North Richmond
Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee
Joint Expenditure Planning Committee

Friday, July 28, 2006
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Richmond City Hall Chambers
1401 Marina Way South
Richmond, CA 94804

Members:
Richmond City Councilmember Nathaniel Bates, Chair
Incorporated Area NRMAC Representative Lee Jones, Vice Chair
Unincorporated Area NRMAC Representative Dr. Henry Clark
Contra Costa County Supervisor John Gioia
Richmond City Councilmember Richard Griffin
Richmond City Councilmember Maria Viramontes
Unincorporated Area NRMAC Representative Joe Wallace

Meeting Agenda:
1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public Comment on any item not on the agenda (not to exceed 2 minutes)
3. Review and Approve April 6, 2006 Meeting Notes/Minutes
4. Presentation - Committee Resource Binder and Website
6. Consider Proposed Modification to Primary Funding Area Map
7. Consider Proposed Funding for On-going Committee Administration/Staffing
9. Set Date and Possibly Agenda for Next Meeting

Agendas, meeting notes and other information regarding this committee can be found online at:
www.co.contra-cost.ca.us/depart/cd/recycle/committee -or- www.cccrecycle.org/committee

The North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Joint Expenditure Planning Committee will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend the Committee’s meeting. Please call or e-mail Committee Staff (John Gregory, Contra Costa County, (925) 335-1089, jgreg@cao.cccounty.us) at least 72 hours before the meeting.
North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee
Joint Expenditure Planning Committee

Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 6, 2006
3:30 pm -5:00 pm
Richmond City Hall Chambers
1401 Marina Way South
Richmond, CA 94804

Members in Attendance:
Contra Costa County Supervisor John Gioia
Richmond City Councilmember Richard Griffin
Richmond City Councilmember Maria Viramontes
Incorporated Area Representative Lee Jones, Vice Chair
Unincorporated Area Representative Joseph Wallace

Members Absent:
Richmond City Councilmember Nathaniel Bates, Chair
Unincorporated Area Representative Dr. Henry Clark

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Public Comment
Robert Kochly, Contra Costa County District Attorney provided brief verbal presentation summarizing points in his memorandum to the Committee dated April 4, 2006 pertaining to potential funding for a prosecutor. The District Attorney indicated support for use of Mitigation Fee revenue to partially fund a Community Prosecutor that could work on illegal dumping cases as well as broad range of issues that affect the quality of life for North Richmond residents. He also indicated that his office had began discussions with John Eastman, Richmond City Attorney regarding the City’s interest in designated local prosecutor.

3. Review and Approve February 2, 2006 minutes
Approved

4. Explain Revised Resource Binder and Website Update
Committee did not consider this item before meeting adjourned.

5. Present Tonnage and Revenue Projection
Committee did not consider this item before meeting adjourned.

6. Describe Status of Transfer Station
Committee did not consider this item before meeting adjourned.
7. Revisit Service Area Map-focus  
Committee did not consider this item before meeting adjourned.

8. Consider Illegal Dumping Strategies  
Staff provided brief overview of the 35 potential Illegal Dumping Strategies included in the Summary Table included in the Committee’s packets. These 35 Strategies fell within one of the following five categories: Prevention, Education, Abatement, Enforcement or Other. The Committee consolidated these five categories into three groupings: Prevention & Education, Abatement & Enforcement and Community Investment. **The Committee voted to split funding/budget for the current two-year Expenditure Plan cycle between the three groupings, as shown below:**

- Prevention & Education (20%)
- Abatement & Enforcement (60%)
- Community Investment (20%)

**The Committee voted to consider funding the following twenty-one Strategies at the next meeting and directed staff to prepare cost estimates for each one:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention &amp; Education</th>
<th>Abatement &amp; Enforcement</th>
<th>Community Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On-Call/Bulky Clean-Ups</td>
<td>10. City/County Pick-up from Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Community Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neighborhood Clean-Ups</td>
<td>11. Vacant Lot Clean-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mandatory Subscription</td>
<td>13. Code Enforcement Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Services Coordinator</td>
<td>14. Graffiti Abatement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bilingual Education Coordinator</td>
<td>15. Illegal Dumping Investigator/Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Relations Campaign</td>
<td>16. Increase Nighttime Patrols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public Service Announcements</td>
<td>17. Surveillance Cameras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee voted not to fund Street Lighting since there are entities (e.g. PG & E) already responsible for maintaining street lights. **Although the Committee voted not to fund a half-time Bilingual Education Coordinator, they did direct staff to come back with cost estimate for Spanish translation services related to preparing bilingual education and outreach materials.** The Committee indicated that they did not see need for separate funding of Sting Operations since these could be conducted by proposed Illegal Dumping Investigator/Officer. The Committee did feel that use of the Sheriff’s Annex and maximizing Illegal Dumping Penalties were worthwhile Strategies, however they did not feel that dedicated funding was needed to move forward.
9. **Provide Staff Direction Regarding Soliciting Community Input and Strategy Development**
   Committee directed staff to prepare draft Expenditure Plan budget for the twenty strategies approved by the Committee under Item 8 and bring back to the Committee for further consideration.

10. **Set Agenda and Possibly Date / Location for Next Meeting**
    Committee directed staff to set next meeting date upon completion of research and development of draft Expenditure Plan budget for those Strategies approved by Committee under Item 8.
## North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
<th>Processible Tons</th>
<th>MSW Tons</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/3/2006</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>$52,044.71</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2006</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>$7,897.00</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>20,364</td>
<td>Supplemental Payment (due to reclassification of some waste types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2006</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>$80,886.00</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>27,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2006</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>$76,036.26</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>25,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2006</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>$106,719.00</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>36,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Grand Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$323,582.97</td>
<td>15,728</td>
<td>110,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,895.74</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>27,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WCCSL Bulk Material Processing Center/Golden Bear Transfer Station Mitigation Fee

**Republic Services' Projections - 2006 (REVISED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Waste Mitigation Fee</th>
<th>$ 2.83 Per Ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processibles Mitigation Fee(^1)</td>
<td>$ 0.77 Per Ton (if gate rate is more than $10.24/ton) 7% Gross Revenue (if gate rate is less than or equal to $10.24/ton)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Daily Tonnage(^2)</th>
<th>Annual Tonnage(^2)</th>
<th>Processibles Mitigation Revenue ($0.77/ton)</th>
<th>Solid Waste Mitigation Revenue ($2.83/ton)</th>
<th>Projected Annual Revenue(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green &amp; Wood Waste</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31,137</td>
<td>$ 23,975.49</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 23,975.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt &amp; Concrete(^3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>$ 1,764.07</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,764.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet/Dusty Material (except WCWD biosolids)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCWD Biosolids</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>$ 3,593.59</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,593.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Reclamation (waste soil &amp; dredged materials)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Solid Waste</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>260,747</td>
<td>$ 737,914.01</td>
<td>$ 737,914.01</td>
<td>$ 737,914.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>828</strong></td>
<td><strong>298,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 29,333.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 737,914.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 767,247.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFERENCES**

1. Currently no processible items are charged under $10.24 per ton and therefore subject to the $0.77 per ton fee rather than 7% gross revenue (as of 2/24/2006)
2. Tonnage and Revenue Projections originally provided by Jim Oppelt, Controller - Golden Bear Transfer Station/Republic Services (e-mail message dated 2/24/2006) and revisions provided by Ed Skelly (e-mail message dated 7/17/2006)
3. Including building material wastes, packaging rubble resulting from construction, remodeling, repair, demolition.
### WCCSL Bulk Material Processing Center/Golden Bear Transfer Station Mitigation Fee

**Republic Services' Projections - 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Daily Tonnage</th>
<th>Annual Tonnage</th>
<th>Processibles Mitigation Revenue ($0.77/ton)</th>
<th>Solid Waste Mitigation Revenue ($2.83/ton)</th>
<th>Projected Annual Revenue $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green &amp; Wood Waste</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31,137</td>
<td>$23,975.49</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$23,975.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt &amp; Concrete</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>$1,764.07</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,764.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet/Dusty Material (except WCWD biosolids)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCWD Biosolids</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>$3,593.59</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,593.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Reclamation (waste soil &amp; dredged materials)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Solid Waste</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>255,531</td>
<td>$723,151.46</td>
<td>$723,151.46</td>
<td>$723,151.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>813</strong></td>
<td><strong>293,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,333.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>$723,151.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>$752,484.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFERENCES**

1. No processible items are charged under $10.24 per ton and therefore subject to the $0.77 per ton fee rather than 7% gross revenue (as of 7/17/2006)
2. Tonnage and Revenue Projections originally provided by Jim Oppelt, Controller - Golden Bear Transfer Station/Republic Services (e-mail message dated 2/24/2006) and revisions provided by Ed Skelly (e-mail message dated 7/17/2006)
3. Including building material wastes, packaging rubble resulting from construction, remodeling, repair, demolition.
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STAFF REPORT
North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee
Joint Expenditure Planning Committee

MEETING DATE: July 28, 2006
AGENDA ITEM: 7
SUBJECT: Proposed Funding for On-going Administration and Staffing

RECOMMENDATION(S)

APPROVE inclusion of funding in the amount of $19,740 for a portion of the administrative staff costs related to the development, implementation and oversight of the 2006/2007 North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan.

BACKGROUND

Currently, this Committee is being staffed by a combination of County and City staff. The on-going staffing of this Committee and the development, implementation and oversight of the Expenditure Plan will require more consistent staff effort than can be subsidized by existing budgets of City and County departments involved in staffing this Committee.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Committee approve funding a portion of the administrative staff costs related to the implementation and oversight of the Expenditure Plan. Specifically, staff requests that $19,740 be allocated in the 2006/2007 Expenditure Plan Budget to cover a share of staff costs associated with the overall administration of the Expenditure Plan. This amount represents only a portion of the actual staff costs related to Plan development and oversight. The remainder of administrative costs will be covered by existing budgets of City and County agencies involved in administration of the Expenditure Plan.

The recommended allocation amount of $19,740 was derived from an Administrative Analyst’s pay scale in the City of Richmond. Using that pay scale, the funding will cover 420 hours for the two-year Expenditure Plan period. The City has an Administrative Analyst which is prepared to handle the majority of the Expenditure Plan implementation.

If approved, this funding will only be used to reimburse City and County for actual staff costs directly resulting from the development, implementation and oversight of the 2006/2007 Expenditure Plan.

Staff has included the recommended allocation of $19,740 in the proposed 2006/2007 Expenditure Plan Budget to be presented at the July 28, 2006 meeting and included in the Committee’s meeting packet (Agenda Item 8).
MEETING DATE: July 28, 2006
AGENDA ITEM: 8
SUBJECT: Proposed Expenditure Plan for Adoption or Further Direction

RECOMMENDATION(S)

APPROVE proposed 2006/2006 North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan and direct respective staff to schedule recommended approval of Expenditure Plan before the Richmond City Council and Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors.

BACKGROUND

This Committee was formed pursuant to the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and County for the specific purpose of preparing a recommended two year Expenditure Plan. This Expenditure Plan provides a means to jointly administer the Mitigation Fee funding for the benefit of the host community (incorporated and unincorporated North Richmond area).

The Expenditure Plan is subject to final approval of the Richmond City Council and the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors. In the event that a two year expenditure plan is not adopted by the Richmond City Council and the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, the Mitigation Fee monies shall be divided equally between the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County and shall be spent to mitigate the impacts of the Bulk Materials Processing Center project on the host community.

At the April 6, 2006 meeting, the Committee directed staff to prepare cost estimates for the following twenty-one strategies:

Prevention & Education
1. On-Call Clean-Ups
2. Neighborhood Clean-Ups
3. Voucher System
4. Mandatory Subscription
5. Community Services Coordinator
6. Bilingual Education Coordinator
7. Public Relations Campaign
8. Public Service Announcements
9. Printed Education & Outreach Materials

Abatement & Enforcement
10. City/County Pick-up from Right-of-Way
11. Vacant Lot Clean-up
12. Vacant Lot Fencing
13. Code Enforcement Staff
14. Graffiti Abatement
15. Illegal Dumping Investigator/Officer
16. Increase Nighttime Patrols
17. Surveillance Cameras
18. Reward System
19. Illegal Dumping Prosecutor

Community Investment
20. Beautification
21. Community Involvement

Although the Committee voted for “Mandatory Subscription” (Strategy # 4 above), it is not included in the proposed Expenditure Plan because staff has learned that no additional funding is needed at this time to aid in enforcing mandatory garbage service. The County’s Environmental Health Department has recently received approval to recruit additional technicians, using fees collected from landfills, to help enforce the County’s Health Code, including the Mandatory Subscription Ordinance.

In the process of developing the proposed Budget for the remaining twenty strategies, several strategies were combined due to their inter-relationships. Additionally, several strategies were renamed to better reflect the proposed activities. The specific discrepancies between the strategies voted on by the Committee at the April 6th meeting and the proposed Expenditure Plan before the Committee on July 28th all fall within the Prevention & Education category and are summarized below:

- “On-call Clean-Ups” (Strategy # 1 above) has been renamed “Bulky Clean-Ups” (Strategy #1 in proposed Expenditure Plan)
- “Mandatory Subscription” removed (Strategy # 4 above)
- “Bilingual Education Coordinator” (Strategy # 6 above) has been renamed to “Bilingual Outreach Services” (Strategy #5 in proposed Expenditure Plan). Although the Committee voted not to fund a half-time Bilingual Education Coordinator, they did direct staff to come back with cost estimate for Spanish translation services related to preparing bilingual education and outreach materials.
- “Public Service Announcements” (Strategy # 8 above) and “Printed Education and Outreach Materials” (Strategy # 9 above) have been incorporated into the “Public Relations Campaign” (Strategy # 6 in proposed Expenditure Plan).

Additional details regarding the Committee’s direction pertaining to the strategies are contained in the minutes from the April 6th meeting, which are included in the Committee’s packet (Agenda Item 3).

The proposed Expenditure Plan Budget is based on revenue and cost estimates with multiple variables. Therefore, it is likely that some adjustments will be necessary to accommodate variations between estimated and actual revenue/costs. Flexibility has been incorporated into the proposed Expenditure Plan to maximize efficiency in the administration of the Plan. Staff has designed this flexibility within certain parameters consistent with the Committee’s previous direction.

ATTACHMENT(S):
2006/2007 North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan and Budget Table

D:\Illegal Dumping\BMPC Mitigation Fee Committee\Jul 28 2006 Meeting\StaffReport-ExpPlan.doc
INTRODUCTION

The Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee was established as a result of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated November 2003 for the WCCSL Bulk Materials Processing Center (BMPC) and Related Actions (Project). The Project involved new and expanded processing and resource recovery operations on both the incorporated and unincorporated area of the Project site, which the EIR concluded would impact the host community. To mitigate this impact Mitigation Measure 4-5 called for a Mitigation Fee to benefit the host community, described as follows:

“Mitigation Fee. The facility operator shall pay a Mitigation Fee of an amount to be determined by the applicable permitting authority(ies) to defray annual costs associated with collection and disposal of illegally dumped waste and associated impacts in North Richmond and adjacent areas. The mitigation fee should be subject to the joint-control of the City and County and should be collected on all solid waste and processible materials received at the facility consistent with the existing mitigation fee collected at the Central IRRF.”

In July 2004, the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreeing to jointly administer Mitigation Fee monies collected from the BMPC for the benefit of the incorporated and unincorporated North Richmond area.

This Committee was formed pursuant to the terms of the MOU for the specific purpose of preparing a recommended two year Expenditure Plan. This Expenditure Plan provides a means to jointly administer the Mitigation Fee funding for the benefit of the host community, as described in the EIR. The Expenditure Plan is subject to final approval of the Richmond City Council and the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors.

BUDGET

The attached Budget Table is incorporated herein by reference. The Budget was developed based on revenue estimates with multiple variables (e.g. number of tons of recovered materials vs. solid waste, per ton gate rate charged and amount of CPI-adjusted per ton Mitigation Fee). Revenue projections may deviate from those provided by Republic and used to prepare the attached Budget Table.
It is likely that some adjustments will be necessary to accommodate variations between estimated and actual revenue as well as disparity between estimated and actual costs for non-fixed cost strategies. Adjustments may be needed due to under-utilization of a particular program if estimated expenditure was based on per unit cost. If the number of units allocated to a particular line item are not exhausted, the remaining funding would need to be redistributed within that expenditure category.

This Expenditure Plan has been designed to maximize efficiency in the administration of the Plan. The Budget includes some line items that are based on fixed costs, however to provide flexibility other line items can be adjusted if needed. The attached Budget Table identifies whether the expenditure amount for each strategy is fixed, based on per unit cost or designed to fit within budget.

If approved, this Expenditure Plan authorizes Staff to make adjustments for certain line items if needed to account for budget shortfalls or overages, being mindful of the Committee’s direction to maintain the funding split over the two-year Expenditure Plan outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Funding Split</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Education</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatement &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This flexibility will allow the City and County to avoid the delays and costs associated with amending the Expenditure Plan. Amendments would only be proposed by Staff if absolutely necessary due to problems adjusting expenditures within each Category consistent with the Committee’s direction. Amending the Expenditure Plan will require Staff to convene this Committee as well as seek the approval of the City Council and Board of Supervisors.

**DESCRIPTION OF STRATEGIES RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Funding allocations recommended below are based on the attached Budget Table. The funding allocation amounts are for the two-year Expenditure Plan period unless otherwise identified (e.g. calendar year 2007).

**PREVENTION & EDUCATION**

1. **Bulky Clean-ups**
   - Fund subsidy program to provide residents in the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area with on-call pick-up service for bulky items that are not accepted in the current on-call clean-ups through Richmond Sanitary Service (RSS)
   - Cost for each on-call pick-up of bulky items/extra waste is $41 which does not include the disposal charge which varies based on the item and
quantity (e.g. non-freon appliances = $25/ea, mattress/sofa = $17.50/ea, etc.)
• Recommended allocation of $32,800 would subsidize 800 bulky item pick-ups (flat pick-up fee only, residents still responsible for disposal charge)

2. Neighborhood Clean-ups
• Fund neighborhood clean-up events per year in the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area
• Explore feasibility of providing one or more events exclusively for creek clean-up and/or bulky items and other materials not accepted through the on-call clean-ups (e.g. tires)
• Cost for neighborhood clean-ups can vary significantly, three neighborhood clean-ups recently provided in the City of Richmond averaged $9,000 each
• Recommended allocation of $18,000 would fund one or more clean-up events depending primarily on quantity of waste accepted

3. Voucher System
• Fund subsidy program to provide residents in the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area with vouchers for disposal at Republic's landfill/transfer station on Parr Blvd.
• Explore feasibility of property clean-up vouchers that could be given to residents in these areas that are unable to remove waste from their property due to age or disability
• City of San Pablo provides residents with up to eight $5 vouchers per household per year upon request, residents must prove residency when picking up vouchers at City Hall and when redeeming vouchers at landfill gate (vouchers do not expire, however RSS only receives the subsidy for vouchers that are actually redeemed)
• Recommended allocation of $64,000 would subsidize 12,800 vouchers ($5 each)

4. Community Services Coordinator
• Fund full-time Community Services Coordinator through the Community Housing and Development Corporation of North Richmond (existing position being funded by County through 2006)
• Community Services Coordinator handles various responsibilities related to illegal dumping and blight in North Richmond including but not limited to:
  o respond to 1-800-No Dumping calls regarding illegal dumping in North Richmond,
  o coordinate with RSS & Sheriff's Office to identify/notify individuals potentially responsible for illegal dumping within the Hot Spot Route, and
  o act as liaison between the community, RSS, City and County regarding illegal dumping and related issues
• Recommended allocation of $69,350 would fund this position (including salary/benefits/overhead) for calendar year 2007

5. Bilingual Outreach Services
• Fund bilingual outreach services on a contract basis to:
  o prepare Spanish education & outreach materials
  o handle Spanish speaking calls to 1-800-No Dumping from North Richmond area
  o identify opportunities to involve Hispanic community (e.g. attend Hispanic community meetings/events) in fight against illegal dumping and blight
• Recommended allocation of $20,000 would fund an undetermined amount of bilingual services depending on need/usage and type/cost of service

6. Public Outreach Campaign
• Fund establishment of a public outreach campaign directed at reducing illegal dumping and blight in North Richmond
• Hire private consultant to help define approach and design campaign, including exploring the effectiveness of Oakland’s campaign that used humor to gain public support and assistance related to illegal dumping (approximate cost of Oakland’s campaign was $200,000)
• Elements of the public outreach campaign may include, but not limited to:
  o emphasis on positive imagery (children, community, humor, etc.)
  o door-to-door outreach effort targeting areas subject to frequent dumping requesting community’s assistance to report illegal dumping and/or independent hauler activities
  o inform community members regarding exact details are needed when reporting illegal dumping and who to contact
  o billboards in community which is changed periodically highlighting on-call clean-ups, HHW facility, how to report illegal dumping, etc.
  o public service announcements (PSAs) in English, Spanish and Laotian and broadcast on CCTV and cable networks
  o printed education & outreach materials in English, Spanish and Laotian, which could include: West County specific guide similar to Contra Costa Reuse and Recycling Guide, new/revised brochures (e.g. County’s Illegal Dumping Brochures & Richmond’s Good Neighbor Brochure), periodic community newsletter about illegal dumping/blight issues, advertisements in Contra Costa Times and other West County publications (listing illegal dumping prosecutions, highlighting educational information that is targeted for season or current events, etc.)
  o identify most effective methods of distribution (eliminate approaches that have not been effective enough in the past)
• Recommended allocation of $95,848 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)
ABATEMENT & ENFORCEMENT

7. City/County Pick-up from Right-of-Way
   • Fund consolidated pick-up program for illegal dumping in the public right-of-way located within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area to supplement similar services provided by RSS in the designated Hot Spot Route
   • Consolidating pick-up within the right of way in unincorporated & incorporated areas using the City of Richmond Public Works staff is expected to create a stable level of service, minimize delays and maximize efficiencies
   • City would pick-up of items from public right-of-way located outside of the RSS Hot Spot Route as well as items not suitable for collection in the compactor truck used to service the RSS Hot Spot Route (Hot Spot Route referrals would provided to the City by the Community Services Coordinator)
   • Recommended allocation of $146,000 would fund incremental cost for City to provide pick-up in the unincorporated & incorporated areas two days per week

8. Vacant Lot Clean-up
   • Fund clean-up of illegal dumping on vacant lots within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area where existing code enforcement processes prove to be inadequate
   • Prior to cleaning up vacant lots, require property owners to sign contract agreeing to fence their property and sign waivers allowing clean-up of waste on property
   • Vacant lot clean-ups (abatements) handled by the County cost an average of $2,000 per lot, however the actual costs can vary significantly
   • Recommended allocation of $40,000 would fund undetermined number of vacant lots depending on the amount of illegally dumped waste on each lot

9. Vacant Lot Fencing
   • Fund fencing of vacant lots where chronic dumping occurs within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area when existing fencing ordinance provisions prove to be inadequate
   • Establish process to expedite the fencing of certain vacant lots as needed to address unique circumstances (e.g. ordinance provisions require delay and specific location poses high-risk, repeated dumping of particularly harmful wastes, etc.)
   • Prior to fencing vacant lots, require property owners to sign contract agreeing to maintain fence and sign waivers allowing installation of fence on their property
Vacant lots fenced by the County cost an average of $4,500 per lot, however the actual costs can vary significantly depending primarily on the size of the lot.

Recommended allocation of $90,000 would fund fencing of an undetermined number of vacant lots, if the cost was consistent with the average mentioned above it would fund 20 fences.

10. **Code Enforcement Staff**

- Fund additional full-time City code enforcement position, to assist with vacant lot abatements and fencing as well as other building/zoning violations related to illegal dumping.
- Recommended allocation of $129,097 would fund this position (including salary/benefits/overhead) for calendar year 2007.

11. **Graffiti Abatement**

- Fund consolidated graffiti abatement program for graffiti visible from the public right-of-way located within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area.
- Consolidating graffiti abatement services through the City of Richmond Public Works staff is expected to create a stable level of service, minimize delays and maximize efficiencies.
- Funding removal of graffiti is intended to supplement not replace existing local ordinance requirements (e.g. property owner or parent responsible for clean-up).
- Prior to removing graffiti located on private property written approval of property owner may be required pursuant to local ordinance(s).
- Recommended allocation of $58,240 would fund incremental cost for City to provide graffiti abatement services in the unincorporated & incorporated areas two days per week.

12. **Illegal Dumping Investigator/Officer**

- Fund new full-time illegal dumping investigator/officer to work within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area to:
  - conduct illegal dumping surveillance and investigations
  - build & file cases specific to instances of commercial dumping, which are suitable for prosecution
  - conduct targeted sting operations to catch illegal dumpers (law enforcement strike-team(s) may also be available to conduct sting operations)
- Recommended allocation of $137,000 would fund full-time Sheriff Deputy on per diem basis and purchase of vehicle equipped with necessary emergency equipment.

13. **Increase Nighttime Patrols**

- Fund increased nighttime patrols within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area to target specific locations/timeframes where illegal dumping occurs most regularly.
• Using private security firm for nighttime patrols would be the most cost effective means of supplementing existing patrols by local law enforcement
• Recommended allocation of $58,240 would fund one private security officer working approximately 20 hours per week

14. Surveillance Cameras
• Fund surveillance cameras program within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area to target specific locations where illegal dumping occurs most regularly
• Determine if more cost effective to purchase surveillance system(s) or hire private firm to manage surveillance system
• Factors that affect the cost to install, maintain and operate a surveillance system includes: types of cameras, number of locations to be monitored, quantities of cameras needed per location, property owner approval, adjusting settings/angle, operator training, retrieval/review of photographic evidence (wireless or film) as well as relocation and repair as needed
• The following would be considered prior to selecting the type of surveillance cameras to be purchased:
  o outcome of City’s surveillance camera system(s) RFP
  o utilize CARB’s surveillance camera system on a trial basis to test a high-quality surveillance system and determine whether such a system would be effective to aid in prosecuting actual instances of illegal dumping in the North Richmond area
  o potential of low quality surveillance camera systems to act as deterrent
• Recommended allocation of $118,418 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)

15. Reward System
• Fund system to provide monetary rewards to individuals that provide information leading to the successful prosecution of illegal dumping cases
• Rewards would be used for cases that do not fall within the reward provisions of local and state laws as described below:
  o California law provides for reward of 50% of the fine collected to person(s) that provide information leading to conviction of illegal dumping cases (limited to violations of Section 374.3 of the Penal Code, which is not applicable to littering, hazardous waste or dumping into creeks or other waters of the State)
  o City Manager is authorized and directed to pay as a reward a sum equal to 25% of the penalty or fine paid for information leading to the successful abatement of nuisances
• Recommended allocation of $30,000 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)
16. Illegal Dumping Prosecutor
- Fund portion of new community prosecutor to work within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area to build cases related to illegal dumping with special emphasis on instances of commercial dumping
- City has budgeted to fund a community prosecutor which could dedicate a portion of time to work on cases within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area
- Recommended allocation of $ 93,000 would fund community prosecutor working approximately 10 hours per week

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT

17. Beautification

A. Neighborhood Landscaping Projects
- Fund landscaping projects within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area, specific projects would be selected after taking the following into consideration:
  - community input regarding needs/priorities
  - beautification projects that do not have existing funding sources
  - regular pruning to maintain any vegetation that is compromising visibility in locations used for illegal dumping
  - new community gardens (recruit community and/or school group to start project) on sites subject to dumping
- Recommended allocation of $12,000 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)

B. Servicing Additional Street Cans
- Fund collection services for three new street cans within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area (cans to be purchased with grant obtained by Keep North Richmond Beautiful)
- Recommended allocation of $1,136 would fund weekly collection for three street cans for calendar year 2007

18. Community Involvement

A. Stipends
- Fund stipends to West Contra Costa Unified School District students and Youth Build members for illegal dumping abatement and beautification programs within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area
- Recommended allocation of $40,000 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)
B. **Mentorship Program**
- Fund mentoring program within the Mitigation Fee Primary Funding Area, the program should be designed after taking the following into consideration:
  - community input regarding needs/priorities
  - existing programs in the North Richmond area that incorporate mentoring opportunities
  - potential opportunities to customize new or existing mentoring programs to specifically aid in efforts to combat illegal dumping and blight
- Recommended allocation of $31,862 could be adjusted if needed to fit within the budget (e.g. reduced to accommodate revenue below the projected amount)

C. **Shields Reid Playground Equipment**
- Fund purchase and installation of new playground equipment for Shields Reid park
- Recommended allocation of $125,000 is a one-time fixed cost provided by the City Public Works Department

D. **Shields Reid Soccer Field Lighting**
- Fund purchase and installation of new light fixtures as well as restoration of existing light fixtures for Shields Reid park
- Recommended allocation of $15,000 is an estimated one-time cost provided by Keep North Richmond Beautiful

E. **Third Street Ballfield Sod Repairs**
- Fund repair and replacement of damaged portions of sod on the Third Street Ballfield
- Recommended allocation of $25,000 is a one-time fixed cost provided by the City Public Works Department

F. **Third Street Ballfield Irrigation**
- Fund irrigation system for the Third Street Ballfield
- Recommended allocation of $50,000 is a one-time fixed cost provided by the City Public Works Department

ATTACHMENT: Budget Table – North Richmond Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan (2006-2007)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Biannual Expenditure (2006-2007)</th>
<th>Funding Allocation (Projected Biannual Revenue)</th>
<th>Total Expense for Activity *</th>
<th>Per Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units Included in 2-Year Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bulky Clean-ups</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
<td>Pick-up = $41 (not including Disposal)</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhood Clean-ups</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>20-yard Debris Box = $265 (City) OR $526.02 + $110.44/ton over 4 tons (County)</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>(2 events based on City average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Voucher System</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>Disposal Voucher = $5</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Services Coordinator</td>
<td>$69,350</td>
<td>$69,350</td>
<td>Annual Labor = $69,350</td>
<td>$69,350</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bilingual Outreach Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>can be designed to fit within available budget</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Relations Campaign (includes PSAs &amp; Outreach Materials)</td>
<td>$95,848</td>
<td>$95,848</td>
<td>can be designed to fit within available budget</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City/County Pick-up from Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
<td>Per Hour = $93.60 (approx)</td>
<td>$93.60</td>
<td>1560 (15 hours/week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vacant Lot Clean-up</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Lot = $2,000 (average)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vacant Lot Fencing</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Fence = $4,500 (average)</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Code Enforcement Staff</td>
<td>$129,097</td>
<td>$129,097</td>
<td>Annual Salary = $129,097</td>
<td>$129,097</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Graffiti Abatement</td>
<td>$58,240</td>
<td>$58,240</td>
<td>Per Hour = $37.33 (approx)</td>
<td>$37.33</td>
<td>1560 (15 hours/week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping Investigator/Officer</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>Per Hour = $25 + Vehicle = $33,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>4160 hours + 1 vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increase Nighttime Patrols</td>
<td>$58,240</td>
<td>$58,240</td>
<td>Per Hour = $28</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>2080 (20 hours/week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Surveillance Cameras</td>
<td>$118,418</td>
<td>$118,418</td>
<td>Camera = $2,500 (approx)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>49 (approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Reward = $1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping Prosecutor</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>Annual Quarter-Time Salary = $46,500</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
<td>2 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total cost for labor/per unit items calculated for 2-year period.

Prevention & Education:

- Budgeted: $299,998
- 20% of $299,998 = $59,999

Abatement & Enforcement:

- Budgeted: $899,995
- 60% of $899,995 = $539,997
- 40% of $899,995 = $360,998

Revised: 7/20/2006
Printed: 7/21/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Biannual Expenditure (2006-2007)</th>
<th>Funding Allocation (Projected Biannual Revenue)</th>
<th>Total Expense for Activity *</th>
<th>Per Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units Included in 2-Year Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Beautification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Landscaping Projects</td>
<td>$ 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Servicing Additional Street Cans (Weekly)</td>
<td>$ 1,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stipends (WCCUSD students &amp; Youth Build)</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentorship Program</td>
<td>$ 31,862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shields Reid Playground Equipment</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shields Reid Soccer Field Lighting</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third St. Ballfield sod repairs</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third St. Ballfield irrigation</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Administration/Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 19,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention &amp; Education Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 299,998</td>
<td>$ 299,998</td>
<td>$ 129,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abatement &amp; Enforcement Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 899,995</td>
<td>$ 899,995</td>
<td>$ 563,337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Investment Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 299,998</td>
<td>$ 299,998</td>
<td>$ 215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$ 1,499,991</td>
<td>$ 1,519,732</td>
<td>$ 907,687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commitment Administration/Staffing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention &amp; Education (% of Projected Revenue)</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abatement &amp; Enforcement (% of Projected Revenue)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment (% of Projected Revenue)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total cost for labor/per unit items calculated for 2-year period.*
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