IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF COUNTY MEASURE "A"

If this measure is approved, it will change the basis on which the county analyzes and determines waste disposal fees from a classification based on whether a dwelling is located on a parcel to a classification based on whether waste is generated on a parcel. In addition, waste-generating parcels would be categorized on the basis of a residential equivalency reflecting the level of waste generated.

If approved, this measure will establish a solid waste disposal parcel fee in Colusa County. If established, the fee will be used to pay the principal, interest, and related charges on monies obtained by the county through the sale of certificates of participation. The parcel fee will be collected with real property taxes for 15 years. The fee will be determined each year by July 1st of that year as the consequence of a calculation by which the amount of money to be paid back to the purchasers of the certificates of participation for that year is divided by the number of Residential Equivalents assigned to all developed parcels within the county and its incorporated cities. The fees will be a lien on the real property to which they are assessed and will be collected in the same manner as real property taxes are collected.

Residential Equivalents will be assigned on the basis of one Residential Equivalent for each single-family residence with once-a-week collection of 90 gallons of garbage. Other developed parcels will be assigned pro-rated Residential Equivalent Values based on the solid waste service they receive utilizing the most recent 12 months of experience.

Revenues received by the county from the sale of the certificates of participation will be used to finance capital improvements at the Evans Road Landfill and the parcel fee revenues can be used for no purpose other than paying the cost of retiring the certificate of participation debt. The amount to be financed through fee collection in the unincorporated portion of the county and the two incorporated cities in Colusa County is estimated to be $690,000 per year. Procedures for adjusting erroneously assigned parcel charges are to be developed by county staff and approved by the board of supervisors. The measure would also make impermissible the disposal of liquid waste and sludges at any location other than the Evans Road Landfill.

DARRELL W. LARSEN
ACTING COUNTY COUNSEL

IMPARTIAL FISCAL ANALYSIS COUNTY MEASURE A

Operation of the Countywide Solid Waste system in Colusa County is currently funded through an enterprise accounting system and includes no contribution of County General Funds.

Evidence from all sources, including the California Integrated Waste Management Board and Colusa County Department of Public Works, indicates that the continued operation, including the receipt of waste at the Evans Landfill Site, will cease in the near future, unless there is an expansion of the site.

This ballot measure, which amends the Colusa County Code, establishes this parcel charge as a proposed funding source for the expansion of the Evans Landfill Site. An analysis of the current revenue stream indicates that the expansion would not be possible without some source of outside revenue to the Enterprise Fund.

Further, the permanent closing of the Evans Landfill Site would require the major expenditure of funds to close the site to the standards required by California Integrated Waste Management Board and current state law. Such closing would terminate any current revenue sources and require the funding of those closing costs from some source other than the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund.

Based on the analysis above, the rejection of this ballot measure could have significant impact on the County General Fund.

ROBERT E. KESSINGER, JR.
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER, COUNTY OF COLUSA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A

If Evans Landfill is not expanded, the closure cost is $7.3 million, and the garbage must be transported out of the County. If Evans Landfill is expanded, the cost is $6.5 million, including required clean-up costs for the existing ponds.

The State Waste Management Board has issued a notice in Order No. 91-228 to the County to close the existing ponds at Evans Landfill by November 1, 1993.

Parcel fees were proposed when it became clear that they were a vital part of the least expensive solution that would:

Provide fees that reflect landfill use. Vacant land or agricultural land that does not produce garbage will not be charged a fee.

Provide a double liner beneath the new garbage disposal area to protect groundwater and comply with State and Federal requirements.

Cleanup the old drilling mud/septage ponds that are believed to be leaking.

Secure a loan at the lowest possible interest rate.

Provide a long term plan for the landfill which does not include further loans. The life of the landfill is expected to be 30-40 years.

Continue to provide a County landfill that is locally controlled.

The plan that was selected meets all the above conditions. The conditions and the solution were selected during a series of public meetings held between July 1992 and January 1993. The meetings included both City Councils, the Board of Supervisors and the public.

The plan provides for action now and allows flexibility in the future. The plan includes setting aside money for future expenses as the landfill space is used. If new opportunities arise to provide less costly or improved service, they can be evaluated against the plan in place.

KAY K. NORDYKE

W.D. MILLS

PATTI ARCAND SCOFIELD

WILLIAM R. WAITE

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A

VOTE NO ON MEASURE A

Measure A says there are only two alternatives: taxpayers pay 6.5 Million; taxpayers pay 7.3 Million. Taxpayers against measure A say there are other alternatives: the well diggers who caused the problem can pay to fix it; their insurers can pay to fix it; the state and federal hazardous site cleanup funds can pay to fix it. Measure A has the taxpayers paying to clean up someone else's mess, without examining the alternatives.

The order to "close the ponds": that order is based on the supervisors' plan to volunteer the taxpayers to pay the cleanup costs without asking the voters first. A vote no on Measure A means they must submit another plan. That plan can be identifying those responsible for the hazardous waste and to obtain state aid in compelling those responsible to clean it up. Those responsible are well drilling companies still operating in the valley. The county may have had insurance in the 1970's that would either help in the cost of cleanup or in identifying responsible parties.

Parcel fees: they are not a part of the least expensive solution they are a way of shifting well drilling costs to the taxpayer.

Public hearings: were held, but alternatives were not presented. The supervisors simply assumed cleaning up someone else's mess was the taxpayers job. Vote no, tells them to think again.

Future flexibility: Measure A is as flexible as your wallet.

Vote no.

NATHANAEL L. McCOY

ROBERT C. FROH

BUTLER R. FERRIER, JR.

JOHN A. ROGERS

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A

Vote no on measure A

Ordinance 564 is an attempt by the Board of Supervisors to bypass the voters of Colusa County and cover up past mistakes.

Ordinance 564 states in part: "the cost...Should be borne directly by those who create the waste". But it does not do that. Drilling mud, containing hazardous material deposited into ponds at the dump by gas drilling companies over the years, is the waste problem at Evans landfill.

Ordinance 564 volunteers taxpayers to pay $6.5 Million plus interest to clean up a problem the well drillers created. Its cost is financed by "certificates of participation" (cop's). They are loans secured by private property, all property owners would pay increased taxes based on the present amount of waste generated on their property. Those who created the waste pay nothing. "Cop's" is a way government avoids taxpayer control over tax increase by calling them something else.

There are alternatives: insurance, under policies paid for in the 1970's and 1980's; state and federal hazardous site cleanup funds; prosecution of those responsible; or covering the mud ponds to keep contaminates dry to prevent leaching, to suggest a few.

Defeating measure A sends the supervisors back to the drawing board to find alternatives to the taxpayers paying the freight of private gas well operations.

Vote no.

NATHANAEL L. McCOY

ROBERT C. FROH

JOHN A. ROGERS

BUTLER R. FERRIER Jr.

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A

Without the Evans Landfill expansion, the drilling muds must be disposed of in an approved out-of-County lined facility at a cost of $7.3 million. If the landfill is expanded, the cleanup of the ponds is included in the $6.5 million, and the County still has a landfill.

The drilling muds were accepted at the landfill to generate revenues to keep the gate fees free for the local users. The drilling muds were derived from local wells which generate tax revenues within the County.

The drilling muds are nonhazardous material, but must be disposed of in a lined facility. There are no State or Federal funds available for cleanup of nonhazardous material. Litigation may provide some cleanup funds for the drilling muds, but not in time to be able to close the ponds by November 1, 1993. The drilling muds are mixed with garbage and septage, making it difficult to allocate the responsibility for the cost of the cleanup. It is important to realize that litigation of the cleanup of the ponds will not provide for landfill expansion; only the users of the landfill can provide those funds.

The Certificates of Participation will provide for the landfill expansion, cleanup of the ponds, closure of the solid waste unit, reasonable gate fees and long-term disposal options.

PATTI ARCAND SCOFIELD

KAY K. NORDYKE

WILLIAM R. WAITE

WILLIAM D. MILLS