funding should be sought to assist supporting waste education programs.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

#### Source Reduction Recommendations Implemented on schedule

- SR1 Conduct solid waste audits within municipal buildings and schools to promote source reduction and to serve as an example to the business community. Goals should be set and measured at intervals to monitor this program.

Implemented in this plans current schedule and previous.

- SR2 The public education program should include close interaction with school districts. Create a timetable for the establishment of a structured public education that includes schools.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

- SR4 Initiate programs to collect and properly dispose of household hazardous waste and promote non-toxic alternatives.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

- SR5 Initiate a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator or some designated member of county government. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

- SR6 Continue a public education program conducted by the solid waste coordinator. This education program to include an informational clearinghouse so as to supply to the public on a regular basis.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

- SR7 The Solid Waste Coordinator to monitor new legislation regarding source reduction such as toxic materials and white goods.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

#### Recycling Recommendations Implemented on schedule

R2 The County should encourage local governments and special agencies to purchase products made from recycled materials.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

R3 Adopt a recycling goal of 40% for the year 2010.

Implemented in the plans current schedule.

R4 The Solid Waste Coordinator should maintain a public education program to promote recycling.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

Combustion for Energy Recovery or Volume Reduction Recommendations Implemented on schedule

COMB1 Monitor regulations relating to incineration such as siting and emission requirements

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

COMB2 Monitor IEPA clean air attainment and non-attainment status for townships of the county relating to incineration siting.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

Transfer Stations Recommendations Implemented on schedule

T1 The County should consider development of a waste transfer facility(s) in the county.

Implemented in the plans current schedule.

Disposal in Landfills recommendations implemented

LD2 Evaluate the factors of public versus private ownership of landfills.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

LD4 The County should consider development of a Municipal Solid Waste disposal facilities only after considering a Transfer Station within the County. This Municipal Solid Waste facility will adhere to all State and local regulations.

Implemented in the plans current schedule.

LD 5 Establish feasible locations for landfills within the County.

Implemented in the plans current schedule.

LD 6 Host Community Benefit Agreement

1. Any Pollution Control Facility must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the County, if the county is the siting authority. (2005)
2. If the County is not the appropriate siting authority a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the siting authority. (2005)
3. Each Host community Benefit Agreement should make considerations for facilities that include materials recovery. (2004)

Many siting requirements and agreements also include a Host Community Benefit Agreement. A host agreement is used as an incentive and compensates the host community and may compensate other affected communities for environmental, infrastructure, economic, aesthetics, and other impacts within its jurisdiction resulting from the development and operation of a new pollution control facility. It is understood that the impact of such facilities may not be limited to the Host Community.

Examples of host community benefits for consideration during the siting of a proposed pollution control facility include the following:

1. Lump sum or per ton payments to host community (per ton credits may be given to the facility for recyclables recovered from the wastestream).
2. Financial support of community departments / organizations (e.g. fire department training programs).
3. Financial support of community infrastructure improvements (e.g. construction and maintenance of roadways and public parks).
4. Guaranteed waste disposal

Implemented in the plans current schedule.

#### Compost Recommendations Implemented on schedule

CO 1 County to create education program to encourage residents to effectively mulch and compost yardwaste.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

- CO2 Continue to monitor local compost facilities and notify the IEPA when potential violations are observed.

Implemented in the plans current schedule and previous.

#### **d. New Schedule for non-implemented recommendations**

##### Not Implemented Administrative Recommendations new schedule

- A1. Create an Intergovernmental Agreement between the County and all municipalities to collectively respond to solid waste issues within the County.

This recommendation has been modified for the current update. The reason for the change is partially due to the ability to implement this recommendation under the current political conditions and challenges for a complex agreement of this magnitude.

- A2 Create and fill the position of a full time solid waste coordinator.

The new schedule for implementation will to continue to consider creating a full time position as workload increases within the plans next 5-year period.

- A5 Consider becoming an IEPA delegated county for enforcement and inspection activities.

The new schedule for implementation will to continue to consider becoming an IEPA delegated county within the plans next 5-year period.

##### Not Implemented Source Reduction Recommendations new schedule

- SR3 The County Board to provide public recognition to businesses and industries to stimulate source reduction.

The new schedule for implementation will include recognition on an annual basis starting in 2010.

##### Not Implemented Recycling Recommendations new schedule

R1 Create an implementation schedule for commercial/industrial recycling ordinance.

The new schedule for implementation will to continue to consider this type of recycling ordinance in the plans next 5-year period.

Not Implemented Combustion for Energy Recovery or for Volume Reduction Recommendations new schedule

COMB3 As incineration becomes more economically feasible locations should be identified and evaluated.

This recommendation will be deleted from the plan as siting responsibilities of the applicant require the individual sites be evaluated for feasibility and therefore the county identifying these locations in advance is not required.

Not Implemented Transfer Stations Recommendations new schedule

Most of the transfer station recommendations were to be implemented if a transfer station were to be attempted to be sited within the county. The county has had no applications for a transfer station and therefore has not implemented most of these recommendations. Therefore the implementation schedule will be dependant on an application being presented to the county for a transfer station. The new schedule for implementation will continue to consider these items in the plans next 5-year period.

T2 Ensure the Transfer Station is large enough to provide adequate buffering and screened from view by a barrier or natural object for safe traffic flow, lighting, landscape plan, vehicle and equipment storage, and other ancillary operations.

T3 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be compatible with adjacent land uses and will be located near major haul roads and railroad facilities, wherever possible.

T4 Ensure the Transfer Station site will be located, aesthetic designed, and operated to minimize dust, odor, and noise impacts to adjacent properties.

T5 Transfer Stations must be enclosed facilities.

T6 During the development of any Host Community Benefit Agreement, consideration should be given to materials recovery as a component of Transfer Stations.

T7 The siting criteria outlined within Kendall County Ordinance will be followed.

Not Implemented Disposal in Landfills Recommendations new schedule

LD1 Negotiate long term contracts with municipal and privately owned out of county landfills to ensure adequate disposal space is reserved at landfills currently serving the County.

This recommendation has been removed from the plan, therefore no schedule is required.

**3. Recycling program status**

a. Has the program been implemented throughout the county?

Yes

b. Has the recycling coordinator been designated to administer this program?

Yes Since 1994

c. Does the program provide for separate collection and composting of leaves?

Yes

d. Does the recycling program provide for public education and notification to foster understanding of and encourage compliance with the program?

Yes

e. Does the recycling program include provisions for compliance, including incentives and penalty?

Yes, The licensing requirement does include fines to “haulers” which do not meet the ordinance requirements.

f. Does the program include provisions for recycling the collected materials, identifying potential markets for at least three materials, and promoting the use of products made from recovered or recycled materials among businesses, newspapers, and local governments.

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1. Recycling the collected materials                      | Yes |
| 2. Identifying potential markets for at least 3 materials | No  |

The residential ordinance requires the haulers to accept recyclable items. It is expected for them to identify markets for recyclables collected.

3. Promoting the use of products made from recovered or recycled materials among businesses, newspapers, and local governments? Yes

- g. Provide any other pertinent details on the recycling program.

The program also includes one (1) used oil collection sponsored by agricultural business within the county.

**4. Current needs assessment information**

Items "b" is estimated using 98,500 population.

- |    |                                |             |
|----|--------------------------------|-------------|
| a. | MW generated per year          | 85,814 tons |
| b. | MW generation rate             | 4.77 pcd    |
| c. | MW recycled/composted per year | 32,551 tons |
| d. | MW incinerated per year        | 0 tons      |
| e. | MW landfilled per year         | 53,263 tons |

Time period for this information  
2008

**5. New and Modified recommendations and implementation schedule.**

Modified Administrative Recommendation

- A1. Create an Intergovernmental Standing Advisory Meeting between the County and all municipalities to collectively respond to solid waste issues within the County (1995).

Schedule: First meeting to be held in 2010 and annually thereafter, through 2015

This recommendation was modified to create a recommendation that ensures countywide input from all concerned parties without creating a complex intergovernmental agreement.

Modified Source Reduction Recommendation

- SR1 Offer solid waste audits within municipal buildings and schools to promote source reduction and to serve as an example to the business community. Goals should be set and measured at intervals to monitor this program (1995).

Schedule: 2010-2015  
Goal is 4 per year

This recommendation was slightly modified changing the first word from “conduct” to “offer” with the same general purpose.

### New or Modified Recycling Recommendations

R3 Adopt a recycling goal of 45% for the year 2015 (2005).

Schedule: 2015

R5 Create a Program for monitoring the Construction and Demolition Waste recycling and disposal activities within the county.

Schedule: 2010-2015

This is a new recommendation added due to this waste stream being more prominent and has been given its own category in the solid waste industry.

### New or Modified Waste to Energy and Alternative Technologies Recommendations

This section was modified to include alternative technologies within the combustion category. The term “Waste to Energy” has also replaced the “Combustion and Combustion for Energy Recovery” terms due to its acceptance within the industry.

COMB1 Monitor regulations relating to Waste to Energy and Alternative Technologies including siting and emission requirements.

Schedule: 2010 – 2015

The modification only dealt with terminology changes as discussed above.

COMB 2 All Waste-to-Energy or Alternative Technology waste processes meeting pollution control facility siting must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement

1. All Waste-to-Energy or Alternative Technology processes must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the County, if the county is the siting authority. (2010)
2. If the County is not the appropriate siting authority a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the siting authority.

3. Each Host Community Benefit Agreement should make considerations for facilities that include materials recovery.

A host community benefit agreement compensates the host community and may compensate other affected communities or districts for environmental, infrastructure, economic, aesthetics, and other impacts within its jurisdiction resulting from the development and operation of a new pollution control facility. It is understood that the impact of such facilities may not be limited to the Host Community.

Examples of host community benefits for consideration during the siting of a proposed pollution control facility include the following:

- Lump sum or per ton payments to host community (per ton credits may be given to the facility for recyclables recovered from the wastestream).
- Financial support of community departments / organizations (e.g. fire departments/library districts/Townships or impacted communities).
- Financial support of community infrastructure improvements (e.g. construction and maintenance of roadways and public parks).
- Guaranteed waste disposal
- Annual collection events for HHW, tires or etc.

This new recommendation incorporated the host agreement requirements required for other pollution control facilities to waste to energy and alternative technologies. Its schedule for implementation will be dependant on applicants for this type of facility that would required its implementation.

- COMB 4 Source and Recycling efforts should be continued by the solid waste coordinator to diminish needs for combustion disposal.

This new recommendation was included to continue the emphasis on other solid waste management practices throughout the plan. The schedule would be ongoing through the plan period.

COMB 5 Continue to investigate Alternative Technologies and educate the public and county leaders regarding these technologies.

This new recommendation was included to emphasize the importance of the new technologies in solid waste management techniques becoming available with advancing technologies. The schedule would be ongoing through the plan period.

#### New Transfer Stations Recommendations

T2 Transfer Station Host Community Benefit Agreement (2010)

1. All Transfer Stations must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the County, if the county is the siting authority.
2. If the County is not the appropriate siting authority the applicant must enter into a Host Community Benefit Agreement with the siting authority.
3. Each Host Community Benefit Agreement should make considerations for facilities that include materials recovery.

A host community benefit agreement compensates the host community and may compensate other affected communities or districts for environmental, infrastructure, economic, aesthetics, and other impacts within its jurisdiction resulting from the development and operation of a new pollution control facility. It is understood that the impact of such facilities may not be limited to the Host Community.

Examples of host community benefits for consideration during the siting of a proposed pollution control facility include the following:

- Lump sum or per ton payments to host community (per ton credits may be given to the facility for recyclables recovered from the wastestream).
- Financial support of community departments / organizations (e.g. fire departments/library districts/Townships or impacted communities).
- Financial support of community infrastructure improvements (e.g. construction and maintenance of roadways and public parks).
- Guaranteed waste disposal
- Annual collection events for HHW, tires or etc.

This new recommendation incorporated the host agreement requirements required for other pollution control facilities to Transfer Stations. Its schedule for implementation will be dependant on applicants for this type of facility that would required its implementation.

### New or Modified Landfill Disposal Recommendations

New recommendation:

LD1 No new or expanded landfills

This recommendation was incorporated due to recent numerous landfill applications within the county. This recommendation of a landfill ban is based on 3 principal issues.

Factors for this recommendation:

- A. Ground water protection, as groundwater becomes more of a diminishing resource in our area solid waste technologies that pose a groundwater risk should be avoided.
- B. Alternative technologies, solid waste technologies seem to be on the verge of some major breakthroughs that would make landfills an old solid waste methodology.
- C. Expansion of the Dekalb County landfill and potential expansion of the Environtech landfill in Grundy County temporarily provides local and adequate solid waste disposal locations for Kendall County solid waste.

### New Composting and Yardwaste Land Application Recommendations

This section was modified to include yardwaste land application within the composting category. The term “yardwaste land application” was included because this method of yardwaste management is being used within the county.

CO3 County to work with State Legislators to update present IEPA Compost and Yardwaste Land Application regulations.

This recommendation was added to direct actions in regulatory changes to better manage the growing yardwaste and other organic material management techniques.