

262

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



FROM: Waste Management Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
July 1, 2013


SUBJECT: Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan – 2013 Five-Year Review Report

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), 2013 Five-Year Review Report, as prepared by the Riverside County Waste Management Department; and
2. Direct the General Manager-Chief Engineer of the Waste Management Department to forward the final report to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

BACKGROUND: The CIWMP, 2013 Five-Year Review Report (Report) has been prepared by the Riverside County Waste Management Department 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 California Code of Regulations (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 waste management practices.

(continued)



Hans W. Kernkamp, General Manager-Chief Engineer

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ NA	In Current Year Budget:	No
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ NA	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ NA	For Fiscal Year:	No

SOURCE OF FUNDS:	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE


BY: 
Alex Gann

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Ashley, seconded by Supervisor Stone and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Stone, Benoit and Ashley
 Nays: None
 Absent: None
 Date: July 16, 2013
 xc: Waste

Kecia Harper-Ihem
 Clerk of the Board
 By: 
 Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 12.1 (9/23/03) and District: All Agenda Number:
 12.1 (6/16/09)

ATTACHMENTS FILED
 WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

12-2

Policy Policy
 Consent Consent

Dep't Recomm.: 2013
 Per Exec. Offc.: 2013

BACKGROUND (continued):

The purpose of the review is to determine if the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management 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. 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 May 28, 2013, to city representatives and the LTF members for final review by June 20, 2013. Three (3) 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.

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-25
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.

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 Waste Management Department		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@co.riverside.ca.us			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Description	Page
SECTION 1.0	COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION.....	1
SECTION 2.0	BACKGROUND.....	3
SECTION 3.0	LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW.....	3
SECTION 4.0	TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H).....	4
Section 4.1	Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency.....	4
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.....	9
Section 4.3	Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element (SE) and Summary Plan (SP).....	15
Section 4.4	Changes in Administrative Responsibilities.....	15
Section 4.5	Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented, But Were Not.....	16
Section 4.6	Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials.....	19
Section 4.7	Changes in the Implementation Schedule.....	19
SECTION 5.0	OTHER ISSUES OR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (optional).....	19
SECTION 6.0	ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW.....	20
SECTION 7.0	REVISION SCHEDULE (if required).....	20

Appendices

Appendix A – LTF Comments

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is the county's Third Five-Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diversion goal reduction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New city name(s): Wildomar (2008), |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New regional agency | Menifee (2008), Eastvale (2010), and Jurupa |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to regional agency | Valley (2011) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 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) 5/28/2013 other (Explain):
- b. The county received the written comments from the LTF on 6/20/2013.

The City of Temecula contacted the County via e-mail on April 22, 2013 to inform them that there is a discrepancy in the disposal tonnage for the years 2008 and 2009 (13 and 9 tons respectively). County staff gathered the disposal tonnage information directly from the CalRecycle website. County staff spoke to Karla Miller at CalRecycle and she said that the difference in tonnage is not enough to warrant a revision in the CIWMP documents. The City of Temecula staff will work with their CalRecycle representative to correct the disposal tonnage reported on the CalRecycle website.

The City of Calimesa representative phoned the County on May 6, 2013 to inform staff that he had no corrections or comments on the CIWMP document.

The City of Riverside contacted the County via e-mailed the County on May 31, 2013 to inform staff that the City no longer sends material to the Synagro Biosolids. County staff spoke to Karla Miller at CalRecycle and was informed that CalRecycle had no procedure for removing a NDFE facility; however, a jurisdiction would make a note of any changes in the jurisdictions Electronic Annual Report (EAR). County staff will make a note in the CIWMP documents as well as the EAR of the closure.

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

Local Task Force Members

Name	Representation
Bob Magee	County Supervisorial District #1
Simon Housman	County Supervisorial District #4
Miguel Arciniega	County Supervisorial District #5
Bruce Scott	Agriculture
Richard Schmid	Agriculture
Russell Keenan	Engineering
Frankie Riddle	Coachella Valley Association of Governments
Ella Zanowic	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
Tom Freeman	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
Patrick Richardson	City of Temecula
Steven Pastor	Agriculture (Alternate)
Linda Krupa	Western Riverside Council of Governments (Alternate)
Michael Goodland	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)
Paul Davis	City of Riverside (Alternate)
Ariana Ayala	City of Moreno Valley (Alternate)
Dale West	City of Temecula (Alternate)
Jack Wyatt	County Supervisorial District #1 (Alternate)
Steven Bayard	County Supervisorial District #4 (Alternate)
Martin Rosen	County Supervisorial District #5 (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 their following websites:
 - Population: Department of Finance
 - Taxable Sales: Board of Equalization
 - Employment: Employment Development Department

- 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 the revision schedule in Section 7.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Population

Jurisdiction	2007	1/1/2011	Change 2007-2012
City of Banning	28,634	29,723	3.80
City of Beaumont	29,668	38,034	28.20
City of Blythe	21,876	20,063	-8.29
City of Calimesa	7,605	7,910	4.01
City of Canyon Lake	10,448	10,606	1.51
City of Cathedral City	50,634	51,400	1.51
City of Coachella	38,851	41,339	6.40
City of Corona	146,272	153,047	4.63
City of Desert Hot Springs	24,124	27,277	13.07
City of Eastvale (Incorporated July 2010)	0	54,090	n/a
City of Hemet	74,434	79,309	6.55
City of Indian Wells	4,779	4,990	4.42
City of Indio	70,948	76,817	8.27
City of Jurupa Valley (Incorporated July 2011)	0	0	n/a
City of Lake Elsinore	47,705	52,294	9.62
City of La Quinta	35,792	37,688	5.30
City of Menifee (Incorporated October 2008)	0	79,139	n/a
City of Moreno Valley	182,330	194,451	6.65
City of Murrieta	97,747	104,051	6.45
City of Norco	27,017	26,968	-0.18
City of Palm Desert	46,867	48,920	4.38

¹ The year of the data included in the planning documents, which is generally 1990 or 1991.

² <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4/2001-10/view.php>, obtained on March 25, 2013.

³ <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php>, obtained on March 25, 2013

Jurisdiction	2007	4/1/2011	% Change 2007-2012
City of Palm Springs	44,154	44,829	1.53
City of Perris	59,014	69,506	17.78
City of Rancho Mirage	16,779	17,399	3.70
City of Riverside	289,674	306,069	5.66
City of San Jacinto	38,963	44,421	14.01
City of Temecula	93,122	101,255	8.73
City of Wildomar (Incorporated July 2008)	0	32,414	n/a
Unincorporated Area	564,465	451,722	-19.97
Total			

Consumer Price Index⁴
County: Riverside

Year	Consumer Price Index (CPI)	CPI Measurement Level*	Population	Taxable Sales (x \$1,000)	Labor Force Employment*	Industry Employment*
1990	135.9	LA	1,170,413	9,522,631	512,300	321,700
1991	141.4	LA	1,221,300	8,911,121	507,200	322,700
1992	146.5	LA	1,275,500	9,227,433	522,700	325,800
1993	150.3	LA	1,312,300	9,275,276	518,400	332,000
1994	152.3	LA	1,340,200	9,814,533	540,200	341,500
1995	154.6	LA	1,365,500	10,320,618	553,800	355,300
1996	157.5	LA	1,391,800	11,138,861	565,200	366,300
1997	160.0	LA	1,420,600	11,972,371	595,200	388,400
1998	162.3	LA	1,451,400	13,140,854	613,300	412,200
1999	166.1	LA	1,490,500	15,076,945	650,100	441,600
2000	171.6	LA	1,533,800	16,979,449	691,000	466,500
2001	177.3	LA	1,583,591	18,231,555	711,500	484,300
2002	182.2	LA	1,645,300	19,498,994	745,400	503,200
2003	187.0	LA	1,719,000	21,709,135	768,100	526,700
2004	193.2	LA	1,807,858	25,237,148	763,800	554,800
2005	201.8	LA	1,888,311	28,256,491	805,800	589,500
2006	210.4	LA	1,966,607	29,816,237	842,000	624,500

⁴ <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Tools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp>, Riverside-Unincorporated, obtained March 23, 2013

Countywide CPI⁵

Year	Consumer Price Index (CPI)	CPI Measurement Level
1990	135.9	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1991	141.4	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1992	146.5	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1993	150.3	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1994	152.3	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1995	154.6	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1996	157.5	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1997	160.0	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1998	162.3	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
1999	166.1	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2000	171.6	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2001	177.3	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2002	182.2	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2003	187.0	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2004	193.2	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2005	201.8	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2006	210.4	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2007	217.338	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2008	225.008	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2009	223.219	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2010	225.894	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County
2011	231.928	Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County

⁵ <http://www.rivcoeda.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=7sY33%2f7mGDO%3d&tabid=1110>, obtained March 23, 2013

Statewide CPI⁶

1990	135.0	CA
1991	140.6	CA
1992	145.6	CA
1993	149.4	CA
1994	151.5	CA
1995	154.0	CA
1996	157.1	CA
1997	160.5	CA
1998	163.7	CA
1999	168.5	CA
2000	174.8	CA
2001	181.7	CA
2002	186.1	CA
2003	190.4	CA
2004	195.4	CA
2005	202.6	CA
2006	210.5	CA
2007	217.4	CA
2008	224.8	CA
2009	224.1	CA
2010	226.9	CA
2011	232.9	CA

⁶ <http://www.dir.ca.gov/OPRL/CPI/EntireCCPI.PDF>, obtained March 25, 2013

**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 of the cities 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.
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 also available at <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Tools/PARIS/jurpgmsu.asp> 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 50percent 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 strategy⁷ 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 strategy² for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. Attached is a revision schedule for the Siting Element (Section 7).

⁷ 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.

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, . The revision schedule(s) is included in Section 7.

Additional Analysis (optional)

Disposal Capacity

AB 939 Time Horizon	Available Permitted Disposal Capacity (Million Tons)	Projected Disposal Capacity Need (Minimum 15 Years Required)
1992 (SRRE) ⁸	42.8 as of 12/31/1991	More than 15 years
1995 (25% Diversion Mandate) ⁹	18.9 as of 12/31/1994 ¹⁰	13 years
1997 (Starting CIWMP 5-Year Review) ¹¹	20.2 as of 12/31/1997 ¹²	More than 15 years
2000 (50% Diversion Mandate) ¹³	21.5 as of 12/31/2000 ¹⁴	More than 15 years
2001 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review) ¹⁵	60.4 as of 12/31/2001 ¹⁶	More than 15 years
2006 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review) ¹⁷	59.3 as of 12/31/2006 ¹⁸	More than 15 years
2011 (Ending CIWMP 5-Year Review) ¹⁹	56.3 as of 12/31/2011 ²⁰	More than 15 years

⁸ 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>

⁹ 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>

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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>

¹² 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.

¹³ The 2000 capacity data was excerpted from the 2000 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2000 Annual Report Appendix E-2.

¹⁴ The increase in permitted disposal capacity shown in the 2000 Time Horizon was primarily due to permitted expansion of the Badlands Landfill in 1998.

¹⁵ The 2001 capacity data was excerpted from the 2001 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2001 Annual Report Appendix E-2.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ The 2006 capacity data was excerpted from the 2007 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2007 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ The 2011 capacity data was excerpted from the 2011 Annual Report supplemental documentation: 2011 Annual Report Appendix E-1.

Disposal Tons²¹

Jurisdiction	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Banning	28,507	26,888	22,731	21,952	22,254
Beaumont	28,783	27,418	24,749	23,336	24,976
Blythe	11,152	9,169	8,138	8,910	9,688
Calimesa	6,258	5,625	5,057	5,323	5,462
Canyon Lake	8,832	6,963	6,563	6,845	6,520
Cathedral City	49,302	48,213	41,899	41,820	39,717
Coachella	33,467	30,777	27,128	23,289	21,583
Corona	210,689	190,292	163,453	158,561	158,655
Desert Hot Springs	14,061	13,336	11,728	13,233	18,049
Eastvale	0	0	0	3,693	20,500
Hemet	73,848	66,507	60,037	59,140	58,005
Indian Wells	12,795	13,665	11,602	10,195	9,341
Indio	97,152	83,026	68,698	63,872	65,175
Jurupa Valley	0	0	0	0	0
La Quinta	47,004	36,870	32,830	31,194	30,309
Lake Elsinore	47,981	41,855	41,293	41,389	39,835
Menifee	0	0	0	42,583	45,147
Moreno Valley	147,019	128,292	113,148	114,824	105,266
Murrieta	73,555	65,874	58,783	59,773	64,822
Norco	41,739	35,990	33,914	34,827	34,292
Palm Desert	80,682	74,992	62,013	59,118	57,820
Palm Springs	82,931	66,396	56,636	56,327	59,604
Perris	68,317	57,293	52,161	50,729	52,392
Rancho Mirage	35,181	30,960	25,826	23,605	23,767
Riverside	382,307	342,316	303,962	310,359	322,099
San Jacinto	34,396	28,926	25,465	25,342	25,525
Temecula	104,611	87,130	78,152	79,207	76,380
Wildomar	0	0	0	18,505	17,673
Unincorporated	636,170	557,152	419,760	395,032	332,543

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

²⁰ 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.

²¹ <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/Reports/DRS/Origin/WFOrgin.aspx>, Selected each listed year and Riverside County. Information obtained March 25, 2013.

Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdictional Diversion/Disposal Progress Report²²

Jurisdiction	Implemented	Year	Target	Annual	Target	(PPD) Annual
Banning	36	2007	6.1	5.5	30.7	29.7
	36	2008	6.1	5.2	30.7	29.8
	26	2009	6.1	4.4	30.7	27.6
	36	2010	6.1	4.1	30.7	30.9
	36	2011	6.1	4.1	30.7	29.8
Beaumont	37	2007	9.7	5.6	42.1	31.5
	37	2008	9.7	4.8	42.1	30.4
	39	2009	9.7	4.2	42.1	27.6
	39	2010	9.7	3.5	42.1	27.6
	39	2011	9.7	3.6	42.1	26.7
Blythe	37	2007	4.3	3.3	29.4	20.5
	37	2008	4.3	2.3	29.4	13.4
	37	2009	4.3	2.1	29.4	12.8
	37	2010	4.3	2.9	29.4	20.5
	37	2011	4.3	2.6	29.4	16.9
Calimesa	36	2007	4.8	4.6	17.3	22.9
	36	2008	4.8	4.2	17.3	23.0
	36	2009	4.8	3.7	17.3	21.8
	36	2010	4.8	3.7	17.3	22.2
	36	2011	4.8	3.8	17.3	24.7
Canyon Lake	32	2007	4.8	4.1	43.0	37.7
	32	2008	4.8	3.5	43.0	31.0
	32	2009	4.8	3.2	43.0	34.1
	32	2010	4.8	3.6	43.0	42.1
	32	2011	4.8	3.4	43.0	39.8
Cathedral City	41	2007	6.9	5.2	31.7	23.1
	41	2008	6.9	5.1	31.7	23.6
	41	2009	6.9	4.4	31.7	23.5
	41	2010	6.9	4.5	31.7	27.2
	41	2011	6.9	4.2	31.7	25.0
Coachella	40	2007	5.7	4.8	24.6	21.7
	41	2008	5.7	4.2	24.6	19.8
	41	2009	5.7	3.7	24.6	17.9
	41	2010	5.7	3.2	24.6	18.7
	42	2011	5.7	2.9	24.6	16.3
Corona	40	2007	8.6	7.9	18.6	15.6
	40	2008	8.6	7.1	18.6	14.6
	40	2009	8.6	6.0	18.6	14.0
	40	2010	8.6	5.7	18.6	15.7
	40	2011	8.6	5.7	18.6	14.9

²² <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/jurisdiction/diversiondisposal.aspx>

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population Target	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Desert Hot Springs	37	2007	3.8	3.1	31.4	32.5
	37	2008	3.8	2.8	31.4	31.3
	37	2009	3.8	2.4	31.4	28.1
	38	2010	3.8	2.8	31.4	35.5
	39	2011	3.8	3.6	31.4	41.0
Hemet	36	2007	7.0	5.5	25.8	19.9
	36	2008	7.0	5.0	25.8	18.3
	36	2009	7.0	4.4	25.8	17.7
	36	2010	7.0	4.1	25.8	19.6
	36	2011	7.0	4.0	25.8	17.8
Indian Wells	42	2007	21.5	14.2	25.5	14.9
	42	2008	21.5	15.0	25.5	15.6
	42	2009	21.5	12.5	25.5	14.2
	42	2010	21.5	11.3	25.5	14.2
	41	2011	21.5	10.2	25.5	12.4
Indio	42	2007	7.5	6.9	31.9	31.2
	44	2008	8.7	5.6	35.6	26.9
	44	2009	8.7	4.6	35.6	23.9
	44	2010	8.7	4.7	35.6	25.8
	44	2011	8.7	4.6	35.6	24.7
La Quinta	39	2007	10.0	6.3	34.8	18.6
	39	2008	10.0	4.7	34.8	14.8
	39	2009	10.0	4.1	34.8	14.2
	40	2010	10.0	4.6	34.8	15.2
	41	2011	10.0	4.4	34.8	14.3
Lake Elsinore	39	2007	5.3	5.5	23.8	24.0
	39	2008	5.3	4.6	23.3	21.5
	39	2009	5.3	4.5	23.3	22.8
	39	2010	5.3	4.4	23.3	25.3
	39	2011	5.3	4.2	23.3	22.1
Moreno Valley	42	2007	4.4	4.5	31.8	31.5
	42	2008	4.4	3.8	31.8	27.9
	42	2009	4.4	3.3	31.8	26.0
	42	2010	4.4	3.3	31.8	23.7
	42	2011	4.4	3.0	31.8	19.6
Murrieta	41	2007	4.6	4.1	23.0	19.8
	41	2008	4.6	3.6	23.0	17.9
	41	2009	4.6	3.2	23.0	17.1
	41	2010	4.6	3.2	23.0	19.2
	42	2011	4.6	3.4	23.0	17.8
Norco	39	2007	11.4	8.4	23.1	15.9
	39	2008	11.4	7.3	23.1	14.0
	39	2009	11.4	6.8	23.1	14.1
	39	2010	11.4	7.1	23.1	16.4
	39	2011	11.4	6.9	23.1	15.8

Jurisdiction	# of Programs Implemented	Year	Population (1,000)	Disposal (PPD) Annual	Employment Target	Employment (PPD) Annual
Palm Desert	42	2007	13.3	8.9	22.3	13.4
	43	2008	13.3	8.1	22.3	12.7
	44	2009	13.3	6.6	22.3	12.0
	44	2010	13.3	6.7	22.3	13.3
	44	2011	13.3	6.5	22.3	12.5
Palm Springs	35	2007	13.9	9.7	30.6	18.7
	35	2008	13.9	7.7	30.6	14.7
	35	2009	13.9	6.5	30.6	13.6
	35	2010	13.9	7.0	30.6	15.2
	35	2011	13.9	7.3	30.6	14.9
Perris	35	2007	6.3	7.4	20.6	24.1
	35	2008	6.3	5.9	20.6	21.4
	37	2009	6.3	5.3	20.6	24.3
	37	2010	6.3	4.1	20.6	26.6
	37	2011	6.3	4.1	20.6	26.3
Rancho Mirage	42	2007	14.7	11.4	20.2	15.4
	43	2008	14.7	10.0	20.2	13.5
	44	2009	14.7	8.2	20.2	11.5
	44	2010	14.7	7.5	20.2	11.7
	44	2011	14.7	7.5	20.2	10.1
Riverside	36	2007	8.6	7.2	19.5	15.2
	37	2008	8.6	6.3	19.5	13.3
	37	2009	8.6	5.6	19.5	12.5
	37	2010	8.6	5.6	19.5	14.7
	37	2011	8.6	5.8	19.5	13.9
San Jacinto	40	2007	6.4	5.5	33.3	28.7
	40	2008	6.4	4.5	33.3	23.1
	40	2009	6.4	3.8	33.3	21.1
	41	2010	6.4	3.2	33.3	25.6
	41	2011	6.4	3.1	33.3	23.7
Temecula	41	2007	7.5	6.0	13.2	11.5
	41	2008	7.5	4.8	13.2	10.1
	40	2009	7.5	4.2	13.2	10.2
	40	2010	7.5	4.4	13.2	11.1
	40	2011	7.5	4.1	13.2	10.4
Unincorporated	45	2007	6.2	6.4	32.5	31.8
	45	2008	6.2	5.1	32.5	26.8
	45	2009	6.2	5.0	32.5	27.3
	45	2010	6.2	4.3	32.5	31.4
	45	2011	6.9	4.0	28.3	32.7

The cities of Wildomar, Menifee, Eastvale and Jurupa Valley incorporated during this Third Five-Year Review Report. Annual report data for these cities is not available on CalRecycle's website. The

available population and employment target information for these cities from CalRecycle²³ is listed in the table below as well as the CalRecycle approval dates of each jurisdiction's planning documents.

Jurisdictions	Year of Incorporation	Population Target	Employment Target	Planning Document Approval Date (CalRecycle)
Wildomar	2008	4.8	36.2	October 18, 2011
Menifee	2008	4.6	29.8	October 18, 2011
Eastvale	2010	3.6	25.9	August 21, 2012
Jurupa Valley	2011	N/A	N/A	Time extension was approved on 2/19/2013. The new deadline is 12/15/13.

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 revenues to fund capital expenditures, landfill operations, landfill closures, environmental remediation, waste inspection 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.

²³ <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/reports/diversionprogram/JurisdictionDiversionPost2006.aspx>

- 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 Waste Management Department continues to be the responsible agency. The government agency or office in each jurisdiction that is responsible for solid waste management and diversion activities is identified below. The individuals responsible for AB 939 implementation in each jurisdiction are identified in the annual reports prepared by each 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
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	Waste Management Department

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).
- 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, 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, _____. The revision schedule(s) is included in Section 7.

Additional Analysis (optional)

See the following table for Current Facilities Identified and Described in Riverside County Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) and in City NDFEs

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, _____. The revision schedule(s) is included in Section 7.

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 above.

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 still are 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 program 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 [REDACTED] 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

SECTION 7.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if required)

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

Utter, Kathleen

From: Dale West <Dale.West@cityoftemecula.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Utter, Kathleen
Subject: RE: Five-Year Review Report tonnage numbers from CalRecycle

Ok, thank you for following up on this.

Dale West

Associate Planner
City of Temecula
(951) 693-3918
dale.west@cityoftemecula.org

From: Utter, Kathleen [<mailto:kutter@co.riverside.ca.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Dale West
Subject: RE: Five-Year Review Report tonnage numbers from CalRecycle

Good Morning Dale –

I spoke to Karla and she said that the amount of the discrepancy in disposal tonnage for the City is not critical to the 2013 Five Year Review. Hopefully, Sasha will find out where the difference is coming from. The County recently had questions about some calculations and they were from rounding errors and potentially data entry mistakes.

Thank you,
Kathleen Utter
Recycling Specialist
Riverside County Waste Management Department
(951) 486-3286
Managing Waste for a Better Tomorrow

From: Dale West [<mailto:Dale.West@cityoftemecula.org>]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 10:17 AM
To: Utter, Kathleen
Subject: RE: Five-Year Review Report tonnage numbers from CalRecycle

Thanks Kathleen. There's a slight discrepancy with CalRecycle's data for years 2008 and 2009; they're off by 13 and 9 tons respectively. I'll work with them to resolve it. How critical is the accuracy of the data for the 5-year report?

Thanks,

Dale West

Associate Planner
City of Temecula
(951) 693-3918
dale.west@cityoftemecula.org

From: Utter, Kathleen [<mailto:kutter@co.riverside.ca.us>]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 9:34 AM

To: Dale West

Subject: Five-Year Review Report tonnage numbers from CalRecycle

Dale –

Attached are the sheets that I took from the CalRecycle website for tonnage information. The information was from the DRS: Single-year Countywide Origin Detail www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/Reports/DRS/Origin/WFOrgin.aspx and there is a note that the data is updated continuously, but they do not list the dates that it is updated.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any further questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Kathleen Utter
Recycling Specialist
Riverside County Waste Management Department
(951) 486-3286
Managing Waste for a Better Tomorrow

Utter, Kathleen

From: Zamora, Frances
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 10:12 AM
To: Utter, Kathleen
Subject: FW: CIWMP 5-Year Report

From: Gardner, Mike [<mailto:MGardner@riversideca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 10:10 AM
To: Zamora, Frances
Cc: Boyd, Tom; English, Tina; Davis, Paul
Subject: RE: CIWMP 5-Year Report

Frances,

The City of Riverside offers the following comment on the subject report:

The table on page 18 lists disposal locations. We no longer dispose of solids at Synagro. We last disposed of biosolids at Synagro in 2008. We currently have a contract with Terra Renewal to haul and dispose of our biosolids. Terra Renewal disposes of our biosolids at two locations:

- Farmland application in Arizona (three farm sites in Mesa)
- Nursery Products Composting facility in Helendale, CA

Thank you for the opportunity to review the report.

Best Regards,

Mike Gardner
Councilmember, Ward 1
City of Riverside

From: Zamora, Frances [<mailto:fzamora@co.riverside.ca.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 9:11 AM
To: DiCiano, Jennifer; Spoonhour, Barbara; Ariana Ayala; Ben Drake; bruce@sdbfarms.com; Chris Cunningham; ctobin@burrtec.com; curtiss@ci.corona.ca.us; Dale West; David Fahrion; dpressgrove@cathedralcity.gov; Dr. Martin Rosen; edc@crrmail.com; Ella Zanowic; Frankie Riddle; Freeman, Tom; wyattjd@earthlink.net; Jordan Ehrenkranz; kate.cnb@verizon.net; Linda Krupa; Magee, Robert; Michael Goodland; miguelarciniegaC@yahoo.com; Gardner, Mike; Moran, Robert; Patrick Richardson; Davis, Paul; Richard Schmid; Robert Lemon; Russell Keenan; simonhousmanlaw@earthlink.net; Steven Bayard; Steven Pastor; Ted Dumas
Cc: Dufresne, Angela; Utter, Kathleen
Subject: CIWMP 5-Year Report

LTF Members and City Representatives:

On April 8, 2013, a draft 2013 Five-Year Review Report dated April 2013 was mailed to each LTF member and city representative for comments. During the April 18, 2013, LTF meeting, County staff gave an overview of the report. Comments were requested by May 6, 2013. The LTF and city representatives reviewed the report and the following comments were received:

The City of Temecula contacted the County via e-mail on April 22, 2013 to inform them that there is a discrepancy in the disposal tonnage for the years 2008 and 2009 (13 and 9 tons respectively). County staff gathered the disposal tonnage information directly from the CalRecycle website. County staff spoke to Karla Miller at CalRecycle and she said that the difference in tonnage is not enough to warrant a revision in the CIWMP documents. The City of Temecula staff will work with their CalRecycle representative to correct the disposal tonnage reported on the CalRecycle website.

The City of Calimesa representative phoned the County on May 6, 2013 to inform staff that he had no corrections or comments on the CIWMP document.

The County incorporated the comments received during the public review period into the final report. In our April 8, 2013 memo, it was anticipated that the final report would be discussed at an LTF meeting planned for June 20, 2013. As there were no significant comments on the draft report and no other pending items that require LTF action, the final report is being transmitted via e-mail rather than at a meeting. 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 July 2013. Once the Riverside County Board of Supervisors approves the 2013 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@co.riverside.ca.us, or 951-486-3286. All comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on June 20, 2013.

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

"Managing Waste for a Better Tomorrow"