



**MONO COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
SOLID WASTE DIVISION**

POST OFFICE BOX 457 • 74 NORTH SCHOOL STREET • BRIDGEPORT, CALIFORNIA 93517  
760.932.5440 • FAX 760.932.5441 • [monopw@mono.ca.gov](mailto:monopw@mono.ca.gov) • [www.monocounty.ca.gov](http://www.monocounty.ca.gov)

**Mono County Solid Waste Task Force**

Meeting of November 1, 2012  
1:00-3:00 p.m.  
Town of Mammoth Lakes Suite Z  
Minaret Mall, Mammoth Lakes

**MINUTES**

1. Call to order.

*1:00 p.m.*

2. Public Comment on items not on the agenda.

*No comments*

3. Update on the RFQ for a MRF feasibility and alternatives analysis, and solicitation of volunteers to serve on the RFQ review committee.

*Deadline for SOQs is Friday Nov 2. Request for volunteers—Johnny Goetz from the TOML, Lisa Isaacs and Brian Robinette as an alternate.*

4. Approval of Minutes from October 4, 2012 meeting.

*Minutes approved without changes.*

5. Discussion and possible recommendation of proposed solutions to the budget issues of the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund, including proposals to increase revenue and proposals to cut costs and/or services.

*Discussion began with some questions and explanations about A-87 costs and how they have been treated in recent years, and how there might be some possibility to re-allocate certain costs to other departments, including health department fees associated with program regulation.*

*Discussion of the schedule for taking any proposal to the Board, which will happen December 11. The Board will also see this item at a workshop November 6.*

*Discussion regarding the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund, and Enterprise Funds in general. The funds are not under a legal mandate to break even, General Fund contributions are allowed.*

*Therefore, the forgiveness of the \$1.9 million in debt is legally possible, and is one of the options that the Board will consider.*

*A brief summary of cost-cutting measures that have already occurred was provided, including staff reductions, competitive bidding in Transfer Station contract, A-87 subsidy, SW staff picking up additional responsibilities, and an audit of departmental charges. Unfortunately, the cost cutting also included a failure to invest appropriately. Long-term budget lacks reserves and set-asides for inevitable future costs, this is a major issue that needs to be addressed.*

*Outreach plan is an effort to make sure the citizens understand who is responsible for any change of fees, and do not associate gate fee increases with the waste haulers.*

*Some of the challenges of reducing costs, and the political repercussions, were discussed. The Board has traditionally not wanted to reduce the services beyond a given point, and it will be difficult to raise fees high enough to recoup costs for many of those services. At that point, it becomes a policy decision.*

*Discussion of whether the RFQ will suggest fee increases that will pay for a MRF. The answer is that it will propose costs for a given facility, from which the Board can determine how to cover the costs—either by raising revenues, or by cutting costs.*

*C&D discussion—requires just as much processing as MSW, and should be the same rate. The amount generated would help provide funding for diversion, but would not create enough to deal with all diversion issues. Operational issues were discussed, as different rates cause certain people to want to try and game the system by claiming they have one thing when they have another.*

*Facility fees may help offset some cost of operation. Questions and discussion about current transfer station fees, operations, and costs.*

*Discussion on the program history looking at the system as a whole, not looking at specific costs and specific charges. This has been the history, but the Board may want to increase some fees specifically and move to less of a system-wide approach.*

*No charge fees—discussion of current practices and the cost implications of each material—there are benefits to diversion, but real costs as well. Discussion on whether those materials may be dumped illegally.*

*Staff issues and associated impacts—what might the long-term impacts of the vacancy be? Discussion of challenges associated with regulatory compliance, litter control, wood chipping, HHW processing, other issues. If regulatory compliance becomes an issue, the vacancy would be filled but there would be savings in the interim in any case.*

*Transfer Stations—underperformance and related issues. Some of these sites are underutilized but still costs good deal to operate. This may be a good cost cutting measure, but probably will not be well-received by those representing these communities.*

*Discussion on a mandatory curbside ordinance. Questions about how it can be passed, by ordinance? What is exactly required? Prop 218 and 26 implications. Presents issues with non-exclusive waste haulers, may be opportunities for HOAs and similar groups to bulk services. Continuing discussion on whether small dumpsters could be strategically placed and utilized. There are limits on the amount of garbage that could be accepted, but it may be a viable option in the future—particularly where services may be reduced*

6. Discussion and possible recommendation on preferred methods to set aside revenues to be used for enhancement of diversion efforts and program transition.

*Reserve accounts—Diversion would focus on processing of C&D material. There is an RFQ out that seeks a consultant to determine a best course forward for this effort. The County meanwhile has determined a way to achieve 50% diversion of C&D at the landfill, by processing large chunk concrete. A diversion set-aside could go toward that effort.*

*Language of reserve accounts-what does the Town want or expect any reserve to say exactly? TOML can get something by end of week to bring to the BOS. There is an issue with the SWEF paying or funding infrastructure that is not owned by the SWEF.*

*Discussion on transition funding, and the current lack of funds to deal with many of the issues that the system is facing, and that the SWTF has been discussing.*

*Discussion on specifics of where the numbers for reserve accounts have come from—some are based on discussion and past concepts. If all of the reserves were set up, it would take approximately \$480,000 in additional revenues if the BOS forgave the debt. TOML pointed out that if they did not want the \$150k, the amount would go down considerably.*

7. Discussion of items for December agenda.

*-Formal recommendation of Solid Waste Enterprise Fund budget proposal  
-Plastic Bag ordinance*

*Discussion on best way to proceed with this proposal—hand-selecting line items versus selecting a given alternative that includes various line items. There was discussion and general consensus was that the creation of a few alternatives would be the best course forward, and would provide the BOS as well as the general public with a specific proposal to support.*

8. Adjourn to the December 6, 2012 meeting.