RIVERSIDE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
WASTE RESOURCES

Hans W. Kernkamp, General Manager-Chief Engineer

September 17, 2018

Alexandra Rosado
Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery
CalRecycle
Local Assistance and Market Development
P.O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

RE: Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan: 2018 Five-Year Review Report

Dear Ms. Rosado:

On behalf of Riverside County, its cities, and its Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force (LTF), the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (Department) is pleased to submit the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), 2018 Five-Year Review Report dated July 2018. On September 11, 2018 the Riverside County Board of Supervisors (BOS) formally approved the 2018 Five-Year Review Report and directed the Department to forward the report to the Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). A copy of the BOS package is enclosed for review by CalRecycle, including the 2018 Five-Year Review Report and the BOS Action on the Final 2018 Five-Year Review Report.

On the basis of the 2018 Five-Year Review Report, which was prepared by the Department, the Riverside County BOS and the LTF concluded, with the findings of the report, that the Riverside CIWMP does not require revision at this time. The CIWMP and its elements, when augmented by updates through annual reports to CalRecycle, are still applicable in defining the goals, policies and objectives to achieve compliance with AB 939 and in describing the County's waste management system, programs, funding, and implementation.

Riverside County is seeking concurrence by CalRecycle of the report's findings. Thank you in advance for your support. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Kathleen Utter of my staff at (951) 486-3200.

Sincerely,

Hans W. Kernkamp
General Manager-Chief Engineer

HWK/JRM/ACMD/:ku

Enclosures: 2018 Five-Year Review Report
Board of Supervisors Approval dated September 11, 2018

cc: Kathleen Utter, w/enclosures

PD#229315

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM
12.1
(ID # 7763)

MEETING DATE:
Tuesday, September 11, 2018

FROM : DEPARTMENT OF WASTE RESOURCES:

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF WASTE RESOURCES: Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan – 2018 Five-Year Review Report, All Districts. [$0 - Department of Waste Resources Enterprise Funds] (CEQA Exempt)

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), 2018 Five-Year Review Report (Report), as prepared by the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources; and

2. Direct the General Manager-Chief Engineer of the Department of Waste Resources to forward the final report to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

ACTION: Policy

Hans Kernkamp, General Manager - Chief Engineer 8/13/2018

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Jeffries, seconded by Supervisor Perez and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes:	Jeffries, Washington, Perez and Ashley
Nays:	None
Absent:	Tavaglione
Date:	September 11, 2018
xc:	Waste

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By: _____ Deputy

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
NET COUNTY COST	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
SOURCE OF FUNDS:			Budget Adjustment: No	
			For Fiscal Year: 18/19	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve

BACKGROUND:

Summary

The Report has been prepared by the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources on behalf of Riverside County, its twenty-eight (28) cities, and its Local Task Force (LTF) to comply with California law (Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 41822 and Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788). The LTF is comprised of members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, the City Council of each City whose population is certified to exceed 100,000, the Coachella Valley Association of Governments, the Western Riverside Association of Governments, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, the Economic Develop Agency, the San Bernardino Riverside Counties Disposal Association, the Riverside County Farm Bureau, and the Riverside Chapter of California Council of Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors. The role of the LTF is to review these documents to aid in ensuring that the county adequately plans for meeting future solid waste handling and disposal needs.

The initial CIWMP documents were developed in September 1996 and approved by the Board of Supervisors on January 14, 1997. The State approved the CIWMP on September 23, 1998. During previous review reports, the notable update was in 2013 with the incorporation of the Cities of Eastvale, Menifee, Jurupa Valley, and Wildomar. The purpose of the review is to determine if the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of practices that were established under the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, et seq. (AB 939) and defined in PRC Section 40051, in order of priority, as: 1) Source reduction; 2) Recycling and composting; and, 3) Environmentally safe landfill disposal and transformation.

To determine if the Riverside CIWMP and its elements remain consistent or require revision, the Report includes a review of demographics, quantities of waste, funding sources for administration of the Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan, administrative responsibilities, programs and implementation, permitted disposal capacity, and changes in available markets for recyclable materials. On June 13, 2018, the draft report was mailed to city representatives and LTF members for review and comment. Comments were incorporated into the final report. The final report was sent via e-mail on July 31, 2018, to city representatives and the LTF members for final review by August 6, 2018. Four (4) comments were submitted to County staff and those comments have been addressed and included in the CIWMP. It has

been determined that the final report adequately represents that the Riverside CIWMP and its elements, when augmented and updated through annual reports to the CIWMB, are still applicable in defining the goals, policies, and objectives to achieve compliance with AB 939 and in describing the County's waste management system, programs, funding, and implementation. If approved by the Board of Supervisors, as recommended, the Report will be submitted to CalRecycle for approval.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the project (approval of the five-year Review Report) could have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

Impact on Residents and Businesses

There is no direct impact on residents or businesses. Completion of this project fulfills the requirements of California law (PRC Section 41822 and 14 CCR Section 18788), which requires that the County's LTF review the CIWMP and its elements every five years, to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of practices.

Additional Fiscal Information

There is no cost associated with approving this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT A. 2018 5-Year Review Report

Gregory P. Priamos, Director County Counsel 8/23/2018

Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 require that each countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan (CIWMP or RAIWMP), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised if necessary, and submitted to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) every five years. CalRecycle developed this Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template to streamline the Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP review, reporting, and approval process.

A county or regional agency may use this template to document its compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and as a tool in its review, including obtaining Local Task Force (LTF) comments on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP that need revision, if any. This template also can be finalized based on these comments and submitted to CalRecycle as the **county or regional agency's** Five-Year CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report.

The Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template Instructions describe each section and provide general guidelines with respect to preparing the report. Completed and signed reports should be submitted to the CalRecycle's Local Assistance & Market Development (LAMD) Branch at the address below. Upon report receipt, LAMD staff may request clarification and/or additional information if the details provided in the report are not clear or are not complete. Within 90 days of receiving a *complete* Five–Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report, LAMD staff will review the report and prepare their findings for CalRecycle consideration for approval.

If you have any questions about the Five–Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report process or how to complete this template, please contact your LAMD representative at (916) 341-6199. Mail the completed and signed Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to:

Dept. of Resources Recycling & Recovery
Local Assistance & Market Development, MS-9
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

To edit & customize this template, the editing restrictions (filling in forms) must be disengaged. Select the Review tab, Protect Document, and then Restrict Formatting and Editing (uncheck editing restrictions). There is no password (options). Please contact your LAMD representative at (916) 341-6199 with related questions.

General Instructions: Please complete Sections 1 through 7, and all other applicable subsections. Double click on shaded text/areas ( ) to select or add text.

SECTION 1.0 County or Regional Agency Information			
I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five-Year Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name Riverside County		County(s) [if a RAIWMP Review Report] Riverside	
Authorized Signature	Title General Manager-Chief Engineer		
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Hans W. Kernkamp		Date 7/31/18	Phone 951-486-3200
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Kathleen Utter		Title Recycling Specialist	Phone 951-486-3286
Mailing Address 14310 Frederick Street	City Moreno Valley	State CA	Zip 92553
E-mail Address kutter@rivco.org			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is Riverside County's fourth Five–Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP. There are no significant changes since the 2013 Five-Year Report.

The following changes have occurred since the approval of the Riverside County's planning documents or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

☐ Diversion goal reduction
☐ New regional agency
☐ Changes to regional agency
☐ New city (name(s) _____)
☐ Other _____

Additional Information (optional)

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

a. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the Local Task Force (LTF) reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP and finalized its comments
☐ at the _____ LTF meeting. ☒ electronically (fax, e-mail) ☐ other (Explain): _____

b. The county received the written comments from the LTF on July 12, 2018 from the City of Moreno Valley, CA. July 13, 2018 from the City of Rancho Mirage, CA. July 31, 2018 from the City of Temecula, CA. August 1, 2018 from the City of Corona.

c. A copy of the LTF comments
☒ is included as Appendix A.
☐ was submitted to CalRecycle on _____.

Table 1: Local Task Force Members

Name	Representative of (e.g., City or County)
Bob Magee	County Supervisorial District #1
Simon Housman	County Supervisorial District #4
Miguel Arciniega	County Supervisorial District #5
Bruce Scott	Agriculture
Richard Schmid	Agriculture
Richard O'Neill	Engineering
Vacant	Coachella Valley Association of Governments
Linda Krupa	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Jordan Ehrenkranz	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Chuck Tobin	Inland Empire Disposal Association
Ed Campos	Inland Empire Disposal Association
Ted Dumas	Institute of Scrap Recycling
Vincent Coffeen	Economic Development Agency
Robert Moran	Economic Development Agency
Katie Barrows	Environmental Community
Mike Gardner	City of Riverside
Robert Lemon	City of Moreno Valley
Curtis Showalter	City of Corona
Luke Watson	City of Temecula

Name	Representative of (e.g., City or County)
Steven Pastor	Agriculture (Alternate)
Councilmember Debbie Franklin	Western Riverside Council of Governments (Alternate)
Councilmember Dick Haley	Western Riverside Council of Governments (Alternate)
Ben Drake	Agriculture (Alternate)
David Fahrion	Inland Empire Disposal Association (IEDA) (Alternate)
Chris Cunningham	Inland Empire Disposal Association (IEDA) (Alternate)
Deanna Pressgrove	Coachella Valley Association of Governments (Alternate)
Mike Soubirous	City of Riverside (Alternate)
Samantha Rodriguez	City of Moreno Valley (Alternate)
Dale West	City of Temecula (Alternate)
Katie Hockett	County Supervisorial District #1 (Alternate)
Steven Bayard	County Supervisorial District #4 (Alternate)
Martin Rosen	County Supervisorial District #5 (Alternate)
Phil Rosentrater	Economic Development Agency (Alternate)

SECTION 4.0 TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H)

The subsections below address not only the areas of change specified in the regulations, but also provide specific analyses regarding the continued adequacy of the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination on any need for revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

When preparing the CIWMP Review Report, the county or regional agency must address at least the changes in demographics.

The following resources are provided to facilitate this analysis:

1. Demographic data, including population, taxable sales, employment, and consumer price index by jurisdiction for years up to 2006, are available at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Tools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp. Data for years beyond 2006 can be found on the following websites:
    - Population: Department of Finance
    - Taxable Sales: Board of Equalization
    - Employment: Employment Development Department Click on the link to Local Area Profile, select the county from the drop down menu, then click on the "View Local Are Profile" button.
    - Consumer Price Index: Department of Industrial Relations
2. The Demographic Research Unit of the California Department of Finance is designated as the single official source of demographic data for State planning and budgeting (e.g., find E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates under Reports and Research Papers and then Estimates).
3. The Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit also provides a list of State Census Data Center Network Regional Offices.

Analysis

Upon review of demographic changes since 1990:[1]

☒ The demographic changes since the development of the CIWMP do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.

☐ These demographic changes since the development of the CIWMP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Table 2: Population

Jurisdiction	2012[2]	1/1/2017[3]	% Change 2012-2016
City of Banning	30,132	31,068	3.11
City of Beaumont	39,317	46,179	17.45
City of Blythe	20,556	19,660	-4.36
City of Calimesa	7,968	8,637	8.39
City of Canyon Lake	10,646	10,891	2.30
City of Cathedral City	52,450	54,557	4.02
City of Coachella	42,385	45,551	7.47
City of Corona	156,065	167,759	7.49
City of Desert Hot Springs	27,947	29,111	4.17
City of Eastvale	55,885	64,613	15.62
City of Hemet	79,642	81,868	2.80
City of Indian Wells	5,097	5,450	6.93
City of Indio	79,087	88,718	12.18
City of Jurupa Valley	96,077	101,315	5.45
City of Lake Elsinore	53,437	62,092	16.20
City of La Quinta	38,129	40,677	6.68
City of Menifee	81,469	90,660	11.28
City of Moreno Valley	198,246	206,750	4.29
City of Murrieta	106,978	114,914	7.42
City of Norco	27,295	26,882	-1.51
City of Palm Desert	49,043	50,740	3.46
City of Palm Springs	45,356	47,379	4.46
City of Perris	70,346	75,739	7.67
City of Rancho Mirage	17,586	18,295	4.03
City of Riverside	311,169	326,792	5.02
City of San Jacinto	45,338	47,925	5.71
City of Temecula	103,211	111,024	7.57
City of Wildomar	33,030	35,782	8.33
Unincorporated Area	355,828	373,755	5.04
Total	**2,239,715**	**2,384,783**	**6.48**

[1] The year of the data included in the planning documents, which is generally 1990.

[2] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2010-17/documents/E-4%202017%20Internet%20Version.xls, obtained on April 3, 2018.

[3] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/documents/E-5_2017_Internet%20Version.xlsx , obtained on April 3, 2018

Table 3: Consumer Price Index, County: Riverside

Year	LA/ RIV/OC (CPI)[4]	CA (CPI)[5]	Population[6]	Taxable Sales[7] (x $1,000)	Labor Force Employment[8]	Industry Employment[8]
2007	217.3	217.4	2,049,902	29,023,609	902,000	631,000
2008	225.0	224.8	2,102,741	26,003,595	911,500	604,000
2009	223.2	224.1	2,140,626	22,227,877	915,800	559,700
2010	225.9	226.9	2,189,641	23,152,780	976,400	549,200
2011	231.9	232.9	2,212,675	25,641,497	978,500	561,800
2012	235.8	238.1	2,240,166	28,096,009	987,100	573,600
2013	239.2	241.6	2,265,789	30,065,467	996,400	599,500
2014	242.4	246.0	2,291,262	32,035,687	1,013,500	628,100
2015	244.6	249.6	2,317,895	32,910,910	1,035,700	657,900
2016	249.2	255.3	2,346,717	34,231,144	1,052,600	688,400

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

A number of tools to facilitate the analysis and review of such changes in the waste stream are available from the following CalRecycle sources:

1. Various statewide, regional, and local disposal reports are available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/DRS/Default.aspx.
   a. CalRecycle's Disposal Reporting System tracks and reports the annual estimates of the disposal amounts for jurisdictions in California; additional California solid waste statistics are also available.
   b. CalRecycle's Waste Flow by Destination or Origin reports include solid waste disposal, export, and alternative daily cover. They show how much waste was produced within the boundaries of an individual city, or within all jurisdictions comprising a county or regional agency. These data also cover what was disposed at a particular facility or at all facilities within a county or regional agency.
2. The Waste Characterization Database provides estimates of the types and amounts of materials in the waste streams of *individual California jurisdictions* in 1999. For background information and more recent statewide characterizations, please see https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/Study/
3. CalRecycle's Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report provides both summary and detailed information on compliance, diversion rates/50 percent equivalent per capita disposal target and rates, and waste diversion program implementation for all California jurisdictions. Diversion program implementation summaries are available at

[4] https://www.rivcoeda.org/Portals/0/demographicReports/OCT%20CPI17.pdf?ver=2017-12-09-125005-187, obtained April 3, 2018
[5] https://www.dir.ca.gov/oprl/CPI/EntireCCPI.PDF, obtained May 22, 2018
[6] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2001-10/ and http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2010-18/, obtained May 22, 2018
[7] http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/tsalescont.htm, obtained May 22, 2018
[8] http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/county/river.html#URLF, obtained May 22, 2018

http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/reports/diversionprogram/jurhist.aspx and
http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/reports/diversionprogram/jurhist.aspx.

Together, these reports help illustrate changes in the quantities of waste within the county or regional agency as well as in permitted disposal capacity. This information also summarizes each jurisdiction's progress in implementing the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and complying with the 50 percent diversion rate requirement (now calculated as the 50 percent equivalent per capita disposal target), see Per Capita Disposal and Goal Measurement (2007 and Later) for details

- ☒ The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., equal to or greater than 15 years).
- ☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity within its physical boundaries, but the Siting Element does provide a strategy[9] for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity.
- ☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity and the Siting Element does not provide a strategy[2] for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Analysis

- ☒ These changes in quantities of waste and changes in permitted disposal capacity since the development of the CIWMP do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.
- ☐ These changes in quantities of waste and changes in permitted disposal capacity since the development of the CIWMP warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, . See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

[9] Such a strategy includes a description of the diversion or export programs to be implemented to address the solid waste capacity needs. The description shall identify the existing solid waste disposal facilities, including those outside of the county or regional agency, which will be used to implement these programs. The description should address how the proposed programs shall provide the county or regional agency with sufficient disposal capacity to meet the required minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Table 4: Disposal Capacity

AB 939 Time Horizon	Available Permitted Disposal Capacity (Million Tons)	Projected Disposal Capacity Need (Minimum 15 Years Required)
1992 (SRRE)[10]	42.8 as of 12/31/1991	More than 15 years
1995 (25% Diversion Mandate)[11]	18.9 as of 12/31/1994[12]	13 years
1997 (Starting CIWMP 5-Year Review)[13]	20.2 as of 12/31/1997[14]	More than 15 years
2000 (50% Diversion Mandate)[15]	21.5 as of 12/31/2000[16]	More than 15 years
2001 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[17]	60.4 as of 12/31/2001[18]	More than 15 years
2006 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[19]	59.3 as of 12/31/2006[20]	More than 15 years
2011 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[21]	56.3 as of 12/31/2011[22]	More than 15 years
2016 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[23]	75.9 as of 06/27/2017	More than 15 years

[10] The 1992 capacity data was excerpted from Table 8-1 of the Riverside County Source Reduction & Recycling Element (SRRE), dated June 1992. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55294-RC-SRRE-HHWE.pdf
[11] The 1995 capacity data was excerpted from Table 3-2 of the Riverside County Siting Element in the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), dated September 1996. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55402-Riverside-CIWMP-Final-Draft-Sept1996.pdf
[12] The significant reduction in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 1995 Time Horizon was primarily the result of the loss of planned disposal capacity at the Coachella Landfill, due to discovery of an active fault, and at the Edom Hill, Anza, Mecca II, and Oasis Landfills, due to a decision not to expand beyond the 1993 footprints established under Subtitle D.
[13] The 1997 capacity data was excerpted from Revised Table 3-2 of the Riverside County Siting Element in the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, dated September 1996. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55402-Riverside-CIWMP-Final-Draft-Sept1996.pdf
[14] The increase in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 1997 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill in the same year.
[15] The 2000 capacity data was excerpted from the 2000 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2000 Annual Report Appendix E-2.
[16] The increase in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 2000 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the Badlands Landfill in 1998.
[17] The 2001 capacity data was excerpted from the 2001 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2001 Annual Report Appendix E-2.
[18] The significant increase in permitted capacity shown in the 2001 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill, which added 40 million tons of Countywide disposal capacity, starting in 2001.
[19] The 2006 capacity data was excerpted from the 2007 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2007 Annual Report Appendix E-1.
[20] The increase in permitted capacity in the 2006 Time Horizon was primarily due to a gain in permitted capacity at Badlands Landfill and permitted expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill in 2006.
[21] The 2011 capacity data was excerpted from the 2011 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2011 Annual Report Appendix E-1.
[22] Approximately 5 million tons and 2.38 million tons of Countywide disposal capacity were added, respectively, to the El Sobrante Landfill in 2009 when the landfill's Solid Waste Facility Permit was revised and to the Badlands Landfill in 2010 as a result of new grading plan for the landfill.
[23] The 2016 capacity data was excerpted from the 2016 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2016 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

Table 5: Disposal Tons[24]

Jurisdiction	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Banning	22,196	23,019	22,112	25,886	26,816
Beaumont	24,768	26,863	27,222	30,112	33,560
Blythe	12,733	10,045	11,950	9,967	13,169
Calimesa	5,332	5,432	5,519	6,136	6,251
Canyon Lake	6,112	6,496	7,045	7,149	7,215
Cathedral City	40,924	39,014	37,831	39,476	40,472
Coachella	19,101	19,610	20,724	22,144	31,763
Corona	158,626	164,071	189,740	195,052	204,312
Desert Hot Springs	19,247	17,058	18,087	18,176	19,167
Eastvale	22,255	24,522	26,283	30,226	29,977
Hemet	56,602	58,049	63,624	67,554	70,893
Indian Wells	8,758	9,736	9,606	9,276	11,827
Indio	65,829	53,991	55,327	69,226	72,938
Jurupa Valley	n/a	59,215	62,337	68,350	71,346
La Quinta	31,245	32,305	33,168	31,055	34,576
Lake Elsinore	36,893	41,275	41,290	44,866	48,663
Menifee	43,483	44,511	48,669	48,638	45,066
Moreno Valley	109,706	114,694	120,737	131,743	143,007
Murrieta	54,975	59,545	63,485	66,920	67,658
Norco	27,297	28,290	29,402	29,225	30,899
Palm Desert	56,170	62,813	63,050	60,122	59,851
Palm Springs	61,467	64,182	64,604	66,355	69,260
Perris	51,545	54,353	61,360	66,860	66,902
Rancho Mirage	23,575	24,666	23,959	24,540	24,109
Riverside	317,075	333,527	329,824	366,461	415,151
San Jacinto	24,313	25,686	27,646	28,220	31,097
Temecula	78,231	78,100	82,329	88,517	88,348
Wildomar	16,827	17,800	20,418	20,505	19,650
Unincorporated	293,568	342,588	329,684	428,590	375,745
Total*	**1,688,853**	**1,841,458**	**1,897,032**	**2,101,346**	**2,159,693**

*numbers may not add up to total due to rounding.

[24] http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Jurisdiction/DiversionDisposal.aspx, selected each listed year and Riverside County. Information obtained March 13, 2018.

Table 6: Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdictional Diversion/Disposal Progress Report

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Banning	36	2012	6.1	4.1	30.7	27.2
	36	2013	6.1	4.2	30.7	29.8
	36	2014	6.1	4.0	30.7	23.9
	37	2015	6.1	4.7	30.7	28.1
	38	2016	6.1	4.8	30.7	27.7
Beaumont	39	2012	9.7	3.5	42.1	25.0
	39	2013	9.7	3.7	42.1	24.2
	39	2014	9.7	3.6	42.1	24.6
	39	2015	9.7	3.9	42.1	27.4
	40	2016	9.7	4.1	42.1	29.8
Blythe	37	2012	4.3	3.4	29.4	21.8
	37	2013	4.3	2.8	29.4	15.2
	37	2014	4.3	3.4	29.4	18.3
	37	2015	4.3	2.9	29.4	15.7
	39	2016	4.3	3.7	29.4	20.5
Calimesa	36	2012	4.8	3.7	17.3	23.4
	36	2013	4.8	3.7	17.3	20.6
	36	2014	4.8	3.7	17.3	22.4
	36	2015	4.8	4.0	17.3	26.6
	37	2016	4.8	4.1	17.3	25.3
Canyon Lake	32	2012	4.8	3.1	43.0	34.5
	32	2013	4.8	3.3	43.0	32.9
	32	2014	4.8	3.6	43.0	32.9
	32	2015	4.8	3.6	43.0	31.4
	33	2016	4.8	3.7	43.0	30.3
Cathedral City	41	2012	6.9	4.3	31.7	25.9
	41	2013	6.9	4.1	31.7	24.4
	41	2014	6.9	3.9	31.7	23.1
	41	2015	6.9	4.1	31.7	23.1
	42	2016	6.9	4.1	31.7	22.6
Coachella	41	2012	5.7	2.5	24.6	16.1
	41	2013	5.7	2.5	24.6	18.0
	41	2014	5.7	2.6	24.6	16.1
	41	2015	5.7	2.8	24.6	16.9
	42	2016	5.7	3.9	24.6	21.9
Corona	40	2012	8.6	5.6	18.6	14.6
	40	2013	8.6	5.7	18.6	14.3
	40	2014	8.6	6.5	18.6	15.5
	40	2015	8.6	6.7	18.6	15.5
	41	2016	8.6	6.8	18.6	15.9
Desert Hot Springs	38	2012	3.8	3.8	31.4	35.1
	37	2013	3.8	3.4	31.4	35.1
	37	2014	3.8	3.5	31.4	31.7
	37	2015	3.8	3.5	31.4	31.4
	38	2016	3.8	3.6	31.4	34.1

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Eastvale	32	2012	3.6	2.2	25.9	22.6
	32	2013	3.6	2.3	25.9	20.7
	32	2014	3.6	2.4	25.9	18.7
	32	2015	3.6	2.7	25.9	18.8
	33	2016	3.6	2.6	25.9	17.9
Hemet	36	2012	7.0	3.9	25.8	17.8
	36	2013	7.0	3.9	25.8	18.2
	36	2014	7.0	4.3	25.8	18.1
	36	2015	7.0	4.5	25.8	18.7
	37	2016	7.0	4.8	25.8	19.1
Indian Wells	42	2012	21.5	9.5	25.5	12.6
	42	2013	21.5	10.5	25.5	15.5
	42	2014	21.5	10.2	25.5	14.6
	42	2015	21.5	9.8	25.5	13.2
	43	2016	21.5	12.1	25.5	17.0
Indio	45	2012	8.7	4.6	35.6	25.0
	46	2013	8.7	3.6	35.6	21.5
	46	2014	8.7	3.7	35.6	20.2
	47	2015	8.7	4.5	35.6	22.8
	48	2016	8.7	4.6	35.6	23.7
Jurupa Valley	n/a	2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	33	2013	5.3	3.3	15.4	13.5
	33	2014	5.3	3.5	15.4	13.2
	42	2015	5.3	3.8	15.4	12.7
	43	2016	5.3	4.0	15.4	12.5
La Quinta	41	2012	10.0	4.5	34.8	14.5
	41	2013	10.0	4.6	34.8	15.5
	41	2014	10.0	4.7	34.8	15.9
	42	2015	10.0	4.3	34.8	14.5
	43	2016	10.0	4.7	34.8	16.3
Lake Elsinore	39	2012	5.3	3.8	23.3	20.1
	39	2013	5.3	4.1	23.3	21.4
	39	2014	5.3	4.0	23.3	18.4
	39	2015	5.3	4.2	23.3	19.4
	40	2016	5.3	4.4	23.3	19.7
Menifee	34	2012	4.6	3.0	29.8	24.3
	34	2013	4.6	3.0	29.8	23.4
	34	2014	4.6	3.2	29.8	23.0
	34	2015	4.6	3.1	29.8	22.0
	35	2016	4.6	2.8	29.8	19.5
Moreno Valley	42	2012	4.4	3.1	31.8	19.2
	42	2013	4.4	3.2	31.8	23.2
	44	2014	4.4	3.3	31.8	20.6
	44	2015	4.4	3.6	31.8	19.8
	45	2016	4.4	3.8	31.8	18.7

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Murrieta	42	2012	4.6	2.9	23.0	14.6
	42	2013	4.6	3.1	23.0	15.3
	42	2014	4.6	3.3	23.0	15.0
	42	2015	4.6	3.4	23.0	15.0
	43	2016	4.6	3.3	23.0	14.0
Norco	39	2012	11.4	5.5	23.1	12.2
	39	2013	11.4	5.8	23.1	12.7
	39	2014	11.4	6.1	23.1	13.1
	39	2015	11.4	6.2	23.1	12.4
	40	2016	11.4	6.3	23.1	12.1
Palm Desert	44	2012	13.3	6.2	22.3	12.1
	44	2013	13.3	6.9	22.3	13.2
	44	2014	13.3	6.9	22.3	12.7
	44	2015	13.3	6.5	22.3	12.0
	45	2016	13.3	6.5	22.3	11.6
Palm Springs	35	2012	13.9	7.4	30.6	15.2
	35	2013	13.9	7.7	30.6	15.6
	35	2014	13.9	7.7	30.6	14.6
	35	2015	13.9	7.8	30.6	14.7
	36	2016	13.9	8.1	30.6	14.4
Perris	37	2012	6.3	4.0	20.6	25.7
	37	2013	6.3	4.2	20.6	23.2
	37	2014	6.3	4.7	20.6	22.5
	37	2015	6.3	5.0	20.6	22.6
	38	2016	6.3	5.0	20.6	20.1
Rancho Mirage	44	2012	14.7	7.4	20.2	9.7
	44	2013	14.7	7.7	20.2	10.2
	44	2014	14.7	7.4	20.2	10.1
	44	2015	14.7	7.5	20.2	10.8
	45	2016	14.7	7.3	20.2	9.7
Riverside	37	2012	8.6	5.6	19.5	13.7
	37	2013	8.6	5.9	19.5	14.0
	37	2014	8.6	5.8	19.5	13.3
	38	2015	8.6	6.3	19.5	14.3
	39	2016	8.6	6.9	19.5	15.4
San Jacinto	41	2012	6.4	3.0	33.3	22.3
	41	2013	6.4	3.1	33.3	21.5
	41	2014	6.4	3.3	33.3	20.3
	43	2015	6.4	3.4	33.3	19.8
	44	2016	6.4	3.6	33.3	20.8
Temecula	41	2012	7.5	4.2	13.2	10.4
	41	2013	7.5	4.1	13.2	10.3
	41	2014	7.5	4.2	13.2	10.2
	41	2015	7.5	4.5	13.2	10.4
	42	2016	7.5	4.4	13.2	9.9

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Wildomar	33	2012	4.8	2.8	36.2	24.1
	33	2013	4.8	2.9	36.2	24.6
	33	2014	4.8	3.3	36.2	27.7
	33	2015	4.8	3.3	36.2	25.6
	34	2016	4.8	3.1	36.2	23.3
Unincorporated	45	2012	6.9	4.5	28.3	27.3
	45	2013	7.3	5.2	30.9	33.5
	45	2014	7.3	5.0	30.9	27.9
	45	2015	7.3	6.4	30.9	34.3
	46	2016	7.3	5.5	30.9	28.3

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element (SE) and Summary Plan (SP)

Since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent), the county experienced the following significant changes in funding for the SE or SP:

Analysis

☒ There have been no significant changes in funding for administration of the SE and SP or the changes that have occurred do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.

☐ These changes in funding for the administration of the SE and SP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

The basic funding sources for the administration of the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan have not changed significantly since the CIWMP was approved. The sources of funding continue to include tipping fees, generated through the County's disposal system of landfills and transfer/collection stations, and solid waste collection and franchise fees at the city or local level. The County continues to manage and maintain a countywide disposal system that provides for the disposal needs of all Riverside County residents. The user tipping fees generated from waste disposal and processing continue to be the primary source of revenue to fund capital expenditures, landfill operations, landfill closures, environmental remediation, waste inspection programs, programs that allow for the diversion of recyclable materials and hazardous materials from landfill disposal, and a variety of AB 939 programs. The County also utilizes State grants, when available, to fund its recycling programs, such as tires, household hazardous waste and used oil collection.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The county experienced significant changes in the following administrative responsibilities since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

Analysis

☒ There have been no significant changes in administrative responsibilities or the changes in administrative responsibilities do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.

☐ These changes in administrative responsibilities warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

No significant changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP, other than normal personnel turnover. Within the unincorporated County, the Department of Waste Resources continues to be the responsible agency. The government agency or office in each jurisdiction that is responsible for solid waste management and diversion activities in identified below. The individuals responsible for AB 939 implementation in each jurisdiction are identified in the annual reports prepared by each jurisdiction.

Table 7: Responsible Departments for Solid Waste Management Activity by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Department or Office Responsible for Solid Waste Management Activities
Banning	Public Works Department
Beaumont	City Manager's Office
Blythe	Public Works Department
Calimesa	Public Works Department
Canyon Lake	Administration/City Clerk's Office
Cathedral City	Department of Environmental Conservation
Coachella	City Manager/Community Service
Corona	Maintenance Services Department
Desert Hot Springs	City Manager's Office
Eastvale	City Manager's Office
Hemet	Public Works Department
Indian Wells	City Manager's Office
Indio	Environmental Programs
Jurupa Valley	City Manager's Office
La Quinta	City Manager's Office
Lake Elsinore	Public Works Department
Moreno Valley	Public Works Maintenance and Operations Division
Menifee	City Manager's Office
Murrieta	City Manager's Office
Norco	Public Works Department
Palm Desert	Community Services Division
Palm Springs	Public Works Department
Perris	Public Services Department
Rancho Mirage	City Manager's Office
Riverside	Department of Public Works
San Jacinto	Public Works Department
Temecula	Community Development Department
Wildomar	Public Works Department
Unincorporated	Department of Waste Resources

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented, But Were Not

This section addresses programs that were scheduled to be implemented, but were not; why they were not implemented; the progress of programs that were implemented; a statement as to whether programs are meeting their goals; and if not, what contingency measures are being enacted to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code Section 41751.

1. Progress of Program Implementation
   a. SRRE and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

      ☒ All program implementation information has been updated in the CalRecycle Electronic Annual Report (EAR), including the reason for not implementing specific programs, if applicable.

☐ All program implementation information has not been updated in the EAR. Attachment _____ lists the SRRE and/or HHWE programs selected for implementation, but which have not yet been implemented, including a statement as to why they were not implemented.

b. Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE)

☒ There have been no changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFEs and any amendments and/or updates).
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFEs).

c. Countywide Siting Element (SE)

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SE.
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes to the information provided in the current SE.

d. Summary Plan

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SP.
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes to the information provided in the current SP.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting their Goals

☒ The programs are meeting their goals.
☐ The programs are not meeting their goals. The discussion that follows in the analysis section below addresses the contingency measures that are being enacted to ensure compliance with PRC Section 41751 (i.e., specific steps are being taken by local agencies, acting independently and in concert with _____, to achieve the purposes of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989) and whether the listed changes in program implementation necessitate a revision to one or more of the planning documents. _____

Analysis

☒ The aforementioned changes in program implementation do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.
☐ Changes in program implementation warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

The county experienced changes in the following available markets for recyclable materials since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

Analysis

☒ There are no significant changes in available markets for recycled materials to warrant a revision to any of the planning documents. Specifically, the markets for recyclable materials are dynamic; market supply, demand, and prices often fluctuate in response to the economy and other variables, such as increasing regulatory requirements, which can potentially add to operating cost or create siting issues.
☐ Changes in available markets for recycled materials warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, . See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule

The following addresses changes to the county's implementation schedule that are not already addressed in Section 4.5:

Analysis

☒ There are no significant changes in the implementation schedule to warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.

☐ Changes in the implementation schedule warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Note: Consider for each jurisdiction within the county or regional agency the changes noted in Sections 4.1 through 4.7 and explain whether the changes necessitate revisions to any of the jurisdictions' planning documents.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES OR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (optional)

The following addresses any other significant issues/changes in the county and whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP to the extent that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed:

Analysis

The overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable. The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the CIWMP are still accurately described. Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been, and are continuing to be, implemented. The existing and selected programs for each contingent programs were reviewed. Nearly all programs have been implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County and each city are updated yearly and reviewed by CalRecycle staff. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs and results, these changes are not considered to be significant. Although a few programs have been either revised or deleted, overall program implementation has been discussed in all prior annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated. The unincorporated County and cities continue to monitor evolving compliance issues. Consequently, the LTF, the County and its cities have decided that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. For these reasons, the County deems that a revision of its CIWMP is not warranted or justified at this time.

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

☒ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the county have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP elements. No jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents.

☐ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the county have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP (or RAIWMP) elements. The following jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents, as listed.

_____

Analysis
The discussion below addresses the county's evaluation of the Annual Report data relating to planning document adequacy and includes determination regarding the need to revise one or more of the documents:

No revisions necessary based on the review.

SECTION 7.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if required)

The County deems that a revision of its CIWMP is not warranted or justified at this time.

Appendix A – LTF Comments

MORENO VALLEY
WHERE DREAMS SOAR

Public Works Department
Maintenance and Operations Division

COMMENT LETTER

TO: **Kathleen Utter, Riverside County Department of Waste Resources**

FROM: **Robert Lemon, City of Moreno Valley Maintenance and Operations Division**

DATE: **July 5, 2018**

SUBJECT: **2018 Five Year CIWMP Review Report – City of Moreno Valley Review**

The City of Moreno Valley has reviewed the 2018 Five Year CIWMP Review Report. The annual report data associated with the City of Moreno Valley within Tables 5 and 6 is accurate. We respectfully request the following two revisions:

1. Table 1: Please update the name of the Moreno Valley (Alternate) contact from Prem Kumar to Samantha Rodriguez.
2. Table 7: Please update the department responsible for solid waste activities in Moreno Valley from Public Works Administration to Public Works Maintenance and Operations Division.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact me at 951.413.3160.

cc: Michael L. Wolfe, P.E., Public Works Director/City Engineer

RIVERSIDE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
WASTE RESOURCES

Hans W. Kernkamp, General Manager-Chief Engineer

June 13, 2018

TO: Riverside County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/
Local Task Force (LTF) Members
City Representatives

FROM: Angela C.M. Dufresne, Principal Engineer
Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (RCDWR)

RE: **Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP): 2018 Five-Year Review Report, dated June 2018**

Every five years following the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) approval of the CIWMP, which was September 23, 1998, the LTF is required to complete a review of the County's CIWMP to ensure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices to integrate source reduction, recycling and composting with environmentally-safe landfill disposal and/or transformation. The County is required to consider the LTF comments as well as those from its cities to determine if a revision to the CIWMP is necessary and to report its findings in a CIWMP Review Report to the LTF and CalRecycle.

To assist in this process, RCDWR staff has prepared the enclosed **2018 Five-Year Review Report**, for your review and comment. While it is staff's preliminary finding, based on the report that the Riverside CIWMP and its elements do not require revision and that the CIWMP, when augmented by updates through annual reports to CalRecycle, is still applicable in defining the goals, policies and objectives to achieve compliance with AB 939, LTF members and City representatives are being asked to review the enclosed report for any inaccuracies or deficiencies. In particular, each City representative is being asked to also review the data collected from their Annual Reports, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP elements. If any updates are needed, please include that information in your comment letter.

In accordance with the enclosed timeline, your written comments are respectfully requested by July 15, 2018, in order for RCDWR staff to respond to comments and to finalize the report before being submitted to the County Board of Supervisors for approval in September 2018.

Please submit or fax written comments to the attention of Kathleen Utter at the address or fax number noted at the bottom of the page. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either Kathleen Utter or me at the telephone number, also so noted at the bottom of the page.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

ACMD: ku

Enclosures: 1) Five-Year CIWMP Review Report
2) Timeline

PD #76743v4

Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 require that each countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan (CIWMP or RAIWMP), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised if necessary, and submitted to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) every five years. CalRecycle developed this Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template to streamline the Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP review, reporting, and approval process.

A county or regional agency may use this template to document its compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and as a tool in its review, including obtaining Local Task Force (LTF) comments on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP that need revision, if any. This template also can be finalized based on these comments and submitted to CalRecycle as the county or regional agency's Five-Year CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report.

The Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template Instructions describe each section and provide general guidelines with respect to preparing the report. Completed and signed reports should be submitted to the CalRecycle's Local Assistance & Market Development (LAMD) Branch at the address below. Upon report receipt, LAMD staff may request clarification and/or additional information if the details provided in the report are not clear or are not complete. Within 90 days of receiving a *complete* Five–Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report, LAMD staff will review the report and prepare their findings for CalRecycle consideration for approval.

If you have any questions about the Five–Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report process or how to complete this template, please contact your LAMD representative at (916) 341-6199. Mail the completed and signed Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to:

Dept. of Resources Recycling & Recovery
Local Assistance & Market Development, MS-9
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

To edit & customize this template, the editing restrictions (filling in forms) must be disengaged. Select the Review tab, Protect Document, and then Restrict Formatting and Editing (uncheck editing restrictions). There is no password (options). Please contact your LAMD representative at (916) 341-6199 with related questions.

General Instructions: Please complete Sections 1 through 7, and all other applicable subsections. Double click on shaded text/areas ( ) to select or add text.

SECTION 1.0 County or Regional Agency Information			
I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five-Year Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name Riverside County		County(s) [if a RAIWMP Review Report] Riverside	
Authorized Signature	Title General Manager-Chief Engineer		
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Hans W. Kernkamp		Date	Phone 951-486-3200
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Kathleen Utter		Title Recycling Specialist	Phone 951-486-3286
Mailing Address 14310 Frederick Street	City Moreno Valley	State CA	Zip 92553
E-mail Address kutter@rivco.org			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is Riverside County's fourth Five–Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

The following changes have occurred since the approval of the Riverside County's planning documents or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

- ☐ Diversion goal reduction
- ☐ New regional agency
- ☐ Changes to regional agency
- ☐ New city (name(s) _____)
- ☐ Other _____

Additional Information (optional)

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

a. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the Local Task Force (LTF) reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP and finalized its comments
☐ at the _____ LTF meeting. ☐ electronically (fax, e-mail) ☐ other (Explain): _____

b. The county received the written comments from the LTF on _____.

c. A copy of the LTF comments
☒ is included as Appendix A.
☐ was submitted to CalRecycle on _____.

Table 1: Local Task Force Members

Name	Representative of (e.g., City or County)
Bob Magee	County Supervisorial District #1
Simon Housman	County Supervisorial District #4
Miguel Arciniega	County Supervisorial District #5
Bruce Scott	Agriculture
Richard Schmid	Agriculture
Richard O'Neill	Engineering
Frankie Riddle	Coachella Valley Association of Governments
Linda Krupa	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Jordan Ehrenkranz	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Chuck Tobin	Inland Empire Disposal Association
Ed Campos	Inland Empire Disposal Association
Ted Dumas	Institute of Scrap Recycling
Vincent Coffeen	Economic Development Agency
Robert Moran	Economic Development Agency
Katie Barrows	Environmental Community
Mike Gardner	City of Riverside
Robert Lemon	City of Moreno Valley
Curtis Showalter	City of Corona
Armando Villa	City of Temecula
Steven Pastor	Agriculture (Alternate)
Councilmember Debbie Franklin	Western Riverside Council of Governments (Alternate)
Councilmember Dick Haley	Western Riverside Council of Governments (Alternate)

Name	Representative of (e.g., City or County)
Ben Drake	Agriculture (Alternate)
David Fahrion	Inland Empire Disposal Association (IEDA) (Alternate)
Chris Cunningham	Inland Empire Disposal Association (IEDA) (Alternate)
Deanna Pressgrove	Coachella Valley Association of Governments (Alternate)
Mike Soubirous	City of Riverside (Alternate)
~~Prem Kumar~~ SAMANTHA	City of Moreno Valley (Alternate)
Dale West RODRIGUEZ	City of Temecula (Alternate)
Katie Hockett	County Supervisorial District #1 (Alternate)
Steven Bayard	County Supervisorial District #4 (Alternate)
Martin Rosen	County Supervisorial District #5 (Alternate)
Phil Rosentrater	Economic Development Agency (Alternate)

SECTION 4.0 TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H)

The subsections below address not only the areas of change specified in the regulations, but also provide specific analyses regarding the continued adequacy of the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination on any need for revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

When preparing the CIWMP Review Report, the county or regional agency must address at least the changes in demographics.

The following resources are provided to facilitate this analysis:

1. Demographic data, including population, taxable sales, employment, and consumer price index by jurisdiction for years up to 2006, are available at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Tools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp. Data for years beyond 2006 can be found on the following websites:
   - Population: Department of Finance
   - Taxable Sales: Board of Equalization
   - Employment: Employment Development Department Click on the link to Local Area Profile, select the county from the drop down menu, then click on the "View Local Are Profile" button.
   - Consumer Price Index: Department of Industrial Relations
2. The Demographic Research Unit of the California Department of Finance is designated as the single official source of demographic data for State planning and budgeting (e.g., find E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates under Reports and Research Papers and then Estimates).
3. The Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit also provides a list of State Census Data Center Network Regional Offices.

Analysis

Upon review of demographic changes since 1990:[1]

[1] The year of the data included in the planning documents, which is generally 1990.

☒ The demographic changes since the development of the CIWMP do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.

☐ These demographic changes since the development of the CIWMP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Table 2: Population

Jurisdiction	2012[2]	1/1/2017[3]	% Change 2012-2016
City of Banning	30,132	31,068	3.11
City of Beaumont	39,317	46,179	17.45
City of Blythe	20,556	19,660	-4.36
City of Calimesa	7,968	8,637	8.39
City of Canyon Lake	10,646	10,891	2.30
City of Cathedral City	52,450	54,557	4.02
City of Coachella	42,385	45,551	7.47
City of Corona	156,065	167,759	7.49
City of Desert Hot Springs	27,947	29,111	4.17
City of Eastvale	55,885	64,613	15.62
City of Hemet	79,642	81,868	2.80
City of Indian Wells	5,097	5,450	6.93
City of Indio	79,087	88,718	12.18
City of Jurupa Valley	96,077	101,315	5.45
City of Lake Elsinore	53,437	62,092	16.20
City of La Quinta	38,129	40,677	6.68
City of Menifee	81,469	90,660	11.28
City of Moreno Valley	198,246	206,750	4.29
City of Murrieta	106,978	114,914	7.42
City of Norco	27,295	26,882	-1.51
City of Palm Desert	49,043	50,740	3.46
City of Palm Springs	45,356	47,379	4.46
City of Perris	70,346	75,739	7.67
City of Rancho Mirage	17,586	18,295	4.03
City of Riverside	311,169	326,792	5.02
City of San Jacinto	45,338	47,925	5.71
City of Temecula	103,211	111,024	7.57
City of Wildomar	33,030	35,782	8.33
Unincorporated Area	355,828	373,755	5.04
Total	**2,239,715**	**2,384,783**	**6.48**

[2] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2010-17/documents/E-4%202017%20Internet%20Version.xls, obtained on April 3, 2018.

[3] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/documents/E-5_2017_Internet%20Version.xlsx , obtained on April 3, 2018

Table 3: Consumer Price Index, County: Riverside

Year	LA/ RIV/OC (CPI)[4]	CA (CPI)[5]	Population[6]	Taxable Sales[7] (x $1,000)	Labor Force Employment[8]	Industry Employment[8]
2007	217.3	217.4	2,049,902	29,023,609	902,000	631,000
2008	225.0	224.8	2,102,741	26,003,595	911,500	604,000
2009	223.2	224.1	2,140,626	22,227,877	915,800	559,700
2010	225.9	226.9	2,189,641	23,152,780	976,400	549,200
2011	231.9	232.9	2,212,675	25,641,497	978,500	561,800
2012	235.8	238.1	2,240,166	28,096,009	987,100	573,600
2013	239.2	241.6	2,265,789	30,065,467	996,400	599,500
2014	242.4	246.0	2,291,262	32,035,687	1,013,500	628,100
2015	244.6	249.6	2,317,895	32,910,910	1,035,700	657,900
2016	249.2	255.3	2,346,717	34,231,144	1,052,600	688,400

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

A number of tools to facilitate the analysis and review of such changes in the waste stream are available from the following CalRecycle sources:

1. Various statewide, regional, and local disposal reports are available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/DRS/Default.aspx.
   a. CalRecycle's Disposal Reporting System tracks and reports the annual estimates of the disposal amounts for jurisdictions in California; additional California solid waste statistics are also available.
   b. CalRecycle's Waste Flow by Destination or Origin reports include solid waste disposal, export, and alternative daily cover. They show how much waste was produced within the boundaries of an individual city, or within all jurisdictions comprising a county or regional agency. These data also cover what was disposed at a particular facility or at all facilities within a county or regional agency.
2. The Waste Characterization Database provides estimates of the types and amounts of materials in the waste streams of *individual California jurisdictions* in 1999. For background information and more recent statewide characterizations, please see https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/Study/
3. CalRecycle's Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report provides both summary and detailed information on compliance, diversion rates/50 percent equivalent per capita disposal target and rates, and waste diversion program implementation for all California jurisdictions. Diversion program implementation summaries are available at

[4] https://www.rivcoeda.org/Portals/0/demographicReports/OCT%20CPI17.pdf?ver=2017-12-09-125005-187, obtained April 3, 2018
[5] https://www.dir.ca.gov/oprl/CPI/EntireCCPI.PDF, obtained May 22, 2018
[6] http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2001-10/ and http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-4/2010-18/, obtained May 22, 2018
[7] http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/tsalescont.htm, obtained May 22, 2018
[8] http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/county/river.html#URLF, obtained May 22, 2018

http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/reports/diversionprogram/jurhist.aspx and
http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/reports/diversionprogram/jurhist.aspx.

Together, these reports help illustrate changes in the quantities of waste within the county or regional agency as well as in permitted disposal capacity. This information also summarizes each jurisdiction's progress in implementing the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and complying with the 50 percent diversion rate requirement (now calculated as the 50 percent equivalent per capita disposal target), see Per Capita Disposal and Goal Measurement (2007 and Later) for details

- ☒ The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., equal to or greater than 15 years).
- ☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity within its physical boundaries, but the Siting Element does provide a strategy[9] for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity.
- ☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity and the Siting Element does not provide a strategy[2] for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Analysis

- ☒ These changes in quantities of waste and changes in permitted disposal capacity since the development of the CIWMP do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.
- ☐ These changes in quantities of waste and changes in permitted disposal capacity since the development of the CIWMP warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, . See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

[9] Such a strategy includes a description of the diversion or export programs to be implemented to address the solid waste capacity needs. The description shall identify the existing solid waste disposal facilities, including those outside of the county or regional agency, which will be used to implement these programs. The description should address how the proposed programs shall provide the county or regional agency with sufficient disposal capacity to meet the required minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Table 4: Disposal Capacity

AB 939 Time Horizon	Available Permitted Disposal Capacity (Million Tons)	Projected Disposal Capacity Need (Minimum 15 Years Required)
1992 (SRRE)[10]	42.8 as of 12/31/1991	More than 15 years
1995 (25% Diversion Mandate)[11]	18.9 as of 12/31/1994[12]	13 years
1997 (Starting CIWMP 5-Year Review)[13]	20.2 as of 12/31/1997[14]	More than 15 years
2000 (50% Diversion Mandate)[15]	21.5 as of 12/31/2000[16]	More than 15 years
2001 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[17]	60.4 as of 12/31/2001[18]	More than 15 years
2006 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[19]	59.3 as of 12/31/2006[20]	More than 15 years
2011 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[21]	56.3 as of 12/31/2011[22]	More than 15 years
2016 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review)[23]	75.9 as of 06/27/2017	More than 15 years

[10] The 1992 capacity data was excerpted from Table 8-1 of the Riverside County Source Reduction & Recycling Element (SRRE), dated June 1992. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55294-RC-SRRE-HHWE.pdf

[11] The 1995 capacity data was excerpted from Table 3-2 of the Riverside County Siting Element in the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), dated September 1996. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55402-Riverside-CIWMP-Final-Draft-Sept1996.pdf

[12] The significant reduction in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 1995 Time Horizon was primarily the result of the loss of planned disposal capacity at the Coachella Landfill, due to discovery of an active fault, and at the Edom Hill, Anza, Mecca II, and Oasis Landfills, due to a decision not to expand beyond the 1993 footprints established under Subtitle D.

[13] The 1997 capacity data was excerpted from Revised Table 3-2 of the Riverside County Siting Element in the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, dated September 1996. http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/55402-Riverside-CIWMP-Final-Draft-Sept1996.pdf

[14] The increase in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 1997 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill in the same year.

[15] The 2000 capacity data was excerpted from the 2000 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2000 Annual Report Appendix E-2.

[16] The increase in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 2000 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the Badlands Landfill in 1998.

[17] The 2001 capacity data was excerpted from the 2001 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2001 Annual Report Appendix E-2.

[18] The significant increase in permitted capacity shown in the 2001 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill, which added 40 million tons of Countywide disposal capacity, starting in 2001.

[19] The 2006 capacity data was excerpted from the 2007 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2007 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

[20] The increase in permitted capacity in the 2006 Time Horizon was primarily due to a gain in permitted capacity at Badlands Landfill and permitted expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill in 2006.

[21] The 2011 capacity data was excerpted from the 2011 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2011 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

[22] Approximately 5 million tons and 2.38 million tons of Countywide disposal capacity were added, respectively, to the El Sobrante Landfill in 2009 when the landfill's Solid Waste Facility Permit was revised and to the Badlands Landfill in 2010 as a result of new grading plan for the landfill.

[23] The 2016 capacity data was excerpted from the 2016 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2016 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

Table 5: Disposal Tons[24]

Jurisdiction	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Banning	22,196	23,019	22,112	25,886	26,816
Beaumont	24,768	26,863	27,222	30,112	33,560
Blythe	12,733	10,045	11,950	9,967	13,169
Calimesa	5,332	5,432	5,519	6,136	6,251
Canyon Lake	6,112	6,496	7,045	7,149	7,215
Cathedral City	40,924	39,014	37,831	39,476	40,472
Coachella	19,101	19,610	20,724	22,144	31,763
Corona	158,626	164,071	189,740	195,052	204,312
Desert Hot Springs	19,247	17,058	18,087	18,176	19,167
Eastvale	22,255	24,522	26,283	30,226	29,977
Hemet	56,602	58,049	63,624	67,554	70,893
Indian Wells	8,758	9,736	9,606	9,276	11,827
Indio	65,829	53,991	55,327	69,226	72,938
Jurupa Valley	57,297	59,215	62,337	68,350	71,346
La Quinta	31,245	32,305	33,168	31,055	34,576
Lake Elsinore	36,893	41,275	41,290	44,866	48,663
Menifee	43,483	44,511	48,669	48,638	45,066
Moreno Valley	109,706 ✓	114,694 ✓	120,737 ✓	131,743 ✓	143,007 ✓
Murrieta	54,975	59,545	63,485	66,920	67,658
Norco	27,297	28,290	29,402	29,225	30,899
Palm Desert	56,170	62,813	63,050	60,122	59,851
Palm Springs	61,467	64,182	64,604	66,355	69,260
Perris	51,545	54,353	61,360	66,860	66,902
Rancho Mirage	23,575	24,666	23,959	24,540	24,109
Riverside	317,075	333,527	329,824	366,461	415,151
San Jacinto	24,313	25,686	27,646	28,220	31,097
Temecula	78,231	78,100	82,329	88,517	88,348
Wildomar	16,827	17,800	20,418	20,505	19,650
Unincorporated	293,568	342,588	329,684	428,590	375,745
Total*	**1,688,853**	**1,841,458**	**1,897,032**	**2,101,346**	**2,159,693**

*numbers may not add up to total due to rounding.

[24] http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/Jurisdiction/DiversionDisposal.aspx, selected each listed year and Riverside County. Information obtained March 13, 2018.

Table 6: Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdictional Diversion/Disposal Progress Report

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Banning	36	2012	6.1	4.1	30.7	27.2
	36	2013	6.1	4.2	30.7	29.8
	36	2014	6.1	4.0	30.7	23.9
	37	2015	6.1	4.7	30.7	28.1
	38	2016	6.1	4.8	30.7	27.7
Beaumont	39	2012	9.7	3.5	42.1	25.0
	39	2013	9.7	3.7	42.1	24.2
	39	2014	9.7	3.6	42.1	24.6
	39	2015	9.7	3.9	42.1	27.4
	40	2016	9.7	4.1	42.1	29.8
Blythe	37	2012	4.3	3.4	29.4	21.8
	37	2013	4.3	2.8	29.4	15.2
	37	2014	4.3	3.4	29.4	18.3
	37	2015	4.3	2.9	29.4	15.7
	39	2016	4.3	3.7	29.4	20.5
Calimesa	36	2012	4.8	3.7	17.3	23.4
	36	2013	4.8	3.7	17.3	20.6
	36	2014	4.8	3.7	17.3	22.4
	36	2015	4.8	4.0	17.3	26.6
	37	2016	4.8	4.1	17.3	25.3
Canyon Lake	32	2012	4.8	3.1	43.0	34.5
	32	2013	4.8	3.3	43.0	32.9
	32	2014	4.8	3.6	43.0	32.9
	32	2015	4.8	3.6	43.0	31.4
	33	2016	4.8	3.7	43.0	30.3
Cathedral City	41	2012	6.9	4.3	31.7	25.9
	41	2013	6.9	4.1	31.7	24.4
	41	2014	6.9	3.9	31.7	23.1
	41	2015	6.9	4.1	31.7	23.1
	42	2016	6.9	4.1	31.7	22.6
Coachella	41	2012	5.7	2.5	24.6	16.1
	41	2013	5.7	2.5	24.6	18.0
	41	2014	5.7	2.6	24.6	16.1
	41	2015	5.7	2.8	24.6	16.9
	42	2016	5.7	3.9	24.6	21.9
Corona	40	2012	8.6	5.6	18.6	14.6
	40	2013	8.6	5.7	18.6	14.3
	40	2014	8.6	6.5	18.6	15.5
	40	2015	8.6	6.7	18.6	15.5
	41	2016	8.6	6.8	18.6	15.9
Desert Hot Springs	38	2012	3.8	3.8	31.4	35.1
	37	2013	3.8	3.4	31.4	35.1
	37	2014	3.8	3.5	31.4	31.7
	37	2015	3.8	3.5	31.4	31.4
	38	2016	3.8	3.6	31.4	34.1

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Eastvale	32	2012	3.6	2.2	25.9	22.6
	32	2013	3.6	2.3	25.9	20.7
	32	2014	3.6	2.4	25.9	18.7
	32	2015	3.6	2.7	25.9	18.8
	33	2016	3.6	2.6	25.9	17.9
Hemet	36	2012	7.0	3.9	25.8	17.8
	36	2013	7.0	3.9	25.8	18.2
	36	2014	7.0	4.3	25.8	18.1
	36	2015	7.0	4.5	25.8	18.7
	37	2016	7.0	4.8	25.8	19.1
Indian Wells	42	2012	21.5	9.5	25.5	12.6
	42	2013	21.5	10.5	25.5	15.5
	42	2014	21.5	10.2	25.5	14.6
	42	2015	21.5	9.8	25.5	13.2
	43	2016	21.5	12.1	25.5	17.0
Indio	45	2012	8.7	4.6	35.6	25.0
	46	2013	8.7	3.6	35.6	21.5
	46	2014	8.7	3.7	35.6	20.2
	47	2015	8.7	4.5	35.6	22.8
	48	2016	8.7	4.6	35.6	23.7
Jurupa Valley	n/a	2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	33	2013	5.3	3.3	15.4	13.5
	33	2014	5.3	3.5	15.4	13.2
	42	2015	5.3	3.8	15.4	12.7
	43	2016	5.3	4.0	15.4	12.5
La Quinta	41	2012	10.0	4.5	34.8	14.5
	41	2013	10.0	4.6	34.8	15.5
	41	2014	10.0	4.7	34.8	15.9
	42	2015	10.0	4.3	34.8	14.5
	43	2016	10.0	4.7	34.8	16.3
Lake Elsinore	39	2012	5.3	3.8	23.3	20.1
	39	2013	5.3	4.1	23.3	21.4
	39	2014	5.3	4.0	23.3	18.4
	39	2015	5.3	4.2	23.3	19.4
	40	2016	5.3	4.4	23.3	19.7
Menifee	34	2012	4.6	3.0	29.8	24.3
	34	2013	4.6	3.0	29.8	23.4
	34	2014	4.6	3.2	29.8	23.0
	34	2015	4.6	3.1	29.8	22.0
	35	2016	4.6	2.8	29.8	19.5
Moreno Valley	42	2012	4.4 ✓	3.1 ✓	31.8 ✓	19.2 ✓
	42	2013	4.4 ✓	3.2 ✓	31.8 ✓	23.2 ✓
	44	2014	4.4 ✓	3.3 ✓	31.8 ✓	20.6 ✓
	44	2015	4.4 ✓	3.6 ✓	31.8 ✓	19.8 ✓
	45	2016	4.4 ✓	3.8 ✓	31.8 ✓	18.7 ✓

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Murrieta	42	2012	4.6	2.9	23.0	14.6
	42	2013	4.6	3.1	23.0	15.3
	42	2014	4.6	3.3	23.0	15.0
	42	2015	4.6	3.4	23.0	15.0
	43	2016	4.6	3.3	23.0	14.0
Norco	39	2012	11.4	5.5	23.1	12.2
	39	2013	11.4	5.8	23.1	12.7
	39	2014	11.4	6.1	23.1	13.1
	39	2015	11.4	6.2	23.1	12.4
	40	2016	11.4	6.3	23.1	12.1
Palm Desert	44	2012	13.3	6.2	22.3	12.1
	44	2013	13.3	6.9	22.3	13.2
	44	2014	13.3	6.9	22.3	12.7
	44	2015	13.3	6.5	22.3	12.0
	45	2016	13.3	6.5	22.3	11.6
Palm Springs	35	2012	13.9	7.4	30.6	15.2
	35	2013	13.9	7.7	30.6	15.6
	35	2014	13.9	7.7	30.6	14.6
	35	2015	13.9	7.8	30.6	14.7
	36	2016	13.9	8.1	30.6	14.4
Perris	37	2012	6.3	4.0	20.6	25.7
	37	2013	6.3	4.2	20.6	23.2
	37	2014	6.3	4.7	20.6	22.5
	37	2015	6.3	5.0	20.6	22.6
	38	2016	6.3	5.0	20.6	20.1
Rancho Mirage	44	2012	14.7	7.4	20.2	9.7
	44	2013	14.7	7.7	20.2	10.2
	44	2014	14.7	7.4	20.2	10.1
	44	2015	14.7	7.5	20.2	10.8
	45	2016	14.7	7.3	20.2	9.7
Riverside	37	2012	8.6	5.6	19.5	13.7
	37	2013	8.6	5.9	19.5	14.0
	37	2014	8.6	5.8	19.5	13.3
	38	2015	8.6	6.3	19.5	14.3
	39	2016	8.6	6.9	19.5	15.4
San Jacinto	41	2012	6.4	3.0	33.3	22.3
	41	2013	6.4	3.1	33.3	21.5
	41	2014	6.4	3.3	33.3	20.3
	43	2015	6.4	3.4	33.3	19.8
	44	2016	6.4	3.6	33.3	20.8
Temecula	41	2012	7.5	4.2	13.2	10.4
	41	2013	7.5	4.1	13.2	10.3
	41	2014	7.5	4.2	13.2	10.2
	41	2015	7.5	4.5	13.2	10.4
	42	2016	7.5	4.4	13.2	9.9

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Wildomar	33	2012	4.8	2.8	36.2	24.1
	33	2013	4.8	2.9	36.2	24.6
	33	2014	4.8	3.3	36.2	27.7
	33	2015	4.8	3.3	36.2	25.6
	34	2016	4.8	3.1	36.2	23.3
Unincorporated	45	2012	6.9	4.5	28.3	27.3
	45	2013	7.3	5.2	30.9	33.5
	45	2014	7.3	5.0	30.9	27.9
	45	2015	7.3	6.4	30.9	34.3
	46	2016	7.3	5.5	30.9	28.3

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element (SE) and Summary Plan (SP)

Since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent), the county experienced the following significant changes in funding for the SE or SP:

Analysis

☒ There have been no significant changes in funding for administration of the SE and SP or the changes that have occurred do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.

☐ These changes in funding for the administration of the SE and SP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

The basic funding sources for the administration of the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan have not changed significantly since the CIWMP was approved. The sources of funding continue to include tipping fees, generated through the County's disposal system of landfills and transfer/collection stations, and solid waste collection and franchise fees at the city or local level. The County continues to manage and maintain a countywide disposal system that provides for the disposal needs of all Riverside County residents. The user tipping fees generated from waste disposal and processing continue to be the primary source of revenue to fund capital expenditures, landfill operations, landfill closures, environmental remediation, waste inspection programs, programs that allow for the diversion of recyclable materials and hazardous materials from landfill disposal, and a variety of AB 939 programs. The County also utilizes State grants, when available, to fund its recycling programs, such as tires, household hazardous waste and used oil collection.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The county experienced significant changes in the following administrative responsibilities since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

Analysis

☒ There have been no significant changes in administrative responsibilities or the changes in administrative responsibilities do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.

☐ These changes in administrative responsibilities warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)
No significant changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP, other than normal personnel turnover. Within the unincorporated County, the Department of Waste Resources continues to be the responsible agency. The government agency or office in each jurisdiction that is responsible for solid waste management and diversion activities in identified below. The individuals responsible for AB 939 implementation in each jurisdiction are identified in the annual reports prepared by each jurisdiction.

Table 7: Responsible Departments for Solid Waste Management Activity by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Department or Office Responsible for Solid Waste Management Activities
Banning	Public Works Department
Beaumont	City Manager's Office
Blythe	Public Works Department
Calimesa	Public Works Department
Canyon Lake	Administration/City Clerk's Office
Cathedral City	Department of Environmental Conservation
Coachella	City Manager/Community Service
Corona	Public Works Department
Desert Hot Springs	City Manager's Office
Eastvale	City Manager's Office
Hemet	Public Works Department
Indian Wells	City Manager's Office
Indio	Environmental Programs
Jurupa Valley	City Manager's Office
La Quinta	City Manager's Office
Lake Elsinore	Public Works Department
Moreno Valley	Public Works ~~Administration~~ MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS DIVISION
Menifee	City Manager's Office
Murrieta	City Manager's Office
Norco	Public Works Department
Palm Desert	Community Services Division
Palm Springs	Public Works Department
Perris	Public Services Department
Rancho Mirage	City Manager's Office
Riverside	Department of Public Works
San Jacinto	Public Works Department
Temecula	Community Services Department
Wildomar	Public Works Department
Unincorporated	Department of Waste Resources

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented, But Were Not
This section addresses programs that were scheduled to be implemented, but were not; why they were not implemented; the progress of programs that were implemented; a statement as to whether programs are meeting their goals; and if not, what contingency measures are being enacted to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code Section 41751.

1. Progress of Program Implementation
   a. SRRE and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

      ☒ All program implementation information has been updated in the CalRecycle Electronic Annual Report (EAR), including the reason for not implementing specific programs, if applicable.

☐ All program implementation information has not been updated in the EAR. Attachment _____ lists the SRRE and/or HHWE programs selected for implementation, but which have not yet been implemented, including a statement as to why they were not implemented.

b. Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE)

☒ There have been no changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFEs and any amendments and/or updates).
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFEs).

c. Countywide Siting Element (SE)

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SE.
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes to the information provided in the current SE.

d. Summary Plan

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SP.
☐ Attachment _____ lists changes to the information provided in the current SP.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting their Goals

☒ The programs are meeting their goals.
☐ The programs are not meeting their goals. The discussion that follows in the analysis section below addresses the contingency measures that are being enacted to ensure compliance with PRC Section 41751 (i.e., specific steps are being taken by local agencies, acting independently and in concert with _____, to achieve the purposes of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989) and whether the listed changes in program implementation necessitate a revision to one or more of the planning documents. _____

Analysis

☒ The aforementioned changes in program implementation do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.
☐ Changes in program implementation warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____. See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

The county experienced changes in the following available markets for recyclable materials since the approval of the CIWMP or the last Five-Year CIWMP Review Report (whichever is most recent):

Analysis

☒ There are no significant changes in available markets for recycled materials to warrant a revision to any of the planning documents. Specifically, the markets for recyclable materials are dynamic; market supply, demand, and prices often fluctuate in response to the economy and other variables, such as increasing regulatory requirements, which can potentially add to operating cost or create siting issues.
☐ Changes in available markets for recycled materials warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, . See Section 7 for the revision schedule(s).

Additional Analysis (optional)

Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule
The following addresses changes to the county's implementation schedule that are not already addressed in Section 4.5:

Analysis
☒ There are no significant changes in the implementation schedule to warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.
☐ Changes in the implementation schedule warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, _____.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Note: Consider for each jurisdiction within the county or regional agency the changes noted in Sections 4.1 through 4.7 and explain whether the changes necessitate revisions to any of the jurisdictions' planning documents.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES OR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (optional)

The following addresses any other significant issues/changes in the county and whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP to the extent that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed:

Analysis
The overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable. The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the CIWMP are still accurately described. Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been, and are continuing to be, implemented. The existing and selected programs for each contingent programs were reviewed. Nearly all programs have been implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County and each city are updated yearly and reviewed by CalRecycle staff. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs and results, these changes are not considered to be significant. Although a few programs have been either revised or deleted, overall program implementation has been discussed in all prior annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated. The unincorporated County and cities continue to monitor evolving compliance issues. Consequently, the LTF, the County and its cities have decided that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. For these reasons, the County deems that a revision of its CIWMP is not warranted or justified at this time.

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

☒ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the county have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP elements. No jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents.

☐ The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the county have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP (or RAIWMP) elements. The following jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents, as listed.

_____

Analysis
The discussion below addresses the county's evaluation of the Annual Report data relating to planning document adequacy and includes determination regarding the need to revise one or more of the documents:

No revisions necessary based on the review.

SECTION 7.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if required)

The County deems that a revision of its CIWMP is not warranted or justified at this time.

Appendix A – LTF Comments

Timeline for Preparation and Approval
of
CIWMP 2018 Five-Year Review Report

Tasks	Due Date	Week of																							
		4/16/2018	4/23/2018	4/30/2018	5/7/2018	5/14/2018	5/21/2018	5/28/2018	6/4/2018	6/11/2018	6/18/2018	6/25/2018	7/2/2018	7/9/2018	7/16/2018	7/23/2018	7/30/2018	8/6/2018	8/13/2018	8/20/2018	8/27/2018	9/3/2018	9/10/2018	9/17/2018	9/24/2018
Complete CIWMP Five-Year Review Report	6/11/2018	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■															
Mail Report to Cities and LTF Members for Review	6/14/2018									■															
Cities & LTF Review Documents	7/16/2018										■	■	■	■											
Deadline for City and LTF Comments	7/16/2018														■										
Consider comments and Revise Draft Report (if appropriate)	7/20/2018														■										
E-Mail Second Revised Report to Cities and LTF Members for Review	7/23/2018														■										
Cities and LTF Members Review Second Revised Report	8/6/2018															■	■								
Consider LTF Comments and Revise Report (if appropriate)	8/10/2018																	■							
Submit BOS Form 11 of Staff Recommendation, CIWMP Five-Year Review Report, and City/LTF Comments	8/20/2018																	■	■	■					
BOS Consideration of CIWMP Five-Year Review Report	9/11/2018	X				X		X				X		X		X		X	X	X		X	■		
Submit CIWMP Five-Year Review Report, BOS Minute Order, and LTF Comments to CalRecycle for review	9/30/2018																						■	■	■

DATE: July 13, 2018

TO: File

FROM: Kathleen Utter, Recycling Specialist

RE: **Comments from the City of Rancho Mirage for the Five Year Review Report**

I received an email from Britt Wilson Management Analyst from the City of Rancho Mirage stating that they had reviewed the 2018 Five Year Review Report and that their consultant William O'Toole would be contacting me with their comments. William O'Toole contacted me by phone and provided the City of Rancho Mirage comments. They had a question about the composting facilities listed in the 2018 Five Year Review Report. These facilities are now updated through each jurisdictions Annual Report Non Disposal Facility Element requirements. Mr. O'Toole also let me know that Frankie Riddle has retired and as a member of the Local Task Force, her position would need to be filled.

cc: Angela Dufresne

From:	Britt Wilson
To:	Utter, Kathleen
Cc:	William O"Toole
Subject:	CIWMP 5 Year Review Report Comments by Rancho Mirage
Date:	Friday, July 13, 2018 10:18:09 AM
Attachments:	Tasteofsummer2018resize_36931e8d-551c-433e-a783-7d1a8fa885b4.jpg

Hi Kathleen,

The City and our consultant have reviewed the CIWMP 5 year Review Report. I have authorized our consultant (William O'Toole of Economics) to contact you by phone/email to provide you with our comments/suggested revisions.

Please accept his comments on our behalf. He is aware of the July 15th comment deadline and he will be in touch with you by that time.

Thanks.

Britt

Britt Wilson
Management Analyst
Phone: 760-324-4511 Ext. 230
Cell: 760-404-5802
E-mail: brittw@RanchoMirageCA.gov
69-825 Highway 111, Rancho Mirage, California, 92270
www.RanchoMirageCa.gov

From: Dale West
To: Utter, Kathleen
Subject: 2018 Fourth Five Year Review Report
Date: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 5:04:45 PM

Kathleen,
Please make the following changes for the City of Temecula:

Table 1: please change the representative name from Armando Villa to Luke Watson.
Table 7: please change the responsible department from Community Services Department to Community Development Department

Thank you,

Dale West
Associate Planner II
City of Temecula
(951) 693-3918
dale.west@TemeculaCA.gov
41000 Main St, Temecula, CA 92590
Visit our Website

From: Reinhardt, Valerie A
To: Dufresne, Angela; Utter, Kathleen
Subject: FW: 2018 Fourth Five Year Review Report
Date: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 8:02:40 AM

Please see Mr. Showalter's response.

From: Curtis Showalter [mailto:Curtis.Showalter@CoronaCA.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Reinhardt, Valerie A <Valerie.Reinhardt@RIVCO.ORG>
Subject: RE: 2018 Fourth Five Year Review Report

Valerie,

> *On Table 7: Please update the department responsible for solid waste activities in Corona from Public Works Department to the Maintenance Services Department.*

Thank you,

Curtis

From: Reinhardt, Valerie A <Valerie.Reinhardt@RIVCO.ORG>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 4:43 PM
To: Alan Kreimeier <akreimeier@jurupavalley.org>; Amer Jakher <ajakher@ci.beaumont.ca.us>; Armando Baldizzone <Abaldizzone@cityofblythe.ca.gov>; avela@ci.banning.ca.us; Bill Thompson <bthompson@norco.ca.us>; Bob French <bfrench@cityofcalimesa.net>; Brian Ambrose <bambrose@murrieta.org>; Charles Russell <crussell@cityofhemet.org>; cjacobs@eastvaleca.gov; Curtis Showalter <Curtis.Showalter@CoronaCA.gov>; dale.west <dale.west@cityoftemecula.org>; Daniel DeGarmo <Daniel.DeGarmo@palmspringsca.gov>; Deanna Pressgrove <dpressgrove@cathedralcity.gov>; Dolores Badillo <dbadillo@wrcog.cog.ca.us>; Gilbert Villalpando <gvillalpando@la-quinta.org>; heather Horning <hhorning@cityofpalmdesert.org>; Katie Barrows <kbarrows@cvag.org>; Ken Seumalo <kseumalo@indianwells.com>; Michele Ogawa <mogawa@cityofperris.org>; Nicole McCalmont <nmccalmon@lake-elsinore.org>; Noelia Chapa <nchapa@coahcella.org>; Olivia Sanchez <osanchez@riversideca.gov>; Randy Viegas <randyv@ranchomirageca.gov>; rjohnson <rjohnson@cityofmenifee.us>; Robert Lemon <Robertle@moval.org>; Rudy Acosta <racosta@cityofdhs.org>; Sara Toyoda <Stoyoda@indio.org>; Sarah Manwaring <smanwaring@cityofcanyonlake.com>; Tim D'Zmura <tdzmura@cityofwildomar.org>; Tim Hults <Thults@sanjacintoca.us>
Cc: Dufresne, Angela <adufresn@RIVCO.ORG>
Subject: 2018 Fourth Five Year Review Report

LTF Members and City Representatives:

On June 13, 2018, a draft 2018 Five-Year Review Report was mailed to each LTF member and city

representative for comments. Comments were requested by July 15, 2018. The LTF and city representatives reviewed the report and the following comments were received:

The City of Moreno Valley sent a memo dated July 5, 2018 with the following comments:

1. *Table 1: Please update the name of the Moreno Valley (Alternate) contact from Prem Kumar to Samantha Rodriguez.*
2. *Table 7: Please update the department responsible for solid waste activities in Moreno Valley from Public Works Administration to Public Works Maintenance and Operations Division.*

The consultant for the City of Rancho Mirage phone the County on July 13, 2018 with the following comments:

1. *Mr. O'Toole asked if there should be a list of composting facilities in the report. The City of Rancho Mirage uses a facility that is not listed in the previous 2013 report. The County stated that each jurisdiction includes in their Annual Report an update to their Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) which is reviewed yearly and approved by CalRecycle; therefore, the list in not included in the 2018 report.*
2. *Table 1: Frankie Riddle has retired and has not been replaced; therefore, the name for the Coachella Valley Association of Governments representative should be "vacant".*

The County incorporated the comments received during the public review period into the final report. In our June 13, 2018 letter it was anticipated that a second round of review may be necessary if significant comments were received. As there were no significant comments on the draft report, the final report is being transmitted via e-mail rather than by mail. According to AB341 regulations, no LTF action is required.

Pending no significant comments, the attached document will be presented to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors for approval in September 2018. Once the Riverside County Board of Supervisors approves the 2018 Five-Year Review Report, the document will be forwarded to CalRecycle for final approval.

Upon review, please forward any comments or suggestions to Kathleen Utter, RCWMD staff, at kutter@rivco.org, or 951-486-3286. All comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on August 6, 2018.

Diane Sloane
Executive Assistant
Riverside County
Waste Management Department
14310 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92553
(951) 486-3204

"Managing Waste for a Better Tomorrow"