



Monterey County

Board Order

168 West Alisal Street,
1st Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
831.755.5066

Upon motion of Supervisor Calcagno, seconded by Supervisor Potter, and carried by those members present, the Board of Supervisors hereby:

- a. Approved responses to the 2012 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury Interim Final Report Nos. 4, 5, and 6; and
- b. Directed the County Administrative Officer to file the approved responses with the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, County of Monterey, by March 11, 2013.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 12th day of February 2013, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Supervisors Armenta, Calcagno, Salinas, Potter, and Parker

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

I, Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an original order of said Board of Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof of Minute Book 76 for the meeting on February 12, 2013.

Dated: February 13, 2013
File Number: 13-0150

Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Monterey, State of California

By Denise Hancock
Deputy



Monterey County Board of Supervisors

Response to the

**2012 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury
Interim Final Report No. 4**

February 12, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Monterey County Overtime Expenditure	
<i>Findings F-3</i>	2
<i>Recommendations R-2, R-3, and R-6</i>	3

REPORT TITLE: Monterey County Overtime Expenditure
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Findings F-3

Finding F-3: Because the County does not request clearly defined budgeting for overtime nor provide clear reports by departments showing overtime costs, we believe the issue does not receive the regular financial scrutiny it deserves.

Response F-3: The Board disagrees partially with the finding. Department budget requests include a line item for projected overtime costs, however, prior recommended budgets did not have focused reports on overtime usage and costs by department. The County Budget Office and Budget Committee regularly reviews overtime usage within departments and agrees that providing a higher level of transparency regarding actual use of overtime will enhance the recommended budget document. The County will provide a greater level of overtime cost detail in future recommended budgets.

REPORT TITLE: Monterey County Overtime Expenditure
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Recommendations R-2, R-3, and R-6

Recommendation R-2: All Monterey County departments should be required to highlight their overtime in their annual budget requests.

Response R-2: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. While the Department budget requests already include projected costs for overtime, the County will include additional detail in the recommended budget regarding overtime budget requests.

Recommendation R-3: The County budget should show the percentage (%) of overtime versus payroll and publish this figure in the Final Budget.

Response R-3: The recommendation will not be implemented. Department budget requests include overtime costs in requested budgets, and the County will include that information in future recommended budget documents. The Final Budget is a separate document from the Recommended Budget. The Final Budget is issued in a specific format by the Auditor-Controller for reporting to the state and the format is regulated by State Controller requirements.

Recommendation R-6: The County payroll system should be modified to provide timely reporting of overtime expenditures by department, and require department heads to explain all overtime exceeding 8% of payroll on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors.

Response R-6: The recommendation requires further analysis. County departments can currently retrieve reports (including overtime usage) from the payroll system including overtime after each payroll cycle. The County closely monitors department expenditures, once the budget is adopted, to be within approved revenue and expenditures appropriations. The County believes that managing critical public safety operations requires operational flexibility to meet public safety needs without undue administrative burdens. When specific overtime expenditures are anticipated to exceed budgeted appropriations, the County Budget Office has procedures in place to begin monthly or quarterly reports to the Board of Supervisors' Budget Committee toward management of the issue.



Monterey County Board of Supervisors

Response to the

**2012 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury
Interim Final Report No. 5**

February 12, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority	
<i>Findings F-5, F-7, and F-8</i>	2
<i>Recommendations R-1, R-2, and R-5</i>	3

REPORT TITLE: Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority (SVSWA)
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Findings F-5, F-7, and F-8

Finding F-5: The CGJ has found that Waste Management's Madison Lane Transfer Station accepts solid waste from self-haul customers. These are self-haul customers that prefer to go to this site rather than the SSTS or Johnson Canyon landfill.

Response F-5: The Board agrees with the finding. The Madison Lane Transfer Station has received up to 2,600 tons per year of solid waste from self-haul customers and the facility is permitted by the Environmental Health Division as the Local Enforcement Agency of Cal Recycle, to receive up to 500 tons of solid waste per day.

Finding F-7: The CGJ feels that SVSWA's financial decision making policies affect the well-being of many businesses in its jurisdiction. The SVSWA is not looking out for the citizens of the Salinas Valley and north east Monterey County.

Response F-7: The Board partially agrees with the finding. The SVSWA landfill fees and proposed rate increases impact residential and commercial businesses' solid waste disposal rates within the SVSWA's jurisdiction.

Finding F-8: The County's notice to withdraw from the SVSWA will put a financial burden on the remaining members of the SVSWA.

Response F-8: The Board partially agrees with the finding. A notice to withdraw, and subsequent withdrawal, should it occur, has potential to place a financial burden on the remaining SVSWA members, depending upon conditions set forth in the negotiated agreements related to withdrawal. Should the withdrawal be implemented, it would be based on the County's intent on lowering long-term solid waste disposal cost to residents and businesses in the unincorporated areas currently in the SVSWA boundaries.

REPORT TITLE: Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority (SVSWA)
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Recommendations R-1, R-2, and R-5

Recommendation R-1: The SVSWA should give proper notice of topics of presentation to County EHB on public meetings so that the public receives correct answers on County questions.

Response R-1: This recommendation has not yet been implemented. Noticing by the SVSWA is not within the purview of the County.

Recommendation R-2: The CGJ recommends that the staff of both SVSWA and MRWMD continue to work on the common area of interest and benefit to address waste in Monterey County to the betterment of its citizens. It is the CGJ's recommendation that a consolidation of the two agencies should occur.

Response R-2: This recommendation requires further analysis. The County is coordinating with representatives of the SVSWA member cities to consider funding a feasibility study evaluating the numerous variables of existing solid waste landfill operations, infrastructures, service levels, strategic goals and objectives of the SVSWA and the MRWMD. Additionally, managers of the SVSWA and MRWMD are actively engaging in discussions with management of the SVSWA members agencies regarding potential consolidation or further coordination between the agencies.

Recommendation R-5: The CGJ recommends that the City of Salinas and unincorporated NE Monterey County utilize the Madison Lane Transfer Station site as a self-haul and Materials Recovery Center.

Response R-5: This recommendation requires further analysis. The Madison Lane Transfer Station currently is permitted to receive 500 tons of solid waste per day, enough capacity for self-haul customers. This recommendation would require a thorough and thoughtful analysis and review of solid waste disposal and Materials Recovery options. Completion of this analysis is contingent upon participation of the SVSWA member agencies funding the feasibility study noted in the response to R-2 above.



Monterey County Board of Supervisors

Response to the

**2012 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury
Interim Final Report No. 6**

February 12, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Trauma in Monterey County	
<i>Findings F-1, F-2, and F-3</i>	2
<i>Recommendations R-2 and R-3</i>	3

REPORT TITLE: Trauma Care in Monterey County
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Findings F-1, F-2, and F-3

Finding F-1: The Monterey County Board of Supervisors did retain a trauma system consultant who drafted a new plan, entitled the 2011 Trauma Care System Plan.

Response F-1: The Board agrees with the finding.

Finding F-2: Pursuant to this plan Monterey County has designated a Level II trauma center with a timeline for putting the facility into operation.

Response F-2: The Board agrees with the finding.

Finding F-3: This time line has been extended approximately six months.

Response F-3: The Board agrees with the finding.

REPORT TITLE: Trauma Care in Monterey County
RESPONSE BY: Monterey County Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO: Recommendations R-2 and R-3

Recommendation R-2: There should be no further extensions of the trauma system timeline (Appendix B) and the schedule of events listed therein should be met as written.

Response R-2: The recommendation has been implemented. The County, through its EMS Agency, has informed the interested hospitals that barring any foreseen circumstances it is in the best interest for the citizens of Monterey County to adhere to the published schedule.

Recommendation R-3: If both of the potential designees, Natividad and SVMH, should withdraw their intention to go forward as a Level II trauma center, Monterey County should consider designating a Level III trauma center.

Response R-3: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be considered for implementation. This issue is dependent on whether the regional hospitals submit proposals or not. In the event that the County EMS Agency does not receive a Level II trauma center proposal from any hospital in the county, the County will determine if it is in the best interest of the citizens to pursue Level III trauma center designation. The County, through the EMS Agency, will consider development of a new Trauma Care plan with designated Level III trauma facilities. An approximate timeline for implementation would be as follows:

- *Develop, write and submit to Board of Supervisors revised Trauma Plan for approval – six months*
- *Submit Board approved Trauma Plan to State for review and approval – three months*
- *Develop and post RFQ requirements of Level III Trauma Center/s – two months*
- *Review received Level III Trauma Center proposals – two months*
- *Enter into MOU agreements with hospital/s whom have qualified as Level III Trauma Center – two months*
- *Implement Level III Trauma Center system in Monterey County – six months*