



**HAPPY ACRES MUTUAL BENEFIT WATER SYSTEM**  
PO Box 742 Cotati, CA . 94931 | 707.775.1252

January 21, 2013

NORTH COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
5550 SKYLANE BLVD STE A  
SANTA ROSA CA 95403-1072

To Whom It May Concern:

Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Water System Inc. (HAMBWS) respectfully submits comments, questions and concerns of the proposed Order No. R1-2013-003 Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) and Order No. R1-2013-003 Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), and request that the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) revise these documents accordingly. Furthermore, until all the comments, questions and concerns have been fully addressed, HAMBWS finds it premature to issue the WDR or MRP and strongly demands that a full EIR covering all phases of this project combined be completed under public review prior to any extension to current operations at the Landfill. Based on the information provided concerning the past performance and current liabilities of Republic Services Inc., HAMBWS considers it in the best interest of the community that Republic Services Inc. be disqualified from participation in this project.

HAMBWS is a community owned and operated non-profit small water system incorporated in the State of California. It is the only supply of potable water to over 90 percent of the Happy Acres subdivision consisting of over 90 residences comprising of over 300 residents. These comments, questions and concerns are offered on their behalf by the HAMBWS Board of Directors.

**WDR questions and concerns:**

The only mention of the leachate pipeline connecting the facility to the City of Santa Rosa's Laguna Wastewater Treatment Facility is in paragraph E.5 Landfill Description and History and paragraph G14. What current and future monitoring exists to protect against potential contamination of adjacent ground water wells in the Happy Acres community wells or the HAMBWS well located off Stony Point and Meacham roads? Why this is issue not addressed in the WDR or the Monitoring plan?

Paragraph E.6 states that landfill 1 is currently undergoing corrective action to control releases of leachate and landfill gas to receiving waters. Correction action involves leachate removal and landfill gas control activities intended to create and maintain an inward ground water gradient. Does this mean that currently there is an outward groundwater gradient? What are the specific parameters of past and current releases? What monitoring is being accomplished to define contaminates and path of past and current releases?

Paragraph E.7 notes a design failure in the construction of the landfill anchor trench as one possible source for landfill gas migration into ground water, and indicated that leachate may have entered ground water during repair work on a landfill gas condensate line. The Discharger also reported a number of breaches in the liner during operation and construction. The Discharger undertook corrective action efforts; subsequent testing indicates that the corrective actions undertaken have mitigated and reduced water quality impacts. To what level has water quality impacts been reduced? Are the current water quality impacts contained to the site? Why is there no offsite monitoring wells etc.? Do current water quality impacts represent potential contamination of adjacent ground water wells in the Happy Acres community or the HAMBWS well located off Stony Point and Meacham roads?

Paragraph E.8 mentions the Regional Water Board Order No. R1--2004-0040, directing cleanup and corrective action efforts with a goal of addressing releases from Landfill 2, controlling leachate formation and migration from Landfill 1 and those subsequent remedial actions have only reduced water quality impacts associated with those Landfills. To what level has water quality impacts been reduced? Are the current water quality impacts contained to the site? Why is there no offsite monitoring wells etc.? Do current water quality impacts represent potential contamination of adjacent ground water wells in the Happy Acres community or the HAMBWS well located off Stony Point and Meacham roads? Has the requirements of Order R1-2004-0040 been met by the current operators? Since this Order rescinds and places Order No. R1-2004-0400, has it incorporated all its requirements as part of the Corrective Action Section, I.22? It appears that section I.22 summarizes these requirements, why not include the requirements of Order R1-2004-0400 verbatim?

Paragraph E.9 states that continued operation of the leachate management systems, in particular the leachate extraction system, is critical to long term environmental management at the site. The leachate pipeline connecting the facility to the City of Santa Rosa's Laguna Wastewater Treatment Facility seems to be an essential part of the extraction process. Why is it not addressed? What is the testing and maintenance requirements of the existing pipe line to insure long term integrity?

Paragraph F.12 describes groundwater resources around the landfill. It does not include the fact that Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Water System, Inc provides water for over 80 of the residents of Happy Acres and that these residents have no other means of a water supply.

Paragraph H.18.a.ii states the geologic mapping will be conducted concurrent with earthmoving activities to determine the geologic formation remaining in the new footprint areas. Why not conduct geologic mapping prior to extension of the landfill operations? This seems to be the best economical and environmental approach. It also states that Landfill 2, Phases III and IV will require additional grading, blasting, and earthmoving in the area of mapped Wilson Grove deposits. Have the risks associated with this blasting been characterized? Are there measures in place to protect against possible contamination of the ground water aquifer in this area?

Paragraph H.18.a.vi states that the Franciscan Complex is fractured. Since Happy Acres Subdivision is also on the Franciscan Complex and Wilson Grove Formation this could provide a path for the potential contamination of wells associated with this community. Why is this not addressed in the JTD or MRP?

Paragraph H.18.a.x states that the JTD indicates that potential geologic conditions that could lead to rapid geologic change should not affect the development of new waste cell in Landfill 2 and the REA because 1) the new cells will not be sited over loose, saturated sands which might experience liquefaction, 2) subsidence due to rapid groundwater extraction is unlikely as there are no known significant groundwater extractions in the vicinity of the Landfill. 3) onsite mapping and observations have not indicated the presence of pre-existing landslides, significant shear zones, zones of weakness, or other structural factors that could significantly affect stability of the expansion areas, and 4) the design team does not expect faulting to affect proposed new cell areas due to the distance from any known active and/or Holocene faults. The Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Well is located with 0.5 miles and extracts well over two million gallons each year. And in fact, the city of Cotati has wells in the same aquifer that extracts many times over that of the Happy Acres community well. Why doesn't the JTD address this issue? Also wording such as should, unlikely, significant and expect indicate there is risk involved but are not scientific or engineering terms that quantify the risk. Does the JTD quantify these risks, if not, why not? Have these risks been evaluated and are they acceptable?

Paragraph 20.ii states that the Basin Plan generally prohibits new point source discharges of waste to coastal stream and natural drainage ways that flow directly to the ocean and requires that existing discharges to these waters be eliminated at the earliest practicable date and that the WDRs do not cover specific types of surface water discharges, such as storm water, and that the Discharger (County) is responsible for securing and/or enrolling for coverage under, and complying with the requirements of applicable general NPDES permits for any proposed discharges of water from the facility into surface waters. Since the Landfill is located within the Stemple Creek watershed and Stemple Creek is a coastal tributary to the Bodega Bay, compliance with the Basin Plan generally suggests that the Discharger will not be successful in securing a new NPDES permit and should stop current permitted discharges ASAP. Since this is essential for the proposed expansion, why is it not a requirement to first obtain the NPDES permit? Again this would be the most practical economic and environmental approach.

**MRP questions and concerns:**

The MRP does not specifically address monitoring requirements for the leachate pipeline connecting the facility to the City of Santa Rosa's Laguna Wastewater Treatment Facility. Para 2 requires leachate management, monitoring and an annual testing of all leachate collection and removal system to demonstrate proper operation, but does not state the monitoring and testing requirements of the offsite piping system. Why are the specific requirements for the piping system not included? What current and future monitoring should be included to protect against potential contamination of adjacent ground water wells in the Happy Acres community wells or the HAMBWS well located off Stony Point and Meacham roads? What specific increased sampling and frequency should be added to the existing Title 22 sampling requirements? Is the Discharger responsible for reimbursement of any increased monitoring? What are the specific monitoring requirements along the pathway of the existing leachate pipeline? What are the specific maintenance and inspection requirements for the offsite leachate pipeline? Regarding the leachate pipeline, is there an existing a water meter at the point of entry and at the point of discharge to the treatment plant to gauge the amount of discharge to the pipeline. This would seem one of the simplest means of monitoring for a leak. In absence of metering, we would expect nothing less than some type of leak monitoring

detection along the Meacham Road section. Approximately two years ago Happy Acre residents observed a discharge on the road just north of Walker Road that was within the pipeline trench.

Since the WRD describes fractures which groundwater contamination can flow, why is there essentially no offsite monitoring wells for groundwater quality included in the MRP?

**General Concerns:**

In the event that any private wells or the Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Water System well are contaminated in any way by the landfill, what provisions are in place to insure that a comparable non-contaminated water supply be provided? Will the Discharger pay the costs for this alternative water supply? Will provisions for the alternative water supply be addressed in the WRD or JTD, if not why not? Will the Discharger put aside funds to cover this possibility?

The Discharger admitted to various spills in the past. Why isn't the nearby community informed? Why not report to Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Water System, Inc. Water board of well testing and concentrations?

R0032013 indicates an emergency response plan. Why is there no provision to notify the surrounding community? With their ability to potentially pollute our water source shouldn't there be an action plan with notification to Happy Acres Mutual Benefit Water System, Inc and customers?

What is the County's responsibilities for testing the shallow neighborhood wells in case of a leachate or storm water overflow onto the Happy Acres subdivision side of the hill? For example a surface water spill may not show up in their deep wells but could pollute our shallow water individual or community wells.

The water drainage and potential pollution from the landfill and the composting are being handled under separate permits. Both systems are tied together and share a common drainage that could impact our neighborhood. Why are they not being permitted as a single system?

What is being done to prevent odors from the settling and storm drain ponds? Can they be covered? Can they be relocated on the property to prevent spills occurring and affecting neighboring properties? Can they be relocated to prevent their odor being blown into our communities? Can they be treated to prevent wind blown bio hazards, toxins, and odors from escaping the landfill area? These issues are not addressed anywhere in these documents but it seems that if the County needs to pump these fluids through a double contained pipeline, then the ponds may be a hazard to people and wildlife as well.

What criteria was used to determine that a full EIR for all phases of this project combined was not required for expansion and long term operations at the landfill? Was public review and comment allowed in this decision process? If not, why not? Considering the extent of the new expansion areas and impact to existing systems (i.e. leachate, gas collection, composting etc.) and to the surrounding public it appears that a full EIR would be essential to insure safe overall operations and environmental protection of both air and water.

What protocol was followed for the compilation, review and approval process of the WDR and MRP? Was an independent review conducted with set criteria to insure that the Basin Plan, prescriptive standards and all other mandatory regulatory requirements were implemented? If not, how was this achieved?

How did Keller Canyon Landfill Company, Allied Waste Systems Inc. and Republic Services Inc. qualify for this contract? What were the performance criteria? Was full financial disclosure required? Has the past performance of Keller Canyon Landfill Company, Allied Waste Systems inc. and Republic Services Inc. been evaluated?

Has Keller Canyon Landfill Company, Allied Waste Systems inc. and Republic Services Inc.. provided full disclosure of all fines and lawsuits? Has the County agreed to limit historical litigation to landfill lawsuits against Keller Canyon Landfill Company, Allied Waste Systems inc. or Republic Services Inc.? A simple search on the internet shows multiple problems with operations and personnel issues. Specifically has fines for solid waste management as recent as this last summer been investigated? Do the County and NCRWQCB know about the lawsuits against Republic Services Inc. for stench from SC landfill reported on Nov. 23, 2012? Here is a summary:

"Stench from SC landfill prompts more lawsuits" was the title of an article reported on Friday, Nov. 23, 2012. The Article addressed legal complaints against the Lee County landfill operator Republic Services Inc., claiming that odors from the company's waste disposal site are making them miserable. A federal jury ordered Republic to pay \$2.3 million in damages. Please consider this article as to Republic's inability to contain odors from landfill under their control. The entire article can be read here:

<http://www.thestate.com/2012/11/23/2529850/stench-from-sc-landfill-prompts.html#storylink=cpy>

Another example of Republic's past performance is: Republic Services, Arizona county share in \$1.5M landfill fine -Solid ... Jul 26, 2012 ... The Maricopa County Solid Waste Department owns the landfill and Republic Services, as Allied Waste, operated the facility from 1996 to when (see the entire article here) ...

<http://www.wasterecyclingnews.com/article/20120726/NEWS01/120729935/republic-services-arizona-county-share-in-1-5m-landfill-fine>

For a more complete history of Republic Services Inc. fines and other documents concerning their past performance and liabilities see Attachments 1 through 4 covering news reports relating to Republic Services Inc. and contributions to County Supervisors. Did Republic Services Inc. disclose any of this information to the County? Was all this information considered during their qualification for this project? If not, the County should revisit the qualification process with consideration to all the attachments.

Sincerely,

Mitch Mann  
President of the Board

cc: HAMBWS File-Secretary/Treasurer [tfleringsb@yahoo.com](mailto:tfleringsb@yahoo.com)  
HAMBWS Board Members  
Shaun Kesterson, Water Master

## **NEWS REPORTS RELATING TO REPUBLIC**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL:**

Air Pollution from Republic owned Imperial Landfill affecting nearby residents and schools because the gas capture system not maintained; Pittsburgh 2009. Teachers allege cancer caused by landfill gases. 2010- Republic installed 28 gas wells and 14000 feet of piping (after paying \$650,000 fine). Improvements cost about \$6 M. Gas collection increased from 800 to 1200 cubic feet per minute.

**2012 - April, Lee County South Carolina.** Neighbors sued Republic for odors, fumes, dust and gas, airborne trash, excessive truck traffic, and rodents a **\$2.3 M verdict** was awarded. Alleged: failed to follow waste treatment regulations, failed to install needed technology, and attempted to handle more waste than landfill could handle.

**2012 - Republic suspends recycling** in Hernando County, Florida due to flooding at landfill.

**2011 - Sugar Creek, Jackson County, MO,** state issued violations to Republic for methane leakage requiring Republic to install emergency gas management plan, residential monitoring, and detection. Not upgraded since 2003.

**2009 - Grundy County** neighbors of a Republic landfill had well water tests showing levels of heavy metals many times higher than federal limits. Cancer rates were also high in the area. The company disputed liability, pointing to gravel mining, nearby nuclear plants, and another landfill as potential sources.

**2010 - Republic opposes a trash to ethanol plan for Lake County Indiana** as a breach of antitrust laws pertaining to the control of solid waste flow. Some attack the deal for lack of transparency (note similarities to situation here).

**2010 - Warrensburg MO,** Show Me Regional Sanitary Landfill issued notice of violation by State for **methane leakage**. The landfill **periodically burns off natural gas**.

**2010 - Lorain County landfill near Cleveland** was the subject of a **nuisance suit about odors by the State**. The company drilled new gas wells and "pre-drilled" others.

**2011 - Jefferson City, MO,** Butler County landfill in Poplar Bluff **cited for methane leakage**.

**1/1/06 - Republic** says that the place was inspected by the state from (220 times) and never cited for odors. **Republic made \$7.2 M in upgrades to fight odor, including a \$1.7 M gas-system upgrade in 2009, \$935k in gas-system upgrades in 2010, \$435,000 in 2011 and \$4.2 M to camp 22 acres in 2010 and 2011.** In fact, the parent company **ESCAPED direct LIABILITY in this case because it did not own the landfill.**

**2008 - Stark Landfill in Cleveland** on fire underground for two years owing to disposal of aluminum, melts landfill liner, gas pipes, threatens aquifers. Neighbors later sue. Subsequent investigation shows that the company buried trash outside the landfill border. Liquid and gas leachate were found there also closure order and fines.

**2006 - 17 ton sewage Sludge Spill near Carleton Farms, Michigan,** which annually accepted 360,000 tons of the stuff at its Republic owned landfill. The facility accepted sewage sludge from Detroit, Toronto and Windsor. People in Huron Township filed a class action. Company stopped accepting sludge. Company also buries 4 M tons of Canadian trash, including all of Toronto's. NAFTA allows international trade in garbage. Michigan attempted repeatedly to regulate the inflow on grounds of health and safety. Company said if the Canadian trash were to be cut off, it would truck in trash from New York, and is contractually bound to find some-place to put the garbage from Canada.

**2005 - Republic pays \$500,000 to resolve problems at Kestrel Hawk landfill in Racine, WI,** for failure to prevent landfill gas emissions, failure to maintain gas wells and leachate extraction pumps, drainage ditches, and sedimentation structures.

**2009 - Republic promised** to control odors, but obviously failed to do so. Trash arriving by rail was allowed to sit out in the sun for a week. **Landfill cited twice by County in 2008 and 2009 for not covering garbage daily.**

**EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES:**

**2009 - Ohio - Republic is subject to a \$43 million** in punitive damages for tampering with manager's employment record after he filed a lawsuit in an age-discrimination retaliation case.

**2010 - Nevada for \$3 M.** Republic settles age discrimination class action (20 workers) in

**RATES:**

**4/21/05 - Vegas, Republic goes from twice a week to once a week collection for the same price, but would pick up recycling four times a month instead of twice.** Citizens complain of open trucks, and **mandatory collection (including fees for services for houses that are vacant).**

**IMMIGRATION:**

**2007 - Raid of Houston Republic plant yields 53 arrests.** Republic was **faced with criminal charges** for employing undocumented migrants in Houston. Case **settled for \$1 million.** About a quarter of the workforce was undocumented.

**SAFETY:**

Garbage truck accidents caused by **loose policies on prescription drug use, failure to maintain** backup beeper and rear view **camera with blind spot** among others. Not all of these cases were about Republic, but safety advocates maintain that **the garbage trucks are inherently unsafe** because they have enormous blind spots and that "multiple systems" must be used to make them safer.

**2003 – 3 - Republic truck related fatalities.**

**2004 - Republic owned truck kills boy** in Ft. Lauderdale on bike.

**2011, Santa Fe Texas man was injured by a bulldozer** at the landfill while unloading his pickup.

**ANTITRUST:**

**2004 - Republic pays \$1.5 M fine** for breaching its agreement with Dept. of Justice (DOJ) on asset exchange with Allied. The company **overcharged customers** in Lakeland FL and Louisville KY from what the consent decree permitted (Civil Contempt Claim).

**BUSINESS DISPUTES:**

**2009 - Nashville \$3 m dispute** with business partner,

**Angleton TX - \$1.2 M breach of contract** for development of landfill. Evidence of forgery by Waste Management was determined.

**2012 - Hilton Head SC warned Republic** is in breach of its franchise agreement for poor performance.

**2012 - AIG sued Republic** and subsidiaries for **failure to pay nearly \$16 M in workers' compensation premiums.**

**Bill Gates** avoided civil penalties in 2001 in 2002 **for not reporting** his purchase of enough shares to push his ownership interest in Republic over 10 percent, but was later **fined \$800,000** for a similar move with another company the next year.

**CORRUPTION:**

2005 - Media story aired in Houston that Republic was charging Houston for disposal of non-City of Houston customer waste being disposed at Republic's landfill. Republic paid the City \$2 million in restitution.

2005 - Votes for Cash in Carson, California. Eleven people were charged in connection with approval of a \$60 million contract between Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), and the city of Carson for waste hauling.

**LITIGATION:**

2003 - Republic sued Liberty Mutual Insurance for breach of contract and fiduciary duty.

2011 - Republic filed suit against Dallas challenging the city ordinance that would force all local waste to be disposed at the City-owned landfill.

2010 - Federal class action against Republic and its subsidiaries in 39 states fails, alleging breach of contract, for charging for fuel and environmental fees unrelated to "actual costs for removal." The Federal court in Arizona ruled that individual issues predominated because more than 105 contracts were at issue, often with handwritten modifications, and more than one contract over the course of the business relationship. In many cases the corporate veil could not be pierced.

S.F. GATE

S.F. CHRONICLE

Oct. 23, 2007

California officials signed an agreement two weeks ago with three companies that consented to pay a \$725,000 fine and upgrade equipment to keep hazardous waste from leaking into the bay from a long-closed Richmond landfill.

The [West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill Inc.](#), [West County Landfill Inc.](#) and [Republic Services Inc.](#), which share ownership of the property, agreed to settle an enforcement order issued by the state [Department of Toxic Substances Control](#) last year. The state issued the order after complaining that the companies had failed to properly close the site in 1985, and that the hazardous waste portion of the landfill presented an "imminent and substantial endangerment."

The owners disputed the order, and then later agreed to settle by making the upgrades and paying the fine, which will go toward instituting e-waste and watershed improvement projects in the county.

The landfill will remain under inspection by the agency.

## **Online resource**

### **View the order:**

[links.sfgate.com/ZBHT](http://links.sfgate.com/ZBHT)

The [West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill Inc.](#), [West County Landfill Inc.](#) and [Republic Services Inc.](#), Are dba's of parent corp. Republic Services Inc.

Read more: <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Landfill-owners-toxics-agency-settle-2495123.php#ixzz2HRm4Y0hS>

# Republic to pay fine, \$36 million to fix landfill site

*Las Vegas Sun* By Dave Toplikar (contact) 

Published Thursday, Aug. 7, 2008 | 12:22 p.m.

## Sun Archives

- [Hauler insists it can boost rates \(8-7-2008\)](#)
- [Landfill decree avoids big issue \(5-15-2008\)](#)
- [Editorial: Using bully tactics \(7-3-2008\)](#)

A settlement filed in federal court today is expected to make sure a closed unlined landfill just east of Las Vegas won't leak pollutants into Lake Mead, southern Nevada's major drinking water supply.

Republic Services of Southern Nevada has agreed to pay a \$1 million civil fine and spend \$36 million to properly seal up the former Sunrise Mountain Landfill.

According to the consent decree filed in the U.S. District Court in Las Vegas, Republic must stop the landfill site from leaking by building and implementing extensive storm water controls, an armored engineered cover, methane gas collection, groundwater monitoring and long-term operation and maintenance.

The settlement follows alleged violations of the Clean Water Act at the 440-acre former solid waste landfill, which is three miles east of the city between Las Vegas and Lake Mead.

"Today's settlement will minimize the risk to Clark County residents from polluted water runoff and hazardous waste discharges from the Sunrise Mountain Landfill," Ronald Tenpas, assistant attorney general for the Justice Department's environmental and natural resources division, said in an announcement from the Justice Department and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The agencies announced that a consent decree was filed today in U.S. District Court in Las Vegas. The deal is subject to a 30-day public comment period and approval from a federal judge.

The unlined landfill contains more than 49 million cubic yards of waste, including municipal solid waste, medical waste, sewage sludge, hydrocarbon-contaminated soils, asbestos and construction waste.

The settlement calls for the containment structure to be completed in two years. It would prevent the release of more than 14 million pounds of contaminants each year, which include stormwater pollutants, methane gas and landfill leachate.

"This essentially memorializes the actions that are required in the ongoing environmental remediation project," said Will Flower, a vice president and spokesman for Republic Services Inc., based in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. "We've been working diligently with the county and the EPA to get to this point."

Flower said Clark County, EPA and Republic representatives reached the accord last Friday.

In September 1998, the current landfill cover failed during a series of storms, sending waste into the Las Vegas Wash.

The landfill was operated from the 1950s through 1993 on behalf of the county by entities affiliated with Republic Services of Southern Nevada.

Following the 1998 leakage, the EPA ordered Republic Dumpco, a company related to Republic, and the Clark County Public Works Department to correct the Clean Water Act violations and immediately stabilize the site.

Republic, which has spent nearly \$30 million on fixing the landfill since then, had been trying to push the county into approving a rate increase to help pay the remaining \$36 million to properly close the site.

Flower said Republic customers could still be asked to pay for the work, Flower said, depending on a funding plan yet to be presented to Clark County commissioners.

Company officials have said Republic already spent \$29 million of \$36 million it agreed in 1999 to pay toward the landfill remediation project in return for a deal extending its exclusive franchise contract to handle Clark County trash through 2035.

— Bob Coyle, Republic Services' area president, told county commissioners this year that the company intended to pay \$7 million more, and that trash customers should bear the remaining cost.

Coyle issued a statement today saying the company planned to discuss "funding mechanisms" with the commission on Aug. 19.

A statement issued by county spokesman Erik Pappa hailed the plan to seal the landfill "so that public health and the environment are protected."

"We urge the court to approve this consent decree for the benefit of all our citizens," the county statement said.

The Associated Press contributed to this story.

**Schedule A (Continuation Sheet)**  
**Monetary Contributions Received**

Type or print in ink.  
 Amounts may be rounded  
 to whole dollars.

SCHEDULE A (CONT.)

Statement covers period from <u>07/01/2011</u> through <u>12/31/2011</u>	<b>CALIFORNIA FORM 460</b>
	Page <u>13</u> of <u>53</u>

NAME OF FILER Friends of Efrén Carrillo for Supervisor 2012	I.D. NUMBER 1304418
--	------------------------

DATE RECEIVED	FULL NAME, STREET ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE OF CONTRIBUTOR (IF COMMITTEE, ALSO ENTER I.D. NUMBER)	CONTRIBUTOR CODE *	IF AN INDIVIDUAL, ENTER OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYER (IF SELF-EMPLOYED, ENTER NAME OF BUSINESS)	AMOUNT RECEIVED THIS PERIOD	CUMULATIVE TO DATE CALENDAR YEAR (JAN. 1 - DEC. 31)	PER ELECTION TO DATE (IF REQUIRED)
09/24/2011	Kyla Brooke [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC	Realtor Frank Howard Allen Real Estate	50.00	150.00	350.00 P 12
08/08/2011	Republic Services, Inc [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		2500.00	2500.00	2500.00 P 12
09/23/2011	Dennis Judd [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC	Property management Cipora Inc	100.00	100.00	540.00 P 12
09/23/2011	Herman J Hernandez [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC	Realtor Hernandez Realty	110.00	560.00	1900.00 P 12
09/23/2011	Russian River Getaways [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		30.00	530.00	1260.00 P 12
<b>SUBTOTAL \$</b>				2790.00		

\*Contributor Codes  
 IND - Individual  
 COM - Recipient Committee  
       (other than PTY or SCC)  
 OTH - Other (e.g., business entity)  
 PTY - Political Party  
 SCC - Small Contributor Committee

FPPC Form 460 (January/05)  
 FPPC Toll-Free Helpline: 866/ASK-FPPC (866/275-3772)

**Direct File**

[http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD\\_Web\\_Images/2012/057/00005720120321F32.pdf](http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD_Web_Images/2012/057/00005720120321F32.pdf)

**Schedule A (Continuation Sheet)  
Monetary Contributions Received**

SCHEDULE A

Statement covers period from 07/01/2011 through 12/31/2011	CALIFORNIA FORM <b>460</b> Page 7 of 17
--	---

NAME OF FILER Shirlee Zane for Supervisor, 3rd District, 2012

I.D. NUMBER  
1302015

DATE RECEIVED	FULL NAME, STREET ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE OF CONTRIBUTOR (IF COMMITTEE, ALSO ENTER I.D. NUMBER)	CONTRIBUTOR CODE	IF AN INDIVIDUAL ENTER OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYER (IF SELF-EMPLOYED, ENTER NAME OF BUSINESS)	AMOUNT RECEIVED	CUMULATIVE TO DATE CALENDAR YEAR (JAN. 1 - DEC. 31)	PER ELECTION TO DATE (IF REQUIRED)
09/25/2011	John R. McNulty [REDACTED]	IND	Private Investor  Self-employed No Separate Bus Name	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000 (P12)
09/25/2011	Melody M. McNulty [REDACTED]	IND	Homemaker  N.A.	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000 (P12)
12/13/2011	Northern California Small Business Assist Inc. [REDACTED]	OTH		500.00	500.00	500 (P12)
09/25/2011	Jill R Ravitch [REDACTED]	IND	District Attorney  County of Sonoma	500.00	500.00	500 (P12)
08/01/2011	Republic Services Inc. [REDACTED]	OTH		2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500 (P12)
<b>SUBTOTAL \$</b>				5,500.00		

\*\* Contributor Codes: IND - Individual COM - Recipient Committee (other than PTY or SCC) OTH - Other PTY - Political Party SCC - Small Contributor Committee

**RABBITT**

Friends of David Rabbitt for Supervisor 2010

1324808

DATE REC'D	CONTRIBUTOR NAME	STREET ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ZIP	CODE	OCCUPATION	EMPLOYER	AMT REC'D THIS PERIOD	CUM. TO DATE 1/1-12/31/11	PER ELECTION TO DATE (IF REQUIRED)
3/17/2011	Judy Shubin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Homemaker		198	198	
3/14/2011	K.R. Glasscock-Bergin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Manufacturing	Bergin Glass	198	198	
3/7/2011	Kastania Vineyards	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			198	198	
3/14/2011	Kevin Strain (Business Acct)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			200	200	
3/7/2011	Larry Waseem	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Investor	Self / Airport Business Ctr	1,000	1,000	
3/17/2011	Lex McConvey	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Rancher / Consultant	Self / None	440	440	
3/11/2011	Linda Williams	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Retired		198	198	
3/9/2011	Marilyn Can Travel	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			800	800	
3/14/2011	Marilyn Mertens	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Homemaker		198	198	
3/17/2011	Mary Farrar	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Marketing	Vintage Senior Living	198	198	
3/16/2011	Max Mickelsen	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Attorney	Max A Mickelsen Law Office	400	800	
3/16/2011	Max Mickelsen	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Attorney	Max A Mickelsen Law Office	400	800	
3/16/2011	McClelland's Dairy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			400	400	
3/17/2011	Montoya & Associates	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			297	297	
3/17/2011	Muelrath Ranches	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			198	198	
3/14/2011	Ost Engineering	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			198	198	
3/4/2011	Paul Lewis	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Retired CEO	Bar Ale, Inc.	198	198	
6/8/2011	Republic Services, Inc.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	COM	FPPC 1324808		800	800	
3/17/2011	Running C Ranch	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			320	320	
3/7/2011	Sara Malone	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Business Owner	Circle Oak Ranch	198	198	
3/16/2011	Saralee's Vineyards LLC	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			400	400	
3/14/2011	Sharon Wright	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Consultant	Wright Consulting	198	198	
3/17/2011	Spring Hill Jersey Cheese	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			1,600	1,600	
3/7/2011	Spurgeon Painting, Inc.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			198	198	
3/17/2011	Stephen Butler	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Lawyer	Clement, Fitzpatrick & Kenv	250	250	
3/16/2011	Tawny Tesconi	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Manager	Sonoma County Fair	160	160	
3/17/2011	Terry Krout	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Firefighter	Yoche Dehe	198	198	
3/17/2011	Thera Buttarro	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Owner	Sonoma Coast Living Real E	200	200	
3/17/2011	Tiffany Voip	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Homemaker		480	480	
3/17/2011	Valley View Dairy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			300	300	
3/17/2011	Wine Country Ranch Equip	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	OTH			160	160	
3/4/2011	Y. Tito Sasaki	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	IND	Farmer	Self / Sasaki Vineyards	198	198	
<b>Subtotal</b>									\$ 11,379.00		

Contributor Codes  
IND - Individual  
COM - Recipient Committee  
OTH - Other (e.g. business entity)  
PTY - Political Party  
SCC - Small Contributor Committee

[http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD\\_Web\\_Images/2011/237/00023720110801F12.pdf](http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD_Web_Images/2011/237/00023720110801F12.pdf)

V. Brown

**Schedule A  
Monetary Contributions Received**

Type or print in ink.  
Amounts may be rounded to whole dollars.

SCHEDULE A

Statement covers period  
from 07/01/2011 through 12/31/2011

**CALIFORNIA FORM 460**  
Page 4 of 9

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE

NAME OF FILER

Friends of Valerie Brown for Supervisor 2012

I.D. NUMBER

1243292

DATE RECEIVED	FULL NAME, STREET ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE OF CONTRIBUTOR (IF COMMITTEE, ALSO ENTER I.D. NUMBER)	CONTRIBUTOR CODE *	IF AN INDIVIDUAL, ENTER OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYER (IF SELF-EMPLOYED, ENTER NAME OF BUSINESS)	AMOUNT RECEIVED THIS PERIOD	CUMULATIVE TO DATE CALENDAR YEAR (JAN. 1 - DEC. 31)	PER ELECTION TO DATE (IF REQUIRED)
07/11/2011	Republic Services, Inc. [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		2,500.00	2,500.00	F 12 2,500.00
		<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC				
		<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC				
		<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC				
		<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC				
<b>SUBTOTAL \$</b>				2,500.00		

**Schedule A Summary**

- Amount received this period – itemized monetary contributions. (Include all Schedule A subtotals.) ..... \$ 2,500.00
- Amount received this period – unitemized monetary contributions of less than \$100 ..... \$ 0.00
- Total monetary contributions received this period. (Add Lines 1 and 2. Enter here and on the Summary Page, Column A, Line 1.) ..... **TOTAL \$ 2,500.00**

\*Contributor Codes  
IND – Individual  
COM – Recipient Committee (other than PTY or SCC)  
OTH – Other (e.g., business entity)  
PTY – Political Party  
SCC – Small Contributor Committee

FPPC Form 460 (January 05)  
FPPC Toll-Free Helpline: 866/ASK-FPPC (866/275-3772)

[http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD\\_Web\\_Images/2012/072/00007220120123F12.pdf](http://campaigndocs.sonoma-county.org/CFD_Web_Images/2012/072/00007220120123F12.pdf)

J. Sawyer

**Schedule A (Continuation Sheet)  
Monetary Contributions Received**

Type or print in ink.  
Amounts may be rounded  
to whole dollars.

SCHEDULE A (CONT.)

Statement covers period from <u>7-1-2012</u>	<b>CALIFORNIA FORM 460</b>
through <u>9-30-2012</u>	
Page <u>8</u> of <u>38</u>	

NAME OF FILER Friends of John Sawyer for Supervisor 2012	I.D. NUMBER 13422197
---	-------------------------

DATE RECEIVED	FULL NAME, STREET ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE OF CONTRIBUTOR (IF COMMITTEE, ALSO ENTER I.D. NUMBER)	CONTRIBUTOR CODE *	IF AN INDIVIDUAL, ENTER OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYER (IF SELF-EMPLOYED, ENTER NAME OF BUSINESS)	AMOUNT RECEIVED THIS PERIOD	CUMULATIVE TO DATE CALENDAR YEAR (JAN. 1 - DEC. 31)	PER ELECTION TO DATE (IF REQUIRED)
7-13-12	Hal Weise [REDACTED]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC	Retired	200.00	200.00	100.00 (A) 200.00 (B)
7-17-12	Sonoma County Law Enforcement Assn PAC #1342219 [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		2500.00	7750.00	5250.00 (A) 2500.00 (B)
7-17-12	Republic Services Inc [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		1500.00	1500.00	1500.00 (C)
7-17-12	Sleepy Hollow Properties [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input type="checkbox"/> COM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		250.00	500.00	250.00 (C) 250.00 (D)
7-17-12	California Real Estate PAC #890106 [REDACTED]	<input type="checkbox"/> IND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COM <input type="checkbox"/> OTH <input type="checkbox"/> PTY <input type="checkbox"/> SCC		2625.00	5250.00	5250.00 (E) 2625.00 (F)
<b>SUBTOTAL \$</b>				7075.00		

\*Contributor Codes  
IND - Individual  
COM - Recipient Committee  
(other than PTY or SCC)  
OTH - Other (e.g., business entity)  
PTY - Political Party  
SCC - Small Contributor Committee