

Riverside

Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

Printed on Recycled Paper



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Supervisor Bob Buster, 1st District

Cities: Lake Elsinore, Murrieta, Temecula, southwest portion of Riverside Communities: Alberhill, Gavilan Hills, Glen Ivy, Lake Hills, Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Pechanga Indian Reservation, Santa Rosa Plateau, Sedco Hills, Temescal Canyon, Wildomar, Woodcrest

Supervisor John Tavaglione, 2nd District

Cities: Corona, Norco, portions of Riverside Communities: Coronita, El Cerrito, Home Gardens, Glen Avon, Mira Loma, Pedley, Rubidoux

Supervisor Kay Ceniceros, 3rd District

Cities: Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, (most of) Desert Hot Springs, Hemet, San Jacinto

Communities: Aguanga, Anza, Cabazon, Cherry Valley, Fern Valley, Garnet, Homeland, Idyllwild, Lakeview, Menifee, Mountain Center, Murrieta Hot Springs, North Palm Springs, Nuevo, Pine Cove, Quail Valley, Romoland, Sage, Sun City, Valley Vista, Winchester

Supervisor Roy Wilson, 4th District

Cities: Blythe, Cathedral City, Coachella, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, small portion of Desert Hot Springs Communities: Desert Center, Mecca, North Shore, Thermal, Thousand Palms

Supervisor Tom Mullen, 5th District

Cities: Moreno Valley, Perris, portions of Riverside Communities: Good Hope, Highgrove, Lake Perris, Lakeview, March AFB

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special acknowledgment is given to the Riverside County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force (AB 939) and its subcommittee members for their work in developing the Siting Element. Currently, these members and who they represent are:

LOCAL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Supervisor Tom Mullen, Chair Lee Anderson, Riverside County Farm Bureau Judith Baitenger, Western Riverside Council of Governments Don Bean, Riverside County Farm Bureau Barry Beck, City of Riverside Diana Beck, Coachella Valley Association of Governments* Gordon Beers, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties Disposal Association Ken Boyd, Economic Development Agency Ken Duke, 3rd Supervisorial District Councilmember Richard Macknicki, Coachella Valley Association of Govt. Bob Magee, Liquid Waste Haulers Association* Richard Marsh, 4th Supervisorial District Joseph Massey, Institute of Scrap Recycling Michelle Randall, 1st Supervisorial District Ron Roberts, Western Riverside Council of Governments Paul Ryan, Economic Development Agency* Jon Sebba, Engineer, Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of CA Ray Teagarden, 2nd Supervisorial District Chuck Tobin, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties Disposal Association Councilmember Sam Torres, City of Perris, 5th Supervisorial District John Wohlmuth, Environmental Community Trent D. Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley

Alternates:

Mike Arreguin, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties Disposal Association* Jim Birckhead, Western Riverside Council of Governments Mary Burns, 2nd Supervisorial District Cole Burr, Burr Tech Keith Butler, Economic Development Agency Vince Carstensen, City of Moreno Valley** Harold Duffy, City of Riverside* David Fahrion, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties Disposal Association Joyce Marshall, Western Riverside Council of Governments** Jeff Percy, Riverside County Farm Bureau A.J. Wilson, Western Riverside Council of Governments

- * Members of the CIWMP Steering Committee.
- ** Joyce Marshall was the Chair and Vince Carstensen was the Vice Chair of the CIWMP Steering Committee.

All the cities in Riverside County participated in the development of the CIWMP. The staffs and City Councils for these cities are hereby acknowledged for their contribution and ongoing efforts to implement AB 939 for their jurisdiction:

CITIES WITHIN RIVERSIDE COUNTY

City of Banning	City of Lake Elsinore
City of Beaumont	City of La Quinta
City of Blythe	City of Moreno Valley
City of Calimesa	City of Murrieta
City of Canyon Lake	City of Norco
City of Cathedral City	City of Palm Desert
City of Coachella	City of Palm Springs
City of Corona	City of Perris
City of Desert Hot Springs	City of Rancho Mirage
City of Hemet	City of Riverside
City of Indian Wells	City of San Jacinto
City of Indio	City of Temecula
City of Lake Elsinore	

The Councils of Governments have assisted the county and cities in the preparation of the CIWMP. Special recognition is given to:

Diana Beck of the Coachella Valley Association of Governments Joyce Marshall of the Western Riverside Council of Governments

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District staff have participated in the development of the county's SRRE, HHWE, NDFE, Siting Element and Summary Plan of the CIWMP. The following staff are recognized:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT STAFF

Robert A. Nelson, Chief Executive Officer Michael Schier, Solid Waste Planning Manager Lesley Likins, Senior Planner Katherine Gifford, Project Planner Sung Key Ma, Planner III Alex Gann, Supervising Recycling Specialist Stacey Hubbard, Recycling Specialist II Ron Sinclair, Computer Graphics Manager Joseph Schupp, Engineering Technician II Narlene Guest, Office Assistant III Ian Grant, Senior Civil Engineer Gary Anderson, Program Administrator Melanie Stangl, (formerly) Supervising Recycling Specialist

Acknowledgment is also given to the Orange County Integrated Waste Management Department, County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Department, and Contra Costa County Community Development Department as their documents have been used in developing the Siting Element. Technical assistance was provided by Jeff Martinez with the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP) TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II. RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN

- Appendix A: Memorandum of Understanding Between the Coachella Valley Association of Governments and the Western Riverside Council of Governments Governing Annexation into the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District
- Appendix B: Descriptions of Cities' and County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) Selected Programs
- Appendix C: Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Cities', the City of Blythe, and County's Planned and Implemented Diversion Programs
- Appendix D: WRCOG Cities' and City of Blythe Program Updates
- Appendix E: Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Board of Directors Policy on Urban Transfer Stations and Riverside County Board of Supervisors' County Purchasing Policies
- Exhibit A: Membership and Duties of the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (Local Task Force)
- III. RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Appendix A: Approaches Taken to Project Disposal Capacity Needs

IV. CIWMP APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Comment Letters and Responses on the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside CIWMP Including the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element
- Appendix B: Cities' Resolutions on the Final Draft Riverside CIWMP Including the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element
- Appendix C: Riverside County Board of Supervisors Resolution on the Final Draft Riverside CIWMP Including the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element
- Appendix D: California Integrated Waste Management Board Action on the Riverside CIWMP Including the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element



COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) has been prepared in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1095 [AB939¹]). AB 939 redefined solid waste management in terms of both objectives and planning responsibilities for local jurisdictions and the state. AB 939 was adopted in an effort to reduce the volume and toxicity of solid waste that is landfilled and incinerated by requiring local governments to prepare and implement plans to improve the management of waste resources.

AB 939 requires each of the cities and unincorporated portions of counties throughout the state to divert a minimum of 25% of the solid waste landfilled by 1995 and 50% by the year 2000. To attain these goals for reductions in disposal, AB 939 established a planning hierarchy utilizing new integrated solid waste management practices. In order of priority, these practices are:

- 1. Source Reduction (Waste Prevention)
- 2. Recycling and Composting
- 3. Environmentally Safe Landfill Disposal and Transformation

In 1992, Assembly Bill 2494 (Statutes of 1992, Chapter 1292 [AB 2494]), changed the method of determining goal compliance. Under this newer legislation, a jurisdiction's compliance with AB 939 is no longer determined by what percentage of solid waste is diverted, but rather by the reduction in the solid waste disposed through landfilling or incineration. Jurisdictions are no longer required to attempt to track diversion from activities which they do not sponsor. Diversion programs sponsored by public agencies, however, must be monitored and these reports are sent annually to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

Transition From Riverside County Solid Waste Management Plan (CoSWMP) to Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)

Prior to adoption of AB 939, the countywide waste management system was shaped by the Riverside County Solid Waste Management Plan (CoSWMP). The California Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act of 1972 required that each county within the State prepare a comprehensive, coordinated solid waste management plan for all waste disposed within a county and all waste exported out-of-county. On January 1, 1975, the California Waste

¹For purposes of this document, all references to AB 939 also include subsequent legislation which has amended this bill.

Management Board (CWMB) established guidelines for the preparation, review, and adoption of this plan, and the first CoSWMP was approved by the CWMB (now known as the CIWMB) in 1976.

In December, 1981, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors established the County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWMAC). The functions of the SWMAC included the revision of the CoSWMP and the evaluation of general solid waste management issues. Consistent with the State guidelines, the SWMAC revised the CoSWMP in 1984 and then again in 1985. The CoSWMP underwent its last revision in 1989. The CoSWMP serves as a guide to solid waste management issues until the CIWMP is adopted. The Board of Supervisors has delegated to the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) all County waste management operations and AB 939 responsibilities, including preparation and revisions to the CIWMP.

Until a CIWMP is approved by the CIWMB, solid waste facilities, which require a Solid Waste Facility Permit and have not been identified and described in the CoSWMP, must comply with the "Gap Bill" (Assembly Bill 2296, Cortese, Chapter 1617, Statutes of 1990). The only exception to this requirement is a nondisposal facility that is located in a jurisdiction with a Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) that has been approved by the CIWMB. In this case, if the nondisposal facility is identified and described in the NDFE, it is in compliance with the regulation. If the nondisposal facility is not identified and described, the jurisdiction in which the nondisposal facility is located must amend the NDFE appropriately to address the facility, in order to comply with the regulation.²

CIWMP Components

The CIWMP, in its entirety, is comprised of the Countywide Summary Plan; the Countywide Siting Element; and the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRRE's), Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWE's), and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE's) for Riverside County and each of the cities in Riverside County. Cities within Riverside County include: Banning, Beaumont, Blythe, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Cathedral City, Coachella, Corona, Desert Hot Springs, Hemet, Indian Wells, Indio, Lake Elsinore, La Quinta, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Perris, Rancho Mirage, Riverside, San Jacinto, and Temecula. Table A shows the current status of the cities and County's SRRE's, HHWE's, NDFE's, Siting Element and Summary Plan.

The SRRE's analyze the local wastestream to determine where to focus diversion efforts, including programs and funding. The HHWE's provide a framework for recycling, treatment, and disposal practices for household hazardous waste. The NDFE's list planned and existing permitted nondisposal facilities such as material recovery and composting facilities that recover waste from the wastestream.

²Telephone conversation with Jeff Martinez with the CIWMB on July 17, 1996.

To complete the CIWMP, the County is required to prepare a Countywide Siting Element that demonstrates that there is at least 15 years of remaining disposal capacity to serve all the jurisdictions within the County. If there is not adequate capacity, a discussion of alternative disposal sites and additional diversion programs must be included in the Siting Element.

The County must also prepare the Countywide Summary Plan, the final element of the CIWMP, which contains goals and policies, as well as, a summary of integrated waste management issues faced by the County and its cities. The Countywide Summary Plan summarizes the steps needed to cooperatively implement programs among the County's jurisdictions to meet the 25% and 50% diversion mandates. The Summary Plan provides a summary of but does not amend any of the cities' or County's SRRE's, HHWE's, NDFE's and Siting Element.

According to CIWMB staff, the CIWMB may give tentative approval of the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element, but will not give final approval of the CIWMP, until the other elements of the CIWMP (the SRRE's, HHWE's, and NDFE's for the County and each of its cities) have been approved by the CIWMB.

Preparation of the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element

Preparation of the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element was initiated by an action to form the CIWMP Steering Committee by the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force (LTF) on March 16, 1995. The Steering Committee and District staff held public meetings from April 1995 through December 1995 to discuss the development of the Preliminary Draft Summary Plan and Siting Element, being prepared concurrently.

To encourage public participation, the May 15, 1995 Steering Committee meeting was advertised in a newspaper with countywide circulation. City representatives, interested parties, and haulers were contacted, and notices were posted in libraries regarding the May 15 meeting. At the meeting, which was held in the City of Banning, the Steering Committee and District staff briefed the public regarding the preparation of the Summary Plan and Siting Element and obtained the public's input regarding the documents. Future meeting dates were also discussed to allow for continued citizen input. Additional meetings were held by the Steering Committee and the preliminary draft Summary Plan and Siting Element were circulated for public comment on January 4, 1996.

On January 18, 1996, the LTF recommended that District Staff prepare revisions to the preliminary draft documents to respond to comments and recommendations from representatives of the Western Riverside Councils of Government (WRCOG) and Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG). The LTF further requested that District staff re-release the revised preliminary drafts for a second comment period. During the first comment period, District staff met with the CIWMP Steering Committee, WRCOG Solid Waste Technical Committee, CVAG Technical Working Group and interested parties to solicit additional input regarding changes to

CIWMP

the preliminary draft Summary Plan and Siting Element. On February 15, 1996, the LTF held a public hearing on the preliminary draft Summary Plan and Siting Element. The written comments and testimony from the February 15 LTF hearing were used to revise the preliminary draft Summary Plan and Siting Element.

The revised preliminary draft Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element were circulated for a second 45-day comment period to cities in Riverside County, the LTF, CIWMB, Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), WRCOG, CVAG and other interested agencies. On July 18, 1996, the LTF held a second advertised public hearing on the CIWMP, including the Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Summary Plan and Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element. As required by Section 18779 of the CCR, at the July 18, 1996 meeting, the LTF approved written comments which were forwarded to the District, as preparers of the document, and to the CIWMB. These written comments included: a recommendation that District staff respond in the Final Draft CIWMP to any written comments which are received on the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside CIWMP; notify the CIWMB that a public hearing has been held on the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside CIWMP with modifications. (These modifications are described in the CIWMP Appendix A, Responses to Comments.)

At the end of the 45-day comment period, the District responded to any comments on the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside CIWMP and incorporated these responses into the Final Draft Riverside CIWMP. The Final Draft Riverside CIWMP was circulated to cities in Riverside County for local adoption, and to the LTF, WRCOG, CVAG, CIWMB, LEA and other interested parties, in conformance with CCR, Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 8, Section 18780.

The following additional actions are required in conformance with CCR, Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 8, Sections 18781 through 18788: (*These actions have not been completed as of this publication.*)

- During the first 45 days of the 90 day adoption period, the LTF submits written comments to the District, cities in Riverside County, and CIWMB regarding the final draft Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element.
- During the 90-day adoption period, each city in the County and the County conducts an advertised public hearing for the purpose of adopting the Riverside Final Draft CIWMP, including the Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan and Final Draft Countywide Siting Element. Environmental documentation verifying compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq., accompanies the Riverside Final Draft CIWMP. After considering all public comments, the County and each city within the County, either approves or disapproves the Riverside Final Draft CIWMP by resolution. Failure by a city to take action on the Riverside Final Draft CIWMP is deemed an approval by that city in compliance with Section 18783. City and County actions are included in the CIWMP Appendices.

Local adoption of the CIWMP occurs when the Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan and Final Draft Countywide Siting Element are adopted by the County and the cities within the County as described in Public Resources Code Section 41721 and 41760.

• Within 30 days of the local adoption of the CIWMP, the County submits the documents listed in Section 18784 to the CIWMB for consideration of approval of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element. The CIWMB at a public hearing determines whether the CIWMP meets the requirements of AB 939, as amended. After considering public testimony, input from the LTF, and written comments, the Board approves, conditionally approves or disapproves the CIWMP, in compliance with CCR Section 18785. The CIWMB notifies the District of its action.

Annual Reports and Five-Year Review and Revisions of the CIWMP

Riverside County is required to submit an Annual Report on the CIWMP within 90 days of the anniversary date of the CIWMB approval of the documents or its most recent revision [14 CCR 18787]. The Annual Report serves as a basis for determining if the Siting Element and Summary Plan should be revised to include additional disposal capacity, reflect new or changed local and regional solid waste management issues, and if the Element's or Plan's goals and objectives should be revised. The CIWMB will review the Annual Report and determine if the County is making progress toward meeting its goals and objectives. If the County and/or the CIWMB determine that additional disposal capacity is needed or if the goals and objectives of the Siting Element and Summary Plan need to be revised, then the County shall revise the document(s) pursuant to Sections 18780 through 18784 of the PRC.

It should be noted that prior to the adoption of the CIWMP, the County and cities within the County were required to submit annual reports regarding the SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE by August 1 of the year following Board approval or conditional approval of their jurisdiction's documents.

Prior to the fifth anniversary of CIWMB approval of the CIWMP, or its most recent revision, the LTF shall complete a review of the CIWMP in accordance with PRC Sections 40051, 40052, and 41822, to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051. The County will comply with CCR Section 18788 and coordinate with affected jurisdictions in the preparation of the Five Year Review and Revision of the CIWMP.

State regulations also require that Annual Reports be prepared for each city's and County's SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE. The State regulations do not require that these Annual Reports be forwarded to the County to ensure that modifications to any city's SRRE, HHWE, and/or NDFE be incorporated into the CIWMP Annual Report. The County will request that the CIWMB provide the County with a record of each city's Annual Report and any amendments to a city's SRRE,

HHWE, and/or NDFE so as to ensure that the CIWMP Annual Report accurately reflects changes to city waste management programs.

Responsible Agencies

The Board of Supervisors has delegated to the District all County waste management operations and AB 939 responsibilities, including the preparation of and revisions to the CIWMP. The activities of the District are limited to handling, treating, and managing solid waste, as defined pursuant to the California Waste Management Act of 1989, Division 30 (Commencing with Section 40000) and the Public Resources Code (PRC), in the same manner as the County of Riverside is authorized pursuant to AB 939.

The Solid Waste Management Advisory Council-Countywide Local Task Force (LTF) provides advice and assistance for integrated solid waste management planning. The LTF is comprised of elected officials and their appointed representatives; solid waste and recycling industry representatives; WRCOG and CVAG representatives; engineering and environmental representatives, city representatives; and representatives of the general public. Under Section 40950 of the PRC, the LTF shall do all of the following:

- (1) Identify solid waste management issues of countywide or regional concern.
- (2) Determine the need for solid waste collection and transfer systems, processing facilities, and marketing strategies that can serve more than one local jurisdiction within the region.
- (3) Facilitate the development of multijurisdictional arrangements for the marketing of recyclable materials.
- (4) To the extent possible, facilitate resolution of conflicts and inconsistencies between or among city and county source reduction and recycling elements.
- (5) Develop goals, policies, and procedures which are consistent with guidelines and regulations adopted by the board, to guide the development of the siting element of the CIWMP.

Each city and the County for the unincorporated area is responsible for its own integrated solid waste management planning, implementation, and monitoring, as well as public information, budgeting, and enforcement. Oftentimes, the cities work cooperatively on waste management issues through their Councils of Governments (COG's); the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) serves the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, San Jacinto, and Temecula and the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) serves the cities of Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage.

Under a Memorandum of Understanding, the District's Board has agreed to utilize the COG's Executive Committees as policy advisory boards. The District's Board submits all significant policy and major fiscal matters to the COG's Executive Committees prior to taking action to allow the input of cities within Riverside County.

Programs for household hazardous waste, and solid waste facility permitting and enforcement are administered by the County Department of Environmental Health. The Department is also the Local Solid Waste Management Enforcement Agency (LEA) for all facilities that require a state Solid Waste Facility Permit. The LEA, with the concurrence of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) issues operating permits to facilities, including landfills, material recovery facilities, and composting facilities.

Conclusion

To meet the requirements of AB 939 and to conserve limited financial resources, cooperation between jurisdictions, agencies, businesses and private groups is essential. New technologies and approaches to waste management must be developed and implemented in a cost-effective manner. Only through cooperation and innovation will the CIWMP goals be achieved.



SUMMARY PLAN TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	1 - 1
1.2	Statutory and Regulatory Basis for the Countywide	
	Summary Plan	1 - 1
1.3	Organization and Scope of the Countywide Summary Plan	1 - 2
1.4	History of Waste Management in Riverside County	1 - 2
1.5	Current Riverside County Landfill System	1 - 4
1.6	Factors Affecting Countywide Waste Management Issues	1 - 5
1.7	Conclusion	1 - 6

CHAPTER 2. GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES

2.1	Purpose and Requirements	2 - 1
2.2	Definitions	2 - 1
2.3	Goals, Policies, and Objectives	2 - 2
2.4	Implementation Schedule	2 - 4

CHAPTER 3. COUNTY PROFILE AND PLAN ADMINISTRATION

3.1	Summary of Requirements	3 - 1
3.2	County Profile	3 - 1
3.3	Governmental Integrated Waste Management Infrastructure	3 - 8
3.4	Plan Administration	3 - 35

CHAPTER 4. CURRENT SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Summary of Requirements	4 - 1
Description of Factors Affecting the Solid Waste System	4 - 1
Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System	4 - 7
Description of Permitted Solid Waste Facilities	4 - 9
Description of Proposed Solid Waste Facilities	4 - 12
Description of Nonpermitted Waste Diversion Facilities	4 - 22
Description of Market Development Activities	4 - 32
	Summary of Requirements Description of Factors Affecting the Solid Waste System Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System Description of Permitted Solid Waste Facilities Description of Proposed Solid Waste Facilities Description of Nonpermitted Waste Diversion Facilities Description of Market Development Activities

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY OF SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS, HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS

5.1	Summary of Requirements	5 - 1
5.2	Description of Source Reduction and Recycling Elements' and	
	Household Hazardous Waste Elements' Programs	5 - 1
5.3	Summary of Facilities Identified in the Nondisposal Facility Elements	5 - 3
5.4	Identification of Programs for Coordination or Consolidation on a	
	Countywide Basis	5 - 3

CHAPTER 6. FINANCING OF COUNTYWIDE PROGRAMS

6.1	Summary of Requirements	6 - 1
6.2	Financing of Countywide Programs	6 - 1
6.3	Financing of City/Council of Government Programs	6 - 1

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Memorandum of Understanding Between the Coachella Valley Association of Governments and the Western Riverside Council of Governments Governing Annexation into the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District
- Appendix B Descriptions of Cities' and County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) Selected Programs

Appendix B1	City of Banning
Appendix B2	City of Beaumont
Appendix B3	City of Blythe
Appendix B4	City of Calimesa
Appendix B5	City of Canyon Lake
Appendix B6	City of Corona
Appendix B7	City of Hemet
Appendix B8	City of Lake Elsinore
Appendix B9	City of Moreno Valley
Appendix B10	City of Norco
Appendix B11	City of Perris
Appendix B12	City of Riverside

Appendix B13	City of San Jacinto
Appendíx B14	City of Temecula
Appendix B15	Riverside County
Appendix B16	Coachella Valley Association of Governments

- Appendix C Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Cities', the City of Blythe, and County's Planned and Implemented Diversion Programs
- Appendix D WRCOG Cities' and City of Blythe Program Updates
- Appendix ERiverside County Waste Resources Management District Board of
Directors Policy on Urban Transfer Stations (E1)

Riverside County Board of Supervisors' County Purchasing Policies (E2)

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A Membership and Duties of the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (Local Task Force)

LIST OF TABLES

Table SP 2-1	Implementation Schedule for Achieving Objectives	2 - 5
Table SP 3-1	Cities in Riverside County by Geographic Areas	3 - 1
Table SP 3-2	Population	3 - 6
Table SP 3-3	City of Banning	3 - 9
Table SP 3-4	City of Beaumont	3 - 10
Table SP 3-5	City of Blythe	3 - 11
Table SP 3-6	City of Calimesa	3 - 12
Table SP 3-7	City of Canyon Lake	3 - 13
Table SP 3-8	City of Cathedral City	3 - 14
Table SP 3-9	City of Coachella	3 - 15
Table SP 3-10	City of Corona	3 - 16
Table SP 3-11	City of Desert Hot Springs	3 - 17
Table SP 3-12	City of Hemet	3 - 18
Table SP 3-13	City of Indian Wells	3 - 19
Table SP 3-14	City of Indio	3 - 20
Table SP 3-15	City of Lake Elsinore	3 - 21
Table SP 3-16	City of La Quinta	3 - 22
Table SP 3-17	City of Moreno Valley	3 - 23
Table SP 3-18	City of Murrieta	3 - 24
Table SP 3-19	City of Norco	3 - 25
Table SP 3-20	City of Palm Desert	3 - 26
Table SP 3-21	City of Palm Springs	3 - 27
Table SP 3-22	City of Perris	3 - 28
Table SP 3-23	City of Rancho Mirage	3 - 29
Table SP 3-24	City of Riverside	3 - 30
Table SP 3-25	City of San Jacinto	3 - 31
Table SP 3-26	City of Temecula	3 - 32
Table SP 4-1	Organization of Services	4 - 2
Table SP 4-2	Ouantities of Solid Waste Generated in Base Year (1990)	4 - 3
Table SP 4-3(a)	Disposition of Solid Waste Collected Annually (1990)	4 - 4
Table SP 4-3(b)	Countywide CIWMB-Approved Base Year Generation.	
	Disposal, and Diversion	4 - 4
Table SP 4-4	Target Materials Transportation and Handling	4 - 4
Table SP 4-5(a)	Ouantities of Solid Waste Disposed in Base Year (1990)	4 - 5
Table SP 4-5(b)	Ouantities of Solid Waste Disposed (1995)	4 - 6
Table SP 4-6	Permitted Solid Waste Disposal Facilities	4 - 10
Table SP 4-7	Riverside County Regional Recyclers List	4 - 26
Table SP 4-8	Used Oil Recycling Centers	4 - 30
Table SP 5-1	Targeted Materials by Program	5 - 2
Table SP 5-2	Summary of Facilities Listed in Riverside County and Cities	5'
	Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE'S)	5 - 4
Table SP 5-3	SRRE/HHWE Schedule for Coordination of Countywide	
	Programs	5 - 7
Table SP 6-1	Costs and Revenue Sources for Countywide Programs	6 - 2
	· · · ·	

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure SP 3-1	Riverside County Cities, Major Roadways, Landfills, and	
	Nondisposal Facilities	3 - 3
Figure SP 4-1	Idyllwild Transfer Station Vicinity Map	4 - 13
Figure SP 4-2	Pinon Flats Transfer Station Vicinity Map	4 - 14
Figure SP 4-3	Trico Transfer Station Vicinity Map	4 - 15
Figure SP 4-4	Moreno Valley Transfer Station/Materials Recovery Facility	
	Vicinity Map	4 - 16
Figure SP 4-5	Perris Transfer Station/Materials Recovery Facility Vicinity	
	Мар	4 - 17
Figure SP 4-6	O.M. Scott & Sons Company Riverside County Regional	
	Composting Facility Vicinity Map	4 - 18
Figure SP 4-7	Recyc Inc. Composting Facility Vicinity Map	4 - 19
Figure SP 4-8	Whitefeather Farms Composting Facility Vicinity Map	4 - 20
Figure SP 4-9	California Bio-Mass Inc. Composting Facility Vicinity Map	4 - 21
Figure SP 4-10	CVAG Transfer Station Proposed Site	4 - 23
Figure SP 4-11	CVAG Transfer Station Proposed Site	4 - 24
Figure SP 4-12	CVAG Transfer Station Proposed Site	4 - 25
Figure SP 4-13	Agua Mansa Recycling Market Development Zone	4 - 33
Figure SP 4-14	Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone	4 - 35

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Countywide Summary Plan, as one component of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), is to describe and summarize all the elements of the countywide waste management planning process. The Countywide Summary Plan includes: the countywide goals, policies, and objectives for integrated waste management planning; a description of the administrative structure for preparing and maintaining the Countywide Summary Plan; a description of current solid waste management practices in the cities and unincorporated area; a summary of the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRRE's), Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWE's), and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE's) for Riverside County and its cities, and a discussion of programs chosen to be implemented countywide, within geographic areas within the County and/or within a city; and how such programs are structured, administered, and financed.

The Countywide Summary Plan is intended to serve as a tool for the cost-effective implementation of countywide waste management policies and programs. "Countywide" is defined as the unincorporated portions of Riverside County and each of the incorporated cities within the County's borders. The Countywide Summary Plan has been prepared by the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) in collaboration with the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/AB 939 Local Task Force (LTF), Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), and cities within Riverside County. These cities include: Banning, Beaumont, Blythe, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Cathedral City, Coachella, Corona, Desert Hot Springs, Hemet, Indian Wells, Indio, Lake Elsinore, La Quinta, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Perris, Rancho Mirage, Riverside, San Jacinto, and Temecula.

1.2 STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BASIS FOR THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN

The Countywide Summary Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Integrated Waste Management of 1989 (Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1095 [AB 939]). The basic statutory requirements for the content and format of the Countywide Summary Plan are found in Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 41751. Additional regulations detailing the requirements of the Countywide Summary Plan are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 6.6, Sections 18757 through 18758.

1.3 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE OF THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN

The format and content of the Countywide Summary Plan are generally consistent with the Model Summary Plan prepared by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). The Countywide Summary Plan includes more information than is required by State regulations to ensure that the major waste management programs and efforts which have been initiated by the District, WRCOG, CVAG and cities within Riverside County beyond those outlined in the SRRE's, HHWE's and NDFE's are discussed. The preparation of the Countywide Summary Plan is discussed in the Executive Summary.

1.4 HISTORY OF WASTE MANAGEMENT IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Transition From Riverside County Solid Waste Management Plan (CoSWMP) to Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)

Prior to adoption of AB 939, the countywide waste management system was shaped by the Riverside County Solid Waste Management Plan (CoSWMP). The CoSWMP serves as a guide to solid waste management issues until the CIWMP is adopted. Whereas the CoSWMP was a single document describing countywide solid waste management, the CIWMP includes the SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE for each city in Riverside County and the unincorporated area, as well as the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element.

Formation of the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District and Memorandum of Understanding with the Councils of Governments

Until 1986, public landfills in Riverside County were under the management of the Riverside County Road Department. Under the direction of the Road Department, the Board of Supervisors authorized the creation of an Enterprise Fund on March 8, 1983, in order to separate disposal costs from the General Fund. To meet the demands of statutory requirements, the Board established the Waste Management Department on August 20, 1985. The transfer of the Road Department's Waste Disposal Division to the newly formed Waste Management Department was completed on February 27, 1986. When the Waste Management Department took over its responsibilities, it acquired responsibility for 13 active landfills and closure and post-closure maintenance for 27 inactive landfills located in the unincorporated area and cities within the County.

To create a financial structure legally separated from the County's General Fund and to provide an opportunity for broader governance of the disposal system, a separate Sanitation District was formed under the provisions of Section 4700 of the Health and Safety Code, in 1994. The new District was named the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District and took over all assets, liabilities, and employees of the former Waste Management Department. The District is headed by a Chief Executive Officer, appointed by the District's Board of Directors, and is currently staffed with nearly 200 employees. The District is governed by a Board of Directors,

CIWMP

which is composed at this time of the County Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors has delegated to the District all County waste management operations and AB 939 responsibilities, including preparation and revisions to the CIWMP. The activities of the District are limited to handle, treat, and manage solid waste, as defined pursuant to the California Waste Management Act of 1989, Division 30 (Commencing with Section 40000) of the Public Resources Code, in the same manner as the County of Riverside is authorized pursuant to AB 939.

No cities have chosen to join as members of the District. Some cities have stated they have chosen not to join due to perceptions there may be potential liability and other factors. Through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the cities of Riverside County agreed to support the formation of the District with the understanding that the initial governing body of the District would be the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County. A copy of the MOU is included in Appendix A. The following summarizes the conditions under which this support was given:

- 1. The Waste Resources Management District Board (WRMDB) will utilize the Councils of Governments (COG's) Executive Committees of WRCOG and CVAG as policy advisory boards.
- 2. The WRMDB shall submit all significant policy and major fiscal matters including the establishment of fees and charges for the landfills, to the COG's Executive Committees prior to taking action to allow the input of all cities within Riverside County.
- 3. The WRMDB agrees to accept, and the COG's Executive Committees agree to support, the annexation or reorganization of cities into the District upon adoption of Resolutions of Application to Join the District from a sufficient number of cities representing a majority of the incorporated population within Riverside County. The WRMDB shall be reorganized to reflect cities' participation consistent with existing State law.
- 4. The WRMDB agrees to consider all requests for annexation or reorganization which do not meet this majority criteria and to consult with all the cities to determine if the annexation and/or reorganization which would result is appropriate.
- 5. The WRMDB and the COG's Executive Committees agree that existing State law regarding governance issues of the Sanitation Districts may not best serve the cities and the County of Riverside if annexation occurs. Accordingly, not later than a proposed annexation, the Board of Supervisors and the COG's Executive Committees will review existing legislation regarding the governance of the proposed new District boundary and will agree to support special legislation regarding the governance of the proposed new District boundary.

The MOU is considered as operative policy of the District so long as the broad system user base is continued, or until modified by the parties.

Current District policy, established after an extensive study of the countywide disposal system which was pursued cooperatively with the WRCOG and CVAG agencies, places District focus on the most economic disposal system, leaving the construction and operation of urban transfer stations and recycling facilities to cities or private vendors.

1.5 CURRENT RIVERSIDE COUNTY LANDFILL SYSTEM

Active Landfills

Riverside County currently has 12 active, permitted solid waste disposal facilities. There are no active, permitted disposal facilities within any of the 24 cities of the County. With the exception of the El Sobrante Landfill, all landfills in Riverside County are operated by the District. The El Sobrante Landfill operates in accordance with agreements between Western Waste Industries and Riverside County (now the District), which collects the user fees for the site.

The Coachella, Edom Hill, and Desert Center Landfills are located on properties owned by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The District is in the process of purchasing the Coachella and Edom Hill properties. These purchases are expected to be completed in 1996. The Desert Center Landfill is operated under a lease from the BLM. All other landfills are currently owned by the Waste Management Department. The District, as successor to the Waste Management Department, is currently in the process of preparing the documents necessary to transfer the ownership of the landfills from the Department to the District. This process should be completed in 1996.

Transfer Stations

Currently, the District operates two permitted transfer stations in the unincorporated area of Riverside County. The Idyllwild Transfer Station is a low to moderate volume transfer facility which serves the Idyllwild and Pine Cove communities. The transfer station receives nonhazardous municipal solid waste which is then transferred to the Lamb Canyon Landfill for disposal. Pine needles, aluminum cans, newspaper, glass, PET, and metals are currently collected and diverted from disposal under an existing vendor contract.

The Pinon Flats Transfer Station is a low volume transfer facility which serves the Pinon Flats community. The transfer station receives only nonhazardous municipal solid waste which is then transferred to the Anza Landfill for disposal.

Inactive Landfills

Twenty-seven inactive disposal sites, which Riverside County operated at one time, are overseen and maintained as required by the District. Most are very small, and many were operated as burn sites. Periodic maintenance such as erosion control, weed abatement, and litter control are performed on an as-needed basis. Other maintenance, such as monitoring for groundwater contamination and landfill gas emissions or migration are performed only after a site has been "ranked" or otherwise designated by a regulatory agency.

1.6 FACTORS AFFECTING COUNTYWIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Numerous factors affect waste management. These factors can be summarized in the following categories: regulatory, court decisions, and local waste management issues. While these categories are not mutually exclusive, they are often driving factors affecting waste management in Riverside County and its cities.

Regulatory Factors

In the early 1990's, two significant changes in solid waste regulations significantly altered the way in which municipal solid waste must be processed and managed. The first of these regulations was AB 939, previously discussed in Section 1.2 as the statutory basis for the Countywide Summary Plan. With its mandated goals of reducing waste disposal in landfills by 25% by 1995 and 50% by the year 2000, AB 939 has caused each city and county in the State to reevaluate its solid waste management practices and submit plans on how these reduction goals will be implemented and funded. According to the CIWMB, created by AB 939 to oversee the regulations promulgated by AB 939, the State as a whole is meeting the 1995 goal. The year 2000 goal presents a much more formidable challenge. The potential costs versus the perceived benefits of reaching 50% diversion are now the focus of attention. Nevertheless, the cities and the unincorporated area of Riverside County are working toward achieving the 50% diversion goal by the year 2000.

Subtitle D (40 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 258, Subpart B) provisions, adopted by the Federal government to reduce the contamination of groundwater and thereby protect the public's health and safety, significantly affected waste management practices by requiring sanitary landfill disposal sites to be fully lined on the bottom and sides of the waste cells. This regulation applies to any horizontally expanded or new landfill. This change in regulations, effective in 1993, has dramatically raised the cost of solid waste disposal in Riverside County and has resulted in the early closure of certain landfills due to the associated costs of horizontal expansions.

Court Decisions

There have been numerous court cases which have impacted waste management. In the case of C.A. Carbone, Inc. v. Town of Clarkstown, the U.S. Supreme Court (May, 1994) held that a flow control ordinance in the town of Clarkstown, New York, violates the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. In the 6-3 ruling, the majority concluded that the town's flow control ordinance discriminated against interstate commerce and therefore is invalid. The decision was viewed as a major victory for private waste haulers and landfill owners and a major setback for local governments.

A local case, Waste Management of the Desert, Inc. v. Palm Springs Recycling, Inc. (March,

1994), has also affected several agency recycling plans. In this case, the State Supreme Court ruled, in a 5-2 decision, that a city does not have authority under state law to grant a private business the exclusive right to collect recyclables. The court decision determined that a city may not prohibit non-franchised companies from collecting recyclable materials which are donated or sold to the company by the waste generator.

Due to legal requirements of AB 939, many California communities are in the planning stages of establishing integrated waste management systems which require debt financing with a focus on recycling and Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF's). In order to assist with successful financing of both existing and planned public-sponsored solid waste facilities, these facilities should have contractual obligations with the participating jurisdictions which direct the flow from the jurisdictions to the facility.

Local Waste Management Issues

A major issue facing Riverside County and its cities is the ability to fund all required mandates while providing environmentally safe disposal of solid wastes. On January 16, 1996, the WRMDB adopted as a general policy that the District will not sponsor future urban transfer station facilities as part of the disposal system funding (see Appendix E). The District was directed to focus on "economic flow control" creating the most economic disposal system by minimizing disposal rates and participating only in small remote area transfers to avoid small disposal sites, thus leaving urban transfer stations and MRF's to the cities and private sector to develop and operate. This action was based, in part, on a yearlong extensive system review study by Hilton, Farnkopf & Hobson (HF&H), financed by the District in cooperation with WRCOG, CVAG and cities in Riverside County.

A number of facilities are under consideration. Efforts have been underway in the Coachella Valley on behalf of the ten affected jurisdictions wherein CVAG has sponsored the siting and development of a transfer station and MRF to meet the needs of the Valley when local disposal capacity is exhausted. The City of Palm Springs is planning a 150-ton per day municipal solid waste composting facility to handle the majority of its own waste. The City of Indio is considering siting a MRF/transfer station which would receive up to 750 tons per day of solid waste and recyclable materials for sorting and other types of processing. Further, the District is proceeding with the design, environmental review, and permitting of a transfer station at the Coachella Landfill, which could be operated by the District or private vendor. This facility is projected to receive up to 1,100 tons per day.

It should be noted that a private MRF/transfer station was recently opened in the City of Moreno Valley. A MRF/transfer station is also under construction in the City of Perris.

1.7 CONCLUSION

Future reshaping of the countywide integrated waste management system will be accomplished primarily through the LTF, as advisors to the WRMDB and Riverside County Board of Supervisors; the Executive Committees of the WRCOG and CVAG as outlined in the MOU; the cities within Riverside County; and the District. The diversity of the LTF membership and the participation of the County, District, cities, and COG's are instrumental in addressing the ever changing issues affecting the countywide integrated waste management system. The diversity of the present makeup of the LTF is shown in Exhibit A, following the Appendices. The two COG's, WRCOG and CVAG, facilitate cooperative efforts between jurisdictions by providing a forum for members to discuss and resolve significant integrated waste management issues. This input has and will continue to be included in the reshaping of the countywide integrated waste management system.

It should be noted that county-city related waste efforts are strongly affected by factors outside the control of local jurisdictions. Competitive tipping fees in other jurisdictions, fluctuating recycling markets, and/or changing legislative/legal regulations affect short-term and long-term landfill operations and recycling programs. These changing conditions require careful monitoring and a cost-effective/environmentally sound response to implement AB 939 requirements.

Over the next decade, policies and strategies will need to be determined pertaining to: 1) the growing concern over illegal disposal of solid waste along roadways and on agricultural and other lands throughout the County; 2) sustaining current levels of waste diversion; and 3) promoting the use of recyclable materials in the manufacturing and use of consumer products. A computer model, which was developed by HF&H to assess both current waste management practices and future viable management scenarios to the benefit of all facilities' users throughout the County and its cities, will continue to be applied to various waste management options to aid in formulating recommendations for a cost-effective waste management system.

Chapter 2

GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

This chapter identifies goals, policies, and objectives for the development and implementation of coordinated waste reduction programs for jurisdictions within Riverside County. The goals, policies, and objectives illustrate the strategies that will ensure a coordinated approach to waste reduction throughout Riverside County. Specific requirements for this chapter of the Summary Plan are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18757.1.

The goals and policies were developed by the District and the Riverside County Local Task Force (LTF), through recommendation by its Steering Committee, to guide the development of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

2.2 **DEFINITIONS**

Goals are broad statements that specify the future ends, conditions, or targets toward which planning measures are directed. The goal sets the direction for more specific policies and is generally not measurable or time dependent. The following goals, as components of the CIWMP, emphasize source reduction, recycling, and composting to reduce dependence on disposal as well as promote conservation of landfill capacity and natural resources. They are established to ensure an effective, economical, and environmentally sound integrated waste management system throughout the unincorporated area and the cities.

Policies are strategies for meeting specific goals. Policies are guidelines that delineate the types of specific actions that will be taken to realize the objectives and achieve the goals of the plan. The following countywide policies have been established for reducing waste and for implementing the programs identified in the individual SRRE's and HHWE's, and in the CIWMP. All of the policies are intended to encourage a coordinated and carefully planned approach to implementing integrated waste management.

Objectives are specific and measurable strategies for achieving goals in the medium-term (1996-2000). The following objectives include an implementation schedule which identifies specific tasks and milestones necessary to achieve each objective.

2.3 GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: Develop a coordinated integrated waste management system to meet the needs of the jurisdictions within Riverside County.

Policies

- Operate a cost-effective integrated waste management system that will be adequately financed to meet AB 939 requirements, as well as operational and maintenance needs.
- Facilitate a cooperative effort by communicating and coordinating all significant solid waste policy and major fiscal matters to all jurisdictions participating in the waste management system.
- Promote an integrated waste management system which emphasizes source reduction as its first priority, recycling and composting as secondary priorities, and environmentally safe landfill disposal and transformation when recycling is not possible.
- Cooperatively assess the need for and development of nondisposal facilities.
- Continue to review and evaluate new waste management technologies in order to implement a more efficient integrated waste management system.
- Work cooperatively to develop programs which assist jurisdictions in achieving long-term economies of scale, resulting in cost savings that could not be achieved individually.
- Pursue state and federal grants for establishing and enhancing reduction programs.
- Continue to examine countywide policies, practices, and/or ordinances that can be implemented to reduce illegal dumping.

Objectives

- Strive to comply with the waste reduction goals of AB 939 et seq.
- Strive to cost-effectively implement the elements and programs within the CIWMP.
- Disseminate for consideration all significant waste management matters to the Local Task Force (LTF), in accordance with state regulations, to affected cities, and Executive Committees of the Councils of Governments to allow the input of

all affected jurisdictions within Riverside County. These matters could include, but are not limited to: development of nondisposal facilities, new waste management technologies (including landfill mining), and illegal dumping ordinances/programs.

- Implement public education programs which focus on waste prevention as the first priority and recycling and composting as secondary priorities.
- Continue to develop and maintain the Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS) in order to provide accurate disposal information to all affected jurisdictions and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

Goal 2: Strengthen and develop markets for recycled or composted materials and products throughout Riverside County.

Policies

- Support the development of markets for recycled or composted materials.
- Encourage the purchase of recycled or composted products.
- Continue to promote the Recycling Market Development Zones (RMDZ's) among participating jurisdictions.

Objectives

- The County, COG's, and each affected city will provide technical assistance to businesses considering locating within the RMDZ's.
- Increase purchasing policies which specify requirements for the purchase of products using recycled or composted materials in businesses, school districts, and government agencies.
- Goal 3: Increase public awareness of the environmental impacts of household hazardous products and support their environmentally safe disposal when recycling and reuse is not possible.

Policies

• Support public education which promotes the proper use, safe disposal, and alternatives to the use of common household hazardous products.

- Strive to provide a convenient countywide household hazardous waste program.
- Work cooperatively with public and private agencies to reduce the production and use of household hazardous products.
- Promote coordination of countywide household hazardous waste efforts, including preparation and distribution of household hazardous waste public education materials.

Objectives

- Provide information on household hazardous waste collection programs, safe disposal, and alternatives to common household hazardous products to all the residents of Riverside County and its cities by the year 2000 through coordinated public education programs.
- By the year 2000, to the greatest extent practical, eliminate household hazardous waste from entering in-County and out-of-County landfills used by Riverside County and its cities.

2.4 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Table SP 2-1 identifies the medium term (1996 - 2000) tasks necessary to achieve the objectives, the milestones to be achieved, projected dates of implementation, and responsible agencies. This table summarizes all of the jurisdictions' program implementation schedules. More detailed tasks for each program are identified in the cities' and County's SRRE's and HHWE's and are summarized in Appendix B.

It should be noted that although Table 2-1 does not identify Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) as responsible agencies, they are instrumental in coordinating various programs for their member jurisdictions. The individual jurisdictions, however, are ultimately responsible for program implementation and complying with the mandates of AB 939.

SUMMARY OF COMBINED	TABLE SP 2-1 JURISDICTIONS' SRRE AND HHW	E IMPLEMENTATIO	N SCHEDULES
TASK*	MILESTONE TO BE ACHIEVED**	IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD	RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES***
Implement Source Reduction Programs	Additional 2.0–6.7% diversion	1996 2000	Jurisdictions
Implement Recycling Programs	Additional 14.0–56.4% diversion	1996 – 2000	Jurisdictions
Implement Composting Programs	Additional 3.8–37.4% diversion	1996-2000	Jurisdictions
Implement Special Waste Programs	Additional 0.1–34.0% diversion	1996-2000	Jurisdictions
Implement Education and Public Information Programs	No diversion % given	1996 – 2000	Jurisdictions
Implement Household Hazardous Waste Programs	No diversion % given	1996 2000	County Environmental Health, Jurisdictions
Notes:			

*Specific tasks by program are identified in the cities' and County's individual SRRE's and HHWE's and are summarized in Appendix B of the Summary Plan. ** The percentages reflect the range of anticipated diversion (of total solid waste generated) by program as listed in the cities' and County's SRRE's/HHWE's. ***It should be noted that although Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) are not identified as responsible agencies, they are instrumental in coordinating various programs for their member jurisdictions. Jurisdiction = individual cities and unincorporated county

Chapter 3

COUNTY PROFILE AND PLAN ADMINISTRATION

3.1 SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

This chapter of the Summary Plan includes a general, descriptive summary of the geography and demography of Riverside County and its cities; a description of how integrated waste management is administered throughout the County and cities; and identification of the entities responsible for administering and implementing the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). This chapter is required by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18757.3.

3.2 COUNTY PROFILE

The following is a general description of the location, topography, climate, transportation system, population characteristics, and employment for Riverside County and its cities.

Location

Riverside County is located in Southern California, easterly of the Los Angeles/Orange County urban area, westerly of the California/Arizona border, southerly of San Bernardino County, and northerly of San Diego and Imperial Counties. The County extends roughly 190 miles east/west and 50 miles north/south, covering an area of 7,310 square miles.

Topography

Riverside County's topography may be divided into four distinct geographic areas: 1) the Western/Southwestern County; 2) the Central County; 3) the Coachella Valley; and 4) the Palo Verde Valley (see Table SP 3-1). Each geographic area includes incorporated cities, as well as unincorporated areas.

TABLE SP 3-1 CITIES IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY BY GEOGRAPHIC AREAS			
Western/Southwestern	Central	Coachella Valley	Palo Verde Valley
Canyon Lake Corona Lake Elsinore Moreno Valley Murrieta Norco Perris Riverside Temecula	Banning Beaumont Calimesa Hemet San Jacinto	Cathedral City Coachella Desert Hot Springs Indian Wells Indio La Quinta Palm Springs Palm Desert Rancho Mirage	Blythe

The Western/Southwestern County geographic area includes nine of the County's twenty-four incorporated cities: Corona, Norco, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Perris, Canyon Lake, Lake Elsinore, Murrieta, and Temecula. This geographic area is characterized by low rolling hills and wide valleys. Agricultural uses such as dry land farming, citrus orchards, and wineries are located throughout. The area contains two major population centers of the County: Corona, Moreno Valley, Norco, and Riverside in the northwest and Murrieta and Temecula in the southwest. The City of Riverside, with a population of 247,800 (January, 1995) is a major metropolitan area. The area, as a whole, has become increasingly urbanized. There are several large lakes. Lake Matthews and Lake Skinner, which are operated by the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), provide domestic water for the Los Angeles Basin. Lake Perris Reservoir and Lake Elsinore serve as recreational centers. Rivers include the Santa Ana River, passing northwest of the City of Riverside, and the San Jacinto River, flowing from the San Jacinto Mountains to Lake Elsinore. Both rivers flow intermittently, depending on rainfall and melting snow from surrounding mountains.

The Central geographic area of the County includes the five incorporated Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Hemet, and San Jacinto. The area is characterized by the San Jacinto and San Bernardino Mountain ranges. Much of this area consists of national forest lands, with the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Hemet, and San Jacinto serving as urban centers. The remaining lands are primarily rural and agricultural.

The Coachella Valley geographic area of Riverside County includes the following nine incorporated cities: Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Springs, Palm Desert, and Rancho Mirage. The Coachella Valley is largely composed of vast desert lands and barren mountains. Only one body of water, the Salton Sea, is located in this geographic area, although the Whitewater River, which traverses the Valley, flows periodically during heavy local precipitation runoff from surrounding mountains.

The Palo Verde Valley, including the City of Blythe, lies at the easternmost end of the County. The area is characterized as primarily agricultural. The Colorado River is also a primary feature. Remaining lands between the Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys are generally barren, open desert, which are predominantly government owned.

Climate

The Western/Southwestern and Central geographic areas of Riverside County have a Mediterranean climate. These regions are semi-arid with mild seasonal changes in precipitation and temperature. Most precipitation occurs from November through April. Temperatures are normally mild, with an average of 62 degrees Fahrenheit (°F).

The climate of the Coachella Valley is a continental, desert-type, with hot summers, mild winters, and very little annual rainfall. Precipitation is less than six inches annually and occurs mostly in the winter months from active frontal systems and, in the later summer months, from thunderstorms.

The Palo Verde Valley geographic area is characterized by arid desert with greatly varying temperatures and very little rainfall. Precipitation is generally light in a few short showers during the year. Summer temperatures commonly exceed 110 °F in the daytime and drop to around 75 °F at night. In the winter, the temperature range is from the lower 30's to the 80's.

Transportation

Riverside County's transportation system is comprised of city and county roadways, local and regional transit systems, federal and State highways, urban arterials, as well as rail and air service. (See Figure SP 3-1 for the locations of roadways, railroads, and airports).









3-3



Major Roadways: The Riverside County highway network includes 2,560 miles of roads within the unincorporated areas maintained by the Transportation and Land Management Agency (TLMA) and 843 miles designated as State and/or Interstate highways (shown in Figure SP 3-1). The remaining streets and roads (over 17,000 miles according to the 1989 Riverside County Solid Waste Management Plan [CoSWMP]) are maintained by the county's 24 incorporated cities.

The major freeway route in the County is Interstate 10 (I-10) which spans roughly 155 miles through the County. The freeway travels in a general east/west direction from the Colorado River to Calimesa and is part of a major transcontinental route which carries large volumes of passenger vehicle, commuter, and truck traffic. It also serves as the major access corridor to the Coachella Valley and Palo Verde Valley.

The 60 Freeway (SR 60) links with I-10 west of Beaumont, providing a connection to the northwestern portion of Riverside County. It is characterized by high commuter traffic, as it provides direct access to Los Angeles and Orange Counties west of Riverside County. This highway carries high truck volume, since it is the most direct route from the agricultural centers of the Coachella and Imperial Valleys to the wholesale market in Los Angeles.

The 91 Freeway (SR 91) connects the City of Riverside with Long Beach in Los Angeles County. It provides direct access to much of Orange County, particularly to its industrial and commercial centers. The 91 Freeway is a commuter highway and usually operates at or near capacity, with motorists typically experiencing significant delays.

Interstate 215 (I-215) links the City of Riverside with the San Bernardino urban area to the north, as well as the San Bernardino Mountains. Interstate 215 also offers freeway access from the western Riverside County area to the Perris Valley and southwest Riverside County. Interstate 15 (I-15) links the Temecula-Murrieta area with Corona-Norco, and connects Western Riverside County with San Diego County to the south and the Ontario area to the north.

Other non-freeway State routes of major importance to Riverside County include State Routes 62, 71, 74, 79, 86, 111, 243, and 371. These highways interconnect urban and rural communities in the central and southern geographic areas with the urban centers in the Coachella Valley. They comprise a major arterial circulation system designed to provide fast and efficient movement of people and goods within and through the county and its cities.

Railroads: Currently, three major railway companies serve Riverside County: 1) the Union Pacific Railway Company; 2) the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company (A.T. & S.F.); and 3) the Southern Pacific Transportation Company.

The Union Pacific Railroad's San Bernardino, Riverside, Ontario, Los Angeles route is an extremely heavy freight route, and is the fastest rail route between Riverside and Los Angeles. In July, 1992, Metrolink purchased trackage and operation rights from Union Pacific for its Riverside line. The Riverside line began operation on June 14, 1993. It currently consists of five stations spanning 59 miles from downtown Riverside to Union Station in Los Angeles and services an average of 3,400 people per day (Monday through Friday).

The A.T. & S.F.'s San Bernardino, Colton, Riverside, Corona, Fullerton, Los Angeles route is a main line and handles all of the A.T. & S.F. transcontinental freight traffic. It offers direct access to several major industrial areas of Los Angeles and Orange Counties. Metrolink has opened another line from downtown Riverside to Irvine in Orange County which will run on the A.T. & S.F. line.

The Southern Pacific Railroad's Indio, Palm Springs, Beaumont, Colton, Pomona, and Los Angeles route is a heavily traveled mainline rail in Southern California.
Airports: There are presently 14 public airports in Riverside County. There are also more than 20 airports or landing strips which are for private, special, medical, or military uses.¹ The Ontario International Airport, located northwest of Riverside County in San Bernardino County, is the major passenger airport serving western Riverside County. The Palm Springs Airport is the major passenger airport serving eastern Riverside County, including the Coachella Valley and the City of Blythe.

Population, Demography, and Social Characteristics

Population: Riverside County has experienced significant population growth in the last 35 years. It was the fastest growing county in the nation in the 1980's. By 1980, the population had more than doubled from 306,010 (1960 U.S. Census-recorded population) to 663,199. In 1995, it was estimated to have doubled again to 1,393,500 (see Table SP 3-2 for population by jurisdiction). The percentage of the county population living within incorporated cities was 67% in 1990 and estimated at 72% in 1995.

It is estimated that the total county population will rise to over 2.5 million by 2010 and, based on current boundaries, 63% of the population will reside in the incorporated cities.² A greater percentage of the population may reside in incorporated cities, if additional areas are annexed into cities in the future.

Seasonal Fluctuations in Population: Portions of Riverside County experience seasonal fluctuations, some due to agriculture and harvesting seasons, while during winter months, the Coachella Valley population may increase by almost 100% with an influx of seasonal residents and tourists. The Hemet Valley and Palo Verde Valley also experience some influx of seasonal residents during the winter months.

Average Age: According to 1990 U.S Census data, the average age of Riverside County residents is 31.5 years. Thirty-one and one-half percent (31.5%) of the population are under 18 years of age, and 13.2% are 65 or older.

Ethnic Composition: According to 1990 U.S. Census records, 76.4% of the county population are White; 5.4% are Black; 3.6% Asian; 1% American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut; and 13.6% other ethic groups. Those of Hispanic origin comprise 26.3% of the total population (e.g. of the previously mentioned groups, 26.3% are of Hispanic origin, even if they are grouped in another race category). According to 1990 U.S. Census data, non-English-speaking residents comprise 6% of the population.

Income: According to 1990 U.S. Census data, median income of households for 1989 was \$33,081; with an average of \$37,694 annual income for families and \$18,496 for non-family (those not related by marriage, blood, or adoption) households. Per capita income was \$14,510. Eleven and one-half percent (11.5%) of the population were below the poverty level.

¹Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division

²Southern California Association of Governments - Growth Forecast, 5/16/94

TABLE SP 3-2

Population

Riverside County

Population of the Cities and Unincorporated County 1980, 1990, and 1995

Jurisdiction	1980 (a)	1990 (b)	1995 (c)	% of change 1980 - 1990	% of change 1990 - 1995
TOTAL	663,199	1,170,413	1,393,500	76.5	19.1
Banning	14,020	20,570	24,250	46.7	17.9
Beaumont	6,818	9,685	10,700	42.1	10.5
Blythe	6,805	8,428	16,700	23.9	98.1
Calimesa (e)	NA	NA	7,450	NA	NA
Canyon Lake (e)	NA	NA	11,450	NA	NA
Cathedral City (d)	11,096	30,085	35,900	NA	19.3
Coachella	9,129	16,896	20,800	85.1	23.1
Corona	37,791	76,095	98,100	101.4	28.9
Desert Hot Springs	5,941	11,668	14,950	96.4	28.1
Hemet	22,454	36,094	53,500	60.7	48.2
Indian Wells	1,394	2,647	3,120	89.9	17.9
Indio	21,611	36,793	42,600	70.3	15.8
Lake Elsinore	5,982	18,285	25,250	205.7	38.1
La Quinta (d)	4,027	11,215	17,600	NA	56.9
Moreno Valley (d)	28,120	118,779	135,600	NA	14.2
Murrieta (e)	NA	NA	33,450	NA	NA
Norco	19,732	23,302	24,800	18.1	6.4
Palm Desert	11,801	23,252	33,700	97.0	44.9
Palm Springs	32,359	40,181	42,450	24.2	5.6
Perris	6,827	21,460	31,100	214.3	44.9
Rancho Mirage	6,281	9,778	10,750	55.7	9.9
Riverside	170,591	226,505	247,800	32.8	9.4
San Jacinto	7,098	16,210	24,200	128.4	49.3
Temecula (d)	4,289	27,099	40,400	NA	49.1
Balance of County	229,033	385,386	386,900	68.3	0.4

(a) Census of Population, April 1, 1980.

(b) Census of Population, April 1, 1990.

(c) California Department of finance estimates for January 1, 1995. Parts may not add to total due to independent rounding.

(d) Incorporated after the 1980 Census.

(e) Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Murrieta, were incorporated after the 1990 Census.

NA - Not applicable.

Source: State of California/Employment Development/Labor Market Information Division, "Annual Planning Information, Riverside-San Bernardino Metropolitan Statistical Area (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties), 1995."

Employment and Major Industries

Economic Development: Economic development in Riverside County may be separated into three geographic areas. The economic base of the western urban area is predominantly based upon light manufacturing. Major industries include mobile home manufacturers, electronics firms, and rock products. Light manufacturing is supplemented by a significant retail trade economy and agriculture.

Light industry has begun to locate in the San Gorgonio and San Jacinto Valleys and the Temecula/Rancho California areas. Products vary with major emphasis on electronics and mobile homes.

The desert region, including the Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys, possesses a limited industrial economy. In the Coachella Valley, the economy is heavily engaged in agriculture and tourism, however, there has been considerable growth in manufacturing and service businesses.³ The Palo Verde Valley is almost totally dependent upon an agricultural economic base with some influence from tourism generated by the Colorado River. In both cases, a significant percentage of employment is seasonal, based upon the tourist season and crop harvests.

Sources of Income and Employment: Although agriculture continues to provide an important mainstay to Riverside County's economy, much of the economic growth in recent years has been attributable to the commercial, industrial, and tourism sectors. In fact, in the Riverside-San Bernardino Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), the government, services, and retail industries comprised 68% of total employment.

Between January 1994 and January 1995, total non-farm employment rose from 733,000 to 748,200 (up 15,200 jobs) in the MSA. All major industry sectors recorded employment gains over the year, except finance, insurance and real estate. Farm employment fell by 1,700 jobs in the same period.⁴

Prospects for Economic Growth or Decline: It has been estimated that the number of industries will double between 1990 and 2000. The types of manufacturers which will locate in the county are expected to vary greatly from the present. The general economic base is anticipated to become more manufacturing oriented with reduced dependency on agriculture.

Housing

Percent of Population in Single Family and Multi-Unit Dwellings: The California Department of Finance estimated that on January 1, 1994, there were 348,010 single family dwellings, 105,183 multi-unit dwellings, and 77,423 mobile homes throughout Riverside County. Of these dwellings, 84% were occupied, with an average of 2.99 persons per household. The average persons per household varies from 2.06 persons per household in the City of Rancho Mirage to 4.7 persons per household in the City of Coachella.

Trends in Development of Housing: In the late 1980's, Riverside County was the fastest growing county in the nation. This growth was characterized by substantial increases in housing units.

³John S. Raymond, Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator, City of Palm Springs, Correspondence dated February 20, 1996.

⁴State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, March 3, 1995

Property Values: The January, 1995 average home price in Riverside County was \$139,594, which is a 4.8% decrease from January, 1994 and a 6% decrease from 1990 average home prices.

Political Units

Cities: Riverside County consists of 24 incorporated cities as well as a vast unincorporated area. Figure SP 3-1 shows the boundaries of each of the cities. Twenty-three of the incorporated cities are members of the two voluntary joint powers agencies, Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG). The WRCOG currently includes the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, San Jacinto, and Temecula. The CVAG includes the Cities of Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage. The County, representing the unincorporated area, is a member of both WRCOG and CVAG. Due, in part, to its remote location, the City of Blythe is not a member of either council.

The CIWMP Steering Committee requested that the Summary Plan include specific information regarding city population, ethnicity, household income, housing, property values, and development trends. The WRCOG, CVAG, and individual cities prepared Tables SP 3-3 through SP 3-26 to reflect information for each of the cities within Riverside County. It should be noted that the Councils of Governments (COG's) and cities left some city categories blank, however, this information is not required by state regulations.

3.3. GOVERNMENTAL INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

Task Forces and Committees

The County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWMAC) was established to provide advice and assistance in the preparation of the CoSWMP. In response to the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, the Council was expanded and formed the Local Task Force (LTF) in March, 1990. The SWMAC/LTF is comprised of representatives selected by the COG's and cities with populations over 100,000; the Board of Supervisors; representatives of the solid waste and recycling industries; and economic development, engineering, and the environmental community. It serves as an advisory body to the Board of Supervisors on solid waste issues and countywide waste prevention and disposal reduction issues. On March 16, 1995, the LTF formed a Steering Committee from its members to assist the District in the preparation of the CIWMP. Members of the CIWMP Steering Committee included representatives from the WRCOG and CVAG, city representatives, and solid waste and recycling representatives.

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District

The District is governed by a Board of Directors, which is composed at this time of the County Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors has delegated to the District all county waste management operations and AB 939 responsibilities, including preparation and revisions to the CIWMP. The activities of the District are limited to handle, treat, and manage solid waste, as defined pursuant to the California Waste Management Act of 1989, Division 30 (Commencing with Section 40000) of the Public Resources Code, in the same manner as the County of Riverside is authorized pursuant to AB 939.

Table SP 3-3 **CITY OF BANNING GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CENTRAL**

	West Boundary: Highland Spring Road East Boundary: Field Road North Boundary: Brookside Ave.
City Boundaries (e)	South Boundary: Death Valley Rd.
City Population (a)	24,250
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	No fluctuation - steady
Average Age (b)	32
Ethnicity (%)(c)	
White	69 %
Black	10%
Asian	7%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	2%
Other	12%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	23%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$19,004
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Schools - 30%, Medical and Nursing - 23%, Eating places - 23%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	9,295
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	73 % 15 % 12 %
Property Values (avg. home price) (g)	\$84,300
Trends in Development (including housing)	Nominal Development

Source: City of Banning and Western Riverside Council of Governments

Citations:

California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments - Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994. The City of Banning, Community Redevelopment Dept. Census Data, 1990 (8)

Table SP 3-4CITY OF BEAUMONT **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CENTRAL**

City Boundaries	The city is located approx. 10 miles east of Moreno Valley. Beaumont is the highest city between Los Angeles and the desert resorts.
City Population (a)	10,700
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	None
Average Age (b)	33
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	84%
Black	2%
Asian	2%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	2%
Other	10%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	_24%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$15,583
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Medical and Nursing - 30%, Schools - 21%, Eating places - 17%, Plastic Products - 8%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	3975
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	64 % 26 % 10 %
Property Values (avg. home price)	Not available*
Trends in Development (including housing)	2%

Source: City of Beaumont and Western Riverside Council of Governments

*This information not provided by the City of Beaumont or Western Riverside Council of Governments.

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**
- **(b)**
- (c) (d) (e)

CITY OF BLYTHE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: PALO VERDE VALLEY		
City Boundaries	N - 4th Avenue; E - Colorado S - 16th Avenue; W - 800 ft. past Defrane	
City Population (a)	19,497 With new annexations	
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	25% increase	
Median Age	33.6	
Ethnicity (%)		
White	61.9%	
Black	9.9%	
Asian	.8%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	3.6%	
Other	1.0%	
Perent of Population of Hispanic Origin	41.9%	
Median Income per Household	\$30,733.00 1993 Estimate	
Sources of Income and Employment	Agriculture; Prisons; School Districts	
Total No. of Dwelling Units	3,327	
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	2,225 1,003 99	
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$89,000	
Trends in Development (including housing)	Housing, commercial, and industrial	

Table SP 3-5

Source: City of Blythe

Citations:

(a)

City of Blythe. Includes the most recent (up to 3/96) Annexation 45-46.

Table SP 3-6 **CITY OF CALIMESA GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CENTRAL**

City Boundaries	The city is 14.79 sq. miles, in Riverside County. It borders San Bernardino County. The area is nestled in the foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains in the San Gorgonio Pass.
City Population (a)	7.450
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	None
Average Age (b)	41
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	94%
Black	0%
Asian	1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	4%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	9%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$29,468
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Manufacturing and retail
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	3.167
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	61 % 5 % 34 %
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$76,000 to \$155,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	Minimal growth in commercial & housing

Source: City of Calimesa and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 (a)
- **(b)**
- (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-7 CITY OF CANYON LAKE **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN**

City Boundaries	The city is located in the western portion of Riverside County. It is a gated community, that surrounds Canvon Lake
City Population (a)	11,450
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	None
Average Age (b)	38
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	96%
Black	1%
Asian	2%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	0%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	5%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$52,724
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Golf course, country club, restaurants
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	3,809
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	97 % 3 % 0 %
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$185,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	Static

Source: City of Canyon Lake and Western Riverside Council of Governments

Citations:

California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments - Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 (a)

- (b) (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-8CITY OF CATHEDRAL CITYGEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY

City Boundaries	Approx. (N) line of Sec's. 27,28,29 T.3S. R.5E (S) Santa Rosa Mt's. (E) Rancho Mirage (W) Palm Springs
City Population (a)	35,880 2.92/Household
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	Approximately 25%
Median Age	31.4
Ethnicity (%) (b)	
White	57.0%
Black	2.0%
Hispanic	37.2%
Asian	3.1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.5%
Other	.2%
Median Income per Household	\$31,309
Sources of Income and Employment	Service, hospitality, agriculture, construction
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	16,837
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	58% (9,682) 24% (4,102) 18% (3,049)
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$113,200
Trends in Development (including housing)	Moderate growth

Source: City of Cathedral City

Citations:

(a) (b)

California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

Table SP 3-9 CITY OF COACHELLA **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY**

City Boundaries	South and east of Indio
City Population (a)	20,800 4.75/Household
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	Minimal
Average Age (b)	23.2
Ethnicity (%)	
White	3%
Black	.4%
Hispanic	95.3%
Asian	.4%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.2%
Other	.2%
Median Income per Household	\$23,318
Sources of Income and Employment	Agriculture/Hospitality
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	4,475
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	65% (2,892) 26% (1,148) 10% (436)
Property Values (median home price)	Not available*
Trends in Development (including housing)	Not available*

Source: City of Coachella

* Information not provided by the City of Coachella.

Citations:

(a) (b)

California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing

Table SP 3-10 CITY OF CORONA GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN		
City Boundaries	South of Norco, southwest of Riverside	
City Population (a)	98,100	
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	N/A	
Average Age (b)	29	
Ethnicity (%) (c)		
White	59%	
Black	3%	
Asian	7%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0.6%	
Other	0.4%	
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	30%	
Median Income per Household (b)	\$41,619	
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Eating places - 26%, Schools - 18%, Medical and Nursing - 14%, Plastic Products - 9%	
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	31,813	
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Mobile Home	62 % 33 % 5 %	
Property Values (median home price) (d)	\$186,300	
Trends in Development (including housing)	More diversity in ethnicity	

Source: City of Corona and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**
- **(b)**
- (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-11CITY OF DESERT HOT SPRINGSGEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY

City Boundaries	North of I-10, east of Hwy. 62; 22 sq. miles
City Population (a)	14,951 2.68/Household
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	minimal
Median Age	30.0
Ethnicity (%) (b)	
White	73%
Black	4%
Hispanic	20%
Asian	2%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	0%
Median Income per Household	\$21,361
Sources of Income and Employment	36.6% Services; 15.4% Construction; 25.4% Retail
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	6,379
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	59 % (3,755) 36 % (2,293) 5 % (331)
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$74,800
Trends in Development (including housing)	Housing Tracts

Source: City of Desert Hot Springs

Citations:

(a) (b)

California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing

Table SP 3-12 CITY OF HEMET **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CENTRAL**

City Boundaries	Hemet is bounded by the San Jacinto Mountains and San Bernardino National Forest to the northeast and south; the Badlands to the northwest; Lakeview Mountains to the west; Santa Rosa Hills, City boundaries Domenigoni Mountains and Diamond Valley to the south.
City Population (a)	53,500
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	10% increase in winter months (5,000 people)
Average Age (b)	47
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	90%
Black	1%
Asian	1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	7%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	15%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$20,414
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Medical/Nursing - 36%, Eating places - 17%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	25,870
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	48% 26% 26%
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$61,000 to 198,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	Growth is increasing with increased housing development

Source: City of Hemet and Western Riverside Council of Governments

Citations:

California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments - Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 (a) (b)

(0) (0) (d)

- (e)

Table SP 3-13 CITY OF INDIAN WELLS GEOGRAPHICAL AREA; COACHELLA VALLEY		
City Boundaries	9,240 Acres, or 14.4 Square Miles	
City Population (a)	3119 2.15/Household	
Seasonal Population Fluctuation (c)	4000	
Median Age (e)	60.9	
Ethnicity (%) (b)		
White	98%	
Black	.3%	
Hispanic	2.0%	
Asian	1.0%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0%	
Other	.4%	
Median Income per Household (e)	\$98,495.00	
Sources of Income and Employment	Resort Hotels, City Golf Course,	
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	3310	
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	88.4% (2,926) 11.5% (380) .1% (4)	
Property Values (avg. home price) (d)	\$393,938 New Home Average Price	
Trends in Development (including housing)	Not available*	

Source: City of Indian Wells

*Information not provided by the City of Indian Wells.

Citations:

- California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. Census of Population & Housing 1990 1995 Economic Overview by Wheeler's Desert Letter. Quarterly Economic Report Jan 1994.
- (a) (b) (c) (d)
- (e) Demographic Profiles by Wheeler's Desert Letter.

Γ

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY	
City Boundaries	19.8 sq. mi La Quinta and Bermuda Dunes on West, Indio Hills on north, Coachella and Cabazon Indian Reservation on east, Ave. 56 on south
City Population (a)	42,600
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	8,000
Median Age (b)	26 years
Ethnicity (%)	
White	27%
Black	3%
Hispanic Origin	68%
Asian	1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.3%
Other	
Median Income per Household	\$25,976
Sources of Income and Employment	Government, retail, hospitality, medical services, manufacturing, etc.
Total No. of Dwelling Units (b)	14,867
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	50 % (7,211) 36 % (5,128) 14 % (2,050)
Property Values (median home price)	\$83,600
Trends in Development (including housing)	Developed 10,400 acres including 600 industrial; 1,800 commercial/retail; 1,000 agricultural; and 7,000 residential. Currently developing several more square miles

Table SP 3-14 CITY OF INDIO

Source: City of Indio

- 19 A

Citations:

(a) (b)

California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing

Table SP 3-15 CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN		
City Boundaries	Located in Riverside County, 73 miles east of Los Angeles and 74 miles north of San Diego, the city is an island bordered by a 4,500 acre lake and the Cleveland National Forest.	
City Population (a)	25,250	
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	None	
Average Age(b)	31	
Ethnicity (%) (c)		
White	77%	
Black	4%	
Asian	2%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%	
Other	16%	
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	26%	
Median Income per Household (b)	\$31,671	
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Eating Places - 28%, Schools - 28%, Grocery Stores - 14%	
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	8,536	
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	68 % 23 % 9 %	
Property Values (avg. home price)	115,500	
Trends in Development (including housing)	Stable	

Source: City of Lake Elsinore and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**

- (b) (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-16 CITY OF LA QUINTA GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY

City Boundaries	31.18 sq. miles
City Population (b)	17,600 (9.4% mean annual increase)
Seasonal Population Fluctuation (a)	Approximately 8,000
Median Age (c)	32.2 Years
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	69.7%
Black	1.7%
Hispanic	26.3%
Asian	1.3%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.8%
Other	.2%
Median Income per Household (c)	\$56,126
Sources of Income and Employment (c)	Managerial/Professional-29.7%, Sales/Admin-29.6%, Service Occupations-15.4%, Production/Repair-13.1% Operators-8.1%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (b)	8,917
Housing Type by Percent (%) (b) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	91.8% (8,189) 5.4% (481) 2.8% (247)
Property Values (avg. home price) (b)	\$117,400
Trends in Development (including housing)	Primarily entry level/move up/2nd home mkt. Commercial growth limited to pads and tenant improvements in existing centers.

Source: City of La Quinta

Citations:

City of La Quinta California Department of Finance Estimates for January 1, 1995 1990 Census (a) (b) (c)

Table SP 3-17 CITY OF MORENO VALLEY **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN**

	Located in the western portion of Riverside County, Surrounded by Riverside, Perris,
City Boundaries (e)	March AFB and the Badlands.
City Population (a)	135,600
Seasonal Population Fluctuation (e)	Population is constant year round.
Average Age (b)	27
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	67%
Black	14%
Asian	7%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	11%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	23%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$38,030
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Military-50%, Public schools/higher learning-18%, Retail merchandise-12%, Misc19%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	41,282
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	84% 13% 3%
Property Values (median home price) (e)	\$135,800
Trends in Development (including housing)	Development activity in the City remains flat during 1995.

Source: City of Moreno Valley and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Moreno Valley Fact Sheet Feb. 1995 (a)
- **(b)**

- (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-18CITY OF MURRIETA **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN**

City Boundaries (f)	Southern boundary abuts Temecula
City Population (a)	33,450
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	none
Average Age (b)	30
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	89%
Black	1%
Asian	4%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	5%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	14%
Median Income per Household (g)	\$49,075
Sources of Income and Employment (g)	Services, retailing, construction and manufacturing.
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	11,184
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	79 % 15 % 6 %
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$149,865.00
Trends in Development (including housing)	Residential growth has averaged 8% since

Source: City of Murrieta and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**

- bedefg
- City of Murrieta Robert Charles Lessor & Co./Claritas- National Planning data, 1994

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN	
City Boundaries	Between the Santa Ana River and the City of Corona and west of Riverside - 14.7 sq. mi.
City Population (a)	24,800
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	none
Average Age (b)	33
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	82%
Black	8%
Asian	1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	8%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	20%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$36,609
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Residential care - 30%, Schools - 18%, Data processing - 15%, Eating places - 10%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	5,955
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	96% 3% 1%
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$200,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	slow growth

Table SP 3-19 CITY OF NORCO

Source: City of Norco and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a**)
- (b) (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-20 CITY OF PALM DESERT GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY

City Boundaries	South of I-10 between Rancho Mirage and Indian Wells
City Population (a)	33,700 2.27/Household
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	59,080 (Permanent and Seasonal)
Median Age	42
Ethnicity (%) (b)	
White	83%
Black	1%
Hispanic	14%
Asian	2%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.3%
Other	.1%
Median Income per Household	\$43,300
Sources of Income and Employment	Tourism (Service Ind.) and Retail
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	26,150
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	70% (18,428) 25% (6,519) 5% (1,203)
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$214,000 (1995) median home price
Trends in Development (including housing)	Not available*

Source: City of Palm Desert

*This information not provided by the City of Palm Desert.

Citations:

(a) (b) California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

CIWMP

Table SP 3-21 CITY OF PALM SPRINGS GEOGRAPHICAL AREA; COACHELLA VALLEY

City Boundaries	West of Cathedral City and Rancho Mirage
City Population (a)	42,450 2.18/Household
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	+ 35,000 - 40,000
Median Age	35.3
Ethnicity (%) (b)	
White	73%
Black	4%
Hispanic	19%
Asian	3%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	_
Median Income per Household	\$27,538 (b)
Sources of Income and Employment	Hospitality, health care, services
Total No. of Dwelling Units (a)	31,324
Housing Type by Percent (%) Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	52% (16,433) 40% (12,584) 7% (2,307)
Property Values (avg. home price)	Zip code 92262 - \$140,000; 92264 -170,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	Very slow housing growth

Source: City of Palm Springs

Citations:

(a) (b) California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

Table SP 3-22 CITY OF PERRIS GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN	
City Boundaries	The city is located in Riverside County, between three low-lying mountain ranges, March AFB, and the Lake Perris State Recreation Area.
City Population (a)	31,100
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	N/A
Average Age (b)	28
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	70%
Black	13%
Asian	3%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%
Other	13%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	36%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$20,229
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Schools - 35%, Catalog and mail order - 15%, Eating places - 23%, Mobile homes - 8%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	9,980
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	66% 16% 18%
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$96,000
Trends in Development (including housing)	Growth over the last five years.

Source: City of Perris and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 (a)

- (b) (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-23CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: COACHELLA VALLEY**

City Boundaries	24.5 sq. miles in mid Coachella Valley
City Population (a)	10,750
Seasonal Population Fluctuation (c)	Additional 7,645 persons
Median Age (b)	59.1 Years
Ethnicity (%) (b)	
White	90.5%
Black	1.3%
Hispanic	6.9%
Asian	.9%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.3%
Other	.1%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$45,064
Sources of Income and Employment (c)	Retail sales; tourism; medical
Total No. of Dwelling Units (c)	9,699 Jan 1, 1995
Housing Type by Percent (%) (c) Detached Single Family Attached Single Family Multi-Family Other: Mobile Homes	34.3 % (3,235) 40.5 % (3,975) 14.0 % (1,403) 11.2 % (1,080)
Property Values (median home price)	\$218,750 1994(c)
Trends in Development (including housing)	Single family residential

Source: City of Rancho Mirage

Citations:

California Department of Finance estimates for January 1, 1995. 1990 Census Community Profile

(a) (b) (c)

Table SP 3-24 CITY OF RIVERSIDE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN		
City Boundaries	Located between the Cities of Norco and Moreno Valley	
City Population (a)	247,800	
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	Not available*	
Average Age (b)	31	
Ethnicity (%) (c)		
White	71%	
Black	7%	
Asian	5%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1%	
Other	16%	
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	26%	
Median Income per Household (b)	\$35,140	
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Schools, college and university - 29%, Medical - 25%, Eating places - 20%, Aircraft parts - 8%	
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	83,542	
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	67% 30% 3%	
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$126,000	
Trends in Development (including housing)	Tourism and convention activities. Located at the mid-point of regional recreational activities.	

Source: City of Riverside and Western Riverside Council of Governments *This information not provided by the City of Riverside or Western Riverside Council of Governments.

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**
- **(b)**
- (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-25 CITY OF SAN JACINTO GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CENTRAL

City Boundaries	Located in Riverside County, it sits at the base of the San Jacinto Mountains.
City Population (a)	24,200
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	Static population
Average Age (b)	25
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	76%
Black	1%
Asian	1%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	2%
Other	20%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	32%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$23,828
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Schools and junior college - 43%, Water supply - 17%, Eating places - 8%, Industrial furnace - 8%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	8,861
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	61 % 13 % 26 %
Property Values (avg. home price)	\$89,000 (includes new existing)
Trends in Development (including housing)	Commercial entertainment users and single family residential (non-restricted)

Source: City of San Jacinto and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1BX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 **(a)**
- (b)
- (c) (d) (e)

Table SP 3-26 CITY OF TEMECULA **GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: WESTERN/SOUTHWESTERN**

City Boundaries (f)	Approx. 26 sq. Miles, located in the most south westerly corner of Riverside County
City Population (a)	40,400
Seasonal Population Fluctuation	N/A
Average Age (b)	29.2
Ethnicity (%) (c)	
White	80.75%
Black	1.46%
Asian	2.62%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	.49%
Other	.14%
Percent of Population of Hispanic Origin (c)	14.54%
Median Income per Household (b)	\$48,394
Sources of Income and Employment (e)	Services and retail - 51%, Manufacturing - 26%, Construction - 15%, Agriculture & Mining - 7%, Eating places - 23%, Surgical Instruments - 17%, Grocery store - 10%, Semiconductor - 8%
Total No. of Dwelling Units (d)	14,090
Housing Type by Percent (%) (d) Single Family Multi-Family Other:	75 % 23 % 2 %
Property Values (avg. home price) (d)	\$119,000 - \$150,000
Trends in Development (including housing) (f)	The city has grown between 6.9% and 10.5% annually over the last five years.

Source: City of Temecula and Western Riverside Council of Governments

- California Department of Finance, "Report 95 E-1, Total Population of California Cities and Counties, January 1, 1995 and 1994". 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF3 extract data file. 1990 Census of Population and Housing, STF1EX extract data file. California Department of Finance, "Report E-5, Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 1995". Southern California Association of Governments Top 10 Employment Categories, 1994 City of Temecula Planning Dept. Update; Feb., 1996 **(a)**

- (b) (c) (d) (e) (f)

As part of this responsibility, the District sets the fees at its landfills. Through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated August 16, 1994 between the District, WRCOG, and CVAG, the Waste Resources Management District Board agreed to use the Executive Committees of WRCOG and CVAG as policy advisory boards and submit all significant policy and major fiscal matters including the establishment of fees and charges for the landfills, to the COG's Executive Committees prior to taking action to allow input of all cities within Riverside County. A copy of the MOU is included in Appendix A, and a discussion of the MOU is included in Chapter 1 of the Summary Plan.

Joint Powers Authorities/Councils of Governments

The two Joint Powers Authorities (JPA's) (not regional agencies for purposes of AB 939) within Riverside County are WRCOG and CVAG. The WRCOG consists of 14 incorporated cities and the unincorporated county in western Riverside County, and CVAG consists of nine incorporated cities and the unincorporated county in the Coachella Valley. The City of Blythe does not belong to either COG due, in part, to its remote location.

Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG): The purpose of WRCOG, established on April 1, 1991, is to conduct studies and projects designed to improve and coordinate the common governmental responsibilities and services on an area-wide and regional basis through the establishment of an association of governments. The WRCOG is governed by a General Assembly with membership consisting of all the elected officials from each of the 14 cities and the four Supervisors with Districts located in Western Riverside County. The Executive Committee exercises the powers of a JPA between sessions of the General Assembly. The Executive Committee consists of a mayor from each of the 14 member cities and the four County Supervisors.

For planning purposes, the jurisdictions within WRCOG are divided into six Area Planning Districts (APD's) as follows:

Mountain:	Unincorporated portions of Riverside County
Northwest:	Cities of Corona, Norco, and Riverside
Southwest:	Cities of Temecula, Murrieta, Canyon Lake, and Lake Elsinore
Central:	Cities of Perris and Moreno Valley
Pass:	Cities of Calimesa, Beaumont, and Banning
San Jacinto Valley:	Cities of Hemet and San Jacinto

Each of these APD's contain portions of surrounding unincorporated areas.

City and County government agencies within western Riverside County recognized the need to work together to resolve numerous complex solid waste issues and to meet the requirement of AB 939. In March, 1992, WRCOG proposed a Solid Waste Consortium to provide its membership with a better opportunity to structure cooperative ventures in addressing waste management issues.

The WRCOG also created a multi-level solid waste advisory structure consisting of technical staff and city managers to advise the consortium.

In 1993, WRCOG member jurisdictions developed the Western Riverside Subregional Comprehensive Plan as a regional planning tool. This Plan, along with the complex committee structure, has enabled WRCOG to successfully manage, implement, and/or reach resolution on a multitude of complicated solid waste issues.

Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG): The CVAG has been in existence since 1974, and has nine cities (Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage) and Riverside County as members. The CVAG role in solid waste, recycling, and diversion began in response to the requirements of AB 939. Cities that had worked cooperatively on other issues formed a Technical Working Group to undertake a waste characterization study and development of a joint Source Reduction & Recycling Element (SRRE).

Following the completion of the initial AB 939 related tasks, the CVAG role has been shaped, to a great extent, by the SRRE, which identified specific programs which would be undertaken on a regional basis. The SRRE identified having CVAG staff support as a means of coordinating and carrying out the regional programs. Once the SRRE's were adopted, at the request of the member jurisdictions, the COG's requested funding from the County Waste Management Department to support the regional programs. This funding was first made available in 1992, and was derived from the tipping fee paid at County landfills. Since then, other funding sources have been identified, such as State grants and distributions from member jurisdictions. Over the four years that the CVAG regional programs have been in existence, at the request of the member jurisdictions, CVAG's role has expanded to cover a wider variety of solid waste issues than those identified by the SRRE.

Riverside County Department of Environmental Health/Local Enforcement Agency

The responsibilities of the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) of the County Health Services Agency include permitting and inspection of the following: waste collection vehicles and facilities; liquid waste transportation vehicles and facilities; solid waste facilities, including transfer stations and composting facilities; active, inactive, exempt and closed disposal sites; and investigation of citizen's complaints related to solid and liquid waste. Additionally, the Hazardous Materials Management Branch (HMB) of the DEH operates household hazardous waste programs throughout the County as described in Chapter 5.

The DEH has been assigned the function of Local Solid Waste Management Enforcement Agency (LEA) by the Board of Supervisors and has been certified by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to perform this function. The LEA designation was also approved by the incorporated cities within the county. The LEA is responsible for enforcing local and State standards relating to the operation and design of solid waste facilities within Riverside County and incorporated communities. In addition, the LEA reviews solid waste facility closure and postclosure maintenance plans; conducts five-year solid waste facility permit reviews and Periodic Site Reviews; investigation and remediation of illegal solid waste facilities; oversees landfill excavations; and enforces State agricultural waste management standards. Other duties include enforcement of the State Medical Waste Management Act and a local ordinance governing the land

CIWMP

application of treated sewage sludge to agricultural land.

Economic Development Agency/City Redevelopment Department

The Economic Development Agency and participating City Redevelopment Departments are responsible for the administration and marketing of the two Recycling Marketing Development Zones within Riverside County. Their responsibilities include: promotion of State AB 939 goals, providing a forum for State/Federal/local market development activities, workshops for businesses, cooperative multi-jurisdictional market strategies, and cooperative business/government relationships. The contacts for both RMDZ's work cooperatively with many professionals from all levels of government. The market development activities require skills in redevelopment, finance, and solid waste. Successful market development is incumbent upon the many layers of government and private business working cooperatively to succeed.

Franchising Authority and Fee-Setting Authority for Refuse and Diversion Services

Each city is responsible for providing solid waste collection services, either through its own employees, or through contracts or franchises with the private sector. Each city is also responsible for establishing residential and commercial refuse collection and disposal rates within its jurisdiction. The County is responsible for fee-setting in the unincorporated areas. The DEH regulates the permit system of waste handling in unincorporated county areas.

Administration and Planning for Major Solid Waste Facilities

In the past, administration and planning for major solid waste facilities was handled on a countywide basis with the County or the District taking the lead. Because waste diversion programs must be tailored to meet the unique wastesheds and geographic circumstances in different areas of the county, individual cities, groups of cities, the COG's, the County, the District, and private waste companies are now undertaking the planning, development, and/or operation of components of the waste management system. With the exception of the El Sobrante Landfill, all landfills in Riverside County are operated by the District. The El Sobrante Landfill, which is privately owned, operates in accordance with agreements between Western Waste Industries and Riverside County, which collects the user fees for the site.

Other examples of regional and local solid waste management projects include the development of a privately owned and operated transfer station in the City of Perris, the development of a transfer station/Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Moreno Valley by a private waste firm, and planning efforts by the CVAG MRF Task Force to develop a transfer station with materials recovery capabilities to serve the Coachella Valley. Land use authority is reserved to each city or to the County for the unincorporated area, for any facility located within individual jurisdictional boundaries.

3.4 PLAN ADMINISTRATION

The District, on behalf of the County, is responsible for the preparation of the CIWMP, including the Summary Plan and Siting Element. The District is responsible for Plan-related functions such as disseminating notices of public meetings and other public information and administration, coordination, maintenance, and revisions of Plan-related documents. The District is also responsible for budgeting and plan implementation of the selected countywide programs (identified in Chapter 5), with the following exceptions: 1) the County Mobile Program for the collection of household hazardous waste is partially funded by the District and implemented by the Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch, of the Health Services Agency, and 2) the Public Sponsored MRF Collection of Household Hazardous Wastes. The countywide programs are described in Chapter 5 of this document.

Each jurisdiction is responsible for maintaining and implementing programs identified in their individual SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE. These programs are identified in Appendix B. The COG's assist cities in the coordination and implementation of their programs, such as the development of the Coachella Valley Transfer Station/MRF, public education, and source reduction programs. In the future, household hazardous waste programs and other countywide programs may be administered at the city level (or groups of cities). For example, once a transfer station commences operations, the affected jurisdictions may choose to administer their own household hazardous waste drop-off events in conjunction with the transfer station operator.

Chapter 4

CURRENT SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

4.1 SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

This chapter includes a description of how integrated waste management is administered throughout Riverside County, including refuse collection, transfer, and disposal practices; solid waste facilities located within the County; diversion programs; and a summary of countywide market development efforts. This chapter is required by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18757.5.

4.2 DESCRIPTION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE SOLID WASTE SYSTEM

Service Areas: The service areas throughout Riverside County are contiguous with the boundaries of the individual jurisdictions (i.e. each city is its own service area and the unincorporated area is a separate service area).

Organization of Services: Within each of the service areas, waste management services may be franchised, provided as a government service, permitted, or contracted as shown in Table SP 4-1. Collection services in the unincorporated areas are provided under a permit system that is administered by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (DEH).

Quantity of Solid Waste Generated and Final Disposition of Materials: Table SP 4-2 provides the base year (1990) daily and annual tonnage and volume of solid waste generated in the County. Most of the annual tonnages are CIWMB-approved generation quantities (see table for explanation of exceptions). Daily tonnages are based on annual tonnages, using seven days per week and 365 days per year. Conversion of tonnages to cubic yards uses standardized conversion factors ranging from 1,200 pounds per cubic yard (1.67 cubic yards per ton) to 667 pounds per cubic yard (3 cubic yards per ton), as identified in the cities' and County's SRRE's.

Table SP 4-3(a) identifies the actual final disposition (diverted, transformed, exported, or landfilled) of solid waste generated and collected countywide in the base year (1990) per the Waste Generation Study. Table SP 4-3(b) identifies the countywide CIWMB-approved base year generation, disposal, and diversion (see table for exceptions). It should be noted that the CIWMB-approved quantities may differ from the Riverside County Waste Generation Study (June 14, 1991) numbers due to the CIWMB-approval process which may include adjustments to the restricted waste and hazardous waste quantities.

Table SP 4-4 lists materials targeted for recycling and their transportation and handling needs.

Quantity of Solid Waste Disposed: Table SP 4-5(a) provides the daily and annual tonnage and volume of solid waste disposed by jurisdictions in the base year (1990). Most of the annual tonnages are CIWMB-approved disposal quantities (see table for exceptions). Table SP 4-5(b)

TABLE SP 4-1				
Undanilahun uf Jervilej				
SERVICE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL		
AREA	COLLECTION	COLLECTION		
Banning	Franchise	Franchise		
Beaumont	Franchise	Franchise		
Blythe	Franchise	Franchise		
Calimesa	Franchise	Franchise		
Canyon Lake	Franchise	Franchise		
Cathedral City	Franchise	Franchise		
Coachella	Franchise	Franchise		
Corona	Franchise	Franchise		
Desert Hot Springs	Franchise	Franchise		
Hemet	City	City		
Indian Wells	Franchise	Franchise		
Indio	Franchise	Franchise		
Lake Elsinore	Franchise	Franchise		
La Quinta	Franchise	Franchise		
Moreno Valley	Franchise	Franchise		
Murrieta	Franchise	Franchise		
Norco	Franchise	Franchise		
Palm Desert	Franchise	Franchise		
Palm Springs	Franchise	Franchise		
Perris	Franchise	Franchise		
Rancho Mirage	Franchise	Franchise		
Riverside	City, Franchise	Franchise		
San Jacinto	Franchise	Franchise		
Temecula	Franchise	Franchise		
Unincorporated	Permit	Permit		

Source: Riverside County Waste Resources Management District and Riverside County Cities

Note: Data as of May, 1996

TABLE SP 4-2

QUANTITIES OF SOLID WASTE GENERATED IN BASE YEAH (1990)

JURISDICTION	TONS		CUBIC YARDS		
	DAILY	ANNUAL	DAILY	ANNUAL	
Banning	71	25,832	118	43,053	
Beaumont	38	13,719	63	22,865	
Blythe	36	13,064	72	26,128	
Calimesa	18	6,625	30	11,042	
Canyon Lake	27	9,916	82	29,748	
Cathedral City	160	58,475	267	97,458	
Coachelia	82	29,869	136	49,782	
Corona	456	166,593	761	277,655	
Desert Hot Springs	39	14,326	65	23,877	
Hemet	400	145,881	666	243,135	
Indian Wells	51	18,592	85	30,987	
Indio	221	80,675	368	134,458	
Lake Elsinore	85	30,846	141	51,410	
La Quinta	78	28,500	130	47,500	
Moreno Valley	315	114,920	630	229,840	
Murrieta*	128	46,629	213	77,715	
Norco	119	43,430	198	72,383	
Palm Desert	285	103,872	474	173,120	
Palm Springs	330	120,376	550	200,627	
Perris	134	48,983	224	81,638	
Rancho Mirage	113	41,324	189	68,873	
Riverside	1,312	478,828	2,186	798,047	
San Jacinto	65	23,639	108	39,398	
Temecula	139	50,599	231	84,332	
Unincorporated**	1,536	560,689	2,606	951,303	
TOTAL	6,236	2,276,202	10,593	3,866,374	

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, Cities' SRRE's, and Riverside County Waste Generation Study, June 14, 1991.

Notes:

- Base Year (1990) = Fiscal Year 1989/1990 (July 1, 1989 June 30, 1990).
- Non-italicized tonnages are CIWMB-approved base year generation quantities, except for the City of Murrieta (see explanation below). CIWMB-approved quantities may differ from the Riverside County Waste Generation Study (June 14, 1991) numbers due to the CIWMB approval process which may include adjustments to the restricted waste and hazardous waste quantities.

Italicized tonnages are from the cities' SRRE's.

The total is a combination of these two sources and differs from the Waste Generation Study total of 2,429,208 tons.

- Due to rounding, daily quantities multiplied by 365 (number of days in a year) may not add up to annual quantities.
- Conversion factors range from 1,200 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 1.67 c.y.) to 667 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 3 c.y.) as identified in the individual SRRE's.
- *The City of Murrieta incorporated on July 1, 1991. Their SRRE was due to the CIWMB in March, 1996. On March 17, 1994, the Riverside County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force approved the calculation for the City of Murrieta to use to estimate their 1990 waste generation. Using the approved calculation, the baseline numbers are 34,949 tons disposed; 11,679 diverted; and 46,629 tons generated.
- **Corrected baseline generation quantity. This number represents the CIWMB-approved generation for the unincorporated area less the LTF-approved generation for the City of Murrieta (which was previously included in the unincorporated County tonnages). Subsequently, the corrected diversion for unincorporated Riverside County is 113,210 tons, and the corrected disposal is 447,480 tons.

DISPOSITIO	T DN OF SOLID	ABLE SP 4-3 NASTE COLL	3(8) ECTED ANNILI	ALLY (1990)	
	Generated	Diverted	Transformed	Exported	Landfilled
Tons Per Year	2,429,208	547,665	20,051	0	1,861,493
Cubic Yards Per Year	4,131,041	926,882	33,507	0	3,170,657
Percent of Total	100.00%	22.55%	0.83%	0.00%	76.63%

Source: Riverside County Waste Generation Study, June 14, 1991.

Note: Countywide diversion for 1994 is 47.5% (assuming all eligible jurisdictions claim credit for the CIWMB-approved inert diversion).

TA COUNTYWIDE C GENERATION,	BLE SP 4-3(b) IWMB-APPRO DISPOSAL, AN	VED DASE YE D DIVERSION	AR
	Generated	Disposed	Diverted
Tons Per Year	2,062,511	1,732,943	329,568
Cubic Yards Per Year	3,437,518	2,888,238	549,280
Percent of Total	100.00%	84.02%	15.98%

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, May, 1996.

Note: These quantities do not include the Cities of Beaumont, Blythe, Desert Hot Springs, and Indio.

TABLE SP:4---4 TARGETED MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION AND HANDLING

TARGETED	PRESENT STORAGE	FUTURE STORAGE AND
MATERIAL	AND TRANSPORT	TRANSPORT
Aluminum Cans	Service provider or operators of	Service provider or operators
CRV and Other Glass	processing facilities (MRF's, IPF's, and	of processing facilities
Green Waste (compost)	transfer stations)	(MRF's, IPF's, and transfer
Inerts		stations)
Metals		
Paper and Cardboard		
Plastics		
Tin Cans		
Tires		
Wood Wastes		

Source: Cities' and County's SRRE's.
TABLE SP 4-5(a) QUANTITIES OF SOLID WASTE DISPOSED IN BASE YEAR (1990)

JURISDICTION	<u> </u>	TONS	CUB	IC YARDS
	DAILY	ANNUAL	DAILY	ANNUAL
Banning	68	24,700	113	41,167
Beaumont	35	12,932	59	21,553
Blythe	31	11,285	62	22,570
Calimesa	17	6,269	29	10,448
Canyon Lake	27	9,881	81	29,643
Cathedral City	144	52,677	241	87,795
Coachella	47	17,294	79	28,823
Corona	436	159,208	727	265,347
Desert Hot Springs	38	13,724	63	22,873
Hemet	116	42,386	194	70,643
Indian Wells	48	17,669	81	29,448
Indio	200	72,908	333	121,513
Lake Elsinore	79	28,674	131	47,790
La Quinta	68	24,708	113	41,180
Moreno Valley	302	110,177	604	220,354
Murrieta*	56	20,407	93	34,012
Norco	117	42,731	195	71,218
Palm Desert	265	96,607	441	161,012
Palm Springs	313	114,213	522	190,355
Perris	127	46,353	212	77,255
Rancho Mirage	93	34,079	156	56,798
Riverside	968	353,161	1,613	588,602
San Jacinto	61	22,194	101	36,990
Temecula	130	47,533	217	79,222
Unincorporated**	1,226	447,480	2,080	759,225
TOTAL	5,012	1,829,250	8,537	3,115,837

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, Cities' SRRE's, and Riverside County Waste Generation Study, June 14, 1991.

Notes:

- Base Year (1990) = Fiscal Year 1989/1990 (July 1, 1989 June 30, 1990)
- Non-italicized tonnages are CIWMB-approved base year generation quantities, except for the City of Murrieta (see explanation below). CIWMB-approved quantities may differ from the Riverside County Waste Generation Study (June 14, 1991) numbers due to the CIWMB approval process which may include adjustments to the restricted waste and hazardous waste quantities. Italicized tonnages are from the cities' SRRE's.
- The total is a combination of these two sources and differ from the Waste Generation Study total of 1,861,493.
- Due to rounding, daily quantities multiplied by 365 (number of days in a year) may not add up to annual quantities.
- Conversion factors range from 1,200 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 1.67 c.y.) to 667 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 3 c.y.) as identified in the cities' and county's SRRE's.
- * The City of Murrieta incorporated on July 1, 1991. Their SRRE was due to the CIWMB in March, 1996. On March 17, 1994, the Riverside County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force approved the calculation for the City of Murrieta to use to estimate their 1990 waste generation. Using the approved calculation, the baseline numbers are 34,949 tons disposed; 11,679 tons diverted; and 46,629 tons generated.
- ** Corrected baseline disposal quantity. This number represents the CIWMB-approved disposal for the unincorporated area less the LTF-approved disposal for the City of Murrieta (which was previously included in the unincorporated County tonnages). Subsequently, the corrected diversion for unincorporated Riverside County is 113,210 tons, and the corrected generation is 560,689 tons.

TABLE SP 4--5(5) QUANTITIES OF SOLID WASTE DISPOSED (1995)

JURISDICTION	-	FONS	CUB	
	DAILY	ANNUAL	DAILY	ANNUAL
Banning	44	16,114	74	26,857
Beaumont	31	11,135	51	18,558
Blythe	39	14,073	77	28,146
Calimesa	12	4,377	20	7,295
Canyon Lake	14	4,958	41	14,874
Cathedral City	112	40,763	186	67,938
Coachella	40	14,537	66	24,228
Corona	292	106,583	487	177,638
Desert Hot Springs	36	13,264	61	22,107
Hemet	108	39,471	180	65,785
Indian Wells	27	10,033	46	16,722
Indio	126	46,139	211	76,898
Lake Elsinore	53	19,393	89	32,322
La Quinta	61	22,395	102	37,325
Moreno Valley	259	94,681	519	189,362
Murrieta	53	19,382	89	32,303
Norco	71	25,901	118	43,168
Palm Desert	150	54,687	250	91,145
Palm Springs	184	67,010	306	111,683
Perris	88	32,227	147	53,712
Rancho Mirage	63	22,909	105	38,182
Riverside	603	220,129	1,005	366,882
San Jacinto	46	16,807	77	28,012
Temecula	95	34,551	158	57,585
Unincorporated*	929	339,189	1,577	575,491
TOTAL	3,536	1,290,708	6,039	2,204,218

Source: Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS)

Notes:

Annual tonnages are from the CDTTS.

Due to rounding, daily tonnages multiplied by 365 (number of days in a year) may not add up to annual tonnages.

Conversion factors range from 1,200 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 1.67 c.y.) to 667 lbs. per cubic yard (1 ton = 3 c.y.) as identified in the cities' and county's SRRE's.

*Includes quantities from land-use (non-scaled) landfills.

provides the daily and annual tonnage and volume of solid waste disposed by jurisdictions in 1995. This information is provided for comparison to the 1990 disposal quantities. Annual tonnages were obtained from the Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS) which is described in the following section. Daily tonnages are calculated from annual tonnages, using seven days per week and 365 days per year. Conversion of tonnages to cubic yards uses standardized conversion factors ranging from 1,200 pounds per cubic yard (1.67 cubic yards per ton) to 667 pounds per cubic yard (3 cubic yards per ton), as identified in the individual SRRE's.

4.3 COUNTYWIDE DISPOSAL TONNAGE TRACKING SYSTEM

Disposal tonnages are measured through the Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS). Following is a discussion of the regulations applicable to the CDTTS, along with a summary of the CDTTS.

Summary of Requirements

Public Resources Code Section 41821.5 requires landfill operators to track the jurisdiction of origin for waste entering their sites for disposal. The Disposal Reporting System Regulations (CCR Sections 18800-18813), which were adopted on October 27, 1994, contain specific reporting requirements for haulers, landfill operators, transformation facility operators, agencies, and jurisdictions.

Hauler Requirements: The regulations require haulers to determine origin of solid waste during origin survey weeks and potential alternative daily cover material for the entire quarter and inform the receiving operator of the jurisdiction of origin at the time of disposal or delivery, unless prior arrangements are made. Further, a hauler who exports waste from California must provide the agency from which the waste originated with the total tons of solid waste exported from each jurisdiction of origin for the entire quarter.

Landfill Operator Requirements: Landfill operators must determine the total number of tons and origin of solid waste disposed each quarter. An operator must also record the jurisdiction of origin for all Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) material used. An operator must provide this information to the agency in which the facility is located.

Transformation Facility Operator Requirements: Transformation facility operators must determine the total number of tons and origin of solid waste that underwent transformation during each quarter. This information must be reported to the agency in which the facility is located.

Agency Requirements: The agency is the local agency responsible for compiling the disposal and ADC information received from haulers and operators. The District, operating as agency on behalf of the County, must use the information provided by operators of landfills to determine quarterly totals for: 1) tons disposed at each facility; 2) tons disposed at each facility allocated to each jurisdiction; 3) tons of ADC used at each facility; and 4) tons of ADC used allocated to each jurisdiction. The District must use the information provided by operators of transformation facilities to determine quarterly totals for tons that underwent transformation at each facility and

tons transformed at each facility allocated to each jurisdiction. Quarterly totals and origin of export from California from within the agency must be determined. An agency must send all compiled information to: 1) each jurisdiction within the agency; 2) each jurisdiction outside the agency that uses a facility within the agency; 3) any region of which the agency is a member; and 4) the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

Jurisdiction Requirements: A jurisdiction must use the information provided by agencies to determine its quarterly and annual totals of: 1) tons disposed at each landfill; 2) tons that underwent transformation at each facility; 3) tons used by each landfill as ADC; and 4) tons exported from California. Further, jurisdictions must use the disposal amounts for the purpose of measuring achievement of the 25% and 50% disposal reduction goals for the years 1995 and 2000, respectively. Jurisdictions may provide additional information related to the tons of waste disposed in California including "host assigned" waste (waste assigned to the jurisdiction in which the facility is located) or waste exported from California for disposal.

Summary of the Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System

The Waste Management Department (now the District) began tracking waste in 1990 by having Fee Collectors ask all drivers where their waste loads originated. The Waste Management Department and the cities realized that a more accurate system was needed, so efforts were taken to improve the method of data collection, as this information would be used to determine whether jurisdictions had met the goals of AB 939. In order to comply with the state mandates and assist the jurisdictions in tracking their waste, the Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS) was developed. The CDTTS was developed not only by District staff and their consultant, but through a cooperative effort among commercial waste haulers, city representatives, and WRCOG and CVAG representatives. A pilot CDTTS was implemented in July, 1993 and then revised in July, 1994.

Through the development of the CDTTS, three main categories of waste haulers have been identified: commercial waste haulers (franchised or DEH permitted haulers), other credit account customers, and cash customers. The CDTTS requires commercial waste haulers to submit copies of their dump tickets (load receipts), with complete jurisdiction information, to the District. To identify origin, the hauler places a checkmark to the left of the appropriate jurisdiction(s) and indicates the percentage split by jurisdiction for each load. Each day's tickets must be accompanied by a signed cover letter from the hauler which includes the quantity and date of the tickets and a statement that the information contained therein is correct. This origin information is then entered into a District database from which the tonnage reports are generated.

The landfill Fee Collectors are required to continue to ask each of the remaining customers (other credit account and cash customers) from which jurisdiction (within city limits or county) their loads originated. The Fee Collector enters this information at the point of transaction, and it is stored in a District database.

Although the regulations only require landfill operators to collect origin information for solid waste disposed during the survey weeks (one week per quarter), the District collects origin

information for each load disposed of every day of operation at all scaled Riverside County landfills. (Non-scaled landfill tonnages are all assigned to the unincorporated area.) Since the beginning stages of the development of the CDTTS in 1990, the focus has been to collect the most accurate tonnage information available. The CDTTS meets, and in most areas substantially exceeds, the requirements outlined in the regulations.

While it is acknowledged that the CDTTS exceeds the requirements of the regulations, an area of concern remains for some jurisdictions. Waste disposed of by credit account customers and cash customers (frequently referred to as self-haulers), is an area of concern due to lack of control over the information reported. A city's self-haul tonnages may at times be overstated because persons living in an unincorporated area may report a city origin. Also, credit card customers, such as construction companies, gardening services, etc., may not report accurate origin information since they may work in multiple jurisdictions and may not be aware of city and county boundaries. The District has instituted various measures to attempt to obtain accurate origin information. For instance, Fee Collectors are required to ask customers if the waste is from within city limits or the unincorporated area. A pilot program has been implemented at select landfills where the Fee Collectors use maps to assist customers in identifying the origin, and a simple, one-page flyer is available for customers which explains the importance of obtaining accurate origin information. The CIWMB is aware of the challenges of tracking self-haul waste and will continue to monitor and evaluate the disposal reporting systems set up by counties, in addition to the effectiveness of the disposal reporting regulations.

Another area of concern is tracking waste from "Indian Country." According to the Disposal Reporting Regulations, waste generated from within Indian Country and disposed in Riverside County must be identified as "Import." This policy applies regardless of who owns or operates the business or other source of waste. The cities and haulers in the CVAG area have expressed concern over the difficulty of accurately tracking this waste. Some cities, such as Palm Springs and Cathedral City, have complex "checkerboard" boundaries between their cities and Indian Country, thus making it more difficult for haulers to determine the jurisdiction of origin. The District has informed the CIWMB of these concerns. The CIWMB staff has pointed out that the regulations do not require haulers to use a specific method to allocate solid waste loads from multiple jurisdictions. Instead, they must use a reasonable method. Board staff has suggested that the District, affected jurisdictions, and their haulers work together to develop a reasonable approach.

4.4 DESCRIPTION OF PERMITTED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES

Disposal Facilities: Riverside County currently has 12 permitted, Class III (non-hazardous), solid waste disposal facilities (landfills). All landfills in Riverside County are located within the unincorporated area and are operated by the District, with the exception of the El Sobrante Landfill as previously stated in Chapters 1 and 3. Table SP 4-6 lists each landfill, its address, and the permitted maximum daily disposal (according to each landfill's Solid Waste Facility Permit [SWFP]). Figure SP 3-1 shows the location of all of the permitted landfills in Riverside County. More detailed vicinity maps of each landfill are contained in Chapter 4 of the Siting Element.

TABLE SP 4--6 PERMITTED SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

			PERN	IITTED		
		PERMIT	MAXIMU	M DAILY		
FACILITY NAME	FACILITY LOCATION	ISSUE	DISP	OSAL		
		DATE	C.Y.	TONS		
Anza Sanitary Landfill	40329 Terwilliger Rd., Anza	04/22/93	80	40		
Badlands Sanitary Landfill	31125 Ironwood Ave., Moreno Valley	05/26/92	2333	1,400		
Blythe Sanitary Landfill	1000 Midland Rd., Blythe	07/19/77*	520	260		
Coachella Sanitary Landfill	87-011 44th St., Coachella	12/15/92	3,333	2,000		
Desert Center Sanitary Landfill	17-991 Kaiser Rd., Desert Center	01/15/91	32	16		
Edom Hill Sanitary Landfill	70-100 Varner Rd., Cathedral City	12/15/92*	2,000	1,200		
El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill	10910 Dawson Canyon Rd., Corona	03/30/94	6,154	4,000		
Highgrove Sanitary Landfill	1420 Highgrove Pass Rd., Riverside	07/25/92	4,500	2,700		
Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill	16411 Lamb Banyon Rd., Beaumont	08/10/92	3,167	1,900		
Mead Valley Sanitary Landfill	22376 Forest Rd., Perris	12/12/94	1,833	1,100		
Mecca II Sanitary Landfill	95250 66th Ave., Mecca	12/21/92	100	50		
Oasis Sanitary Landfill	84-505 84th Ave., Oasis	08/16/93	82	41		
		TOTAL T	ONS	14.666		

Source: Landfill Solid Waste Facility Permits

*Permit currently under revision. May be reissued before adoption of CIWMP.

Nondisposal Facilities: A nondisposal facility is defined as any solid waste facility required to obtain a State Solid Waste Facility Permit, except a disposal facility (i.e. landfill) or a transformation facility (i.e. waste burned for energy). Existing nondisposal facilities in Riverside County include transfer stations and green waste (composting) facilities. A list of these nondisposal facilities and their descriptions follow.

Existing Transfer Stations

- Idyllwild Transfer Station
- Pinon Flats Transfer Station
- Trico Transfer Station and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)
- Moreno Valley Transfer Station and MRF

The Idyllwild Transfer Station, operated by Riverside County, is located in the community of Idyllwild off of Highway 243 and serves the unincorporated communities of Idyllwild, Pine Cove, and the surrounding fee assessment areas of unincorporated Riverside County.

The Pinon Flats Transfer Station, also operated by Riverside County, is located on Pinon Drive, southeast of Highway 74 and serves the unincorporated community of Pinon Flats and the surrounding areas of Riverside County.

The Trico Transfer Station and MRF, which are owned and operated by Burrtec Waste Industries, are located at 9470 Mission Blvd. in the unincorporated community of Glen Avon. The transfer station primarily serves the surrounding unincorporated county area. The MRF is utilized by the City of Riverside and the curbside recycling programs in unincorporated Riverside County and curbside programs in San Bernardino County jurisdictions.

The Moreno Valley Transfer Station and MRF is owned and operated by Waste Management of Inland Valley, a division of Waste Management Collection and Recycling, Inc., a California Corporation. The facility is intended to serve jurisdictions serviced by Waste Management of Inland Valley, including but not limited to the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Hemet, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Temecula, and the surrounding unincorporated areas.

Permitted, Not Yet Constructed Transfer Stations

• Perris Transfer Station and MRF

The Perris Transfer Station and MRF is permitted, but not yet constructed. Groundbreaking ceremonies were conducted in the Fall of 1995, and as of this writing, the facility is under construction.

Existing Composting Facilities

• O.M. Scott and Sons Company, Riverside County Regional Composting Facility

- RECYC, Inc.
- Whitefeather Farms (closed)
- California Biomass (obtaining permit)¹

The O.M. Scott and Sons Company, Riverside County Regional Composting Facility is located at the southwest corner of Riverside Avenue and Wineville Road in the Jurupa area of Riverside County and serves the unincorporated and incorporated areas within Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties.

RECYC, Inc. is located at 22500 Temescal Canyon Road in Corona and accepts municipal sewage sludge from the cities and unincorporated areas within Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles Counties.

Whitefeather Farms is located at 69-780 New Edom Hill Road in Cathedral City, however, it is now closed and unlikely to reopen. It previously served the Cities of Cathedral City, Palm Springs, Palm Desert, Desert Hot Springs, Rancho Mirage, La Quinta, Coachella, Indio, Indian Wells, and the unincorporated areas within the Coachella Valley.

California Biomass is a 15-acre facility located at the southeasterly corner of Jackson St. and Avenue 62 in the Coachella Valley. It is a farm composting project with feedstock from curbside, commercial (resorts), and commercial landscape. The facility receives green waste, food waste, and paper waste, and the products include compost, mulch, and vermiculture. Its markets are agriculture, resorts, and golf courses. The facility is designed for 300+ tons per day and will use an in-vessel compost technique. Though the facility has opened, composting operations are pending the issuance of a permit (anticipated in October, 1996) from the Local Solid Waste Management Enforcement Agency (LEA).

Figures SP 4-1 through SP 4-9 are vicinity maps of each of the nondisposal facilities located throughout Riverside County and its cities. The locations of all existing nondisposal facilities in the County are also shown in Figure SP 3-1.

4.5 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES

Disposal Facilities: A Class III landfill, the Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center, has been proposed. The area proposed for the new landfill is located in an abandoned iron ore mine at Eagle Mountain in the unincorporated area of eastern Riverside County, 10 miles northwest of the community of Desert Center.

Nondisposal Facilities: The CVAG Transfer Station/MRF Task Force has been developing plans for a transfer station(s) in the Coachella Valley for over two years. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was released in May, 1995. The RFP requested proposals for operation, design, and construction of a transfer facility with MRF capabilities to be owned by cities wishing to participate in the

¹Telephone conversations with Laurie Holk, L.E.A., March, 1996 and August, 1996.



















project. The deadline to receive proposals was October 6, 1995. The RFP specifically required each proposer to submit proposals that would satisfy two scenarios: (a) one centrally located, mid-valley station that would transfer up to 1,500 tons per day; and (b) two smaller stations located in the west and east ends of the Valley, operating at up to 1,000 tons per day, and up to 500 tons per day, respectively. The proposers were required to locate and secure sites as part of each scenario. Figures SP 4-10 to SP 4-12 are maps which show the sites proposed for each of the required scenarios which are currently under consideration. Four proposals and two alternate proposals were received and evaluated. The Task Force selected two vendors to begin contract negotitations. Final vendor selection is scheduled for November 1, 1996. The transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by Fall 1998.

The Riverside County NDFE and the NDFE for the cities of the Coachella Valley indicate that one Coachella Valley MRF will be developed. The documents also indicate that a second Coachella Valley MRF is contingent on waste stream tonnages in the Coachella Valley requiring an additional facility. The NDFE's indicate that the location of the proposed Coachella Valley MRF is undetermined at this time and the second Coachella Valley MRF, if established, would be strategically located so that it will complement the first Coachella Valley MRF.

The District has had plans to develop the Agua Mansa Transfer Station in the north area of the county as a replacement for the Highgrove Landfill when it closes in 1997. As discussed in Chapter 1, the District Board adopted a policy that it would not sponsor future urban transfer station facilities as part of the disposal system funding, thus leaving urban transfer stations and MRF's to the cities and private sector to develop and operate. This new policy will require the project to be developed and eventually operated by the private sector or another public agency. The District's involvement will be limited to the rights that accrue to ownership of the land on which the project is sited.

It should also be noted that the City of Palm Springs has been developing a plan for a 150-ton/day municipal solid waste co-composting facility which would service the City of Palm Springs. The city has specified an in-vessel system (Bedminster or equivalent), which will be fully enclosed with a full odor-control system. As of this writing, the city has, through an RFQ process, certified Bedminster as the sole qualified proposer and begun negotiations on a design, build, and operate contract for a municipal solid waste composting facility. Jurisdictions utilizing this facility may be required to amend their NDFE.

4.6 DESCRIPTION OF NONPERMITTED WASTE DIVERSION FACILITIES

Nonpermitted facilities are those facilities that do not require a SWFP. Nonpermitted facilities include private buy-back centers and drop-off centers. These facilities accept materials with California Redemption Value and are regulated by the Department of Conservation. Table SP 4-7 is a listing of these facilities, by area and materials collected. (Table SP 4-7 also includes a listing of MRF's, transfer stations, and compost facilities, which may require SWFP's.)

Used oil collection centers are a special category of recycling centers that are regulated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control, and those that apply and become certified used oil collection centers are regulated by the CTWMB. Certified used oil collection centers are required to offer incentives to the public for the collection of used motor oil as well as comply with other State requirements. Table SP 4-8 is a listing of used oil collection centers by area.









Riverside County Regional Recyclers

Please contact the individual center for information on how to prepare your materials and to confirm the materials accepted.

	0001000			ŀ	Wei	als		Appli	ances	Ū	ass	Pla	stics	فالكلة		Pape		
NAME	AUUKEDS		LHONE			Ž	3			3					j	비	_	
					ľ						Ī			ľ				7
20/20 Recycling Center	1731 Pomona Kd.	Corona	0022-6/2-606	×		_				×	×	×						
20/20 Recycling Center	480 McKinley St.	Corona	909-279-2200	×					4	×	×	×		<u>×</u>	_			
20/20 Recycling Center	2661 Green River Dr.	Corona	909-279-2200	×	_		_	-	-	×	×	×	-	<u>×</u>	_	_	_	
20/20 Recycling Center	301 S. Lincoln	Corona	800-275-9449	X					_	×		×		_	_			
IMCO Recycling	1462 Quarry Rd.	Corona	909-737-2922	X														
Liston Brick Co. of Corona	20401 Temescal Canyon	Corona	909-277-4221	X	-	X		-		_		-	-				-	
Mobile Recycling Inc.	1288 Border Ave.	Corona	714-891-7766	X	X					X	Х	x		X				
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	1300 W. 6th St.	Corona	909-980-1203	X	X							X			_			
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	821 N. Main St.	Corona	909-980-1203	×	×				-			×	┢					
Six-Pack Recycling Center	1430 E. 6th St.	Corona	909-734-2910	×	×	X		Ê	×	×	×	×	∩ ⊾	X	×	×	×	×
National Polystyrene Recycling Cor	720 S. Temescal	Corona	800-696-6965	Ļ	╉	+		╞	╀		Γ	-	f		-			
Yawl Recycle Center	31 E. Grand Blvd.	Corona	909-371-9716	×	f	×			-	×	×	×						
Rurries Weste Industries Recvoling	9470 Mission Rlvd	Glen Avon	909-360-9073						ř			×			×	×	×	k
A & C Recveling	9401 Friwanda Ave	Mira Loma	909-356-2830				Ţ	┢		k		×	+	<u> </u>	-		L	
Mobile Recvoling Inc	11070 Limonite	MiraLoma	714-891-7766					+	4		×	×	╀	ľ	+	Ĺ		
Mobile Recveling Inc	1999 River Rd	Norco	714-891-7766					-	╞	×	X	×						Γ
Pernold's Allminum Peruchan	2790 Hamner Ave	Norco	909-980-1203			+			╇			×	-					
	2170 LIMINUS AVV.	Directo	071 00 101 1201			╀	Ţ	f	ł			:	+					
Appliance Kecycling Factory	3851 Pyrite	KIVerside	10/0-100-606	_ -	┥	4	Ī	1		1	J	;	┦	4		4		
Beverage Container Recycling	10471 Magnolia Ave.	Riverside	909-781-8810	×		_				×		×	_					
Bill's Appliance Services	2431 Rubidoux Blvd.	Riverside	909-276-1030			X		X	×									
California Liquidators	3001 Chicago Ave.	Riverside	609-686-0583															
Recycling Service Center	6565 Mission Blvd.	Riverside	909-681-2525	×		×			-	×	X	×		\sim			×	
20/20 Recycling Center	5202 Arlington Ave.	Riverside	800-275-9449	×	┝			<u> </u>		×		×	╞					
20/20 Recycling Center	3840 La Sierra Ave.	Riverside	800-275-9449	×	┢	_			-	×		×						
20/20 Recycling Center	3520 Riverside Plaza	Riverside	800-275-9449	×	┢			┝	┞	×		×	-					
20/20 Recycling Center	769 Blaine St.	Riverside	800-275-9449	×	╞	Ļ	L	╞	┞	×		~	╞					
20/20 Recveling Center	5225 Canvon Crest Dr.	Riverside	800-275-9449		+-				-	×		×	$\left \right $	-				
20/20 Recveling Center	4775 Brookhollow Circle	Riverside	800-275-9449	×	┢				╞	×		X	$\left \right $					
M K Batterv	2627 N Main St	Riverside	909-682-4230	Ţ	┢	╞	×	┢	┞							_		
M K Ratterv	4811 Van Buren Blvd	Riverside	000-329-0704		╁╸	+	* *	╞	╀	Ļ	Ι		╀	╞	+	Ļ		Ţ
Mabila Decialing Inc	0775 Manualia Ava	Divareida	714-801-7766		┝	╀	:	╀	╀	þ	À	>	+		╀			Ţ
Mobile Devicting Inc.	KIEA A-dinaton Auto	Diverside	714-201-7766			-		$\frac{1}{1}$	╉	• •		: >	╉					
		NIVEI SHUE	00/1-100-414	4	- -	╉		╉	╀	أ⊳	∢₽	 	╉	<u> የ</u>				
Mobile Recycling Inc.	400U LA SIEITA AVE.	KIVERSIUC	00/1-120-11/	\$	- -	-		╉	┥	<u> </u>	</td <td>4</td> <td>╉</td> <td>< </td> <td>4</td> <td>\downarrow</td> <td>┛</td> <td></td>	4	╉	< 	4	\downarrow	┛	
Mobile Recycling Inc.	313 E. Alessandro Blvd.	Kiverside	/14-891-1/06		×					~	×	×	+	*				
Recycling Service Center	8566 Limonite	Riverside	909-685-4430	×		×		_	_	×	×	×			-			
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	5500 Van Buren Blvd.	Riverside	£071-086-606	X	X				 	_		X		_				
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	3417 Van Buren Blvd.	Riverside	909-980-1203	X	X							X			_			
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	17050 Van Buren Blvd.	Riverside	6051-086-606	×	X							×	-					
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	10895 Magnolia Ave.	Riverside	£021-086-60 <u>6</u>	X	X]			Х	-					
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling	2861 Mary St.	Riverside	909-980-1203	×	X							X			-			
Riverside Scrap Iron and Metals	2993 6th St.	Riverside	909-686-2120	×	×	×			×	×	X	×	\vdash	\times		×	×	
Summit Pulp and Paper	1575 Marlborough Ave.	Riverside	0009-982-606	×	╞					×		~	-	×	×	×	×	×
20/20 Recycling Center	4250 Van Buren Blvd.	Riverside	909-279-2200	×	\vdash			$\left \right $		×	×	×		×	 			
20/20 Recycling Center	3520 Adams St.	Riverside	0072-612-606	×							k	X	┢	2				
	$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}$	intervention of the Press						L'UE.										
Serap Appliances). GLASS: (CG = CRV)	Glass, NC = Non-CRV Glass). PL/	STICS: (PT = #1 PET	(soda bottles), H =	HDPE (1	nilk and	i water	iues).	S = Pol	vstvren	e fstyn	ofaam	TAF	ER: C	_ NP =]	Newsp) and due	- - - -	office Office

4-26

TABLE SP 4-7

(white) paper, CP ·· Computer Paper, C = Cardboard, MP = Mixed Paper (magazines, junk mail)).

This list is provided as a public service and is not an endorsement of these companies or their services. The District is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this listing. Printed on Recycled Paper

8/96

MAME ADDRESS Moreno Valley/Perris Arca ADDRESS Beverage Container Recycling 14930 Perris Blvd. 20/20 Recycling Center 11875 Pigeon Pass Rd Mobile Recycling Inc. 112625 Fredrick Ave. Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv										1			cepted					
Moreno Valley/Perris Area Beverage Container Recycling 14930 Perris Blvd. 20/20 Recycling Center 11875 Figeon Pass Rd Mobile Recycling Inc. 12625 Fredrick Ave. Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv Tri-Cale Recycling 24595 Sumrymead Blv	U	CITV	ANODA		Ĭ	stals T			plian	S	Clas H		Plastic	S S		Pape		
Beverage Container Recycling 14930 Perris Blvd. 20/20 Recycling Center 11875 Pigeon Pass Rd Mobile Recycling Inc. 12625 Fredrick Ave. Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv. Tri-Cycle Recyclino 73720 Sunnymead Blv	2				1		7								2	3	<u>.</u>	
20/20 Recycling Center 11875 Pigeon Pass Rd Mobile Recycling Inc. 12625 Fredrick Ave. Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv. Tri. Cvole Recyclino 23770 Sunnymead Bly	N	foreno Valley	0188-181-606	K		┠	┡	Ļ			X	ř		╞	┞			
Mobile Recycling Inc. 12625 Fredrick Ave. Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv. Tri-Corle Recyclino 24720 Sunnymead Bly	Rd. Ste A. N	foreno Valley	800-275-9449	×	1	┢	-		1	<u>I</u>	×	×		 	╞	ļ		
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 24595 Alessandro Blv	<u>.</u>	foreno Valley	714-891-7766	×	×	┝	$\left \right $		Ē	Ī	×	× ا		<u> </u>				
Tri-Cuola Recucling	alvd. N	1 oreno Valley	909-980-1203	×	×	×					╞					<u> </u>		
	Blvd. N	foreno Valley	909-924-5391	×		F					×	X V		╞				
20/20 Recycling Center 25065 Sunnymead Blv	Blvd. N	foreno Valley	909-279-2200	×		╞	-					X		r				
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling 3977 N. Perris Blvd.	<u>ч</u>	erris	909-980-1203	×	×	-	-			<u> </u>	 	×						
Newsco Recycling 703 E. 4th St.		erris arris	909-657-9811 and-774-7760	××	┝┼	X				×	×	××		$\frac{rr}{1}$			X	
United (Van Tarinta Ana							-	┨		╡						-		ľ
nucluosan jacunu An ca																	ľ	
20/20 Recycling Center 3125 W. Florida	ان ا	emet	800-275-9449	×	-	+	+			1	×.	ז× ו		ľ		_		
Mobile Recycling Inc. [41849 Florida Ave.	<u></u>	emet	714-891-7766	×	×	╉	-	_			~	×i ×i		<u>~ r</u>				
Mobile Recycling Inc. [43396 Florida Ave.	¥	emet	714-891-7766	X	×	-	-			╡	\mathbf{x}	× ×				_		ŀ
Recycle America of Riverside Co. 37210 Wentworth Ave	lve. H	emet	909-925-6561	×	×	┦	-				×	× ×	×	<u>~''</u> 		×	×	×
Valley Metais 400 N. Buena Vista		lemet	1108-026-606	~	1	+				+	×	×) ~				4		
Kelly Mtg. Co. 16/2 Juanita	S	an Jacinto	909-024-1468	Υ	ľ			_		┥	×	ľ		┥	-			
San Gorgonio Pass											-							
All Metals Recycling 1243 E. Ramsey Ave.	/e. B	anning	909-849-5997	X	X	X	XX			X	X	XX					Х	
Reynold's Aluminum Recycling [1661 E. 6th St.	B	eaumont	909-980-1203	×	×							×						
Mobile Recycling Inc.]1155 Calimesa Blvd.	<u>i.</u> [C	alimesa	714-891-7766	X	X	-	-	_		-	X	X			-			
San Bernardino Area					н. М													
All-Metals Recycling 10065 Alder Ave.	al	loomington	2878-777-8785		×	Ê	X			X	X	ř			L	Ļ	K	
Augustine Metals 2021 W. Placentia		alton	909-682-8102	×		2	X			×	┢──				 			
Cannco [1224 N. Mt. Vernon	5	olton	909-824-2559	×		F					×	X			-			
Colton Iron and Metal 790 East M St.		olton	909-825-1662			X				X								
Fontana Paper Mills 13733 E. Valley Blvd.	vd. F	ontana	909-823-4100								-		1	<u> </u>	X V	X	Х	X
Frankel Iron and Metal 15615 Arrow Route	E	ontana	909-823-3431	×		X				×	┝							
Inland Paper Stock [777 W. Rialto	S	an Bernardino	909-884-8672	X		-	_				X	XX			X X	Х	Х	Х
San Bernardino Metal Co. 144 S. G St.	S	an Bernardino	909-889-0626	×		Ĥ	XX				X	X	х				Х	
Western San Bernardino County																		
American Metal Recycling 2202 S. Millikin Ave.	/e. 0	Intario	0008-886-606		×		F			k	╟─				╟┈			
D & M Metals 840 State St.		ntario	9661-986-606	×	┢	<u> </u>						×			-		×	
Inland Container Corp. 5100 E. Jurupa		ntario	909-605-1033		┠─	┢╴	┞─			┢╸	┢	<u> </u> 		<u> </u>	-	ļ	×	
Main Street Fibers 608 Main St.		Intario	909-986-6310	×	×	Ê	2	 		T	×	×	×	<u>r</u> 	X	×	×	×
Ontario Metal Recycling [717 S. Taylor		ntario	909-983-0655	×		×		Ļ		×	×	X	×		-			
Pomona Paper Stock [1460 W. 2nd St.		omona	909-622-2076	×	T	┢	┞			Γ	×	X		r	X	×	×	×
Recycling Resources 1406 W. 2nd St.	Ь	omona	1166-629-606	×	F	$\left \right $					X	X			X	×	×	X

4-27

This list is provided as a public service and is not an endorsement of these companies or their services. The District is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this listing. Printed on Recycled Paper

TABLE SP 4-7

8/96

ecyclers
Ž
egional
~
inty
Col
e Cou
de Cou
verside Cou
Riverside Cou

Please contact the individual center for information on how to prepare your materials for recycling and to confirm that specific materials will be accepted.

TABLE SP 4-7

Scrap Appliances). GLASS: (CG = CRV Glass, NC = Non-CRV Glass). PLASTICS: (PT = #1 PET (soda bottles), H = HDPE (milk and water jugs), PS = Polystyrene (styrofoam)). PAPER: (NP = Newspaper, OP = Office (white) paper, CP = Computer Paper, C = Cardboard, MP = Mixed Paper (magazines, junk mail)).

8/96

This list is provided as a public service and is not an endorsement of these companies or their services. The District is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this listing. Printed on Recycled Paper

4-28

Riverside County Regional Recyclers

Please contact the individual center for information on how to prepare your materials and to confirm the materials accepted.

Material-Specific Recyclers

Construction Debris Recycl	ers		
E.L. Yeager/Agua Mansa	687 Agua Mansa Rd.	Colton	909-824-3867
Hemacinto Recycling	1871 Warren Rd.	Hernet	909-654-6869
Granite Construction	38155 Monroe St.	Indio	619-775-8270
A-One Delivery	12000 E. Philadelphia St.	Mira Loma	909-685-8343
Chino Valley Sawdust Inc.	13434 Ontario Ave.	Ontario	909-923-0563
A & A Equipment	5610 Market St.	Riverside	909-684-1025
Lawson Enterprises	88800 Avenue 70	Thermal	619-397-2800
The Recyclers			
Amercian Tire Recyclers	11001 Compton Ave.	Corona	909-736-7020
ligon Tires	3660 Placentia Ln.	Riverside	909-781-8392
Styrofoam Packing Peanut.	Recyclers		
Mail Boxes Etc.	All stores in S. California - for n	earest location call	800-949-6660
Mattress Recyclers			
MBC Mattress	19270 Envoy St.	Corona	909-371-8044
Greenwaste Recyclers			
California Biomass (W)	10397 Alder St.	Bloomington	909-875-6441
B. P. John Hauling (W)	17954 Euclid Ave.	Chino	909-696-1144
Inland Empire Composting (A)	1951 West Key St.	Colton	909-684-7336
Apollo Woodgrinding (A)	13303 San Bernardino Rd.	Fontana	909-356-2735
Bengal Recycling (A)	8640 Cherry Ave.	Fontana	909-428-0527
A. Lua Wood Recycling (W)	18938 Mermack Avenue	Lake Elsinore	909-245-4497
COLMAC (W)	62300 Gene Welmas Dr.	Mecca	619-396-2554
Agriscape (A)	37760 Borel Rd.	Murrieta	909-696-0651
Chino Valley Sawdust Inc. (A)	13434 Ontario Ave.	Ontario	909-923-0563
One-Stop Landscaping (A)	13024 San Timeteo Cyn Rd.	Redlands	909-798-1278
Rios Recycling (W)	1890 Market St.	Riverside	909-686-1921
B. P. John Hauling (A)	30249 Hwy. 74	Romoland	909-696-1144
CST (A)	345 E. Pioneer	San Bernardino	909-795-5639
California Biomass (W)	Corner of Jackson and Ave. 62	Thermal	619-399-4128
Lawson Enterprises (A)	88800 Avenue 70	Thermal	619-397-2800
World Products Recycling (A)	27105 Sierra del Sol	Thousand Palms	619-343-0095

G = Grass only, W = Wood and Woody Wastes only, A = all greenwastes accepted

This list is provided as a public service and is not an endorsement of these companies or their services.

The District is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this listing.

TABLE SP 4-8

Used Oil Recycling

BANNING

Chief Auto Parts, 3181 Ramsey St.

* Ted's Lube Auto Plus, 4097 W. Ramsey St.

BEAUMONT

§ Kragen Auto Parts, 635 Highland Springs Ave.

BLYTHE

§ Kragen Auto Parts, 1315 W. Hobson Way

CATHEDRAL CITY

- * Crystal Chrysler Center, 36444 Auto Park Dr.
- * Firestone, 68240 Ramon Rd.
- * The Lube Shop, Inc., 68-815 Ramon Rd.

COACHELLA

- * Ajax Auto Wrecking, 84-851 Ave. 48
- * T & M Auto Repair, 1047(B) Grapefruit Blvd.

CORONA

- * A Plus Auto Repair, 1359 W. 6th St.
- * Big O Tires, 1002 W. 6th St. Chief Auto Parts, 701 W. 6th St. Chief Auto Parts, 641 N. Main St.
- * Firestone, 522 N. Main St.
- * Grease Monkey, 1270 E. Grand Ave.
- * Goodyear Tire, 2189 Simpson Ave.
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 1220 Magnolia Ave. Pep Boys, 581 N. Main St.
- * Spee Dee Oil Change and Tune-Up, 906 W. 6th

DESERT HOT SPRINGS

Chief Auto Parts, 12975 Palm Ave.

* Maverick Automotive, 66271 Pierson Blvd.

HEMET

Centers

Chief Auto Parts, 2050 E. Florida Ave.

- * Firestone, 350 W. Florida Ave.
- * Grease Monkey, 532 W. Florida Ave.
- Hemet Auto Mall Lube 'N Wash 450 Carriage Circle
 - Hemet Corporation Yard, 3777 Industrial Ave.
- * Inland Chevrolet Geo Oldsmobile 2505 W. Florida Ave.
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 3209 Florida Ave., Ste. B
- § Kragen Auto Parts. 3330 E. Florida Ave.
- * Masterlube, 3615 W. Florida St.
- * Phil's Auto Clinic, 111 N. Soboba St.
- * Plaza Chevron Automotive, 2099 E. Florida Ave.

IDYLLWILD

* Idyllwild Garage, 25015 Hwy 243

INDIO

- * Firestone Store, 82323 Hwy 111
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 81930 Hwy 111
- * Pep Boys, 81246 Hwy 111

* A 16 cent per gallon redemption is available through these Certified Used Oil Collection centers.

† Free used oil collection container available through these locations (while supplies last). Sponsored by the City of Riverside.

 $\$ A coupon of at least 32 cents per gallon will be issued by these Certified Used Oil Collection Centers

For more information on recycling used motor oil call the Riverside County hotline at

800-366-SAVE

or the California Integrated Waste Management Board hotline at

800-553-2962

Continued on other side

JURUPA

- * Chappy's Auto Parts, 9410 Mission Blvd. Chief Auto Parts, 5623 Mission Blvd.
- * Goodyear Tire, 6078 Camino Real
- ** INABA Auto Parts, 5680 Mission Blvd.
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 8702 Limonite Blvd.
- * Performance Systems, 4161 Pyrite St.

LAKE ELSINORE

- Autoaid, 31760 Mission Trail Rd. Chief Auto Parts, 30850 Riverside Dr.
- * Firestone, 31748 Mission Trail Rd.
- * Lake Elsinore Unocal, 515 Main St.
 Walmart Tire Lube & Express, 31700 Grape St.

LA QUINTA

* The Lube Shop, 78-988 Highway 111

MORENO VALLEY

- * Ayers Auto Service, 24759 Sunnymead Blvd. California Pit Stop, 24035 Sunnymead Blvd. Chief Auto Parts, 12601 Perris Blvd. Chief Auto Parts, 23031 Sunnymead Blvd.
- * Firestone Store, 24673 Alessandro Blvd.
- * Jiffy Lube, 12300 Heacock St.
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 25010 Alessandro Blvd. Pep Boys, 23470 Sunnymead Blvd.
- Purrfect Auto Service
 24320 Sunnymead Blvd., #101
 Walmart Tire & Lube Express
 2663 Canyon Springs

NORCO

* Phillips Pontiac Mazda, 2000 Hamner Ave.

PALM DESERT

- * Palm to Pines Chevron, 72-801 Hwy 111
- * Waste Management of the Desert 41-800 Corporate Way

PALM SPRINGS

- * 76 Car Care Center, 1777 E. Palm Canyon Chief Auto Parts, 1800 Sunrise Way
- * Yousef's Service Center (Mobil) 1708 N. Palm Dr.

PERRIS

Chief Auto Parts, 1675 N. Perris Blvd.

§ Kragen Auto Parts, 119 W. Nuevo Rd. Perris Corp. Yard, 1015 S. "G" St. Walmart Tire Lube & Express 2560 N. Perris Blvd.

RIVERSIDE

- Chief Auto Parts, 10249 Arlington Ave. Chief Auto Parts, 3400 E. La Sierra Ave. Chief Auto Parts, 4030 Madison Ave. Chief Auto Parts, 6047 Magnolia Ave. Chief Auto Parts, 1947 University Ave.
- Chief Auto Parts, 16960 Van Buren Blvd.
- † Feola Truck/Auto Repair, 6691 Indiana Ave.
- *† Firestone Store, 4199 Market St.
- *† Firestone Store, 10091 Magnolia Ave.
- * Goodyear Tire, 3553 Merrill Ave.
- * Goodyear Tire, 3863 Tyler St.
- *† Grease Monkey, 7437 Arlington Ave.
- *† Grease Monkey, 3399 Arlington Ave.
- *† Jiffy Lube, 2634 Alessandro Blvd.
- * Kamal's Mobil Service, 6608 Indiana Ave.
- §† Kragen Auto Parts, 6160 Arlington Ave.
- §† Kragen Auto Parts, 10403 Magnolia Ave.
- §† Kragen Auto Parts, 1765 University Ave.
- * Lube & Tune Express, 11850 Magnolia Ave.
- Magnuson Tire, 1555 University Ave. Membership Recycling, 2466 Main St. Mike Burke Chevron, 1011 University Ave. Pep Boys, 10831 Magnolia Ave.
- * Purrfect Auto Service, 4811 Van Buren Blvd.
- *† Quaker State Minut-Lube, Inc. 3693 La Sierra Blvd.

SAN JACINTO

Chief Auto Parts, 1470 San Jacinto Ave. Hemet Corporation Yard, 3777 Industrial Ave. Quality Auto, 570 S. State St.

* San Jacinto Unocal 76, 709 S. San Jacinto Ave.

TEMECULA

- * Big O Tires, 40525 Winchester Rd.
- § Kragen Auto Parts, 41125 Winchester Rd. Pep Boys, 40605 Winchester Rd.
- Rancho Car Wash & Quick Lube 27378 Jefferson Ave.
- * Spee Dee Oil Change and Tune-Up 30690 Rancho California Rd.

* A 16 cent per gallon redemption is available through these Certified Used Oil Collection centers.

† Free used oil collection container available through these locations (while supplies last). Sponsored by the City of Riverside.

 $\$ A coupon of at least 32 cents per gallon will be issued by these Certified Used Oil Collection Centers

For more information on recycling used motor oil, call the

Riverside County hotline at

800-366-SAVE

or the California Integrated Waste Management Board hotline at

800-553-2962

4.7 DESCRIPTION OF MARKET DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Riverside County is actively involved in the pursuit of diverting and marketing waste to manufacturers of value-added products. In this regard, there are two active Recycling Market Development Zones (RMDZ's) within the County, covering a combined area of over 192,400 acres: the Agua Mansa RMDZ (see Figure SP 4-13) and the Riverside County RMDZ (see Figure SP 4-14).

Agua Mansa Recycling Market Development Zone: The Agua Mansa RMDZ is comprised of a multi-jurisdictional team of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and the Cities of Colton, Rialto, and Riverside. It is located ten miles east of the Ontario International Airport and surrounded on three sides by major transportation arterials (Interstate 10, Interstate 215, and Highway 60), providing excellent access for industrial users. Figure SP 4-13 shows the location of the Agua Mansa RMDZ and describes the target materials, site infrastructure, business incentives, and tonnage diversion for the participating jurisdictions.

The Agua Mansa RMDZ also serves as the Enterprise Zone, as designated by the State Department of Commerce. This classification allows businesses to be eligible to receive such incentives as employer hiring credit, sales and tax credit, and non-tax investments, which allow a business to receive free California tax on interest earned on investments. San Bernardino County manages the administrative operations of the Agua Mansa RMDZ, and Riverside County is responsible for marketing. A subcommittee of representatives from all five jurisdictions assists in the marketing functions. This committee actively seeks ways to attract potential business to the RMDZ. Marketing activities include, but are not limited to, attendance of business trade shows, placement of ads in trade journals, and business retention strategies. Targeted materials include: mixed waste paper, glass, tires and rubber, plastic, yard waste, and inert solids (targeted for retention only). The goal is to attract businesses that can process these materials.

San Bernardino County and the District also provide vital assistance, in the form of statistical data, regarding the RMDZ. Waste generation data has proven to be a very useful tool for companies considering locating in the zone.

Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone: The Riverside County RMDZ extends from Blythe to the Coachella Valley to the western portion of the county. It is a partnership between the County of Riverside and the Cities of Blythe, Cathedral City, Coachella, Indio, Hemet, Moreno Valley, Perris, and San Jacinto. The RMDZ is diversified in its industries and includes the resort industry in the Coachella Valley. Much of the RMDZ is located in what is known as the Inland Empire², an area which has seen the most rapid growth in the nation in the past decade.

The City of Palm Springs has applied to the CIWMB for a redesignation of the Riverside County

²The Inland Empire is defined as Riverside and San Bernardino counties and a portion of eastern Los Angeles County.



STATE OF CALIFORNIA • ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

AGUA MANSA RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE



ZONE INFORMATION

The Agua Mansa Recycling Market Development Zone is comprised of a multi-jurisdictional team of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and the cities of Colton, Rialto, and Riverside. This Zone also serves as the Enterprise Zone, as designated by the State Department of Commerce. The Zone is centrally located in the Western Riverside/San Bernardino County area, commonly known as the Inland Empire, where over 2.7 million people reside.

PROGRAM INFORMATION

California Recycling Market Development Zones are a program of the California Integrated Waste Management Board. For more information on this and other market development programs, contact the Board's Assistance Branch at (916) 255-2708.

Figure SP 4-13

STATE OF CALIFORNIA . ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY . INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

AGUA MANSA Recycling Market Development Zone

'ARGET MATERIALS

STEE

faterials targeted within the Zone include mixed waste paper, lass, tires and rubber, plastic, yard waste, and inert solids targeted for retention only). The goal of the Zone is to attract usinesses that can process these materials within the Zone.

VAILABLE AND PLANNED

Located just ten miles east of Ontario Airport and surrounded n three sides by major transportation arterials - Interstate 10, nterstate 215 and Highway 60 - the Zone provides excellent ccess for medium and heavy industrial users. The Zone neludes over 10,400 acres, much of which is zoned for indusrial and commercial development. Portions of the Zone have been improved with infrastructure such as new roads, rail spurs, ewer and water systems, and are ready for industrial users. A Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) will be centrally located n the Agua Mansa Industrial Center.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES

The CIWMB offers a 40 percent tax credit for businesses purchasing recycling equipment, low-interest loans up to \$1 million, technical assistance on financing strategies, and assistance in marketing zones nationally and internationally.

Incentives offered by the Zone include Small Business Administration loans; Community Development Block Grant funds and Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs). IDBs offer below-market rates, and are used for the purchase of land, buildings, and capital equipment. As an Enterprise Zone designated by the State Department of Commerce, businesses are eligible to receive such incentives as employer hiring credit, sales and tax credit, and non-tax investments, which allow a business to receive free California tax on interest earned on investments.

Zone contact person--Eileen Dalton Ph. (909) 275-6669 FAX (909) 275-6686.

TABLE 1: TOTAL TONNAGE GENERATED FOR ALL AGUA MANSA RMDZ JURISDICTIONS IN 1990

Vaste Type	RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE STREAM	SAN BERDNO. COUNTY WASTE STREAM	TOTAL	TOTAL%
Portugated	46.633	57.066	103 600	10.7%
vixed Paper	21,560	31,755	53,315	5,5%
ilm Plastics	1,793	15,475	17,268	1.8%
Other Plastics	6,601	15,979	22,580	2.3%
Ca. Redemption Glass	2,895	5,228	8,123	0,8%
Refillable Glass Beverage	0	0	0	0.0%
i'ard Waste	75,812	55,191	131,003	13.5%
Fires and Rubber	3,585	8,919	12,495	1.3%
Inert Solids	121,057	35,040	156,097	16.0%

TABLE 2: TOTAL PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS' ESTIMATED TONNAGE DIVERTED 1995

	RIV. CO.	SAN BERDNO.	CITY OF	CITY OF	TOTAL	TOTAL
Manager Tunn	PROPOSED MRF	COUNTY TONS	COLTON TONS	RIALTO	DIVERTED	CO. WASTE
WASTE IYPE	UIVERSION	DIVERTED	DIVERTED	TONNAGE	TONNAGE	STREAM %
Corrugated	10,629	3,832	937	10,679	26,077	25.1%
Mixed Paper	1,161	867	864	6,496	9,388	17.6%
Yard Waste	12,142	2,766	0	15	14,923	11.4%
Film Plastics	0	281	0	1,415	1,696	9.8%
Other Plastics	0	254	2	1,921	2,177	9.6%
Ca. Redemption Glass	1,157	143	465	405	2,170	26.7%
Other Recyclable Glass	1,177	251	312	1,488	3,228	22.1%
Refillable Glass Beverage	• • •	0	0	0	0	0%
Tires and Rubber	677	1,077	0	101	1,855	14.8%
Inert Solids	3,265	0 4	⁰	0	3,265	2.1%



RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA . ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD



ZONE INFORMATION

The Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone (Zone) spans from Blythe to the resort area of the Coachella Valley to the western portion of the county. The Zone, which lies 70 miles north of San Diego between eastern Los Angeles County and the Arizona border, is diversified in its industries, and includes the world renowned resort industry in the Coachella Valley. Much of the Zone is known as the Inland Empire, an area which has seen the most rapid growth in the nation in the past decade.

PROGRAM INFORMATION

California Recycling Market Development Zones are a program of the California Integrated Waste Management Board. For more information on this and other market development programs, contact the Board's Zone Assistance Branch at (916) 255-2708. STATE OF CALIFORNIA . ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY . INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE

TARGET MATERIALS

Materials to be used as feedstock in the Zone will include: paper, plastic, glass, green waste, inert solids, and wood waste.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The Zone has 200 industrial and commercial buildings available, ranging in size from 1,000 to 200,000 square feet. The realignment of March Air Force Base in the Perris Moreno Valley area will also provide additional infrastructure to the area. Highway service is available from Interstate 10, east, through the region and into Arizona. Less than 75 miles west along Interstate 10 is the Port of Long Beach. State Highways 91, 86, 62, 177, 60, 215, 74, 78, and 79 also serve the region as offshoots of Interstate 10. Rail service through the region is provided by Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and a main line of Southern Pacific. Ontario International Airport is located 25 miles west of the Zone, handling commercial and passenger service. Palm Springs Airport, in the center of the Zone, serves the Coachella Valley and Blythe with commercial service. Several general aviation airports are located in the areas of Thermal, Blythe, Chiraco Summit, Dessert Center, and Hemet-Ryan for air shipping and cargo. The region also has numerous existing and proposed material recovery facilities.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES

The CIWMB offers a 40 percent tax credit for businesses purchasing recycling equipment, low-interest loans up to \$1 million, technical assistance on financing strategies, and assistance in marketing zones nationally and internationally.

Fast track permitting is available for industrial site plans. Redevelopment areas within the Zone provide low-interest loans, and tax increment financing. Small Business Administration loans are also available.

Additional local incentives include abundant water at low costs, affordable housing, rail access, freeway access, 350 days of sunshine, affordable industrial land and recreational amenities just to name a few.

Zone contact person– Lori Moss, Phone (619) 863-8331 FAX (619) 863-8478

TABLE 1: TOTAL RMDZ JURISDICTIONS TONNAGE DIVERTED (Figures Reported in Tons)

Commodity	1990	1995
Corrugated	26,621	95,542
Mixed Paper	3,716	15,862
Newspaper	1,449	25,566
CA. Redemption Glass	3,725	6,947
Aluminum Cans	3,013	4,446
Yard Waste	2,714	117,563
Food Waste	13,659	15,433
Wood Waste	5,916	39,812
Inert Solids	190,893	220,205
Total Waste Generated	253.688	582.210

Notes:

These figures include collected recyclable materials plus disposed recyclable materials.

Construction materials include: soils, concrete, asphalt, drywall and roofing,

Metals include: CRV aluminum, bi-metal cans, ferrous, non-ferrous, tin cans, white goods and mixed metals.

RMDZ to include the city limits of Palm Springs. A portion of the city (Annexation 26, October 1994) was included in the original zone boundaries. The Environmental Assessment of the redesignation, required by newer California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for RMDZ's, was approved by the Palm Springs City Council on February 21, 1996. The City continues to pursue a redesignation of the RMDZ to include the city limits of Palm Springs and is working with the Riverside County Economic Development Agency toward that end. The CIWMB approval of the redesignation is expected to occur by November, 1996.

The Riverside County Economic Development Agency coordinates the administration of the RMDZ. A subcommittee of representatives from all involved jurisdictions assists in the marketing functions. Targeted materials include: paper, plastic, glass, green waste, inert solids, and wood waste.

The most recent business to locate in the Riverside County RMDZ is California Biomass, a greenwaste composting facility. This facility was approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and is awaiting approval of its SWFP (anticipated in October, 1996).³

Highway service is available from Interstate 10, east through the region and into Arizona. Less than 75 miles west along Interstate 10 is the Port of Long Beach. State Highways 91, 86, 62, 177, 60, 215, 74, 78, and 79 also serve the region. Rail service is provided by the Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and a main line of Southern Pacific Railroads.

Figure SP 4-14 shows the location of the Riverside County RMDZ and describes the target materials, infrastructure, business incentives and tonnage diversion for the RMDZ jurisdictions.

Other Strategies for Processing and/of Marketing Secondary Materials: The Riverside County Board of Supervisors approved two amendments to the county purchasing policy in June, 1990. One amendment (see Appendix E1) requires County letterhead and business card paper to be recycled stock with the highest possible percentages of recycled and post consumer waste content as long as the end product is consistent with the need for appearance and performance (e.g. ability to perform effectively in existing printing presses and photocopiers). This same policy encourages County personnel to choose papers made with recycled stock and post consumer waste for all specialty printed products (e.g. posters, flyers, brochures, etc.).

The second amendment (see Appendix E2) to County policy authorized the agent to develop a program for the purchase of products using recycled materials. The agent may also request that only recycled materials be specified even if the cost involved is greater than the cost for materials without recycled content, as long as the agent determined that it is an advantage to the County and that no laws or regulations are violated. When a contract is awarded for materials with recycled content, the agent shall advise the Board of Supervisors if the cost of the materials with recycled content exceeds the cost of comparable materials without recycled content by more than a prescribed amount (5% in 1990).

³Telephone conversations with Laurie Holk, L.E.A., March, 1996 and August, 1996.

As part of this Summary Plan, the following goal, policies, and objectives were developed (as presented in Chapter 2) to address the issues of market development for recyclable solid wastes:

Goal 2: Strengthen and develop markets for recycled or composted materials and products throughout Riverside County.

Policies

- Support the development of markets for recycled or composted materials.
- Encourage the purchase of recycled or composted products.
- Continue to promote the Recycling Market Development Zones (RMDZ's) among participating jurisdictions.

Objectives

- The County, COG's, and each affected city will provide technical assistance to businesses considering locating within the RMDZ's.
- Increase policies which specify requirements for the purchase of products using recycled or composted materials in businesses, school districts, and government agencies.

The goal, policies, and objectives will be implemented through the joint efforts of the District, county agencies, COG's, participating cities, and adjoining jurisdictions. The achievement of the goals can only be accomplished through a coordinated effort and support of local, State, and Federal agencies, such as Federal and State programs which offer economic inducements which encourage the development of secondary markets.

Additional Market Development Activities: Another strategy for market development is to hold vendors fairs. The County held a recycled products vendor fair in Western Riverside County in 1990. Businesses involved with recycling efforts were invited to demonstrate products made from recycled materials. Another vendor fair was coordinated by CVAG for the Coachella Valley in the Spring of 1993.

In addition, other market development activities are practiced by agencies outside of local City and County government. These practices include: employing strategies which make financing available to growing successful businesses; creating jobs in a cost effective manner by adopting a strategy which creates new jobs and makes financing available to businesses which, in turn create the most jobs for the least cost; increasing awareness of the RMDZ program and the development of recycling-based businesses in the zones; and developing programs and policies which provide the zone administrators, local governments, and recycling-based manufacturers with direct "hands-on" technical assistance regarding siting decisions and regulatory compliance, feedstock information, business planning and development assistance, financing resources, manufacturing technologies, and marketing assistance for recycled content products.⁴

⁴Paul Ryan, P.F. Ryan & Associates, May 6, 1996.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY OF SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS, HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS

5.1 SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

This chapter includes a descriptive summary of the types of diversion programs selected in each city's and the County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) and a list of the types and number of nondisposal facilities, and the jurisdictions they serve, as described in each city's and the County's Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE). Also included is a list of programs which are contained in the SRRE's and HHWE's which could be coordinated on a countywide basis. This chapter is required by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18757.7.

5.2 DESCRIPTION OF SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS' AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS' PROGRAMS

Descriptions of city and county SRRE and HHWE programs, including tasks, responsible entities, and schedules, are presented in Appendix B. Program descriptions for the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) cities, Blythe, and the unincorporated area are shown in Appendices B1 through B15. The Coachella Valley cities' programs are included in the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) program descriptions (Appendix B-16). The SRRE and HHWE programs for the WRCOG cities, Blythe, and the unincorporated area are also summarized in Appendix C. (For more detailed discussions of programs, please consult the individual city and county SRRE's and HHWE's.) Targeted materials for each of the programs are shown in Table SP 5-1.

It should be noted that as of April, 1996, the City of Hemet has not yet prepared a HHWE (due to the California Integrated Waste Management Board [CIWMB] in April, 1996), therefore, no programs have been included in Appendix B. In addition, the City of Murrieta incorporated in November, 1991. Their SRRE and HHWE were due to the CIWMB in March, 1996, but have not been submitted as of August, 1996. Further, the programs in the City of Blythe's Final Draft SRRE and HHWE dated February, 1993 have been included in the Summary Plan, however, in April, 1996, the City resubmitted a revised SRRE and HHWE to the CIWMB for review and approval. (The Blythe documents are on the August, 1996 CIWMB agenda for approval).

It should also be noted that the wide array of programs included in the SRRE's and HHWE's were, for the most part, planned in the early 1990's (1990-1992). Because of changing conditions in waste management and the resulting knowledge gained, some programs may have since been

5	88	æ	82	88	88	- 20	80	×	-	х.	-0	82	82		2	85	83	ю.	25	22	88	2	83	-	82	- 6	80	88	83	88	23	88	22	23	κ.	8.	8	22	82	88	80	20	83	æ	22	- 68	ж.	83	-	22	2
5	88	88	63	80	82	- 55	83	55	88	σ.		83	82	1	25	80	8	20	æ	33	82	Ρ.	28		х.	12	а.	22	81	82	82	88	82	22	20	х.	12	8	12		82	23	23	82	- 22	- 20	R .	22	88	83	e
1	- 3	88	83	88	88	- 33	œ	22	88	8			а.	28	22	57	2	23		х		E.	1	20	22	2	25	а.	83		83		86	13	х.	82	23	23	88	-	е.	20	83	20	- 2	682	12.7	83	88	20	2
6	- 6	82	10	- 22	82	- 22	82	88	-	х.	2	83		22	23	2	- 2	24	č,	25	ά.	ь.	2		86	- 2	0	ς.	83	2	9	22	22	12	25	а.	22	22	53		82	83		88		-33	ю.	20	8.	-65	
5		8	88	88	88	-23	8	88	22	8	51		82		88	ю.	22	2	ь.	8	s	×	8	83	22	88	24	89	89	83	90	88	80	28	8	82	- 3	22	82	88	80	83	-	83	82	88	ю.	88	88	22	
1	22	82	12	87	82	12	22	22	33	82	2	35	88	3	83	EC.	10		6		s		2	æ		22	2	ĸ	88		Υ.	-8			88	е.		82	22	82	67		87	E.	12	23	Ρ.	22	82	89	б
5	-	88	80	88	е.	-0	20	28	- 22		24	22	20	- 23		82	- 24	- 2	8	1				2	- 2	-8			99		ŝ	ъ			22	20	ς.	æ			80		88	88	63	68	88	88	88	28	я
5	63	82	62	88	82	- 22	88	-	-	2		86	82		85	88	22	а	۶.	æ		۰.	24	æ		24	~	х	84	х.	a	æ	22	- 2	88	٤.	2	83	83	-	æ	æ	22	80	83	68	D.	22	80	88	8
ŝ	- 11	8	87	-	82	12	57	1	-3	Ξ.	e	8	8	22		E.	- 6	8	R	x	ĸ		2	8	2	- 1	-	ĸ	91	25	-0	92	83	- 0	8	87	-0	88	æ	- 1	R	8	×	8	23	- 22	88	10	82	-2	2
2		æ	1	- 2	Υ.	- 14	ε.		1	22		2	1	5	8	8	-3	r	68	r	ю.	Υ.	ø	6	ω,	37	х	20	1	×	0	46	-		8	а.	-	æ	88	83	27	5		۰.	22	52	2	97	-	×.	х
2					- 2	20	~			10			-		-	-			•		-			х.	- 64			к.	- 22					-		80		-				-8		- 62	- 22	2.1				~	

C 2 3 4

PROGRAM	TARGETED MATERIAL	MARKETING STRATEGY
Source Reduction	Paper: Corrugated containers, mixed paper, high grade ledger paper Plastics: Film plastic, other Metals: White goods Organics: Yard waste, tires, wood waste, textiles, disposable diapers	Change attitudes which originally resulted in the generation of excess refuse using ambitious education programs that will promote the new approaches to waste management.
Recycling	Aluminum cans, glass, plastics, paper, cardboard, metals	Programs are aimed at the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors for waste diversion. Market coordination and development activities are also included, which will increase the end uses available for recycling.
Composting	Yard waste, sludge, wood, and municipal solid waste	Develop and implement composting programs for residents of Riverside County. Develop markets for the finished compost material. Any composting facilities established will serve both incorporated and unincorporated areas.
Special Wastes	Wood waste, tires, inert solids, liquid waste, and sludge	Ensure proper handling practices and recycle to the maximum extent possible. Deter special wastes from County landfills and from illegal dumping.
Education and Public Information	All types of material	Change practices of residents and businesses by promoting participation in diversion programs and providing continuous public information regarding waste management issues and programs.
Household Hazardous Wastes	Motor oil, household and car batteries, paints, solvents, pesticides, and cleansing agents.	Inform public of proper disposal or recycling practices and promote use of non-hazardous substitutes. Provide collection facilities for residents and information on existing facilities.
deemed inviable and implementation schedules may have changed. Appendix D includes program updates for the WRCOG cities, which were provided by WRCOG, and for the City of Blythe. As of this writing, program updates for the CVAG cities have not been provided, however, current regulations do not require that the Summary Plan include this information. A detailed status of programs should be included in individual jurisdictions' annual reports to the CIWMB.

5.3 SUMMARY OF FACILITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS

Each city and the County were required to prepare an NDFE, which identifies new, expanded, or planned nondisposal facilities in the County and the jurisdictions served by such facilities. Nondisposal facilities include permitted transfer stations, materials recovery facilities, and compost facilities. Table SP 5-2 lists the facilities identified in each city's and the County's NDFE and which jurisdictions use the facilities. It should be noted that the Moreno Valley Transfer Station and MRF has been constructed and the Whitefeather Farms facility has closed.

A jurisdiction that plans to utilize a nondisposal facility that has not already been identified and described in its NDFE must amend its NDFE to include the facility. Prior to the public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment, the city or county shall send a copy of the final draft to the Local Task Force (LTF) for review. Within 90 days of receipt of the final draft NDFE amendment, the LTF must provide written comments to the city or county and the CIWMB regarding the final draft NDFE amendment. The governing body of the jurisdiction shall conduct a public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment. A city must transmit a copy of its NDFE to the county in which it is located for incorporation into the CIWMP within 30 days of its adoption by the city. Copies of the NDFE amendment, along with all of the required supporting documentation, must be submitted to the CIWMB for consideration.

5.4 IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAMS FOR COORDINATION OR CONSOLIDATION ON A COUNTYWIDE BASIS

SRRE/HHWE Programs Identified for Countywide Coordination or Consolidation

The following programs are considered appropriate candidates for coordination or consolidation and implementation as countywide programs, either because they are already being implemented on a countywide basis; they were most often selected for implementation in the individual SRRE's and HHWE's; or because of the nature of the program, they were a logical candidate for countywide implementation. Final program selection will be done in full cooperation and coordination among willing participating jurisdictions through proper arrangements and/or agreements.

								TABLE	SP 5-2	_							
SUN	IMARY	OF FA	CILITIES	S LISTEI	D IN RIV	ERSID	E COUI	NTY ANI	D CITIES	NON .	ISPOS/	AL FACI		EMEN	ITS (ND	FES)	
								FACILITY	NAME								
WRCOG	Anza Transfer	Blythe Transfer	Coachella Valley	Coachella Valley	Eagle Min. Local Waste	ldyllwild Transfer	Mid-County Transfer	Moreno Valley	Murrieta } Transfer	torth County Fransfer	O.M. Scott and Sons Co.	Perris Transfer	Pinon Flats	Recyc. 1 Inc E	ri-Co ransfer	West County (Corona)	Whitefeather Farms E
	Station - P	StationWRF	Transfer Station/MRF - P	Transfer Station/MRF - CF	Receining Facility - P	Station - E	Station/MRF - CF	Transfer Station/MRF - PNC	StationMRF - S	Station/MRF -	Compositing Factifity - E	StationMRF - PNC	Station - E		lation - E	Transfer Station/MRF - P	
Banning		·					60	8			8						
Beaumont				-				8			201	8		m			
Calimesa								8					_				
Canyon Lake							8		8		001	B					
Corona									_	50	æ					<u>6</u>	
Hemet*							8	8			ß	8		8			
Lake Elsinore											8	Ð		B		1	
Moreno Valley								A			60	Ð		8		:	
Murrieta							B		×		ß	B		8			
Norco*	:								-	m	ŝ			8		8	
Perns							B	a			œ	A		8			
Riverside									-	m	m				~		
San Jacinto							8	8			80	8		8			
Temecula							B		B		60	B		8			
CVAG																	
Cathedral City			A or B	A or B													×
Coachella			A or B	A or B													
Desert Hot Spr.		-	A or B	A or B												-	ω
Indian Wells			A or B	A or B										-			8
Indio			A or B	A or B													
La Quinta			ک اور	A or B													
Palm Desert	1		A Or B	A or B					-								œ je
	:																
	1													:	•		<u>0</u> 1
Blythe"	, ,																
UNINCORP. RIV.	4	•	A OF R	A or B	•	•	•	q		4	4	α				4	a
FACILITY	CF CONTINCE	INT FACILITY	PNC PERMITTED	D BUT NOT CONST	RUCTED		40FE		A - WITHIN JURISO	ICTION WITH AT	LEAST 5% DIVER	SION RATE		RUL NHTHU - C	SDICTION WITH	LESS THAN SN DIVER	SION RATE
CATEGORIES. Other Fach Itles IDEN	E - EXISTING F. TIFIED IN CITY	ACUTY	P. PROPOSED				CATEGORIES:		B · OUTSIDE JURS	DICTION WITH A	<u>r LEAST 5% OWE</u>	RSION RATE	J	D. OUTSIDE JU	RISDICTION WIT	HLESS THAN SH DIVI	RSION RATE
The Blythe NDF	E identifie	ad the Palo	Verde Valle	ey Recyclin	g Facility a:	s a Contin	gent facility	r to be local	ed in Blythe								
The Corona and	I Norco NI	DFEs identi	fied Wester	m Waste In	dustries IPI	F and Buy	back Cente	ir and RRF	for Mulching	of Green	and Woody	Wastes as	Existing,	Non-Pern	itted Facili	ties.	
The Hemet ND	E identifi	ed the Hem	net Processi	ing Facility	as a Propos	sed Facilit	y in Hemet										
Source: Riverso	tie County	Waste Res	sources Ma	nagement L	District. Nov	rember 19	94.)		

5-4

Source Reduction Programs

Backyard Composting (Residential Yard Waste Management Program/Master Recycler Composter Program): This program strives to educate the public on how to compost and the uses of compost in order to divert organics (yard, vegetable, and wood wastes) from the landfills.

Accomplishments: Since October 9, 1993, a total of 53 workshops have been held countywide, attracting over 2,300 residents throughout, who have purchased more than 1,900 low-cost composting bins. The Master Composter Program, which began in September, 1994, has had three training classes to date, and has trained 35 volunteers. These volunteers have led many of the above workshops. Total yearly diversion from the program is approaching 650 tons.

Recycling Programs

Telephone Book Recycling: Although not specifically discussed in the SRRE's, the District, several cities, and the COG's have implemented telephone book recycling programs.

Accomplishments: The CVAG coordinated a 1995 Phone Book Recycling Drive with the CVAG cities, the District, GTE, and area waste haulers. The program offered residential curbside recycling of old telephone books, and there were several drop-off sites for businesses located throughout CVAG cities and in the adjoining unincorporated area. Over 46 tons of old phone books were collected for recycling.

In April and May, 1995 and 1996, the District worked with the Cities of Corona, Moreno Valley, Norco, and Riverside, local waste haulers, and Pacific Bell to implement a telephone book recycling program. The program offered residential curbside recycling of old telephone books, as well as drop-off sites for businesses. (Complete tonnage data is not available for this program.)

Composting Programs

Christmas Tree Recycling: This program is a cooperative effort among the County, cities, COG's, and waste haulers to provide advertising and promotion for Christmas tree collection, including drop-off locations and curbside pickups, for residents throughout Riverside County. Collected trees are composted.

Accomplishments: Annually, since 1991, fliers which advertise each city's and hauler's Christmas tree recycling efforts are compiled and distributed during the months of October and November. In 1994, 66.5 tons of Christmas trees were diverted from County landfills, and in 1995, 352 tons were diverted. (Diversion records prior to 1994 are not available.)

Backyard Composting Programs (see Source Reduction Programs)

Education and Public Information Programs

Awards (Recognition Program): This program recognizes businesses and entities throughout the County which have successfully reduced their waste through recycling and source reduction.

Accomplishments: Since 1992, four to six Recycling Awards are given each Spring to businesses and individuals countywide. The recipients are nominated by County residents through an extensive press campaign encouraging nominations. Each recipient is given the award at a Board of Supervisors meeting, and a press release listing the recipients is subsequently distributed to the media.

Household Hazardous Waste Programs

Participation in County Mobile Program: This program utilizes a mobile container which serves as a storage bin to collect and temporarily store the wastes before transporting to an approved storage facility or a site of disposal or recycling.

Accomplishments: Since 1990, the Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch, of the Health Services Agency has implemented mobile household hazardous waste collection events at 11 sites throughout the County. These events are widely publicized, including fliers and press releases. Additionally, two permanent ABOP (Antifreeze, Batteries, Oil, and Paint) Collection Centers have been opened: one in western Riverside County in the unincorporated area of Pedley, and one in the Coachella Valley in the City of Palm Springs. Both ABOP's are open every Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., except holidays and rainy days. The ABOP located in the City of Palm Springs is located at the Palm Springs Fire Department and is a joint effort between the County and the City of Palm Springs.

Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all Household Hazardous Waste (HHW): This program envisions the collection of household hazardous waste at future nondisposal facilities developed within the county or subregion of the county.

Coordination Schedules

As indicated above, there are already several existing programs which are implemented on a countywide basis. Table SP 5-3 lists each of the programs selected for countywide implementation, each program's individual tasks, the agency responsible for coordination, and the estimated implementation schedule. Please note that the planned responsible agencies and implementation schedules are from the cities' and County's SRRE's and HHWE's. Actual responsible agencies, implementation dates, and schedules may have since been revised. Updates should be provided in the cities' and County's Annual Reports.

TABLE SP 5--3 SRRE/HHWE SCHEDULE FOR COORDINATION OF COUNTYWIDE PROGRAMS

	RESPONSIBLE	
PROGRAM/TASK	AGENCY	TIME FRAME
Backyard Composting		Ongoing Program
1. Investigate equipment requirements and costs	RCWRMD	1992
associated with backyard composting and not	RCSWMAC/LTF	
bagging grass clippings.	LEA	
2. Determine parameters of program.	AO	1992
3. Determine region(s) in the unincorporated	Printing	1992
area for implementing initial pilot programs.		
4. Design public education/information for		1992
initial pilot programs.		
5. Present pilot backyard composting/not		1992
bagging grass clipping programs to		
RCSWMAC/LTF for approval.		
6. Present pilot programs to BOS for		1992
consideration and approval.		
7. Promote pilot programs in chosen area(s).		1993
8. Implement pilot programs.		1993
9. Monitor pilot programs.]	1993
10. Evaluate and design public education program.		1993
11. Expand program.		1994
12. Monitoring.]	1995-2000
Master Recycler Composter Program		Ongoing Program
1. Determine parameters of program.	RCWRMD	1994
2. Compile/design MRC program training	LEA	1994
manual/classes.	Cities/Agencies	
3. Compile public information materials.	AO	1994
4. Investigate city/agency interest in program	Printing	1994
participation.		
5. Investigate locations for demonstration sites.		1994
6. Acquire any necessary approvals (BOS, City		1994
Agency, etc.) and negotiate agreements for		
locations of demonstration sites.	_	
7. Begin work on demonstration sites and		1994
acquire necessary program supplies/materials.		
8. Recruit volunteers for MRC program and		1995
begin training.	_	
9. Begin MRC outreach to the public.		1995
10. Monitor program.		1995
11. Expand program.		1995-1996
12. Monitoring.		1996-2000

TABLE SP 5–3 (continued)		
	RESPONSIBLE	
PROGRAM/TASK	AGENCY	TIME FRAME
Christmas Tree Recycling		Ongoing Program
1. Evaluate pilot program.	RCWRMD	1991
2. Redesign program based on pilot program.	Cities	1991
3. Meet with dept. personel and cities to	AO	1991
coordinate the program.	Printing	
4. Investigate whether area compost facilities		1991
can utilize the material.		
5. Agreement with a vendor to grind the trees.		1991
6. Set up grinding site.		1991
7. Meet with private haulers.		1991
8. Contact tree lots.		1991
9. Design and implement public education		1991
campaign.		
10. Print and distribute flyers.		1991
11. Implement the program.	-	1991
12. End of annual program.		1992
Awards (Recognition Program)		Ongoing Program
1. Determine categories for recognition.	RCWRMD & PES	1993
2. Determine time of year for presentation.		1993
3. Determine judging body.	-	1993
4. Determine methods by which to publicize the		1993
program.		
5. Monitoring.		1993-2000
Participation in County Mobile Program		Ongoing Program
1. Service each of the Supervisorial Districts	RCWRMD	1990-2000
at least once per year.	НМВ	
Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all HHW		
1. All RFP's distributed for MRF operation/	RCWRMD	1992
ownership will specify that all types of HHW will	Cities	
be accepted from residents.		
2. Contractors selected for each MRF will develop		1992 ongoing until
permanent HHW facilities at the MRF.		completion
3. Monitoring.		1993 at least annually

SOURCE: Cities' and County's SRRE's and HHWE's

Legend to Abbreviations

AO: Riverside County Administrative Office

BOS: Board of Supervisors

HHW: Household Hazardous Wastes

HMB: Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Agency

LEA: Local Enforcement Agency of Riverside County

MRC: Master Recycler Composter

MRF: Materials Recovery Facility

PES: Public Education Subcommittee of the Local Task Force

RCSWMAC/LTF: Riverside County Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force

RCWRMD: Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (formerly known as the Waste Management Department

RFP: Request for Proposal

Programs Which Have Been Undertaken Through Coordination or Consolidation at the Subcounty Level

The CVAG jurisdictions identified many programs to implement in the jointly prepared Coachella Valley SRRE. Some were identified as programs for which individual jurisdictions would be responsible, and others were identified to be undertaken regionally. It has been the intent to coordinate selected programs through CVAG, using resources from a variety of sources to carry out the tasks necessary. The rationale for designating programs for regional action was that some programs were required to be undertaken by all jurisdictions, and economies of scale and efficiencies could be achieved through a regional approach in those cases where coordination made sense (i.e. public education programs and transfer station development). Other programs, for which the individual jurisdiction. A summary of the CVAG programs identified in the SRRE programs can be found in Appendix B-16.

Although the WRCOG jurisdictions' SRRE's were individually prepared, the cities have worked jointly through WRCOG on a number of programs and projects in order to achieve economies of scale and to reach maximum efficiency. The WRCOG has or is currently implementing or providing member jurisdictions with assistance in the implementation of the following programs: Household Hazardous Waste; Special Wastes; Business Waste Reduction Training; Market Development; Curbside Recycling; Greenwaste Collection; Metallic Discards; Waste Reduction Awards; Exhibits; and Media Campaigns, including brochures, flyers, cable and radio spots, bumper stickers, magnets, and newspaper advertisements.

Chapter 6

FINANCING OF COUNTYWIDE PROGRAMS

6.1 SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

This chapter provides cost estimates for countywide and regional programs and summarizes funding and revenue sources. This chapter is required by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18758.

6.2 FINANCING OF COUNTYWIDE PROGRAMS

There are several sources of funds which were identified in the Riverside County Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) for planning, operating, and monitoring the programs selected for countywide implementation:

- revenues from landfill disposal fees and MRF tipping fees;
- contributions from jurisdictions participating in countywide programs. (These funds may originate from franchise fees, general funds, or other sources at the discretion of each jurisdiction);
- grants and loans from state or other agencies; and
- private funds.

Any programs that will be funded with grants, loans, and participating jurisdictions' contributions will necessarily involve establishing written agreements between all participating jurisdictions which detail financial, administrative, and programmatic responsibilities.

Costs and revenue sources for programs selected for countywide coordination or consolidation are summarized in Table SP 6-1.

6.3 FINANCING OF CITY/COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

City programs and programs coordinated by WRCOG and CVAG are also funded by many sources. Programs may be funded by a combination of franchise fees; general funds; grants and loans from state and other agencies; private funds; and District funds.

COSTS AND REVENUE	TABLE SOURCES	SP 6-1 FOH COUNTYWIDE PROD	HANS
PROGRAM	START DATE	PROGRAM COST (\$): START-UP/ANNUAL	REVENUE SOURCES
Backyard Composting (Residential Yard Waste/ Master Composter Program)	1992	RYW: \$158,0000-\$606,300/ \$97,200-\$373,300 MCP: \$378,900/78,800	RCWRMD Funds LEA Funds City/Agency Funds Grants Private Funds
Christmas Tree Recycling	1991	\$4,300/\$4,300	RCWRMD Funds City/Agency Funds Private Funds
Awards (Recognition Program)	1993	\$1,620/\$1,620	RCWRMD Funds
Participation in County Mobile Program	1990	*	HMB Funds RCWRMD Funds
Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all Household Hazardous Wastes	1992	\$135,000-\$185,000/ \$1,100,000	MRF Contractor/MRF Tipping Fees
Source: Cities' and County's SRRE's and	HHWE's.		

Notes:

For each bin sold in the Backyard Composting Program, an estimated 750 lbs. per household per year is diverted from the landfill * Costs not provided in HHWE, however, the HHWE indicates \$0.50 per ton is allocated to household hazardous waste programs. (per Judith Friedman, Manager, Office of Local Assistance, CIWMB, Correspondence dated 12/22/93; Michael Schier, Solid Waste Planning Manager, Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Correspondence dated July 26, 1993).

Legend of Abbreviations:

HMB: Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency LEA: Local Enforcement Agency of Riverside County

MCP: Master Composter Program

MRF: Materials Recovery Facility

RCWRMD: Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (formerly known as the Waste Management Department) RYW: Residential Yard Waste Program

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS GOVERNING ANNEXATION INTO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

SUT TITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOT Y OF RIVERSIDE. STATE OF CALIFOR CD



FROM: Waste Resources Management District SUBMITTAL DATE: August 16, 1994

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding between the Coachella Valley Association of Governments and the Western Riverside Council of Governments Governing City Annexation into the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

- Approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the Coachella Valley Association of 1. Governments and the Western Riverside Council of Governments Governing City Annexation into the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District: and
- Authorize the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to execute the agreement. 2.

BACKGROUND:

On April 26, 1994 the Riverside County Board of Supervisors approved the establishment of the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District). This action was taken after many discussions with the cities and Councils of Governments (COG's) regarding the structure of the new District. (commund)

pert A. Nelson, Chief Executive Officer

FINANCIAL DATA: CURRENT YEAR COST S N/A NET COUNTY COST S N/A

ANNUAL COST S N/A IN CURRENT YEAR BUDGET: YES/ NO/ BUDGET ADJUSTMENT: YES/ NO/ FOR FY:

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

C.A.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE.

Administrative Officer Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Ayes: Buster, Ceniceros, Larson and Younglove Noes: None Gerald Absent: Dunlap Clerk August 16, 1994 Date: By: Waste Resources Management District, xc: Co.Co., Dist. ENDA NO. Prev. Agn. ref. 10 **3** 31

FORM 11 (Rev 7/93)

F11 - Memorandum of Understanding between the Coachella Valley Association of Governments and the Western Riverside Council of Governments Governing City Annexation into the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District August 16, 1994 Page 2

One of these discussions was the process by which cities could join the District. During the formation process, none of the cities were interested in joining the District. While the cities still seem ambivalent at this time about whether they may want to become members in the future, they want to establish a process for annexations.

The attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) provides a reasonable process by which a majority of the cities could join the District. The Waste Resources Management District Board of Directors would subsequently reorganize, consistent with existing State law, to reflect city participation. The COG's and the County may also consider the appropriateness of requests for annexation that do not constitute a majority of the population.

The Executive Committee of Western Riverside Council of Governments approved the MOU in March of 1994. The Coachella Valley Association of Governments approved it on July 25, 1994. It is now appropriate for the Board of Supervisors and the District Board of Directors to approve this document.

MIS:ng

Attachment

cc: CAO County Counsei

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Whereas, the County of Riverside desires to establish a Sanitation District (District) to assume control and responsibility for the operations of landfills and other disposal facilities which serve the Cities of Riverside County; and

Whereas, the Cities of Riverside County have agreed to the formation of this district with the understanding that the initial governing body of the district will be the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County; and

Whereas, the Board of Supervisors and the Cities of Riverside County seek to insure proper input into the policy decisions of the district from the Cities of Riverside County; and

Whereas, the Board of Supervisors and the Cities of Riverside County seek to establish an agreement which will guide the process of annexations into the Sanitation District should Cities seek to participate in the future; now, therefore

It is agreed that the following procedures shall be incorporated into the record of the LAFCO action establishing the sanitation district, and shall be utilized to guide the actions of the Board of the Sanitation District:

- 1. The Board of the Sanitation District shall utilize the Executive Committees of the Western Riverside Council of Governments and the Coachella Association of Governments (COGs) as policy advisory boards and shall submit all significant policy and major fiscal matters including the establishment of fees and charges for the landfills, to the Executive Committee prior to taking action to allow the input of all Cities within Riverside County. It is agreed by all that this will take place in a timely manner.
- 2. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the Sanitation District Board, agrees to accept, and the COG Executive Committees agree to support, the annexation or reorganization of Cities into the Sanitation District upon adoption of Resolutions of Application to Join the District from a sufficient number of Cities representing a majority of the incorporated population within Riverside County. The Board of Directors of the District shall be reorganized to reflect Cities' participation consistent with existing State law. In the event an annexation containing a majority of the incorporated population occurs, the Board of Supervisors and the Executive Committees of the COGs agree to support the annexation of any other City which subsequently adopts and submits a Resolution of Application to Join the District.

- 3. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the Sanitation District Board agree to consider all requests for annexation or reorganization which do not meet this majority criteria identified in number 2 and to consult with all the Cities to determine if the annexation and/or reorganization which would result is appropriate. The Board of Supervisors agrees to support annexations or reorganizations which have the positive endorsement of the Executive Committees if the vote of all the Cities indicate two-thirds of the Cities concur.
- 4. The Board of Supervisors and the COGs agree that existing State law regarding governance issues of the Sanitation Districts may not best serve the Cities and the County of Riverside if annexation occurs. Accordingly, not later than a proposed annexation, the Board of Supervisors and the COG's will review existing legislation regarding the governance of the proposed new District boundary and will agree to support special legislation regarding the governance of the proposed new District boundary and will agree to support special legislation regarding the governance of the proposed new District boundary.
- 5. The Board of Supervisors and the COGs anticipate the Board of Directors of the District, when formed, will enter into a similar Memorandum of Understanding with the COGs.

It is agreed by the Board of Supervisors and the Cities that they will work together to insure the successful operation of the landfill and disposal facilities to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Sanitation District and shall establish agreements which will define reasonable and appropriate methods to achieve that goal.

This agreement Executed this _//e_ day of _____, 1994

Chair, Board of Supervisors Riverside County

ener el

Chair Executive Committee Western Riverside Council of Governments

AUG 1 6 1994 ATTEST: GERALD A. MAI

Kay Mennas

Chair, Riverside County Waste Management Resources District

Chair/Executive Committee Coachella Valley Association of Governments

stillar 3.31

A-4



COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

- County of Riverside & Cities of:
- Catheorai City
 Coacheila
 Oesert Hot Sonings
 Indian Wells
 Indio
 La Quinta
 Palm Desert
- · Palm Sorings · Rancho Mirage

July 14, 1994

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO:

Diana Beck, Director of Planning FROM:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING-SANITATION DISTRICT RE:

ISSUE:

The attached Memorandum of Understanding formalizes agreements reached during discussions of the Sanitation District formation. The MOU now needs to be formalized.

RECOMMENDATION:

- THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REVIEW AND COMMENT 1. UPON THE PROPOSED MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING. AND
- THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE 2. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING, AND
- THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR OF 3. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO EXECUTE THE MEMORANDIM OF UNDERSTANDING ON BEHALF OF CVAG.

BACKGROUND:

The CVAG Executive Committee agreed to support the establishment of a Waste Resources District in the unincorporated County. As part of the formation discussion. Cities raised concerns that a mechanism be in place that would describe how the district would function, and specifically what process would be used if Cities decide to join the District at a later time. The attached Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared based on discussions of those issues, and submitted to LAFCO as part of the formation application. WRCOG and CVAG are being asked to endorse and approve the MOU. The Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and approved the MOU, and recommend that the Executive Committee approve it, at the July 8 meeting. PLEASE NOTE ADDITIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE MOU WHICH WERE MADE AFTER THE TAC ACTION. THE ADDITIONS ARE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES.

Date: March 24, 1994

Agenda Item: III-B

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS STAFF TRANSMITTAL

- TO: Executive Committee
- FR: A.J. Wilson, Executive Director
- BY: Joyce Marshall, WRCOG Associate
- RE: Annexation MOU The Waste Resources Management District

ISSUE: The need to establish a mechanism to address City Annexation into the Waste Resources Management District (District).

BACKGROUND: The Executive Committee agreed to support the County's proposal to establish a Sanitation District for the Unincorporated portions of Riverside County. The Executive Committee's approval was conditioned on two factors. First the District formation must include a mechanism to address City Annexation into the District. The second was developing a mechanism to insure City input regarding the establishment of policies for the District.

Currently none of the cities in Western Riverside County have indicated a desire to be included in the proposed District. This situation could change at some point in the future. Some cities may wish to become part of the District, while others may not. If one or more cities joined, the governance structure would then have to be altered. The process for decision making regarding City annexation needs to be agreed upon and put in place through an appropriate mechanism such as an MOU.

CVAG's Executive Committee took the position that the bylaws and other organizational documents creating the District shall contain a provision which states that the Governing Board of the District (which is the Board of Supervisors for Riverside County) will not be changed without notification of, and approval by, the Cities in Riverside County.

The Solid Waste Sub-Committee of the TAC met several times in to resolve the this issue. The committee has developed the attached MOU to address the issue of cities annexing into the proposed Waste Resource Management District and City input into the development of policies for the District.

Requested Action:

Recommend the Executive Committee approve the attached MOU regarding the Cities annexation into the District and City input into the development of policies for the District.

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIONS OF CITIES' AND COUNTY'S SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT (SRRE) AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT (HHWE) SELECTED PROGRAMS

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

CITY OF BANNING

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B1

	Table SOURCE REDUCTION P	: B1-1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Adoption of Local Ordinances	City Manager's Office City Representative	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	December 1992	\$ 2,000
		Adopt mandates for waste evaluations. Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	July 1993	\$2,500
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium-term.	July 1994-Ongoing	Included above
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	City Manager's Office City Representative	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	March 1994	\$1,500-2,000
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	March 1995	\$2,000-3,500
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	1996-Ongoing	Incl. Above
Public Recognition	City Manager's Office City Representative	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	September 1994	000'1\$-005\$
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program	September 1995	N/A

BA-4/Revised: August 31, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

		 								
	Annual Costs	See Sec. 8	N/A	VIN	V /N			\$2,500	N/A	V/Z
	Schedule	June 1992	Ongoing	June 1993	June 1993	June 1994	June 1997	July 1992	July 1994	July 1997
81-1 ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Use double sided copiers	Encourage non-confidential single-sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.	Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.
Table B SOURCE REDUCTION P	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Departments	City Representative					City Manager's Office City Representative		
	Program	Efficient Use of Paper in City Department						Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping		

1 million 1 million 1 million

	Table I SOURCE REDUCTION PI	B1-1 ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
	Waste Hauler Solid Waste Facilities City Manager's Office City Representative	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	September 1992	\$ 500/year
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	July 1997	٨/٨
e kaging	City Manager's Office City Representative	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored.	June 1992	\$ 500/year
		Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	September 1993	N/A
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	VIN

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-4/Revised: August 31, 1992

B1-3

.

	Tab SOURCE REDUCTION PI	le B1-1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	City Manager's Office City Representative	Inform businesses of funds available from the Department of Conservation.	September 1992	N/A
		Educate groups of the availability of funds.	September 1992	N/A
		Establish a special fund for loans and grants for businesses to help them implement source reduction programs.	September 1994	\$500/ycar
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	January 1995	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Business License Fee Modification	City Manager's Office City Representative	Evaluate whether modified business license fees are necessary, according to the participation level of businesses.	September 1993	\$ 2,500
		Monitor and Evaluate participation and effectiveness of program.	January 1995	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during redium-term.	June 1997	N/A

	Table B: source reduction P	1-1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Waste Evaluations	City Manager's Office	Implement a waste evaluation program.	September 1993	\$12,000-\$15,000
	Uny representative Waste Hauler	Report results of the program annually. Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of	1994-Ongoing	N/A
		program. Monitor and evaluate program for	September 1995	N/A
	Υ.	participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	٧/N
Support for Onsite Composting	City Manager's Office City Representative	Provide information and technical assistance to help establish on-site composting.	1994- Ongoing	\$4,000-\$3,000
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	City Manager's Office City Representative	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction programs.	1994- Ongoing	\$2,000-\$3,000
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	V/N
1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			Ē	4.4/Revised: August 31, 199.

	Table SOURCE REDUCTION	B1-1 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Non-Procurement Programs	City Manager's Office City Representative	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.	July 1992	\$1,000-\$2,500
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1996	V/N

.

BA-5/Revised: August 31, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	TION	Annual Schedute Costs	lers and assess 1992-Ongoing 1,000 - 4,000 orting system	rce. Develop 1993-Ongoing See Sec. 8 ampaign to tified ers to identify on of facilities Monitor	ad recyclers as 1996-Ongoing See Sec. 4 ncy of am.	plement 1997 N/A
1401	RECYCLING PROC	Responsible Entity	Certified Recyclers City Manager's Office City Representative			
		Program	Certified Recycling Center Promotion			

Table B1-1

IENTATION	asks Schedule Costs	<pre>family curbside 1992-Ongoing \$171,360-\$181,136 n</pre>	luate effectiveness in 1993 - 1995 \$2,000/ycar mg period. Consider for mixed refuse	chosen during short-	nmance during nning period.	cycling program 1993-Ongoing \$16,130-\$16,990	uate effectiveness in 1993-1995 \$500/year ag period	nedium-term 1996-2000 N/A	efficiency in medium- nod.
Table B1-1 RECYCLING PROGRAM IMPLEN CITY OF BANNING	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office Implement Sing Waste Hauler City Representative	Monitor and Ev short-term plans necessity of MR during medium-	Monitor progra	Re-evaluate per medium-term pl	City Manager's Office Implement MF Waste Hauler Waste Hauler MRF Operators	City Representative Monitor and evi short-term plan	Monitor during	Assess diversion term planning p
	Program	Single family commingled curbside recycling				Multi-family recycling			

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-5/Revised: August 31, 1992

FINAL		Annual Costs	۷/N	See SF program		N/A	N/A	\$173,138 - \$176,120	\$1,500/ycar		
		Schedule	6661-2661	1993-Ongoing	5661-5661	1995	1993-1994	1994-1995	1994-1995	1996-2000	661
B1-1	RAM IMPLEMENTATION DF BANNING	Tasks	Identify IPF facility feasible for short- term needs. Establish agreement through/with waste hauler for use of facility	Process residential wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term planning period	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Identify MRF for use in short-term and medium-term	Process MF, commercial/ industrial through short-term	Monitor and evaluate	Process all waste streams through MRF during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.
Table	RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office Waste Hauler Facility Operators City Representative								
		Program	Processing through Facility (IPF and MRF)								

FINAL		Annual Costs	See IPF/MRF	4,000	See IPF/MRF	000,1	N/A	See IPF/MRF	Stee Sec. 8
		Schedule	1992	1992	6661	1993-Ongoing	5661	1993-2000	1996 - 2000
B1-1	RAM IMPLEMENTATION JF BANNING	Tasks	Accomplish facility identification (see IPF/MRF)	Form agreement with waste hauler	Begin recycling programs.	Organize Public Agency department recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Require reporting from hauler and monitor programs.	Evaluate programs to improve performance on annual basis.
l'able l	RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Employees, City Department Heads City Manager City Council	Waste Hauler	Facility Operators				
		Program	ofic Agency mmercial and Industrial voling Programs						

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-5/Revised: August 31, 1992

FINAL		Annual Costs	V/N	V/N	N/A	1,000	See Sec. 8	V/N	See Sec. 4	V X
		Schedule	6661 - 1 661	1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1992-Ongoing	1992 - 1993	1994	1993 - 1995	1996 - 2000
B1-1	AM IMPLEMENTATION F BANNING	Tasks	Develop dialogue among County, other cities, and Lake Elsinore to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Implement salvaging improvements. Monitor and reaseess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Lake Elsinore. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance and improvement measures.
Table	RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	Recycling Coordinator County Lucal Task Force Public Works Department City Manager City Council			City Manager's Office Riverside County County Local Task Force City Representative				
		Program	Salvaging			Other Programs (Tire recycling)				

1901 Kleinfelder, Inc. All Rights Reserved

BA-5/Revised: August 31, 1992

- -- --

FINAL		Annual Costs	1,000	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	1,000 N/A	
		Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992-Ongoing	1996-Ongoing	1993-Ongoing 1993-2000	
1-1	XAM IMPLEMENTATION JF BANNING	Tasks	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually.	Evaluate City procurement policies to increase recycled material use. Assist industry, businesses and hauler in obtaining markets for recycled materials through programs such as CALMAX, etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of effectiveness of marketing for materials recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- and medium-term, annually.	
Table B	RECYCLING PROGI	Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers City Manager's Office City Representative			Waste Hauler Industries in City City Manager's Office City Representative	
		Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs			Markets for Recyclable Materials	

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-5/Revised: August 31, 1992

FINAL		Annual Costs	lycar	<u></u>						
			\$200	V/N	A/A		\$500	V/N	\$500	N/A
		Schedule	1994 - Ongoing	1994-Ongoing	0961 MiM	1996 - Ongoing	5661 P!W	1996 - Onguing	1994 - Ongoing	7991 MiM
B1-1	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Tasks	Establish - promote policy to offer incentives to landscapers/gardeners for voluntary delivery of yard wastes to selected processing facility or drop-off area	Develop long term marketing contracts and identify end users	Evaluate program effectiveness and ascertain whether mandatory collection will be necessary	Monitor and evaluate during medium- term	Enter into a memorandum of agreement with a selected facility for processing	Deliver yard wastes through the collection program to the facility	Develop markets for use of compost products	Monitor and evaluate program in complement to the delivery program during medium term
Table	COMPOSTING PROGRAM	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Representative Gardeners and Landscapers				City Manager's Office City Council I andscarres/Gardeners	Private Facility Operator		
		Program	Yard Waste Delivery/Drop-Off Program				Privately Operated Compost/Co- Compost Program at Municipal, Inrichicitional or Privata Eacility			

	Land area with the states	ble B1–1		
	STECIAL WASTE FRUGRAM	I IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	2	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Waste Management Department City Manager's Office	Support County Diversion Program	July 1992	Included in County Tipping Fees
	City Representative	Monitor program during short-term	1992-Ongoing	(shredding only) N/A
		Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	1994	N/A
		Monitor program during medium-term	1996-Ongoing	N/A
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	City Manager's Office Construction Waste Haulers Solid Waste Facilities Descritises	Work with construction waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs.	December 1992	\$ 2,000
		Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	December 1993	YIN
		Require diversion to begin	December 1993	(assume \$20/ton)
		Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1993	V/N
		Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1993-Ongoing	V/N

BAN-7/Revised: August 31, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL		Annual Costs	Included in disposal tees for white goods at the facility	N/A	Not implemented in short term.	N/A
	व्य	Schedule	July 1992	1992-Ongoing	1993	9661
	1 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	Tasks	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	Work with the County and Water District in developing a studge composting facility.	Implement in medium-term if feasible.
	SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM	Responsible Entity	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager's Office	Solid Waste Facility Managers	Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager's Office	City Representative Banning Wastewater Treatment Facility
		Program	White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities		Development of a Sludge Composting Facility	

Table B1-1

·

	NGRI.	e B1-1		FINAL
	CITY OF BANNING - SOURCE REI UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL MATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	LEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Designation of a City Designee/Representative	City Manager's Office would designate a representative	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.	January 1992	\$22,000 plus 40 % benefits, overhead
		Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.		
		Prioritize programs.		
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.		
		Monitor and evaluate performance on annual basis	1992 - 2000	N/A
Develop Public Information Resources	City Manager's Office City Representative	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials.	1992 - Ongoing Distribute information to a minimum of 50%	\$ 2,000 per year
		Insert into utility bills or make into door hangers. Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber	of businesses and residents within the first year (by January 1992) and 50% the next year	
		or commerce. Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium term	.(ceel granner ga) 1994 - 1997	VIN

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-8/Revised: August 31, 1992

FINAL		Annual Costs	Materials Printing Advertising \$500 - 1,000	V/N	Materials Printing Distribution \$1,000 - 1,500 N/A
	EMENT HEDULE	Schedule	July 1992 - Ongoing	1994, 1997	January 1993 - Ongoing 1994, 1997
	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL	Tasks	Meet regularly with various groups. Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.	Monitor and evaluate program in short- and medium-term.	Develop monthly newsletter. Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices. Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.
1001	ITY OF BANNING - SOURCE REI BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Representative Block Leaders		City Manager's Office City Representative
	PU PU	Program	Community Group Outreach		Establish a City Recycling Newsletter

Table B1-1
	Table	B1-1		FINAL
, M	DELIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL ATION IMPLEMENTATION SC	EMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Establish a Public Information Center	City Manager's Office City Representative	Ensure information is readily available.	9661	Materials Printing
		Advertise the center's use.		Distribution Description
		Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center.		Space \$2,500 - 3,000
		Monitor and evaluate program.	8661	N/A
Business Training Sessions	City Manager's Office	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	1993 - Ongoing	Materials
		Develop and distribute a recycling guide.		Awards Recycling Bins
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.		Signs \$2,100 - 3,000 per session w/3 sessions
		Initiate an awards program.		per ycar
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA-8/Revised: August 31, 1992

				FINAL
	CITY OF BANNING - SOURCE REI UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	DUCTION AND RECYCLING ELI IATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	EMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Develop a Media Campaign	City Manager's Office City Representative	Develop a recycling logo.	July 1992 - develon loso	Materials Printing
	Certified Recyclers	Distribute publicity materials.		Distribution
		Create and distribute a press packet.	distribute various	Press Pauket
		Develop brochuces and pamphlets.		1993
		Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	Ongoing media program.	\$1,000 in 1994 and 1995
		Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
Spring Clean Up	City Manager's Office City Representative Waste Hauler	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program.	January 1993	\$500 - 1,000
		Prepare and distribute information on the program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A

Table B1-1

	Table	B1-1		FINAL
	CITY OF BANNING - SOURCE REU	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL	EMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Designate a School Recycling Coordinator	School District City Manager's Office	Organize a recycling program at school.	September 1992	Speakers' fees Materials
		Choose curriculum.		Printing
		Monitor the effectiveness of the program.		
		Initiate an in-house service training session for school's staff.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			8V B	8/Revised: August 31, 1992

-

-**1**

FINAL		Annual Costs	Materials Printing	Distribution Awards Advertising	000'7 000'10		<u></u>	7 <u></u>	N/A	Curriculum 61 000 - 3 000		N/A
	LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	September 1993						1994, 1997	1995 -Ongoing		1995, 1998
1-1	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL	Tasks	Create a recycling theme or logo.	Develop displays and exhibits with student-created materials to be placed around the community.	Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin.	Distribute bulletin to parents.	Initiate an awards program.	Promote schools progress with local media.	Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	Choose a recycling curriculum.	Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress.	Monitor and evaluate program.
Table B	ITY OF BANNING - SOURCE REU BLJC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	School Recycling Coordinator Recycling Council	City Manager's Office City Representative						School Recycling Coordinator Drinning	Curriculum Council Recycling Committee	
	PL	Program	Develop a Recycling Program for							Recycling Curriculum		

þ **T**

N PROGRAMS	Comments	Program began in February of 1990	Program began in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health.
2 OUS WASTE COLLECTIC	1990 Diversion from County Landfills*	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247**	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668
Table B1-5 ISTING HOUSEHOLD HAZARD	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Department	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health
SUMMARY OF EX	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	One-Day Events	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BA/Revised: August 31, 1992

FINAL

Table B1-3

Included in landfill Included in refuse collection fees Annual Costs tipping fees ٧N 1992 - Ongoing Schedule 1992-Ongoing **HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE** 1994 1994 1994 1992 1994 1994 Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Banning. Advertise and promote the Roundup(s) Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Roundup(s) and obtaining all necessary approvals preparing all applications, manifests, Assist the County in advertising the Mobile Collection Center. Inland Disposal will responsible for Evaluate the feasibility of siting a Select date(s) of Roundup Day(s) permanent collection center. Conduct the Roundup(s) Tasks for the Roundup(s) **Responsible Entity** Franchise Waste Hauler City Solid Waste Representative Inland Disposal City Solid Waste Representative Riverside County Staff City Solid Waste Representative **County Mobile Collection Center** Residential Hazardous Waste Roundup Day(s) City Deregulated HHW Collection Center Program

BA/Revised: August 31, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CITY OF BEAUMONT

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B2

FINAL		Costs			bove	2,000		3,500	000	
		Annua	\$2,000	\$2,500	Included a	\$1,500 -		\$2,000 -	1\$-005\$	V/N
		Schedule	December 1992	July 1993	July 1994-Ongoing	March 1994	March 1995	1996-Ongoing	September 1994	September 1995
	B2-1 ogram implementation	And the second	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	Adopt mandates for waste evaluations. Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium- term.	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program
	Table source reduction pr	Responsible Entity	Planning Department City Manager			Planning Department City Manager			City Manager	
		Program	Adoption of Local Ordinances			Solid Waste Reduction Plans			Public Recognition	

-

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

Be-4A/Revised: August 24, 1992

FINAL	IATION	Schedule Annual Costs	June 1992 See Section 8	single-sided June 1992 N/A ch paper.	nts to to June 1993 N/A tened,	ats to utgoing June 1993 N/A ith the	veness of June 1994	m for ss during June 1997	landscape July 1992 \$2,500 o use	iveness of Jufy 1994 N/A	m for July 1997 N/A ss during	
	Table B2-1 source reduction program impleme	Responsible Entity Tasks	City Manager With the stated copiers	City Department City Department material to be reused as s	Encourage all City depart analyze their business for determine if any can be sl combined, or discontinue	Encourage all City depart unalyze their incoming an mail lists on a yearly basi intent of reducing their si	Monitor and Evaluate eff program.	Monitor and evaluate pro participation and effective modium-term.	City Manager Planning Department plans submitted to the Cidrant drough resistant plants.	Monitor and Evaluate eff program.	Monitor and evaluate pro participation and effective modium-term.	
		Program	Efficient Use of Paper	In City Department					Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping			

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

•

ار						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
FINAI		Amual Costs	\$500/ycar	N/A	NIA	\$500/ycar	VIN	N/A	N /N
		Schedule	September 1992	June 1994	1997 July 1997	June 1992	September 1993	June 1994	June 1997
	82-1 kogram implementation	Tasks	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored.	Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.
	Table I source reduction pr	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler Solid Waste Facilities			City Manager Planning Department			
		Program	Referral System for White Goods			Support for State and Federal Packaging Laws			

-

B2-3

	Tabl source reduction P	e B2-1 rogram implementation		FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	City Manager Planning Department	Inform businesses of funds available from the Department of Conservation.	September 1992	N/A
	City Manager	Educate groups of the availability of funds.	September 1992	V/N
		Establish a special fund for loans and grants for businesses to help them implement source reduction programs.	September 1994	\$500/year
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	January 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	Y/N
Business License Fee Modification	City Manager	Evaluate whether modified business license fees are necessary, according to the participation level of businesses.	September 1993	\$2,500
		Monitor and Evaluate participation and effectiveness of program.	January 1995	N/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	V /N
1000 Klin fitte 1 All Dictor				

Be-4A/Revised: August 24, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Tal source reduction pr	ole B2-1 kogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Amual Costs
Waste Evaluations	Planning Department	Implement a waste evaluation program.	September 1993	\$12,000-\$15,000
	Uity Manager . Waste Hauler	Report results of the program annually.	1004 Oraciaa	
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of	1994-Ungoung	VN
		program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for		
		medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Support for	Planning Department	Provide information and technical	1994- Ongoing	\$4,000-\$3,000
Onsite Composting	City Manager County Extension	assistance to help establish on-site composting.		(Higher cost first year due to set up.)
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for	June 1997	N/A
		participation and effectiveness during medium-term.		
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	Planning Department City Manager	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction programs.	1994- Ongoing	\$2,000-\$3,000
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during	June 1997	V/N
Parameter States Based			Å	IA/Revieed: August 24, 1992

FINAT

,

.

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

14/00/14/10/00/14/10/00/14/14	à			1991 Kleinfelder Inc All Richts Reserved
N/A	June 1996	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.		
N/A	June 1994	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.		
\$1,000-\$2,000	July 1992	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.	City Manager Planning Department	Non-Procurement Programs
Annual Costs	Schedule	Tasks	Responsible Entity	Program
		ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	SOURCE REDUCTION PR	
		le B2-1	Tabl	
FINAL				

.

4

1 Ż

TUTT	al s	53 , 536 l/mo)			160	<u> </u>		
	Annu Cost	\$102,360-\$2 (assume \$2/houschold	\$2,000/yr	N/A	\$21,960-\$26	\$500/yr	N/A	N/A
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1993- 1995	1997	1993-Ongoing	1993-1995	1996-2000	1997
e B2-1 kam implementation · beaumont	Tasks	Implement Single family curbside recycling program	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period. Consider necessity of MRF for mixed refuse during medium-term	Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.	fuplement MF recycling program	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Monitor during medium-term	Assess diversion efficiency in medium- term planning period.
Tabl RECYCLING PROGN	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler			City Manager Waste Hauler MRF Operators			
	Program	Single family commingled curbside recycling			Multi-family recycling through a MRF			

.

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

Be-5/Revised: August 24, 1992

B2-7

LINAL	Annual Costs	V/N	See Single Family Curbside Program	N/A	N/A	V/N	See individual programs	N/A
	Schedule	£661-2661	1993-Ongoing	1993-1995	1995	1993	1994-2000	1995-1997
ble B2–1 ram implementation f beaumont	Tasks	Identify IPF facility feasible for short- term needs. Establish agreement through/with waste hauler for use of facility	Process residential wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term planning period	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	ldentify MRF for use in short-term and medium-term	Process public agency, MRF, commercial and industrial waste streams through MRF during medium-term and short term.	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.
Ta RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler Facility Operators						
	Program	Processing through Facility (IPF and MRF)						

,

Be-5/Revined: August 24, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - Ail Rights Reserved

				FINAL
	Table RECYCLING PROGR	B2-1 ram implementation beaumont		
	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
	City Manager Waste Hauler	Adopt ordinances and monitoring prognams	1992-Ongoing	\$2,000
	racinity Operators	Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	1995	V/N
		Monitor during medium-term	1996-2000	N/A
		Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.	<i>L</i> 661	NA
	City Manager Waste Hauler	Accomplish facility identification (see IPF/MRF)	1992	See IPF/MRF
	Businesses and industry Facility Operators	Form agreement with waste hauler	1992	4,000
. <u></u>		Begin recycling programs.	6661	\$500/yr (Processing:
and a book deget a tra		Organize Public Agency department recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Monitor program.	1993-Ongoing	1,000
		Evaluate program.	5661	N/A
		Require reporting from hauler and monitor programs.	0002-£661	Sæ IPF/MRF
<u></u>		Evaluate programs to improve reformance on amual basis.	1996 - 2000	See Sec. 8
Ī				

.

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Annual Costs				2	Sec. 8		Sec. 4	
		V/N	N/N	V/N	1,00		N/A	See	V/V
	Schedule	661 - 1661	1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1992-Ongoing	5661 - E661	1994	5661 - E661	1996 - 2000
B2-1 tam implementation beaumont	Tasks	Develop dialogue among County, other cities, and Beaumont to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Implement salvaging improvements. Monitor and reassess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Beaumont. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance and improvement measures during medium-term.
Table RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	Riverside County Local Task Force County Local Task Force City Manager			City Manager Riverside County County Local Task Force				
	Program	Salvaging			Other Programs (Tire recycling)				

Be-5/Revised: August 24, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

B2-10

FINAL							
	Annual Costs	2,000	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	1,000-4,000	N/A	
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992-Ongoing	1994-1997	1993-Ongoing	1993-2000	
82-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION	r BEAUMONT Tasks	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually through short and medium-term.	Evaluate City procurement policies to increase recycled material use. Assist industry, businesses and hauler in coloring markate for recycled materiale	through programs such as CALMAX, etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of	recurveness of transcent for matching recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- and medium-term, annually.
Table RECYCLING PROGE	CITY OF Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers City Manager			Waste Hauler Industries in City City Hauler		
	Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs (Certified Recycling Centers, Drop-Off Centers, Buy-Back)			Markets for Recyclable Materials		

Be-5/Revised: August 24, 1992

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

				FINAL
	Tab composting program	le B2-1 implementation schedule		
Program	Responsible Entity	Taska	Schedule	Annuel Costs
Yard Waste Delivery/Drop-Off Pilot Program	Planning Department City Manager Gardeners and Landscapers	Establish - promote policy to offer incentives to landscapers/gardeners for voluntary delivery of yard wastes to waste water treatment stockpile area	1992 - Ongoing	\$500/year
		Begin collection of yard wastes. Stockpile and monitor program	Mid 1992 - Ongoing	V/N
		Develop long term marketing contracts and identify end users	1992 - Ongoing	See City operated facility
		City operated facility planned to begin operations	Mid 1993 - Ongoing	See City operated facility
		Evaluate plot program cliectiveness and ascertain whether mandatory collection will be necessary.	Mid 1993 - Ongoing	\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate during short and medium-term.	1995-1997	N/A
1001 Kininfelder fra All Binke Berne				

.

Bc-5/Revised: August 24, 1992

				FINAL
	T composting program	able B2-1 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
City Operated Compost/Co- Compost Program at Municipal Waste Water Treatment Facility	Planning Department City Manager Beaumont City Water Department Landscarers/Gardeners	Receive yard wastes through the pilot collection program and stockpile at facility	Mid 1992 - Ongoing	N/A
		Develop markets for use of compost products	1992 - Ongoing	Mello-Roos District Fees
		Facility planned to begin operations	Mid 1993 - Ongoing	Mello-Roos District Fees
		Monitor and evaluate program in compliment to the voluntary delivery pilot program	Mid 1993	See Pilot Program Costs
		Monitor and evaluate during medium term	1991	N/A

.

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-6/Revised: August 24, 1992

	Table SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM	B2-1 I IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	a	FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Waste Management Department City Manager	Support County Diversion Program	2661 ylul	Included in County Tipping Fees
		Monitor program during short-term	1992-Ongoing	(shredding only) N/A
		Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	1994	N/A
		Monitor program during medium-term	1996-Ongoing	N/A
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	City Manager Private Facility Operators Waste Hauler	Work with construction waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs.	December 1992	\$2,000
(industrial wood, inert and remainder wastes)		Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	December 1993	V /N
		Require diversion to begin	December 1993	\$104,760 - \$123,580 (assume \$20/ton)
		Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1993	N /N
		Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1993-Ongoing	VN

- 1991 Kleinfetder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-7/Revised: August 24. 1992

	Tabi SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM	le B2-1 i implementation schedui	Ë	FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager Sold Waste Essility Manager	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	July 1992	Included in disposal fees for white goods at the facility
	JUIU WASIC FACIILY MANAGEL	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1992-Ongoing	N/A
Development of Sludge Co- Composting Facility Operated by City	City Sewer Department City Public Works Department City Manager	Work with City Water District in developing a sludge co-composting facility.	1991-ongoing	Will implement a Mello-Roos district
		Facility will begin accepting yard waste to stockpile as bulking agent	1992-ongoing	Will implement a Mello-Roos district
		Facility planned to be operational. Monitor program during short and medium-term	1993-ongoing	Will implement a Mello-Roos district
		Evaluate effectiveness in short and medium-term	1994 - 1997	Will implement a Mello-Roos district

-

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-7/Revised: August 24, 1992

B2-15

	Annual Costs	\$2,000 per year	Materials Printing Advertising \$500 - 1992 \$1000/year from 1993 on
LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	1992 -Distribute information to a minimum of 50% of businesses and residents 1993 - Distribute information to the balance of the community	1992 - ongoing
e B1-1 eduction and recycling e aation implementation sc	Tasks	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials. Insert recycling information into utility bills or make into door hangers. Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Commerce.	Meet regularly with various groups. Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.
Table B CITY OF BEAUMONT - SOURCE REDU PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMAT	Responsible Entity	City Manager Planning Department	City Manager Block Leaders
IJ. IJ	Program	Develop Public Information Resources	Community Group Outreach

FINAL

.

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-8/Revised: August 24, 1992

B2-16

FINAL

-

<u>j</u> r	Table TY OF BEAUMONT - SOURCE RI UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	B2-1 EDUCTION AND RECYCLING E	LEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity		Schedule	Annual Costs
Establish a City Recycling	City Manager	Develop monthly newsletter.	1993 - ongoing	Materials Drinting
	Planning Department	Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices.		Distribution \$1,000 - 1993 \$1.500/vear from
				1994 on
Establish a Public Information	City Manager	Ensure information is readily available.	1996	Materials Drinting
	Planning Department	Advertise the center's use.		Distribution Dental of Occurving
		Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center.		Space \$2,500 - 3,000
Business Training Sessions	City Manager	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	1993 - ongoing	Materials Driving
	Planning Department	Develop and distribute a recycling guide.		Awards Recycling Bins
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.		Signs \$2,100 - 3,000 per session w/3 sessions
		Initiate an awards program.		per year

BE-8/Revised: August 24, 1992

1991 Kteinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

\$1,000 in 1994 & 1995 Annual Costs \$500 in 1992 & Press Packet \$500 - 1,000 Distribution Materials Printing Awards per year 1993 1992 - distribute various publicity 1993 - ongoing Ongoing media 1992 - develop Schedule CITY OF BEAUMONT - SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE materials. program. logo. Insert brochures into bills or use as door Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of Prepare and distribute information on the program. "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits". Create and distribute a press packet. Develop brochures and pamphlets. Distribute publicity materials. Develop a recycling logo. Tasks Create and distribute the program. Table B2–1 hangers. **Responsible Entity Certified Recycler** City Manager Waste Hauler City Manager Waste Hauler Annual Community Clean-Up Develop a Media Campaign Program

FINAL

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-8/Revised: August 24, 1992

.

				FINAL
JA	Table ity of beaumont - source ru ublic education and inform	: B2-1 EDUCTION AND RECYCLING EI IATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	LEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Designate a School Recycling Coordinator	School District	Organize a recycling program at school.	1992 - ongoing	Speakers' fees Materials
	City Manager	Choose curriculum.		Printing \$500 mer veer
		Monitor the effectiveness of the program.		the find our t
		Initiate an in-service training session for school's staff.		
Develop a Recycling Program for	School Recycling Coordinator	Create a recycling theme or logo.	1993 - oagoing	Metcrials
the Classroom	City Manager	Develop displays and exhibits with		rimung Distribution Averade
	Recycling Council	enuclin-created transitions to be praced		Advertising
		Develop a student-produced monthly builtetin.		00017 - 000114
		Distribute builetin to parents.		
		Initiate an awards program.		
		Promote schools progress with local media.		
1991 Kleinfeldet, Inc All Rights Reserved				8/Revised: August 24, 1992

Annual Costs Curriculum \$1,000 - 3,000 1995 - ongoing Schedule CITY OF BEAUMONT - SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress. Choose a recycling curriculum. Tasks Table B2-1 **Responsible Entity** School Recycling Coordinator Recycling Committee Curriculum Council Principal School Recycling Curriculum Program

FINAL

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE-B/Revised: August 24, 1992

B2-20

ECTION PROGRAMS	Comments	Program began in February of 1990	Program began in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hitl, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have teen held in the Citics of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health.
2-2 Ardous waste colle	1990 Diversion from County Landfills*	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247**	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668
Table B2 NG COUNTY HOUSEHOLD HAZ	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Department	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health
SUMMARY OF EXISTIN	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	One-Day Events	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil

.

*For a complete fisting of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE/Revised: August 24, 1992

DRAFT

Table B2-3

Included in City refuse collection fees landfill tipping fees Included in County Annual Costs **N/A** 1992 - Ongoing 1992-Ongoing Schedule HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE 1992 1994 1994 1994 1994 1994 Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Beaumont. Advertise and promote the Roundup(s) Inland Disposal will be responsible for Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and obtaining all necessary approvals preparing all applications, manifests, Assist the County in advertising the Evaluate the feasibility of siting a permanent collection center. Select date(s) of Roundup Day(s) Mobile Collection Center. Conduct the Roundup(s) Tasks for the Roundup(s) of the Roundup(s) **Responsible Entity** City Solid Waste Representative City Solid Waste Representative Inland Disposal City Solid Waste Representative Planning Department Franchise Waste Hauler **Riverside County Staff** Planning Department Planning Department **County Mohile Collection Center** Residential Hazardous Waste Roundup Day(s) City Deregulated HHW Collection Center Program

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE/Revited: August 24, 1992

B2-22

DRAFT

Table B2-3

	HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WA	STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEI	DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Public Education and Information	Inland Disposal City Solid Waste Representative Planting Department Riverside County Staff	Assist the County in educating the residents of Beaumont in proper handling, treatment, and disposal of HHW.	1992 - Ongoing	Included in County landfill tipping fees
Recycling	Inland Disposal City Solid Waste Representative Planning Department Riverside County Staff	Identify endusers for waste oil and batteries. Assist the service stations and auto repair centers, located in the City of Beaumont, in obtaining the necessary approval to accept waste oil and batteries. Identify endusers for paint. Encourage paint retailers to accept	1993 1994 1993 1994	VN
Load Checking	Riverside County Staff City Solid Waste Representative Planning Department	unused paint from residents. Encourage the County to continue and expand the load checking program at all County landfills.	1992 - Ongoing	VIN

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

BE/Revised: August 24, 1992

CITY OF BLYTHE

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B3

INTEGRATED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Component PROGRAM	RESPONSIE AGENCY/PE	le RSON	1991	19 92	19 93	YEAR 1994	19 95
SOURCE REDUCTI	ON						
l. Waste Excha Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	nge Program nning lementation itoring	PWD			x x x	x	x
2. White Goods Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	Collection nning lementation itoring	PWD			x x x	x	x
3. Xeriscape I Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	nformation nning lementation itoring	PWD			x x x	x	x
4. White Goods Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	Repair nning lementation itoring	PWD			x x x	x	x
5. City Purcha Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	se Programs nning lementation itoring	CM			x x x	x	x
6. Office Pape Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	r Programs nning lementation itoring	СM			x x x	x	x
7. Develop Rep Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	orting System nning lementation itoring	CM			X X X	×	x
8. Info. on ba Tasks:Pla Imp Mon	ckyard composti nning lementation itoring	ng PW	ם			x x x	x

Note: PWD- Public Works Department CM- City Managers Office

COMPONENT PROGRAM	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY/PERSON	1 991	1992	1993	YEAR 1994	19 95
RECYCLING						
l. Building Codes Tasks;Planning Implemen Monitori	PWD tation ng			x x x		
2. Recycled Content Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	Policy CM tation ng			x x x	x	x
3. Office Paper Rec Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	ycling CM tation ng				x x x	x
4. Drop off Center Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	PWD tation ng			×	x x	x
5. Commercial Recyc Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	ling PWÐ tatíon ng			x	x x	x
6. Modify Rate stru Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	cture CM tation ng				x x x	x
COMPOSTING						
1. Continue Existin Christmas Tree &	g PWD					

	Nursery Recycling Tasks;Planning Implementation	o ng oing ongoing					
	Monitoring	x	x	x	x	x	
2.	Site Grinding facility	no	action	pla	inned		
3.	Curbside Separation of Yardwastes	ה סת	action	pla	inned		

C OMPONENT PROGRAM	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY/PERSON	1991 19	992 1993	YEAR 1994	1995
SPECIAL WASTE					
 Encourage use of wood grinding Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori 	PWD tation ng		x	x x	x
2. Referral for Rep Goods Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	aired CM tation ng		x	× ×	x
3. Encourage Tire R Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	ecycling PWD tation ng			x x x	x
4. Encourage C&D Fa Tasks: Plannin Impleme Monitor	cility PWD g ntation ing		×	x x	x
5. Encourage Sludge Tasks: Plannin Impleme Monitor	Recycling PWD g ntation ing		x	x x	x
6. Develop Sludge M Plan Tasks:Planning Implemen Monitori	anagement PWD tation ng			x x x	x

CON	PONENT	RESPONS	SIBLE	1007	1007	1007	YEAR	1005
PR	ARAM	AGENCI,	PERSON	TAAT	1332	1993	1224	1995
EDI	JCATION A	AND PUBLIC	INFORMAT:	ION				
1.	Prepare	Public	a 1					
	Service	Ads.	CM					
	Tasks:Pl	Lanning				x		
	Imp	piementation	n				X	
_	Mor	nitoring					x	x
2.	Mail Inf	to to Reside	ents CM					
	Tasks	Planning				x		
		Implementat	tion				x	
_		Monitoring					x	x
з.	Particip	pate County	Pr. CM					
	Tasks	Planning				x		
		Implementa	LION				x	
		Monitoring						x
4.	Recycli	ng Hotline	CM					
	Tasks	Planning				x		
		Implementa	tion				x	
		Monitoring						x
5.	Support	Legislation	n CM					
	Tasks	Planning				x		
		Implementa	Lion				X	
		Monitoring					x	x
6.	Awarness	s Program	CM					
	Tasks:	Planning				X		
		Implementat	zion				X	
		Monitoring						x
7.	Technica	l Assistance	ce PWD					
	Tasks:	Planning				x		
		Implementat	tion				x	
	_	Monitioring	3					x
8.	Educatio	onal Program	is CM					
	Tasks:	Planning				x		
		Implementat	tion				x	
		Monitoring		_				x
9.	Develop	Speakers Bu	ireay Cl	1				
	Tasks:	Planning	_			x		
		Implementat	cion				x	
		Monitoring						x

Note: CM- City Managers Office PWD- Public Works Department

HHW IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

PRO	OGRAM	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY/OFFICE	1991	YEAR 19 9 2	1993	1994	19 9 5
1. Load Checking Task:Plannin		PWD	ongo	ing p	rogra	m	
	Implement Monitor		x	x	х	x	x
2. One Day Collect Task:Planning		on PWD	ongo	ing p	rogra	m	
	Implement Monitor		x	x	x	x	x
з.	Media Education	PWD			x		
	Inplement Monitor	:				x x	x
4.	HHW Recycling Task:Planning	PWD			x		
	Implement Monitor	:				x	x
CITY OF CALIMESA

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B4

_1		_				
FINAL			Annual Costs	See Recycling Section 5	See Section 5	See Section 5
			Schedule	6661	September 1994	June 1997
	; B4-1	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Keep records and enforce program	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term
	Table	SOURCE REDUCTION P	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Designee Waste Hauler		
			Program	Quantity Based Local User Fees (Variable Can Rate)		

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-11/June 1993

FINAL	Annual Costs	\$500 Incl. Above	Incl. Above		Provided by Waste Hauler N/A N/A N/A	
	Schedule	August 1993 July 1994	July 1997		July 1993 1993-Ongoing September 1995 June 1997	
B4-1 Rogram implementation	Tasks	Require through ordinance, landscape plans to be submitted to the City demonstrating use of drought resistant plants for new development.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Implement a waste evaluation program. Report results of the program annually. Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program. Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	
Table source reduction f	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Designee City Council			City Manager's Office City Designee Waste Hauler	
	Program	Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping	- <u></u>		Waste Evaluations	

B4-2

LINAL		Annual Costs	\$500/yr	Incl Above	Incl Above		\$200	N/A	VIN
		Schedule	September 1993	July 1994	June 1997		July 1993	June 1994	June 1996
14-1	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Set conditional uses on new developments roquiring solid waste reduction planning.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.		Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during modium-term.
Table B	SOURCE REDUCTION PI	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Designee				City Manager's Office City Designee		
		Program	Incentives and Disincentives to Land Use				Non-Procurement Programs		

CAL-11/June 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	131	ble B4-1		
-	SOURCE REDUCTION	N PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
ent Use of Paper in Denartment	City Manager's Office City Designee	Use double sided copiers	June 1993	See Sec. 8
	City Employees	Encourage non-confidential single-sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	Ongoing	N/A
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shorted, combined or discontinued.	September 1993	V/N
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.	September 1993	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	
rting System	City Manager's Office City Designee Waste Hauler	Establish requirements for reporting of source reduction activities through the business ficense permit process.	September 1993	\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate participation and effectiveness of program.	January 1995	Included Above
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	Included Above

	Annual Costs	\$ 500	Included Above	1,000	N/A	N/A	Provided by Waste Hauler	N/A	V/V
	Schedule	March 1993	July 1994-Ongoing	June 1993- Ongoing	September 1994	1001 June 1997	1993- Ongoing	September 1995	June 1997
4-1 ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short- and modium-term.	Provide information and technical assistance to help establish on-site composting.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction programs.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.
Table B SOURCE REDUCTION P	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Designee City Council		City Manager's Office City Designee			City Manager's Office City Designee Waste Hauler		
	Program	Adoption of Local Ordinances, CUPs, etc.		Support for Backyard Composting			Technical Assistance for Business		

·

CAL-11/June 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

B4-5

	Annual Costs	94 \$500 95 Included Above
	Schedule	September 19 September 19
le B4-1 program implementation	Tasks	Recognize businesses that use source reduction practices. Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.
Tabi source reduction i	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Designee Businesses Chamber of Commerce
	Program	Public Recognition

FINAL

B4-6

PRELIMINARY		Annual Costs	айд \$ 48,000 - 52,320	995 Included above	995 N/A	A/N 799
		Schedule	1992-Ongo	1993- 1	,	_
	e B41 ram implementation f calimesa	Tasks	Implement Single family curbside recycling program	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period. Consider necessity of MRF for mixed refuse during short- and medium-term	Monitor program chosen during short- term	Re-evaluate performance during medium-tern planning period.
	Tabl RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office Waste Hauler City Designee			
		Program	Single family commingled curbside recycling			

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - Ali Righta Reserved

CAL-11/March 1, 1993

RELIMINARY		Annual Costs	æ SF Program		V,	×,	56,700 vorumercial) 57,420 ndustrial)	icluded in City esignee (Section 8)	<u> </u>	
Ъ		Schedule	1992-Ongoing S	1992-1995	N 5661	1993-1994 N	5661 23 2 2	1994-1995 In D	1996-2000	<i>1</i> 661
	B4-1 kam implementation f calimesa	Tasks	Continue to use IPF facility feasible for short-term needs.	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Identify MRF for possible use in short- term and medium-term	Process commercial/ industrial through short-term	Monitor and evaluate	Process all waste streams through MRF during modjum-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in modium-term planning period.
	Table RECYCLING PROGI CITY OI	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office Waste Hauler Facility Operators	CNY Designee						
		Program	Processing through Facility (IPF and MRF)			<u> </u>				

B4-8

PRELIMINARY

	Annual Costs	\$500 (see special waste Section 7 for Costs)	V/N	N/A	N/A	V/X	N/A	VN
	Schedule	1994-Ongoing	5661	1996-2000	1997	1993 - 1994	1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000
e B4-1 Ram implementation F calimesa	Tasks	Adopt ordinances and monitoring programs	Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	Monitor during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in modium-term planning period.	Develop dialogue among County and other cities to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Implement salvaging improvements. Monitor and reassess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.
RECYCLING PROGI	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office Waste Hauler Facility Operators City Designee				County Local Task Force City Manager's Office City Designee		
	Program	Ordinances				Salvaging		

CAL-11/March 1, 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

.

\sim	I
Z	l
IV	ł
	1
1	h
щ	ł
H.	Ĩ
	1

	Annual Costs	1993 Included in City Designer (Section 8)	P994 N/A	-1997 N/A	going Included in City Designee (Section 8)	going See Sec. 8	going See Sec. 4
	Schedul		Jan.	1994	IQ-E661	0-6661	1996-Or
e B4-1 iram implementation of calimesa	Tasks	Analyze feasibility of automated collection.	implement variable can rate structure.	Monitor and evaluate program during short- and medium-term.	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information "ampaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually.
Table RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office 7 ity Designee Waste Hauler			Certified and Other Recyclers City Manager's Office City Designee		
	Program	Modification of Existing Rate Structures			Maintenance of Existing Programs (drop-off and certified recycling centers)		

	Table B4 COMPOSTING PROGRAM	-1 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		PRELIMINARY
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Yard Waste Delivery/Drop-Off Program	City Manager's Office City Designee	Establish - promote policy to offer incentives to landscapers/gardeners for	1994 - Ongoing	\$63,600-65,400
	Gardeners and Landscapers Waste Hauler Compost Facility	voluntary delivery of yard wastes to selected processing facility or drop-off area	June 1994	V/N
		Develop long term marketing contracts and identify end users	1994-Ongoing	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program effectiveness and ascertain whether mandatory collection will be necessary	June 1995	A/A
		Monitor and evaluate during medium- term	1996 - Ongoing	
Privately Operated Compost/Co- Compost Program at Municipal, Insidictional or Drivets Excition	City Manager's Office City Council	Enter into a memorandum of agreement with a selected facility for processing	Mid 1994	By waste hauler
	Facility Operator Waste Hauter Civ Designee	Deliver yard wastes through the collection program to the facility	1996 - Ongoing	V /N
		Develop markets for use of compost products	1994 - Ongoing	\$500
		Monitor and evaluate program in complement to the delivery program during medium term	Mid 1997	Υ'N

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-II/Merch I, 1993

				PRELIMINARY	
	Tal	ble B4-1			_
	SPECIAL WASTE PROGI	RAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUI	LE		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs	
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Waste Management Department City Manager's Office	Support County Diversion Program	July 1992	Included in County Tipping Fees	
1 1	City Designee	Monitor program during short-term	1993-Ongoing	(shredding only) N/A	
		Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	1994	V/N	
		Monitor program during medium-term	1996-Ongoing	N/A	
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	City Manager's Office Construction Waste Haulers Solid Waste Facilities Recycling Facilities	Work with construction waste haulers and franchise waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs.	December 1993	\$2,000	
	City Designee	Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	December 1994	ViN	
		Require diversion to begin	December 1993	(assume \$20/ton)	
		Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1993	N/A	
		Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1993-Ongoing	V/N	

B4-12

SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE Program Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule Annual White Goods Salvaging Weste Hauler Schedule Costs Costs White Goods Salvaging Weste Hauler Schedule Costs Costs Program at Solid Waste Nanagenent Department Included in disposal Included in disposal Facilities Solid Waste Facility Managers Monitor program throughout short and 1992-Ongoing N/A		Та	able B4–1		
ProgramResponsible EntityTasksScheduleAnnualWhite Goods SalvagingWaste HaulerSupport and promote the salvaging programJuly 1992Included in disposalProgram at Solid WasteManagement DepartmentFor white goods.July 1992Included in disposalFacilitiesCity Manager's OfficeSolid Waste Facility ManagersMonitor program throughout short and1992-OmgoingN/A		SPECIAL WASTE PROG	RAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	E	
White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste FacilitiesWaste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management DepartmentSupport and promote the salvaging program for white goods.July 1992Included in disposal fees for white goodsProgram at Solid Waste FacilitiesManagement Department City Manager's Office Solid Waste Facility ManagersSupport and for white goods.July 1992Included in disposal fees for white goodsProgram at Solid Waste Solid Waste Facility ManagersMonitor program throughout short and medium-term1992-OngoingN/A	Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Solid Waste Facility Managers Monitor program throughout short and Inedium-term	White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager's Office	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	July 1992	Included in disposal fees for white goods at the facility
		Solid Waste Facility Managers	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1992-Ongoing	V/N

PRELIMINARY

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-11/Revised: December 30, 1992

	A	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Annual Costs	Included in an existing staff	member's dutice, funded from General Fund, supported by	the waste bauler		V/N
LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	March 1993				1993 - 2000
B4-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI ATION IMPLEMENTATION SC	Tasks	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.	Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.	Prioritize programs.	Establish future staff and funding requirements.	Monitor and evaluate performance on annual basis
Table ity of calimesa - source re iblic education and inform	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office would designate a representative				
D 2	Program	Designation of a City Designee/Representative				

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

B4-14

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Table B4-1 CITY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	
---	--

Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Develop Public Information Resources	City Manager's Office City Representative Waste Hauler	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials.	1994 - Ongoing Distribute information to a minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within	Provided largely by the waste hauler, City costs \$500 - \$1,000
		Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Conumerce and other volunteer grousp.	the first year and 50% the next year.	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium term	1994 - 1997	N/A
Community Group Outreach	City Manager's Office City Representative Block Leaders Waste Hauler Volunteer & Non-Profit Groups	Meet regularly with various groups. Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives and develop composting demonstrations at the annual street fair.	July 1994 - Ongoing	Materials Printing Advertising \$500 Supported hy the waste hauler
		Monitor and evaluate program in short- and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-11/March 1, 1993

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

υď	Table ITY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE RE JBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	B4-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI LATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	LEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual •Costs
Establish a City Recycling Newsletter	City Manager's Office City Representative Waste Hauler	Develop a regular newsletter. Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, city offices and/or as a supplement to the local newspaper. Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	September 1994 - Ongoing 1994, 1997	Materials Printing Distribution \$500 Supported by the waste hauler N/A
Establish a Public Information Center	City Manager's Office City Representative	Ensure information is readily available. Advertise the center's use. Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center. Monitor and evaluate program.	1996 1998	Materials, printing \$500, Rental of Space - \$0 to \$500 (possibly donated) N/A

MINARY DRAFT		Annual Costs	Materials, printing, awards, recycling bins, signs - provided by waste hauler or donated. N/A
PRELI	LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	October 1993 - Ongoing 1994, 1997
	B4-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI IATION IMPLEMENTATION SC	Tasks	Initiate training sessions for businesses. Develop and distribute a recycling guide. Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets. Initiate an awards program. Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.
	Table TTY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE RE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	City Manager's Office City Representative Waste Hauler
		Program	Business Training Sessions

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-II/March I, 1993

			PRELIN	MINARY DRAFT
	Tab CITY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE RE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	le B4-1 eduction and recycling ei attion implementation sc	LEMENT	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Develop a Media Campaign	City Manager's Office City Demonstring	Develop a recycling logo.	July 1993 -	Materials, printing,
	Criftod Rocyclers Waste Hauler	Distribute publicity materials.	logo.	distribution awards, press packet \$500 hv City the
		Create and distribute a press packet.	September 1993 - distribute variates	balance provided thy
		Develop brochures and pamphlets.	publicity materials.	volunteers
		Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	Onguing media program.	
		Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".	1. 10 - 10 - 1	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
Annual Clean-Up	City Manager's Office City Representative Waste Hauler County of Riverside Household	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program. Coordinate to coincide with County HHW Program	Existing (started May 1992)	Provided by waste hauler and volunteers
	International (ALLIAN) States and Subgradies	Prepare and distribute information on the program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N

MINARY DRAFT		Annual Costs	Speakers' fees, materials, printing. \$500/year, providual by school and waste hauler N/A	
PRELI	LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	September 1994 1994, 1997	
	[-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING E [ATTON IMPLEMENTATION SC	Tasks	Organize a recycling program. Choose curriculum. Monitor the effectiveness of the program. Initiate an in-house service training session for achool staff. Monitor and evaluate program in short	and modium-term.
	Table B4 TY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE RE BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	School Administrators City Manager's Office Waste Hauler	
	05	Program	Designate a School Recycling Coordinator	

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CAL-II/March I, 1993

.

52	Table B4 TY OF CALIMESA - SOURCE RE BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EL LATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	PRELIN LEMENT HEDULE	IINAKY DKAFI
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Develop a Recycling Program for the Classroom	School Recycling Coordinator City Manason's Office	Create a recycling theme or logo.	September 1995	Awards, advertising, materials, printing
	City Representative Waste Hauler	Develop displays and exhibits with student-created materials to be placed around the community.		\$500/year, provided by school and waste hauler
		Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin.		
		Distribute bulletin to parents.		
		Initiate an awards program.		<u> </u>
		Promote schools progress with local media.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1995, 1997	V/N
Recycling Curriculum	School Recycling Coordinator School Administration	Choose a recycling curriculum.	1995 -Ongoing	Curriculum tson
	Waste Hauler	Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress.		
		Monitor and evaluate program.	1995, 1998	N/A

SUMMARY OF EX	Table B4-2 isting household hazard	OUS WASTE COLLECTIO	N PROGRAMS
Existing Program	Sponsor	1990 Diversion from County Landfills*	Commedia
Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247**	Program began in February of 1990
Load Checking Program	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Department	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	Program began in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.
One-Day Events	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.
Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668 Calimesa waste hauler provides these services	Operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health.

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency CALHHW: June 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Table B HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WA	4–3 ste implementation schei	DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
County Mohile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff City Solid Waste Representative	Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Calimesa.	1992 - Ongoing	Included in landfill tipping fees
		Assist the County in advertising the Mobile Collection Center.	1992-Ongoing	
Residential Hazardous Waste Doundon Devict	Franchise Waste Hauler City Administrator	Select date(s) of Roundup Day(s)	1992	Included in refuse
		Waste hauler will responsible for preparing all applications, manifests, and obtaining all necessary approvals for the Roundup(s)	1994	
		Advertise and promote the Roundup(s)	1994	
		Conduct the Roundup(s)		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness	1994	
			1994	
City Deregulated HHW	Waste Hauler	Evaluate the feasibility of siting a	1994	N/A
Collection Center	City Administrator	permanent collection center.		

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CALHHW: June 1993

J

CITY OF CANYON LAKE

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B5

	Table source reduction P	; B5-1 rogram implementation			
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs	
Adoption of Local Ordinances	City Manager City Council	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	December 1992	\$1,500	
		Adopt ordinances which are found to be effective.	July 1993	\$1,000	
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium-term.	July 1994- Ongoing	Included above	
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	Public Works Department City Manager	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	March 1994	Provided by waste hauler	
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	March 1995	Provided by waste hauler	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	1996-Ongoing	Provided by waste hauler	
Public Recognition	City Manager Waste Hauler	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	September 1994	Provided by waste hauler	
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program in short and medium- term.	September 1995 and 1997	A/A	

CL-4/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Tab SOURCE REDUCTION	ile B5–1 program implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Efficient Use of Paper	City Manager City Denatments	Use double sided copiers	June 1992	N/A-See Section 8
		Encourage non-confidential single- sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	June 1992	N/A Included in public education
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.	June 1993	A/A
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.	June 1993	Y/N
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	1991 June 1997	
Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping	City Manager City Council	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	July 1992	\$500 first year
	_	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	July 1994	A/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.		

CL-4/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Juc. - Alt Rights Reserved

FINAL		Annual Costs	Provided by waste hauler	N/A	N/A	\$500	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,000	N/A	N/A	/Revised: December 1, 1992
		Schedule	September 1992	June 1994	1997 July	June 1992	September 1993	June 1994	June 1997	September 1992	January 1995	June 1997	CLA
	B5-1 ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored.	Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Adopt ordinances requiring solid waste management planning for new developments.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	
	Table source reduction P	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler Solid Waste Facilities			City Manager				City Manager City Council			
		Program	Referral System for White Goods			Support for State and Federal Packaging				Incentives and Disincentives for Land Use			1992 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved

	Tal SOURCE REDUCTION PI	ole B5–1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Business License Fee Modification	City Manager	Evaluate whether modified business license fees are necessary, according to the participation level of businesses.	September 1993	\$500
		Monitor and Evaluate participation and effectiveness of program.	January 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Waste Evaluations	City Manager Waste Hauler	Implement a waste evaluation program.	January 1993	Provided by waste hauler
		Report results of the program annually.	1994-Ongoing	N/A
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	٨/٨
Support for Onsite Composting	City Manager County Extension	Provide information and technical assistance to help establish on-site composting.	1994- Ongoing	000'1\$
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	VIN
1992 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			D	L-4/Revised: December 1, 1992

4

FINAL

	Table source reduction P	B5-1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	City Manager Waste Hauler	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction programs.	1994- Ongoing	Provided by waste hauler
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1995	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Non-Procurement Programs	City Manager	Institute a program identitying materials that can be source reduced.	July 1992	\$500
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.		
Deposits, Refunds, Rebates	City Manager Local Businesses Waste Hauler	Encourage a business to provide deposits, refunds, rebates for recycled materials.	September 1994	\$500
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	September 1996 1997	Y/N
1992 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			CLA	/Revised: December 1, 1992

FINAL	Table B5–1 reduction program implementation	Entity Tasks Schedule Annual Costs	Require reporting by waste haulers. September Provided by waste Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term. 1995 - 1997 N/A
	Table] source reduction Pr	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler
		Program	Reporting System

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-4/Revised: December 1, 1992

onsible Entity	Tasks Adopt ordinances and monitoring programs Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	Schedule 1992-Ongoing	Annual
	Adopt ordinances and monitoring programs Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	1992-Ongoing	Costs
	Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period))	\$500
		1995	N/A
	Monitor during medium-term	1996-2000	N/A
	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.	7991	N/A
er Operators. rs' Association	Continue existing programs.	1992	By POA and waste hauler
	Develop public information campaign to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials.	1992 - 1993	See Sec. 8
	Monitor and evaluate program.	July 1994	N/A
	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	661 - 1661	See Sec. 4
	Monitor program.	1996 - 2000	N/A
	Evaluate program performance and implement improvement measures.	1991	NIA
	Perators. Association	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period. Dperators. Continue existing programs. Association Develop public information campaign to improve public and reaterials. Monitor and evaluate program. Provide technical assistance and public information as needed. Monitor program. Monitor program. Evaluate program. Monitor program.	Perators. 1997 Derators. Continue existing programs. Derators. Continue existing programs. Develop public information campaign to improve public information campaign to focations and materials. 1992 - 1993 Association Develop public information campaign to improve public avareness of drop off locations and materials. 1992 - 1993 Monitor and evaluate program. 1993 - 1993 Monitor and evaluate program. 1993 - 1995 Provide technical assistance and public 1996 - 2000 Evaluate program. 1996 - 2000 Evaluate program. 1996 - 2000 Evaluate program performance and implement improvement measures. 1997

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

				FINAL
	Table F RECYCLING PROG	35–1 ram implementation canyon lake		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Certified Recycling Center Promotion	Certified Recyclers City Manager Waste Hauler	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	1992-Ongoing	\$500
		Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted. Monitor program.	1992-Ongoing	See Scor. 8
		Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Reassess efficiency of program. Monitor program.	1996-Ongoing	See Sec. 4
		Evaluate program and implement improvements.	1997	N/A
1992 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			G	Revied: December 1 1903

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

B5-8

				<u></u>]
LINA	Annual Costs	\$7,896-100,800 (assume \$2/household	\$1,000/ <i>y</i> r	N/A	NIA
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1993- 1995	1995-2000	2661
, B5-1 ram implementation canyon lake	Tasks	Implement curbside recycling program	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period. Consider necessity of MRF for mixed refuse during medium-term	Monitor program chosen during medium-term	Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.
Table RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler Property Owners' Association			
	Program	Residential commingled curbside recycling			

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

B5-9

HINAL	Annual Costs	N/A	<u> </u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$67,940 - \$75,120 (MF/commerical/ind ustrial)	\$3,500/yr for all		
	Schedule	1992-1993	1992-Ongoing	1993-1995	5051	1994	1993-1995	1994-1995	1996-2000	
B5-1 ram implementation canyon lake	Tasks	Identify IPF facility feasible for short- term needs. Establish agreement through/with waste hauler for use of facility	Process residential wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term planning period	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Identify MRF for use in short-term and medium-term	Process MF, commercial/industrial through short-term	Monitor and evaluate	Process all wastestreams through MRF during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.
Table RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler Facility Operators County Waste Management								
	Program	Processing through Facility (IPF and MRF)								

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

r 1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Annual Costs	ee IPF/MRF	ee [PF/MRF	ee IPF/MRF		1/V	tee IPF/MRF	tee Sec. 8
	Schedule	S 2661	1992 S	S 661	1993-Ongoing	V 5661	1993-2000 S	1996 - 2000 S
B5-1 tam implementation anyon lake	Tasks	Accomplish facility identification (see IPF/MRF)	Form agreement with waste hauler	Begin recycling programs.	Organize Public Agency department recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Require teporting from hauler and monitor programs.	Evaluate programs to improve performance on annual basis.
Table RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler	Facility Operators					
	Program	Public Agency Commercial and Industrial	recycling riograms					

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Annual Costs	VIN	V/N	V N	80	See Sec. 8	I/A See Sec. 4	YN
	Schedule	£661 - 1661	1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1992-Ongoing	1992 - 1993	1994 N	1996 - 2000
-1 AM IMPLEMENTATION ANYON LAKE	Tasks	Develop dialogue among County and other cities to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Implement salvaging improvements. Monitor and reassess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County and other cities. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Monitor program.	Evaluate program. Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance and improvement measures.
Table B5 RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager			City Manager Riverside County Waste Management Department			
	Program	Salvaging at Solid Waste Facilities			Other Programs (Tire recycling)			

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved
TINAL	ks Schedule Costs	nd certified 1992-Ongoing 500 their needs. stem to City by hroughout short	istance. Develop 1992-Ongoing See Sec. 8 ion campaign to Certified cyclers to identify tansion of facilities	rtified recyclers as 1996-Ongoing See Sec. 4 d reassess efficiency	ement policies to terial use. Assist and hauler in and hauler in recycled materials trecycled materials trecycled materials hum-term. I 1993-2000 N/A hauler in a call materials termin of terminals to the short- and thy.
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992-Ongoing	1996-Ongoing	1993-Ongoing 1993-2000
B5-1 ram implementation canyon lake	Tasks	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually.	Evaluate City procurement policies to increase recycled material use. Assist industry, businesses and hauter in obtaining markets for recycled materials through programs such as CALMAX, etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of effectiveness of marketing for materials recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- and medium-term, annualty.
Table 1 RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers City Manager POA Waste Hauler			City Manager County Waste Management Dept. Waste Hauler Facility Operators
	Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs (Drop-Off, Buy-Back Centers)			Markets for Recyclable Materials

CL-11/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Table COMPOSTING PROCEMAN	B5-1 Made EMENTATION SCHEDULE		FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Source-Separated Residential, Commercial/Industrial, Public	City Manager Waste Hauter	Begin diversion of yard waste	August 1992	\$500
Agency Program	Facility Operators (Compost Facility)	Work with facility operators to develop markets for the recovered materials	1992-Ongoing	N/A
		Monitor program during short and medium term	1993-1997	
Private Facility	City Manager Waste Hauler Escility Observes (Compost Escilitud	Assure franchise hauler has agreement with compost facility	1992	Provided by waste hauler
		Work with facility operators to develop markets for the recovered materials	1992-Ongoing	
		Monitor program	1997-Ongoing	

B5-14

	Annual Costs	Included in County Tipping Fees (shredding only) N/A	N/A	N/A	See Section 5 (included)				
	Schedule	July 1992 1992-Ongoing	1994	1996-Ongoing	August 1992	1992-Ongoing	August 1992	1993-Ongoing	
35-1 M IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Tasks	Support County Diversion Program Monitor program during short-term	Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	Monitor program during medium- term	Require diversion to begin.	Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	
Table] SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAI	Responsible Entity	Waste Management Department City Manager			Waste Management Department County LEA	Waste Hauler Recycling Facility			
	Program	Tire Shredding and Recycling Program			Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling	(industrial wood, inert and remainder wastes)			

	Annual Costs	2 Included in disposal fees for white goods at the facility	g N/A	Ig N/A - Costs are not incurred by City for proprese	g implementation.
	Schedule	July 199	1992-Ongoin	1991-Ongoin	1991 - Ongoin
B5-1 M IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Tasks	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	Continue existing diversion through EMWD	Work with the County and Water District in developing a sludge composting facility.
Table special waste progra	Responsible Entity	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager Solid Waste Eacility Manager		Riverside County Waste Management Department Fastern Municinal Water District	Recyc, Inc.
	Program	White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities		Co-Composting and Private Development Facilities	

FINAL

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-7/Revixed: December J. 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-8/Revised: December 1, 1992

	Table	e B5-1		FINAL
5-	IY UF CANYON LAKE - SUURCE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	HEDUCTION AND RECYCLING E AATION IMPLEMENTATION SCH	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.2 - Develop Public Information Resources	City Manager	Prepare information on recyclable materials. collection programs and	Distribute information to a	Provided by Waste Hauler
	Waste Hauler or Designee	uses for collected materials.	minimum of 50% of	
		Distribute information.	businesses and residents within	
		Prepare and develop an information	the first year (by	
		packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Commerce.	January 1992) and 50% the	
			next year (by January 1993).	
		Monitor and evaluate during the		N/A
		short and medium-term.	1994-1997	
8.4.3 - Community Group	City Manager	Meet regularly with various groups.	July 1992	Provided by
	waste namer of Designee Block Leaders	Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures.		
		Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.		
		Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A

CL-8/Revised: December 1, 1992

- 1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CI	Y OF CANYON LAKE - SOURCE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	B5-1 Reduction and recycling f iation implementation sch	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.4 - Establish a City Recycling Newsletter	City Manager Waste Hauler or Designee	Develop monthly newsletter.	Mid 1992	Provided by Waste Hauder
		Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices.		
		Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
8.4.5 - Establish a Public Information Center	City Manager Waste Hauler or Designee	Ensure information is readily available.	1996	\$2,000
		Advertise the center.		
		Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center.		
		Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.		N/N

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-8/Revised: December 1, 1992

B5-19

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			101	
	Annual Costs	Provided by Waste Hauler				N/A	
LEMENT EDULE	Schedule	September 1992				1994, 1997	
B5-1 reduction and recycling e ration implementation sch	Tasks	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	Develop and distribute a recycling guide.	Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.	Initiate an awards program.	Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.	
Table TY OF CANYON LAKE - SOURCE F UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler or Designee					
5	Program	8.4.6 - Business Training Sessions					

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - Ali Rights Reserved

CL-8/Revised: December 1, 1992

	le s	er	<u>4</u>			•		<u> </u>	
	Annu Cost	Provided by Waste Hau						NIA	
element Iedule	Schedule	July 1992 . develop logo.	July 1992 -	distribute various publicity	materíals.	Ongoing media	program.	1994, 1997	
e B5-1 reduction and recycling e mation implementation sch	Tasks	Develop a recycling logo.	Distribute publicity materials.	Create and distribute a press packet.	-	Develop brochures and pamphlets.	Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".	Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.
Table TY OF CANYON LAKE - SOURCE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	City Manager Waste Hauler or Designee							
5	Program	8.4.7 - Develop a Media Campaign							

1992 Kieinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL-8/Revised: December 1, 1992

B5-21

Ō	TY OF CANYON LAKE - SOURCE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORN	15-1 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING E	element Iedule	FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.8 - Canyon Lake's Community Clean-Up	City Manager Waste Hauler or Designee	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program.	January 1993	Provided by Waste Hauler
		Prepare and distribute information on the program.		
		Monitor and evaluate during the short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
1992 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved			5	/Revised: December 1, 1992

1992 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

B5-22

1	[F
	Ŧ	L
•		L
(ž	Į
	Ξ	Ļ
1		L
Í	~	
	◄	
1	Ζ	L
1		
1	2	Ł
1	1	
Ì		
	Y	
ì	٦.	

Table B5-2

SUMMARY OF EX	ISTING HOUSEHOLD HAZARD	DUS WASTE COLLECTIO	N PROGRAMS
Existing Program	Sponsor	1990 Diversion from County Landfills	Comments
Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247"	Program began in February of 1990
Load Checking Program	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Department	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	Program began in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.
One-Day Events	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.
Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health.

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL/August 12, 1992

4

	Costs	Included in fandfill tipping fees	V/N
DULE	Schedule	1992 - Ongolng 1992 - Ongolng	1994-1995 1996
\$5-3 STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEI		Assist the County in hosting the Mobite Collection Center in Canyon Lake. Assist the County in advertising Mobite Collection Center.	Evaluate the feasibility of stiling a permanent collection center. If feasible, site facility
I able Household Hazardous wa	Responsible Entity	Riverside County Staff City Recycling Staff	Franchise Waste Hauler City Manager
	Program	County Mobile Collection Center	City Deregulated HHW Collection Center

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

©1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CL/August 12, 1992

CITY OF CORONA

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B6

Table B6–1

Program Implementation Schedule

Programs	1991	1992	E661	1994	1995	9661	1661	8661	6661	2000
Source Reduction Existing Programs										
Quantity-Based Variable Rates - Residential										
waste Evaluations/waste Minimuzation Rackvard Commosting		+ + + + +								
Educational Efforts										
Awards and Public Recognition		1								
Non-procurement Programs by Local Government										
Adoption of Government Procurement Policies										
Recycling Residential Curbside Recycling										
Commercial/Industrial Collection										
Multi-Family Collection Program										
Buy-Back Centers		1	1 1 1 1							
Intermediate Processing Facility		1		I						
Mixed Waste Material Recovery Facility						1	1 1 1			
Composting Residential Curbside Collection										
Drop-off Collection										
Separate Bins for Selected Businesses										
Development of Composting Facility										
Special Waste		-								
Concrete and Asphalt Recycling										
Expansion of Bulky Items Collection Days										
Public Education and Information										

Pilot Phase ---- Full Operations ----

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1 991	1992	1 993	1 994	1 995
A. Existing Diversion						
1. Initiate Contact	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Quantification of Diversion Activity	business owners/ Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			ongoing		
			~		$\Phi(x_i) = \{x_i\}_{i \in I}$	
B. Waste Evaluations						
1. Program Development	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Distribute Questionnaire	Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Create Database	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
4. Evaluation of Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		х			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
	an a	, frank Semerakan sarangar			de n and de	
C. Backyard Composting						
1. Design Program	Consultant/ Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		X			
3. Procure Composting Bins	Recycling Coordinator/ Private Individuals		x			
4. Distribute Composting Bins	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
5. Monitor and Evaluate Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		

EBA Wasterbeitigen SECLICOR/December, 1991 City of Corona Final Druk SRRB - Integration Composition ٢.

Alternative Dependent	Remonsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1005
D. Non-Procurement Source Reduction for the City Government						
1. Program Development	City DPW/ Consultant		x			
2. Education Programs	City employees/ Consultant/ City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			ongoin 2		
						····.
E. Adoption of City Government Procurement Policies						
1. Program Design	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			
2. Present Model Program to local govt. agencies for review and approval	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			
3. Adoption by City Council	City Government Staff/ City DPW			x		
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW				x	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component (continued)

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1 991	1 992	1 993	1994	1 995
A. Curbside Recycling						
1. Evaluate Pilot Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator	x				
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Hauler/ City DPW	x				
3. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW	X				
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Hauler		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
				•		
B. Multi-Family Recycling						
1. Initial Study and Program Design	Recycling Coordinator/ Building Owners, Mngrs/ City DPW		x			
2. Purchase of Bins, Vehicles	Waste Hauler		x			
3. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Hauler			x		
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

EBA Wassanciogias SECLICOR/Deemaar, 1991 City of Coross Final Dealt SRLR - Integration Computer

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1 992	1993	1994	1 995
C. Commercial/Industrial Recycling Program						
1. Initial Study of Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator/ Bus. Owners, Managers			x		
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Hauler/ City DPW			x		
3. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Hauler			x		
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW				x	ongoing
D. Buy-Back Center						
1. Apply for Local Operating Permits	Buy-back Operator/ Local Planning Dept.		x			
2. Apply for Permit from Dept. of Conservation	Buy-back Operator			x		
3. Purchase Equipment	Buy-back Operator			x		
4. Begin Operations	Buy-back Operator				x	
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Buy-back Operator/ City DPW				x	ongoing

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

City of Corean Final Dealt SRRE - Insegnation Competition

				1	····		
Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1 992	199	3:	1994	19 95
E. Intermediate Processing Facility (IPF)				 			
1. Detailed Engineering and Feasibility Study	Waste Hauler/ County Waste Mgmt.		x		i		
2. Acquisition of Land	Waste Hauler		x				
3. Permitting	Waste Hauler/ Local Government/ CIWMB		x				
4. Construction	Waste Hauler			x			
5. Equipment Procurement	Waste Hauler			x			
6. Start-up Testing and Full Operations	Waste Hauler				x		
7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Weste Hauler/ City DPW/ County Weste Mgmt./ CIWMB					x	ongoing

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

ERA Wanasimmogues SECIICOR/December, 1991 City of Corona Final Druk SREE - Integration Companies

Alternative Programs	Responsible Eatity	1991	1 992	1993	1 994	1 995
A. Curbside Recycling						
1. Design Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Start Development of Composting Facility (if not sent to Existing Facility)	Composting Facility Operator		x			
3. Finalize Program Details	Recycling Coordinator/ Composing Fac. Oper./ City DPW		x			
4. Obtain Approval for Program	City Council		x			
5. Develop and Distribute Educational Materials	Recycling Coordinator/ Composing Fac. Oper./ City DPW		x			
6. Begin Curbside Collection (if sent to existing facility)	Waste Hauler			x		
7. Begin Curbside Collection (if not sent to existing facility)	Waste Hauler				x	
8. Site Drop-off Facilities	City DPW/ Wante Hauler					x
9. Begin Source-separated Bin Collection for Selected Commercial Businesses	City DPW/ Waste hauler					X
10. Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Composting Component

EBA Wastactinologite \SEC11COIK\December, (991

City of Corean Final Druk SILE - hangements Compages

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1 992	1993	1994	1 995
A. Landfill Salvaging for Tires						
1. Identify Site at Landfill for Temporary Storage and Handling of Tires	Landfill Operator/ County Waste Mgmt.		x			
2. Contact Recycler and Arrange for Pick-up	Landfill Operator/ County Waste Mgmt.		х			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Landfill Operator/ County Waste Mgmt./ City DPW		x	ongoing		
		e g	Save t			
B. Concrete and Asphalt Recycling						
1. Set Disposal Rates to Discourage Landfilling	Waste Hauler/ City Council		x			
2. Develop and Distribute Education Materials	Waste Hauler		x			
3. Issue Special Debris Boxes to Asphalt and Concrete Producers	Wasta Hauler		x			
4. Contact Recyclers and Arrange for Delivery	Wasts Hauler/ Concrete, Asphalt Recyclers		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	ongoing	
C. Bulky Items Collection						
1. Develop Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Publicize Program	Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Contact Recycler and Arrange for Pick-up	Recycling Coordinator		x			
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			X	ongoing	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Special Waste Component

EBA Wasastantingan SBC11COR/Decregan, 1991 City of Corosa Final Deal. SRRE - Integration Completion.

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1 995
A. Select Recycling Coordinator						
1. Solicit Candidates	City DPW/ Waste Hauler	x				
2. Interview Candidates and Select	Waste Hauler/ City DPW	X				
				1		
B. Recycling Task Force						
1. Make Appointments	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
C. Community Network Program			_			
1. Solicit Volunteers through Media, Flyers, Newsietters	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Orientation Meeting	Recycling Coordinator		x	1		
3. Quarterly Mailings	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		х	ongoing		
4. Annual Meetings	Recycling Coordinator/ Community Volunteers/ City Task Force/ City DPW			x	ongoing	
D. School Curriculum						
1. Meet with Schools	Recycling Coordinator/ Community Volunteers/ City Task Force		x			
2. Purchase Materials	Recycling Coordinator/ School Districts/ City Task Force			x		į
3. Implement Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ School Districts/ City Task Force/ Volunteers			x		

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component

EBA Wasterbraisgins SEC11COR/December, 1991

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1 992 .	1993	1 994	1 995
E. Commercial/Industriai Business Programs						
i. Develop Chamber Awards Plan	City Task Force/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Awards Event	City Task Force/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Develop BIA Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
4. Implement Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
			-		el des el esté est	
F. Community Evens						_
1. Develop Informational Materials	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x			
2. Prepare Display	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
3. Participate in Events	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
	antina a secondaria de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcc	a da an		an a	ni Serie analasi	
G. Modia Advertising						
1. Develop Ads	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		X			
2. Schedule and Buy Media	Recycling Coordinator		X			

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1 991	1 992	1 993	1 994	19 95
H. Collateral Materiais					1	
1. Mayor's Letter	Recycling Coordinator/ Mayor's Office		x			
2. Residential Curbside Recycling Instructions	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
3. Develop General Information Brochure	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
4. Develop and Dist. Info. for Backyard Composting	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
5. Begin Educ. Program for Source Red. to City Emps	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
6. Develop and Distribute Information for Asphalt and Concrete Recycling	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
7. Publicize Bulky Items Collection Days Pick-Ups	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
8. Develop and Distribute Information for Yard Waste Pick-up Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
9. Multi-Family Recycling Instructions	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
10. Commercial/Industrial Recycling Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
na an a	n an				a da	inga mangang Pangang
L Video						
1. Develop and Produce	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
2. Distribute Video	Recycling Coordinator		x			
	4		alfa. 1 1			
J. Monitoring and Evaluation			-			
i. Schedule and Implement	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			X		
2. Report Findings	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

EBA Wassestaniogue SECIICOR/December, 1991 City of Corona Final Deaft SRRE - Insegration Component

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The lead agency for program administration will be the City's Department of Public Works. It is likely that any local programs will be a multi-jurisdictional in nature, administered in cooperation with the City of Norco and implemented by their franchised wasted hauler. Primary funding for the programs will be provided for by modification of the rate structure for refuse collection. These rate increases will have to be approved by the City Councils of both Cities after recommendations by staff. Secondary funding will include reimbursement in part through grants issued by the CIWMB. A solid waste coordinator will be designated and given the responsibilities of implementing the HHW program.

Table B6-2

Tasks	Completion	Responsible	Funding
	Date	Entity	Source.
Design program procedure, schedule, personnel Provide recommendation Approve funding Coordinate publicity program Implement program Ongoing monitoring	5/92 6/92 7/92 7/92 1/93, ongoing 1/93, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler City Dept. of Public Works City Council Franchised Waste Hauler Franchised Waste Hauler Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure

Implementation Tasks for Curbside Collection of Motor Oil

Implementation Tasks for Drop-Off of Recyclable HHW

Tasks	Completion	Responsible	Funding
	Date	Entity	Source
Design program site, facilities, schedule, personnel Provide recommendation Approve funding Coordinate publicity program Implement program Ongoing monitoring	5/92 6/92 7/92 7/92 1/93, ongoing 1/93, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler City Dept. of Public Works City Council Franchised Waste Hauler Franchised Waste Hauler Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure

Implementation Tasks for Public Education Program

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Prepare original printed material	6/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	Rate Structure
Procure source reduction material	6/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	j .
Procure videotapes	6/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Prepare school curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Hauler/School Districts	
Implement curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Hauler/School Districts	
Distribute media releases	12/92. ongoing	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Mail brochures	12/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Establish HHW hotline	6/92	City DPW	

Implementation Tasks for Monitoring and Evaluation

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Curbside monutoring for HHW collector training	6/92	Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure
Program implementation Program monitoring	6/92, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure
City participation in County program	1/92, ongoing	County Dept. of Health	Tipping fees
Annual update reports of the waste stream	Annually, through 1995	County Department of Waste Management	County-wide tipping fees

Implementation Tasks for County-Wide Mobile Drop-Off Sites

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Continue implementation	Ongoing	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees
Report City participation	Annually	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees

Tasks	Completion	Responsible	Funding
	Date	Entity	Source
Engineering and feasibility study City accepts or rejects proposal City passes supportive legislation Acquisition of land RFP for MRF/HHW project Permits including EIR Construction Equipment procurement MRF starup HHW collection begins Ongoing monitoring	6/96 9/96 12/96 7/96 7/96 7/98 9/98 9/98 1/99 6/99 6/99, ongoing	MRF Operator/County Waste Management Dept. City DPW/City Council City Council Riverside County Riverside County MRF Operator, JPA MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator MRF Operator/County Waste Management/City DPW	County-wide tipping fees

Implementation Tasks for Permanent HHW Drop-Off Facility

City of Corean First Orac Hougehold Hazardold Wards Elements

B6-14

CITY OF HEMET

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B7

FINAL

Table B7-1 SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION					
PROGRAM	RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	TASKS	TIME LINE	SOURCE OF FUNDS	YRLY COSTS
Locai Government Procurement Programs	City Manager, IWM.CC	Review city purchasing procedures and make changes as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	On- going	User Fees	\$1,000
		Purchase recycled paper and plastic products for use. Discontinue the use of one time use items.	On- going		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium term.	On- going		\$1,000

City of Hemet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Revised: March 1, 1995

Locai Government Non- Procurement Programs	CC, IWM. Development Department	Institute a program that identifies materials that can be source reduced.	On- going	User Fees	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		N/A
Business Waste Reduction Plans	IWM	Require businesses to develop waste reduction plans.	1996- 1997	User Fees	\$2,500
		Evaluate effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate the program for participation.	On- going		\$7 50+
Generator Reporting System	IWM	Require reporting by waste haulers.	1996- 1997	User Fees	\$1,000 +
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$750+

Public Recognition	IWM	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	1996- 1997	User Fees	\$1.000
		Monitor and evaluate the program for participation and effectiveness.	On- going		\$750+
Waste Exchange Directory	IWM, Recycling Coordinator	Work with local businesses to set up a network that will provide businesses the names and numbers of others who could possibly use their waste products.	On- going		N/A
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	1996- 1997		N/A

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Promote Reuse	IWM. Planning Department, P.I.O., City Manager	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistance plants.	1997	User Fees	\$1,000 +
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	1998- 2000		\$2,500 +
Supporting Laws Prohibiting Products with	City Council, City Manager, P.1.O	Monitor State and Federal legislation.	On- going	User Fees	\$1,00 0 +
Adverse Effects on the Environment		Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	1993		\$500
		Monitor and Evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$1,000 +

Deposits. Refunos. and Rebates	CC.IWM. Finance Department	Encourage businesses to provide deposits. refunds, and rebates for customers who return recyclable materials. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	1995- 1996- 1997 1996- 1998	User Fees	\$3.000 + \$2.500 +
Business License Fee Modification	CC,IWM, Finance Department	Modify business license fees. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	1995- 1997 1996- 1998	Business License Fees	\$3,000 + \$2,500 +
Waste Evaluations	CC,1WM, Finance Department	Implement a waste evaluation program. Report annual results. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	1995- 1997 1996- 1998	User Fees	\$3,000 + \$2,500 +

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IWM

FINAL

Backyard Composting Program	IWM.Recyciing Coordinator	Implement a Backyard Composting Program.	1996	User Fees	\$5,000
		Report annuai results.	On- going		\$2,000 +
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	CC.IWM	Provide technical assistance to business and industry to help them establish a source reduction program.	1995	User Fees	\$5,000
		Evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$3 ,500 +
Onboard Weight and Scanning System	IWM	Use a weight based system for the collection of refuse.	1997	User Fees	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		N/A

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IWM

Revised: March 1, 1995

Incentives and Disincentives for Land Use	CC,IWM, Planning Department, Admin, Analyst	Evaluate ordinances for land use development.	On- going	User Fees	\$7.500 +
		Adopt ordinances requiring solid waste management planning for new developments.	On- going		\$7,500 +
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$5,000 +

RECYCLING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION CITY OF HEMET								
PROGRAM	RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	TASKS	TIME LINE	SOURCE OF FUNDS	COSTS			
Residential Commingled Curbside Recycling	IWM	Implement curbside recycling program.	1992- 1995	User Fees	\$173,699 to \$182.384			
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going					
Multi-Unit Recycling Collection	IWM,CC, Planning Department	Implement Multi-family recycling program.	2000	User Fees	\$10,000			
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	2005					
Commercial Collection	IWM,CC. Planning Department	MRF all commercial wastes as soon as facility is available throughout the medium-term planning period.	1996	User Fees	\$48,617 to 59,094			
--------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------	--------------	--------------------------			
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going					
Mixed Waste MRF	CC,LEA	Provide commingled curbside recycling for Hemet multi- family residents.	1996	User Fees	N/A _			
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		N/A			
Manuai MRF	IWM,CC, Planning Department	Perform feasibility study.	2000	User Fees	N/A			
		Monitor and evaluate in the short and long-term periods.	Yeariy		N/A			

City of Hemet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Lanofill Salvaging	Administrative Analyst. IWM	Perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives.	1991- 2005	User Fees	\$2.5 00		
		Reassess annually.	Yearly		\$1,000		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$1,000		
Legena: CC=City	Council IWM=in	tegrated Waste M	anagem	ent			
COMPOSTING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE							
COMPOSTING	PROGRAM IMPL	EMENTATION SC	CHEDUL	e tajaga en en Egiti			
COMPOSTING PROGRAM	PROGRAM IMPL RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	EMENTATION SC TASKS	CHEDUL TIME LINE	E SOURCE OF FUNDS	COSTS		
COMPOSTING PROGRAM Residential Program	PROGRAM IMPL RESPONSIBLE ENTITY IWM,CC	EMENTATION SC TASKS Negotiate a program to recover yard wastes.	TIME LINE 1992- On- going	E SOURCE OE FUNDS User Fees	COSTS \$44,097 to \$50,094		
COMPOSTING PROGRAM Residential Program	PROGRAM IMPL RESPONSIBLE ENTITY IWM,CC	EMENTATION SC TASKS Negotiate a program to recover yard wastes. Begin collection and processing program.	TIME LINE 1992- On- going 1992- On- going On-	E SOURCE OF FUNDS User Fees	COSTS \$44,097 to \$50,094		

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IWM

FINAL

Table B7-1

Drop-Off Collection	IWM	Implement a drop-off collection program for composted waste, study the feasibility of a voluntary or mandatory program.	1996	∪ser Fees	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		N/A
MRF	IWM	Investigate a MRF to sort waste and remove compostable material from the waste stream.	1996	User Fees	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		N/A

B7-11

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Separate Bin Collection From Selected Commercial	IWM.CC	Negotiate a program to recover yard wastes.	1996- On- going	User Fees	\$44.097 to \$59.094
		Begin collection and processing program.	1996		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		

SPECIAL WASTE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE SOURCE PROGRAM RESPONSIBLE TASKS TIME ANNUAL ENTITY UNE OF COSTS FUNDS On-User Tire Shredding **IWM** Support \$1.000+ Fees and Recycling county going Program diversion program Construction/ IWM. Work with 1996-User \$7.500 1998 Fees Demolition Business construction Private Facility License waste haulers in establishing Recycling Department Program construction and demolition recovery programs. \$7,500+ Work with 1996construction 1998 and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials. \$750+ 1997-Arrange for 1999 proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.

FINAL

White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities		Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	On- going	User Fees	\$5,000
---	--	--	--------------	--------------	---------

Table B7-1

FINAL

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE								
PROGRAM	RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	T ASK S	TIME LINE	SOURCE OF FUNDS	COSTS			
Designation of a City Recycling Coordinator	CC.Recycling Coordinator	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.	1995- 2000	User Fees	\$28,000 to \$35,000			
		Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.	On- going					
		Prioritize programs.	On- going					
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.	Yeariy					
		Monitor and evaluate performance annually.	On- going					

B7-15

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IWM

Develop Public Information Resources	IWM. Recycling Coordinator	Prepare information on recyclable materials. collection programs, and uses for collected materials.	On- going	User Fees	\$1,000 +
		Prepare an insert for utility bills.	On- going		\$1,000 +
		Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Commerce.	On- going		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$750+

B7-16

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Community Group Outreacn	IWM. Recycling Coordinator	Meet regularly with various groups.	On- going	User Fees	\$1,000
		Work with non- profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop- off boxes and newspaper drives.	On- going		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$750+
Establish a City Recycling	IWM, Recycling	Develop a monthly	On- going	U ser Fees	\$8,551
Newsletter	Coordinator	newsletter.			\$12,031
Newsletter	Coordinator	newsletter. Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices.	On- going		\$12,031

B7-17

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/IVM

Establish a Public Information Center	IWM. Recycling Coordinator	Ensure information is readily available.	On- going	User Fees	\$1,000
		Advertise the center's use.	On- going		\$1,000
		Develop mailers, inserts. and newspaper articles to advertise the center.	On- going		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$750

City of Hernet - Public Works Administration/WM

B7-18

Business Training Sessions	Recycling Coordinator	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	1995	User Fees	\$6,600 (First Year)
		Develop and distribute a recycling guide.	1995		\$1,200 Annual after the first
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.	1995		yoa
		Initiate an awards program.	1995		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		
		<u> </u>			}

B7-19

Develop a Media Campaign	Recycling Coordinator, Finance	Develop a recycling logo.	1995	∪ser Fees	\$1,000
Canpaly:	Department	Distribute publicity materials.	1995		\$1,000
		Create and distribute a press packet.	1995		\$1,000
		Develop brochures and pamphlets.	1995		\$1,000
		Insert brochures into bills.	1995		\$1,000
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		\$1,000

FINAL

Table B7-1

Designate a School Recycling Coordinator	Recycling Coordinator	Organize a recycling program at school.	1995	User Fees	\$2.738 to \$3.495
		Choose curriculum.	1995		
		Initiate an in- house service training session for school's staff.	1995		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		
Recycling Curriculum (Schoois)	Recycling Coordinator, IWM,PIO	Choose a recycling curriculum.	1995	User Fees	\$9,427 to \$12,031
		Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress.	1995		
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the program.	On- going		

B7-21

City of Hernet - Public World Administration/IVM

CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE

2

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B8

	Table B	8-1		
		HUGHAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Adoption of Local Ordinances	Public Works Department Recycling Coordinator	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	December 1992	\$2,500
		Adopt mandates for waste evaluations. Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	Juity 1993	\$3,000
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium-term.	July 1994- Ongoing	Included above
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	Public Works Department City Manager	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	March 1994	\$1,500
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	March 1995	\$4,000
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	1996-Ongoing	\$1,500
Public Recognition	Recycling Coordinator	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	September 1994	\$500-\$1,000
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program	September 1995	N/A

FINAL

Program Efficient Use of Paper City I in City Department Publi Recy	Table B source reduction PF Responsible Entity	8-1 Dogdam Indel Ementation		
Program Efficient Use of Paper City I Publitin City Department Recy	Responsible Entity			
Efficient Use of Paper City A In City Department Public Recy City f		Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
City C	Manager In Works Department	Use double sided coplers	June 1992	N/A
	cling Coordinator Department	Encourage non-confidential single- sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	June 1992	N/A
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.	June 1993	N/A
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their Incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the Intent of reducing their size.	June 1993	N/A
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	
Use of Drought Resistant Recy Landscaping Publi	cting Coordinator Ic Works Department	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	July 1992	\$2,500
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	July 1994	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	July 1997	N/A

,

Club Reidelder Inc. All Rights Reserved

FLS-4A/Revised: June 15, 1992

	al Costs	~					<u> </u>	
	Annua	N/N	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Schedule	September 1992	June 1994	July 1997	June 1992	September 1993	June 1994	June 1997
8-1 ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	Establish a system by which state and federat legislation is monitored.	Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.
Table B source reduction P	Responsible Entity	Recycling Coordinator Waste Hauler Solid Waste Facilities			City Manager Public Works Department Berwiter Coordinator			
	Program	Referral System for White Goods			Support for State and Federal Packaging	0		

,

	Table B	8-1		
	SOURCE REDUCTION F	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
oans, Grants, and oan Guarantees	City Manager Public Works Department Bennating Coordinator	Inform businesses of funds available from the Department of Conservation.	September 1992	N/A
		Educate groups of the availability of funds .	September 1992	N/A
		Establish a special fund for loans and grants for bushesses to help them implement source reduction programs.	September 1994	A/N
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	January 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
tusiness License ee Modification	City Manager Recycling Coordinator	Evaluate whether modified business license fees are necessary, according to the participation level of businesses.	September 1994	\$2,500
		Monitor and Evaluate participation and effectiveness of program.	January 1995	N/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A

,

Table Entity Responsible Entity Norks Department ng Coordinator Hauler
Vorks Departmer ng Coordinator Extension
Norks Department ng Coordinator

FINA

ELS.d.A (Devised: Innau) 5, 1902

	Annual Costs	\$1,000-\$2,500	N/N	A/A
	Schedule	July 1992	June 1994	June 1996
8-1 Rogram IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	Monitor and evaluate program lor participation and effectiveness during medium-term.
Table B source reduction P	Responsible Entity	City Manager Public Works Department Berwiling Coordinator		
	Program	Non-Procurement Programs		

FINAL

				HINAL
	Table RECYCLING PROGI CITY OF LI	B8–1 ram implementation ake elsinore		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Amual Costs
Single family commingled curbside recycling	Recycling Coordinator Public Works City Manager Works Hander	Implement Single family curbside recycling program	1992-Ongolng	\$ 215,760-\$399-552 (assume \$2/household
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period. Consider necessity of MRF for mixed refuse during medium-term	1933- 1995	N/A
		Monitor program chosen during medium-term	1995-2000	N/A
		Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.	1997	N/A
Muttl-family recycling	Public Works Recycling Coordinator City Manager	Implement MF recycling program	1993-Ongoing	\$103,972-\$128,360 (assume \$10/ton)
	City Council Waste Hauler MRF Operators	Monttor and evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	1993-1995	N/A
		Monttor during medlum-term	1996-2000	N/A
		Assess diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.	1997	N/A

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

LE-SA/Revised: June 4, 1992

FINAL		Amtual Costs	V/N	\$182,574 - \$225,400 (assume \$10/ton)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$20/ton	¢	\$2,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Schedule	1992-1993	1993-Ongoing	1993-1995	1995	1994	1996-2000	1997	1992-Ongolng	1995	1996-2000	1997
B8-1	RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Identity IPF facility feasible for short- term needs. Establish agreement through/with waste hauler for use of facility	Process residential wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term planning period	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Identity MRF for use in short-term and medium-term	Process all waste streams through MRF during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.	Adopt ordinances and monitoring programs	Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	Monitor during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.
Table	RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	Public Works Department Recycling Coordinator City Manager City Council Waste Haufer	Facility Operators County Waste Management						Public Works Recycling Coordinator	City mainage Business License Supervisor City Council	waste nauter Facility Operators	
		Program	Processing through Facility (IPF and MRF)							Ordinances			

LE-SA/Revised: June 4, 199.

oly) ! Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

HINA	unuat Costs	- 4,000	Sec. 8	<u></u>	iec. 4		
	40	-000 -	See	N/N	SeaS	N/N	N/A
	Schedule	2661	1992 - 1993	July 1994	1993 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1997
) B8-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Contact drop off center operators. Identify areas where improvements can be made. Provide technical assistance.	Develop public Information campaign to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials.	Monttor and evaluate program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monttor program.	Evaluate program performance and implement Improvement measures.
Table RECYCLING PROG CITY OF L	Responsible Entity	Drop-Off Center Operators. Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department City Manager City Connet					
	Program	Unstatfed Drop-Off Center Promotion					

e1991 Kicinfelder, Iac. - All Rights Reserved

TP CA / Davidente: 1 - 1 1005

	Annual Costs	1,000 - 4,000	See Sec. B	See Sec. 4	N/A
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992-Ongoing	1996-Ongoing	1997
e B8-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public Information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted. Monitor program.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as reeded. Reassess efficiency of program. Monitor program.	Evaluate program and implement improvements.
Table RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	Certified Recyclers Public Works Department City Manager City Council			
	Program	Certified Recycling Center Promotion			

B8-10

LE-5A/Revised: June 4, 1992

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - Alt Rights Reserved

TAT

	Annual Costs	See IPF/MRF 4 mm	See IPF/MRF	1,000	N/A	See IPF/MRF	See Sec. B
	Schedule	1992 1992	1993	1993-Ongoing	1995	1993-2000	1996 - 2000
B8-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Accomplish facility identification (see IPF/MRF) Form agreement with waste hauler	Begin recycling programs.	Organize Public Agency department recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Require reporting from hauler and monitor programs.	Evaluate programs to improve performance on annual basts.
Table RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Employees, City Department Heads Recycling Coordinator Planning Commission	Public Works Department City Manager, City Council Waste Hauler	Businesses and Industry Facility Operators	<u></u>		
	Program	Public Agency Commercial and Industrial Recycling Programs					

LE-SA/Revised: June 4, 1992

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Amual Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,000	See Sec. 8 See Sec. 9	N/A	See Sec. 4	V/V
	Schedule	1991 - 1992	1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1992-Ongoing	1992 - 1993	1994	1993 - 1995	1996 - 2000
38-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Develop dialogue among County, other cities, and Lake Elsinore to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Implement salvaging improvements. Monitor and reassess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.	Identify county programs for fire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Lake Elsinore. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance and improvement measures.
Table I RECYCLING PROG CITY OF L	Responsible Entity	Riverside County Local Task Force Recycling Coordinator County Local Task Force Public Works Department City Manager			Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department City Manager City Council Riverside County	County Local Task Force			
	Program	Salvaging			Other Programs (The recycling)				

01991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

LE-SA/Revised: June 4, 1992

FINAL		Annual Costs	88	88 Sec. 8	38 Sec. 4	8	
				й 	ů g	9 1.00	N 00
		Schedule	1992-Ongoin	1992-Ongoln	1996-Ongoin	1933-Ongoin	1993-200
	8-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION AKE ELSINORE	Tasks	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Montror and reassess efficiency of program annually.	Evaluate City procurement policies to increase recycled material use. Assist industry, businesses and house in chalono and see for	recycled materials through programs such as CALMAX, etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of effectiveness of marketing for materials recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- and medium-term, annually.
	Table B Recycling Progi City of L	Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers Public Works Department Recycling Coordinator			Recycling Coordinator County Waste Management Dept. Waste Hauler	
		Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs			Markets for Recyclable Materials	

				FINAL
	Table B8-	i		
	COMPOSTING PROGRAM	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Residential Program	Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department Waste Harder	Identity MRF and compositing facility for medium-term processing	1993	N/A
	Facility Operators (MRF, Compost Facility)	Work with facility operators to develop markets for the recovered materials	1994-Ongoing	\$1,000/year
		Begin diversion of yard waste	July 1997	
		Monitor program	1997-Ongoing	
Commercial/ Industrial, Public Agency	Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department	Identity MRF and compositing facility for medium-term processing	1993	N/A
	Facility Operators (MRF, Compost Facility)	Work with facility operators to develop markets for the recovered materials	1994-Ongoing	\$1,000/year
		Begin diversion of yard waste	July 1997	
		Monitor program	1997-Ongoing	

oput Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Riphis Reserved

ELS-6/Revised: June 4, 1992

	Table B8-	1		LINAL
	SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAI	A IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	щ	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Waste Management Department Public Works Department	Support County Diversion Program	July 1992	Included in County Tipping Fees
	City Manager	Monitor program during short-term	1992-Ongoing	(shredding only) N/A
		Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	1994	N/A
		Monitor program during medium- term	1996-Ongoing	N/A
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	Waste Maragement Department County LEA Public Works Department	Work with construction waste haulers In establishing construction and demoition recovery programs.	December 1992	\$2,000
(industrial wood, inen and remainder wastes)	City Manager	Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	December 1993	N/A
		Require diversion to begin	December 1993	\$313,120 - \$407,000 (assume \$20/ton)
		Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1993	N/A
		Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1993-Ongoing	N/A
Open1 Kleinfelder, Inc All Riphts Reserved				ELS-6/Revised: June 4, 199

FINAL N/A - Costs are not Incurred by City for disposal fees for white goods at the program implementation. Annual Costs Included in **facility** A/A 1992-Ongoing 1991 - Ongoing July 1992 Schedule SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE Support and promote the saivaging program for white goods. Monitor program throughout short and medium-term Work with the County and Water District in developing a sludge composting facility. Tasks Table B8–1 Riverside County Waste Management Riverside County Waste Management Elsinore Municipal Water Treatment **Responsible Entity** City Manager Solid Waste Facility Manager Public Works Department Waste Haufer Department Department Plant Development of a Sludge Composting Facility White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities Program

Dring Place of L. Pulling Black Processing

I E-7/Revised: June 4, 1992

CIT	'l'âdi Y of lake elsinore - source vibitic editication and inform	e B8-1 Reduction and recycling Mation implementation sce	ELEMENT JEDUI E	
rogram	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
ignation of a City Coordinator	Recycling Coordinator (City Manager would hire Recycling Coordinator)	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.	January 1992 - 2000	\$39,200-\$45,379 (includes 40% homefite)
	Public Works Department	Prepare reports and agenda ttems for the City Council.		formation
		Ptioritize programs.		
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.		
		Monitor and evaluate performance on annual basis	1992 - 2000	N/A
velop Public In Resources	Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department	Prepare Information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials	1992 - Ongoing Distribute Information to a	\$2,000 per year
		Insert into utility bills or make into door handers.	minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within	
		Prepare and develop an Information backet to be distributed by the	the first year (by January 1992) and 50% the next	
		Chamber of Commerce.	year (by January 1993).	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium term	1994 - 1997	N/A

ELS-8/Revised: June 4, 1992

91991 Kicinfefder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

5	Table B8- ry of lake elsinore - source public education and inform] REDUCTION AND RECYCLING MATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.3 - Community Group	Recycling Coordinator	Meet regularly with various groups.	July 1992 - Oncoina	Matertals Printing
Outreach	Diocx Leauers	Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.		Advertising \$500 - 1,000
		Monitor and evaluate program in short- and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
8.4.4 - Establish a City	Recycling Coordinator	Develop monthly newsletter.	January 1993 - Ornolog	Materials Deterting
Recycling Newsletter	Public Works Department	Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices.		Distribution \$1,000 - 1,500
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
and and all all all all all all all all all al				El S.8/Revised: June 4, 19

elder, Inc Nein 6610

ELS-8/Revised: June 4, 1997

°1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Annual Costs	Materials Printing Distribution Rental of Occupying Space \$2,500 - 3,000	Materials Printing Awards Awards Becycling Bins Signs \$2,100 - 3,000 per sessions per year N/A
ELEMENT	Schedule	1996 1996	1993 - Ongoing 1994, 1997
8-1 Reduction and recycling Iation implementation SCF	Tasks	Ensure Information is readily available. Advertise the center's use. Develop mallers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center. Monitor and evaluate program.	Initiate training sessions for businesses. Develop and distribute a recycling guide. Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets. Initiate an awards program. Monitor and evaluate program in short and meditum-term.
Y OF LAKE ELSINORE - SOURCE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department	Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department
CH	Program	8.4.5 - Establish a Public Information Center	8.4.6 - Business Tralming Sessions

IJ	Table 1 7 of lake elsinore - source 9 ublic education and inform	88-1 Reduction and recycling Aation implementation Sci	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.7 - Develop a Media Campaign	Recycling Coordinator Certified Recycler Waste Hauler	Develop a recycling logo. Distribute publicity materials.	July 1992 - develop logo.	Materials Printing Distribution
	Public Works Department	Create and distribute a press packet. Develop brochures and pamphlets.	July 1992 - distribute various publicity materials.	Awards Press Packet \$500 - 1,000
		Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	Ongoing media program.	
		Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".	<u> </u>	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A
8.4.8 - Spring Clean Up	Recycling Coordinator	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program.	January 1993	\$500 - 1,000
		Prepare and distribute information on the program.		

FINAL

#1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

ELS8/Revised: June 4, 1992

N/A

1994, 1997

Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.

G	Table B fy of lake elsinore - source public education and inform	8–1 Reduction and recycling Aation implementation Sch	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.9 - Designate a School Recycling Coordinator	School District Recycling Coordinator	Organize a recycling program at school.	September 1992	Speakers' fees Materials
		Choose curriculum.		Buithing
		Monitor the effectiveness of the program.		
		Initiate an In-house service training session for school's staff.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	N/A

FINAL

ELS&/Revised: June 4, 1992

e1991 Kicinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL	Annual Costs	Materials Printing	Distribution Awards Advertising	000'Z - 000'I¢				N/A	Curriculum		A/A
ELEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	September 1993						1994, 1997	September 1994 -	- Buo Buo Buo	1995, 1998
88-1 Reduction and recycling Aation implementation SC	Tasks	Create a recycling theme or logo.	Develop displays and exhibits with student-created materials to be placed around the community.	Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin.	Distribute builetin to parents.	initiate an awards program.	Promote schools progress with local media.	Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	Choose a recycling curriculum.	Meet monthy to discuss the school's goals and progress.	Monttor and evaluate program.
Table T Y OF LAKE ELSINORE - SOURCE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	School Recycling Coordinator Recycling Council	Recycling Coordinator						School Recycling Coordinator	School EAC Curriculum Council	Hecycling Commutee
5	Program	8.4.10 - Develop a Recycling Program for the Classroom							8.4.11 - Recycling Curriculum		

⁰1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

ELS-8/Revised: June 4, 1992
FINAL

N PROGRAMS	Comments	Program began in February of 1990	Program began in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside, and Beaumont.	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health	
OUS WASTE COLLECTIO	1990 Diversion from County Landfills*	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247**	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	(Diversion was not during calendar ycar 1990)	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668	
Table B8-2 isting household hazard	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Dept.	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health	
SUMMARY OF EX	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	One-Day Events	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil	

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency.

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

1.E/Revised: June 4, 1992

	Table Household hazardous we	B8-3 STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHED	DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
County Mobile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff City Recycling Staff	Assist the County in hosting the Moble Collection Center In Lake Elsinore.	1992 - Ongoing	Included in landill tipping fees
		Assist the County in advertising Mobile Collection Center.	Buloguo-2661	
City Deregulated HHW Collection Center	Franchise Waste Hauler City Manager	Evaluate the feasibility of siting a permanent collection center.	1994-1995	N/A
		If feasible, site facility	1996	

©1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

LE/Revised: June 4, 1992

CITY OF MORENO VALLEY

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B9

	Table B9 SOURCE REDUCTION P)—1 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Adoption of Local Ordinances	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	1992	\$2,500
		Adopt mandates for waste evaluations.	1963	000'6\$
		Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	1993	
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	1994-1995	\$3,000-\$4,000
		Evaluate effectiveness of program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness.	1996	\$2,000-\$3,500
Public Recognition	City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	1994-1995	\$500.\$1,000

	Table source reduction P	B9-1 Rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Efficient Use of Paper	Public Works Department	Use double-sided copiers	1992	N/N
	Cry some representative Task Force	Encourage non-confidential single- sided material to be reused as scratch paper.		
		Encourage all Clty departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.		
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mall lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.		
Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping	City Sotid Waste Representative Public Works Department Task Force	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	1992	\$2,500
Referral System for White Goods	City Solid Waste Representative Waste Haufer Task Force	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for reuse.	1992	V/N
Support for State and Federal Packaging Laws	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored. Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	1992 1993	V/N
olyn Kleinfekter, Inc All Rights Reserved				

	Table B source reduction p	19—1 Rogram Implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Establish a special fund for loans and grants for businesses to help them implement source reduction programs. Inform businesses of funds available form the Department of Conservation. Educate groups of the availability of funds.	1994 1982 1982	N/N
Business License Fee Modification	City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Modify business license fees according to the participation level of businesses.	1993	\$ 2,500
Waste Evaluations	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Waste Haufer Task Force	Implement a waste evaluation program. Report results of the program annualty.	1983	\$12,000-\$15,000
Support for On Site Composting	Public Works Department City Solki Waste Representative Task Force	Provide Information and technical assistance to help establish on site compositing.	1994-1995	\$4,000-\$3,000

	Annual Costs	\$3,000-\$4,000	\$1,000-\$2,500
	Schedule	1994-1995	1992
891 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction program.	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.
Table 1 source reduction i	Responsible Entity	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force	Public Works Department City Solid Waste Representative Task Force
	Program	Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	Non-Procurement Programs

Operator Physical Arristics and Antibution Devices and

APA 4A Minute Real Presson in 1 1995

	Annual Costs	\$829,800- 1,114,000 N/A	N/A \$23,700 - 29,300 N/A
	Schedule	1992-1995 1992 1997	1993 - 1995 1997
89–1 Ram implementation Oreno valley	Tasks	Implement single family curbside recycling program. Evaluate effectiveness in short- term planning period. Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning	period. Implement multi-family recycling program Evaluate effectiveness in medium-term planning period.
Table I RECYCLING PROGI CITY OF MO	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Department Waste Hauler	City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Department Waste Hauler MRF Operators
	Program	Single Family Commingled Curbside Recycling	Multi-family Recycling through a Material Recovery Facility (MRF)
	<u> </u>		

P1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-5/Revised: Pebruary 3, 1992

	Annua! Costs	\$274,800- 321,900 N/A	A/N A/N	A/N
	Schedule	1993-1995 1995-1997	1991 - 1993 1994 - 1995	1996 - 2000
e By-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION ORENO VALLEY	Tasks	MRF all commercial wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short-term planning period Evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.	Develop dialogue among County, other cities, and Moreno Valley to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program. Implement salvaging improvements. Reassess annually.	Assess salvaging program effectiveness and modify as appropriate.
TADI RECYCLING PROG	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Department City Manager Waste Hauler MRF Operators	Riverside County Waste Management City Solid Waste Representative County Local Task Force Public Works	
	Program	Commercial Recycling through a Material Recovery Facility	Salvaging	

And the second of the second second

[····-			······································	
	Annual Costs	\$2,000 per year	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4
	Schedule	1992		
9–1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION ORENO VALLEY	Tasks	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Reassess efficiency of program.
Table B RECYCLING PROG CITY OF M	Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers Public Works City Solid Waste Representative		
	Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs (Buyback Centers, Drop- off Centers, Certified Becyclars)		

MV-5/Revised: Pebruary 3, 1992

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

ŗ

			······································					
	Annual Costs	\$3,000 per year	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	N/A	\$2,000 per year		1997
	Schedule	1992	1992 - 1993	1993 - 1995	1996 - 2000	1992	1994	1995 - 1997
: By-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION ORENO VALLEY	Tasks	Contact drop-off center operators. Identify areas where improvements can be made. Provide technical assistance.	Develop public information campaign to improve public awareness of drop-off locations and materials. Develop monitoring and evaluation program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Assess program performance and improvement measures.	Adopt ordinance requiring mandatory diversion rates of recycling.	Assess diversion efficiency in short-term planning period.	Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.
TADIE RECYCLING PROG CITY OF M	Responsible Entity	Drop-off Center Operators City Solid Waste Representative Public Works				City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Department Business License Supervisor City Manader	City Council Waste Hauler	
	Program	Unstatfed Drop-off Center Promotion				Commercial and Industrial Ordinances		

°1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

.

MV-5/Revised: Rebruary 3, 1992

		<u> </u>		
	Annual Costs	\$3,000 per year	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4
	Schedule	1992		
B9-1 GRAM IMPLEMENTATION AORENO VALLEY	Tasks	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Reassess efficiency of program.
Table RECYCLING PROC CITY OF N	Responsible Entity	Certified Recyclers City Solid Waste Representatives Public Works		
	Program	Certified Recycling Center Promotion		

•1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-5/Revised: February 3, 1992

Present awards to best 1993 - 2000 See Sec. 8 programs on annual basis. Reassess programs to improve performance on annual basis.	ogram Programs	Responsible Entity City Employees City Department Heads City Solid Waste Representative Public Works	Tasks Continue high grade paper recycling program. Develop and initiate other recycling programs. Organize department employee recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Develop monitoring and evaluation program.	Schedule Ongoing 1992 - 1993	Annual Costs \$1,000 per year
	<u></u>		Present awards to best programs on annual basis. Reassess programs to improve performance on annual basis.	1993 - 2000	See Sec. 8

ary 3, 1992 MV-5/Revi

	Annuel Costs	\$1,000 per Bar	See Sec. B	See Sec. 4	N/A
	Schedule	1991 - 1992 ye	1992 - 1993	1993 - 1995	1996 - 2000
B9–1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION ORENO VALLEY	Tasks	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Moreno Valley. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop-off locations and materials. Develop monitoring and evaluation program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Assess program performance and improvement measures.
Table RECYCLING PROGI CITY OF MI	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Riverside County Waste Management County Local Task Force			
	Program	Other Programs (Tire Recycling)			

#1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-5/Revised: Pebruary 3, 1992

	Table B9-1 composting progra	M IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
lesidential rogram	City Solid Waste Representative Public Works Department	Arrange for Inland Disposal to recover yard waste Work with Inland Disposal to develop markets for the recovered materials Arrande for proper documentation	1995 1992-1998 1995	N/A* N/A
		from Inland Disposal		
commercial/ ndustriat rrooram	City Solid Waste Representative	Work with Inland Disposal in establishing yard waste recovery programs	1995	V/N
	Public Works Department	Work with Inland Disposal to develop markets for recovered materials Arrange for proper documentation from inland Disposal	1992-1998 1995	N/A N/A
		-		

* Not applicable at this time. To be determined at a later date.

©1991 Kleinfetder, Iac. - All Rights Reserved

MV-6/Revieed: February 3, 1992

DRAFT	Annual Costs	Included In County Tipping Faes	\$2,000 per year	Assume \$20 per ton processing cost at facility		included in Isndfilling fees for white goods.	N/A - Costs are not incurred by City for program implementation.
	Schedule	1992-2000	1892-1998	1993-Ongoing		1992-2000	1991-1993 1993-1996 1995-1998
9-1 A IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULI	Tasks	Support County Diversion Program	Work with construction waste harders in establishing construction and demotition recovery programs.	Work with construction and demotion haders to develop markets for recovered materials.	Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demoition hauters.	Support and promote the landfill salvaging program for white goods.	Work with the County and Water District in developing a sludge composting facility.
Table B Special waste program	Responsible Entity	Waste Management Department Public Works Dept.	Waste Maragement Department County LEA County Public Works Public Works Dept.	City Manager		Waste Hauler Riverskie County Waste Management Department	Riverside County Waste Management Department Public Works Department Eastern Mu nicipel Water Treat ment Plant
	Program	Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program			White Goods Salvaging Program	Development of Sludge Composting Facility

91991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

NT	Annual dule Costs	Speakers' fees Materials Printing	ñuwar -			1 - Materials	Distribution	o various Press Packet		media		
i eleme Hedule	Sche	1994				July 199		distribute	puukicity materials	Ongoing program		
E REDUCTION AND RECYCLING MATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	Tasks	Organize a recycling program at school.	Choose curriculum.	Monitor the effectiveness of the program.	Initiate an in-service training session for school's staff.	Develop a recycling logo.	Distribute publicity materials.	Create and distribute a press packet.	Develop brochures and pamphlets.	Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".	
Table B9–1 1 of moreno valley - Source Ublic education and inform	Responsible Entity	School District Principal School Recycling Coordinator				City Solid Waste Representative	Public Works Department	Waste Hauler	City Public Information Office			
CITY	Program	8.4.1 - Designate a School recycling coordinator				8.4.2 - Develop a Media			. <u></u>			01991 Kleinfelder, Inc All Rights Reserved

				DRAFT
L D	Tal OF MORENO VALLEY - SOURCE UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	ole B9-1 Reduction and recycling ation implementation sch	ELEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.3 - Designation of a City	City Solid Waste Representative	Advertise the position	January 1992	\$45,000 plus 40% for estimated
Solid Waste Hepresentative	(City Manager would designate a City Solid Waste Representative)	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.		benefits
		Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.		
		Prioritize programs.		
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.		
·				
8.4.4 - City Recycling	City Solid Waste Representative	Continue monthly newsletter.	Existing	Materials Printing
Newsletter	Public Information Department	Develop an informational brochure that details curbside collection.	1993	Distribution \$1,500
		Distribute through direct mall, free distribution stands, and all city offices.		

01991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-BA/Revised: Pebruary 3, 1992

UKAF	Annual Costs	Staff time needed to train and give demonstrations. Materials Printing Distribution Demonstration compost facility Advertising \$2,500 per year \$2,000 per year	
à ELEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	1993 Distribute Information to a minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within the first year (by July 1992) and 50% the next year	(by July 1993).
Le B9–1 E reduction and recycling Mation implementation sci	Tasks	Recruit individuals to give compositing and mulching demonstrations. Develop fact sheets and guidelines for composing. Develop a "demonstration compost" facility. Advertise compost facility. Prepare information on recyclable materials, collected materials. Insert information into utility bills or make into door hangers.	
「「なり」 「ない」 「 「ない」 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「 「	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Representative City Solid Waste Representative Public Information Department	
Ъ В С О	Program	 8.4.5 - Develop Compositing 'How to' Information 8.4.8 - Develop Public Information Resources 	

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-BA/Revised: Rebruary 3, 1992

. 01991 Kielnfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-&A/Revised: Rebruary 3, 1992

Ë	Table B: OF MORENO VALLEY - SOURC UBLIC EDUCATION AND INFOR	9-1 3-1	ELEMENT JEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity		Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.10 - Develop a Recycling	School Recycling Coordinator	Create a recycling theme or logo.	September 1994	Materiais D
	School EQAC	Develop displays and exhibits with		Distribution
	Recycling Council	placed around the community.		Advertising
	City Solid Waste Representative	Develop a student-produced monthly builetin.		
	Principal	Distribute bulletin to parents.		
		Initlate an awards program.		
		Promote schools progress with local media.		
8.4.11 - Recycling Curriculum	School Recycling Coordinator	Choose a recycling curriculum.	September 1995	Curriculum et non - 3 non
	School EQAC Curriculum Council Recycling Committee	Meet monthly to discuss the schoot's goals and progress.		

.

©1991 Kicinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV-&A/Revied: Pebruary 3, 1992

N PROGRAMS	Comments	Program began in February of 1990	Program began in February 1990. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all fandfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Depart.
OUS WASTE COLLECTIO	1990 Diversion from County Landfills	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247*	Gallons Pounds Containers (Diversion was not during calendar year 1991)	Gallons Pounds Containers ^{**} (Diversion was not during calendar year 1991)	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668
Table B9–2 isting household hazard	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Dept. Environmental Health Division Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Depl. Environmental Health Division Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Dept. Environmental Health Division Hazardous Materials Branch	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Dept. Environmental Health Division
SUMMARY OF EX	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	Onc-Day Events	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1.
**Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Department

03993 Kleinfelder, inc. - All Rights Reserved

MV/Revised: February 3, 1992

	Table B9 Household hazardous wa		DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
County Mobile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff City Solid Waste Representative	Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Moreno Valley.	1992 - Ongolng	Included in landfill tipping fees
		Assist the County in advertising the Mobile Collection Center.	1992-Ongoing	
Residential Hazardous Waste Doundur Daviel	Moreno Valley Disposal Cliv Sold Waste Benzesentative	Select date(s) of Roundup Day(s)	1992	Included in refuse
		Moreno Valley Disposal will responsible for preparing all applications, manifests, and obtaining all necessary approvals for the Roundup(s)	1994	
•		Advertise and promote the Roundup(s)	1994	
		Conduct the Roundup(s)	1994	
		Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Roundup(s)	1994	
City Deregulated HHW Collection Center	Moreno Valley Disposal City Solid Waste Representative	Evaluate the feasibility of shing a permanent collection center.	1994	V/V

MV/Revised: Pebnury 3, 1992

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

CITY OF NORCO

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B10

Propriet and the second	50	12.2	1976	1661	\$661	1956	1997	8661	1999	2000
Source Reduction										
existing Programs Quantity-Based Variable Rates										
Waste Evaluations/Waste Minimization										
Beeryaru Composting Educational Efforts										
Non-procurement Source Reduction		1								
Programs by Local Government										
Auoption of Government Procurement Policies		••••								
Rocycling Residential Curbside Rocycling										
Commercial Recycling Programs										
Buy-Back Center		•	•••••							
intermotiate Processing Facility Mixed Waste Material Recovery Facility		•	•							
Composting Bootstored on the State										
restacting Luraside Collection Residential Bin Service for Manue										
Drop-off Collection at Composting Facility		••••								
Contribution of Comparison Landing										
Special Waste Landfill Salvaging of Tires	÷						-			
Concrete and Asphalt Recycling Bulky Item Collection										
Public Education and Information					Ī					
	•									
Program Development										
Pilot Program		1aule	1-01a							

B10-1

Program Implementation Schedule

ERA Wencheringten VEICITHORVENIEMY, 1992

Pilot Program

Full Scale Operation

City of Nervo Final Draft SRRE - hangesion Component

Integrated Implem	entation Plan - Source Redu	ction Com	ponent	-		
Abstantive Programs	Basponshis Bathy	1991	1992	1995	1994	19954
A. Existing Diversion						
1. Initiate Contact	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Quantification of Diversion Activity	business owners/ Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x
3. Wante Brahastina		L			<u> </u>	
1. Program Development	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Distribute Questionnaire	Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Creste Database	Resycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
4. Evaluation of Program	Resysting Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Resysting Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x
F	Contract of the second					
C. Rockyard Composing						
1. Design Program	Consultant/ Resysting Coordinator/ City DFW		x			
2. Education Program	Resyeling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
3. Procure Composing Bins	Recycling Coordinatoe/ Private individuals		x			
4. Distribute Composting Bins	Resysting Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
5. Monitor and Evaluate Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x

EBA Warnshindingins SECIINOR/Fahruny, 1992 City of Name Final Dealt SILLE - Jacqueire Company

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component (continued)

Absorbire Program	Responden Barby	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
D. Non-Procursument Source Reduction for the City Government						
1. Program Development	City DPW/ Consultant		x			
2. Education Programs	City employees/ Consultant/ City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x
E. Adaption of City Government Protocomment Policies						
1. Program Design	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			-
2. Present Model Program to local govt. agencies for review and approval	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			
3. Adoption by City Council	City Government Staff/ City DPW			x		
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DFW			x	x	x

-

City of Norso Final Deat SRRE - Integration Company

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component

Abassative Programs	Responsible Entry	1991	1992	1995	1994	1995
A. Carbaids Recycling						
1. Evaluate Pilot Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator	x				
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Hauler/ City DPW	x				
3. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW	x				
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Hauler		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

Abanairo Propunsion	Responsible Ruity -	*1991**	1972	1993***	L.	مىنى دە
C. Commercial/Industrial Recycling Program						
1. Initial Study of Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator/ Bus. Owners, Managers			x		
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Hauler/ City DPW			x		
3. Education Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Heuler			x		
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	x	x
D. Buy-Back Contor						
1. Apply for Local Operating Permits	Buy-back Operator/ Local Planning Dept.			x		
2. Apply for Permit from Dept. of Connervation	Buy-back Operator			x		
3. Purchase Equipment	Buy-back Operator			x		
4. Begin Operations	Buy-beck Operator				x	
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Buy-back Operator/ City DPW				x	x

EBA Warathaningins SECLINORVEntrany, 1992 City of Nanta Finit Druk SRRE - Integration Company

B10-4

Abarative Propaga	Rampsonikis Bathy	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
B. Intermediate Proceeding Pacificy (IPP)				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1. Detailed Engineering and Feasibility Study	Waste Hauier/ County Waste Mgmt.		x			
2. Acquisition of Land	Wane Hauler		x			
3. Permitting	Waste Hauler/ Local Government/ CIWMB		x			
4. Communica	Wana Haular			x		
5. Equipment Procurement	Wana Haular			x		
6. Stars-up Testing and Full Operations	Weste Hauler			x		
7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Wasta Hauler/ City DPW/ County Waste Mgmt./ CTWMB			x	x	x

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

EBA Warnstmologue SEC11MOR/February, 1992

.

Integrated Implementation Plan - Composing Component

Alumative Programs	Respondeds Bathy	1991	1992	1995	1994	1995
A. Curbuids Recycling						
I. Design Program	City DPW/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Start Development of Composing Facility (if not sent to Existing Facility)	Composting Facility Operator		x			
3. Finalize Program Details	Recycling Coordinator/ Comparing Fac. Oper./ City DPW		x			
4. Obtain Approval for Program	City Council		x			
5. Develop and Distribute Educational Materials	Recycling Coordinator/ Composing Fac. Oper./ City DPW		x			
6. Begin Source-separated Bin Collection for manure	City DPW/ Wasta hauler/Home owners	_		x		
7. Begin Curbside Collection (if sent to existing facility)	Waste Hauler			x		
8. Begin Curbside Collection (if not sent to existing facility)	Waste Hauler				x	
9. Site Drop-off Facilities	City DPW/ Waste Hauler					x
10. Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	x	x

EIIA Wastachuchtgins \SECTINOR\Fabruary, 1992

City of Norm Final Draft SIGLE - Integration Compound

Integrated	Impiementati	on Pian -	Special	Waste	Component
------------	--------------	-----------	---------	-------	-----------

Absentive Programs	Responsible Satis	1991	1992	1995	1794	1995
A. Lambfill Solvaging for Tires	-					
1. Identify Site at Landfill for Temporary Storage and Handling of Tires	Landfill Operator/ County Waste Mgmt.		x			
2. Contact Recycler and Arrange for Pick-up	Landäll Operator/ County Waste Mgmt.		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Landfill Operator/ County Waste Mgmt./ City DPW		x	x	x	x
R. Concrete and Aspink Recycling						
1. Set Disposal Rates to Discourage Landfilling	Waste Haules/ City Council		x			
2. Develop and Distribute Education Materials	Weste Hauler		x			
3. Issue Special Debris Boxes to Asphalt and Concrete Producers	Waste Hauler		x			
4. Contact Recyclers and Arrange for Delivery	Weste Hauler/ Concrete, Asphak Recyclers		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x
C. Bully hours Collection						
1. Develop Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Publicize Program	Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Contact Recycler and Arrange for Pick-up	Recycling Coordinator		x			
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	x	x	x

EBA Wuterinologiae SECLINOR/February, 1992

City of Norus Final Deak SRRE - Integration Competence

Absorber Propage	Responshis Eathy	1991	1992	1992	1994-	12.7
A. Select Recycling Coordinator						
1. Solicit Candidates	Waste Hauler	x			ļ	
2. Interview Candidates and Select	Waste Hauler	x				
						10.000
B. Ratycing Task Perss					<u> </u>	
1. Make Appointmente	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
C. Program	; 					
1. Solicit Volumeers through Media, Flyers, Newsletters	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
2. Orientation Meeting	Recycling Coordinator		x			
3. Quarterly Mailings	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	oogoing		
4. Annual Meetings	Recycling Coordinator/ Community Votunteers/ City Task Force/ City DPW			x	x	x
D. School Carriogium						
1. Most with Schools	Resycling Coordinator/ Community Volunteers/ City Task Force		x			
2, Purchase Materials	Recycling Coordinator/ School Districu/ City Task Force			x		
3. Implement Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ School Districtu/ City Task Force/ Volumeers			x	x	x

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component

ERA Warenteningins SECTINORVIetnary, 1992 City of Norte Final Draft SIJRE - Integration Companies

•

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

Abustative Programme	Responsible Bathy	1991	1992	1993	1994	1955
B. Commercial/Interacial Busicess Programs						
1. Develop Chamber Awards Plan	City Task Force/ Recycling Coordinator		x			
2. Awards Evens	City Task Force/ Recycling Coordinator	-	x			
3. Develop BIA Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
4. Implement Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
F. Community Events						
1. Develop Informational Materials	Resycling Coordinator/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x			
2. Prepare Display	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
3. Participate in Events	Recycling Coordinator/ City Tesk Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
(J. Idadia Advertising						
1. Develop Ads	Recycling Coordinator/ City Task Force		x			
2. Schedule and Buy Media	Recycling Coordinator		x			

Absorber Program	Responsible Setty	1991	1992	1995	1994	1955
H. Collatoral Meterials						
1. Mayor's Letter	Recycling Coordinator/ Mayor's Office		x			
2. Residential Curbaide Recycling Instructions	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
3. Develop General Information Brochure	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
4. Develop and Dist. Info. for Backyard Composing	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
5. Begin Educ. Program for Source Red. to City Emps	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x	:		
6. Develop and Distribute Information for Asphak and Concrets Recycling	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
7. Publicize Bulky Items Collection Days Pick-Ups	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
8. Develop and Distribute Information for Yard Waste Pick- up Program	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW		x			
9. Commercial Recycling Programs	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
[. Video			<u> </u>			
1. Develop and Produce	Recycling Coordinator/ City Taak Force		x			
2. Distribute Video	Recycling Coordinator		x			
J. Monitoring and Bouloution						
1. Schedule and Implement	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x		
2. Roport Findings	Recycling Coordinator/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

EBA Wastedmologies \SEC11NOR\February, 1992 City of Norme Final Dash SRRE - Integration Companies

B10-10

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The lead agency for program administration will be the City's Department of Public Works. It is likely that any local programs will be a multi-jurisdictional in nature, administered in cooperation with the City of Corona and implemented by their franchised wasted hauler. Primary funding for the programs will be provided for by modification of the rate structure for refuse collection. These rate increases will have to be approved by the City Councils of both Cities after recommendations by staff. Secondary funding will include reimbursement in part through grants issued by the CIWMB. A solid waste coordinator will be designated and given the responsibilities of implementing the HHW program.

Table B10-2

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Design program			
site, facilities, schedule, personnel	5/92	Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure
Provide recommendation	6/92	City Dept. of Public Works	
Approve funding	7/92	City Council	
Coordinate publicity program	7/92	Franchised Waste Hauler	
Implement program	1/93, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler	
Ongoing monitoring	1/93. ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler	

Implementation Table for Drop-Off of Recyclable HHW

Implementation Table for Education Program

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Prepare original printed material	6/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	Rate Structure
Procure source reduction material	6/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Procure videotapes	6/92	Hauler/School District	
Prepare school curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Hauler/School District	
Implement curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Distribute media releases	12/92, ongoing	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Mail brochures	12/92	Waste Hauler/City DPW	
Establish HHW hotline	6/92	City DPW	

City of Name Find.Ded. Science: Ware Classes

B10-11

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Curbside monitoring for HHW collector training program implementation Load-checking program	6/92 6/92, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler Franchised Waste Hauler	Rate Structure Rate Structure
public education landfill employee training program implementation Program monitoring	6/93 1 6/93 6/93	Landfill Operator Landfill Operator Landfill Operator	Tipping fees Tipping fees Tipping fees
Quantification of recyclables collected City participation in County program Annual report Annual update reports of the waste stream	1/93, ongoing 1/92, ongoing 2/93, ongoing 6/91, ongoing	Franchised Waste Hauler County Dept. of Health Franchised.Waste Hauler County Department of Waste Management	Rate Structure Tipping fees Rate Structure County-wide tipping fees

Implementation Table for Monitoring and Evaluation Table B10-2

When RWQCB permit is renewed

Implementation Table for County-Wide Mobile Drop-Off Sites

Tasks	Completion	Responsible	Funding
	Date	Entity	Source
Continue implementation	Ongoing	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees
Report City participation	Annually	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees

Implementation Table for Permanent HHW Drop-Off Facility

Tasks	Completion	Responsible	Funding
	Date	Entity	Source
Engineering and feasibility study City accepts or rejects proposal City passes supportive legislation Acquisition of land RFP for MRF/HHW project Permits including EIR Construction Equipment procurement MRF startup HHW collection begins Ongoing monitoring	6/96 9/96 12/96 7/96 7/98 9/98 9/98 1/99 6/99, ongoing	MRF Operator/County Waste Management Dept. City DPW/City Council City Council Riverside County Riverside County MRF Operator, JPA MRF Operator MRF Operator	County-wide tipping fees

.

н
CITY OF PERRIS

1

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B11

				FINAL DRAFT
	Table	B11-1		
	SOURCE REDUCTION PI	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Adoption of Local Ordinances	Planning Department Recycling Coordinator Solid Waste Advisory Council	Review local ordinances and make changes, as apprupriate to increase source reduction activities.	December 1992	\$1,500 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Adopt mandates for waste evaluations.	July 1993	
		Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	December 1993	
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	Planning Department City Manager Recycling Courdinator Solid Waste Advisory Council	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans. Evaluate effectiveness of program.	January 1994 January 1996	\$2,000 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness.	January 1997	
Public Recognition	Recycling Coordinator Solid Waste Advisory Council	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled conteat products for use in their everyday work.	July 1994	\$500 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Monitor and evaluate program		

l

PE-11/kevisee. April 13, 1992

				FIN.L DRAFT
	Table E SOURCE REDUCTION PI	SI I – I ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Efficient Use of Paper In City Department	City Manager Planning Department Recycling Coordinator Solid Waste Advisory Council	Use double sided copiers Encourage non-confidential single-sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	1992 July	N/A See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.		-
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.		
Jse of Drought Resistant andscaping	Recycling Coordinator Planning Department Solid Waste Advisory Council	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	December 1992	\$2,500 Sue Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Develop informational material to be distributed to residents and landscape companies.		
		Distribute to residents and landscape companies.		
		Monitor and evaluate program.		
teferral System or White Goods	Recycling Coordinator Waste Hauler Solid Waste Advisory Council	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable gouds so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	December 1993	N/A See Section 10 for Revenue Sources

PE 11/Revised: April 13, 1992

4 1991 Kkintelder, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

B11-2

	Table source reduction PR	B11-1 cogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Butity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Support for State and Federal Packaging Laws	City Manager Planning Department Recycling Coordinatur Solid Waste Advisory Council	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored. Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	January 1994 December 1993	N/A See Section 10 for Revenue Sources N/A
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	City Manager Planning Depurtment Recycling Coordinator Sulid Waste Advisory Council	Establish a special fund for loans and grants for businesses to help them implement source reduction programs. Inform businesses of funds available from the Department of Conservation. Educate groups of the availability of funds.	December 1993 July 1994 December 1994	N/A See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
Business License Fee Modification	City Manager Recycling Coordinator Solid Waste Advisory Council	Modify business license fees according to the participation level of businesses. Monitor and evaluate the program.	January 1994	N/A See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
Waste Evaluations	Planning Department Recycling Coordinator Waste Hauler Sulid Waste Advisory Council	Implement a waste evaluation program. Report results of the program annually.	August 1993	\$8,000 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources

FINAL DRAFT

	Table	B11-1		FINAL DKAFI
	SOURCE REDUCTION PH	OGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	:	
Program	Responsible Bality	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Support for On-Sile Composting	Planning Department Recycling Coordinatur Solid Waste Advisory Council	Develop informational material for residents on on-site composting. Distribute information and provide technical assistance to help establish on- site composting.	October 1992	\$2,000 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources
		Munitur and evalute program.		
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	Planning Department Recycling Coordinator Sulid Wuste Advisory Council	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction program. Monitor and evaluate program.	January 1994	\$3,000 Sue Section 10 for Revenue Sources
Non-Procurement Programs	City Manager Planning Department Recycling Cuordinator Sulid Waste Advisory Council	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced. Distribute information to residents and businesses. Monitor and evalute program.	October 1992	\$1,500 See Section 10 for Revenue Sources

.

+ 1991 Kleinfelder, kw. - All Rights Reverved

PE-[]/Revised: April |], 1942

B11-4

				FIN DRAFT
	Table F RECYCLING PROGI	311-1 ram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Unstaffed Drop-off Center Pronotion	Drop-off Center Oprirs. Recycling Coordinator Planning Department City Manuver	Contact drop-off center operators. Identify areas where improvements can be made. Provide technical assistance.	October 1992	3,000
	City Council	Develop public information campaign to improve public awareness of drop-off locations and materials. Develop	December 1992	
		Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	December 1993	
		Assess program performance and improvement measures.	December 1996	
Certified Recycling Center Promotion	Certified Rocyclers Planating Department City Manager	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	December 1992	3,000
	City Council	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaiga to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.		
		Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Reassess efficiency of program.		
r 1991 Kicintelder, Inc All Rights Reserved				

FINAL DRAFT	Annual Costs	\$387,750 in 1993 to \$471,180 in 1995 (User Fees)	lactuded	lactuded	\$2,000 To be Determined	
	Schedule	June 1993	December 1993	January 1995	November 1992 November 1997	
811-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION	Tasks	MRF all MSW as soon as facility(s) available throughout short-term planning period.	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period.	Reassess performance during medium- term planaing period.	Adopt ordinance requiring mandatory diversion rates for recycling. Assess diversion efficiency in medium- term planning period.	
Table B RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	Recycling Coordinatus Planning Department			Planning Department Recycling Coordinator Public Works Dept. Business License Supervisor City Manager	City Council Waste Hauter MRF Operators
	Program	Material Recovery Facility			Commercial and Industrial Programs	

r 1991 Kici. r, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

B11-6

PE-II/Reviv April 13, 1992

.

1991 Klei 🛛 🕫 kw. - Ali Righte Reserved

PE-11/Revi April 13, 1992

	Table B. RECYCLING PROG	I 1 - I RAM IMPLEMENTATION		FINAL DRAFT
Program	Responsible Entily	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Other Programs	Recycling Coordinator Planning Department City Manager City Council Riverside County County Local Task Force	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Perris. Establish monitoring and evaluation program. Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop-off locations	July 1992 January 1993	2,500
		and muterials. Develop monitoring and evaluation program. Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	January 1995	
		Assess program performance and improvement measures.	Junuary 1996	٧N
Pronution of Existing Programs	Certified and Other Recyclers Planning Department Recycling Courdinator	Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accented.	May 1993 January 1994	2.500
		Continue to assist certified recyclers as newled. Reassess efficiency of program.	January 1995	
r 1991 Kleinfelder, Jac All Rights Reserved				-11/Revied: April 13, 1992

B11-8

	Tabl Composting program	e B11-1 Implementation schedule		FINAL DRAFT
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Residential Program	Planning Department Recycling Coordinator	Negoliate with CR&R to recover yard waste.	January 1996	YIN
		Work with CR&R to develop markets for the recovered materials.		
		Arrange for proper documentation from CR&R.		
		Implement Program		
Commercial/ Industrial	Planning Department Recycling Coordinator	Work with CR&R in establishing yard waste recovery programs.	January 1996	VIN
		Work with CR&R to develop markets for recovered materials.		
		Arrange for proper documentation from CR&R.		
		laipicaicait Program		

1.1991 Kieli ., tim. All Rights Reserved

PE-11/Reví. Vpril 13, 1992

B11-9

				FINAL DRAFT
	Table B Special waste program	11-1 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	Э	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Wasie Management Department Public Works Dept. City Representative	Support County Diversion Program	1992 yılı	Included in County Tipping Fees
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	Waste Management Department County LEA County Public Works Public Works Dept. City Representative	Work with construction waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs. Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials. Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1992 December 1993 July 1994	\$2,000
White Goods Salvaging Program	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Representative	Support and promote the landfill salvaging program for white goods.	July 1992	Included in landfilling fees for white guxds.
Develop a Sludge Compositing Facility	Riverside County Waste Management Department Public Works Department Eastern Municipal Water Treatment Plant	Work with the County and Water District in developing a sludge composting facility.	October 1992	N/A - Costs are not incurred by City for program implementation.

Per-L1/Revised: April 13, 1992

Id	Tabl ublic education and inform	e B11-1 Iation implementation sci	II EDUL.E	FINAL DRAFT
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Develop a Media Cumpuign	Recycling Coordinator	Develop a recycling logo.	November 1992	Materials
	Certified Racycler	Distribute publicity materials.	December 1992	Fransag Distribution
	Waste Hauter	Create and distribute a press packet.	Ongoing media	Press Packet
	Planning Department	Develop brochures and pamphlets.	program.	\$1,000 per year
		Insert brochures into bills or use as door hungers.		
		Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".		
Designute a School Recycling	School District	Organize a recycling program at school.	September 1992	No costs are
	Recycling Coordiantor	Choose curriculum.		
		Monitor the effectiveness of the program.		
		laitiate an in-house service training session for school's staff.		

/---

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - Alf Rights Reserved

PE-11/Revied: April 13, 1992

B11-11

	Table B11			FINAL DRAFI
Pl.	BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	ATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Designation of a City Recycling Coordinator	City Council City Manager	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals. Prepare reports and agenda items for the	October 1992	\$35,000 including 40% benefits
		Prioritize programs.		
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.		
Develop Public Information Resources	Recycling Coordinator Planning Department	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials. Insert information about recycling into utility bills or made into door hangers. Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Conmerce.	Distribute information to a minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within the first year (December 1992) and 50% the next year (December 1993).	\$2,000 per year
r-1991 Kleinfelder, Juc All Rights Reserved			Ξ	S-11/Revied: April 13, 1992

B11-12

	M-11- D1			FIN, DRAFT
Πď	IBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	LTL ATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Community Group Outreach	Recycling Coordinator	Meet regularly with various groups.	December 1992	Materials Printine
	Block Leaders	Work with non-prufit groups to distribute flyers and brochures.		Advertising \$500 in first year \$1 000 carb was
		Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.		thereafter
Establish a City Recycling	Recycling Coordinator	Develop monthly newsletter.	December 1993	Materials Principa
Acwsteller	Planning Department	Distribute through direct muil, free distribution stands, and all city offices.		Dustribution 51,500 per year
Business Training Sessions	Recycling Coordinator	laitiste training sessions for businesses.	October 1993	\$6,500
	Planning Department	Develop and distribute a rocycling guide.		
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.		
		laitiste en swards program.		<u></u>

r 1991 Kieiafeider, Iac. - All Rights Reserved

PE-11/Revived: April 13, 1992

B11-13

	Annual le Costs	er 1993 \$1,500		<u> </u>				er 1992 \$2,000		
CHEDULE	Schedu	Septemb						Septemb		
-1 AATION IMPLEMENTATION SC	Tasks	Create a recycling theme or logo.	Develop displays and exhibits with student-created materials to be placed around the community.	Develop a student-produced munthly buttetin.	Distribute bulletin to parents.	łniliate an awards program.	Promote schools progress with tocal nectia.	Choose a recycling curriculum.	Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress.	
Table B11 BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	School Recycling Courdinator	Recycling Council Recycling Coundinator					Schoul Recycling Coordinator	rrineipa Curriculum Council Recycling Committee	
74	Program	Develop a Recycling Program for the Cheerson						Recycling Curriculum		

r 1991 Kleinfekler, Iw. - Alt Rights Reserved

PE-11/Revised: April 13, 1992

FINAL DRAFT

Recycling
City Manager City Council Planning Department Solid Waste Advisory Committee

1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

PE-11/Revieut: April 13, 1992

For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1.
Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Department

e1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

PB/Revised: November 5, 1991

DRAFT

	Table BI HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WA	I - 3 STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHED	DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
City Deregulated HHW Collection Center	CR&R City Manager	CR&R will be responsible for siting and permitting the center.	1992 1003	Included in refuse collection fees
		CR&R will be responsible for construction of the center.	1994	
-		CR&R will be responsible for operating, maintaining, and monitoring the center.	Ongoing	
County Mobile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff	Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Perris.	1992 - Ongolng	included in landfill tipping fees
	uny necycling ordi	Assist the County in advertising Mobile Collection Center.	1992-Ongoing	

01991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

PE/Revised: September 27, 1991

CITY OF RIVERSIDE

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B12

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1 993	1994	1995
A. Existing Diversion						
1. Initiate Contact	City DPW/Resource Recovery Manager		x			
2. Quantification of Diversion Activity	business owners/ Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x	ongoing		
B. Waste Evaluations						
1. Program Development	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
2. Distribute Questionnaire	Resource Recovery Manager		x			
3. Create Database	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
4. Evaluation of Program	Resource Recovery Manager/ City DPW		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW			x	ongoing	
	and a second			· •	ē.	
C. Backyard Composing						
1. Design Program	Consultant/ Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
2. Education Program	Resource Recovery Manager/ City DPW		x			
3. Procure Composting Bins	Resource Recovery Mgr/ Private Individuals		x			
4. Distribute Composting Bins	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
5. Monitor and Evaluate Diversion	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW			x	ongoing	

SRA Watachailagian VIIICI I RIVJammy, 1912 Chy of Housido Final Dash SRBS - Integration Computer

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component (continued)

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
D. Non-Procurement Source Reduction for the City Government						
1. Program Development	City DPW/ Consultant		x			
2. Education Programs	City employees/ Consultant/ City DPW		x			
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion Activity	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW			ongoing		
·					· · ·	<u>.</u>
E. Adoption of City Government Procurement Policies						
1. Program Design	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			
2. Present Model Program to local govt. agencies for review and approval	City Government Staff/ City DPW		x			
3. Adoption by City Council	City Government Staff/ City DPW			x		
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW			x		
					• 	
F. Tax Incentives, Grants and Contributions						
1. Development of tax incentive programs	Resource Recovery Manager/City Finance Department/City Council		x			
2. Adoption of tax incentive programs	City Council			x		
3. Development of grants programs	Resource Recovery Manager/City Finance Department/City Council		x			
4. Monitor and evaluate programs	Resource Recovery Manager/City Task Force		x			

EBA Westerlegin VECIIX/Vienny, 1992 Chy of Electric Stat But SREE - Linguis Congenes

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
G. Awards and Public Recognition Program						
1. Program Development	Resource Recovery Manager/Waste Haulers/City Recycling Task Force/Chamber of Commerce		x			
2. Determine Recipients	Resource Recovery Manager/City Recycling Task Force		x			
3. Presentation of Awards	Resource Recovery Manager/City Recycling Task Force/Awarding Agency		x	ongoing		
4. Ensure Awards are publicized	Resource Recovery Manager		x			
H. Land Use and Development						
1. Program Development	Resource Recovery Manager/City Planning Department			x		
2. Adoption of Program	City Council			x		
3. Create Database	Resource Recovery Manager/Planning Department				x	
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Resource Recovery Manager/Planning Department			x		

Integrated Implementation Plan - Source Reduction Component (continued)

IZA Westerlaufes MECHIRZVJenney, 1992

City of Riverito Part Sud SUS - Linearies Company

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1 992	1 993	1994	19 95
A. Curbuids Recycling						
1. Evaluate Pilot Program	City DPW/ Resource Recovery Mgr	x				
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Haulers/ City DPW	x				
3. Education Program	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW	x				
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Haulers		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
B. Multi-Family Recycling						
1. Initial Study and Program Design	Resource Recovery Mgr/ Building Owners, Mngrs/ City DPW		x			
2. Purchase of Bins, Vehicles	Waste Haulers		x			
3. Education Program	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Haulers			x		
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

ELA Westerlauber MECHERViewery, 1992

Cay of Rissian First Dash SREE - Languages Compares

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
C. Commercial/Industrial Recycling Program						
1. Initial Study of Program	City DPW/ Resource Recovery Mgr/ Bus. Owners, Managers			x		
2. Purchase Bins and Vehicles	Waste Haulers/ City DPW			x		
3. Education Program	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x		
4. Distribution of Bins	Waste Haulers			x		
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW/City Council				x	ongoing annual
D. Buy-Back Center						
1. Apply for Local Operating Permits	Buy-back Operator/ Local Planning Dept.		x			
2. Apply for Permit from Dept. of Conservation	Buy-back Operator			x		
3. Purchase Equipment	Buy-back Operator			x		
4. Begin Operations	Buy-back Operator				x	
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Buy-back Operator/ City DPW				x	ongoing

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

HIA Watabalagia VECHINANANY, 1992 Chy of Rissolds First Deak SRRE - Jacquetes, Company,

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1 994	1995
E. Drop-Off Facilities						
1. Feasibility Study	Resource Recovery Manager		x			
2. Receive approval for bins	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW/City Council		x			
3. Site bins	Resource Recovery Manager/Site Owners		x			
4. Agreement with processors to accept materials	Processors/Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
5. Purchase equipment	City DPW		x			
6. Education program	City DPW		x			
7. Install bins	City DPW/Site Owners		x			
8. Begin operations	City DPW		x			
9. Monitor and Evaluate	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW/City Council		x	ongoing		
and the second						
F. Intermediate Processing Facility						
1. Detailed Engineering and Feasibility Study	Waste Haulers/ County Waste Mgmt.		x			
2. Acquisition of Land	Waste Haulers		x			
3. Permitting	Waste Haulers/ Local Government/ CIWMB		x			
4. Construction	Waste Haulers			x		
5. Equipment Procurement	Waste Haulers			x		
6. Start-up Testing and Full Operations	Waste Haulers			x		
7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Waste Haulers/ City DPW/ County Waste Mgmt./ CIWMB				x	ongoing

Integrated Implementation Plan - Recycling Component (continued)

ERA Westerlandigies VECTIEIV/Integry, 1990 Chy of Rissish Plan Deck 2022 - Jacquetin Company

megrates m			,			
Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1 994	1 995
1. Gain approval to begin pilot curbside program	City DPW/City Staff/City Council	x				
2. Agreement with Recyc to accept materials	City DPW/Recycinc.	x				
3. Education program	City Staff	x	<u> </u>			
4. Begin pilot collection	City DPW	X				
5. Contact UCR and quantify yard waste diversion	Resource Recovery Mgr/ UCR Public Works	x				
6. Evaluate pilot	City DPW		x			
7. Gain approval for City- wide curbside collection	City DPW/Waste Haulers/City Staff/City Council		x			
8. Contract with composting facility operator to accept materials	City DPW/Waste Haulers/Compost Facility Operator		x			
9. Education materials	City DPW/Waste Haulers		x			
10. Begin City-wide curbside collection	City DPW/Waste Haulers		x			
11. Evaluate potential sites for drop-offs	City DPW			x		
12. Site drop-offs	City DPW/Compost Facility Operator	 		x		
13. Begin source separated bin collection	Waste Haulers/Business Owners, Managers			x		
14. Evaluate in-vessel processing system	City Staff/Facility Operator		x			
15. Evaluate anaerobic processing system	City Staff/Facility Operator		x			
16. Evaluate ban on yard waste at landfills	Riverside County					x
17. Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x	ongoing		

Integrated Implementation Plan - Composting Component

EBA Westerlaufen VERCLIRIV/Jongery, 1993 Chy of Riverside First Dash Shiff - Integration Company

Integrated Implementation Plan - Special Waste Component

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
A. Landfill Selvaging for Tires						
1. Attract tire recycler to region	County WMD/City Staff		x			
2. Identify Site at Landfill for Temporary Storage and Handling of Tires	County WMD		x			
3. Contact Recycler and Arrange for Pick-up	County WMD		х			
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program	County WMD/City DPW		x	ongoing		
B. Concrete and Asphait Recycling						
1. Set Debris Box Rates to Encourage Source Separation	Waste Haulers/ City Council		x			
2. Develop and Distribute Education Materials	Waste Haulers		x			
3. Issue Special Debris Boxes to Waste Asphalt and Concrete Generators	Waste Haulers		x			
4. Contact Recyclers and Arrange for Delivery	Waste Haulers/ Concrete, Asphalt Recyclers		x			
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Resource Recovery Manager/ City DPW			x	ongoing	
					1. T.1	at a second
C. Bulky Items Collection						
1. Develop Program	Resource Recovery Manager/City DPW		x			
2. Publicize Program	Res. Recovery Manager		x			
3. Contact Recyclers and Arrange for Pick-up	Res. Recovery Manager		x	ongoing		
4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Diversion	Res. Recovery Manager/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

ERA Westerlandegies VIIICI LILIV Antony, 1982

Chy of Elements First Sock SRIE- Jacquetes Compares

Integrated 1	Implementation	Plan -	Education	Component
--------------	----------------	--------	-----------	-----------

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1993	19 94	19 95
A. Block Leader Program						
1. Solicit Candidates	City Task Force/Resource Recovery Manager		x			
2. Orientation Meeting	City Task Force/Resource Recovery Manager		x			
B. City Government Programs						
I. Expand, Monitor	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force		x			
C. Compost Faire	Resource Recovery Mgr/City Task Force	i	x			
1. Organize, Present	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
19 ¹¹						
D. School Curriculum						
1. Meet with Schools	Resource Recovery Mgr/ Community Volunteers/ City Task Force		x			
2. Purchase Materials	Resource Recovery Mgr/ School Districts/ City Task Force		x			
3. Implement Programs	Resource Recovery Mgr/ School Districts/ City Task Force/ Volunteers		x			

ELA Waterberingin VERCI 18/7V Jammy, 1993

Chy of Riverido First Dash SHEE - Integration Company

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	1992	1 993	1994	1 995
E. Commercial/Industrial Business Programs						
1. Develop Chamber Awards Plan	City Task Force/ Resource Recovery Mgr		x			
2. Awards Event	City Task Force/ Resource Recovery Mgr		x			
3. Design, produce materials	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force		x			
4. Implement Programs	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
F. Community Events						
1. Develop Informational Materials	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x			
2. Prepare Display	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force	_	x			
3. Participate in Events	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force/ City DPW		x	ongoing		
G. Source Reduction Collateral Materials						
1. Design and Dissemination of Programs and Materials	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force/County WMD		x			

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

EXA Wasadaningin VECI IZIVinany, 1993

Chy of Rissolds Field Data 2020 - Company Company

Alternative Programs	Responsible Entity	1991	19 92	1993	1 994	1995
H. Collateral Materials						
1. Mayor's Letter	Resource Recovery Mgr/ Mayor's Office		x			
2. Residential Curbside Recycling Instructions	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
3. Develop General Information Brochure	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
4. Develop and Dist. Info. for Backyard Composing	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
5. Begin Educ. Program for Source Red. to City Emps	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
6. Develop and Distribute Information for Asphalt and Concrete Recycling	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
7. Publicize Bulky Items Collection Days Pick-Ups	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
8. Develop and Distribute Information for Yard Waste Pick-up Program	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW		x			
9. Multi-Family Recycling Instructions	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x		
10. Commercial/Industrial Recycling Programs	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x		
I. Video						
1. Develop and Produce	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City Task Force		x			
2. Distribute Video	Resource Recovery Mgr		x			
					· ·	
J. Monitoring and Evaluation						
1. Schedule and Implement	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x		
2. Report Findings	Resource Recovery Mgr/ City DPW			x	ongoing	

Integrated Implementation Plan - Education Component (continued)

ERA Waterbacksjin VEICI (REV Jammy, 1912 Chy of Riversito First Dust RRE - Integration Component

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The lead agency for program administration will be the City's Department of Public Works (DPW). In cooperation with other departments the DPW will develop the City's quarterly drop-off days for recyclable HHW, public education for City and County HHW collection programs, and a monitoring and evaluation program. The DPW will provide a recommendation of staff to the City Council for approval of funding. Primary funding for the programs will be provided for by modification of the rate structure for refuse collection. These rate increases will have to be approved by the City Council after recommendations by staff. Secondary funding will include reimbursement in part through grants issued by the CIWMB.

Table B12-2

Implementation Table for Drop-Off of Recyclable HHW

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Interdepartmental discussion and planning	6/92	City Dept. of Public Works	
Provide recommendation	7/92	City Dept. of Public Works	
Approve funding	9/92	City Council	Rate Structure
Design program			· ·
select site, schedule, personnel	12/92	Program operator/City DPW	
Coordinate vendors	12/92	Program operator/City DPW	
Coordinate publicity program	12/92	Program operator/City staff	
Implement program	1/93. ongoing	Program operator/City DPW	
Ongoing monitoring	1/93. ongoing	Program operator/City staff	

Implementation Table for County-Wide Mobile Drop-Off Sites

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Continue implementation	Ongoing	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees
Report City participation	Annuaily	County Department of Health	County-wide tipping fees

Implementation Table for Public Education Program

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Prepare original printed material	9/92	Program operator/City staff	Rate Structure
Procure source reduction material	9/92	Program operator/City staff	
Procure videotapes	9/92	Program operator/City staff	
Prepare school curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Operator/School Districts	
Implement curriculum	9/92, ongoing	Operator/School Districts	
Distribute media releases	1/93, ongoing	Program operator/City staff	
Mail brochures	1/93	Program operator/City staff	
Establish HHW hotline	6/ 92	City staff	

Implementation Table for Monitoring and Evaluation

Tasks	Completion Date	Responsible Entity	Funding Source
Curbside monitoring for HHW collector training	6/92	Franchised Waste Haulers	Rate Structure
program implementation	6/92, ongoing	Franchised Waste Haulers	Rate Structure
Quantification of recyclables collected	1/93, ongoing	Program operator/City staff	Rate Structure
City participation in County program	1/92, ongoing	County Dept. of Health	Tipping fccs
Annual report Waste generation study	Annually, through	County Department of	Rate Structure
······································	1995	Waste Management	tipping fees

. (

CITY OF SAN JACINTO

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B13

	Table B1 source reduction P	3-1 Rogram implementation			·
Program	Responsible Entity	Tesks	Schedule	Annual Costs	
Adoption of Local Ordinances	Community Development Department City Manager or designoe	Review local ordinances and make changes, as appropriate to increase source reduction activities.	1992	\$2,500-\$4,000	
		Adopt mandates for waste evaluations.	6661	\$2,500-\$4,000	
		Require solid waste reduction plans for businesses.	6661	\$500	
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of programs through short and medium- term.	1994-Ongoing	VIN	
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	Community Development Department City Manager	Require businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	1994	\$1,500-\$3,500	, <u> </u>
	Lity manager or designee	Evaluate effectiveness of program.	5661	\$4,000	
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effoctiveness during short and medium-term.	1994 - 1996	\$2,000-\$3,500	
Public Recognition	City Manager or designee	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	1994	\$500	·
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during short and medium-term.	1995 - 1997	VIN	
Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All	l Rights Reserved		14	//Revised: June 3, 1993	-

B13-1

	Table F source reduction P	313–1 rogram implementation		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Reporting System	City Manager or designee	Require reporting by waste haulers.	1992-Ongoing	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	1994 - 1997	V/N
Efficient Use of Paper	City Manager	Use double sided copiers	1992	V/N
in City Department	Community Development Department City Manager or designce	Encourage non-confidential single-sided material to be reused as scratch paper.		
		Encourage all City departments to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.		
	 -	Encourage all City departments to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.		
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	1994 - 1997	NIA
Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping	City Manager or designee Community Development Department	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	1992	\$2,500-\$3,000
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	1993 - 1997	VIN
Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All	Rights Reserved		S1-4/	V/Revised: June 3, 1993

.

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

SJ-4A/Revised: June 3, 1993
FINAL				8				· _ · _ ·	~	
	Annual Cost	N/A	YN	\$12,000-\$15,0	N/A	VIA	 00°25'000	N /A	\$2,000-\$4,50	VN
	Schedule	1992	1994 - 1997	1993		1994 - 1997	1994	1661 - 5661	1994	1994 - 1997
3-1 rogram implementation	Tasks	Modify business license fees according to the participation level of businesses.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	Implement a waste evaluation program.	Report results of the program annually.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	Provide information and technical assistance to help establish on-site composting.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction program.	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.
Table B1: source reduction P	Responsible Entity	City Manager City Manager or designee		Community Development Department City Manaser or detioned	Waste Hauler		Community Development Department City Manager or designee		Community Development Department City Manager or designee	
	Program	Business License Fee Modification		Waste Evaluations			Support for On-Site Composting		Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	

SJ-4A/Revised: June 3, 1993

FINAL

	Table Recycling Prog City OF	B13-1 ram implementation ·san jacinto		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Single Family Commingled Curbside Recycling	City Manager or designee Community Development Department Waste Hauler	Implement SF curbside recycling program.	July 1992	\$121,362 - \$150,315
	IPF or MRF Operator	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period.	1993	VIN
		Monitor and evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.	1991	N/A
Multi-family Recycling through a	City Manager or designee	Implement MF recycling program	August 1993	\$13,448 - \$16,810
MKF	Community Development Department	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness in		N/A
	MRF Operators	short and medium-term planning periods.	1994 & 1997	
Commercial Recycling through a Material Recovery Facility	Community Development Department City Manager or designce Waste Hauler	MRF all commercial wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term vlavning period	July 1993	\$58,824 - \$68,530
	MRF Operators			
		moutor and cvatuate effectiveness in short-term planning period	1994	V M
		Monitor and evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.		V/N

SJ-5/Revised: June 3, 1993

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL		Annual Costs	\$1,500-\$3,000 N/A	\$1,000 N/A N/A
		Schedule	1992 1997	1993 - 1997
	1 3-1 rogram implementation	Tasks	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced. Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.	Evaluate ordinances for land use development which encourages source reduction practices. Adopt ordinances requiring solid waste management planning for new developments. Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program during short and medium-term.
	Table B source reduction P	Responsible Entity	City Manager Community Development Department City Manager or designoe	City Manager City Manager or designee Community Development Department
		Program	Non-Procurement Programs	Incentives and Disincentives for Land Use

SJ-4A/Revised: June 3, 1993

-

B13-6

FINAL

L .

									1001
	Amual Costa	\$2,000	N/A	N/A	3,000	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	N/A	(Paritad: June
	Schodule	May 1992	1994	1997	July 1992	1993	5661 - E661	1996 - 2000	
3-1 Ram Implementation San Jacinto	Takka	Adopt ordinance requiring mandatory diversion rates of recycling.	Monitor and assess diversion efficiency in short-term planning period.	Monitor and evaluate performance during modium-term planning period.	Contact drop off center operators. Identify areas when improvements can be made. Provide technical assistance.	Develop public information campaign to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Develop monitoring and evaluation program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance for effectiveness during short and medium-term.	
Lable BI RECYCLING FROGI CITY OF	Responsible Entity	Community Development Department Business License Supervisor	City Manager of designed Waste Hauler MRF Operators		Drop Off Center Oprtrs. City Manager or designee Community Development Department				Rights Reserved
	Program	Commercial and Industrial Ordinances			Unstaffed Drop Off Center Promotion				Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All

5 Ż

							-
	Amual Costs	3,000	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	V/N	1,000	See Sec. 8
	Schodulo	July 1992	1992 - Ongoing	1994 - 1997	January 1992	January 1993	1994 & 1997
-1 ram implementation san jacinto	Tisks	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify	opportunities for expansion of inclutes and materials accepted. Monitor and evaluate efficiency of program during short and medium-term.	Implement high grade paper recycling program. Develop and initiate other recycling programs.	Organize department employee recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Present awards to best programs on annual basis.	Monitor and evaluate programs during the short and medium-term.
Table B13 RECYCLING PROG CITY OF	Responsible Entity	Certified Recyclers City Manager or designee Community Development Department			City Employees City Department Heads City Manager or designce	Community Development Department	
	Program	Certified Recycling Center Promotion			Public Agency Recycling Programs		

FINAL

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Coste	Existing		V Z	000'1	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	V/N
	Schodule	1991 - Ongoing	1992 - Ongoing	1994 & 1997	September 1992	1993	, 1993 - Ongoing	1994 & 1997
3-1 ram implementation san jacinto	Teda	Develop dialogue among County and other cities to perform feasibility study of regional salvaging and set salvaging objectives. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Reassess annually.	Monitor and assess salvaging program effectiveness during the short and medium-term.	Identify county programs for tire recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other citics. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Develop monitoring and evaluation program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance during short and medium- term.
Table B1 RECYCLING PROG CITY OF	Responsible Entity	Riverside County City Manager or designee County Local Task Force Community Development Department			City Manager or designee Community Development Department Riverside County County Local Task Force			
	Program	Salvaging			Other Programs - (Tire Rocycling)			

SJ-5/Revised: June 3, 1993

FINAL

FINAL

İ

	Amual Costa	2,000 See Sec. 8	V/N
	Schodnle	1991 - Ongoing 1993	1994 & 1997
5-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION SAN JACINTO		Meet with existing and certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Monitor and evaluate program effectiveness during short and medium- term.
LAULE DI RECYCLING PROG CITY OF	Responsible Entity	Certified and Other Recyclers Community Development Department City Manager or designee	
	Program	Maintenance of Existing Programs (Includes drop-off, buyback and certified recycling centers)	

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

SJ-5/Revised: June 3, 1993

.

	Table B15	3-1			
	COMPOSTING PROGRAM	I IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE			_
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs	-
Residential Program	Community Development Department	Negotiate with OK & Associates to	1994	\$2000	
	City Manager or his designee				
	Facility Operators	PUBLICUS support ALVERSIGE COUNTY WMD in development of landfill	1992	N/A	
	Waste Hauler	composing programs to serve as regional facilities to meet the county and city reduction and diversion goals.			
•		Assist Riverside County and OK & Associates as much as feasible, in development of long term marketing contracts	1995 - 2000	V/N	
		Begin collection and processing program	<i>L</i> 661	N/A	
		Monitor and evaluate program effectiveness during the medium term	1997-ongoing	Approx. \$65/ton	
Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All	Rights Reserved		S1-	5/Revised: June 3, 1993	

.

B13-11

		Annual Costs	\$2000	V/N		VIN	NIA	Approx \$64/ton
		Schedule	1994	1992		1995 - 2000	1997	1997 - ongoing
3-1	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Tasks	Negotiate with OK & Associates to recover yard wastes.	Publicly support Riverside County WMD in development of landfill	composting programs to serve as regional facilities to meet the county and city reduction and diversion goals.	Assist Riverside County and OK & Associates as much as feasible, in development of long term marketing contracts.	Begin collection and processing program	Monitor and evaluate program effectiveness during the medium term
Table B1	COMPOSTING PROGRAM	Responsible Entity	Community Development Department	City Manager or his design oc Facility Operators	Waste Hauler			
		Program	Public Agency, Commercial/ Industrial	rogram				

SJ-6/Revised: June 3, 1993

.

B13-12

FINAL	Annual Costs	Included in County Tipping Fees (NIC Recycling)	\$2,000 \$2,000 per year \$1,000 per year Assumed \$20 per ton charge	Included in fees for white goods disposal.	N/A - Costs are not incurred by City for program implementation.
	Schedule	1991-2000	1991-1992 1992-1998 1992-1994	1991-2000	Ongoing 1993-1995 1995-1998
-1 M IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Tasks	Support county diversion program	Work with construction waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs. Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for haulers to develop markets for construction and demolition haulers.	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	Work with the County and Water District in continuing existing program
Table B13 special waste prograi	Responsible Entity	Waste Management Department Community Development Department	Waste Management Department County LEA Community Development Department	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department Solid Waste Facility Mgr.	Riverside County Waste Management Department Community Development Department Eastern Municipal Water Treatment Plant San Jacinto Water Department
	Program	Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities	Sludge Composting Facility

SJ-7/Revised: June 3, 1993

FINAL	Annual Costs	\$39,200-\$45,379 (includes 40 % benefits)		N/A	\$2,000 per year	N/A
LE	Schedule	January 1992 - 2000		1992 - 2000	1992 - Ongoing Distribute information to a minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within the first year (by lanuary 1992) and 50% the next year (by January 1993).	1994 - 1997
.3-1 LEDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMI AATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDU	Tasks	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals. Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.	Prioritize programs. Establish future staff and funding requirements.	Monitor and evaluate performance on annual basis	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials. Insert into utility bills or make into door hangers. Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Commerce.	Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium term
Table B1 CITY OF SAN JACINTO - SOURCE R PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	Recycling Coordinator (City Manager would hire Recycling Coordinator) Public Works Department			Recycling Coordinator Public Works Department	
	Program	8.4.1 - Designation of a City Recycling Coordinator			8.4.2 - Develop Public Information Resources	

SJ-8/Revised: June 3, 1993

	Table F CITY OF SAN JACINTO - SOURCE F PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	3131 reduction and recycling eleme mation implementation schedui	ENT	FINAL
Ртодгаш	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.3 - Community Group	Recycling Coordinator	Meet regularly with various groups.	July 1992 -	Materials
		Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.	805800	Advertising \$500 - 1,000
		Monitor and evaluate program in short- and modium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N
8.4.4 - Establish a City Dominian Normalister	Recycling Coordinator	Develop monthly newsletter.	January 1993 -	Materials
	Public Works Department	Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices.	ougoing	Priming Distribution \$1,000 - 1,500
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/A
8.4.5 - Establish a Public	Recycling Coordinator	Ensure information is readily available.	1996	Materials
	Public Works Department	Advertise the center's use.		Distribution
		Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center.		Space \$2,500 - 3,000
		Monitor and evaluate program.	1998	N/A
L Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All	Rights Reserved		5-2	/Revised: June 3, 1993

•

į

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Table B	13-1		LINAL
	CITY OF SAN JACINTO - SOURCE F PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEME MATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUI	cnt LE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annued Costs
8.4.6 - Business Training Sessions	Recycling Coordinator	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	1993 - Ongoing	Materials Drining
	Public Works Department	Develop and distribute a recycling guide.		Awards Recycling Bins
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.		Sugus \$2,100 - 3,000 per session w/3 sessions
		Initiate an awards program.		per year
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N
8.4.7 - Develop a Media . Compoion	Recycling Coordinator Certified Becycles	Develop a recycling logo.	July 1992 -	Materials
	Waste Hauler Public Works Demantment	Distribute publicity materials.	Lulu 1007 .	Distribution Auseds
		Create and distribute a press packet.	distribute various	Press Packet
		Develop brochures and pamphlets.	puoticity muchans. Ontoine medie	non'I - mct
		Insert brochures into bills or use as door hangers.	vugourg mouta program.	
		Create and distribute Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits [*] .	1001 1007	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and modium-term.		NIA

SJ-8/Revised: June 3, 1993

	Table B1 CITY OF SAN JACINTO - SOURCE R PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 4ATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUI	ent Le	FINAL
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.8 - Spring Clean Up	Recycling Coordinator	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program.	January 1993	\$500 - 1,000
		Prepare and distribute information on the program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N
8.4.9 - Designate a School	School District	Organize a recycling program at school.	September 1992	Speakers' fees
		Choose curriculum.		Printing
		Monitor the effectiveness of the program.		
		Initiate an in-house service training ession for school's staff.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	V/N
Coovright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc All	Rights Reserved		2	8/Revised: June 3, 1993

FINAL	Annual Costs	Materials Printing Distribution Advertising \$1,000 - 2,000	V/N	Curriculum \$1,200 - 2,200 N/A
ent Ile	Schedule	September 1993	1994, 1997	September 1994 - Ongoing 1995, 1998
B13-1 eduction and recycling elem tation implementation schedu	Tasks	Create a recycling theme or logo. Develop displays and exhibits with student-created materials to be placed around the community. Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin. Distribute bulletin to parents.	Initiate an awards program. Promote schools progress with local media. Monitor and evaluate program in short and mediam-term.	Choose a recycling curriculum. Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress. Monitor and evaluate program.
Table] City of san jacinto - source r public education and inform	Responsible Entity	School Recycling Coordinator Recycling Council Recycling Coordinator		School Recycling Coordinator Principal School EAC Curriculum Council Recycling Committee
	Program	8.4.10 - Develop a Recycling Program for the Classroom	·	8.4.11 - Recycling Curriculum

SJ-8/Revised: June 3, 1993

	Table B13-2		FINAL
STING	USEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE	COLLECTION	V PROGRAMS
	Spotator from Count	iversion ty Landfills*	Comments
Ríversid Agency, Health,	unty Health Services Gallons t. of Environmental Pounds rdous Materials Branch Containers	7,195 18,359 247**	Program began in February of 1990
Riversidé Agency, Health, I Waste M	unty Health Services t. of Environmental rdous Materials Branch There was no calendar year 1 cenent Dept.	diversion during 990	Program began in February 1990. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.
Riverside Agency, 1 Health, H	unty Health Scrvices There was no t. of Environmental calendar year 1 rdous Materials Branch	diversion during 990	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside & Beaumont
Operated and regult Health Se Environm Materials	he private waste haulers by the Riverside County es Agency, Dept. of 657, Resolution al Health, Hazardous nch	egin July 1, ty Ordinance n 90-668	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Dept. of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

•

SJ/Revised: June 3, 1993

FINAL

,

	Table B13- HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WA	-3 LSTE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Rteponsible Entity	Tisks	Schedule	Amual Costs
Public Education and Information	Riverside County Staff City Manager or his Designee City Manager's Office Waste Hauler	Assist the County in educating the residents of San Jacinto in proper handling, treatment, and disposal of HHW.	1992 - Ongoing 1992-Ongoing	Included in landfill tipping fees
County Mobile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff City Manager or his Designce	Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in San Jacinto. Assist the County in advertising the Mobile Collection Center.	1992 - Ongoing 1992-Ongoing	Included in landfill tipping fees

Copyright 1991 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

SI/Revined: June 3, 1993

-

	Table B1 household hazardous wa	3-3 STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Repossible Endir			
Recycling	Riverside County Staff City Manager or his Designee City Manager's Office	Identify enducers for waste oil and batteries.	E661	VIN
		Assist the service stations and auto repair centers, located in the City of San Jacinto, in obtaining the necessary approval to accept waste oil and batteries.	1994	
		Identify endusers for paint.	1993	
-		Encourage paint retailers to accept unused paint from residents.	1994	
Load Checking	Riverside County Staff City Manager or his Designee City Manager's Office	Encourage the county to continue and expand the load checking program at all County Landfills.	1992-Ongoing	V/N

FINAL

SJ/Revised: June 3, 1993

CITY OF TEMECULA

,

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B14

	Table B1	4-1		
	SOURCE REDUCTION PI	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Solid Waste Reduction Plans	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Weste Hauler	Encourage businesses to develop solid waste reduction plans.	March 1994	\$1,500
	Local Businesses Chamber of Commerce	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	March 1995	VN
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	1996-Ongoing	N/A
Public Recognition	City M anager City Solid Waste Program Manager Waste Hauler	Recognize businesses that purchase recycled content products for use in their everyday work.	September 1994	\$500-\$1,000
	Chamber of Commerce	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program	September 1995	V/N

B14-1

FINAL DRAFT

TEM-4/Revised: February 15, 1993

				FINAL DRAFT
	Table B	[4-]		
	SOURCE REDUCTION P	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Efficient Use of Paper in City Departments	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager	Use double sided copiers	1991-Ongoing	See Section 8
and Businesses	City Clerk's Office Local Businesses	Encourage non-confidential single-sided material to be reused as scratch paper.	1991-Ongoing	A/A
		Encourage all City departments and businesses to analyze their business forms to determine if any can be shortened, combined, or discontinued.	1661	V N
		Encourage all City departments and businesses to analyze their incoming and outgoing mail lists on a yearly basis with the intent of reducing their size.	1991-Ongoing	NA NA
		Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during	June 1994	
		medium-term.	June 1997	
Use of Drought Resistant Landscaping	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Planning Department	Require through ordinance, landscape plans submitted to the City to use drought resistant plants.	1661	\$2,500
	-	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	July 1994	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	July 1997	N/A

Propright 1943 Kleic Gilder, Inc. All Rights Parenced

тем. 4/Re . ч. Febra - 4/Re . 1997 .

SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION Program Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule A Program Referral System City Manager Wase Hauler Set up a system to assist owners of Wase Hauler 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Wase Program Manager Set up a system to assist owners of Wase Hauler 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Wase Program Manager Notite Goods Nate Hauler 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Wase Program Manager Notite and evaluate cleativeness of Notite and evaluate cleativeness of June 1994 NiA Support for State City Manager Monitor and evaluate cleativeness of program. 1992-Ongoing \$500 Support for State City Manager Establish a system by which state and the officitories of the order of the officitories of the order of th		Table B1	<u> -1</u>		<u>FINAL UKAFI</u>
Program Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule A Referral System City Manager Wase Haufer White and resystable goods so that wase Haufer 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Waste Program Manager White and resystable goods so that wase Haufer 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Waste Program Manager St up a system to asist owners of under ease. 1991 \$500 Referral System City Solid Waste Program Manager Nonitor and Evaluate clicutiveness of nonitor and evaluate program for June 1994 NIA Support for State City Manager Monitor and evaluate program for nectitum-term. June 1994 NIA Support for State City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for Laws September 1993 NIA Laws City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to legislation its monitored. June 1994 NIA Laws City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to legislation that limits packaging. June 1993 NIA		SOURCE REDUCTION PF	OGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Referral System City Manager Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that City Solid Waste Program Manager Set up a system to assist owners of organizations that would refurtish them for re-usc. 1991 5500 Referral System City Solid Waste Program Manager organizations that would refurtish them for re-usc. 1991 5500 Referral Process Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program. Monitor and evaluate program for program. 1001 1997 N/A Support for State City Manager Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for Laws City Manager 1992-Ongoing 5500 Support for State City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for Laws 1992-Ongoing 5500 Support for State City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for Laws 1992-Ongoing 550 Referance Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of heigitation that limits packaging. 1993-Angoing 1993 N/A	Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Monitor and Evaluate clicctiveness of June 1994 N/A Program. Monitor and evaluate program for program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term. July 1997 N/A Support for State City Manager Establish a system by which state and 1992-Ongoing \$500 1992-Ongoing \$500 Laws Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation its monitored. 1992-Ongoing \$500 Monitor and evaluate program for and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness of hume 1993 N/A	Referral System for White Goods	City Manager Waste Haufer City Solid Waste Program Manager	Set up a system to assist owners of white and recyclable goods so that products can be directed to organizations that would refurbish them for re-use.	1661	\$500/yr
Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term. Muly 1997 N/A Support for State City Manager Establish a system by which state and federal Patckaging 1992-Ongoing 550c Support for State City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to legislation is monitored. 1992-Ongoing 550c Laws City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to legislation that limits packaging. N/A Monitor and Evaluate cffectiveness of program. Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program. June 1994 N/A			Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	N/A
Support for State City Manager Establish a system by which state and 1992-Ongoing 5500 and Federal Packaging City Solid Waste Program Manager Establish a system to allow the City to September 1993 N/A Laws Establish a system to allow the City to September 1993 N/A Communicate their support for Laws Romitor and Evaluate effectiveness of June 1994 N/A Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of Monitor and evaluate frectiveness of June 1997 N/A			Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	July 1997	N/A
Communicate their support for communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging. September 1993 N/A Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program. June 1994 N/A Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during June 1997 N/A	Support for State and Federal Packaging	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager	Establish a system by which state and federal legislation is monitored.	1992-Ongoing	\$500/yr
Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of June 1994 N/A program. N/A Monitor and evaluate program for and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during madium-form June 1997			Establish a system to allow the City to communicate their support for legislation that limits packaging.	September 1993	V/V
Monitor and evaluate program for June 1997 N/A participation and effectiveness during			Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	N/N
			Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	V/V

TEM-4/Revised: February 15, 1993

B14-3

				FINAL UKAFI
	Table	B14-1		
	SOURCE REDUCTION PR	KOGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Waste Evaluations	City Manager Waste Hauler	Implement a waste evaluation program.	1661	Provided by Waste Hauler
	City Solid Waste Program Manager	Report results of the program annually.	1994-Ongoing	N/A
	FOCAI BUSINESSES	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of	0	
		program.	September 1995	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	A NA
Technical Assistance for Business and Industry	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Waste Hauler	Provide technical assistance to businesses and industries to help them establish source reduction programs.	1661	\$2,000 (waste hauler to contribute materials)
	Local Businesses Chamber of Commerce	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	September 1994	V/N
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1997	N/A
Non-Procurement Programs	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager	Institute a program identifying materials that can be source reduced.	1661	\$1,000-\$2,500
	Local Businesses Chamber of Commerce	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1994	VIA
		Monitor and evaluate program for participation and effectiveness during medium-term.	June 1996	NA

FINAL DRAFT

B14-4

Carryright 1003 Klein (11-1 Inc. 112 Pights 7 1 1 ed

---- 4/Re Febru ---- 1995

	ารปล	R14-1		FINAL DRAFT
	SOURCE REDUCTION PI	ROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Reporting System	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Waste Hanler	Implement reporting system for waste diversion activities.	1661	N/A (provided by waste hauler)
	Local Businesses Chamber of Commerce	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness of program.	6661	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate for medium-term.	9661	V/V
Local Ordinances	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Local Rusinesses	Adopt ordinances which require reporting as part of business ficensing.	1661	\$2,500
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1993	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate effectiveness of program.	June 1996	N/A

TEM-4/Revised: February 15, 1993

FINAL DRAFT		Annual Costs	Ig \$215,760-\$399-552 (assume \$2/household	A/A	V/N 0	7 N/A	g \$103,972-\$128,360 (assume \$10/ton)	5 N/A	0 N/A	7 N/A
		Schedule	1991-Ongoin	1993- 199	1995-200	661	1993-Ongoin	661-£661	1996-200	199
	B14-1 RAM IMPLEMENTATION F TEMECULA	Tasks	Implement Single family curbside recycling program	Monitor and Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period. Consider necessity of MRF for mixed refuse during medium-term	Monitor program chosen during medium-term	Re-evaluate performance during medium-term planning period.	Implement MF recycling program	Monitor and evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Monitor during medium-term	Assess diversion efficiency in medium- term planning period.
	Table RECYCLING PROGICTY OI	CITY OF TEA Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Program M anager City Manager Waste Hauler				City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager City Council Waste Hauler	MRF Operators		
		Program	Single family commingled curbside recycling			-	Multi-family recycling			

TE-5/Revised: February 15, 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL DRAFT		Annual Costs	V/A	(assume \$20/ton for IPF, \$35/ton for MRF)	N/A	V/N	N/A	\$20/ton N/A		\$2,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Schedule	1992-1993	1993-Ongoing	1993-1995	1995	1994	1996-2000	661	1992-Ongoing	1995	1996-2000	2661
14-1	14-1 AM IMPLEMENTATION TEMECULA	Tasks	Identify IPF facility feasible for short- term needs. Establish agreement through/with waste hauler for use of facility	Process residential wastes as soon as facility(s) available throughout short- term planning period	Monitor throughout short-term	Evaluate effectiveness in short-term planning period	Identify MRF for use in short-term and medium-term	Process all waste streams through MRF during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.	Adopt ordinances and monitoring programs	Assess diversion efficiency in short- term planning period	Monitor during medium-term	Re-evaluate diversion efficiency in medium-term planning period.
D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	RECYCLING PROGR	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager City Council Waste Hauler	Facility Operators County Waste Management						City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager	Business License Supervisor City Council Waste Hauler	Facility Operators	
		Program	Processing through Facility (1PF and MRF)							Ordinances			

TE-5/Revised: February 15, 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

	Annual Costs	2 1,000 - 4,000	See Sec. 8	N/A See Sec. 4	A/N C	
	Schedule	2661	1992 - 1993	July 1994 1993 - 1993	1996 - 2000 1997	
e B14-1 ram implementation f temecula	Tasks	Contact drop off center operators. Identify areas where improvements can be made. Provide technical assistance.	Devetop public information campaign to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials.	Monitor and evaluate program. Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor program. Evaluate program performance and implement improvement measures.	
Tabl RECYCLING PROG CITY O	Responsible Entity	Drop-Off Center Operators. City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager City Council				
	Program	Unstaffed Drop-Off Center Promotion				

FINAL DRAFT

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

TE-S/Revised: February 14, 1993

B14-8

	Annual Costs	1,000 - 4,000	See Sec. 8	See Sec. 4	V/N
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992-Ongoing	1996-Ongoing	2661
B14-1 ram implementation temecula	Tasks	Meet with certified recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted. Monitor program.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as needed. Reassess efficiency of program. Monitor program.	Evaluate program and implement improvements.
Table RECYCLING PROGI CITY OF	Responsible Entity	Certified Recyclers City Manager City Council			
	Program	Certified Recycling Center Promotion		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

TE-5/Revised: February 15, 1993

B14-9

	Annual Costs	See IPF/MRF	4,000	See IPF/MRF	(1,1,1,1)	N/A	See IPF/MRF	See Sec. 8
	Schedule	1992	1992	6661	1993-Ongoing	5661	0002-5661	1996 - 2000
B14-1 ram implementation f temecula	Tasks	Accomplish facility identification (see IPF/MRF)	Form agreement with waste hauler	Begin recycling programs.	Organize Public Agency department recycling projects. Provide educational materials and technical assistance to employee run programs. Munitor program.	Evaluate program.	Require reporting from hauler and monitor programs.	Evaluate programs to improve performance on annual basis.
Table RECYCLING PROG CITY 0	Responsible Entity	City Employees, City Department Heads City Solid Weste Program Manager	Planning Commission	Waste Hauler Businesses and Industry	Facility Operators			
	Program	Public Agency Commercial and Industrial Revoling Programs						

FINAL DRAFT

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

TE-5/Revised: February 15, 1993

	Annual Costs	000'1	See Sec. 8	V/N	See Sec. 4	N/A
	Schedule	1992-Ongoing	1992 - 1993	1994	5661 - £661	1996 - 2000
e B14-1 ram implementation f temecula	Tasks	Identify county programs for thre recycling. Develop dialogue among County, other cities and Ternecula. Establish monitoring and evaluation program.	Develop public information to improve public awareness of drop off locations and materials. Monitor program.	Evaluate program.	Provide technical assistance and public information as needed.	Monitor and assess program performance and improvement measures.
Table RECYCLING PROGI CITY OI	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager City Council Riverside County County Local Task Force				
	Program	Other Programs (Tire recycling)		•		

TE-5/Revised: February 15, 1993

B14-11

Table B14-1 VCLING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION CITY OF TEMECULA	e Entity Tasks Schedule Costs	cyclers Meet with existing and certified 1992-Ongoing 1,000 recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City by recyclers. Monitor throughout short term.	Provide technical assistance. Develop joint public information campaign to educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to identify opportunities for expansion of facilities and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recyclers as 1996-Ongoing See Sec. 4 needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually.	ram Manager Evaluate City procurement policies to 1993-Ongoing 1,000 ment Dept. increase recycled material use. Assist industry, businesses and hauler in obtaining markets for recycled materials	through programs such as CALMAX, 1993-2000 N/A etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of effectiveness of marketing for materials recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- and medium-term, annually.
Table B14-1 RECYCLING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION CITY OF TEMECULA	Responsible Entity Tasks	ng Programs Certified and Other Recyclers Meet with existing and certified City Solid Waste Program Manager recyclers and assess their needs. Develop reporting system to City t recyclers. Monitor throughout sho	Provide technical assistance. Developint public information campaign joint public information campaign educate public about Certified Recyclers. Assist recyclers to ider opportunities for expansion of faci and materials accepted.	Continue to assist certified recycle needed. Monitor and reassess efficiency of program annually.	Image: City Solid Waste Program Manager Evaluate City procurement policie. County Waste Management Dept. increase recycled material use. As industry, businesses and hauler in obtaining markets for recycled material	through programs such as CALMA etc., through the medium-term. Monitor through observation of effectiveness of marketing for mate recycled through various programs implemented throughout the short- medium-term, annually.
	Program	Maintenance of Existing			Markets for Recyclable	

TE-S/Revised: Fehruny 15, 1993

B14-12

	Table B:	[4-1		
	COMPOSTING PROGRAM I	MPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Single Family Source Separated C Curbside Collection with Private Sc Facility Processing Fa	ity Manager Did Waste Program Manager aste Hauler acility Operator	Begin collection of yard wastes according to program description, ensure waste hauler negotiates agreement with a processing facility.	Fall 1991 - Ongoing	Assume \$2.50/household/ month 1991: \$78,000 1992-1995: \$338,000-\$419,000
		Develop long term marketing contracts and identify end users	1992-Ongoing	\$1,000/year
		Monitor and evaluate program effectiveness and determine whether mandatory collection will be necessary.	Mid 1993	Included above
		Monitor and evaluate program.	1997	N/A
Commingled Collection and Ci Centralized Processing of Multi- So	ity Manager Did Waste Project Manager	Deliver yard wastes through the collection program to the facility.	6661	N/A
ratinty, connectuat and Industrial Yard Wastes Fi	acility Operator	Develop markets for use of compost products.	1994-Ongoing	\$1,000/ycar
		Monitor and evaluate program for effectiveness.	1994	N/A
		Monitor and evaluate program.	7691 bìM	N/A

TE-6/Revised: February 15, 1993

	Table B:	4-1		
	SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM	1 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	E	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Tire Shredding and Recycling Program	County Waste Management Department City Manager	Support County Diversion Program	1991 ylul	Included in County Tipping Fees
)	City Solid Waste Program Manager	Monitor program during short-term	1992-Ongoing	(shredding only) N/A
		Re-evaluate effectiveness of program	1994	V/N
		Monitor program during medium-term	1996-Ongoing	N/A
Construction/Demolition Private Facility Recycling Program	County Waste Management Department County LEA City Manager	Work with construction waste haulers in establishing construction and demolition recovery programs.	December 1992	\$2,000 per year
(industrial wood, and inert)	City Solid Waste Program Manager Waste Hauler Crush Masters Recyc, Inc.	Work with construction and demolition haulers to develop markets for recovered materials.	December 1992	N/A
		Require diversion to begin	December 1992	Approx. \$20/10m)
		Arrange for proper documentation from construction and demolition haulers.	December 1992	N/A
		Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	1991-1997	N/A

FINAL DRAFT

B14-14

FINAL DRAFT

	Annual Costs	991 Included in disposal fees for white goods at the facility	997 N/A	oing Included in water bills	997 N/A
Э	Schedule	July I	1992-1	- 1991 - Ongo	1-661
le B14-1 1 implementation schedul	Tasks	Support and promote the salvaging program for white goods.	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term	Continue to process studge at a private facility. Establish agreement through a MOU.	Monitor program throughout short and medium-term.
Tabi SPECIAL WASTE PROGRAM	Responsible Entity	Waste Hauler Riverside County Waste Management Department City Manager	City Solid Waste Program Manager Solid Waste Facility Manager	Riverside County Waste Management Department City Solid Waste Program Manager	
	Program	White Goods Salvaging Program at Solid Waste Facilities		Sludge Composting Facility	

Cupyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

TE-7/Revised: February 15, 1993

				FINAL DRAFT
ני אכ	TY OF TEMECULA - SOURCE RE BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	4-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI ATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	LEMENT HEDULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
8.4.1 - Define Duties of City Solid Waste Program Manager (PM)	City Manager	Achieve the mandated recycling and source reduction goals.	January 1992 - 2000	\$63,700-\$79,300 (includes 40% benefits)
		Prepare reports and agenda items for the City Council.		
		Prioritize programs.		
		Establish future staff and funding requirements.		
•		Monitor and evaluate performance on annual basis	1992 - 2000	N/A
8.4.2 - Develop Public Information Resources	City Manager City Solid Waste Program Manager Waste Hauler	Prepare information on recyclable materials, collection programs and uses for collected materials.	1992 - Ongoing Distribute information to a	\$2,000 per year
		Insert into utility bills or make into door hangers.	minimum of 50% of businesses and residents within	
		Prepare and develop an information packet to be distributed by the Chamber of Commerce.	January 1992) and 50% the next year (by January 1993).	
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium term	1994 - 1997	V/N
				له محمد محمد محمد محمد محمد محمد محمد محم

Tem-8/Revised: February 15, 1993

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

FINAL DRAFT	Annual Costs	Materials Printing Advertising \$500	000'1\$	Materials Printing Distribution \$1,000 - 1,500 N/A	
LEMENT HEDULE	Schedule	July 1992	1993, 1997	January 1993 - Ongoing 1994, 1997	
B14-1 EDUCTION AND RECYCLING EI	Tasks	Meet regularly with various groups. Work with non-profit groups to distribute flyers and brochures. Establish drop-off boxes and newspaper drives.	Monitor and evaluate program in short- and medium-term.	Develop monthly newsletter. Distribute through direct mail, free distribution stands, and all city offices. Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	
TY OF TEMECULA - SOURCE RE BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	Responsible Entity	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager Waste Hauler Chamber of Commerce Realty Board		City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager Waste Hauler	
54	Program	8.4.3 - Community Group Outreach		8.4.4 - Establish a City Recycling Newsletter	

Tem-8/Revised: February 15, 1993
PU	TV OF TEMECILLA - SOURCE PE	1 1.1		
	BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI	LEMENT HEDULE	
.0gram	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
blish a Public Center	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager	Ensure information is readily available.	1996	Materials Printing
	Waste Hauler	Advertise the center's use.		Distribution Beats of Occurving
		Develop mailers, inserts, newspaper articles to advertise center.		Space 5,000
		Monitor and evaluate program.	8661	NIA
wss Training	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager	Initiate training sessions for businesses.	1993 - Ongoing	Materials Printing
	Waste Hauler	Develop and distribute a recycling		Awards
	Chamber of Commerce	gulde.	1993 - Ungoing	Recycling Bins Signs
		Develop and distribute brochures and fact sheets.	1993 - Ongoing	\$2,100 - 3,000 per session w/3 sessions
	- 	luitiate an awards program.		per year
				Cooperative between City and Waste
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	Hauler N/A

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

Tem-B/Revised: February 15, 1993

				FINAL DRAFT
ರಸ	TY OF TEMECULA - SOURCE RE JBLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	14-1 DUCTION AND RECYCLING EI ATION IMPLEMENTATION SCI	LEMENT HEDULE	
E	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
Ntedia	City Solid Waste Program Manager City Manager	Develop a recycling logo.	July 1992 - develop logo.	Materials Printing
	Waste Hauler	Distribute publicity malerials. Create and distribute a news nacket	July 1992 - distribute variance	Distribution Awards Deves Devised
		Develop brochures and pamphlets.	publicity materials.	\$500 first two years
		Insert brochures into hills or use as door hangers.	Ongoing media program.	\$1,000 1994-1995
•		Create and distribute "Newspaper Recycling Starter Kits".		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	NIA
a Semiannu al an-Up	City Solid Waste Program M anager City Manager Waste Hauler	Contact thrift stores, recycling centers, and scrap metal dealers to be a part of the program.	January 1993	\$500 - 1,000
		Prepare and distribute information on the program.		
		Monitor and evaluate program in short and medium-term.	1994, 1997	VIN

.

Cupyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

Tem-B/Revised: February 15, 1993

B14-19

5		•		
PU PU	TY OF TEMECULA - SOURCE RI BLIC EDUCATION AND INFORM	le B14-1 eduction and recycling ei attion implementation sci	LEMENT HEDULE	
	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
istrict-wide	School District City Solid Watte Drosram Manager	Assist in selection of a coordinator.	September 1992	N/A
	City Manager Waste Hauler	Organize a recycling program at school.	September 1993	\$500/year
•		Assist in development of a curriculum.		
			1995-Ongoing	Including in school
				recycling curriculum
		Monitor the effectiveness of the		
		program.	1	N/A
		-	1994	
		Monitor and evaluate program in		
		medium-term.	1007	V/V

.

Copyright [993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

Tem-8/Revised: February 15, 1991

V OF TEMECULA - SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT LIC EDUCATION AND INFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE Annual Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule Annual Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule Costs Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule Costs Risponsible Entity Tasks Schedule Costs Riven evelow Develop displays and cathibits with atown due community. September 1993 Materials Distributed Entities an avards program. Statest states Statest statest Adventising Distribute hulterin Distribute nullerin Statest statest Statest statest Statest statest Distribute an avards program. Promote statest 1994, 1997 N/A Distribute an avards program. September 1995 Curriculum Distribute an avards program. September 1997 N/A Distribute an avards program in short 1994, 1997 N/A Distributer September 1995 Curriculum
Responsible Entity Tasks Schedule Annual chool Recycling Coordinator Create a recycling theme or logo. September 1993 Materials Sity Manager Develop displays and extritis with Vaste Frogram Manager Develop displays and extritis with Develop a student-produced monthly September 1993 Materials Distribution Develop a student-produced monthly Printing Distribution Advertising Distribution Distribute bulletin to parents. Distribute bulletin. Advertising Alvertising Distribute Distribute bulletin. Distribute bulletin. Distribute bulletin. NiA Distribute Monitor and evaluate program. 1994, 1997 NiA Distribute Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum Distribute Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 NiA Monitor and evaluate program. September 1995 - Curriculum September 1995 - Curriculum Distribute faulter Monitor and evaluate program. September 1995 - Stude Stude
Ribol Recycling Coordinator Create a recycling theme or logo. September 1993 Materials Printing Distribution Distribution Develop displays and extribits with Awards Awards Distribution Nase Hauler Develop a student-produced monthly bulletion. Pevelop a student-produced monthly bulletion. Awards Distribution Develop a student-produced monthly bulletion. Pistribution Awards Distribute bulletion. Distribute bulletion Pistribute bulletion Pistribute Distribute bulletion. Distribute bulletion Pistribute Pistribute Distribute Distribute bulletion Pistribute Pistribute Distribute Distribute Pistribute Pistribute Distribute Distribute Pistribute Pistribute Distribute Pistribute Pis
City Solid Weste Program Manager Develop displays and exhibits with studem-created materials to be placed Distribution Waste Hauler around the community. Avertising Avertising Develop a student-produced monthy bulletin. Distribute bulletin to parents. Distribute bulletin Distribute bulletin. Distribute bulletin to parents. Distribute bulletin Rowerds Distribute bulletin. Distribute bulletin. Rowerds Distribute bulletin. Distribute bulletin. Rowerds Rowerds Rowerds Rowerds Rowerds Rowerds Rowerds
Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin. Develop a student-produced monthly bulletin. N1.000 - 2,000 Distribute bulletin to parents. Distribute bulletin to parents. N1.000 - 2,000 Initiate an awards program. Promote schools progress with local media. N100 Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N1/A Ity Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum City Solid Waste Program Manager Meet monthly to discuss the school's goals and progress. September 1995 - Curriculum Monitor and evaluate program. 1995, 1998 N1/A
Distribute bulletin to parents. Distribute bulletin to parents. Initiate an awards program. Initiate an awards program. Promote schools progress with local media. Promote schools progress with local media. Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N/A Sity Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum Sity Solid Waste Program Manager Meet monthly to discuss the school's ongoing \$1,000 per year Waste Hauler Monitor and evaluate program. 1995, 1995 - Curriculum
Initiate an awards program. Initiate an awards program. Promote schools progress with local Promote schools progress with local Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N/A and medium-term. Solid Waste Program Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. Solid Waste Program Manager Meet monthly to discuss the school's Vaste Hauler September 1995 - Monitor and evaluate program. 1995, 1998
Promote schools progress with local Promote schools progress with local media. Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 Monitor and evaluate program in short Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N/A and medium-term. September 1995 - Curriculum Solid Waste Program Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum Solid Waste Program Manager Meet monthly to discuss the school's September 1995 - Curriculum Vaste Hauler Ongoing S1,000 per year Vaste Hauler 1995, 1998 N/A
Monitor and evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N/A and medium-term. and medium-term. Evaluate program in short 1994, 1997 N/A ity Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum ity Solid Waste Program Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum Vaste Hauler Ongoing \$1,000 per year Vaste Hauler goals and progress. 1995, 1998 N/A
ity Manager Choose a recycling curriculum. September 1995 - Curriculum ity Solid Waste Program Manager Ongoing \$1,000 per year chool Recycling Coordinator Meet monthly to discuss the school's Ongoing \$1,000 per year Vaste Hauler Meet monthly to discuss the school's 995, 1998 N/A
Any some wave truggan managed behood Recycling Coordinator Meet monthly to discuss the school's Waste Hauler Goad and progress. Monitor and evaluate program. 1995, 1998 N/A
Monitor and evaluate program. 1995, 1998 N/A

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

.

Tem-B/Revised: February 15, 1993

FINAL DRAFT

	CTION PROGRAMS	Comments	Program began in February of 1990	Program hegan in February 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. It will he expanded to all landfills as they are due for repermitting under the RWQCB.	One-day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.
	ARDOUS WASTE COLLE	1990 Diversion from County Landfills [*]	Gallons 7,195 Pounds 18,359 Containers 247**	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)	(Diversion was not during calendar year 1990)
Table B14-2	VG COUNTY HOUSEHOLD HAZ	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and the Waste Management Department	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch
	SUMMARY OF EXISTIN	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	One-Day Events •

*For a complete listing of all materials collected from these programs, please see Table 4-1. **Source: Riverside County Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agency

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

TEM/Revised: February 15, 1993

_			
	CTION PROGRAMS	Comments	Will be operated by private disposal companies and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health.
	ARDOUS WASTE COLLE	1990 Diversion from County Landfilts*	Program will begin July 1, 1992 per County Ordinance 657, Resolution 90-668
Table B14-2	NG COUNTY HOUSEHOLD HAZ	Sponsor	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the Riverside County Health Services Agency. Department of Environmental Health
	SUMMARY OF EXISTIN	Existing Program	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil

FINAL DRAFT

Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc. - All Rights Reserved

TEM/Revised: February 15, 1993

				FINAL DRAFT
	Table HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WA	B14-3 STE IMPLEMENTATION SCHED	DULE	
Program	Responsible Entity	Tasks	Schedule	Annual Costs
County Mobile Collection Center	Riverside County Staff City Solid Waste Representative	Assist the County in hosting the Mobile Collection Center in Temecula.	1992 - Ongoing	Included in landfill tipping fees
		Assist the County in advertising the Mohile Collection Center.	1992-Ongoing	
Residential Hazardous Waste Roundon Dav(s)	City Solid Waste Representative Waste Hauler	Select date(s) of Roundup Day(s)	1992-Ongoing	Included in refuse collection fees
		The franchise waste hauler will he responsible for preparing all applications, manifests, and obtaining all necessary approvals for the Roundup(s)	1992-Onguing	
		Advertise and promote the Roundup(s)	1992-Ongoing	
		Conduct the Roundup(s) Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness	1992-Ungoing	
		of the Roundup(s)	1994 and 1997	
City Deregulated HHW Collection Center	City Solid Waste Representative Waste Hauler	Evaluate the feasibility of siting a permanent collection center.	1994	N/A
Copyright 1993 Kleinfelder, Inc All Richts R				

TEM/Revised: February 15, 1993

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B15

Table B15-1

Integrated Implementation Plan

	Responsible	L		Year			Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Sources
A. State Waste Exchange Directory	СГШМВ	Ongo	ing Pro	gram			WMD Funds
1. Contact state about program	WMD	1	X	1			i
2. Put together state promotional literature for local distribution			X	İ	1	1	1
3. Promote program with local bus, and indust.		1	X	1		†	ł
4. Design jocal monitoring plan			1	x	<u> </u>	†	
S. Monitoriag		1	1		x	x	
					1		
B. Source Reduction Education Program	(See Chapter 7 Educ for the Implementation p	ation and ian for th	i Public I sis progra		ion Com	ponent	
C County Durchssing Program	 Purchasing	Oner	ing Pro				CEA Evede
L. County I declarating I togram	WMD	Y		i i			
2. Englante europet numbering entitien recicles coulent products warte resinte			×			+	Filling Dept
2. Evaluate corrent porcessing spires			Ŷ	v		 	Funds, CC
A Design waste untring processing program cases on evaluations of system	<u> </u>		+	Ŷ.	<u>+</u>	<u> </u>	1
4. Design monitoring program			<u>^</u>	A V	<u> </u>		
5. Fresent parcassing program to BLAS as parts of thate rendy for consumeration		+	!		[!	[
6. Istorn County Deputyendors of purchasing program		+	T	<u>^</u>	v	v	
7. Monitoring			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
D Drought Resistance Plants	Planning	Onec	ine Prr	ומימה			Planning Den
1. Amond County Ordinance 348 to making downshit resistant plants in specified uses		10000	1		1	1	Evode CC
7. Jalow County developert/andrene architects recording amended ordinance		+	T		<u> </u>	+	Funde WAAT
2. Julia Courie standard and the interior in the second and the se	Brissing		+				Funds CSA
A. Manihar meters and anostic dimensions (if passible)		+	<u> </u>	v v			Funda, Cars
4. MOENOR Program and deserth Australia (11 bomints)					1	<u></u>	
R State/Federal Law Resarding Packasing	wwm	Onec	ving Prr	in a substance a substance a substance a substance a substance a substance a substance a substance a substance Nativa da substance a substa			WACD Engde
1. Monitor state and federal levitlation meanling wate paragement fatter		X				<u></u>	
2 Analyze bills related to packaging income		x					1
3 Compose mointion in support of particular bills		x	1-		<u> </u>	+	4
4. Present resolutions to the BOS for consideration		x		<u> </u>		+	
4. Free at the second to be able to control the formation of County action to either	<u> </u>	1X	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	+	4
J. Further and the second s		1					
4 Manihanna			Y			+	1
		<u>.</u>	1.4.6	1	<u>.</u>	<u></u>	
E State/Federal Laws for a Advance Disposal Fee	WWD	Oner	ing Pro	מינגידער.			WMD Funde
P. State/ Colorat Law View & Advances Disposar 1 00		X	1) 	T		
1. Monitor state and reaction regarding when a suggestion to the		X			+·		1
2. Compare employing in support of particular bills		X					-
		Y -		<u> </u>		+	-
4. Freezet residuation to the account consideration		1x		-	-	+	1
		1					
A the setum of the setum of a shift a set of a shift a setum of							-
and urge similar action			Y	<u> </u>		1	
and urge similar action			x				
and urge similar action	(See Chapter 7	Eduar	x	- D			
and wrge similar action 6. Monitoring G. Environmental Labeling Program	(See Chapter 7 for the implemental	Educat	X tion and n for th	d Publi	ic Infor	mation	Component
and arge similar action 6. Monitoring G. Environmental Labeling Program	(See Chapter 7 for the implemental	Educat tion pla	X tion and n for th	d Publi nis pro	ic Infor gram)	mation	a Component
And arge similar action 6. Monitoring G. Environmental Labeling Program H. Source Reduction Curriculum for Grades K-12	(See Chapter 7 for the implemental (See Chapter 7	Education pla	X tion and n for th tion and	d Publi nis proj d Publi	ic Infor gram) ic Infor	mation	a Component

Source Reduction Component (Cont.)

	Responsible	1	Yca	r	-	Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991 199	2 1993	1994	1995	Sources
I. Paper Efficiency Program	Purchasing	Ongoing I	rogram			GSA Funds.
1. Design program to increase efficiency in the use of paper within County Depts.	WMD	X	X	1		WMD Funds.
2. Present program to BOS as parts of it are ready for coasideration	County Depts.		X			County Dept.
3. If BOS approves program, inform County Depts.	1		X	1		
4. Phase in implementation of program	1		X	i –		
5. Monitoring	!			X	X	f (
						·
J. Public Recognition Program	(See Chapter 7 Edu implementation plan for	ation and Publ	ic Iaforma	tioe Cos	iponent (or the
V Defermi Sur, for White/Repairship Coode	110.00	Oncoing I		_		
Kelerral Sys. for white/Repairable Goods	WMD Det vi		10gram			WMD Funds
1. Update int of tarit/repair shops	rnsturg	+	<u>X</u>			
2. Print let		┿╾╌┼╌╍	<u>X</u>	+		
3. Promote the isst throughout the County	1		<u>X</u>	4		
4. Design monitoring system			X	+		
5. Monitoring	i		X	<u> </u>	X	
				<u> </u>		
L. Kesidentiai Yaro wasie Management Program	WMD	Ongoing 1	bing Program			WMD Funds,
1. Investigate equipment requirements & costs associated with backyard	RCSWMACLTF					LEA Funds
composting & not begging grass clippings	LEA			<u> </u>		
2. Determine parameters of program	<u> </u>			4	<u> </u>	
3. Determine region(s) in the unincorporated area for implementing	Printing			1		
isitial pilot programs				ļ		
4. Design public education/information for initial pilot programs			<u>x</u>			
S. Present pilot heciyard companing/not hagging grass clipping programs to			শ			
RCSWMACLTF for approval	<u></u>			(
6. Present pilot programs to BOS for cossideration and approval	<u></u>		<u>x</u>			
7. Promote pilot programs in chases area(s)	·		X	1		
8. Implement pilot programs			X			
9. Monitor pilot programs			<u>כ</u> ג	٥		
10. Evaluate and design public education program	1		2	d		
11. Expand program				X	1	
12. Monitoring					X	1
				1.0		aantaa ah
M. White Goods Collection During Trashbuster Cleanups	DEH	Ongoing I	rogram			DEH Funds,
1. Investigate options for collecting white goods during Trashbuster cleasups	GRHC	X			1	WMD Funds
2. Determine which option(s) to require	WMD		X			1
3. Detign amendment to County Ordinance 657	Goodwill		XX	1		1
4. Present amended ordinance to Garbage Refuse Hauler Committee for consideration	1		X]
5. Present amended Ord. 657 to BOS for consideration			X		1	Ţ
6. Monitoring	1		1	X	X	1
						· · · · ·
N. Technical Assistance to Business and Gov't Agencies	(See Chapter 7 Edu implementation plan for	cation and Publ this program)	ic laforma	tion Co	a postal i	for the

Source Reduction Component

	Responsible		Year			Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991 1992 1	993	1994	1995	Sources
O. Reporting System	₩MD	Ongoing Prog	ram –			WMD Funds.
1. Review ensuing County ordinances	County Agency	X				County Dept.
2. Design monitoring/reporting form		X				Budgets
3. Design reporting system that will interface with existing ordinances or		X				-
provide basis for sew ordinance						
4. If amending existing ordinance, meet with agencies responsible for administering it			X			
5. Present ordinance to BOS			X			
6. Administer reporting ordinance			X			Í
7. Monitor diversions/practices				X	Х	
P. Incentives/Disincentives to Land Use Development	Planning	Ongoing Prog	ram –			Building &
1. Survey existing land use ordinances & building codes to determine their impact	Building & Safety					Safety Funds,
os source reduction	RCSWMAC/LTF		X		<u> </u>	Planning
2. Review laad use ordinance and building code modifications from other jurisdictions	WMD		<u>X </u>	X		Funds, WMD
3. Determine committee structure/membership for development of modifications				X		Funds
4. Set up committee				X		
5. Design, if necessary, changes/amendments to existing ordinances/codes				XXX	1	
6. Present proposed changes/amendments to the Planning Commission				х		
and RCSWMAC/LTF						1
7. Present changes/amendments to BOS for consideration					X	
8. If BOS approves changes/amendments, promote & begin implementation					X	
9. Monitoring	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	
		1. 972 A.	ang madi T	States (*	e - Costraj	
Q. Master Recycler Composter Program	WMD	<u> </u>				WMD Funds,
1. Determine parameters of program	LEA		2	ζ		LEA Funds,
2. Compile/design MRC program training manual/classes	Cities/Agencies			a	<u> </u>	City/Agency
3. Compile public information materials	<u> </u>			X		Funds, Private
4. Investigate city/agency interest in program participation	Printing			X	<u> </u>	Funds,
5. Lavastigate locations for demonstration sites				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Investigate
6. Acquire any necessary approvals (BOS, City, Agency, etc.) and negotiate				X	ŀ	other Sources
agreements for locations of demonstration sites						(C.g. grants,
7. Begin work on demonstration sites and acquire necessary program supplies/materials	<u> </u>			X	<u> </u>	(.219
8. Recruit volunteers for MRC program & begin training	<u>.</u>				x	1
9. Begin MRC outreach to the public	<u> </u>				<u>×</u>	4
10. Monitor program					<u>x</u>	4
11. Expand program		<u> </u>			<u>X-</u>	1
12. Mositoriag	1			_		1
					29.20 00	personal de la completa de la completa de la completa de la completa de la completa de la completa de la comple
R. Refuse Collection Rate Structure	(See Chapter 4 Rec	icling Component fo	or the in	.pieme	attice	
ļ	plan for this program)					

Recycling Component

A. Material Recovery Facilities*	WMD &				WMD Fund
1. Network with incorporated cities to develop a Countymde coordinated	Cities	X			Public Funds
approach					Lead agency
2. Determuse areas and time schedules for MRF development			X		&/or private
3. Develop each (acility according to schedule			X - C compl	Dingoing until etion	funds
4. Monitorag			X at le	ast annual	
-			monit	oring of each facility	

Recycling Component (Cont.)

	Responsible			Yea	r		Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	1992	1993	1994	11995	Sources
B. State/federal Policy on Products Containing Recycled	WMD & A.O.	1			1	i	WMD Funds
Content					!		
1. Support formulation of such legislation through letters of support to State		-	X				
& Federal Government representatives						[
2. As legislation is introduced, analyze for adequacy and either support through			Specia	fic as to	the	date of	
Board of Supervisors resolution or suggest alternative language			intro.	for leg	islatic	วก	
3. As legislation is formally supported, send copies of County action to Cities			Speci	fic as to	the	date of	
and urge similar actions			intro.	for leg	islatio	a	
4. Monitoring		1		X	X	X	
C. Private Enterprise Usage of Recyclable Products in the	EDA & WMD	Ongo	ing Pro	gram-			EDA Funds,
Products in the Manufacturing Process					_		WMD Funds,
1. Determine existing opportunities			Х				Market Dev.
2. Determine capabilities to increase current assistance, including, but not		1	XX				Zones
limited to the application for a Market Development Zone through the CIWMB							
3. Work with EDA to attract industries			X		!	1	
4. Monitoring				Х	X	X	
D. County Purchase of Products Containing Recycled Content	G SA/P.D. &	Ongo	ing Pro	gram-			GSA
1. Develop informational brochures on the advantages of products	WMD		X				
containing recycled content			[(
2. Distribute information to purchasing agents, at purchasing lisson meetings				X			
& management, at Management Council Meetings.							
3. As individual County Departments request specific products, Purchasing		1		X	Ong	oing	
will encourage the purchase of recycled products							
4. On an as needed basis, one-on-one meetings will be encouraged to discuss			[X	- Ong	oing	
individual departmental resistance to the use of recycled products		1					
S. Monitoring					X	X	
			10000 1999 - 1997	12			ana ing kang pangang pa Pangang pangang
E. Technical Assistance Program	WMD/DEH	_					DEH Funds,
1. Work with the baulers in an effort to develop uniform methods for calculating				XXX	1		WMD Funds
participation rates.							
2. Work with the haulers in an effort to develop uniform conversion factors for				XXX]
multi – family waste collection.]	ļ		J
3. Monitor effectiveness of uniform methods developed.					X	X	
Also reference Chapter 7 - Education and Public Information Component for other pert	inent portions of this proj	RE.]
						C.	n server i server i server server i server server i server server i server server server server server server s
F. Anti-scavenging Ordinance	DEH & WMD			1			DEH Funds
1. Gather and review existing ordinances from other jurisdictions				X]
2. Develop a draft ordinance				X]
3. Coordinate development of draft ordinance with County Counsel		}		X]
4. Submit draft ordinance for review to the Waste Collection Advisory Committee		1	1	X	X]
and Task Force			1		ļ		ļ
5. Board of Supervisors Adoption			i		X		-
		the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second s			_		

*Material Recovery Facilities will be operational in either 1994, 1999 or somewhere in between those years. The decision as to when to develop each facility has not been made. For more information on Material Recovery Facilities, please see page 4 - 6.

	Responsible	Yea	 I		Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991 1992 1993	1994	1995	Sources
G. Expansion of County Office Recycling	GSA/P.D. &	Ongoing Program			GSA &/or
1. Determine additional items to include in County program	WMD	X		1	revenue from
2. At the end of the upcoming contract, negotiate for inclusion of additional			1	1	sale of
items and pick -up of materiais at satallite offices with current contractor			1	i	material
3. If current contractor will not include additional items and offices, an RFP		XX	1	1	
requiring consideration of these services will be distributed.	ļ				
4. Review RFP's and Select Vendor		1 1 2	<u>a</u>	1	
5. Execute Agreements	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ā —		
6. Maintain and Monitor Agreement				100100	
7 Monitoria				X	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>		
H Salvare Opportunities	WWD	·	1		MAD English
1 Determine another states mathed (as each in diff)				: 	WMD Funds
2. Denies Research for Dennes (DDD): Comment	·		+		
Develop Acquest for Proposal (APP 5) for Services Develop Acquest for Proposal (APP 5) for Services			 		
4. Distribute Kirt's according to unplementation schedule for each taliging	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u>_</u>		
S. Review Proposals	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
6. Select a vendor.	1		<u>u</u>		
7. Negotiale contract.	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
8. Board of Supervison approval.			<u>X</u>	1	
9. Monitoring	<u> </u>			X	
	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			·
I. Building Code Modifications	P.D., P.C. &		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Pianning
1. Provide comments to State in their development of model building code ordinance	WMD				Dept. Funds
2. Review state model ordinance to determine if revisions will be necessary	1				
in order to adopt for Riverside County	<u> </u>				-
3. If necessary, make revisions		X			
4. Coordinate approval of modifications with the Planning Commission and LTF			4	1	
5. Board of Supervisors Consideration			d	1	
6. Monitor Ordinance Requirements			x	x	1
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	· · · ·
J. Drop-off Centers	WMD			1	WMD Fund
1 Determine start locations (i.e. Anta, Detert Center etc.)			<u>.</u>	+	
			2		
2. If avoided externa DEB and/or mark thick externs	·	┼──┼──╴┼──╴	1		+
A Eachlich Contents)		+ +	<u></u>	- <u>-</u>	1
		<u> </u>			4
5. Monitoring	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u>]</u>
T. T		<u> </u>	1	3	
L Zoning Ordinance Modifications	r.D., r.C. &				rianning
1. Support passage of State legislation (begin local review only if State legislation	UMW WIL		1		Dept. Fund
is not implemented)				÷	4
2. Review current zoning ordinances to determine deficiences			KI		
3. Gather and review zoning ordinance modifications from other jurisdictions	<u> </u>	+ + - + - 3	<u>vi X</u>		1
4. Determine committee structure/membership for development of modifications			X		
5. Set up committee	<u> </u>		X	<u> </u>	1
6. Determine specific modifications needed for Riverside Cousty	<u> </u>		XX	<u> </u>	4
7. Develop modifications	<u> </u>			1	_
8. Coordinate approval of modifications with the Planaus Commission & LTF	<u> </u>		>	<u>(</u>]	1
9. Board of Supervisors Consideration	<u> </u>			X	_
	i			i	

Recycling Component (Cont.)

	÷.	Responsible		Revenue				
Alternative Program		Agency/Person	1991	11992	1993	1994	1995	Sources
L. Billing Systems to Encourage Recycling	÷	DEH & WMD		i		1		DEH Funds
1. Research existing similar programs	i			i	1	1	X	
2. Develop a committe of Cousty, waste hauler and citizes representatives	í			1		[X	
3. Review options available (i.e. Variable can rate, Two-tier Tipping Fee)	1			i	1	l	XX	
4. Develop escà option as a proposal							XXI	
5. Evaluate each proposal in light of current conditions in Riverside County	1		1	1	Ì		X	
& in terms of applicability and case of implementation				<u> </u>				
6. Develop a recommended action				1				
7. Present recommended action to both the Waste Collection Advisory Committee &	ł							
the LTF, & if approved carry forward for Board of Supervisors consideration	1		1	[
8. Monitoring	ì		1		ļ			

Composting Component

A. Composting Facilities First Consider Riverside County Feedstock	WMD Planning	Ong	ong Pi		WMD Funds,		
1. Meet with facility principals	1	X	1	1	İ	i	Dent. Funds
2. Begin pissning process with expectation of condition of approval		X	1	1	1		1
3. Notify agencies/jurisdictions responsible for feedstock supplies regarding	<u> </u>	X	1		1	1	1
regarding condition of app.	E		1				
4. Monitoring			X	X	X	X	t
B Material Recovery Facility (MRF) Yard/Wood Waste	WMD	One		ngram			WACD Eurode
Staring/Compositing Area	Planning						Planning
I Meet with MRF principals	RESIMACATE	x	1	-	1		Dest Eurode
2. Determine if comparing is to take place at size		X	+		+		Depute Funde
2. Determine a composing 5 to date place at and			+	<u> </u>	+		Permiser Unus
A Salaria MBR assessed to Binarida Canan Salid Wate Met Advisor Canani/		Î	+	+			Kecyching
4. Sebel K MKT Propose to Riverside Councy Solid Water Mgt. Adverty Councy	1	^					Development
		-	╧┯				Development
6 Maninging	/ ···	^ -					Zones
0. Moerionag	<u> </u>	<u></u>		<u> </u>	X	X	1
C Biomass-Fuel Plant to Divert 30% of Its Woody Waster		One	ning P	meran			WMD Eurode
Composible Material that is diverted at County I andfills	RAMD	ogBomP 1105 mm					CC Evende
to a Credit Worthy Operation	Printing						Private Fund
1 Neuristan array of battern County and Plant to making 20% of most mate		Y	1	<u> </u>	·	<u> </u>	ruvate rubus
A regular systems a control of a second state of the second state	~~~	^	ļ		1		1
			·	+			
2. Electre agreenest			1.			+	4
3. Complete lasts 3-> of program exclude: "Processing Station for			A-	^			
Woody Waste at 1200 Hill and Coaceeus Landiull' is Capiter 6.	·						-
4.30% diversion required between 1-1-95 & 12-31-99 (Please see Appendix G,			1			X -	
page 13, for a discussion concerning plans concerning this program after 1999).			+				-
D. Purchase of Compost by County Departments	20	Ong	oing P	rogran)		WMD Funds,
1. BOS mandate dept. use of composit/mulch where appropriate (phase in)	County Depts.			X			County Dept.
2. Meet with applicable County depts.	WMD			X			Budgets, DEH
3. Establish compost uses & specifications for Cnty Depts	DEH		1	X	ļ		Funds, GSA
4. RFP development and issuance	Purchasing		1	X			Funds
5. Negotiate agreements between Caty. depts. & Composting facilities		1	1	X	1		7
6. Execute sgreetments		1	1	1	X		7
7. Monitoring					X	X	

	Responsible	<u> </u>		Yca			Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Sources
E. Christmas Tree Recycling	WMD	Ongoi	ng Pro	gram	•• •• •• •		WMD Funds
1. Evaluate pilot program	Cities	X					City Budgets,
2. Redesign program based on pilot program	Printing	X					Private Funds
3. Meet with dept, personnel and cities to coordinate the program	AO	X				1	
4. Investigate whether area compose Facilities can utilize the material		X			1		
5. Agreement with a vendor to grind the trees		I X					
6. Set up granding site		X	i		[
7. Meet with private Laulers		X					
8. Contact tree lots		X				<u> </u>	
9. Design and implement public education campaign		X					
10. Print and distribute flyers		X					
11. In plan shi the Biogram		X			1	┼──	
12. End of assess theorem			x		1	÷	
			<u>.</u>			<u> </u>	·
F. Encouragement of Entities to Use Compose	WMD	Ongoi	ng Pro	gram			WMD Funds
1. Determine Agencies/Estities that include Isudacape duties as part of their function	RCSWMAC/		X			1	
2. Compose and Watsmit letter to all targeted agencies entries	LTF		x		• 	+- <u></u>	1
3. Desire and implement public educ. campaire		+ - +	X			<u> </u>	
4. Monitorint				X	x	x	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
G. Cubside Separation and Pick Up of Yard Waste	DEH	Ongoi	ng Pro	gram-			WMD Funds,
1. Survey existing and plaused composting facilities to evaluate the quantity	WMD		X			1	DEH Funds,
and quality of yard waste to be diverted	GRHC						Private Funds
2. Evaluate the impact of curbinde separation & pick up of yard waste on diversion	RCSWMAC/		<u>X</u>				
3. Design amendment to Ordinance 657	<u>L17</u>			X	1	ļ	-
4. Present amanded Ordinance 657 to the Garbage Rafus Hauler Committee and the				x	1	1	
Riverside County Sulid Waste Mgt. Advisory Council/Local Task Porce	- <u></u>						
5. Present advented Ord. 657 to BOS		┿╼╼┤		X _		V	4
	[erma en	× Sin of a		<u>1</u>	an an an an an an an an an an an an an a
H Composting Facilities	www.	Oneoi	ng Pro	יתואדעו			WMD Funds
1 Identify monthin) anantity & quality of comment material & (data base study) meers	I FA		X			1	LEA Funds.
nee of compati & determine becausely Balland of compati material (mutremut to	DEH					1	DEH and
promote sales). Network with incorporated cities for Countywide coordinated approach.	Planning					1	Planning
2. Determine opposing approaches/technologies that can produce the desired	00		X		-		Dent. Funds.
quality company	Citize/Districts						Cities/Dist.
3. Survey state regulations regarding compost sludge management to determine	Printing		Х	<u> </u>		1	Funds.
if they import finding in the above tasks.	A0				1		Private Funds
4. Evaluate potential locations of yard wasts composting programs including	j		X]	1	Recycling
equipinent & operational requirements							Market
5. Investigate the establishment of composting facilities on or near County landfills			X				Development
6. Determine accurate cost estimates & projections of potestial revenues for			X				Zones
cost com \$45000	_					1	
7. Prepare RFP/contract for acquisition of vendors to implement program			X	1			
8. Select firm	1			X			
9. Design and implement a public education program to enhance market				X			
development and facilitate collections	ļ			[<u> </u>		1
10. Submit programs to the Riverside County Solid Waste Magmat. Advisory Council					X		1
Local Task for consideration			_	1			1
11. Implement programs where environmental and economic feasibility can be assured	<u> </u>	1		<u> </u>	X	<u> </u>	4
12. Maintam present markets and develop additional outlets	<u> </u>	_		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		4
13. Monisonny	1		_	·		X	-1

Composting Component (Cont.)	Deservation			Vee		,	
Alternative Brasser	A separation	1001	1007	1007	1004	1000	Kevenue
Alternative Program	Agency/rerson	1991	1992	1993	11994	1995	Sources
1. Investigate the Use of Compost as Cover Material							WMD Funds
	LEA	+	<u> </u>	v		<u> </u>	LEA Funds
1. Survey jurisdictions in CA that may be using compositis cover insternal	WMU	:				<u> </u>	
2. Evaluate County compost system regarding present & future capacity,	æ	1		A			
investory & market coaditions		+	<u> </u>				
3. Evaluate the need to pursue the use of compost as cover material at County landfills						<u> </u>	
4. If determined to proceed, submit proposal request to the CIWMB and LEA				X			
for consideration					<u> </u>		
5. If CIWMB approves request, establish a demonstration project				<u> </u>	<u>x</u>		
6. At the end of demonstration project, CIWMB & LEA evaluate the suitability				ĺ	X		
of the demonstration cover material	<u> </u>	+		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
7. If material deemed "suitable cover", file an Amended Report of Disposal Site						X	
Information & an application to revise the Solid Waste Facilities Permit				 .	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
8. Upon receiving approval, contact local cmpst, facilities regarding the use				Į		X	
of finished compost as cover material				 	<u> </u>		
9. Negotiate agreements with compost facilities	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
10. BC/5 consideration of agreements		+		<u> </u>			
11. MOBINITIE (19894)	l	5		L	L	<u> </u>	
I Investigate the lise of Mulch as Cover Material at	CRUND	1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1	WARD Energy
County I andfille				[1	(
				v	├		LEA FUIDE
I. Survey jernolotion is CA tast may be aling match as cover material		+					
2. Determine the quantities of yars waste disposed and diverted in the County	C			X			
3. Evaluate the aced to pursue the use of mulch as cover material at County landfills			<u> </u>	X			
4. If determined to proceed, submit proposal request to the CIWMB				X	ł		
and LEA for consideration					<u> </u>		
S. If CTWMB approves request, establish a demonstration project			L		<u> X</u>		
6. At the end of demonstration project, CIWMB & LEA evaluate the		1			X	1	
suitability of the demonstration cover material							
7. If material deemed "suitable cover", file an Amended Report of Disponal Site						Х	
Information & an application to revine the Solid Waste Facilities Permit							
8. Upon receiving approval, determine potential sources of mulch, needs in terms						Х	
mulch, needs in terms of machinery, sites, etc.							
9. Negotiate agreements with vendors for mulch, equipment, etc.		_	L	L	ļ	XX	
10. BOS consideration of agreements		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ļ		<u>X</u>	
11, Mountains (saasa)	[1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	1	laner de 1
		1	1	1	T T	nere na si siji	2000
K. Phased in Han OI Yard Waste at County Landtills	WMD			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	36	WMD Fund
1. Survey existing composting facilities to evaluate the quantities of yard waste diverted	Cities				–	<u> X</u>	Cities' Fund
2. Survey County landfills to evaluate the quantities of yard waste disposed	<u>A0</u>			Į	<u> </u>	X	ļ
3. Survey existing diversion programs to evaluate how the County and cities are	RCSWMACLTF	1	{			X	
progressing toward the state goals		1	 	ļ		ļ	ļ
4. Determine if a han on yard waste at the County landfills is necessary to ensure that		1		1	1	X	
the County & Cities achieve the State goals				<u> </u>			
5. If a han is seeded, determine landfill priority for implementing it & the		1			1	X	
corresponding schedule							
6. Meet with cities and impacted compasses regarding the ban and its implications		1		i	} _	X	1
7. Design public information campaign		1				X]
8. Submit ben of yard waste to the Riverside County Solid Waste Mgt. Advisory						X	
Council/LTP for consideration			1	1			
9. Board of Supervisors consider the ban of yard waste at County landfills			į	į		X	
10. If BOS approves the bas, implement it, phase in over time, and monitor the program					1	1	<u> </u>

Special Wastes Component

	Responsible		·	Yca		Reve	Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1 991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Sources
A. Processing Station for Woody Wastes at Edom Hill and	WMD					;	WMD Funds
Coachella Landfill	œ		1	<u>i</u>	<u> </u>	i	
1. Negotiate agreement between County & Operator to sublease sites at area		X		1			
landfills to process wood waste for transport to plant.							
2. Execute Atreement		x		<u> </u>			
3. Make any modifications to landfill administration/operations that result from		x	X		1		
diversion of wood waste to the dasignated processing site.			<u> </u>				
4. Promote the program and its procedures to businesses undividuals that would		1	X		{	}	
normally bring the appropriate woody waste material to the landfill for disposal							
5. Begin processing woody waste material at the designated landfill sites for			X	1			
shipment to Plant.	<u> </u>			<u> </u>			
6. Mositor Program			X	X	X	X	
	······································	.,	, <u> </u>				
B. Encourage the siting of a tire recycling facility within	WMD/		1				WMD Funds
Riverside County or the region.	Cities	ļ		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
1. Hold meetings with proposens of specific projects to gain information and		Ongo	ing Pro	ogram-]
evaluate the proposais.			_				
2. Support visible recycling alternatives to the landfaling of tires.	•	Ongo	ing Pro	ogram-			
3. Monisoring		1	X	X	X	x	
C. Encourage/site Green Waste/Sewage Sludge Composting	(See Chapter 5 Cog	posting C	Compose	nat)			
	<u>}</u>						!
D. Beferrel Sustem for Bibite/Departurble Coods	(Fee Channel Cam	Dadau					
D. Reichtal System for WilkerKepattavie Goods	1 (SHE CEEPSELS SOL		105 CO)		
R. Resources Harrs of Mobile Demolition Reputing facilities	(Chanter 7 Rda		d Bablis 1		·····	_	
E. Eliconiege Charge of Moone Frenkrittig Recipting lectricities	[(300 Califiet) 200						L
E Enguine the Dedication of Adequate Wattemater Transme	NACE A		T		T	1	NOO Ened
F. Encodings the Densetton of Audquate watewater Around	Biogning				•	i	
Capacity when Flades are Proposed of Papanonig	riesens		- v		+		
1. 126 waste Magagement Department was work with the main fac			^				1
TODED to ITE THE OF LEARNING STREETS FOL CANADA REAL COCREMENCE TOL	-				i		ſ
creations to or new wallowing treatment plants.	<u> </u>			1	<u> </u>		4
2. The watte Management Department will work with the Planning Lept. to orwap			^	1			
procedures for including wasterwater creatment plants to the County Past Track Tyttem				V		<u> </u>	ł
3. Review environmental documents, as they as submitted, for adequacy in dedicating		ł		A	- Ongi	oing	
capacity for septic task and chemical totlet waste generated both within & outside	1	1	1				1
of the service area.	<u> </u>			1			ļ
4. Implement procedures for including wastewater treatment plants to the				×			
County "Fast Track" system.			ļ	<u> </u>	1	. <u> </u>	-
5. Monitoring	<u> </u>		!	!	<u>X</u>	X	<u> </u>
C. Trunching Allergradies Discourses Mannes Mathe de fee Time	NA DOM:		γ				11000 0
U. Investigate Alternative Disposal/Keuse Methods for Lifes	W MLD/C)DEL		1	1		ļ	WMU Fund
1. Identify existing facilities/technologies capable of processing tires for reuse.			1	V	T		1
				X			1
2. Research the methods employed and the feasibility of using the existing facilities				X X]
2. Research the methods employed and the feasibility of using the existing facilities 3. If feasible, implement programs to direct waste tires to vable secycling alternitives			1	X X X			

Special Wastes Component

	Responsible			Year			Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	1992	<u>1993</u>	1994	1995	Sources
H. Encourage all Incineration Facilities within the County to	WMD	1	1 1		ĺ		WMD Funds
utilize appropriate methods to source reduce and recycle their						1	
ash, and if necessary, investigate alternatives to landfilling							
incinerator asb							
1. Identify emitting facilities/sochaologies capable of processing ash for reuse.				<u>X</u>			
2. Research the methods employed and the feasibility of using existing				X	1	1	
facilitien/technologies.						1	
3. Encourage the mage of viable reuse alternatives.					X		
4. Monitoring.						X	
I. Encourage the Development of Demolition Materials	WMD/						WMD Funds,
Recycling Facilities in Riverside County.	Cities	1				1	Private Funds
1. Evaluate the need for demolition materials recycling facilities within the				X			
various landfill/MRF service areas of the County.				_			
2. Evaluate demotition materials generation in those service areas.		1	ĺ	X		1	
3. In areas with sufficient generation of demolition materials, and a need for				X			
, recycling facilities, the Department will consider establishing these facilities.	. <u> </u>						
4. Establish/Escourage Development					X		1
5. Monitoring						X	
J. Encourage the Development of Alternative Liquid/Sludge	WMD/						WMD Funds
Disposal, Treatment and/or Recycling Facilities.	Cities						
1. Research alternative disposal methods for liquids and studge			1	X		1	1
2. Evaluate environmental and technical feasibility of alternatives	· · · · · ·			X		1	1
3. Meet with proposers of specific projects and support environmentally		1	1		X On	going	
feasible projects.							
4. Monitoring		1	1		1	X	1
a a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a second a	el en la la presigna e come co			e aran	i Anti-Anti-		Second R. Maria
K. Encourage the siting/usage of wood grinding operations that	WMD		T			Ĭ	WMD Funds
will divert root balls, tree trunks and other hand-to-handle	Cities						
peices of wood]		
1. Evaluate the need for wood grinding sites at each landfill/MRF.				X	1	1	1
2. Evaluate the private sector involvement in wood grinding in each landfill/			1	X	1		
MRF service area.]		
3. Develop a listing of sites requiring wood grinding.				X	ł		1
4. Develop an implementation mbedule.			1	X	1	1	1
5 Implementation.			1		x	1	1
6 Monitoriur					<u> </u>	X	1
			·				<u> </u>
I. Establish salvage opportunities at County solid waste	(See Chapter 4 Rec	teline Co	ntoerat	· · · ·			T
facilitics		,		•			
							·
M. Promote Source Reduction of Special Waster	WMD	1		}	1	1	WMD Fund
1 Research source reduction methods and technologies for special watter		1	1	x	† –	1	
7 Englisses the fearibility of each method			+	XX	t -	+	
2. Develops of report to be sent to versions industries Audine stands wester				1	x	1	
a the Country on the statistic course advectors matheda]			ļ	1	1 [1
U Lie Courty, ou las analisme pourse revention metalogs.	<u> </u>	1	1	<u></u>		X	4
The second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second se	1			÷		· • •	1

	Responsible			Yca	r		Revenue			
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	11992	1993	11994	1995	Sources			
N. Work with Other Agencies to Encourage all Treatment Plant	WMD	i	i –	1	1		WMD Funds			
to Develop Sludge Management Plans.		1				ļ				
1. Through written coorespondence, notify the Regional Water Quality Control Board			_	X						
of the Waste Management Department's support for the development of sludge		1								
management plans.										
2. Through written courespondence, notify treatment plant operators of the Waste]		X	1	j				
Management Department's support for the development of sludge management plans										
3. The Department will offer all feasible technical assistance in preparing these plans	-			' X	01	going				
4. Mositonag				!	X	X				
			·							
O. Investigate the Potential for Establishing Septic Tank	DEH 🛃	į.	Ì	1	ł	1 1	DEH Funds			
Maintenance Districts.	WMD		<u> </u>	1		L				
1. Research existing situat programs.		<u> </u>	·		X					
2. Develop a committee, composed of residents, liquid waste kaulers, and measupai		1		1	X					
wastewater treatment blast operators to work through the specifics of this program				:	1					
3. Working with the commutee, develop procedures for establishing septic task				1		X				
maintesatice districts.		<u> </u>		1	1					
4. Implement.					j	X				
5. Moninoring.				<u> </u>						
P. Research Constituent Materials of street sweepings and its'	WMD			<u> </u>	· · · ·	· ·	WMD Eved			
applicability to reuse methods.				1		ļ	WIND LOUNS			
1. Research the constinuent materials is street sweepings		Ī		1		x				
2. Research the applicability of street sweeping material to reuse methods						X				
3. Encourage the usage of environmentally feasible reuse methods for street sweepings						X				
4. Moeitoriag			1	1			ſ			

Education and Public Information Component

A. Environmental Labeling Program	WMD				WMD Funds		
1. Support enactment of state legislation for environmental labeling at grocery stores & supermarkets		X	X Ongoing until Enacimen				
						÷-	n în presente
B. Press Releases/Public Service Advertising	WMD & PIO	Ongo	ing P	rogram	1		WMD Funds
1. Establish and maintain contact with County PIO		X		1			[
2. Develop and distribute all press releases through the County PIO		X		i		1	
3. Monitoring			x	X	X	x	<u> </u>
C. Conduct Mass Mailing to Unincorporated County Residents	WMD	Ongo	ing P	rogran	1		WMD Funds
1. Determine subject of mailing		1	5	(1	1		1
2. Develop brochure		i		X	1	1	
3. Determine method of distribution		1	!	X		ł	1
4. Printing				X	-	i]
5. Distribute			1	X –	- On	ing	1
б. Мовкопад				X	X	X	T

Education and Public Information (Cont.)

	Responsible	·	Yea	1		Revenue		
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991 1992	1993	11994	1995 i	Sources		
D. Conduct a General Publicity Campaign	PIO&WMD	Ongo	ng Pro	ogram		WMD Funds		
1. Determine Subjects and times to cover		<u> </u>						
2. Determine mediums to utilize	i	X						
3. Prepare material/advertuements	i	<u> </u>						
4. Coordinate with County PIO to purchase/acquire advertising space	<u> </u>		x	<u> </u>				
5. Monitoriag	!	<u> </u>		X	X			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
E. Countywide logo	WMD & PES					WMD Funds		
1. Develop committee	1	X	 	! !				
2. Determine criteria upon which to judge logo's		X		1				
¹ 3. Gather possible logo's from all available sources, including, but not limited.			xx					
school contests, county contests, college sources and professional services								
4. Judge and determine finalists		¢	<u>X</u>	<u> </u> i				
5. Determine the body to choose the final logo.			X	1 '				
6. Determining body chooses final logo.	1		<u>X</u>	1				
					,			
F. Brochures	WMD			!		WMD Funds		
1. Determine specific brochuses for pristing		X		 				
2. Determine critical info for each brochure	-	X	<u> </u>	ļ :				
3. Javonigate alteratives source for development			X					
4. Choose developing body			X					
S. Develop brockure(s)			XX					
6. Printing			<u> </u>					
7. Distributios				X On	going			
8. Monitoring	<u> </u>				X			
G. Speaking engagements	WMD	Ongo	ing Pr	ogram		WMD Funds		
1. Develop outline for presentations			X	!				
2. Develop speakers bureau			X					
3. Solict engagements	· · ·		X					
4. Mositonag	£	<u> </u>	į	X	X			
H. Recycling Holling	WMD					WMD Funds		
1. Order/purchase automated telephone equipment		1	X					
2. Determine recorded mension		<u> </u>	X					
3. Train personnel on equipment	- <u></u>		X	1		l l		
4. Monitoring		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	X	X			
			-					
I. Curriculum Guides	WMD		WMD Funds					
1. Support CIWMB curriculum development	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		X					
2. Gather and Review existing guides		1	XX					
3. Develop listing of available guides			<u> </u>			Į		
4. Determine iocations for storage of guides			<u> </u>			ļ		
5. Publicize availability of guides to teachers and schools tonce CIWMB		. :	<u> </u>	(On	going	i		
curriculum is developed, the County will supplement publicity for the guide)	100 T 10 T 10 T 10 T 10 T 10 T 10 T 10	· · ·	:			ļ		
6. Mosilonsz				X	X	1		

Education and Public Information (Cont.)

	Responsible		Year		ŀ	Revenue
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1 991	1992 1993	1994	1995	Sources
J. Recognition Program	WMD & PES		Ongoing Pro	gram		WMD Funds
1. Determine categories for recognition			<u> </u>			
2. Determise time of year for presentation			X			ļ
3. Determine sudging body			X			
4. Determine methods by which to publicize the program		<u>i</u> .	X		1	
5. Monitoring		Ì		X	x	ŀ
K. Technical Assistance	WMD	i	Ongoing Pro	gram		WMD Funds
1. Gather guides from similar programs					1	
2. Develop guide for Riverside County (using as much as possible from existing	1					
documents)						
3. Develop outline of presentations			X			
4. Determine persons to conduct technical assistance and train		1		XX	<u> </u>	
5. Contact a few large firms and solicit participation		i	;	X	3	
6 Publicize program through media and presentations		;		X	Oscolar	
? Coordinate program with Health Dept. Hazardous Waste Minimization				X	Ostoned	-
Program	I					1
8. Publicize state Materials Exchange & Reuse Program		T	X Oagoi	12		
9. Monitoriat					x	
		1				
L. Video Programs	WMD					WMD Funds
1. Determine subjects to cover			X			
2. Conduct comprehensive march of existing video programs			XX			
3 Gather video's for viewing & grading		1	x		†	
			X			
· Journetiente soutres of production			XX		1 1	
		1	X			
- Pendure seden			Y	Y -		
C. Dutomine facility for storage		+		Y		
5. Detrig de la de la dela de la dela de la dela de				Î V		
0. FUELE # ########				<u> </u>		
/ Mounding		.!	I I		^	
M Mideo Information Center	SUMD.	Onen	in a Bennessen			NO D Tuesday
M. Video Information Center	wmD	Ougo		1		
1. Determine speroprate warening in ware to causes						
2. Deterpute talta backets) to cover		+				
3. FUCLASS/LEVIOD VICEO S	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	<u>.</u>		
4. Purchase Equipment			<u> </u>			
). Establise			<u> </u>	<u></u>	1 32	
6. Mosionst			<u> </u>	ļ	J X	
M Manufacture on Wasse Managements Former						110 00 0
N. NEWSICILET OD WASIE MADAGEMEDI ISSUES				gram		WMD Funds
1. Discuss possibility of combining all environmental related matters into one	WMD &		XX	ļ	•	
newsietter with other affected agencies	other	- .	<u> </u>			
2. Determine way in which newsletter will be structured fisanced	applicable		<u> </u>	1		
3. Determine editor(s) and possible article contributors	Departments		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
4 Determine basic format & frequency of issues			<u> </u>			
5. Determine method of distribution			X			
6 Editor(s) determine operating procedures and time of first usue			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
Monitorine			. <u> </u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	

Education and Public Information (Cont.)

	Responsible		Yea	r	Revenue				
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	<u> 1992 1993</u>	1994 11995	Sources				
O. Regional and Coutywide Fairs and Events	WMD		Ongoing Pr	Ogram	WMD Funds:				
1. Research existing fairs			<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
2. Develop listing of fairs along with organizing budies			X						
3. Determine events to attend			<u> </u>						
4. Contact lead agencies and express desire to participate			x	<u>.</u>					
5. Develop display		ţ	<u> </u>	1	1				
6. Develop graphics			<u> </u>		1				
7. Monitoriag		1	F I	XX	1				
P. Recycled Product Awareness Campaign	WMD	1	Ongoing Pr	ogram	WMD &				
1. Designate lead organizing body	1	1	X		could charge :				
2. Determine rules for recognition of efforts	1	(x	1	for the				
3. Design logo for this program			X		sticker				
4. Print jogo			X	1					
5. Publicize program			X		1				
6. Press Event/celebration for first distribution			· X	1	1 :				
7. Monitorne				xx	1				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-			i				
O. Community Education Workshops	WMD	1	Ongoing Pr	ngram	WMD Funds				
1. Develop route for workshops		ī		ki i	i				
2. Determine attain) in which to conduct workshops				4	1 1				
Develop a rough schedule of when to conduct		1	1 - i - i	X	┥ ┆				
A Develop contest outline for specific workshope		1		IX I	4				
Determine speakers and depice graphics if accessory			†	X	4 1				
6 Develop handont materials if anotherinte			<u>†</u>	x -					
7 Conduct let service			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
1 Monitoring			<u> </u>	X	-				
					·····				
R. Purchase of "novelty items"	WMD	1	Ongoing P	ogram	WMD Eunds				
L Gather infortering info		1	1	XI					
2. Determine amount available	······································			X					
	···· <u>···</u> ·····	1	1 1	IXI	-				
			1	<u> </u>					
C Purchase sent		-	1-1	x -	-				
6 Manitaring			+	X	-				
0. MOBILOFIER		1							
C. Master Remmier Composier Broaram	(See Chanter 2 Se-	P d							
3. Malet Kelytter Compositer Fiogram	(ot this promet				NEWSCON PLAN				
Legend to Abbreviations									
Exercite to Above matched	Geodesili: Geodesili Indu								
	GRHC Gashana & Bakk	معادي باد مار رامن	Connider						
	1 SA: Local Enformement		en Commite of Riverside Cor						
	Deinters Drinting Content	Concerciones de la concerción de la conc	Samanca Anton	• 6 5 7					
USAVED = Furchasting Division of the Underst Services Agency	Frinting: Frinting service	in General C	amian Anno	7					
UER + Department of Environmental realing of the realing Services Agency	i erentenig, i erentenig, utatiat gervich Ageney								
		NUE COUR	14 30112 W 1216 1	viana gement Adv	Hory Collect/				
Building & Safety = Riverside County Building and Safety Department	AD 737 LOCAL LASE FORCE								
CIWMB = California lategrated Waste Masagement Board	Cities: incorporated Citie		THE COULTY						
CC = Cousty Counsel	Districts: Special District	s, Waler i	Distincts, etc.	_					
County Depts Agency = Riverside County Departments Agencies	PES = Public Education	Subcomm	attlee of the LTI	F					

PIO = Public information Officer

B15-14

EDA = Economic Development Agency

mentation Plan	Frequency of Program and Comments	The County endevors to service each of the Supervisorial Districts at least once per year. Program began in February of 1990	Each day landfills are operating. Program began in February of 1991. As of July 1, 1991, it was operating at the Blythe, Coachella, Edom Hill, Mecca and Oasis Landfills. It will be expanded to all landfills as they are routinely repermitted under the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Periodically. One - day events are similar to the mobile program and have been held in the Cities of Moreno Valley, Riverside and Beaumont.	Pick-up will be once per week. Will be operated by private disposal companies.
Hazardous Waste Implei Existing Programs Table B15-2	Sponsor	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch and Waste Management Department	Riverside County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Branch	Operated by the private waste haulers and regulated by the County Health Services Agency, Department of Environmental Health
Household	Existing Program	Mobile Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	Load Checking Program	One-Day Events	Curbside Collection of Used Motor Oil

B15-15

Household Hazardous Waste Element Implementation Plan

	Kesponsible			ř	J			ļ		
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1991	1992	1993 19	94 19	35 19	96 195	7 199	8 1999	2000
A. Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all HHW	WMD, Cities									
1. All RFP's distributed for MRF operation/ownership will			×							
specify that all types of HHW will be accepted from residents						_				
2. Contractors selected for each MRF will develop permanent			×	Ongo	ing until	compl	etion			
HHW facilities at the MRF.										
3. Monitoring				X at least	annual	monito	ring on	ce impl	cmented	
	Second Second							a the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second		
B. Utilization of Available Promotional Sources	HMB	Ongoir	L Prog	ram						
1. Determine available sources				×						
2. Develop a listing, by area, of sources with contact persons				×						_
3. Utilize appropriate sources in each area for collection events				X (Dagoing					
4. Monitoring				X	X	X	X	X	×	×
	1									
C. Media Educational Program	HMB	Ongoir	IL Prog	ram						
1. Develop database of media outlets in the County with										
contact persons				×			_	_		_
2. Utilize all appropriate outlets in publicizing upcoming events) X	Dngoing					
3. Develop a library of available video presentations on HHW				×						
4. Encourage the use of appropriate video's on cable T.V. stations				X	Ou	going				
5. Monitoring					X	X	X	x	×	×
	and a second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second		E							
D. Encourage the use of Alternatives to HHW	HMB	Ongoir	IS Prog	ram				1		
1. Have brochures, listing the alternatives available to the use of									. <u>.</u>	
HHW, at all collection events				×		-	_	-		
2. Advertise, through various mediums, the benefits of using		-		X X	Ongoing					
alternative products to HHW						;		;		
3. Monitoring			-	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
			į,			5 3635 4605 47 27 27 27				
E. Promotional Packets for City Utilization	HMB	Ongoir	Ig Prog	ram						
1. Develop outline of what packets will include				×			-			
2. Develop each section of the packet				×		-				
3. Assemble packets				×		_				
4. Distribute to neighboring cities for each collection event				×	Ongoi	2	-			
5. Monitoring				×	×	×	뇍	×	×	×

,

	Responsible				Ycar						
Alternative Program	Agency/Person	1661	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
7 Private MRF Collection of HHW	HMB & WMD										
I. Work with the operators of private MRF's to provide for the				×	Ongoir	ng until	compli	ance			
acceptance of oil, paint, antifreeze and car batterics										lo mon	1
2. Monitor collection program, if implemented.					A at le	ast and	oui ipn				2
G HHW Recycling/Reuse	HMB	Ongoi	ng Prop	ram							
. Develop and maintain listing of private businesses which				1							
accept HHW				×							
2. Publicize the HMB capability to direct residents to				;	č						-
appropriate businesses				- <			>	>	>	×	X
3. Monitoring					×	Y	<	<	<		
										332 X X	
H. MRP Capability to Accept Mobile Collection	HMB & WMD					_					
Proeram Services											
[If private and existing MRF's do not provide a permanent				×							
collection noint for HHW, develop an example of the required						-					
facility additions to MRF's in order to host the Mobile Collection								-			
Program.											
2. Encourage/assist MRF operators in expanding facilities to											
include those which would allow set -up of the Mobile Collection						(
Prooram					 		un Bu			.	
2 Monitoriae					X	at least	angual	monit	oring if	impler	nented
3. Monitoring			ľ								
T Cantest HHW Collection Facility	HMB, WMD,										
Determine annrontiate time frame for implementation	GSA , Cities				×						
Determine one ration of facility (nublic, private or partnetship)						×					
1. Determine annrobriate site(s)						×					
4. If private or partnership, use competitive bidding process to						×	×				
determine vendor							>				
5 Selection of site							<	>			
6 Environmental documentation							×	× N	>		
7 Construction								X	<) <		
R Fanipment Purchase									<	>	>
0 Manine										<	<
2. Monutoning HMB = Hazardous Materials Branch of the Health Services Agen	lcy	MMM	= Was	te Man	ageme	nt Dep	artmen				
CIA - General Services Agency											
	NIC NICH										

Table B15-3

Household Hazardous Waste Element Implementation Plan

COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

SRRE/HHWE PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Appendix B16

		•	Shoi	RI-TER	W		W	EDIUM	TERM	*
PHOGHAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1661	1992 1	993 1	994 19	95 195	96 199	1996	1999	2000
 MODEY RATE STRUCTURE Gather information on variable can rate programs and inform political leaders/community groups Determine operational decisions for program (container type, enforcement, billing system) Conduct a leasibility analysis on program (container type, enforcement, billing system) Hold public hearings Bevelop a workplan to address collection dianogo system, publicly Plan rate structure Develop public relations program Hali an ordinance change Conduct a pict program Haliale an ordinance change Conduct a pict program Hold public program Hold program Revelop public operation Bevelop public program Hold public program Hold public program Revelop public program 	CVAG TWG / AB 939 Coordinator CVAG TWG / AB 939 Coordinator CVAG TWG / AB 939 Coordinator (contract out) CVAG TWG / Waste hauker CVAG TWG / Waste hauker CVAG TWG / Waste hauker CVAG TWG/AB 939 Coordinator Waste hauker CVAG TWG/AB 939 Coordinator Waste hauker CVAG TWG/AB 939 Coordinator Waste hauker CVAG TWG/AB 939 Coordinator									
LEGEND Cectsion Point or Reporting Deadline Planned Activity Possbie Activity	Table B16-1 source reduction program		COM		- Coacte Co	Dunty He.	A associate and a social and as social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and as social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and a social and	a pour of a sar	Governm Ma	ents, B

WFIFIQURES/CITY OF IRVINE FIGURS

			- SHORT	-TERM -		•	MEDIL	IM-TEF	ž	
PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	992 199	3 1994	1995	1996 1	997 1	938	666	2000
BUSINESS LICENSE / SOURCE REDUCTION PLANS										
Develop a source reduction plan form	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator									
Coordinate implementation of program with City Business License Departments	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator / Business License Departments		1							
 Initiate the inclusion of source reduction form with business iconse renewal/ application forms 	Business License Departments		- 4	<u> </u>			<u> </u>			
 Review voluntary participation, implement mandiony program il necessary 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator / Business Libense Departments			-	- -		◀	◀	◀	
Revise source reduction form	CVAG TWG / AB 939 Coordinator			1	1 _!_	ŗ	Ţ	İ	1	l
GROCERY BAG REUSE / REBATE			<u> </u>							
Review existing programs	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator						_			
Develop promotional poster	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator		T							
Promote additional store participation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator									
			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••							
LEGEND A Decision Point or Recording Deadline	Table B16-1		County	= Pävorsi	le Count	v Health D	Jept., H	azardoı	is Mate	nials Bra
Planned Activity	SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM		CVAG	0 - 0 M	achella chnical	Valley Ass Vorking G	sociation iroup	o Go	/ernme	Ś

B16-2

WE/FIGURES/CITY OF IRVINE FIGH-1 SR

SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

		V V	SHORT-1	IERM —		⊥ ▼	- MED	IUM-TE	W	
PHOGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991 19	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	6661	5000
PRODUCT DEFOSITS / REBATES	CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator CVAG/AB 939 Coordinator							1		
LEGEND Decision Point or Reporting Deadline Planned Activity Pressile Activity	Table B16-1 CORCE REDUCTION PROGRAM	County	= Riversi TWG = C	de Couni bechelle schnicel 1	y Health Valley As Norking	Dept., (ssociati Group	Hazard on of G	ws Mate	rrials Br nts,	an ch
WFFKSURESCTTY OF IRVINE FIG4-1 SR	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE									

		•	HS	ORT-TE	MR:	▲	•	MEC		ERM		
PROGRAM/TASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
BACKYARD COMPOSTING									_	_		
 Determine if program is needed to meet diversion goals 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator											_
 Determine scope of activities, audience, and timelines 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator						1			<u>. </u>		
 HireArain staff Archunteers 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator						l					
 Purchase equipment/materials/supplies 								1				
 Implement promotional campaign 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator					_			1	<u>i</u>	i	r
 Develop implement monitoring/evaluation system 								I L				
 Refine materials/program 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator	_										
PROCUREMENT POLICIES											<u> </u>	
Review City purchasing practices	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG Cities	ľ	1									
 Make recommendations for source reduction policies 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator		◄									
 Adopt policies 	City Councils		l	_			·					
 Notify vendors 	Purchasing Departments			4								
Educate employees	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator											
										<u></u>		
LEGEND A Decision Point or Reporting Deadline	Table B16–1		රී	a - Yinu	liversid	Count	y Healt	Dept.,	Hazen	kous Mi	aterials	Bra
Enternance Activity Enternance Possible Activity	OURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		S	MT DA	0 -10 -10	achella hnical	Valley / Working	Group	ion of (sovernr	nents,	

WF/FIGURES/CITY OF IRVINE FIG4-1 SR

		¥	ĦS)AT-TE	- MR			MEDI	UM-TE	MA	A	
PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1983	1994	1995	1 986	266	8661	1999	2000	
EXPANDED DROP-OFF					Γ		┟─					
Harning and Development	CVAG TWG /Class			4								
Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/CIfes			1					·			
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/CM++			4	Ĩ	Ì	ij	Ţ	Ì	I	1	
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 CoordinationClines					Ĵ	1	Ť	Ţ	J	J	
EXPAND CURBSIDE PROGRAMS												_
Haming and Development	CVAG TWG/CIles				_							
 Program implementation 	CVAG TWG/CHes		1									
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG /Clies		┫		l	Ì	Ť	Ì				
 Monitoring and Evakuation 	CVAG AB 839 Coordinator/Cilles			J		Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	
COMMERCIAL FIBER RECYCLING												
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/Cites						-					
 Program implementation 	CVAG TWG/Cites							₹				
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/CHes				4	Î	+	1	l	- 	1	
Moribring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Cities					J	1	T	Ţ	Ţ	I	
LANDRILL-BASED PROGRAMS									<u> </u>	-		
Harning and Development	CVAGTWG/CNewCourty							Ŧ			_	
Program Implementation	CVAGTWG/CKes/County								J			
 Promotion and Education 	CVAGTWG/Cles/County								1		 	
 Monthoring and Evaluation 	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator/Clifea/County									Ţ	Ţ	
					-			-				
LEGEND	Table B16–1		Count	r= Rhu TWG=	ndde C Coeffe	unty He da Vale	w Assoc	A., Haz Jation o	ardous A Gove	Materia	la Branc	5
Planned Activity					Techni	cal Work	80 80	9				
🕳 📻 Possble Activity	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		Cilies	25	represe	ntatives ntation v	en CVA	G TWG	a will be	point o	i contac	τ

WE/FIGURES/CITY OF IRVINE FIGH-1 SR

Planned Activity

Possible Activity

1

SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

CVAG TWG - Conchelle Valley Association of Governments. Technical Working Group

Table B16-1

County - Riverside County Health Dept., Hazardous Materials Branch

Decision Point or Reporting Deadline LEGEND ◀

		Ī	ſ		Į			ſ				
PROGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
SLATIVE DEVELOPMENT		_										
priate information channels	CVAG AB \$29 Coordinator	1										_
priate fortums	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator		T									
8	CVAG AB \$29 Coordinator			T								
WAINVA / ZONRAIQ ORDINANCES												_
al leaders, community groups, business organizations of need for and use ordinances, etc	CVAG Cilles											
d-use master plan for source reduction activities	CVAG Cilies/TWG				-				 _1	ן 1		
J-use zoning requirements for source reduction activities	CVAG Cäres/TWG									ו _		
d-use conditions	CVAG Cities/TWG								 _1	 _]_		
i implement monitoring and evaluation system	CVAG Chies/TWG	_								 _]		
sse zoning tequirements	CVAG Chies/TWG										1	_
pt illegal dumping ordinance	CVAG Cities/TWG									۱ ۲		
										······································		يهي بالشقاد المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المستريب المحمد بيري والمحمد بالمتقاد المحافظ المحاف المحاف المحاف

	.		- SHO	HT-TE				MEDI	UM-TE	- MA	
PROGRAWTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	666	39	1 19 19	996 1	166	1998	1999	ğ
CITY INHOUSE PROGRAMS • Planning and Development	CVAG TWG/Cities/Publicly Funded Agencies (Schools, Aliponts, etc.)										
Program implementation	CVAG TWGCRies/Publicly Funded Agencies (Schools, Aliports, etc.)		4								
 Promotion and Education 	CVAG TWG/CitiesPiblich Funded Agendes (Schode, Alports, etc.)		Ŧ	ļ	İ		Ţ	Ì	T.		1.
Monitoring and Evaluation MODIFICATION OF RATE STRUCTURE	CVAG AB 839 Coordinator/Cities/Publicy Funded Agencies (Schools, Atports, etc.)	_#	1								
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/Clines/County			4							
- Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/Cities/County			1							
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWGCttlesCounty			Ţ	Î		Ì	Ì	T I	- ,	
- Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/China/County					Ţ	于	Ţ	Ţ	T	
CALIFORNIA REDEMPTION PROGRAM											
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/Citles		J								
 Program Implementation 	CVAG TWGChies		ł								
Promotion and Education	CVAGTWG/Chies		1	_~ 	Î		ļ	i	ľ		
 Monitoring and Evaluation 	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Chies			Ţ	Ţ	1]	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	
CONCRETE/ASPHALT RECOVERY							<u> </u>				
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/Cities		-	Ţ				_			
 Program Implementation 	CVAG TWG/Chies			ł						_	
Promotion and Education	CVAGTWG/Cities			1	Î		i	Ì	T	1	1
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 CoordinatorCilies				Ţ	1]	Ţ	Ţ	I	
				·····							
LEGEND	The RIG-1	1	County	- Here	- S - S - S - S - S - S - S - S - S - S	unty Hea	E Dec	M., Haz	ardous	Materia	als Bran
Decision Point or Reporting Deadline Diamand Archite			CVAG	- 9MI	Coache Technik	lla Valley al Worki	/ Assoc ng Grot	iation o UP	ol Gove	rument	ต์
Possible Activity	RECYCLING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		Cities	22	aprese piemes	ntatives c Itation wi	on CVA ithin the	iG TWC e cifies		e point e	of conta

		ļ	OHS	AT-TE	7			MEDIL	IM-TEF	W	A
PROGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	192	281	8	<u>8</u>	5661	1996	1 166	998	88	8
PLANNING AND BUR DING CODE MODIFICATIONS						<u></u>					
Planning and Development	CVAG TWG/Cities				Ţ			<u>.</u>			
Program implementation	CVAG TWG/Cities				Ŧ			<u> </u>			
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/CIties				1			i	ļ	$\frac{1}{1}$	
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Cilles					I			1	┠	Γ
MARKET DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES								_			
Planning and Development	CVAG TWG/Cities			T							
Program timplementation	CVAG TWG/Cities			ſ							
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/Cities		-	Ĩ		Ì		Ť	Ï		T
- Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Cites				Ţ						
ENHANCEMENTS TO CURBSIDE PROGRAMS											
Planning and Development	CVAG TWG/Cities										
Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/Cities							T			
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/Cities	-						ſ		Ï	T
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Cline							.			Γ
MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY											
Planning and Development (Including cost benefit analysis)	CVAG TWGChiesCounty		T	Τ	Ī						
Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/Calles/County	_						F			
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/Cities/County	_					.	ſ		Ï	
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator/Cities/County										
				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				<u> </u>			<u> </u>
						1 Au	alth Deo	4. Haza		Materiais	Branch
LEGEND Dedsion Point or Heporting Deadline	Table B16–1		CVAG	= ØM	Coache Technic	tia Val Nori	Associ Associ	iation of	Gover	ments.	
Planned Activity Possible Activity	RECYCLING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE		Cities	202	emelon emelon	ntative: ntation :	t on CVA within the	G TWG	vil 15	point of	contact

		-	DHS	RT-TEI	N.		¥.	- MEDI	UM-TE	- MA	A
PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	2001	1994	1995	1996	1881	1996	1999	2000
MANDATORY RESOLUTIONS OR ORDINANCES					İ		-		[
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/CIlles							1			
Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/CH+=								4		
· Promotion and Education	CVAGTWG/Clies							8,	1	ļ	T
Horitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 839 Coordinatos/Cities										
ENHANCED COMMERCIAL SECTOR COLLECTION											
Plauring and Development	CVAG TWG/CHes		<u> </u>		_	_	<u> </u>]		
Program implementation	CVAG TWG/CIEss								₹	_	
 Promotion and Education 	CVAGTWG/CM++								1	Î I	1
 Monitoring and Evaluation 	CVAG AB 839 Coordinator/Clies										
BAR/RESTAURANT/HOTEL PROGRAM							-			-	
 Planning and Development 	CVAG TWG/CM++							J	_		
Program Implementation	CVAG TWG/CMes							₹			
Promotion and Education	CVAGTWG/CHes			- <u>-</u>				1]	I	
Monitoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB 839 Coordinator/Clies								J		
LANDFILL BANS											
Plarting and Development	CVAG TWG/Clies/County							1			
Program implementation	CVAG TWG/Clifes/County		-						I		
Promotion and Education	CVAG TWG/Clies/Courty								1	l	ł
Monthoring and Evaluation	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator/Clifes/County				-						
			· <u> </u>	<u> </u>							
		_] °					the contract of the contract o	Hazan	- Hotel M		Branch
Decision Point or Reporting Deadline	Table B16-1	ŭ	VAG TV	6 0 1	achella cimical	Valley Workey	Associat Group	tion of C	Joverni	nents,	
Possible Addvity	RECYCLING PROGRAM MPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	0	1		amenti Amenti	don whi	n CVAG	A DAL	d Pa	olnt of e	pontact

County = Riverside County Health Dept., Hazardous Materials Barnch Cities - City representatives on CVAG TWG will be point of contact for implementation within the cities ٨ 2000 1 I Í —► 🕶 ······· MEDIUM-TERM 1 T 1999 Ī 1997 1998 Ī Į 1 1996 1995 SHORT-TERM ----1994 1993 1992 1991 **COMPOSTING PROGRAM** Table_B16-1 RESPONSIBLE AGENCY Cilies/County Cities/County Cities/County Cilies/County Cities/County County Cilies Cilies Citias Cities Cities Citles Cities Cities Cities Cities Cilies Cities Cities Cilies · Establish Multiple Drop off and Transfer Sites for Compost Pre-processing Evaluate Mixed Solid Waste Compositing; Implement if Necessary · Continue Commercial Landscaper Collection of Compost Material · Evaluate Residential At-Source Compost Collection; Implement if · Evaluate Source Separation Ordinance; Implement if Necessary Evaluate Procurement Requirements; Implement if Necessay Review Zoning Ordinance Changes; Implement if Necessary Implement Residential Sell-Haul of Composting Material Continue Waste Characterization/Diversion Studies Evaluate Incentive Rates; Implement il Necessary • Evaluate Rate Structures; Implement il Necessary • Evaluate Disposal Ban; Implement il Necessary **Decision Point or Reporting Deadline** Implement Business Permitting [gram Establish Technical Assistance Program Continue Composting Yard Waste Only Establish Fines for Illegal Disposal · Establish Procurement Guidelines Establish Building Code Changes Evaluate Success of Programs Provide Public Education SUPPORT MEASURES Planned Activity PRE-PROCESSING **PROGRAM/TASK** COMPOSITING MONITORING COLLECTION Necessary LEGEND 4

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

WE/FIQURES/ ADDIED1.AB.05 FIG 6-1 CP

Possible Activity

Į

B16-10
			SHORI	TERN	Ī	¥	MEI	T-MUID	ERM	- 🔺
			+							
PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992 199	199	4 1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
TRES										
· Encourage Tire Shredding at Edom and Coachella Landfilts	CVAB TWG		╉	+	╞	i	1	ļ	1	
Prohibit Curbside Collection of Tires	Ciles	1	╂	╉	╀	1				
 Support State Waste Tite Facility Registration and Permitting 	County		╁	╀	┦	┦		┦		
 Select Its ShreddingRecycling Contractor and Implement StreddRecycle Program, Renew Every Three Years 	County		┼	╂─	-	! -	1_	_		
Develop Litting of Existing Tire Recyclers in Region	County/CVAG TWG	j			-					
 Research and Coordinate Regional Tire Shredding/Recycling Options 	County/Other So. California Counties	Ì	╂	╀		+	i 	i	i +-	1
 Maintain Tip Fees for Tires at Landkiks 	County									
 Support Private Sector Alternate Tre Management 	Country (Cities									
Monitor Tue Reuse Technologies	County/CVAG TWG			-	-		 -{-		Ļ	! _!
Ban Tire Stockpiling	Clées									<u></u>
If Stockplies Exist, Encourage Inventory Reduction	Country/Cities		╏	-	┦	╀	1	Ļ		
 Encourage Regional Tre Recycling Option, if feesitie 	Ciées			<u></u>			1	┦_		
Education Program	Country/Cities		ļ		ł		ļ	ļ	Ļ	
Test and Evaluate Use of Recycled Tires, Report to CVAG Clines	Countricvag Two	4								
Review and Promote Revision of Bid Specification for Tite as Road Base	CountryCVAG TWG	Ì								
 Implement Procurement Policies for Tire Asphalt 	Country/CVAG Cities									
Recycle all City Fleet Vehicle Tires	Cities		╏	╀	╀	╀				
COMSTRUCTION DEMOLITION (CD) DEBRIS										
Test and Evaluate Use of Recycled Materials	Country/CVAG TWG/Cities	•								
Prapere and Distribute Educational Materials to Disposers	County/CVAG TWG		1		╉					
 Review and Promote Revision of Bid Specifications for Road Base, etc. to Include Consideration of Recycled Materials. 	Country/CVAG TWG			 	1			<u> </u>		
 Develop Listing of Existing C.D Debris Recyclers in Region 	CountricVAG TWG	Ì								
LEGEND Decision Point or Reporting Deadline Planned Activity Possible Activity	Table B16-1 special waste	County COUNT Cities	- Riversid Cattorn Cattorn Publicy City rep impleme	e Count e Dept. ormed nitation	A Health I I Health I Treatme was on C within the	Dept. H Service NAG T VAG T s cilies	ezardou: 95 WG with	s Mater be point	als Bran of conta	

B16-11

WF/FIGURES/NEW/FIG7-1

Ι.			V	×.	HT-TE				MEDIU	M-TER	-	
	PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995 1	996 1	997 1	998	666	000
	 Recycle al Municipal Generated CO Debris 	Contro Cities										
	• Evaluate CrD Debris Markets	County	L	┝╼╌╇								
	 Evaluate C.O. Debris Recycling Capacity in CountyRegion 	County		┫	i	_						
	 Ban C/D Debris from Landfills, Il Recycling Capacity is Available 	County							Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	-T
	 Establish Capacity at Landfills if Recycling Capacity is not Available 	County				Ì						
	 Establish a Regional C/D Debris Recycling Facility to be Operated by the private Sector & Necessary 	County/Other So. Catifornia Counties								i		
	INFECTIOUS WASTE					-						
	 Identity Small Quantity Generators (SOCs) 	HANB EHD, CDHS										
	 Implement Load Check Program for Large Quantity Generator (LQG) and SQG Weste 	County	4	T	T	T	t	Ì	╏	╏	╋	T
	 Incorporate Investigation and Education of SOCs in Existing Program 	HMB EHD, CDHS		T	T	1	t	╡	╋	T	╈	T
	Continue Existing LOG Program	HAUB EFD, COHS	T	T		T	T	╋	╀	╉	╋	T
	Public Education	County, HAMB EHD, DHS, CVAG TWG								-		
	 Support State Program for Registration and Plan Development for SOGs 											
	 Continue Existing Incineration and Autodaving of Intectious Waste 		<u></u>									
	 Encourage Use of Recycable Materials 	HINB EHD, COHS			Ť		İ		Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	T
	SLUDGE											
	Continue Studge Ban of County Landliks	County		┨	1		1	┨	1	╈	╏	T
	 Continue POTW Studge Management Programs 	POTWE					t	-	T		╏	Ţ
	Enforce Strong Pretreatment Program	POTWs	T	T	T	T	T	╋	╏	╏	╏	T
	 Implement Procurement Policy for Municipal Use of Composit 	Cities				+	i		<u></u>			
	Public Education	CVAG TWG	Ì	Ì	Ì	i	Ì	Ť	i	i	Ť	
٭	 Evaluata Sludge Reuse Alternatives 	County/CVAG		1		1	Ť	╎	Ţ	<u>_</u>	Ţ	Ţ
	ieno		30	₩ - A=	verside alliomia	County	Health of Health	Dept. Ha Service	azardou 15	s Mater	als Bra	Ę
	Declaion Paint or Reporting Deadline		Q S	±0 ≥‡	ublich (ir repr	. peuko japuesa	Freetmer ves on C	Neth VAG TV	VG will	be poin	of con	lact for
	- Pranted Activity Possible Activity	Table BIO-1		-	plama	Itation V	within the	cities		•		

			SHORT	TERN -	Ī		MED	IUM-TE	MH	▲1
PROGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY 19	91 19	92 199:	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
DEVELOP VALLEY-WIDE CANPAIGN						[
· Identity and evaluate use of existing nonprofit unbrelie organization	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	1								
- Develop central theme, mascot and/or logo	CVAG-AB \$39 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	1						-		
• Establish central office for AB 939 educational activities	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG						_			
· Identify staff/volunteer workers for educational activities	CVAG AB \$38 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	_1								
DISTRIBUTE WRITTEN PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS										
 Identify/evaluate existing materials 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	╉	_	_	_				Ι	
• Purchase applicable materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	-		_						
Modify/develop materials for local use	CVAG-AB \$39 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	┦	Ⅎ	4	┫	╡	4	┨	┫	┫
· Identify appropriate targets	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	┥	_	╡	┦	╡	┛	┛		
Distribute materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	╉	┦	┦	1	┦	ļ			
DISTRIBUTE WRITTEN INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS										
 Identity/evaluete existing materials 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	4	┦	┥	_	┦				
• Purchase applicable materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	-	-	4		4		4		◀
Modily/develop materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		┥						J]
· Identify appropriate targets	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	4	-	1	⊥	1		4		
- Cistribute materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		1		1		┫		4	
DEVELOP/DISTRIBUTE DIRECTORIES										
• Identify/evaluate existing materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG				-1-			-4-		
- Purchase applicable materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		-		4			•		
• Modity/develop materials	CVAG-AB 839 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	<u> </u>			1			1		
· identity eppropirate targets	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	. <u>.</u>						4		
• Distribute materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAGTWG				•			1		
UTILIZE MEDIA							-			
- Identity evaltable media outets	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	1								
Develop press releases	CVAG-AB \$38 Coordinator/CVAG TWG					_				
Develop public service announcements	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		┦	_	1	4			T	
Develop peld advertisments	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG	1	_i	 - -	Ţ	Ļ	 	1		1
TEGEND	m_L12 D16-1		CVAG TWG	- Caechel		Association 244	at Gowm	ente. Tech	Ital Work	the Croup
Decision Point or Reporting Deadline	ladie Div i		ļ		a ndialini					
Planned Activity EDUC	CATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAM	Z	NOTE: Sch	19 19 19 19 19 19 19	heatton (clai Was)	nd Public Ir es éhown li	nlormation	Programs	or Source	Reduction

			Ť.)HT-TE				- MEDI	JUL-TER	3	1
PROGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1983	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	866	8
ESTABLISH HOT LINE											
Dedicate phone at campaign central office	CVAG-AB 938 Coordinator/CVAG TWG										e -
 Identify staff/volunteer workers 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		I								
- Train stattworkers	CVAG-AB \$39 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		Ι]							
Publicize hot fine number	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG				T					╏	
DEVELOP DISPLAY				_							
 Identify target population(s) 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		_								
 Identify/evaluate existing materials 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		4								
• Purchase applicable malerials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		4		_						
Modify/develop materials for local use	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		T								
· Identify events for display use	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		l								
 Use display at public events 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		I	I	T			Ī	Ť	ſ	T
Modify display for current bends	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG				_		4				
DEVELOP PRESENTATIONS											
 Identify target population(s) 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			•	~			-		-	
Develop presentation	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		1		1		1		1		1
Present to various groups	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		ſ	T	T	I		T		Ť	T
DEVELOP WORKSHOPS											
 Identify target population 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG							······		-	
Develop workshop	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		1				1				1
 Present to various groups 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		Γ		T				┢	T	T
ESTABLISH SPEAKERS BUREAU											
•Identity speaker pool from cities' statts, business community, elected officials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		•	•	•	◀	•	◀	◄	•	•
Provide presentation materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		I	Ī	T	Ĩ	Ī	T	╏	╏	

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Table B16-1

Dedsion Point or Reporting Deadline
 Planned Activity
 Possible Activity
 Possible Activity
 WFFFQURES21581.48.13 FOR 8.1

LEGEND

		•	F S	DRT-TE				MEDI	JM-TEF	W		
PROGRAMTASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	8661	6661	2000	
ESTABLISH AWARDS PROGRAM												
- Identify groups to participate	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG											
tidentijy appropriate awards, criteria	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		1									
 Publicize program 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		T	T	1	T	╋		T	T	T	
 Solidit nominations from community 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			T	t	T	╏	T	T	Ť		
• Identify judges	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		4	◀	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
 Hold awards caremony 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			→	-	-	-	-		-	-	-
- Publicize winners	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			T	Ţ	T	╁	Ť	t	T		
DISTRIBUTE MATERIALS TO SCHOOLS		_					•		-	_		
- Identity/evaluete existing materials	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		T							-		
 Purchase applicable materials 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			_			4				4	
 Modify/develop materials for local use 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			1			1	_			1	
Distribute to ell school districts	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			I							I	
SPONSOR SCHOOL CONTESTS												
Solicit teacher support	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		◀	◄	4	•	◀	•	•	◀	◄	
Provide prizes	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		•	_	-		•	-		-		
- Publicize winners	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		T	T	T		T	T	T		T	_
ORGANIZE STUDENT RECYCLING PROGRAMS					.		· · · · ·					
Solicit teacher support	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG		•							·		
 Provide educational/technical essistance 	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			T	T	T	1	T	T	T	T	
- Provide "kickoff" presentations	CVAG-AB 939 Coordinator/CVAG TWG			T								
			<u> </u>						_			
					-			-		٦		

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Table B16-1

CVAD TWD - Coachela valley Association of Governments, Technical Working Group Ches - Chy representations on CVAD TWD will be point of context for the context of the technication of the context of th

A Decision Point or Reporting Deadline LEGEND

			5 	ORT-TE				- MEDI	UM-TE		1
PROGRAMITASK	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	1991	1992	1993	1991	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
COLLECTION					 				\square		
Continue to participate in Riverside County mobile #HW collection	Cities/County		T	Ţ		T	T	T		T	T
Work with the County to arrange for Coachelfa Valley area time and location for mobile program	CVAG TWG/County	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	ļ	Ì	Ì	Ì
Evaluate teasibility of additional AHAV collection programs	County			T	T	T					T
RECYCLING								-			
Work with local businesses to encourage retail return programs	CVAG AB 939 Coordinator		T	T	T	T		T	┫	T	T
krvestigate feastbility of waste exchange with Riverside County	CVAG TWG/County	l		T	1	Ì					
Work with hauters to make curbside waste of collection available to all CVAG area residents	Cities		T	T	T	T			_		
Idaniity recyclers/end users for waste paint (reusable as paint product)	CVAG TWG/County			1	T	Ī	Ī	T	Ť	Ī	T
· . estigate the leasibility of a retail return program for household betteries	CVAG TWG								T	T	
.ONITORING							-	-			
Distributaticollect mobile collection program questionnaire	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator			t	T	Ī	T				T
Develop annual participation/diversion statistics for mobile program and report to the County	CVAG AB 839 Coordinator	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì		Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	J
Continue load check program at desert landfilts	County	Ī		Ī	T			T		Ī	
Evaluate HRAW disposal patterns using load check data	CVAG TWG	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ì	Ţ	Ì	Ì
Developution transmission for the relative program	CVAG TWG		Ì	Ţ	T	T		T	T	T	
Summarize /distribute retail return program data	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinatur			T	T		Ī	T	T	1	T
PUBLIC EDUCATION					_						
Distribute brochure emphasizing source reduction, retail return program, mobile collection events	CVAG TWG	Ĩ	Ĩ	*	T	Î	Ţ	*	T	*	
Distribute press releases (as necessary)	CVAG AB \$39 Coordinator/Okies	T	T	T	T	T	Ì	Ī		Ţ	I
Advertise the mobile collection program area wide	CVAG TWG	T	ſ	T	T			T	╏	T	T
Give presentations to local groups/schools	CVAG TWG/Cities	T	Ĩ	Ţ	*	J	*	T	*	1	
Developidis tribute brochures promoting curtiside waste of collections	CVAG TWG/Cities	I	T	t	T	T			T	1	T
Investigate development of retail displays and product identification labels	CVAG TWG								1	T	T
Notity press of programs/events	CVAG AB \$29 Coordinator/Chies	Ţ	T	T	1					1	
Prenerie and disinturite mailings	CVAG TWG							-		_	
					H	Π					
		U	lities =	City Ta Taring	present Hementi	atives o thon will	on CVAC	a TWG v Cities	vill be p	olnt of 6	contact
A Devision Point or Reporting Deadline	ole B16-2	Ŭ	= (juno;	Rivers	de Cour	вөН үл	ith Depi	, Hazan	dous Mi	alerials	Branch
Planned Activity Planned Activity Provisions, if Necessary SHORT- AND MEDILIM-TER	HAZARDOUS WASTE M IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDUL	ц Ш	VAG T	MG = C	oachells Bchnicai	h Valley 1 Workir	Associa Group	ntion of (Governn	nents,	
		1									

វេទាភាគនេ ជាភាសាភាព ខេត្ត ---- ជាវ

HHW Hnusehold Hazardous Waste

APPENDIX C

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (WRCOG) CITIES', THE CITY OF BLYTHE, AND COUNTY'S PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

Summary of Western Riverside County, Blythe, and Unincorporated Jurisdictions'

Planned and Implemented Diversion Programs

																ſ
	M	/csteri	n Rive	side C	ounty	Citics										
Program	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	2	•	4	S	9	2	80	•	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Source Reduction																
Awards	ď	4	d	d.	Ρ	P	Ρ	Ь			4	b	Р	<u>م</u>	Р	Ъ
Backyard Composting	Р	٩.	4	Р	٩.	4	Р	۹.		Ρ	P	ط	P		٩	٩.
Business Technical Assistance	۵.	۵.	d	۵.	Ъ	4	Ъ	4			م		۵.	۵.		
Business License/Source Reduction Plans	d. ,	4		4		4	4	٩.			4		4	<u>م</u>	4	4
Calmax – Waste Exchange						4										
Education and Information Programs					P									۵.		
Food Distribution Programs					ш	ല										
Furniture Re-upholstering					Э	ш	_									
Grocery Bag Reusc/Rebate						E										
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	۵.,	٩	4.	٩		۵.	Ρ	٩.			4	٩	4	٩.	~	٩
Legislative Support & Development	4	۵.		۵.		۹.	Ч	a .			Р		4			<u>س</u>
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	¢.,	٩					Ч	<u>م</u>			4	Р				
Non - Procurement Gov't Programs	۵.	۵.	4	٩.	ď	ه.	a .	d		4	٩.	ď	4	٩.		٩.
Procurement Policies					٩	٩.				٩.		Ь				
Product Deposits/Rebates				<u>a</u> .		۵.							۵.			
Quantity-Based User Fees			٩.			ш				4						4
Recapped (Used) Tires					ш										Ч.	٩
Repair Shops Referral					ш	ப								4		L.
Reporting Requirements			٩.	<u>a</u> .	P.	4							a.,	<u> </u>	Р	۵.
Support State-Levet ADF's														٩.		Ρ
Thrift Store Promotion					ш	ш									ய	Р
Waste Stream Evaluations	Ч	4	Ъ	Р	<u>م</u>	Ч	۲	Р		Ρ	Ч	Р	<u>a</u> ,	۵.	-	
White Good Referral	P	e. ,		<u>م</u>			2				4		٩.,	4		
Xeriscaping	A .	₽.	4	а.	ш	4	Ч	Ч			4		4	4	Ρ	Ρ
Reycling																
California Redemption Program					នា			P				Ρ		E	Ρ	
Certified Recycling Centers	Ъ	4	P	4	ш		4	Ρ			Ρ		٦	ш	٩.	ш;
Commercial Collection	4	đ		4	ы	4	٩.	Ρ		٩		Ρ	9	<u>م</u>	۵.	ш
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Р	4	4	- -			•	Ρ			Ч		٩.		₽.	
Curbside Recycling	Ρ	۵.	Ρ	٩	Р	P	Ρ	Ρ		Р	_		4	ш	۵.	Ш
Source: County/City Source Reduction a	and Rec	ycling	Blement	H bue s	ouschol	d Hazaı	dous W	aste B	icments.	p jo se)	ate writt	ten) an	d West	cra Rive	straide C	ouncil

•

of Governments.

LEGEND:

E - denotes existing programs; P - denotes planned programs; C - denotes contingency programs

16 = Unincorporated 13 = San Jacinto 14 = Temecula 10 = Norco 11 = Perris 8 = Moreno Valicy 4 = Canyon Lake 7 = Lake Elsinore2 = Beaumonl 5 = Corona1 = Banning

12 = Riverside 15 = Blythe 9 = Murrieta 6 = Hemet 3 = Calimesa

¹ The Murriets Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element are due to the CIWMB by March, 1996.

Summary of Western Riverside County, Blythe, and Unincorporated Jurisdictions'

Planned and Implemented Diversion Programs

	B	esteri	Rive	rside C	ounty	Citics					 	-		1	-	
Program	-	2	¢1	4	2	9	L	~	ö	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Education and Public Information	COL	BIEC														
Awards	P	Ρ	Ρ	P	Ρ		4	4		4	P		٩.	٩.	Р	Ρ
Block Leader Program					d,							Ч.				
Brochures	Ч	а.	Ρ	Ъ	E	P	Ρ	d.		Ь	Ч	d.	Р	ы	-	-
Business Training	۹	<u>а</u>	P	4		P	d	ፈ			٩	4	۵.	۵.		
Classroom Visits	4	4	с.	1	Ē		۵.	.			4		4	ш	. m	
Containers for Recyclables					Ч									ш		
Cleanups	۵.	Ρ	P	4		d	d						<u> </u>	<u>e.</u>		
Community Outreach	a .	Р	4	4	.	.	۵.	۵.			Р	P	Ч	<u>م</u>	!	
Drop-Off Centers (School)						Ρ				_				4		
Employee Training					4							٩.		۵.		
Exhibits/Public Information Center	۹.	Ρ	Р	P	٩.	Ρ	۹.						<u>а</u> ,	.		۹
Media Campaign	4	Р	Р	4	4	a.	. .	۵.		4	4		٩.	٩.		
Newsletters	d.	Р	P	Р	ш	а.	٩	۵.		4	4	<u>م</u>	۵.			۵.
Press Releases					d.							а.		<u>ш</u>	۵.	ш
Public Workshups					۹.									Δ.	~	.
Recycling Logo	Ч	Ρ	P	Р			~ .	۵.			Ρ		Р	Э	ш	4
School Recycling	۵.	Ь	Р		ш	đ	4	d.			d .		4	ы		
Special Events			4		٤									P	Э	Е
Solid Waste Coordinator/Education Staff	Ч	Ч	Ρ	Ρ		Ρ	Р	Ч		4	۰.		٩			
Technical Assistance/Public Information	g.,	ł	Ρ	Р	P	P	4	۹.			٩.		-	-	٩.	e i
Telephone Hotline					ப										٩.	4
Video Development					Ь					-		2			_	4
Volunteer Coordination					له					Ъ					2	
Waste Reduction Curricula	a.	Ρ	Ρ		٩.	P	P	Ъ		P	P.		Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ
Fiburende Fazatébut Farité Fiel																
City Collection of Recyclable HHW										Ч		4		٩.	ш	
City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	<u>م</u>	4	4					۵ .						ш	<u>م</u>	۹.,
Curbside Waste Oil Collection	ш	ш	ш	ы	E		Е	E		ш	ы.		ш		4	ш
Load Checking	đ	Р	Ъ	4			6.	▲.			P		٩.	۰		
Participation in County Mobile Program	٩	Р	٩.	d.	щ		٩	ď		<u>م</u>	P	Р	٩.	ш	ш.	ല
Permanent Collection Centers	4	P	Ч	Р	Р		4	d.		ч.	ፈ		۵.	а.	٩.	4
Public Education					4							۵.	۵.	۰.	~	ш
Retail Return Program															† !	
Source: County/City Source Reduction a	ind Rec	cling E	licacol	s and H	ouscho	Id Haza	rdous 1	Vaste E	ilements	p jo se)	late wri	tten) an	d Weste	sra Riv	crside C	ouncil
of Governments																

LEGEND:

E- denotes existing programs; P - denotes contingency programs1 = Banning4 = Canyon Lake7 = Lake Elsinore10 = Norco13 = San Jacinto2 = Beaumont5 = Corona8 = Moreno Valley11 = Perris14 = Temecula3 = Calimesa6 = Hemet9 = Murrieta12 = Riverside15 = Blythe

16 = Unincorporated

¹ The Murrieta Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element are due to the CIWMB by March, 1996. 9 = Murrieta

Summary of Western Riverside County, Blythe, and Unincorporated Jurisdictions' Planned and Implemented Diversion Programs

											1		•	ļ	1	-
	8	csterr	River	side C	ounty	Citics	ļ			1	ļ	-				
Program		2	ŝ	4	ŝ	9	L	×	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Recreitik (continued)																
Drop-Off Centers	4	۵.		ш	<u>م</u>		Ъ	Ч			P	P	Ρ	ы	٩	ш
Landfill Bans					4									1	2	
Legislation Review and Support													1		٩.	ய
Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances					۵								-	~		
Market Development Activities	٩.	4		۵.	4		4							~	d	£
MRF/IPC Facility Usage	۵	۵.	4	•	4	Ρ	P	Р		Ч	٩.	٩.	•	~	ပ	4
Multi-Family Collection	•	٩			۵.	٩.	Ъ	4				Ρ	۵.	ш		Р
Office Paper Recovery	٩.	a.		а.	4		Ρ	Ρ			Р		٩.	ш	٩.	ш
Salvaging	A.	٩	۹.	۵.	4		4	4		٩.	P		Ρ	<u>م</u>	P	4
Composing																
Christmas Tree Recycling						ല								ш	ш	ш
Composting Facility	_	٩.	٩							 ا ــه			i	<u>م</u> ,		ĉ i
Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		.			۹.	4				4		P			- i	;
Industriat/Comm. Greenwaste Collection				Ч	4	Ч	Ъ	P			~		٩	ما		P
Residential Bin Service for Manure										P		_		ш	1	
Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	a.,			Р	P	Р	4	Ρ		۹.	۵	۵.	4	ш	4	4
Support Measures														4		
Compost - Landfill Cover Material															i	۵.
Mulch - Landfill Cover Material												_				4
Special Waster																
Bułky Items				-	Р					٩		a. .		4	~	۵
Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	4	<u>д</u>	4	4	<u>م</u>	م	a	٩.		-		۵.	٩.	ا م		<u>د</u> :
Sludge Composting	Ч	4		٩.	ш		~	٩			A .		~	(3 	a
Tire Recycling	٩.	4	Ρ	ď	Р	4	Р	Ρ			4		4		Ч	٩
White Goods Collection	P	Ч	٩.	Ρ	В		~	٩			4	-	-		٩	٩
Liquid Waste Diversion Programs					٩.										4	-
Salvaging					4	L L	_			Ч		Ρ		٩.		d
Education and Public Information																
Assemblies and Field Trips				_	<u> </u>									l	٩.	ш
Audio - Visual Presentations					-							Ţ		مرا	<u>م</u> ر :	ш; ;

Source: County/City Source Reduction and Recycling Elements and Household Hazardous Waste Elements (as of date written) and Western Riverside Council of Governments.

LEGEND:

 $E \sim denotes existing programs; P - denotes planned programs; C - denotes contingency programs$

1 = Banning 4 = Canyon Lake 7 = Lake Elsinore 10 = Norco 13 = San Jacinto

16 = Unincorporated

2 = Beaumont 5 = Corona 8 = Moreno Valley 11 = Perris 14 = Temecula

3 = Calimesa 6 = Hemet 9 = Murrieta 12 = Riverside 15 = Blythe

¹ The Murrieta Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element are due to the CIWMB by March, 1996.

APPENDIX D

WRCOG CITIES' AND CITY OF BLYTHE PROGRAM UPDATES

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

City of **BANNING**

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	_	Legislative Review and Support	-	Block Leader	
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	I
Business Technical Assistance		Market Development Activities	Ρ	Business Training	<u>а</u> ,
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	а,	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	Ι
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	l l	Clean-ups	₽.
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	I	Community Outreach	<u>d</u> .
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Employee Training	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	1	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	-
Legislative Development	Ч	Christmas Tree Recycling	Α	Media Campaign	Ρ
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	д,	Composting Facility	Α	Newsletters	c.
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	ļ	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	I	Press Releases	
Procurement Policies		Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	А	Public Workshops	:
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	Р
Quantity-Based User Fees	V	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	1	School Recycling	L
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	-
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	1
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items		Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations	I	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	I	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	P	Waste Reduction Curricula	
Xeriscaping	Ι	Tire Recycling	I	 Household Hazardous Waste Element 	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	I	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs	A N	City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	ፈ
Certified Recycling Centers	I	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Load Checking	
Commercial Collection	I	Salvaging		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	P	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	I
Curbside Recycling	Ι	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	I
Drop-Off Centers	I	Audio-Visual Presentations	I	Public Education	I
Landfill Bans		Awards		Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (I)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

Update
Program
Reduction
1995/96
BEAUMONT
of
City

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	1	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	٩
Business Technical Assistance	Р	Market Development Activities	Р	Business Training	Ι
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	Ъ	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Р	Classroom Visits	d l
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Р	Clean-ups	d.
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	Ъ	Community Outreach	Р
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	Ρ	Drop-Off Centers (School)	Ь
I and Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	d	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	Ь
Legislative Development	Ь	Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	Ь
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	Ь	Composting Facility	Ρ	Newsletters	
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	Р	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	Р	Press Releases	
Procurement Policies		Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection		Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	Ч
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection		School Recycling	Ч
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	4
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	Р
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items		Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations	Р	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	I	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral	Į	Sludge Composting	Р	Waste Reduction Curricula	Ч
Xeriscaping	4	Tire Recycling	Р	 Household Hazardous Waste Element 	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	P	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	а
Certified Recycling Centers		Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	
Commercial Collection	ፈ	Salvaging		Load Checking	I
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	ď	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	I
Curbside Recycling	Ρ	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	4
Drop-Off Centers	Ρ	Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	
Landfill Bans		Awards	1	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (I)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

Update
Program
1995/96 Reduction
CALIMESA
City of

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	ፈ	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances	A	Brochures	I
Business Technical Assistance	4	Market Development Activities		Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	M	Classroom Visits	Σ
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Α	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	A	Community Outreach	
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications	A -	Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	Ρ	Employee Training	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	W
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling	А	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility	Ρ	Newsletters	
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs		Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	D	Press Releases	A
Procurement Policies		Indus.1/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	Α	Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	d.
Quantity-Based User Fees	4	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Α	School Recycling	
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	
Reporting Requirements	h	Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	1
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion	A	Bulky Items	А	Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations	W	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling		Volunteer Coordination	
White Good Referral		Sludge Composting		Waste Reduction Curricula	l
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling	I	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	I	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	ط
Certified Recycling Centers		Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	
Commercial Collection	A	Salvaging		Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Ι	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	
Curbside Recycling	I	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Ω
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	I
Landfill Bans		Awards	М	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (1)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deteited (A) Added

City of CANYON LAKE

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	Ч	Legislative Review and Support	V	Block Leader	
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances	V	Brochures	1
Business Technical Assistance		Market Development Activities	1	Business Training	Ι
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	Ч	MRF/IPC Facility Usage]	Classroom Visits	Y
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Α	Clean-ups	1
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	1	Community Outreach	Ι
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications	Υ	Drop-Off Centers (School)	A
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	P	Employee Training	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	Ρ
Legislative Development	с,	Christmas Tree Recycling	V	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	A	Composting Facility		Newsletters	
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	A	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Press Releases	A -
Procurement Policies	V	Indus.1/Comm. Greenwaste Collection		Public Workshops	A
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	Ρ
Quantity-Based User Fees	A	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	1	School Recycling	A
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures	Υ	Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral	A	Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Ч
Reporting Requirements	I	Mulch-Landfill Cover Material	V	Technical Asst./Public Information	Р
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items	A	Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations		Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	Ī	Volunteer Coordination	
White Good Referral		Sludge Composting	b	Waste Reduction Curricula	A
Xeriscaping	ď	Tire Recycling	I	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection		City Collection of Recyclable HHW	1
California Redemption Program	A	Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	A
Certified Recycling Centers	a	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs	A	Curbside Waste Oil Collection	W
Commercial Collection		Salvaging		Load Checking	I
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance		Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	1
Curbside Recycling	-	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Ч.
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations	Υ	Public Education	۵.
Landfill Bans		Awards	4	Retail Return Program	_

Program Status Codes: (1) Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

City of CORONA

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	W	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	۷
Backyard Composting	I	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	Ι
Business Technical Assistance		Market Development Activities		Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Ρ	Classroom Visits	A
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Ь	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs	A	Office Paper Recovery		Community Outreach	д.
Furniture Re-upholstering	A	Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	۷
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility	Ī	Newsletters	1
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	Ч	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	W	Press Releases	V
Procurement Policies	Ч	Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	Ь	Public Workshops	V
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	
Quantity-Based User Fees	Ч	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Ι	School Recycling	V
Recapped (Used) Tires	Y	Support Measures		Special Events	A
Repair Shops Referral	V	Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	1
Reporting Requirements	A	Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	۷
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion	A	Bulky Items	Р	Video Development	Ч
Waste Stream Evaluations		Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	Ι	Volunteer Coordination	W
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	V	Waste Reduction Curricula	Р
Xeriscaping	A	Tire Recycling	е,	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	V	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	Р
California Redemption Program	_	Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	
Certified Recycling Centers	A	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs	A	Curbside Waste Oil Collection	I
Commercial Collection	I	Salvaging	A	Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	А	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	Ι
Curbside Recycling	1	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	W
Drop-Off Centers	A	Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	Ч
Landfill Bans		Awards	W	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (I)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

HEMET
of
City

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	I	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	A
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances	V	Brochures	1
Business Technical Assistance	Ч	Market Development Activities	A	Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	_	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	A
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	I	Clean-ups	Р
Food Distribution Programs	μ	Office Paper Recovery	Y	Community Outreach	I
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications	Α	Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	Ρ	Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	Ч	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	I
Legislative Development	d.	Christmas Tree Recycling	Ī	Media Campaign	Ī
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility	A	Newsletters	Σ
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	¥	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	I I	Press Releases	Y
Procurement Policies	Ι	Indus.l/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	I	Public Workshops	A
Product Deposits/Rebates	പ	Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	A
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	I	School Recycling	I
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures	A	Special Events	A
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material	A	SW Coordinator	I
Reporting Requirements	c.	Mulch-Landfill Cover Material	Α	Technical Asst./Public Information	
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	A
Thrift Store Promotion	I	Bulky Items	A	Video Development	A
Waste Stream Evaluations		Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	1	Volunteer Coordination	A
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	V	Waste Reduction Curricula	M
Xeriscaping	Г	Tire Recycling	I	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	Υ	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program	A	Landfill Based Programs	Α	City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	
Certified Recycling Centers	A	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs	V	Curbside Waste Oil Collection	
Commercial Collection		Salvaging	P	Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	A	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	
Curbside Recycling	I	Assemblies and Field Trips	A	Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations	A	Public Education	
Landfill Bans		Awards	V	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (1)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Detclted (A)Added

City of LAKE ELSINORE

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	I	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting	I	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	I
Business Technical Assistance	Ι	Market Development Activities	Ь	Business Training	Ρ
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	Р	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Ь	Classroom Visits	I
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Р	Clean-ups	Ι
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	1	Community Outreach	Ι
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	Ч	Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	Р	Composiing		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development	Ь	Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	-
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility		Newsletters	Ф.
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	-	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Press Releases	
Procurement Policies		Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	Ь	Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	Ι
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Ι	School Recycling	Π
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	A
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Ι
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	Ι
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items		Video Development	۷
Waste Stream Evaluations	Ι	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	1	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral	<u> </u>	Sludge Composting	Р	Waste Reduction Curricula	Ρ
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling	I	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection		City Collection of Recyclable HHW	A
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	A
Certified Recycling Centers	I	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	W
Commercial Collection	Ч	Salvaging		Load Checking	Ι
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Ρ	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	Ι
Curbside Recycling	I	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Ч
Drop-Off Centers	Ι	Audio-Visual Presentations	Ρ	Public Education	-
Landfilt Bans		Awards		Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: ([) Implemented, (P) Planned, (M) Modified, (D) Deleited (A) Added

1995/96 Reduction Program Update City of MORENO VALLEY

	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	I	Legislative Review and Support	Ρ	Block Leader	
Backyard Composting	I	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	
Business Technical Assistance	I	Market Development Activities		Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	Р	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	1
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	1	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	1	Community Outreach	4
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Drop-Off Centers (School)	٩,
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	Р	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development	I	Christmas Tree Recycling	Υ	Media Campaign	Ρ
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	Р	Composting Facility		Newsletters	Ι
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	Ь	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Press Releases	
Procurement Policies		Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	Ι	Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	-
Quantity-Based User Fees	A	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Ι	School Recycling	1
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	I
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items	A	Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations	Ι	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	-	Volunteer Coordination	A
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	Ь	Waste Reduction Curricula	Ι
Xeriscaping	Ţ	Tire Recycling	I	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	I	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program	A	Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	Р
Certified Recycling Centers	Ь	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	-
Commercial Collection	-	Salvaging		Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Р	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	I
Curbside Recycling	I	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	1
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	1
Landfill Bans		Awards		Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (I)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deleted (A)Added WRCOG UPDATE.96

Update
Program
6 Reduction
1995/9
MURRIETA
City of

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards		Legislative Review and Support			
Backyard Composting	-	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Block Leader	1
Business Technical Assistance	۵.	Market Development Activities		Brochures	Ρ
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Ρ	Business Training	
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	I	Classroom Visits	P
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	1	Clean-ups	
Fumiture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Community Outreach	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Employee Training	
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility		Media Campaign	
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs		Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Newsletters	Р
Procurement Policies	d.	Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection		Press Releases	Р
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Public Workshops	Р
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	I	Recycling Logo	
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		School Recycling	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		Special Events	I
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Ч
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Technical Asst./Public Information	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items	I	Telephone Hotline	
Waste Stream Evaluations		Concrete/Asphalt Recycling		Video Development	
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting		Volunteer Coordination	
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling		Waste Reduction Curricula	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	1	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
Certified Recycling Centers		Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	
Commercial Collection		Salvaging		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	I
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance		Education and Public Information		Load Checking	I
Curbside Recycling	Ι	Assemblies and Field Trips		Participation in County Mobile Program	I
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	
Landfill Bans		Awards	Р	Public Education	1
Program Status Codes: (1) Implemented, (P) Pla	aned, (M)Moc	ified, (D) Dulcted (A)Added		Retail Return Program	

NORCO	
ty of]	•
77	

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards		Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting	Ч	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	Р
Business Technical Assistance		Market Development Activities		Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Р	Classroom Visits	
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	Ь	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery		Community Outreach	
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility	Ь	Newsletters	Р
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	d	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	b	Press Releases	
Procurement Policies	d	Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection		Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure	A	Recycling Logo	
Quantity-Based User Fees	Ч	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	I	School Recycling	
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures	I	Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Ч
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items	I	Video Development	4
Waste Stream Evaluations	Ч	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	d	Volunteer Coordination	Р
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting		Waste Reduction Curricula	Р
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling		Household Bazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection		City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	Ч
Certified Recycling Centers		Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	H
Commercial Collection	-	Salvaging	Ь	Load Checking	Ρ
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance		Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	Р
Curbside Recycling	1	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Ρ
Drop-Off Centers		Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	
Landfill Bans		Awards	<u>م</u>	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (1)laphemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

City of **PERRIS**

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	P	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	1
P., hyard Composting	-	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	-
Business Technical Assistance	۵.	Market Development Activities		Business Training	٩,
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	٩	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	I
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	A	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	I	Community Outreach	Р
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications	А	Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate	A	Salvaging		Employee Training	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development	<u>а</u> ,	Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility		Newsletters	
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	Ь	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	A	Press Releases	V
Procurement Policies		Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	Ρ	Public Workshops	V
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Ρ	School Recycling	_
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	A
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Р
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	Ι
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items	Α	Video Development	A
Waste Stream Evaluations	d	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	Ρ	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	d	Waste Reduction Curricula	Ρ
Xeriscaping	Ч	Tire Recycling	I	Rousehold Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	I	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	A
California Redemption Program	A	Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	A
Certified Recycling Centers	-	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	D
Commercial Collection	V	Salvaging		Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Р	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	
Curbside Recycling		Assemblics and Field Trips	A	Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Р
Drop-Off Centers	1	Audio-Visual Presentations	Р	Public Education	I
Landfill Bans		Awards	ď	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (1)implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deletted (A)Added

Update
Program
Reduction
1995/96
RIVERSIDE
City of

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards		Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	٩.
Backyard Composting		Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	
Business Technical Assistance		Market Development Activities	A	Business Training	Ъ
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	Ρ	Classroom Visits	
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	I	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery		Community Outreach	Ι
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	1
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rehate		Salvaging		Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	_	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling	V	Media Campaign	
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees	d.	Composting Facility		Newsletters	Р
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	م	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites	Р	Press Releases	Ι
Procurement Policies	а.	Indus.I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	A	Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure	A	Recycling Logo	
Quantity-Based User Fees	A	Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	I	School Recycling	A
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	V
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	V
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	۷
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items		Video Development	Ч
Waste Stream Evaluations	_	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	1	Volunteer Coordination	V
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	A	Waste Reduction Curricula	
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling		Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	Υ	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	Ρ
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs	A	City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	
Certified Recycling Centers		Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	
Commercial Collection		Salvaging	d	Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance		Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	Ι
Curbside Recycling	W	Assemblies and Field Trips	A	Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	
Drop-Off Centers	1	Audio-Visual Presentations	А	Public Education	
Landfill Bans		Awards	A	Retail Return Program	۷

Program Status Codes: (1) fimplemented, (P) Plauned, (M) Modified, (D) Deleited (A) Added

City of SAN JACINTO

1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards	I	Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting	1	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	_
Business Technical Assistance	I	Market Development Activities		Business Training	
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans	Д	MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	I	Clean-ups	
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	1	Community Outreach	
Furniture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Employee Training	
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging	Ρ	Drop-Off Centers (School)	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances	Ч	Composting		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development		Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	1
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility		Newsletters	I
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs	I	Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Press Releases	
Procurement Policies		Indus. I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	I	Public Workshops	
Product Deposits/Rebates	Р	Residential Bin Service for Manure		Recycling Logo	Ъ
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	1	School Recycling	I
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures		Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral		Compost-Landfill Cover Material		SW Coordinator	Ь
Reporting Requirements	М	Mulch-Landfill Cover Material		Technical Asst./Public Information	I
Support State-Level ADF's		Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion		Bulky Items		Video Development	
Waste Stream Evaluations	P	Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	I	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral	I	Sludge Composting	P	Waste Reduction Curricula	
Xeriscaping	Ь	Tire Recycling	I	Household Bazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	I	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	
California Redemption Program		Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	Ь
Certified Recycling Centers	1	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	D
Commercial Collection	I	Salvaging		Load Check	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Ρ	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	1
Curbside Recycling	Ι	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Р
Drop-Off Centers	1	Audio-Visual Presentations		Public Education	
Landfill Bans		Awards	I	Retail Return Program	

Program Status Codes: (1)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Deleted (A)Added WRCOG UPDATE.96 City of TEMECULA 1995/96 Reduction Program Update

Program	Status	Program	Status	Program	Status
Source Reduction		Recycling		Education and Public Information	
Awards		Legislative Review and Support		Block Leader	
Backyard Composting	۲	Mandatory Resolutions/Ordinances		Brochures	
Business Technical Assistance	4	Market Development Activities	1	Business Training	Ч
Busi. License/Source Reduction Plans		MRF/IPC Facility Usage	I	Classroom Visits	V
Calmax-Waste Exchange		Multi-Family Collection	1	Clean-ups	4
Food Distribution Programs		Office Paper Recovery	A	Community Outreach	Ч
Fumiture Re-upholstering		Planning & Building Code Modifications		Drop-Off Centers (School)	۷
Grocery Bag Reuse/Rebate		Salvaging		Employee Training	
Land Use Planning/Zoning Ordinances		Compositing		Exhibits/Pub. Info. Centers	
Legislative Development	4	Christmas Tree Recycling	A	Media Campaign	Ч
Loans, Grants, and Loan Guarantees		Composting Facility	A	Newsletters	Ъ
Non-Procurement Gov't Programs		Drop-Off and Transfer Collection Sites		Press Releases	Z
Procurement Policies		Indus. I/Comm. Greenwaste Collection	I	Public Workshops	V
Product Deposits/Rebates		Residential Bin Service for Manure	Α	Recycling Logo	
Quantity-Based User Fees		Res. Curbside Greenwaste Collection	Ι	School Recycling	Ι
Recapped (Used) Tires		Support Measures	Y	Special Events	
Repair Shops Referral	V	Compost-Landfill Cover Material	A	SW Coordinator	
Reporting Requirements		Mulch-Landfill Cover Material	A	Technical Asst./Public Information	
Support State-Level ADF's	۷	Special Wastes		Telephone Hotline	
Thrift Store Promotion	A	Bulky Items	A	Video Development	A
Waste Stream Evaluations		Concrete/Asphalt Recycling	1	Volunteer Coordination	
White Goods Referral		Sludge Composting	1	Waste Reduction Curricula	-
Xeriscaping		Tire Recycling	Ь	Household Hazardous Waste Element	
Recycling		White Goods Collection	1	City Collection of Recyclable HHW	A
California Redemption Program	A	Landfill Based Programs		City-Sponsored One-Day Collections	H
Certified Recycling Centers	1	Liquid Waste Diversion Programs		Curbside Waste Oil Collection	D
Commercial Collection		Salvaging	A	Load Checking	
Commercial/Industrial Ordinance	Ρ	Education and Public Information		Participation in County Mobile Program	
Curbside Recycling	I	Assemblies and Field Trips		Permanent Collection Centers at MRF's	Ъ
Drop-Off Centers	1	Audio-Visual Presentations	A	Public Education	П
Landfill Bans		Awards	I	Retail Return Program	V

Program Status Codes: ([)Implemented, (P) Planned, (M)Modified, (D) Delelted (A)Added

INTEGRATED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN CITY OF BLYTHE SRRE Check (x) all applicable boxes in columns A - G (note: B - G are optional); provide status codes in columns H, J, L, N; and provide dates in columns I, K, M, O. Insert program/policy types in blank rows as needed

		V	æ	υ	2		0	H	-	-	Х	۲	Σ	z	0
		kurindiction 	Cost	floctives	cue de Prog (Optionnel	grann Goal	a Rating		Initial SRI	erters IV			uttere Re	Visions	
		Punded (P)	2	OR WORK		Program G	als were	Per	SRRE	Actu	al	Per SR	RB	Review	5
Type of Program, Policy or Process		Operated (0) and Responsible Agenty	(x) എല	(x) sitemay	(x) #01		Not Met (x)	*ebo⊃ euns	Dete	*oboD autai	əte	*sboD euter	Date	*sboD attial	Date
KOURCE REDUCTION Resultary Processes	-							s 				5		5	
City Purchase Program	SRI	F/O City of Blythe							9/93					•••••	
City Paper Reduction Program	SR2	F/O City of Blythe		┼╍╏				┝╼╿	566						
Technical Assistance Programs Business 1 ka of C at MAY	(a)	to unite							3			••••			
Recognition Program	SRI	F/O Chamber/Hauler		╞	+	-			2	T	╈	╺╎╸			
Business Source Reduction	SRS	F/O Chamber/Hauler		+	-			. <mark>.</mark>	<u>8</u>	•••••		•	5	-	
Land Use & Development Standards:							 								
Zoning Code and	SR6	F/O City of Blythe					•••••	4	85/2			-	96/6		
Building Code Changea		F/O City of Blythe		-		_			18	+			800	<u> </u>	
													ł	 	
Other Source Reduction Programs:							 			••••		 			
Backyard Composting	SR7	F/O Riverside County						-	9/94						
					+			_			+				
RECYCLING													┢		
Residential Collection Programs:						P** 1 P4		_		••••				••••••	
Curbside (single-family, co-mingled)	RI	F/O City/Hauler						0	8			 م	1/99		
Curbeide (multi-family, co-mingled)	R2	F/O City/Hauler				. <u>.</u>		υ	8	 		•	8		
Food Waste-Animal Feed (prisons)	R	F/O Prisons/Hauler					 	-	1658						
Recycling and Salvage (prisons)	R.	F/O Prisons/Lauler					 		105			і ш	1001		
Commercial Recyclables Collection	R5	FAD City/Hauler						U	66/1				8	 	
			••••												
				••••								•			

INTEGRATED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN CITY OF BLYTHE SRRE

		¥	Ð	с С	<u>ш</u>	<u>ب</u>	0	н	-	-	ч	Ľ	Σ	z	D
		Juriediction	Load Ef	foctivence	& Progra	m Goala F	anie Buile		itial SRI	E Status			Future R	visions	
		Pumided (F)	ŝ	D WORD		ogram Coals	X	Per S	RRE	Actu	la	Per SI	RE	Revis	5
Type of Program, Policy or Proces		Operated (O) and Responsible Agency	(x) dgiH	(x) s8uavA	(x) popeoorg	jyjet (x)	Not Met (x)	•əboD autail	್ಷೆ ಾಕಿದ	*sbo.) euter?	Sad Sa	*oboD aulais	Date	*sbo.) श्वाबार	⇒lsC .
Facilities/Processing Centers:				-					-					 	
Drop-off Boxes & Center(s)	R10	F/O Business/Hauler							ISI I				_		
Buyback Center(s)		F/O Business/Hauler							101				-		ĺ
Intermediate Processing Center(s)	RII	F/O Hauler		_	-			U	8			4	1099		
Salvage at Landfill or Salvage Yard	R12	F/O Hauler						4	101						
									Ī			•••••		•••••	
Other Remeting Programs/Policies				+	_				T		T				
and the state of the second states.			•••••												_
										ļ			ſ		
COMPOSTING Collection Program:							[*******					
Ourbride Collection , Co-mingled	CI	F/O City/Hauler						ပ	66/1	•••••		а.	66/1		
Yard Waste Delivery/Drop-off	ខ	F/O Hauler						٩	<u>88</u> 1		†	••••			
Collection (including Christmas trees)			•••••							••••				 	
			••••										-		
Processing Methods: Brush/Wood Waste Chipping	8	F/O City/Hauler						٩	1/89						
Acrobic Static Pile	2	F/O Prisons						υ	1/39			Ч	8		Ī
SPECIAL WASTES			•••••												
Concrete/Rubble Used for Rip-Rap	SPI	F/O Hauter							161		··· ·				
Subbase Mat'l for Roads	SPI	F/O Hauler						-	1/93		T		Ţ		
Concrete/Arghaft Recycling	SPI	F/O Hauler						-	E&/I					 	ľ
						• • • •							T		
			••••								ſ			 	
Sewage Sludge: Land Application	SP2	F/O City/Applicator						-	<u>&</u>						
								1			İ			 	
Tites	SP3	F/O Tire Haulers						I	6/94						
				••••		 					F				Γ

ECRATED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	JUY OF BLYTHE SRRE
NTEG	5
INTEGRATED IMPLEMENTATIO	CUTY OF BLYTHE SRRE

		Ā	D B	٩	Щ	U	×	_	_	×	M	z	٥
			Cest Effective		log (in	- Celue		and State	E Statun			e Remuia	
		Paradad (P)	STOR WER		Program G	and were	Per	RRE	Actual		Per SRRE	Re	vinion
Type of Program, Policy or Process		Opmud (O) with Percental A	(x) aftaany (x) aftaany	(x) mor	Exceeded (x)	(X) 3974 80N	sbo 0 ada t8	and	sbo) edai2	Dete	Status Code	*abo⊃ autaj&	ellaite
White Goods: RepairRe-use	SP4	F/O Hauler						\$6/9		-			
Special Collection Events	sP4	F/O Hauler						ŝ					
Salvage at Salvage Yard	SP5	F/O hauler					-	661L		+			
										-			
EDUCATION Media:													
Public Scrvice Announcements	EDI	F/O City/Hauler					1	4/93					
Newspaper Articles	ä	F/O City/Hauler					-	493		_			
				-							••••		
Communications				╎									
Brochure, Newsletters & Publications	ED3	F/O Hauler		•		••••••		4/93			•••••		
Seminary/Workshops	N	F/O Hauler				****	1	66/1					
Spoakers Bureau	ED5	F/O Chambes/Hauler			-	••••	1	564					
Awards Programs	ED6	F/O Chamber/Hauler				••••	Α,	193					
Block Leader	EDJ	F/O City/Hauker					ပ	1/99			Б Т		
											 .		
Public Education:										+			
School Cumrculturn		E/O Schools/Hauter						4/93				-	
Speakers	ED10	F/O Schools/Hauler					•					-	
Technical Assistance: Commercial (Brochures, etc.)	ED11	F/O Chamber/Hauler						9/94					
											- -		
						••••							
OTHER PROGRAMSPOLICIES Recycling Market Development Zone (Rb	M OT2	F/O City/County					_	16/6	••••••				
					•••••								
					• • •	•				_		-	

APPENDIX E

RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS POLICY ON URBAN TRANSFER STATIONS (E1)

AND

RIVERSIDE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' COUNTY PURCHASING POLICIES (E2)

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE. STATE OF CALIFORNIA



FROM: Waste Resources Management District SUBMITTAL DATE: January 16, 1996

SUBJECT: Tipping Fee Rate Adjustments for FY 96-97

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS: That the Board of Directors:

- 1. Adopt as a general policy, a decision that the District will not sponsor future urban transfer station facilities as part of the disposal system funding, intending instead to focus on "economic flow control" by creating the most economic disposal system. minimizing disposal rates, and participating only in small remote area transfers to avoid small disposal sites, thus leaving urban transfer stations and material recovery facilities to the Cities and private sector to develop and operate.
- 2. Adopt the District Reserves Policy Statement presented on Nov. 21, 1995, attached as Exhibit 1. FORM APPROVED

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL

JAN 0 8 1996

BY J. Blanker

Robert A. Nelson, Chief Executive Officer

RAN:dw

Attachments cc: CAO County Counsel

FINANCIAL DATA:					
CURRENT YEAR COST	SO	ANNUAL COST	\$	0	_
NET COUNTY COST	\$ <u></u>	CURRENT YR BDG	T: YES	_X_ NO	
SOURCE OF FUNDS: See	narrative discussion in	Justification			

11.7

F11 -January 16, 1996 Page 2

- 3. Introduce and set for final hearing and adoption on February 13. 1996 (with Clerk to advertise) Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Ordinance No. 1 establishing a 530 per ton (routine refuse) gate fee to be effective July 1, 1996.
- 4. Adopt the Differential Rate Policy Statement attached as Exhibit 2. providing discounts for qualifying transfer truck deliveries.
- 5. At the close of the public hearing, adopt Ordinance No. 1 and its accompanying Appendix effectuating the rate adjustments.

BACKGROUND: On November 21, 1995, your Board directed staff to solicit comments from Cities and the Regional Governments returning to the Board (within 60 days) for the required hearings and Ordinance changes to implement a proposed tipping fee rate reduction to \$30 per ton for regular customers and \$25 per ton for qualifying transfer rig deliveries. All of the recommendations included herein are consistent with what staff submitted on Nov. 21, 1995.

For the past year the District. in a cooperative effort with the two regional associations of governments (WRCOG & CVAG) in the County, participated in an extensive system review study and supplemental work by Hilton, Farnkopf & Hobson (HF&H). Since the completion of the study and supplemental work, District staff has utilized the computer model developed by HF&H to analyze its projected financial picture over the next fifteen years. The recommended tipping fees (designed to retain the County's current customer base of tonnage, and supported by the model), with inflation adjustments in future years, will retire the District's proportional shortfall of closure/postclosure and remediation liabilities of approximately \$49 million in a 10-year period of time. As of the submittal date for this document, we have received comments from only the City of Riverside and the WRCOG Technical Advisory Committee (City Managers), attached in Exhibit 3. Several agencies are scheduling the matter for discussion on their agendas in early January, and comments received by the time of the hearing will be presented to the Board and summarized by staff.

JUSTIFICATION: The District is able to support this significant reduction in the tipping fee due to several factors. The Reserves Policy Statement presented on November 21, 1995 and proposed for adoption herein would authorize the District to allocate existing excess operating reserves for the purpose of funding accrued liabilities for closure/postclosure and remediation. In addition, the Board policy to not sponsor urban transfer stations minimizes future capital outlay and operating costs. Lastly, the District will be downsizing staff and equipment with the anticipated closures of Highgrove and Coachella Landfills in FY 96-97, plus the closures of Mead Valley, Mecca, and Anza within the next three (3) years.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Subject:	Policy <u>Number</u>	Page
PRINTED FORMS CONTROL/PURCHASE AND USE OF RECYCLED	A-17	1 of 1

- 1. Letterheads will be on regular 20 lb. bond paper, or less: without rag content. Letterheads and business cards are to be in one color only-the color to be at the discretion of the department head. Letterhead and business card paper will be recycled stock with the highest possible percentages of recycled and post consumer waste, consistent with the need for appearance and performance (e.g. ability to perform effectively in printing presses and photocopiers).
- All County departments are authorized to use the County seal on business cards and letterheads, color to be the same as the printing.
- County personnel are encouraged to choose papers made with recycled stock and post consumer waste for all specialty printed products (e.g. posters, flyers, brochures, etc.).
- 4. County personnel are encouraged to authorize Printing Services and Purchasing, when outside vendors are used, to print on the paper the fact recycled paper is being used, or use any of the generally recognized logos that represent the fact that recycled paper is being used, whenever the action is consistent with the need for appearance. This action is necessary to increase public awareness on the availability of quality recycled products.

Reference:

- 1. Board Policy A-39
- 2. Hinute order dated 6-17-74
- 3. Hinute order dated 7-16-69
- 4. Minute order 3.38 dated 6-26-90

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Subject:						Policy <u>Number</u>	Pa	ige	
PURCHASE	AND	USE	OF	RECYCLED	MATERIALS	A-39	1	of	1

Policy:

That the Board of Supervisors, recognizing the need to develop demand for recycled materials and that government procurement policy must play a leading role, directs the Purchasing Agent to develop a program for the purchase of products using recycled materials. The Purchasing Agent shall work with vendors, purchasing staff members and using departments, through the Purchasing Liaison group to develop programs that stimulate the purchase of products using recycled materials with recycled content. To the extent the Purchasing Agent determines it is of advantage to the County, and doesn't violate any law or regulation, the Purchasing Agent may decide that recycled materials only will be specified even if the cost involved is greater than materials without recycled content. The Purchasing Agent shall advise the Board of Supervisors when a contract is awarded for materials with recycled content, when the cost of the materials with recycled content exceeds the cost of comparable materials without recycled content by more than five percent.

Reference:

- 1. Board Policy A-17
- 2. Minute Order 3.38 dated 6-26-90

EXHIBIT A

MEMBERSHIP AND DUTIES OF THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (LOCAL TASK FORCE)

Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan

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

FROM: Waste Management

SUBMITTAL DATE: December 19, 1989

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Membership and Duties of the Soli Waste Management Advisory Council

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Approval of Resolution 89-636 which revises the duties, and expands the membership of the Solid Waste Management Advisory Council to include broader City, Environmental, and Recycling representation on the Council, consistent with the requirements set forth in AB 939 (Chapter 1095 of the statues for 1989) to establish such a "Task Force".

Authorize the Director of Waste Management to seek support of the action of all the cities in the County within 60 days, and submit these results to the California Integrated Waste Management Board upon receipt of approval of 50% of the Cities, containing 50% of the population of the Cities within the County.

JUSTIFICATION: The action is required to promote greater City/County cooperation and coordination in the development of future recycling, source reduction elements, and siting elements of a new County Integrated Waste Management Plan.

AB 939, passed by the Legislature in September 1989, requires the formation of this new "Task Force" by March 1, 1990. The action proposed retains the use of all the active membership participants of the existing Solid Waste Management Advisory Council and expands it to include the other interests which should be represented on this Council. (CONT'D)

Director sdn.

C.A.O. RECOMMENDATION:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Ininistrative Officer Signature

Prev. Agn. ref.

Depts. Comments

Dist.

AGENDA NO

3.19

6 1589

ي. بي بي الم

ø

à

F11 - Revisions to membership & duties of Solid Waste Management Advisory Council December 19, 1989 Page 2

FINANCIAL: Minor additional travel allowance expenses for the members who submit claims to attend the typical monthly meetings will be absorbed by the Department's administrative budget.

RAN: ft

Attachment

cc: CAO County Counsel
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

6 19

යි

ප ප

111

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

RESOLUTION NO. 89-636

ESTABLISHING A SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL & RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 87-501

BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 19, 1989, that there is hereby established a Solid Waste Management Advisory Council as follows:

1. Functions

The Solid Waste Management Advisory Council, herein а. Council, shall study, called review, evaluate and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, herein called Board, preparation and future revisions of the Countyrelative to the wide Integrated Waste Management Plan, which shall include source reduction, and recycling elements, and other elements required by the State to be prepared under the guidance of a new County "Task Force" as set forth in AB 939; (Chapter 1095 of the statutes for 1989) including any environmental impact reports in connection therewith, coordination with Cities on waste management issues, and solid waste management in general. The Council shall file its reports and recommendations with the Board of Supervisors for its consideration and action. The Board may refer back to the Council, as directed by the Board, any proposals and recommendations made by the Council, after action or approval of the Board.

27 28

b. The Council may establish committees as necessary to 1 gather knowledge and expertise in areas pertaining to Solid Waste 2 Management. 3 2. Membersnip. 4 The Council shall consist of a minimum of 22 a. 5 members as follows: 6 Six persons shall be appointed by the Board and (1)7 such appointments shall include one member of the 8 Board (who shall serve as president of the Council, 9 but shall have no vote) and one person from each 10 Supervisorial District. 11 (2) One person who is appointed by the City Council of 12 each City whose population is certified by that 13 100,000 Council to exceed at the time of 14 appointment. 15 (3) Two persons who shall be appointed by the Coachella 16 Valley Association of Governments to represent the 17 Cities of Eastern Riverside County not otherwise 18 represented on the Council. 19 (4) Two persons who shall be appointed by Western 20 Riverside Association of Governments to represent 21 County not the Cities of Western Riverside 22 otherwise represented on the Council. 23 (5) One member shall be appointed by the Institute of 24 Scrap Recycling Industries. 25 111 26 111 27 111 28 111 EA-4

member o£ the environmental (6) One community 1 interested in matters of waste management who shall 2 be nominated by the Chairman of the County Board of 3 Supervisors and approved by a majority of the 4 County Board of Supervisors. 5 (7) Two persons, who are industry representatives, 6 shall be appointed by the Board of Directors of the 7 County Department of Development. 8 (8) Three persons, two who are refuse haulers and one 9 who is a liquid waste hauler, shall be appointed by 10 the San Bernardino and Riverside Counties Disposal 11 Association. 12 (9) Two persons, who are agricultural representatives, 13 shall be appointed by the Riverside County Farm 14 Bureau, Inc. 15 (10) One person shall be appointed by the Riverside 16 Chapter of the California Council of Civil 17 Engineers and Land Surveyors Association. 18 vacancies occur within ь. As the membership 19 appointments allocated hereinabove, appointments shall be made by 20 the concerned appointing authority to fill such vacancies. 21 Each appointing authority may appoint an alternate c. 22 Council Member to serve upon sub-committees or represent their 23 appointing authority during Council meetings in the absence of the 24 primary Council Member. 25 The County Administrative Officer, з. Staff Assistance. 26 the County Health Officer, the County Planning Director and the 27 Director of Waste Management or their designated representatives, 28 111

EA-5

shall each serve as ex officio members but shall have no vote. They shall provide such technical assistance an may be required or deemed necessary by the Council. The Director of Waste Management shall act as secretary of the Council and shall keep its records and transmit its recommendations and reports, and shall provide such staff assistance as may be needed by the Council. The Director of Waste Management shall act as administrator of the County Solid Waste Management Plan and the County-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan and shall be authorized to perform those functions that require, findings of conformance, County determination of need and necessity, implementation of goal 11 and policies, and other duties required to meet State and Federal 12 Rules and Regulations.

Reimbursement of Expenses. Reimbursement for the voting 4. actual and necessary expenses while carrying out the members' duties of the Council shall be as provided in Section 9 of County Ordinance No. 440.

17 5. Vacancies. A vacancy shall be deemed to exist upon the 18 resignation or death of a member, or when a member has failed to 19 attend three consecutive meeting and such absence has not been 20 excused by the Council. A report thereof shall be made by or on 21 behalf of the Council to the concerned appointing authority.

22 Removal of a Member. Members of the Council shall serve 6. 23 at the pleasure of the concerned appointing authority, and may be 24 removed at any time by such appointing authority.

> 7. Officers.

26 The members of the Council shall elect one of its а. 27 members to serve as vice president.

111 28

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

b. The president shall preside at all Council meetings, exercise general supervision of the affairs and activities of the Council, and serve as an ex officio member of all Council committees. The chairman shall appoint from Council membership a chairperson and committee personnel to serve on each committee established pursuant to this resolution.

c. The vice president shall assume the duties and powers of the president in the event of the president's absence.

d. In the event of the president's and the vice president's absence, the secretary shall supervise the election a president pro tempore.

8. <u>Quorum</u>. A quorum shall consist of eleven members. Any action of the Council shall require affirmative votes of not less than a quorum, except that less than a quorum may adjourn a meeting sine die or to a specified time and place.

15 9. Meetings. The Council shall hold regular meetings at 16 such times and places within the County of Riverside as may be 17 designated by the president or the Council. The calling, giving 18 notice and conducting of meetings shall be in accordance with the 19 Ralph M. Brown Act (Section 54950 et seq. of the Government Code) 20 and as ordered by the president of the Council or as directed by a 21 majority of a quorum.

22 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED AND ORDERED that Resolution No. 23 87-501 and any and all prior resolutions and orders adopted by 24 this Board relating to the establishment, organization and 25 functions of a Solid Waste Management Advisory Council are hereby 26 rescinded.

27 1/1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

28 ///



SITING ELEMENT TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	n	1 - 1
1.2	Statutory ar	nd Regulatory Overview	1 - 2
1.3	Organizatio	n of the Countywide Siting Element	1 - 3
1.4	Waste Man	agement in Riverside County	1 - 3
1.5	Issues Affe	cting Landfill Capacity and Location	1 - 4
CHA	PTER 2.	GOALS AND POLICIES	
2.1	Introduction	n	2 - 1
2.2	Definitions		2 - 1
2.3	Goals and H	Policies	2 - 2
СНА	PTER 3.	DISPOSAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS	
3.1	Introduction	n	3 - 1
3.2	Existing Re	maining Countywide Disposal Capacity	3 - 1
3.3	Anticipated	Disposal Capacity Needs	3 - 3
СНА	PTER 4.	EXISTING SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES	
4.1	Introduction	n	4 - 1
4.2	Existing Pe	rmitted Solid Waste Disposal Facilities	4 - 1
СНА	PTER 5.	SCREENING AND SITING CRITERIA	
5.1	Introduction	n	5 - 1
5.2	Screening a	and Siting Criteria	5 - 1
5.3	Screening I	Process	5 - 11
СНА	PTER 6.	PROPOSED FACILITY LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	
6.1	Introduction	n	6-1
6.2	Review Pro	ocess	6-1
6.3	Proposed F	acility Location and Description	6 - 1
6.4	Volumetric	Capacity and Life Expectancy Projections	6 - 2

CHAPTER 7. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

7.1	Introductio	n	7-1
7.2	The Rivers	side County Comprehensive General Plan	7 - 1
7.3	General Pl	an Consistency of Proposed Expansions and New Landfill	7 - 2
7.4	Amending	the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan	7 - 5
CHAI	PTER 8.	SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL STRATEGIES WHEN SITES FOR ADDITIONAL CAPACITY ARE NOT AVAILABLE	
8.1	Introductio	n	8-1
8.2	Alternative	e Strategies for Solid Waste Diversion and Disposal	8 - 1
СНАІ	PTER 9.	SITING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION	
9.1	Introductio	n	9 - 1
9.2	Implement	ation Program	9 - 1
9.3	Proposed I	Landfill Projects Implementation Program	9 - 1

APPENDICES

Appendix A Approaches Taken to Project Capacity Needs

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 3-1:	Remaining Countywide Refuse Disposal Capacity	3 - 1
Table 3-2:	Disposal Capacity for Riverside County (Tons)	3 - 5
Table 3-3:	Disposal Capacity for Riverside County (Cubic Yards)	3 - 6
Table 4-1:	Anza Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 5
Table 4-2:	Badlands Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 7
Table 4-3:	Blythe Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 9
Table 4-4:	Coachella Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 11
Table 4-5:	Desert Center Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 13
Table 4-6:	Edom Hill Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 15
Table 4-7:	El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 17
Table 4-8:	Highgrove Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 19
Table 4-9:	Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 21
Table 4-10:	Mead Valley Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 23
Table 4-11:	Mecca II Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 25
Table 4-12:	Oasis Sanitary Landfill Fact Sheet	4 - 27
Table 4-13:	Estimate of Remaining Site Life	4 - 28
Table 5-1:	Screening Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities	5 - 2
Table 5-2:	Siting Criteria Point Weighting	5 - 3
Table 5-3:	Siting Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities	5 - 4
Table 6-1:	Lamb Canyon Landfill Proposed Expansion	6 - 5
Table 6-2:	Badlands Landfill Proposed Expansion	6 - 7
Table 6-3:	El Sobrante Landfill Proposed Expansion	6~9
Table 6-4:	Eagle Mountain Landfill Proposal	6 - 11
Table 6-5:	Edom Hill Landfill Vertical Expansion Proposal	6 - 13
Table 9-1:	Siting Element Implementation Strategy	9 - 2
Table 9-2:	Proposed Landfill Projects Implementation:	
	Responsible Entities	9-4
Table 9-3:	Proposed Landfill Projects Implementation - Schedule	9 - 5
Table 9-4:	Proposed Landfill Projects Implementation -	
	Revenue Sources	9 - 5

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 4-1:	Anza Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 4
Figure 4-2:	Badlands Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 6
Figure 4-3:	Blythe Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 8
Figure 4-4:	Coachella Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 10
Figure 4-5:	Desert Center Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 12
Figure 4-6:	Edom Hill Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 14
Figure 4-7:	El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 16
Figure 4-8:	Highgrove Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 18
Figure 4-9:	Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 20
Figure 4-10:	Mead Valley Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 22
Figure 4-11:	Mecca II Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 24
Figure 4-12:	Oasis Sanitary Landfill Vicinity Map	4 - 26
Figure 6-1:	Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill Proposed Expansion	6 - 4
Figure 6-2:	Badlands Sanitary Landfill Proposed Expansion	6 - 6
Figure 6-3:	El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill Proposed Expansion	6 - 8
Figure 6-4:	Eagle Mountain Landfill Proposal	6 - 10
Figure 6-5:	Edom Hill Landfill Proposed Vertical Expansion	6 - 12

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1095) (AB 939) redefined solid waste management in terms of both objectives and planning responsibilities for local jurisdictions and the State of California, by requiring that cities and counties reduce solid waste disposal by 25 percent (%) by 1995 and 50% by the year 2000. To reach these diversion goals, a planning hierarchy was established, which placed the importance on first reducing waste through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting before disposing of waste through environmentally-safe landfilling or transformation facilities (e.g., regulated incineration of solid waste materials).

To ensure that solid waste is managed in a manner consistent with the planning hierarchy, the provisions of AB 939 require that each county, except for counties within certain regional agencies, prepare a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The CIWMP is composed of the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRRE's), Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWE's), and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE's) for each jurisdiction within and including the County; the Siting Element; and the Summary Plan.

The Countywide Siting Element for Riverside County and its cities, as one component of the CIWMP, has been prepared in accordance with the objectives of AB 939 and describes those areas that will be used for the development of adequate transformation or disposal capacity for waste that has been first reduced through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting (*Public Resources Code* [PRC], Section 41700). Because transformation facilities are not currently operated or proposed within the jurisdictional boundaries of Riverside County and its cities, the Countywide Siting Element focuses entirely on landfills. However, the goals and policies outlined in Chapter 2 do not preclude the development of future transformation facilities. The Countywide Siting Element demonstrates that Riverside County has sufficient disposal capacity for 15 years of solid waste disposal for its participating jurisdictions, when any one of the planned lateral landfill expansions or new landfill, as discussed in Chapter 6, is included and waste diversion programs implemented.

The Countywide Siting Element serves as a policy manual that outlines various strategies for meeting Riverside County's and its cities' disposal needs, rather than providing a specific development program. While expansion of existing landfills is relied upon for additional capacity, each landfill expansion or new landfill proposal will be reviewed separately through local land use approval, environmental review, and the State's solid waste facility permitting procedures. The inclusion of proposals in this Element does not guarantee their approval by any agency or jurisdiction. Review and adoption of this Element does not limit any jurisdiction's or interested

CIWMP

party's right to conduct more in-depth review of each proposal and to consider alternative methods of disposal, including the export of non-hazardous waste to landfills outside the County or other technologies to increase landfill capacity, such as landfill mining.

1.2 STATUTORY AND REGULATORY OVERVIEW

The statutory requirements for the content and format of the Countywide Siting Element are found in PRC, Sections 41700 through 41721.5. These requirements are further clarified in regulations adopted by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and approved by the Office of Administrative Law, for the preparation of a Siting Element (*California Code of Regulations* [CCR], Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 6.5, Sections 18755 through 18756.7). The Siting Element is required to demonstrate that there is a minimum of 15 years of countywide permitted solid waste disposal capacity that is or will be available through existing or planned facilities or other strategies. The Siting Element is restricted to the siting of nonhazardous waste disposal facilities.

Additional regulations governing the procedures for preparing and revising Siting Elements are contained in CCR, Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 8.0, Sections 18776 through 18788. A discussion regarding the preparation of the Countywide Siting Element and the requirements for an Annual Review Report and Five-Year Review and Revision of the CIWMP are fully described in the CIWMP Executive Summary, included herein.

In regard to the Countywide Siting Element, the Annual Review Report shall serve as a basis for determining if the Countywide Siting Element should be revised to include additional disposal capacity, reflect new or changed local and regional solid waste management issues, and if the Element's goals and objectives should be revised. CCR Section 18787 requires, in part, that the Annual Review Report include:

- An evaluation of the adequacy of the existing countywide solid waste management system to handle and dispose of the solid waste generated in the area which cannot be diverted;
- Changes in the permitted disposal capacity;
- An update of the implementation schedule; and,
- A timetable for making any necessary revisions to the Siting Element.

Upon receipt of the Annual Review Report, the CIWMB shall determine if the County is making progress toward meeting the goals and objectives that it has adopted. If the County and/or CIWMB determine that additional disposal capacity is needed or if the goals and objectives need to be revised, then the County shall revise the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to CCR Sections 18780 through 18784, including forwarding the document to cities for their local adoption.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

The Siting Element is structured to correspond to the regulations for the preparation of the Siting Element, and its format and contents are generally consistent with the Model Siting Element prepared by the CIWMB. However, the order with which various topics are discussed has been modified to add greater clarity to the document and its chapters. This organization is reflected in the Table of Contents.

1.4 WASTE MANAGEMENT IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Riverside County is located in southern California and is bordered by San Bernardino County on the north, Orange County on the west, San Diego and Imperial Counties on the south and the Colorado River and State of Arizona on the east. Riverside County covers about 7,310 square miles and has a population of 1,393,500 as of January 1, 1995, as estimated and published by the California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit.

There are 24 incorporated cities within Riverside County. The western portion of the County includes the following Cities: Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, San Jacinto, and Temecula. The central portion of the County, the Coachella Valley, includes the following Cities: Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage. The City of Blythe is located in the Palo Verde Valley or eastern portion of the County. The populations in these cities comprise about 72 percent of the total County population. No landfills are currently located within city boundaries.

Currently, the County has 12 active permitted landfills; these landfills are the Anza, Badlands, Blythe, Coachella, Desert Center, Edom Hill, El Sobrante, Highgrove, Lamb Canyon, Mead Valley, Mecca II and Oasis Landfills. These active landfills are more fully described in Chapter 4. It should be noted that the El Sobrante Landfill is a private landfill owned and operated by Western Waste Industries, in accordance with agreements with Riverside County. Until September 1994, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) operated the Double Butte Landfill. Final closure activities are scheduled to be completed at the Double Butte landfill in 1996.

The only landfill operated by the District which accepts out-of-county waste is the Blythe Landfill. Approximately 1.5 tons of waste per day are currently received at the Blythe Landfill from sources in the State of Arizona. No other County landfill currently operated by the District accepts imported waste. In 1993, the El Sobrante Landfill (owned by Western Waste Industries) began accepting out-of-county waste. The current design capacity of the El Sobrante Landfill is eight million tons, of which 1.1 million tons of capacity are reserved for out-of-county imported waste.

The Board of Supervisors is currently considering a major expansion to the El Sobrante Landfill which would allow increased out-of-county import and permit out-of-county import at other

CIWMP

County landfills. One non-disposal facility, the Moreno Valley Materials Recovery Facility, is permitted to receive up to 250 tons per day of out-of-county import.

1.5 ISSUES AFFECTING LANDFILL CAPACITY AND LOCATION

During 1995, the District, in a cooperative effort with the Western Riverside Councils of Government (WRCOG) and Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), participated in an extensive system review study and supplemental work by Hilton, Farnkopf & Hobson (HF&H). On January 16, 1996, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Board of Supervisors adopted a general policy that the District will not sponsor future urban transfer station facilities as part of the disposal system funding, intending instead to focus on "economic flow control" by creating the most economic disposal system, minimizing disposal rates, and participating only in small remote transfers to avoid small disposal sites, thus leaving urban transfer stations and material recovery facilities to the cities and private sector to develop and operate.

The Board also adopted the District Reserves Policy Statement presented on November 21, 1995, which states:

"It shall be the policy of the District Board of Directors to use existing excess reserves above and beyond a reasonable operating reserve of approximately 25% of annual budgeted expenditures, for the purpose of funding accrued liabilities for closure/postclosure and remediation. Excess revenues beyond those required to maintain the operating reserve shall be designated for use in funding these accrued liabilities until such time as the reserve balances reflect an equivalent percentage of funding when compared to the total system landfill capacity filled. When these reserves are fully funded the tipping fee elements for closure/postclosure and remediation shall be set to reflect the current dollar amount necessary to fund these costs in a proportion to the projected capacity to be filled during the next budget year or as necessary to insure compliance with State or Federal closure funding requirements."

The District continues to work on alternatives for the funding of accrued liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation. In June 1996, the CVAG Executive Committee directed the CVAG Transfer Station/MRF Task Force to propose mechanisms to assist the County and the District to fairly, equitably and responsibly fund the remaining unfunded liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation of existing Coachella and Edom Hill Landfills.

The financing of District landfills and their future closure/postclosure is affected by increased competition from dropping tipping fee rates in southern California and megafills in and outside the State. If volume is lost, the rates to remaining customers could increase, resulting in a spiral of additional losses and rate increases. With the Board's concurrence, the tipping fee rates have been reduced, in order to retain customers and provide the best long-term protection to all users.

The District Board also adopted a Differential Rate Policy Statement which provides discounts for qualifying transfer truck deliveries. The revised tipping fee rate will require an estimated 10-year period to complete the "catch up" on unfunded closure costs. It is proposed that the Double Butte, Coachella, Highgrove and Mead Valley Landfills will be closing in the near term, resulting in reduction in system costs. Shortly after these closures, the smaller Anza and Mecca Landfills will also close.

Chapter 2

GOALS AND POLICIES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the goals and policies for the environmentally safe disposal of non-hazardous solid waste that cannot be reduced, reused, recycled or composted are identified. The goals and policies illustrate the strategies needed to ensure that sufficient disposal capacity is available to accommodate the waste generated by participating jurisdictions for a minimum of 15 years and that such capacity maximizes the protection of the public and the environment. Specific requirements for this chapter of the Siting Element are contained in Section 18755.1, California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The goals and policies were developed by the Local Task Force (LTF) to provide guidance to the County in the preparation of the Siting Element and are a required component of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The goals are "consistent with the state mandate 1) that all jurisdictions maximize source reduction, recycling and composting options in order to reduce the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of by transformation and land disposal; and, (2) that environmentally safe transformation and/or environmentally safe land disposal are acceptable waste management practices for wastes that cannot feasibly be reduced at the source, recycled or composted."¹

The policies specify any programs, regulatory ordinances, actions or strategies that may be established to meet the described goals and to assist in siting solid waste disposal facilities. An implementation schedule is required that identifies the tasks necessary to achieve each goal. The implementation schedule is discussed in Chapter 9, Implementation.

2.2 **DEFINITIONS**

Goals are broad statements that specify the future ends, conditions, or targets toward which planning measures are directed. The following goals are components of the CIWMP which will emphasize source reduction, recycling, and composting to reduce dependence on disposal, as well as promote conservation of landfill capacity and natural resources. A goal statement sets the direction for more specific policies and is generally not measurable or time dependent.

Policies are strategies for meeting the specific goals. The following policies are aimed at reducing the amount of waste disposed at landfills, protecting the public health and safety, and providing

¹ California Integrated Waste Management Board, How to Prepare a Countywide or Regional Siting Element, Including a Model Siting Element, April 1994, page 3.

for the economical and long-term disposal of waste which cannot be reduced, reused, recycled or composted.

2.3 GOALS AND POLICIES

- Goal 1. Provide for long-term landfill disposal of non-hazardous solid waste and facilitate the future siting of new and expanded solid waste disposal facilities in Riverside County.
- Policy 1-1: Develop appropriate siting criteria to facilitate siting of non-hazardous solid waste disposal facilities.
- Policy 1-2: Ensure that landfills within Riverside County can cumulatively provide a minimum of 15 years of disposal capacity.
- Policy 1-3: Promote efforts that will provide for 30 years of disposal capacity in Riverside County.
- Policy 1-4: Develop appropriate land use criteria to protect existing and future landfills from conflicting land uses in order to avoid long-term land use conflicts which could result in the premature closure of disposal facilities.

Goal 2. Protect the public health, safety and welfare of residents of Riverside County and its cities by ensuring the safe disposal of non-hazardous solid waste.

- Policy 2-1: Develop appropriate siting criteria that aid in identifying areas in Riverside County suitable for landfill development that minimizes public health and safety risks.
- Policy 2-2: Develop appropriate siting criteria that aid in identifying areas in Riverside County suitable for landfill development that minimizes environmental impacts.
- Policy 2-3: Comply with applicable local, State and Federal policies, laws, statutes, and regulations in order to protect the public health and the environment from impacts from the solid waste disposal system.
- Policy 2-4: Promote programs to educate residents and businesses on how to reduce and eliminate the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) from being inadvertently disposed at County landfills.

Goal 3. Provide for economical disposal of non-hazardous solid waste.

Policy 3-1: Develop appropriate siting criteria and identify areas of Riverside County suitable for landfill development that minimize public and private sector costs, given environmental health and safety constraints.

- Policy 3-2: Permit the import of non-county-generated, non-hazardous waste to be disposed at public or privately-owned landfills in Riverside County to reduce the unit cost of disposal, so long as the long-term interests of Riverside County and its cities are protected.
- Policy 3-3: Continue to work cooperatively with affected user jurisdictions to evaluate and implement cost effective and efficient adjustments to the waste management system, such as alternative methods for the economical disposal of waste, including, but not limited to, exporting waste.
- Policy 3-4: Continue to pursue new technology, such as landfill mining, that may provide alternatives to landfill disposal of solid waste.
- Goal 4. Maximize the use of all feasible source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting programs to reduce solid waste disposal in order to extend the life of landfills.
- Policy 4-1: Follow state regulations in implementing Source Reduction Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) programs to reduce waste through source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting.
- Goal 5. Comply with regulatory requirements for the preparation of the Siting Element, Annual Review of Progress, and the five-year review and revision of the CIWMP.
- Policy 5-1: Prepare a Countywide Siting Element that meets all the requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41700 and changes as per AB 3001.
- Policy 5-2: Prepare an Annual Review of Progress regarding disposal capacity and local/regional waste management issues for the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) in accordance with CCR Section 18787.
- Policy 5-3: Prepare a CIWMP Review Report every five years for the CIWMB in accordance with CCR Section 18788.

Chapter 3

DISPOSAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 18755.3 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to disposal capacity requirements when preparing or revising the Siting Element, requires the County to identify the amount of disposal capacity that was available within Riverside County in 1990, established pursuant to CCR 18777 (b), and the amount of existing disposal capacity in the year the Siting Element is prepared or revised. In addition, the County is required to project the anticipated countywide disposal capacity needs for fifteen (15) years, beginning with the year the County prepares or revises its Siting Element.

3.2 EXISTING REMAINING COUNTYWIDE DISPOSAL CAPACITY

Table 3-1 shows the remaining countywide refuse disposal capacity (excluding cover material) as of January 1, 1990 and as of January 1, 1995, in both tons and cubic yards. These figures represent the combined remaining refuse disposal capacity of the County's active landfills on the date indicated.

	1990 Remai	ning Capacity	1995 Remaining Capacity				
	Tons	Cubic Yards	Tons	Cubic Yards			
A	259.365	518.729	21,748	43,496			
Bedlande**	30,000,000	60.000.000	7,347,856	12.270.920			
Blythe*	1.557.797	3,115,593	1,446,893	2.893.786			
Coachella**	13,657,409	27.314.818	263.911	440.731			
Desert Center*	177.000	354.000	41.034	82,068			
Double Butte**	578.000	963,333	Closed	Closed			
Edom Hill**	7.450.267	14.900.533	2.081.710	3.476.456			
El Sobrante**	4.086.000	6,823,620	4.666.637	7,793,284			
Highgrove**	3,500,000	5.833.333	563,700	941,379			
I amb Canyon**	6.476.923	12.953.845	1,767,619	2.951.924			
Mead Valley**	2.652.272	4,420,453	507,422	847,395			
Mecca II*	760.000	1.520.000	52,394	104.788			
Oasis*	290.000	580,000	121.428	242,856			
TOTAL	71,445,033	139,298,257	18,882,352	32,089,082			

TABLE 3-1 REMAINING COUNTYWIDE REFUSE DISPOSAL CAPACITY

See notes next page for detailed explanation of Table 3-1.

CIWMP

TABLE 3-1 NOTES:

- 1. A standardized conversion factor was utilized for landfills (denoted with **) with compaction capability of 1 ton equals 1.67 cubic yards. A standardized conversion factor of 1 ton equals 2 cubic yards was utilized for landfills (denoted with *) without compaction capability. Some landfills without compaction equipment in 1990 added compactors to their operating equipment during the period from 1990 to 1995. The conversion factors for these landfills changed accordingly.
- 2. The 1990 remaining refuse disposal capacity figures were based upon what was estimated as the ultimate buildout disposal capacity of 13 active landfills. These figures were adopted by the Riverside County Local Task Force (LTF) on January 17, 1991, pursuant to CCR 18777 (b). It should be noted that Table 3-1 accurately represents the remaining refuse disposal capacity as of January 1, 1990 as 139,298,257 cubic yards, even though 136,560,637 cubic yards is the figure that was actually adopted by the LTF. It was corrected, because the remaining refuse disposal capacity for the El Sobrante Landfill had been added into this number measured as tons instead of cubic yards.
- 3. The 1995 remaining refuse capacity figures were established by the Landfill Closure Projection Study, which was performed by the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) in Spring 1995. The District Study utilized current permitted design capacity information from the Report of Disposal Site Information (RDSI) for each of the 12 remaining active landfills, actual tonnage data, and remaining capacity data from the most recent field and aerial surveys.
- 4. As noted in Table 3-1, there has been a significant decrease in the County's available refuse disposal capacity from 1990 to 1995. The reduction in refuse disposal capacity, which amounts to almost 52 million tons, has not paralleled a comparable increase in disposal tonnage received at the landfills. In fact, the disposal tonnage has been low in the past few years due to the economic climate and recycling efforts. The significant reduction in available refuse disposal capacity can be attributed to the following factors:
 - a. The 1990 figures included the ultimate buildout refuse disposal capacity of each landfill, whereas the 1995 figure included only the currently permitted design capacity. The planned expansion capacities for the Badlands, Edom Hill, and Lamb Canyon Landfills were excluded from the 1995 figure for this reason and have been addressed in Chapter 6, Proposed Facility Location and Description, of the Siting Element.
 - b. The 1995 figures represent a loss of planned refuse disposal capacity for the Edom Hill, Anza, Mecca, and Oasis Landfills. In light of Federal Subtitle D requirements for lining new landfill and expansion areas and associated costs, these landfills will not be expanded beyond their 1993 established footprint.
 - c. The 1995 figures represent a loss of planned refuse disposal capacity for the Coachella Landfill. The discovery of an active fault in the planned expansion area precludes expanding this landfill, as per Federal Subtitle D requirements.¹

¹Under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act, an active fault is defined as a fault that has surface displacements in Holocene time (about the last 11,000 years), constituting a potential hazard to structures that might be located across it.

3.3 ANTICIPATED DISPOSAL CAPACITY NEEDS

Disposal Capacity Needs Projection

Table 3-2 and Table 3-3 show the countywide refuse disposal capacity needs in tons and cubic yards, respectively, for the next 15 years. This capacity needs projection was based on the 1995 District Study, which is a disposal-based method using actual tonnage data recorded at the landfills for the past 5 years and disposal growth factors. The absence of accurate estimates for both waste generation and diversion over the 15-year period made using a waste generation-based approach for projecting disposal capacity needs unreliable. Because waste disposal is also a function of waste generation and diversion, the disposal-based approach seemed the more logical approach to project disposal capacity needs. More discussion on both of these approaches can be found in Appendix A of the Siting Element.

The parameters outlined in the Tables 3-2 and 3-3 are defined as follows:

- a) Disposal is the projected amount of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) disposed of at Riverside County landfills annually by Riverside County and its jurisdictions from 1995 through 2010;
- b) Exports represent the projected amount of MSW exported annually by Riverside County and its jurisdictions to out-of-county landfills from 1995 through 2010, under formalized import/export agreement(s) with the recipient jurisdiction(s);
- c) Imports² represent the projected amount of MSW imported annually to Riverside County landfills from out-of-county jurisdictions from 1995 through 2010, under formalized import/export agreement(s) with the exporting jurisdiction(s); and,
- d) Remaining Capacity is the projected annual remaining countywide refuse disposal capacity from 1995 through 2010.

Assumptions were used in this disposal-based projection that would result in the highest rate of consumption of landfill capacity or a "worst case" disposal capacity needs. These assumptions are shown below, as well as, listed at the bottom of Table 3-2 and Table 3-3:

a) It was assumed that the 1995 wastestream sources would continue to utilize permitted Riverside County landfills throughout the 15 year forecast period.

² The disposal capacity shown for the El Sobrante Landfill is reflective of the disposal capacity reserved for residents of Riverside County and its cities and does not include any disposal capacity reserved for out-of-county imports. Consequently, Tables 3-2 and 3-3 do not show the amount of import accepted at the El Sobrante Landfill.

- b) No waste diversion will result by using Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF's) or Transfer Stations established during the 15-year period. (It should be noted, however, that the Moreno Valley MRF has begun operations, the Perris MRF is scheduled to begin operations in the Fall of 1996, and the Coachella Valley transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by the Fall of 1998.)
- c) Disposal tonnage will not increase from 1995 to 2000 at all landfills, except at the Blythe Landfill where disposal will increase 4% annually. After 2000, disposal tonnage will grow 2% annually at all landfills.
- d) No imported MSW will consume landfill capacity during the projection period. Although El Sobrante Landfill currently accepts imported waste, the disposal capacity used in the capacity needs projection only reflect the portion which is allocated for residents of Riverside County and its cities at this landfill.

The County and its cities are not precluded from choosing disposal options that vary from those stated in these assumptions in order to accomplish the goals and policies outlined in Chapter 2 of the Siting Element. In accordance with Section 18787 of the CCR, the District, on behalf of the County, will prepare an Annual Review Report that will include, in part, an evaluation of the adequacy of the existing countywide solid waste management system to handle and dispose of the solid waste generated in the countywide area that cannot be diverted, a report on changes in the permitted disposal capacity, and a report on policy decisions, activities, and other factors that affect the disposal capacity projections.

Findings

As shown in Tables 3-2 and 3-3, Riverside County has approximately 13 years of refuse disposal capacity and will not need additional refuse disposal capacity until the last quarter of 2008. The additional 2+ years of refuse disposal capacity, that Riverside County needs in order to provide 15 years of disposal capacity, are expected to be provided through the siting of the proposed rail-haul landfill or landfill expansions, as discussed in Chapter 6 of the Siting Element. Additional capacity may also be gained through the export of waste out of the County and/or disposal reduction programs and technologies which could include, but are not limited to, landfill mining and waste baling.

While Tables 3-2 and 3-3 show a picture of the countywide disposal capacity, they do not show the distribution of this capacity. In fact, Table 4-13 in Chapter 4 of the Siting Element, shows that some areas of the County, such as the Coachella Valley area, may need additional capacity before the year 2008 as the landfills serving their respective areas reach capacity. Lack of disposal capacity in specific areas of the County may well be resolved by diverting waste from an area in the County lacking disposal capacity to an area of the County with disposal capacity. In fact, the District's 1995 Spring Study assumed such diversion. However, economic factors will influence this type of disposal decision; i.e., transportation costs, whether transfer stations or material recovery facilities are built to reduce longer haul distances, or whether it is cheaper to export the waste out of the County than to haul to a landfill within the County.

CTWMP

	(TONS)
	COUNTY
6	RIVERSIDE
LE 3	FOR
TAB	CAPACITY
	DISPOSAL

			:														-	~
ADDITIONAL CAPACITY	NEEDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1,511,343)	(3,075,773)
REMAINING CAPACITY		18,882,352	17,616,006	16,348,763	15,080,587	13,811,440	12,541,284	11,257,906	9,948,861	8,613,635	7,251,704	5,862,535	4,445,582	3,000,290	1,526,093	22,412	(1,511,343)	(3,075,773)
ANNUAL DISPOSAL IN REGION	(DISPOSAL - EXPORTS + IMPORTS)	1,258,018	1,266,346	1,267,243	1,268,176	1,269,147	1,270,156	1,283,378	1,309,045	1,335,226	1,361,931	1,389,169	1,416,953	1,445,292	1,474,197	1,503,681	1,533,755	1,564,430
IMPORTS		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EXPORTS		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DISPOSAL		1,258,018	1,266,346	1,267,243	1,268,176	1,269,147	1,270,156	1,283,378	1,309,045	1,335,226	1,361,931	1,389,169	1,416,953	1,445,292	1,474,197	1,503,681	1,533,755	1,564,430
YEAR		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010

Source: Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995

Assumptions used in the Disposal Capacity Projection:

The 1995 wastestream sources in Riverside County would continue to utilize permitted County landfills for disposal throughout the 15-year forcast period. ÷

No waste diversion will result by using MRF's or Transfer Stations established during the 15-year period. പ്പ

Disposal tonnage will not increase from 1995 to 2000 at all landfills, except at the Blythe Landfill where disposal will increase 4% annually. After 2000, disposal tonnage will grow 2% annually at all landfills.

accepts imported waste, the disposal capacity used in this table only reflect that portion which is allocated for residents No imported MSW will consume landfill capacity during the projection period. Although El Sobrante Landfill currently of Riverside County and its cities at this landfill. 4

	(CUBIC YARDS)
	COUNTY
TABLE 3 - 3	RIVERSIDE
	FOR
	CAPACITY
	DISPOSAL

YEAR END	DISPOSAL	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	ANNUAL DISPOSAL IN REGION	REMAINING CAPACITY	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY
	-			(DISPOSAL - EXPORTS + IMPORTS)		NEEDED
1994	2,112,074	0	0	2,112,074	32,031,752	0
1995	2,126,059	0	0	2,126,059	29,905,693	0
1996	2,127,854	0	0	2,127,854	27,777,839	0
1997	2,129,022	0	0	2,129,022	25,648,817	0
1998	2,129,728	0	0	2,129,728	23,519,089	0
1999	2,130,570	0	o	2,130,570	21,388,519	0
2000	2,151,183	0	0	2,151,183	19,237,336	0
2001	2,193,123	0	0	2,193,123	17,044,213	0
2002	2,236,985	0	0	2,236,985	14,807,228	0
2003	2,281,725	0	0	2,281,725	12,525,503	0
2004	2,327,360	0	0	2,327,360	10,198,143	0
2005	2,373,907	0	0	2,373,907	7,824,236	0
2006	2,421,385	0	0	2,421,385	5,402,851	0
2007	2,469,813	0	0	2,469,813	2,933,038	0
2008	2,519,209	0	0	2,519,209	413,829	0
2009	2,569,593	0	0	2,569,593	(2,155,764)	(2,155,764)
2010	2,620,985	0	0	2,620,985	(4,776,749)	(4,776,749)
Corroo.	Afil Closure Dro	iection Study S	Zoring 1005			

Source: Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995

Assumptions used in the Disposal Capacity Projection:

- The 1995 wastestream sources in Riverside County would continue to utilize permitted County landfills for disposal throughout the 15-year forcast period. . -
 - No waste diversion will result by using MRF's or Transfer Stations established during the 15-year period. പ്പ
- Disposal tonnage will not increase from 1995 to 2000 at all landfills, except at the Blythe Landfill where disposal will
- accepts imported waste, the disposal capacity used in this table only reflect that portion which is allocated for residents No imported MSW will consume landfill capacity during the projection period. Although El Sobrante Landfill currently increase 4% annually. After 2000, disposal tonnage will grow 2% annually at all landfills. of Riverside County and its cities at this landfill. 4

Chapter 4

EXISTING SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the identification and location of each of the existing solid waste disposal facilities in Riverside County with a Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) are included. In addition, each facility is described in terms of owner, operator, facility permit number, a permitted rate of disposal, average daily rate of waste received, permitted waste types and future land use. Specific requirements are contained in Section 18755.5 (a) and (b) of the California Code of Regulations.

4.2 EXISTING PERMITTED SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

Identification of Existing Disposal Facilities

Riverside County has twelve (12) active sanitary landfills. Each of these landfills, which are all located in the unincorporated area of the County, are classified as Class III landfills. These landfills are identified as follows: 1) Anza; 2) Badlands; 3) Blythe; 4) Coachella; 5) Desert Center; 6) Edom Hill; 7) El Sobrante; 8) Highgrove; 9) Lamb Canyon; 10) Mead Valley; 11) Mecca II; and, 12) Oasis.

Identification of Owner/Operator of Existing Disposal Facilities

Up until May of 1994, the Riverside County Waste Management Department (Department) owned eight (8) of the active landfills, which include the following landfills: 1) Anza; 2) Badlands; 3) Blythe; 4) Highgrove; 5) Lamb Canyon; 6) Mead Valley; 7) Mecca II; and 8) Oasis. In May of 1994, the Department was transformed into a county sanitation district, called the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District). The ownership of these eight (8) landfills is now being transferred from the Department to the District.

Three (3) of the active landfills are owned by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM). These landfills are: 1) Coachella; 2) Desert Center; and 3) Edom Hill. The District is in the process of purchasing the Coachella and Edom Hill Landfill properties. These land transfers will be completed in 1996. The Desert Center Landfill is operated under a lease from the BLM.

The District operates all but one (1) active landfill. This landfill is the El Sobrante Landfill, which is privately owned and operated by Western Waste Industries. The District, however, manages the gate and scale.



Countywide Siting Element

Description of Existing Solid Waste Disposal Facilities

Descriptions of each of the existing solid waste disposal facilities are presented in Tables 4-1 through 4-12. A table for each active landfill has been prepared that identifies the owner/operator, as previously described. Additionally, each table includes information specific to the landfill's current SWFP and Report of Disposal Site Information (RDSI), such as the facility permit number, the maximum permitted rate of disposal, the permitted waste types, and the future land use. The source of information is listed in parentheses behind each topic.

In the Tables under Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal, daily tons were converted to cubic yards using a standardized conversion factor of 1 ton equals 1.67 cubic yards (i.e., 1200 pounds per cubic yard) for landfills with compaction capability. A standardized conversion factor of 1 ton equals two cubic yards (i.e., 1000 pounds per cubic yard) was used for landfills without compaction capability. The El Sobrante Landfill is the only exception with a demonstrated compaction rate of 1350 pounds per cubic yard.

The average daily rate of waste received is based on information gathered from July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995 for the 12 landfills. Maps showing the location of each of the existing solid waste disposal facilities are presented in Figures 4-1 through 4-12.

The estimate of remaining site life for each of the disposal facilities is presented in each landfill table and in Table 4-13. These estimates are based upon the Landfill Closure Projection Study conducted by the District in the Spring of 1995. The District Study utilized current permitted design capacity information from the RDSI for each of the 12 active landfills, actual tonnage data, and remaining capacity data from the most recent field and aerial surveys. The Study also used certain assumptions regarding where waste would be sent upon the closure of individual landfills. These assumptions are listed in Table 4-13. The assumptions are subject to revision based upon changing economic and operational considerations.

In Table 4-13, the Badlands, Blythe, Desert Center, and Oasis Landfills have an estimated remaining site life which extends beyond the year 2009, the year shown in Table 3-2 when Riverside County and its cities will need additional disposal capacity. The combined capacity of all County landfills, however, falls short of the 15 years required by the State.



TABLE 4-1 ANZA SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Anza Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0013
Permit Issue Date:	April 22, 1993
Permit Review Date:	April 22, 1998

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Yearly Cubic Yards:

Daily Tons:40Daily Cubic Yards:80 (1000 lbs. per cubic yard)Yearly Tons:12,360

24,720

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	23
Cubic Yards:	46

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-agricultural	-inert materials
-industrial	-dead animals
-construction	-septic tanks*
-demolition	-contaminated soil
-tires	-municipal waste

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

1997 (See Table 4-13 for Study Assumptions)

^{*} Although allowed by its current permit to take septic tank waste, these wastes are no longer accepted here.



TABLE 4-2 BADLANDS SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Badlands Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0006
Permit Issue Date:	May 26, 1992
Permit Review Date:	May 26, 1997

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	1400
Daily Cubic Yards:	2333 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)
Vearly Tons	432 600

Yearly Tons: 432,600 Yearly Cubic Yards: 720,897

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	318
Cubic Yards:	530

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-municipal solid waste*	-tires
-inert wastes	-approved agricultural wastes
-dead animals	-construction/demolition wastes
-approved industrial wastes	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

2010 (See Table 4-13 for Study Assumptions)**

^{*} This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.

^{**} If wastestreams from the Coachella and Mecca II Landfills are not diverted to the Badlands Landfill, the estimated closure date for the Badlands Landfill may be the year 2014.



TABLE 4-3 BLYTHE SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Blythe Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-017
Permit Issue Date:	In Process: Issuance Expected in 1996
Permit Review Date:	Five Years Following the Permit Issuance Date

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	260
Daily Cubic Yards:	520 (1000 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	80,340
Yearly Cubic Yards:	160,680

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	67
Cubic Yards:	134

5. Permitted Waste Types: (RDSI)

-general residential waste	-mixed municipal
-agricultural	-empty pesticide containers (triple rinsed and punctured)
-tires	-non-hazardous industrial
-construction/demolition	-dead animals

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

2033 (See Table 4-13 for Study Assumptions)



TABLE 4-4 COACHELLA SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Coachella Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Bureau of Land Management
Operator:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0012
Permit Issue Date:	December 15, 1992
Permit Review Date:	December 15, 1996

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:2000Daily Cubic Yards:3333 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)

 Yearly Tons:
 618,000

 Yearly Cubic Yards:
 1,029,897

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	449
Cubic Yards:	748

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-agricultural	-construction
-dead animals	-mixed municipal wastes*
-demolition	-tires
-industrial wastes	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

1996 (See Table 4-13 for Study Assumptions)

^{*} This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.



4 - 12
TABLE 4-5 DESERT CENTER SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Desert Center Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Bureau of Land Management
Operator:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District

2. **Permit Information:** (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-016
Permit Issue Date:	January 15, 1991
Permit Review Date:	January 15, 1996

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:16Daily Cubic Yards:32 (1000 lbs. per cubic yard)Yearly Tons:5840

Yearly Cubic Yards: 11,680

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 365 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1995-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	4
Cubic Yards:	8

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-tires	-mixed municipal wastes
-agricultural	-demolition
-construction	-dead animals
-industrial	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)



4 - 14

TABLE 4-6 EDOM HILL LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. **Facility Information:**

Facility Name:	Edom Hill Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Bureau of Land Management
Operator:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0011
Permit Issue Date:	Current Permit Issued December 15, 1992
Permit Review Date:	March 7, 1994
	Repermitting Currently in Process: Issuance Expected in 1996

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Yearly Cubic Yards:

Daily Tons:	1200
Daily Cubic Yards:	2000 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	370,800
Yearly Cubic Yards:	618,000

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	514
Cubic Yards:	761

5. Permitted Waste Types: (RDSI)

-mixed municipal solid waste*	-dead animals
-agricultural waste	-tires
-nonhazardous solid wastes from industrial sources	-liquid waste**
-triple rinsed and punctured pesticide containers	-
-construction demolition waste	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.

^{**} Until July 1996, the Edom Hill Landfill will accept portable toilets and grease trap waste.

^{***} If wastestreams from the Coachella and Mecca II Landfills are diverted to the Edom Hill Landfill, the estimated closure date for the Edom Hill Landfill may be the year 2002.



TABLE 4-7 EL SOBRANTE SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Western Waste Industries
Operator:	Western Waste Industries

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0217
Permit Issue Date:	March 30, 1994
Permit Review Date:	March 30, 1999

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	4000
Daily Cubic Yards:	6154 (1300 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	1, 236,000
Yearly Cubic Yards:	1,901,586

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	1570
Cubic Yards:	2415

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-municipal solid waste	-septic tank and chemical toilet waste*
-agricultural wastes	-construction and demolition wastes
-dead animals	-egg washing wastes*
-urban wood wastes	-animal wastes (manure and stable waste)
-inert materials	-white goods and other large metallic materials**
-tires	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use	
After Closure:	Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

^{*} Liquid wastes will no longer be accepted beginning July 1, 1996.

^{**} This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.



TABLE 4-8 HIGHGROVE SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. **Facility Information:**

Facility Name: Highgrove Sanitary Landfill Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) Owner: **Operator:** District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0003
Permit Issue Date:	July 25, 1992
Permit Review Date:	July 25, 1997

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	2700
Daily Cubic Yards:	4500 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)

Yearly Tons: 834,300 Yearly Cubic Yards: 1,390,500

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	720
Cubic Yards:	1,200

5. Permitted Waste Types: (RDSI)

-municipal solid waste*	-tires
-agricultural wastes	-dead animals
-inert materials	-construction/demolition wastes

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: **Open Space**

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.



TABLE 4-9 LAMB CANYON SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:Lamb Canyon Sanitary LandfillOwner:Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)Operator:District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0007
Permit Issue Date:	August 10, 1992
Permit Review Date:	August 10, 1997

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	1,900
Daily Cubic Yards:	3,167 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	587,100
Yearly Cubic Yards:	978,603

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	413
Cubic Yards:	688

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-municipal solid waste*	-septic tank and chemical toilet wastes**
-agricultural waste	-grease trap waste**
-tires	-inert waste
-animal waste	-construction demolition wastes
-industrial waste	-contaminated waste
-dead animal waste	

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

^{*} This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.

^{**} Liquid wastes will no longer be accepted beginning July 1, 1996.



^{4 - 22}

TABLE 4-10 MEAD VALLEY SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Mead Valley Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0009
Permit Issue Date:	December 12, 1994
Permit Review Date:	December 12, 1999

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	1,100
Daily Cubic Yards:	1,833 (1200 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	339,900
Yearly Cubic Yards:	566,397

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	609
Cubic Yards:	1015

5. Permitted Waste Types: (RDSI)

-municipal solid waste	-tires
-agricultural wastes	-dead animals
-inert waste	-animal waste (manure and stable waste)
-wood waste	-construction and demolition waste
-contaminated soil	-waste appliances/large metallic materials*

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

^{*} This landfill accepts metallic discards and mattresses for recycling.

^{**} If a Materials Recovery Facility is built in the Perris/Moreno Valley area no later than September 1996, the estimated closure date of the Mead Valley Landfill may be extended one year.



TABLE 4-11 MECCA II SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Mecca II
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0071
Permit Issue Date:	December 21, 1992
Permit Review Date:	December 21, 1997

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Daily Tons:	50
Daily Cubic Yards:	100 (1000 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	15.450

Yearly Cubic Yards: 30,900

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995)

Tons:	45
Cubic Yards:	90

5. **Permitted Waste Types:** (RDSI)

-mixed municipal	-dead animals
-agricultural	-tires
-industrial	-construction/demolition

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)



TABLE 4-12 OASIS SANITARY LANDFILL FACT SHEET

1. Facility Information:

Facility Name:	Oasis Sanitary Landfill
Owner:	Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District)
Operator:	District

2. Permit Information: (Report of Disposal Site Information [RDSI])

Permit Number:	33-AA-0015
Permit Issue Date:	August 16, 1993
Permit Review Date:	August 16, 1998

3. Maximum Permitted Rate of Disposal: (RDSI)

Yearly Cubic Yards:

Daily Tons:	41
Daily Cubic Yards:	82 (1000 lbs. per cubic yard)
Yearly Tons:	12,669

25.338

Note: Days of Operation per Year = 309 Days

4. Average Daily Rate of Waste Received: (District Records from July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995)

Tons:	16
Cubic Yards:	32

5. Permitted Waste Types: (RDSI)

-mixed municipal-dead animals-agricultural-empty pesticide containers triple rinsed and punctured-inert-contaminated soil-construction/demolition

6. Future Land Use: (RDSI)

Expected Land Use After Closure: Open Space

7. Estimated Closure Date: (Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995)

Landfill Name	Estimated Closure Date
Anza	1997
Badlands	2010 ¹
Blythe	2033
Coachella	1996
Desert Center	2012
Edom Hill	2006 ²
El Sobrante	2005
Highgrove	1996
Lamb Canyon	2006
Mead Valley	1997 ³
Mecca II	2000
Oasis	2019

TABLE 4-13 ESTIMATE OF REMAINING SITE LIFE UNDER CURRENT PERMITS

Source: Landfill Closure Projection Study, Spring 1995

Assumptions Used in the Study:

- Badlands Landfill is estimated to receive 50% of Highgrove waste beginning November, 1996, 50% of Mead Valley waste beginning March, 1997, 100% of Coachella waste beginning October, 1996, 100% of Mecca II waste beginning January, 2000, 100% of Edom Hill waste beginning July, 2006, 100% of Oasis waste beginning July, 2019.
- B. Blythe Landfill is estimated to receive 100% of Desert Center waste beginning February, 2012.
- C. El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to receive 50% of Highgrove waste beginning November, 1996 and 50% of Mead Valley waste beginning March, 1997.
- D. Lamb Canyon Landfill is estimated to receive 100% of Anza waste beginning November, 1997.

¹If wastestreams from the Coachella and Mecca II Landfills are not diverted to the Badlands Landfill, the estimated closure date for the Badlands Landfill may be the year 2014.

²If wastestreams from the Coachella and Mecca II Landfills are diverted to the Edom Hill Landfill, the estimated closure date for the Edom Hill Landfill may be the year 2002.

³If a Materials Recovery Facility is built in the Perris/Moreno Valley area no later than September 1996, the estimated closure date of the Mead Valley Landfill may be extended one year. (Note: The MRF/transfer station in Moreno Valley opened in March 1996.)

Chapter 5

SCREENING AND SITING CRITERIA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the criteria for siting new landfills or siting expansions of existing Class III, nonhazardous solid waste landfills in Riverside County are described. The process by which new landfills or expansions of existing landfill sites will be identified, evaluated, compared, and selected through the use of siting criteria is also described. No new solid waste disposal facility or expansion of an existing landfill will be established that does not satisfy the minimum criteria that are adopted in the Siting Element. A solid waste disposal facility must be described within the Siting Element prior to being established or a Siting Element amendment must be approved which identifies and describes the facility and the date of its inclusion in the Element, pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41721.5. Specific requirements for the content of this chapter are contained in Section 18756, California Code of Regulations (CCR).

5.2 SCREENING AND SITING CRITERIA

The most appropriate location for a new landfill or for a landfill expansion is a site that best satisfies a complex mix of environmental, engineering, economic and land use factors. Because the perfect site rarely exists, the objective is to select a site that provides an acceptable balance of siting characteristics. Table 5-1 lists Screening Criteria from Section 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), known as Subtitle D, which regulate the location of solid waste facilities. A new facility or lateral expansion must comply with the Screening Criteria or it does not meet the minimum standards of the Siting Element. The Screening Criteria in Table 5-1 can also be used to assess a wide geographic area to determine the potential for locating landfill sites within the area.

Table 5-3 lists Siting Criteria that can be used for screening potential landfill sites. The Siting Criteria are superseded by Federal and State regulations for permitting, siting, and environmental review of potential sites. The Siting Criteria may also be used to rank multiple sites to determine how a site compares to other sites which are being evaluated and to determine which issues most significantly affect a proposed site. The Siting Criteria can be used for scoping issues affecting landfill development, but there is no minimum standard which must be met to conform with the Siting Criteria.

Screening and Siting Criteria may be used before specific landfill plans have been developed for the property; in this event, the entire property should be reviewed as a potential landfill site. If necessary, a second, more refined review can occur when more specific site information is developed, such as the location of the proposed landfill footprint.¹ The Siting Criteria reference a landfill site, but, when the criteria are applied to landfill expansions, only the expansion area should be considered.

TABLE 5-1 SCREENING CRITERIA FOR NEW/EXPANDED DISPOSAL FACILITIES

SCREENING CRITERIA ²	Indicate Y/N For Project ³
New Municipal Solid Waste Landfill units (MSWLF) or lateral expansions are located within 200 feet of a known Holocene fault. (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.13)	
New MSWLF units and lateral expansions are located in a seismic impact zone. (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.14)	
New MSWLF units and lateral expansions are located in an unstable area. (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.15)	
New MSWLF units or lateral expansions are located in a 100-year floodplain. (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.11)	
New MSWLF units or lateral expansions are located within 10,000 feet from an airport runway used by turbojet aircraft and/or within 5000 feet from an airport runway used solely by piston-type aircraft. (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.10)	

In Table 5-3, Siting Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities, points are allocated based upon the project's site characteristics, then these points are weighted based upon the scale described in Table 5-2, Siting Criteria Point Weighting. A range of points has been established,

¹The landfill footprint is the area within the landfill property boundary where refuse is actually buried.

²When specific information regarding the location of MSWLF units is unknown, the entire landfill property should be assessed. Subtitle D does not restrict vertical expansions of existing landfills.

³If yes is indicated, additional environmental and technical studies would be required to ensure that the project can demonstrate compliance with Subtitle D before the project can be determined to be consistent with the Countywide Siting Element and these Screening Criteria.

in some cases to allow the reviewer to reflect estimated costs or the level of impact at the site. For criteria where an impact has been identified, a range of points (usually 1-10) has been given to allow the reviewer to account for varying levels of mitigation. If a project can fully mitigate an impact, then more points would be given. If mitigation is very expensive or not feasible, a minimum number of points would be allocated. Zero points may also be given if the project conflicts with Subtitle D requirements. If information is unknown, a minimum of points would be allocated, either zero or one.

After identifying points, based upon site and area characteristics or project mitigation potential, the reviewer will multiply these points by the assigned weighting factor. Several criteria may be listed under one topic, as in the case of geologic/seismic and soils. The scores for each topic should be added together for a total site score which can be used as a relative comparison for multiple sites. In general, more points will accrue to projects which have fewer site constraints or require less mitigation.

Documentation should be provided at the end of the table to identify the source(s) of information or the basis upon which the point allocation was determined. The use of established criteria ensures that the site selection process is fair and consistent. Statutory regulations are referenced where applicable.

TABLE 5-2 SITING CRITERIA POINT WEIGHTING

- Weight of 5: Criteria is of key importance. Extenuating circumstances may allow further consideration of the site. Mitigation is impossible or extremely difficult and may result in high costs.
- Weight of 4: Criteria is very important. Defects should be corrected in order for the site to be selected for development. Mitigation generally requires considerable expenditure of resources and/or finances.
- Weight of 3: Criteria is important. Defects are generally correctable and require moderate use of resources, including financial resources, to mitigate.
- Weight of 2: Criteria is somewhat important. Site flaws or development issues may be remedied and require minimal use of resources to mitigate.
- Weight of 1: Criteria is of minor importance and is relatively easy to comply with.

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
A.	Seismic:			
1.	The proposed landfill site is more than 200 feet from a known active fault as identified on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps or other known active faults. (PRC Sec. 2621.5) (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill expansion is a vertical expansion within 200 feet from a known active fault as identified on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map or other known active fault but complies with the requirements of Subtitle D. (5 points), or		5	
	The landfill site is within 200 feet from a known active fault. (0 points)		-	
2.	The proposed landfill site is not located in a County Fault Hazard Zone. (10 points)		5	
	The proposed landfill site is located in a County Fault Hazard Zone. (0-5 points)		5	
3.	The proposed landfill site is not located on a potentially active fault, as shown on published geologic references. (10 points), or		5	
	The proposed landfill site is located on a potentially active fault, as shown on published geologic references. (0-5 points)			
4.	The proposed landfill site is not located in a County liquefaction area. ⁴ (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is located in a County liquefaction area. (1-5 points)		5	

⁴Liquefaction is the phenomenon whereby during a threshold seismic event, the ground in proximity to the seismic event takes on liquid characteristics.

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
B,	Geology:			
1.	The proposed landfill site is located in an area without porous alluvium. (10 points)		Ę	
	The proposed landfill site is located in an area with porous alluvium. (1-5 points)		3	
2.	The proposed landfill site is not located in a sand and gravel mining pit. (10 points)		5	
	The proposed landfill site is located in a sand and gravel mining pit. (1-5 points)		5	
3.	The proposed landfill site is not located in a known landslide area, as shown on published geologic references. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is located in a known landslide area. (0-5 points)		4	
4.	The proposed landfill site is not located in an area subject to ground subsidence as identified in known published references. ⁵ (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is located in an area subject to ground subsidence. (0-5 points)		4	
C.	Flood/Drainage: (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.11)			
1.	The proposed landfill site is not within a 100-year floodplain or major drainage. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is located within a 100-year floodplain or major drainage. (0-5 points)		5	
D.	Dam Inundation:			
1.	The proposed landfill site is not within a dam inundation area. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is within a dam inundation area $(1-5 \text{ points})$		5	

⁵ Ground subsidence occurs when the existing ground elevation (above mean sea level) decreases permanently to any appreciable degree.

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
E.	Water Quality: (CCR, Title 23, Chapter 15)			
1.	The proposed landfill site is located in an area where groundwater is non-potable. (10 points) or			
	The proposed landfill site is located in an area where groundwater is potable. (1-5 points)		5	
2.	No drinking water wells or developed springs within 1 mile gradient from the site and/or insufficient groundwater for domestic use. (10 points), or			
	Drinking water wells or developed springs serving less than three homes are within 1 mile down gradient of the site and/or groundwater is sufficient for domestic use. (5 points), or		5	
	Drinking water wells or developed springs serving three or more homes are within 1 mile down gradient of the site and/or water supply is suitable for municipal supply. (1 point)			
F.	Groundwater Depth*: (CCR, Section 2530 [d])			
1.	The depth of groundwater exceeds 200 feet at the proposed landfill site. (10 points), or			
	The depth of groundwater ranges from 51 feet to 200 feet at the proposed landfill site. (6-9 points), or			
	The depth of groundwater ranges from 10 feet to 50 feet at the proposed landfill site. (2-5 points), or		5	
	The depth of groundwater is less than 10 feet at the proposed landfill site or information is unknown at this time. (1 point)			
G.	Blowsand:			
1.	The proposed landfill site is located outside a blowsand area. (10 points), or		4	
	The proposed landfill site is located inside a blowsand area. (1 point)			

⁶ Groundwater includes aquifer or perched water table.

SITIN	G CRITERIA:	POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)_	SCORE (P x W)
H.	Biological:			
1.	The proposed landfill does not impact rare, threatened or endangered species. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill does impact rare, threatened or endangered species. (1-5 points)		5	
.	Habitat: (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258,12)			
1.	The proposed landfill does not impact unique or sensitive habitats, including wetlands. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill impacts unique or sensitive habitats, including wetlands. (1-5 points)		5	
J.	Paleontological:			
1.	Low or no probability of paleontological resources on the proposed landfill site. (10 points), or			
	Moderate probability of paleontological resources on the proposed landfill site. (5 points), or			
	High probability of paleontological resources on the proposed landfill site. (3 points), or		2	
	Known paleontological resources on the proposed landfill site. (1 point)			
K.	Historical/Archaeological:			
1.	The proposed landfill does not impact historical/archaeological resources. (10 points), or		1	
	The proposed landfill impacts historical/archaeological resources. (1-5 points)		2	
L.	Scenic Resources:			
1.	The proposed landfill is not within the viewshed of a scenic highway corridor. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill is within the viewshed of a scenic highway corridor. (1-5 points)		2	

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
М.	Road Improvements: (CCR Title 23, Section 17659)			
1.	All weather access is provided with minimal or no offsite road improvements needed to the proposed landfill site. (10 points), or			
	Offsite roads need moderate or extensive offsite improvements in order to provide all weather access to the proposed landfill site. (1-5 points)		4	
N.	Access:			
1.	The primary access route to the proposed landfill site utilizes secondary and arterial routes which do not go through or near residential neighborhoods. (10 points), or		5	
	The primary access route to the proposed landfill site is through or very near residential neighborhoods. (1-5 points)			
0.	Site Life:			
1.	The proposed landfill has a site life greater than 30 years or is a landfill expansion. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill has a site life of 15-30 years. (5-9 points), or		4	
	The proposed landfill has a site life of less than 15 years. (1-4 points)			
P.	Water Availability:			
1.	The proposed landfill site has an available water supply located onsite. (10 points), or			
1	The proposed landfill site has an available water supply located within 1 mile of the site. (7-9 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site has an available water supply located within 5 miles of the site. (4-6 points), or		2	
	The proposed landfill site has an available water supply located more than 5 miles from the site. (1-3 points)			

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
Q.	Proximity to Wasteshed/Rail:			
1.	The proposed landfill is a local facility located within 25 miles or less of an urban wasteshed; and/or, The proposed landfill is a regional facility with direct access to rail or a rail head. (10 points)			
	The proposed landfill is a local facility located more than 25 miles from an urban wasteshed; and/or, The proposed landfill is a regional facility without direct access to rail or a rail head. (1-5 points)		3	
R .	Cover Material:			
1.	Adequate suitable cover material is available onsite for the entire proposed landfill project. (10 points), or			
	Adequate suitable cover material is not available onsite, but is available within 25 miles and/or can be obtained at a reasonable cost. (5-9 points), or			
	Adequate suitable cover is more than 25 miles from the proposed landfill project or cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost. (1-4 points)		3	
S .	Source of Clay for Liner:			
1.	Adequate quantities of suitable clay or other approved liner material are available onsite. (10 points), or			
	Adequate quantities of suitable clay or other approved liner material are not available onsite, but are located within 25 miles or less of the proposed landfill site and/or can be obtained at a reasonable cost (5-9 points), or		2	
	Adequate quantities of suitable clay or other approved liner material are more than 25 miles from the proposed landfill site or cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost. (1-4 points)			

SITING CRITERIA:		POINTS (P)	WEIGHTING (W)	SCORE (P x W)
T.	Airport Safety: (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart B, Section 258.10)			
1.	The proposed landfill site is located outside airport zones (within 10,000' of jet airport or 5,000' of piston type airport). (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site is within an airport zone: bird hazards may result from landfill operations. (0 points)		5	
U.	Buffer Zone:			
1.	The proposed landfill boundary is more than 1000 feet from approved or existing residential development or occupied public facilities, such as schools, jails and hospitals. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill boundary is less than 1000 feet from approved or existing residential development or public facilities, such as schools, jails and hospitals. (1 point)		4	
۷.	Property Acquisition:			
1.	The proposed landfill site will not need to be acquired. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill site will need to be acquired from a public agency. (5 points), or		3	
	The proposed landfill site will need to be acquired from a private party. (1 point)			
W.	General Plan Consistency: (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 41702 [b] and [c])			
1.	The proposed landfill project is consistent with the General Plan and adjacent general plan land uses. (10 points), or			
	The proposed landfill project is inconsistent with the General Plan and will require approval of a General Plan Amendment. (1 point)		3	
тота	L POINTS:			

INFORMATION/DATA SOURCES FOR

TOPIC	FINDINGS

5.3 SCREENING PROCESS

Applying the Screening and Siting Criteria to Facilities Which Have Been Identified in the Siting Element

In Chapter 6, Proposed Facility Location and Description, the proposed expansions of the Lamb Canyon, Badlands, El Sobrante and Edom Hill Landfills are described. Chapter 6 also includes a description of the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill. Each of these proposed facilities was screened against the Subtitle D requirements in Table 5-1, Screening Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities, and met the criteria.

Applying Screening and Siting Criteria to Facilities Which Are Not Identified in the Siting Element

New landfills or expansions of existing landfills, which are not already identified in the Siting Element, will require an amendment to the Siting Element. An amendment may be initiated by an individual application or by a jurisdiction following an areawide review where candidate sites were identified. If a Siting Element amendment is required, each jurisdiction within the County will be requested to act upon the amendment. The County and a majority of the cities with a majority of the incorporated population must approve any amendment. Failure by any city governing body to act upon a Siting Element amendment within 90 days is considered equivalent to an approval. If a jurisdiction does not act upon the amendment, this will be noted in the Element. Resolutions from jurisdictions acting upon the amendment will be placed in the CIWMP Appendices.

Proposals which require a Siting Element amendment will also be evaluated by the District based upon the Screening and Siting Criteria. If multiple sites are proposed, these sites may be ranked based on each proposal's Siting Criteria score. The District will document its findings to the LTF regarding each proposed facility's consistency with the Siting Element when the LTF conducts the proposed project's CIWMP consistency review.

Applying Siting Criteria to Screen Potential Landfill Sites

The Screening and Siting Criteria may also be used to search a broad geographic area to develop new disposal sites. Under this program, the District would define a broad geographical search area. This area would be analyzed based on the Screening Criteria listed in Table 5-1 to rule out specific geographic areas from further consideration as disposal facility sites. Geographic Information System (GIS) data will be used to create overlay constraint maps for the entire area which could identify areas that should be further investigated. Candidate sites could then be ranked using the Siting Criteria listed in Table 5-3.

This process will enable the District and an affected jurisdiction(s) to choose one or more preferred sites for further technical, environmental and permitting evaluation. Any sites chosen for a new landfill or expansion will require an amendment to the Siting Element and will be required to comply with the review procedures outlined above in "Applying Siting Criteria to Facilities Which Are Not Identified in the Siting Element." The District will document its findings to the LTF regarding each proposed facility when the LTF conducts the proposed project's CIWMP consistency review.

Environmental Review and Permitting

Determining site suitability through the review of the Screening and Siting Criteria does not replace the environmental review process required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Consistency with the Siting Element also does not guarantee that a proposed facility will receive local land use approval or State approval of a Solid Waste Facility Permit. Siting a new facility or a major expansion is an intensive and lengthy process. Community involvement during the environmental review and public hearing process is essential to successful facility siting.

Chapter 6

PROPOSED FACILITY LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, each landfill expansion and/or new landfill facility that is planned in Riverside County to ensure that the county and its cities have a minimum of 15 years of combined disposal capacity is described. Specific requirements for this chapter of the Siting Element are contained in Sections 18755(b) and 18756.1, California Code of Regulations (CCR).

6.2 **REVIEW PROCESS**

Each landfill expansion and/or new landfill facility will be subject to Federal, State and local requirements to become a fully-permitted facility. The identification and description of these planned facilities in the Siting Element are one of the State's requirements for a Solid Waste Facility Permit in finding a planned facility consistent with the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). This finding of consistency that the planned facility is identified and described in the Siting Element does not supersede any other permitting requirements, nor does it guarantee approval of the facility.

In conformance with the adopted Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) will utilize the Councils of Governments' (COG's) Executive Committees of the Western Riverside Council of Governments and Coachella Valley Association of Governments as policy advisory boards and shall submit all significant policy and major fiscal matters to the COG's Executive Committees prior to taking action. A full copy of the MOU is included in Appendix A of the Summary Plan. As outlined in Chapter 9, Implementation, other agencies/reviewing bodies which would be actively involved in any landfill expansion or new landfill include, but are not limited to, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, Riverside County Local Task Force (LTF), Water Quality Control Boards, Air Quality Management Districts, Environmental Health Department, California Integrated Waste Management Board, and Local Enforcement Agency (LEA).

6.3 **PROPOSED FACILITY LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

In Riverside County, the Waste Resources Management District (District) is proposing to laterally expand both the Lamb Canyon and Badlands Landfills. Western Waste Industries, as owner and operator, is proposing a lateral and vertical expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill. Mine Reclamation Corporation (MRC) is proposing to establish the Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center. Maps of the proposed expansions are shown in Figures 6-1 through 6-3, and descriptions of the expansions can be found in Tables 6-1 through 6-3. The map of the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center is shown in Figure 6-4, and its description is found

CIWMP

in Table 6-4. The information provided is subject to revision as more detailed plans are prepared for each of these proposals or plans are modified to address environmental or site concerns.

Any one of the expansions proposed at Lamb Canyon, Badlands, or El Sobrante Landfills, or the development of the Eagle Mountain Landfill project, when combined with the existing permitted capacity described in Chapter 3, provide Riverside County and its residents with a greater than 15-year disposal capacity. The existing permitted disposal capacity may be further increased if waste is exported or waste is reduced due to recycling programs.

The District is also proposing a vertical landfill expansion at the Edom Hill Landfill, as shown in Figure 6-5 and described in Table 6-5. The permit review for the Edom Hill Landfill vertical expansion is currently in process and an Environmental Impact Report is being prepared. The proposed expansion would provide approximately two quarters of additional capacity to the countywide capacity shown in Chapter 3.

An amendment to the Siting Element will be required if expansions or landfills, other than those described in this chapter, are identified in the future.

6.4 VOLUMETRIC CAPACITY AND LIFE EXPECTANCY PROJECTIONS

The projections of volumetric capacity and life expectancy for the Lamb Canyon, Badlands, El Sobrante and Edom Hill Landfills, shown in Tables 6-1 through 6-3 and 6-5, use information from a District study, which was completed in June 1995. Assumptions were used in this disposal-based projection that would result in the highest rate of consumption of landfill capacity or a "worst-case" disposal capacity needs. These assumptions include:

- a) It was assumed that the 1995 wastestream sources would continue to utilize permitted County landfills throughout the 15-year forecast period.
- b) No waste will be diverted to transfer stations or Materials Recovery Facilities. (It should be noted, however, that the Moreno Valley MRF has begun operations, the Perris MRF is scheduled to begin operations in the Fall of 1996, and the Coachella Valley transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by the Fall of 1998.)
- c) Disposal tonnage will not increase from 1995 to 2000 at all landfills, except at the Blythe Landfill where disposal will increase 4% annually. Disposal tonnage will grow 2% annually at all landfills after the year 2000.
- d) No imported municipal solid waste will consume landfill capacity during the projection period. Although El Sobrante Landfill currently accepts imported waste, the projected volumetric capacity and life expectancy for the El Sobrante Landfill reflects only the capacity that is allocated for residents of Riverside County and its cities.

The projected volumetric capacity and life expectancy of the proposed lateral/vertical expansions, as shown in Tables 6-1 through 6-3 and 6-5, will be refined during the environmental review and permitting processes, when final site design and engineering occur. These projections may also be affected by any system modifications of waste flow, increases in waste generation or diversion, or other factors. Any significant changes will be addressed in the Annual Review of Progress Towards Solid Waste Disposal Goals and the Five-Year Review and Revision of the CIWMP.

Table 6-4 is based on information provided by MRC for the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center. The study, which was performed by the District to project the volumetric capacity and life expectancy of the county's landfills, did not account for the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center as a disposal alternative. If waste from the county and its cities is disposed at the Eagle Mountain Landfill or at landfills outside Riverside County, the life expectancy at the Lamb Canyon, Badlands, El Sobrante or Edom Hill Landfills could increase. Landfills in the Coachella Valley may reach capacity by 2006, which will result in a need to export trash outside the Valley to landfills inside or outside the county.



6 - 4

TABLE 6-1LAMB CANYON LANDFILL PROPOSED EXPANSION

1. Facility Type

The proposed project is a lateral expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill with the same Class III classification as the existing landfill. The landfill expansion will include containment features which comply with new Federal landfill design standards for new landfills and lateral landfill expansions (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart D, Section 258.40[b]).

2. Location

The area proposed for expansion adjoins the existing Lamb Canyon Landfill in the unincorporated area of Riverside County, south of the City of Beaumont, at 16411 Lamb Canyon Road, Beaumont, CA.

3. Size

The total site acreage of the Lamb Canyon Landfill is currently 788 acres. Approximately 74 acres has been used for landfilling. The proposed expansion is subject to the acquisition of 354.5 acres of private property which is located on the southwest and northwest side of the current fill area. The proposed expansion also includes approximately 283 acres of the current landfill holding. Only a portion of the expansion area would be used for landfilling.

4. Volumetric Capacity

This landfill expansion will provide additional disposal capacity of 20,833,333 or more cubic yards (12,500,000 or more tons).

5. Life Expectancy

Without the expansion, the Lamb Canyon Landfill is planned for closure in 2006. This landfill expansion will add more than 30 years to the Lamb Canyon Landfill site life, extending the life of the site to at least the year 2036.

6. Expansion Options

Other than the expansion described herein, no additional expansion of the Lamb Canyon Landfill is being considered at this time.

7. Postclosure Uses

In accordance with state and federal landfill requirements, there will be 30 years of post-closure monitoring and maintenance after the landfill is closed. During this period, the site will be used as undeveloped open space.

8. Consistency With Waste Diversion Goals and Required Minimum Waste Disposal Capacity

Current diversion programs will continue so long as they contribute to the county and its cities' diversion goals. This landfill expansion will contribute to the minimum 15-year disposal capacity that is required by the State.



6 - 6

TABLE 6-2 BADLANDS LANDFILL PROPOSED EXPANSION

1. Facility Type

The proposed project is a lateral expansion of the Badlands Landfill with the same Class III classification as the existing landfill. The landfill expansion will include containment features which comply with new Federal landfill design standards for new landfills and lateral landfill expansions (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart D, Section 258.40[b]).

2. Location

The area proposed for expansion adjoins the existing Badlands Landfill which is located in the unincorporated area of Riverside County, east of the City of Moreno Valley, north of State Highway 60 at 31125 Ironwood Avenue, Moreno Valley, CA.

3. Size

The total site acreage of the Badlands Landfill is 1081 acres. The currently permitted disposal area is 141 acres. The proposed expansion area includes approximately 851 acres, a small portion which needs to be obtained from the Riverside County Regional Parks and Open Space District. Only a portion of the expansion area would be used for landfilling.

4. Volumetric Capacity

This proposed expansion area will provide additional disposal capacity of more than 33 million cubic yards (20 million or more tons).

5. Life Expectancy

Without the expansion, the Badlands Landfill is planned for closure in 2010. This landfill expansion will add approximately 23 years to the Badlands Landfill site life, extending the life of the site to the year 2033.

6. Expansion Options

Other than the expansion described herein, no additional expansion of the Badlands Landfill is being considered at this time.

7. **Postclosure Uses**

In accordance with state and federal landfill requirements, there will be 30 years of post-closure monitoring and maintenance after the landfill is closed. During this period, the site will be used as undeveloped open space.

8. Consistency With Waste Diversion Goals and Required Minimum Waste Disposal Capacity

Current diversion programs will continue so long as they contribute to the county's and its cities' diversion goals. This landfill expansion will contribute to the minimum 15-year disposal capacity that is required by the State.


TABLE 6-3 EL SOBRANTE LANDFILL PROPOSED EXPANSION

1. Facility Type

The proposed project is a lateral and vertical expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill with the same Class III classification as the existing landfill. The landfill expansion will include containment features which comply with new Federal landfill design standards for new landfills and lateral landfill expansion (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart D, Section 258.40[b]).

2. Location

The area proposed for expansion includes the existing landfill and areas adjoining the existing El Sobrante Landfill which is located in the unincorporated area of Riverside County, 5 miles south of the City of Corona, east of Temescal Canyon Road and Interstate 15 at 10910 Dawson Canyon Road, Corona, CA.

3. Size

The currently permitted disposal area at El Sobrante Landfill is 90 acres. Under the expansion, waste would be disposed of on these 90 acres and on an additional 405 acres, for a project total of 495 acres. Support areas, cut and fill slopes and drainage areas disturb an additional 150 acres in both the existing and proposed expansion, resulting in a project total of 645 acres of disturbance on a 1322 acre site.

4. Volumetric Capacity

The proposed expansion area will provide additional disposal capacity of 100 million tons (179.7 million cubic yards). "Based on the draft business agreement currently being negotiated for the expansion, 40 percent of the capacity of the expansion is reserved exclusively for waste generated in the county and its cities; however, in the event the expansion does not reach 100 million tons as proposed, a minimum of 25 million tons (i.e., 44.9 million cubic yards) of capacity would be reserved exclusively for waste generated in the county and its cities."¹

5. Life Expectancy

Without the expansion, the El Sobrante Landfill will reach capacity in 2005. This landfill expansion will add approximately 30 years to the El Sobrante Landfill, extending the life of the landfill to beyond the year 2035.

6. Expansion Options

Other than the expansion described herein, no additional expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill is being considered at this time.

7. **Postclosure Uses**

In accordance with state and federal landfill requirements, there will be 30 years of post-closure monitoring and maintenance after the landfill is closed. During this period the site will be used as undeveloped open space/habitat preserve.

8. Consistency With Waste Diversion Goals and Required Minimum Waste Disposal Capacity

Current diversion programs will continue so long as they contribute to the county's and its cities' diversion goals. This landfill expansion will contribute to the minimum 15-year disposal capacity that is required by the State.

¹Correspondence from Environmental Solutions, Inc., dated December 12, 1995 on file with the District.



TABLE 6-4 EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER PROPOSAL

1. Facility Type

The proposed facility is a new landfill with a Class III classification. The new landfill will include containment features which comply with new Federal landfill design standards for new landfills and lateral landfill expansions (40 CFR, Part 258, Subpart D, Section 258.40[b]).

2. Location

The area proposed for the new landfill is located in an abandoned iron ore mine at Eagle Mountain in the unincorporated area of eastern Riverside County, 10 miles northwest of the community of Desert Center.

3. Size

The total site acreage of the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center is approximately 4,654 acres. The total acreage of the Eagle Mountain Landfill footprint, as proposed, is 2,164 acres.

4. Volumetric Capacity

The total volume of the Eagle Mountain Landfill as proposed at ultimate buildout is 708 million tons. "Mine Reclamation Corporation has proposed to guarantee unlimited disposal capacity to Riverside County and its cities."²

5. Life Expectancy

This landfill is expected to have a life expectancy of approximately 100 years.

6. Expansion Options

Not applicable as this is a proposed new landfill.

7. **Postclosure Uses**

In accordance with state and federal landfill requirements, there will be 30 years of post-closure monitoring and maintenance after the landfill is closed. During this period, the site will be used as undeveloped open space.

8. Consistency With Waste Diversion Goals and Required Minimum Waste Disposal Capacity

Diversion programs which are currently in existence will continue so long as they contribute to the county's and its cities' diversion goals. This landfill expansion will contribute to the minimum 15-year disposal capacity that is required by the State.

²Correspondence from MRC, dated December 12, 1995 on file with the District.



TABLE 6-5 EDOM HILL LANDFILL VERTICAL EXPANSION

1. Facility Type

The proposed project is a vertical expansion of the Edom Hill Landfill with the same Class III classification as the existing landfill. The proposal is for a vertical landfill expansion above an existing landfill footprint and will comply with all Federal, State and local regulations.

2. Location

The area proposed for expansion is at the existing Edom Hill Landfill in the unincorporated area of Riverside County, east of and immediately adjacent to the City of Cathedral City, at 70-100 Varner Road, Cathedral City, CA.

3. Size

The total site acreage of the Edom Hill Landfill is currently 640 acres. The permit proposes to add an additional 15 acres for the purposes of constructing a sedimentation basin, which would reduce drainage impacts from the existing landfill, as well as the proposed expansion. Approximately 148 acres has been used for landfilling. The proposed vertical expansion will be located above this existing footprint.

4. Volumetric Capacity

This landfill expansion will provide additional disposal capacity of 1,184,169 or more cubic yards (709,083 or more tons).

5. Life Expectancy

Without the expansion, the Edom Hill Landfill is planned for closure in 2006. This vertical landfill expansion will add approximately four more years to the Edom Hill Landfill site life, extending the life of the site to at least the year 2010.³

6. Expansion Options

Other than the expansion described herein, no additional expansion of the Edom Hill Landfill is being considered at this time.

7. Postclosure Uses

In accordance with state and federal landfill requirements, there will be 30 years of post-closure care and maintenance after the landfill is closed. During this period, the site will be used as undeveloped open space.

8. Consistency With Waste Diversion Goals and Required Minimum Waste Disposal Capacity

Current diversion programs will continue so long as they contribute to the county and its cities' diversion goals. This landfill expansion will contribute to the minimum 15-year disposal capacity that is required by the State.

If wastestreams from the Coachella and Mecca II Landfills are diverted to the Edom Hill Landfill, the estimated closure date for the Edom Hill Landfill with the expansion may be the year 2004.

Chapter 7

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of a discussion on the general plan consistency of proposed landfill expansions or proposed new solid waste disposal facilities. Proposed areas that are not situated in, coextensive with, or adjacent to an area authorized for land use as a solid waste disposal facility may be "tentatively reserved" for future or expanded solid waste disposal facilities. By the first five-year revision of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), the areas that have been tentatively reserved, to ensure that a minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity is maintained, must meet the requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41702. This Section requires general plan consistency for new solid waste facilities. Specific requirements for this chapter of the Siting Element are contained in Section 18756.3, California Code of Regulations (CCR).

7.2 THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN

The Badlands, Lamb Canyon, El Sobrante and Edom Hill Landfills and their expansions, as well as the proposed Eagle Mountain landfill, are all located in the unincorporated area of Riverside County and are therefore required to be consistent with the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan (General Plan). The General Plan requires a four-step review process to determine general plan consistency.

First Step: Determining consistency with the Open Space and Conservation map and policies.

The Open Space and Conservation map and policies specifically permit landfills in the following open space areas: Mountainous Areas, Desert Areas, and Agriculture Areas. The Parks/Forests designation permits limited resource development, as allowed by park authorities. Other Open Space and Conservation categories include: Water Resources/Flooding, Stringfellow Hazardous Waste Disposal Site, Wildlife and Vegetation, Mineral Resources, Adopted Specific Plans and Regional Trails.

Second Step: Review of environmental hazards and resources.

The Composite Hazards Map and Composite Resources Map indicate those areas within the County where land uses may be limited due to environmental hazards and environmental resources. The purpose of this review is to identify when an environmental hazard or resource affects the siting of a new land use, including a landfill expansion or new landfill. The screening and siting criteria used to evaluate potential landfill sites are based, in part, on applicable General Plan policies

CIWMP

Third Step: Land use planning area review.

While land use planning area policies do not specifically address landfills, review for land use compatibility is required in the siting criteria.

Fourth Step: Land use category review and land use determination, including compliance with the Public Facilities and Services Element.

The Land Use Category Review and Land Use Determination section of the General Plan identifies five (5) land use categories. Landfills are not permitted in Category I (Heavy Urban) areas. Class II and III waste disposal facilities are permitted in Category II (Urban) areas if the landfill complies with the following land use policies:

- 1. A proposed waste disposal facility . . . must be consistent with the land use standards of the Hazardous Materials and Waste section of the Environmental Hazards and Resources Element and the County Solid Waste Management Plan (CoSWMP).
- 2. All Federal, State and local regulations must be met.
- 3. All significant environmental resources must be mitigated.¹

According to the General Plan, a Class II and III landfill may be appropriate within Category III (Rural) areas if it is consistent with both CoSWMP, and with Category II policies 2 and 3, as shown above. A Class I, II or III landfill may be appropriate in Category IV (Outlying Areas) if it complies with the solid waste policies listed for Category II. Category V areas apply to specific plans and do not address the potential development of a landfill. It should be noted that the proposed landfill expansions and the new Eagle Mountain Landfill are proposed to be Class III landfills.

7.3 GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY OF PROPOSED EXPANSIONS AND NEW LANDFILL

Lamb Canyon Landfill Expansion

The proposed expansion at the Lamb Canyon Landfill is located in the "Mountainous Areas" designation on the Open Space and Conservation Map. The Composite Environmental Hazards Map (Figure VI.30 of the General Plan) shows the current landfill property. The expansion area, which includes private property northwest and southwest of the current fill area, is shown as "Major Topographic Features" and "Fire Hazard Area" on the Hazards Map (Figure VI.30 of the

¹County of Riverside Comprehensive General Plan, Fourth Edition, Amended December 19, 1989, p.168.

General Plan). No environmental resources are shown for the site on the Composite Environmental Resources Map (Figure VI.32 of the General Plan). The Lamb Canyon Landfill and the proposed expansion are located in the San Gorgonio Pass Land Use Planning Area. The proposed expansion is consistent with the Land Use Planning Area and Category IV land use policies.

Badlands Landfill Expansion

The proposed expansion at the Badlands Landfill is located in a "Parks/Forests" classification on the Open Space and Conservation Map. The "Parks/Forests" designation reflects the De Anza Cycle Park which was formerly operated by the Riverside County Regional Parks and Open Space District on property adjoining the Badlands Landfill. The Riverside County Board of Supervisors has found the Badlands Landfill to be a compatible use, consistent with the General Plan.

The Composite Environmental Hazards Map (Figure VI.30 of the General Plan) identifies the Badlands Landfill and expansion area as a landfill. The southern portion of the expansion borders areas identified as "Wildlife" on the Composite Environmental Resources Map (Figure VI.32 of the General Plan). This area reflects the range of the Stephens Kangaroo Rat (SKR), a federally listed endangered species. The Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted a Short-Term Stephens Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan in 1990 which the District could utilize if SKR is found on the site.²

The existing landfill area and the proposed expansion area are located in the San Gorgonio Pass Land Use Planning Area. The proposed expansion is consistent with the Land Use Planning Area and Category IV land use policies.

El Sobrante Landfill Expansion

The Open Space and Conservation Map designates the majority of the expansion site as "Mountainous Areas." As noted in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the El Sobrante Landfill Expansion, "approximately 40 acres of the expansion site is designated as "Rural"; however, no landfill development is planned in this area."³ The Composite Environmental Hazards Map (Figure VI.30 of the General Plan) shows "Major Topographic Features" and "Fire Hazard Areas" in the landfill expansion area. The Composite Environmental Resources Map (Figure VI.32 of the General Plan) shows that the site contains "Wildlife

²The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, dated February 1995, was recently submitted to federal and local agencies for their review. This plan may replace the Short-Term Plan, following environmental review and federal and local approvals. The District will comply with the effective document to ensure mitigation for the SKR.

³Draft Environmental Impact Report El Sobrante Landfill Expansion, State Clearinghouse No. 90020076, Environmental Solutions, Inc., April 1994, p. 4.4-2.

Resources." The expansion has the potential to impact Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR), California gnatcatcher, and several sensitive animal and plant species. The EIR for the proposed expansion, consisting of the Draft EIR, dated April 1994, and the Final EIR, dated April 1996, outlines extensive mitigation that includes such measures as the conveyance of 292 acres of the eastern portion of the project property as part of a permanent multi-species reserve, the nondisturbance of an additional 180 acres, and, upon completion of the landfill expansion, the conveyance of the acreage utilized for the landfill (approximately 645 acres) by a conservation easement.

Additionally, the expansion area of the landfill is located within the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Core Reserve of the SKR Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Western Riverside County, dated February 1995. The expansion area is identified as "land under negotiation for conservation easements." The HCP includes discussion of the proposed SKR mitigation for the expansion of the landfill, including the dedication of a portion of tipping fees to SKR conservation revenues and the advanced payment of \$500,000 of these funds to the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA). The SKR HCP acknowledges that the revenue source is dependent upon approval of the landfill expansion.

The El Sobrante Landfill and proposed expansion are located within two Community Planning Areas: Temescal/El Cerrito and Lake Mathews. The Temescal/El Cerrito Community Plan (TECCP) specifies that development proposals within one mile of the landfill boundary (as designated on the Land Use Allocation Map) must be compatible with the landfill and be submitted to the County Waste Management Department (now District) for review. The landfill expansion is located entirely within the Lake Mathews Community Plan (LMCP) and is consistent with the designation of "Mountainous." The proposed expansion is also consistent with Category III policies.

Eagle Mountain Landfill

The proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill is shown on the Open Space and Conservation Map primarily as "Mountainous Areas," with a portion designated as "Mineral Resources" and "Desert Areas." The proposed landfill is not consistent with the General Plan land use designation of "Mineral Resources." The project proponent, Mine Reclamation Corporation (MRC), has filed a General Plan Amendment with the County of Riverside. The amendment will also address the project's inconsistency with the land use policy for the Eagle Mountain area, which allow open space uses and possible reactivation of mining uses and do not address landfilling operations.

Because the site is not consistent with the General Plan, the site will be "tentatively reserved" as permitted by Section 18756.3 (c). By the first five-year revision of the CIWMP, the Eagle Mountain Landfill proposal must meet the requirements of PRC Section 41702.

Edom Hill Landfill Vertical Expansion

The Edom Hill Landfill includes 640 acres in the unincorporated area of Riverside County. The proposed expansion is on the existing landfill footprint of 148 acres. The existing landfill and the proposed expansion are located in the "Desert Areas" designation on the Open Space and Conservation Map. The Composite Environmental Hazards Map (Figure VI.30 of the General Plan) shows the current landfill property. The General Plan shows that the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone crosses the site and the northern half of the site has Major Topographic Features.

The Composite Environmental Resources Map (Figure VI.32 of the General Plan) shows the site has Wildlife Resources. The Coachella Valley Fringe-Toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) specifically excludes the Edom Hill Landfill site from any HCP mitigation fee. The HCP states: "This land use [Edom Hill Landfill] will not be restricted by the HCP. The Palm Springs Disposal Site [known as the Edom Hill Landfill] will be exempt from mitigation fees as an existing use, and as a governmental project (VI-19)."⁴

The Edom Hill Landfill is located in the Upper Coachella Valley Land Use Planning Area. The Coachella Valley Community Policies include dust control standards, currently applied at the landfill. The Western Coachella Valley Plan shows the Edom Hill Landfill as a Public Facility. The proposed expansion is consistent with the Land Use Planning Area and Category IV land use policies.

7.4 AMENDING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN

In the Public Facilities and Services Element, the General Plan provides policies regarding solid waste disposal. As required by the Element, all active County landfills are identified on the Public Services Map, Figure IV.17 of the General Plan, and comply with the General Plan's Solid Waste Objectives, Programs and Land Use Standards.

The County will initiate a General Plan Amendment to update the General Plan so that it replaces all references to the CoSWMP and accurately references the CIWMP and its elements in the Land Use Category Review and Land Use Determination and Solid Waste Sections. The Public Services Map (Figure IV.17 of the General Plan) can also be updated to reflect new landfills/expansions.

⁴Correspondence from RECON Regional Environmental Consultants, quoting Section VI of the HCP, letter dated November 17, 1993.

Chapter 8

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL STRATEGIES WHEN SITES FOR ADDITIONAL CAPACITY ARE NOT AVAILABLE

8.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, alternative strategies for disposal of waste from Riverside County and its cities are identified. Specific requirements are contained in Section 18756.5 California Code of Regulations (CCR). The regulations require that counties that cannot provide 15 years of disposal capacity, either through existing or planned disposal facilities, must provide an explanation as to why new disposal sites or expansion are not proposed. Additionally, these jurisdictions must describe how the 15-year capacity will be attained without new or expanded facilities.

8.2 ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION AND DISPOSAL

Riverside County is not required to develop alternative strategies for solid waste diversion and disposal because the County has sufficient disposal capacity for the next 15 years with the proposed expansions at Badlands, Lamb Canyon, and El Sobrante Landfills and the new Eagle Mountain Landfill. Any of these expansions, or development of the Eagle Mountain Landfill, will ensure that Riverside County has a planned disposal capacity well in excess of the 15 years of capacity required by state law.

On an ongoing basis, the District continues to evaluate alternative strategies which will provide a cost-effective system for the long-term benefit of residents of the County and its cities. As part of this effort, the District, in cooperation with the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), financed a yearlong extensive system review study by Hilton, Farnkopf & Hobson (HF&H). The computer model developed by HF&H to assess both current waste management practices and future viable management scenarios to the benefit of all facilities' users throughout the County will continue to be applied to various waste management options to aid in formulating recommendations for a cost-effective waste management system.

The County and its cities will continue to consider alternative disposal strategies which may offer economic and environmental benefits to waste disposal system users. The following is a discussion of some alternative disposal strategies:

Alternative Disposal Sites

Alternative disposal facilities may be considered by the County and its cities due to the closure of local landfills or economic factors. Landfill capacity is unevenly distributed within the County.

CIWMP

Some areas within the County, such as the Coachella Valley, may face a shortage of local disposal capacity. Upon closure of the Coachella Landfill in 1996, the Coachella Valley may be required to consider: (1) exporting waste to the Edom Hill Landfill; (2) exporting to other County landfills; or (3) exporting to landfills outside the County.

The County and its cities have not ruled out the export of waste to other jurisdictions outside of the County if that option is more economical than using landfills within the County. Possible outof-county options include landfills in Orange, San Diego, or Los Angeles Counties; rail haul facilities, such as the proposed Bolo Station Landfill in San Bernardino County or Mesquite Regional Landfill in Imperial County; or facilities in other states, such as the La Paz or Butterfield Landfills in Arizona.

Landfill Mining

Landfill mining/reclamation is one technology which could extend the life of landfills in Riverside County. Mining or reclamation of landfills is defined as the "...recovery and reuse of solid waste from landfills, waste piles, and disposal sites..."¹ At disposal sites, cover material can be reclaimed and valuable materials, i.e. ferrous metal, aluminum, white goods, etc., can be sold or reused. The remaining waste is then replaced in the landfill, or in some instances, converted to energy. Some other potential benefits can include:

- a) Reducing groundwater contamination from leaching landfills;
- b) Providing space for the deposition of new Municipal Solid Waste (MSW);
- c) Redesigning excavated landfills to include new technologies (i.e., liners, leachate collection/treatment, monitoring, etc.); and,
- d) Reducing the cost or need for new sanitary landfills.²

Prior to determining if landfill mining is appropriate, numerous issues must be considered, including:

a) Worker/community safety due to the unknown nature of materials which may have been landfilled historically and the possible release of gas from a landfill cell;

¹Scott Walker, Regulatory Overview of Landfill Reclamation in California, California Integrated Waste Management Board, Prepared for: Reclaiming Landfills - The New Solution for Sanitary and Hazardous Waste Landfills, March 24, 25, 26, 1993, San Jose, CA.

²Cross/Tessitore & Associates, "Overview Landfill Mining - The Future in Solid Waste Management," prepared for Randolph, Breyer & Associates Sanitary Landfill Mining Conferences, Chicago, Illinois, March 3, 4, and 5 1993.

- b) The ecological impact to plants and animals from contaminated dust generated by the excavation and moving of potentially contaminated waste;
- c) The special oversite and cost of the removal of hazardous materials (if present);
- d) Management of ground and surface water as well as leachate (if present) to comply with regulations;
- e) Control of slopes and structures to avoid earth movements that are considered detrimental to the reclamation operation or adjacent structures; and,
- f) Nuisance issues, such as odor, noise, dust or litter must be controlled.³

Alternative Technologies

Alternative technologies may also be useful in extending existing landfill capacity. Alternative technologies, i.e. transformation facilities (waste-to-energy facilities), can extend the life of landfills by reducing the amount of waste which is received at the landfills.

Further study and testing of these systems are needed to determine if they are economically feasible.⁴ The Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) is funding a study by the University of California at Riverside to develop a prototype plant to convert green waste and landfill gas into methanol gas.

The City of Palm Springs, through its evaluation of the Bedminster municipal solid waste cocomposting process, is investigating post-processing of the non-compostable residuals. Once metals have been recovered, the residual is 80-90% plastic by volume. The City has asked Bedminster to examine using a pyrolytic process (high heat, oxygen-free) to reclaim the energy value of the material without burning trash. According to the City (John Raymond, Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator), a combination of the two technologies could yield a 90-95% diversion rate in a costeffective, environmentally sound manner. The decision to add the second-stage processing hinges on its cost-effectiveness and the test results on the air emissions potentially released through pyrolysis itself and the combustion of the gas produced by the process (NO_X, SO_X, and particulates).⁵

³National Conference on Reclaiming Landfills, Presentation: "How to Assess Your Landfill for Mining: the Cautions," Metcalf & Eddy, Inc., 1993.

⁴"Solid Waste Management Programs in the United States", Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Environmental Programs Division, January 1996.

⁵Correspondence from City of Palm Springs, John S. Raymond, Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator, Letter dated June 24, 1996.

It is not within the scope of this Siting Element to determine how much reduction can be achieved through the use of disposal outside the County, landfill mining or alternative technologies. The District will continue to work with the Local Task Force, California Integrated Waste Management Board, Southern California Association of Governments, Western Riverside Council of Governments, Coachella Valley Association of Governments and cities within Riverside County to develop waste disposal policies and strategies in conformance with the goals and policies listed in Chapter 2. As part of this effort, the economic and environmental factors associated with the use of landfill mining and alternative technologies would have to be considered.

Chapter 9

SITING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the programs that will be implemented by Riverside County and its cities to ensure achievement of the goals of the Siting Element, found in Chapter 2, are outlined. Specific requirements for this chapter of the Siting Element are contained in Section 18756.7 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

9.2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The Siting Element Implementation Strategy in Table 9-1 identifies each of the goals of the Siting Element, the programs that will be implemented to meet each goal, the entity that is responsible for implementing each program, the schedule by which each program will be implemented, and the revenue source(s) that will be utilized to implement each program. Not only will many of these programs serve to accomplish more than one goal, but many are established and ongoing programs, that are administered by either the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District), cities in Riverside County, Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), the Riverside County Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), the Riverside County Environmental Health Department, or some combination thereof.

9.3 PROPOSED LANDFILL PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

In Chapter 6, the plans for landfill expansions and the siting of new landfills in Riverside County were addressed. These plans include the lateral expansion of the Lamb Canyon and Badlands Landfills, the vertical and lateral expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill, the development of the Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center and the vertical expansion of the Edom Hill Landfill. The entity or agency responsible for monitoring the different tasks in the permitting of these proposed projects is identified in Table 9-2. The schedule by which each of these tasks in the permitting process will be implemented is outlined in Table 9-3. The dates that are indicated in the schedule are tentative and reflect when tasks are tentatively planned to be initiated. The revenue sources or funding that have been initially identified to be used to complete the different tasks in the permitting process are indicated in Table 9-4. The reference to "corporate" revenue sources was used for the El Sobrante Landfill and Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center (if approved) because the landfills are under private ownership. Other revenue sources or funding may be utilized if available.

Multiple factors affect the decision and timing to expand or site new landfill facilities, such as economic trends, recycling rates, rates of disposal and new legislation and regulations. Other regulatory factors which may also have an effect are environmental review, local land use approval, and solid waste permitting. The development of expanded or new disposal capacity demands significant agency or operator resources, including time, financing and staff. The annual and five-year reports will provide updates regarding the progress in completing these efforts in accordance with Sections 18787 and 18788 of the CCR.

_	
TABLE 9-1	

SITING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

GOAL	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS	KESPONSIBLE ENTITY	SCHEDULE	REVENUE SOURCE
Provide for long-term disposal of non- hazardous solid waste and facilitate the future siting of new and expanded solid waste disposal facilities in Riverside County.	 Develop additional disposal capacity through landfill expansions or new landfills. Continue to monitor waste disposal rates and landfill capacities to assess potential needs. Process Siting Element amendments for proposed expansions or new landfills not already identified in the Element. Conserve landfill capacity by improving landfill operations and/or the use of new technologies. Review less expensive disposal options outside the Countywide system. 	 District, Riverside County Local Task Force (LTF) District, LTF, WRCOG, CVAG, cities District District, LEA District, LTF, WRCOG, CVAG, cities 	 As outlined in Table 3. Ongoing 3. To be determined for any new proposal 4. Ongoing 5. Ongoing 	 Revenue sources are discussed in Table 9.4 Tipping Fees Newly proposed facilities will identify revenue source Tipping Fees & Grants, if available Tipping Fees
Protect the health, safety and welfare of residents of Riverside County and its cities by ensuring safe disposal of non- hazardous solid wastes.	 Monitor state and federal legislation concerning landfill siting and operations. Ensure compliance with these regulations. Monitor implementation of Solid Waste Facility Permit requirements and agency requirements regarding protecting air and water quality. Continue the District's Load Checking Program to minimize household hazardous waste (HHW) entering landfills. Continue to implement programs which educate County/city residents on how to properly dispose of HHW. 	 District, LTF, LEA District, LEA, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) District, LEA District, LEA District, Cities, CVAG, WRCOG, Environmental Health Department 	1,2,3,4. Ongoing	1,2,3,4. Tipping Frees, Agency Funding, Agency Permitting Fees and Grants
Provide for economical disposal of non- hazardous wastes.	 I. Identify additional areas for future landfill expansion, if needed. Evaluate alternative waste methods and systems, including, but not limited to: use of transfer stations, Materials Recovery Facilities, small vs. regional landfills, in-county vs. out-of-county disposal, new technology for landfill operations, landfill mining and alternative technology for waste disposal. 	1. District, LTF 2. District, LTF, Cities, WRCOG, CVAG	 Based upon capacity needs Ongoing 	1,2. Tipping Fees, Agency funding and revenues

GOAL	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS	RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	SCHEDULE	REVENUE SOURCE
Maximize the use of all feasible source reduction (waste prevention), reuse, recycling and composting programs to reduce solid waste disposal in order to extend the life of landfills.	 Continue and expand programs within the County's and cities' Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) and Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs). Support land use proposals which assist in recycling and composting programs. 	 District, LTF, Cities COGS want to be listed here but are they a responsible agency? District, Cities 	1,2. Ongoing	 Agency funding, revenues and grants when available Permitting fices
Comply with regulatory requirements for the preparation of the Siting Element, Annual Review of Progress, and the five- year review and revision of the Countywide Integrated Wanagement Plan. (CIWMP).	 Comply with State requirements for the preparation of the Siting Element. Prepare Annual Review of Progress, and five-year review and revision of the CIWMP, in accordance with Sections 18787 and 18788. Process a Comprehensive General Plan Amendment to update language regarding the CIWMP. Prepare Annual Review of Progress and five-year review and revision of the cities' and County's SRRE's, HHWE's, NDFE's. 	 District District, Riverside County Planning Department Cities and District 	1. June 1996 2. Ongoing 3. 1996 4. Ongoing	1,2,,3, 4. Tipping Fees, Agency funding and revenues

TABLE 9-2

PROPOSED LANDFILL PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES

RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES	LAMB CANYON EXPANSION	BADLANDS EXPANSION	EL SOBRANTE EXPANSION	EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER	EDOM HILL EXPANSION
Facility Owner	District	District	Western Waste Industries	Mine Reclamation Corporation (MRC)	District
Facility Operator	District	District	Western Waste Industries/District in private/public partnership	MRC	District
Determination of Consistency with the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)	LTF	LTF	LTF	LTF	LTF
Environmental Review Authority	District	District	District	Riverside County Planning Department	District
Local Land Use Authority	Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Solid Waste Permit Authority	LEA	LEA	LEA	LEA	LEA
Design Engineer	District	District	Private	Private	District
Construction Management	District	District	Western Waste Industries	MRC	District

TABLE 9-3

PROPOSED LANDFILL PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

PERMITTING TASK	LAMB CANYON EXPANSION	BADLANDS EXPANSION	EL SOBRANTE EXPANSION	EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER	EDOM HILL EXPANSION
Preliminary Design	1996	1997	Completed	Completed	Completed
Environmental Review	1997	1998	1995/1996	1995/1996	1996
Facility Design	1997/2000	1997/2000	1995/1996	1995/1996	1996
Land Use Approval and Permitting	8661	1998	1995/1996	1996	1996
Facility Construction	2002/2003	2008/2009	1997 or later	1997	1996/1997
Initiation of Operations	2004	2010	1997 or later	1997	1996/1997
	G		1001 1- V 0		

Source: El Sobrante Landfill Expansion - Draft Environmental Impact Report, April 1994. Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center - Staff conversation with Rick Daniels, President of MRC, June 1995.

TABLE 9-4

PROPOSED LANDFILL PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION REVENUE SOURCES

REVENUE SOURCES	LAMB CANYON EXPANSION	BADLANDS EXPANSION	EL SOBRANTE EXPANSION	EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER	EDOM HILL EXPANSION
Corporate			X	X	
Tipping Fees	X	X	X		x

APPENDIX A

APPROACHES TAKEN TO PROJECT DISPOSAL CAPACITY NEEDS

Appendix A

Approaches Taken To Project Disposal Capacity Needs

A.1 Introduction

Title 14, Section 18755.3, of the California Code of Regulations requires a county to demonstrate in the Siting Element that it can meet a required minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity. The regulations also require a county to consider the total amount of solid waste generated, the existing remainder of combined permitted disposal capacity, and an estimate of the total disposal capacity needed for the required 15-year period.

In order to develop these projections, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (District) staff applied two different analytical approaches to project the combined disposal capacity of Riverside County landfills over the next 15 years; a Waste-Generation-Based Approach and a Disposal-Based Approach.

A.2 Waste-Generation-Based Approach

The Waste-Generation-Based Approach is considered the Integrated Waste Management Board's (IWMB) recommended approach to calculate the remaining disposal capacity. It is based upon the amount of solid waste generated and the diversion rate.

In the *Model Siting Element* provided by the IWMB, it is recommended that the Disposal Capacity Projections in the Disposal Facility Capacity Component of the Source Reduction Recycling Element be utilized as a method to project waste generation. These Disposal Capacity Projections were based upon the Waste Generation Study that each County was required to prepare. The Riverside County Waste Generation Study (WGS), which was prepared in 1991, proved to be an unreliable source for waste generation information for the following reasons: 1) The WGS utilized high population growth factors and high economic growth factors, based upon the growth evidenced in the 1980's (the population and economic growth factors for the 1990's are, in fact, less than that projected); and, 2) The WGS covered the period from 1990 to 2005, which is five years short of the 15-year capacity needs projection period, requiring the District to project the growth rate for the remaining five years.

To update the Solid Waste Generation Data Projections in the WGS would require updating the population projections. Population projections are provided by both the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the California Department of Finance (DOF). However, because of the different projection modeling used by each, the growth factors are different, resulting in divergent waste generation figures. The SCAG growth projections are also provided on ten-year intervals, requiring interpolation of each year's growth rate. This method also assumes a direct correlation between population growth and increased waste generation.

However, population growth has not had a correlating increase in disposal as shown in Table A-6, which shows population increasing while disposal decreased from 1990 to 1994.

Additionally, using the Waste-Generation-Based Approach requires a projection of the diversion rate in order to calculate the disposal tonnage. The IWMB Disposal Reduction Calculation, which is a formula to calculate the diversion rate, uses various demographic and economic indices, as well as, the total disposed tonnage. To predict future diversion performance using this formula requires projecting each of these factors over 15 years.

A.2.1 Application of Waste-Generation-Based Approach

In order to compare the effects of different population growth projections, five different projection scenarios were prepared. These scenarios are shown in Tables A-1 to A-5. Waste generation for 1994 was the starting point for projecting waste generation from 1995 to 2010. It should be noted, however, that the 1994 waste generation figure could be calculated in three different ways, as follows:

- 1. The Countywide waste generation figure that was denoted for 1994 in the WGS could be used (based upon SCAG population projections which utilized 1980 census data).
- 2. The Countywide waste generation figure that was denoted for 1990 in the WGS could be used to calculate waste generation for 1991 and each year thereafter through 1994 by applying the corresponding projected growth rate (based upon DOF population projections published in its 1993 Population Series which utilized 1990 census data).
- 3. The recorded amount of waste disposed in 1994 could be used to calculate waste generation in 1994 by adding this disposal tonnage to the amount of waste diverted in 1994 (based upon the IWMB Disposal Reduction Calculation).

Each of the five scenarios used one of these three methods to calculate the 1994 waste generation figure. These scenarios are more fully described as follows:

- 1. Table A-1 represents a scenario that used the WGS's 1994 waste generation figure as the starting point for the projection of waste generation. DOF population growth rates were utilized to project waste generation from 1995 to 2010. Waste diversion was assumed to be at a rate of 25% in 1995, increasing in equal increments to 50% in the year 2000, and remaining at 50% beyond the year 2000.
- 2. Table A-2 represents a scenario that used the WGS's 1990 waste generation figure and DOF's population growth rates for 1991 through 1994 to calculate the amount of waste generation for 1994. Using the 1994 waste generation figure, the DOF's population growth rates for the next 15 years were then applied to calculate waste generation for each of these 15 years. Under this scenario, the waste diversion was also assumed to be a rate

of 25% in 1995, increasing in equal increments to 50% in the year 2000, and remaining at 50% thereafter.

- 3. Table A-3 represents a scenario that used the WGS's 1994 waste generation figure as the starting point for the projection of waste generation. Population growth from 1995 to 2010 was calculated using polynomial interpolation of SCAG's long range population projection to the year 2020. Under this scenario, the waste diversion was also assumed to be at a rate of 25% in 1995, increasing in equal increments to 50% in the year 2000, and remaining at 50% thereafter.
- 4. Table A-4 represents a scenario that used the recorded disposal tonnage for 1994 and the Countywide diversion rate of 46.5% for 1994, as calculated using the IWMB Disposal Reduction Calculation, to project the starting waste generation figure in 1994. Waste generation from 1995 to 2010 was projected by applying the DOF's population growth rate for those years. Under this scenario, waste diversion was assumed to increase equally from 46.5% in 1994 to 50% in the year 2000, remaining at 50% beyond the year 2000.
- 5. Table A-5 represents a scenario that used the WGS's 1994 waste generation figure as the starting point for the 15-year waste generation projection. DOF's population growth rates for the 15 years were used to project waste generation. Under this scenario, waste diversion was assumed to increase equally from 46.5% in 1994 to 50% in the year 2000, remaining at 50% thereafter.

As shown in Tables A-1 to A-5, the projected disposal capacity needs vary substantially from one scenario to another scenario, with a difference of up to four years of disposal capacity needs between the "best-case" and "worst-case" scenarios. Moreover, these results have demonstrated that the Waste-Generation-Based Approach is (1) very sensitive to the starting waste generation data, (2) sensitive to population growth rates, and (3) more sensitive to growth in waste generation than waste diversion.

A.2.2 Disposal-Based Approach

The Disposal-Based Approach is based upon the District's Landfill Closure Projection Study that was prepared in the Spring of 1995. The District Study utilized actual landfill disposal data recorded over the past five years (1990 to 1994) to determine disposal growth factors. Based on the disposal trend represented by these five years of data, it was assumed that disposal at all landfills, except the Blythe Landfill, will experience no growth between the years 1995 and 2000. After 2000, disposal at all landfills was assumed to grow at 2% annually. The no-growth assumption for the landfills that serve the majority of the County's population was based on the expectation that economic growth, which is a determinant factor for waste generation, would be slow during this 5-year period. Moreover, it is expected that any growth in waste generation due to population growth would likely be offset by increasing waste diversion through the existing and proposed source reduction and recycling programs by the County and its Cities. The view

that economic growth has a greater influence on waste generation than population growth is supported by the information contained in Table A-6, which shows an inverse relationship between Countywide population growth and disposal tonnage received at the landfills in Riverside County between the years 1990 and 1994. The unusually rapid decline in disposal tonnage between 1990 and 1993 was a clear indication of a significant decline in waste generation, which was primarily attributable to the nationwide, as well as, local economic recession taking place at that time.

The Blythe Landfill serves a small population residing in the City of Blythe and several small unincorporated communities in the eastern portion of the County. It is expected that economic and population growth for the City of Blythe and the surrounding unincorporated communities will grow at higher rates than the rest of the County in the next few years and that diversion would not be able to offset growth in waste generation. Therefore, the disposal rate for the Blythe Landfill was assumed to grow 4% annually from 1995 and 2000. After 2000, the rate of growth for this region is expected to slow down. Consequently, disposal rate for the Blythe Landfill was assumed to approximate the same estimated rate of growth (2% annually) for the rest of the County's landfills after the year 2000.

It is noteworthy that the Disposal-Based Approach does not consider waste generation and diversion from existing and future transfer stations/MRF's directly, but both are inherent in the projection; waste disposal is a function of both waste generation and diversion. Lastly, this approach was not utilized in the County's or Cities' Source Reduction And Recycling Elements.

A.3 Conclusion

The Waste-Generation-Based Approach relies on the prediction of a number of variables, including waste generation growth rates and diversion rates. The prediction of diversion rates using the State-recommended formula will add more variables, such as demographic and economic indices and disposal tonnage, to the projection equation. Because of the number of variables, the projection of disposal capacity needs will become more unreliable. Even with the replacement of the IWMB Disposal Reduction Calculation with very simple assumptions for predicting diversion rates, the Waste-Generation-Based Approach still requires reliable waste generation information for the projection of disposal capacity needs, as demonstrated in Tables A-1 through A-5. Since reliable waste generation data for Riverside County is not readily available, this approach may not produce a reliable projection of disposal capacity needs of the County.

In contrast, the Disposal-Based Approach relies only on one variable, the disposal growth factor, which was based on actual tonnage data. The District chose the Disposal-Based Approach, due to its more direct approach to calculate the County's remaining disposal capacity over the next 15 years. Consequently, waste generation and diversion are not shown in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 in Chapter 3 of the Siting Element.

Regardless of which approach is used to forecast disposal capacity needs of the County, Chapter 6 of the Siting Element identifies proposed landfill expansions and a proposed new landfill which,

if approved, could ensure adequate landfill capacity for the next 15 years and beyond. The disposal capacity needs projection in Chapter 3 will be reviewed annually as required for the Annual Review Report. Any significant changes will be identified and evaluated to determine if the Siting Element should be revised to include additional disposal capacity, in accordance with California Code of Regulations Section 18787. The Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (described in Chapter 4 of the Summary Plan) will be a valuable tool in assisting the County in monitoring landfill capacity based on actual waste disposal rates.

DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY (GENERATION-BASED) **TABLE A-1** (TONS)

0 0 0 Ö 0 255,650 6,435,696 8,619,602 13, 182, 055 2,254,868 4,314,463 0,867,337 ADDITIONAL CAPACITY NEEDED (2, 254, 868)(4, 314, 463)(6,435,639) (8,619,602)10,867,337) (13, 182, 055) REMAINING (255,650)18,882,352 4,631,219 2,616,973 5,398,319 1,685,716 16,723,817 8,870,923 7,164,987 10,693,151 3,570,171 CAPACITY ,258,018 2,158,535 DISPOSAL IN 2,092,599 2,014,246 ,822,228 ,705,937 ,766,668 ,828,148 ,884,455 ,941,365 ,999,218 2,059,595 2,121,176 2,183,963 2,247,735 2,314,718 ,923,822 **EXPORTS +** (DISPOSED **IMPORTS** ANNUAL REGION DISPOSAL | EXPORTS | IMPORTS ; \square ,999,218 2,059,595 2,121,176 2,183,963 2,247,735 2,314,718 258,018 2,158,535 2,014,246 822,228 ,828,148 ,884,455 ,941,365 2,092,599 ,923,822 ,705,937 766,668 719,512 DIVERSION ,941,365 ,999,218 2,121,176 2, 183, 963 2,314,718 ,282,548 490,914 ,766,668 ,828,148 ,884,455 2,059,595 2,247,735 **896,828** ,084,594 ,705,937 WASTE RATE 3.48% 3.87% 3.66% 3.47% 2.98% 3.08% 3.02% 2.98% 2.96% 2.92% 5.11% 3.33% 3.56% 3.02% 2.99% 2.98% GENERATION 2,878,046 3,533,336 3,656,296 3,998,436 2,738,128 3,098,840 3,206,369 3,411,873 4,119,189 367,927 1,495,470 1,629,435 3,313,142 3,768,910 1,242,353 2,989,427 3,882,731 TOTAL YEAR END 996 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2010 984 1995 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2007 2008 2009

Notes:

1. The figure for waste generation in 1994 was the 1994 waste generation figure in the Waste Generation Study

2. Population growth from 1994 to 2010 utilized Department of Finance's projections: "Total population by County by Year by Race/Ethnicity, 1993 Population Series."

3. Waste diversion rates were assumed to be 25% in 1995, increasing by 5% increments annually thereafter to reach 50% by the year 2000. The 50% diversion rate is assumed to be maintained from the year 2000 to the end of the projection period. The State formula was not used to estimate diversion.

CAP1.XLS

DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY (GENERATION-BASED) TABLE A-2 (SNOT)

÷ ,351,183 7,884,938 2,570,324 5,017,545 3,464,844 5,642,338 0, 193, 920 ADDITIONAL CAPACITY NEEDED (7,884,938)12,570,324) 15,017,545) (1,351,183) (3,464,844) (5,642,338) 10, 193, 920) 2,258,318 701,314 6,600,254 0,224,370 REMAINING **18.882,352** 4,387,867 8,297,830 6,494,239 2,693,642 4,626,441 CAPACITY **DISPOSAL IN** ,256,018 2,129,549 2,033,949 2,308,982 2,376,404 2,282,098 ,926,539 ,803,591 ,867,799 ,932,798 ,992,328 2,177,494 **EXPORTS +** 2,212,387 2,052,497 2,113,661 2,242,601 2,447,221 (DISPOSED **IMPORTS** ANNUAL REGION EXPORTS | IMPORTS C DISPOSAL 266,018 2,308,982 2,129,549 2,033,949 ,992,328 2,376,404 1,926,539 ,803,591 ,867,799 ,932,798 2,052,497 2,177,494 2,282,098 2,242,601 2,212,387 2,113,661 2,447,221 760,699 948,166 ,992,328 2,177,494 308,982 DIVERSION 355,966 576,259 ,932,798 2,052,497 2,376,404 ,146,680 ,867,799 2,113,661 2,242,601 ,803,591 2,447,221 WASTE RATE 5.11% 3.87% 3.66% 3.47% 3.33% 2.98% 3.56% 3.48% 3.08% 3.02% 2.98% 3.02% 2.99% 2.96% 2.92% 2.98% GENERATION 3,276,229 3,160,553 3,389,914 3,865,596 1,752,808 2,894,869 3,042,797 3,502,799 3,607,182 3,735,598 3,984,657 4,104,993 4,227,322 1,354,987 1,485,202 1,617,964 ,894,442 TOTAL END YEAR 694 3661 1996 1998 1999 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 1997 2000 2001

Notes:

1. The waste generation figure in 1994 was calculated by means of compounded growth from the waste generated in 1990 from the Waste Generation Study, using

Department of Finance's (DOF) projections:"Total Population By County By Year By Race/Ethnicity, 1993 Population Projection Series.

2. Population growth rates from 1994 to 2010 were adopted from DOF's 1993 Population Projection Series.

3. Waste diversion rates were assumed to be 25% in 1995, increase in 5% increments annually to reach 50% in the year 2000, and maintain at 50% to the end of the projection period. The State formula was not used to estimate diversion.

CAP2.XLS

DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY (GENERATION-BASED) TABLE A-3 (TONS)

0 0 1,298,006 10,474,258 12,930,435 15,451,947 3,493,054 8,082,420 ADDITIONAL 5,755,051 CAPACITY NEEDED (1,298,006) REMAINING 827,949 3,493,054) 10,474,258) 12,930,435) 15,451,947) 10,519,478 [5,755,051] (8,082,420) 8,596,189 6,768,715 4,863,574 8,882,352 16,721,969 14,599,954 2,527,837 2,882,607 CAPACITY 1,258,018 **DISPOSAL IN** 2,456,178 2,521,512 2,160,383 2,122,015 ,980,966 2,008,359 ,923,289 ,827,474 ,905,142 2,054,658 2,125,955 2,195,048 2,327,369 2,391,837 2,072,117 2,261,997 **EXPORTS +** (DISPOSED **IMPORTS**) ANNUAL REGION DISPOSAL | EXPORTS | IMPORTS 2,456,178 521,512 268,018 2,160,383 2,122,015 2,072,117 2,008,359 ,923,289 ,827,474 ,905,142 ,980,966 2,054,658 2,125,955 2, 195,048 2,261,997 2,327,369 2,391,837 720,128 ,338,906 DIVERSION B09,435 ,115,755 ,827,474 ,905,142 ,980,966 2,054,658 2,125,955 2, 195,048 2,456,178 2,521,512 ,573,600 2,261,997 2,327,369 2,391,837 WASTE RATE 4.25% 3.47% 3.05% 5.20% 5.24% 5.16% 5.00% 4.47% 4.52% 3.98% 3.72% 3.25% 2.89% 2.77% 2.69% 2.66% END GENERATION 3,347,266 3,031,449 3,187,872 3,496,889 3,654,948 3,810,283 3,961,933 4,109,316 4,251,910 4,523,995 4,654,738 4,783,674 4,912,355 2,738,128 4,390,097 5,043,024 2,880,511 TOTAL YEAR **1881** 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2009 2010 1996 1998 1999 2002 2008 1995 1997 2000 2001

Notes:

I. The figure for waste generation in 1994 was the 1994 waste generation figure from the Waste Generation Study.

2. Population growth from 1994 to 2010 were calculated by means of Polynomial Interpolation from SCAG's long range population projection to 2020.

3. Waste diversion rates were assumed to be 25% in 1995, increasing by 5% increments annually thereafter to reach 50% in the year 2000. The 50% diversion rate is

assumed to be maintained from the year 2000 to the end of the projection period. The State formula was not used to estimate diversion

CAP9.XLS

DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY (GENERATION-BASED) TABLE A-4 (TONS) **REMAINING ADDITIONAL** 0 0 0 0 0 0 3,016,135 4,946,433 1,140,602 6,934,254 CAPACITY NEEDED 4,946,433) 1,140,602) 3,016,135) 6,934,254) 4,166,618 8,882,352 6,230,689 4,853,249 2,004,289 0,539,274 9,022,104 7,452,136 5,833,814 2,449,739 CAPACITY 17,574,385 3,443,982 681,011 258,018 ,343,696 ,377,440 ,439,693 465,015 ,569,968 ,667,196 ,716,878 ,768,728 ,821,613 ,875,533 ,930,298 ,987,821 ,517,170 ,618,323 ,409,267 DISPOSAL IN 307,967 **EXPORTS + IMPORTS)** DISPOSED ANNUAL REGION IMPORTS EXPORTS DISPOSAL ,517,170 ,930,298 258.018 343,696 ,409,267 465,015 569,968 667,196 716,878 ,821,613 377,440 439,693 618,323 768.728 ,875,533 ,307,967 987,821 DIVERSION ,517,170 ,930,298 093,418 ,163,626 223,549 465,015 ,716,878 821,613 ,875,533 283,766 ,344,283 569,968 618,323 667,196 ,768,728 405,550 987,821 WASTE RATE 5.11% 3.87% 3.66% 3.47% 3.48% 3.08% 2.98% 2.92% 3.33% 2.98% 3.56% 3.02% 3.02% 2.99% 2.96% 2.98% GENERATION 2,471,594 2,661,206 3,236,645 2,567,245 2,753,550 2,845,243 3,034,340 3,139,935 3,537,456 3,643,226 3,751,066 2,351,438 3,334,392 2,930,031 3,433,757 3,860,597 3,975,642 TOTAL END YEAR 188 1995 1996 2002 2003 2005 2006 2010 2004 2007 2008 2009 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001

Notes:

rate was estimated using the State formula and consistent with the level of diversion estimated in the Riverside County Cooperation Waste Management Study, dated 9/1/95 1. The 1994 waste generation figure was calculated by applying the Countywide diversion rate of 46.5% to the actual disposal tonnage for the year. The Countywide diversion Waste generation growth from 1995 to 2010 was based upon population projection in the Department of Finance's projections:"Total Population By County By Year By

3. Waste diversion rates for 1995 to 2000 were assumed to grow in equal increments each year from 46.5% in 1994 to 50% in 2000. Diversion rates beyond 2000 were Race/Ethnicity, 1993 Population Projection Series."

assumed to be maintained at 50%. The State formula was not used to estimated diversion.

CAP5.XLS

DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY (GENERATION-BASED) **TABLE A-5** (TONS)

YEAR	TOTAL	RATE	WASTE	DISPOSAL	EXPORTS	IMPORTS	ANNUAL	REMAINING	ADDITIONAL
END	GENERATION		DIVERSION				DISPOSAL IN	CAPACITY	CAPACITY
							REGION		NEEDED
							(DISPOSED -		
							EXPORTS +		
							IMPORTS)		
1894	2,738,128			1,268,018	0	0	1,258,018	18,882,352	0
1995	2,878,046	5.11%	1,354,984	1,523,062	0	0	1,523,062	17,359,290	0
1996	2,989,427	3.87%	1,424,761	1,564,666	0	0	1,564,666	15,794,624	0
1997	3,098,840	3.66%	1,494,880	1,603,959	0	0	1,603,959	14,190,664	0
1998	3,206,369	3.47%	1,565,350	1,641,020	0	0	1,641,020	12,549,645	0
1999	3,313,142	3.33%	1,636,692	1,676,450	0	0	1,676,450	10,873,195	0
2000	3,411,873	2.98%	1,705,937	1,705,937	0	0	1,705,937	9,167,258	0
2001	3,533,336	3.56%	1,766,668	1,766,668	0	0	1,766,668	7,400,590	0
2002	3,656,296	3.48%	1,828,148	1,828,148	0	0	1,828,148	5,572,442	0
2003	3,768,910	3.08%	1,884,455	1,884,455	0	0	1,884,455	3,687,987	0
2004	3,882,731	3.02%	1,941,365	1,941,365	0	0	1,941,365	1,746,622	0
2005	3,998,436	2.98%	1,999,218	1,999,218	0	0	1,999,218	(252,596)	252,596
2006	4,119,189	3.02%	2,059,595	2,059,595	0	0	2,059,595	(2,312,191)	2,312,191
2007	4,242,353	2.99%	2,121,176	2,121,176	0	0	2,121,176	(4,433,367)	4,433,367
2008	4,367,927	2.96%	2,183,963	2,183,963	0	0	2,183,963	(6,617,331)	6,617,331
2009	4,495,470	2.92%	2,247,735	2,247,735	0	0	2,247,735	(8,865,066)	8,865,066
2010	4,629,435	2.98%	2,314,718	2,314,718	0	0	2,314,718	(11,179,783)	11,179,783

Notes:

1. The figure for waste generation in 1994 was the 1994 waste generation figure from the Waste Generation Study.

2. Population growth from 1994 to 2010 utilized Department of Finance's projections: "Total population by County by Year by Race/Ethnicity, 1993 Population Series."

3. Waste diversion rates for 1995 to 2000 were assumed to grow in equal increment annually from 46.5% in 1994 to 50% in 2000. Diversion rates beyond 2000 were assumed to be maintained at 50%. The State formula was not used to estimate diversion.

CAP8.XLS

TABLE A-6

Year	Countywide Population*	Countywide Disposal Tonnage
1990	1,195,400	1,818,325
199 1	1,255,791	1,551,845
1992	1,307,007	1,373,791
1993	1,366,417	1,300,451
1994	1,424,482	1,258,018

* Population figures are based on DOF's 1993 Population Projection Series.



APPENDIX A

COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES ON THE REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES ON THE RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN: REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

This Appendix provides specific responses to public and agency comments on the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), which includes the Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Summary Plan and Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element. The Appendix also includes responses to comments which were received on Environmental Assessment No. 37011 which determined that the CIWMP will not have a significant effect on the environment and recommends that a Negative Declaration be adopted.

Comment letters are listed first, with responses to these comments following. Specific comments within each letter have been assigned a sequential comment number (e.g., 2-A, indicating the second letter, first comment). Comments received regarding the Environmental Assessment have been assigned a letter identification (e.g., B-1, indicating the second letter on the Environmental Assessment, first comment). Table A-1 below provides a listing of all of the comment letters which have been received.

NUMBER/LETTER	COMMENTER
1	City of Palm Springs
2	Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG)
3	The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
4	Larry and Donna Charpied
5	Mine Reclamation Corporation
6	California Integrated Waste Management Board
7	Desert Protection Society
8	Riverside County Fire Department
9	Western Riverside Council of Governments
A	Palo Verde Irrigation District
В	State of California Office of Planning and Research
С	Coachella Valley Water District
D	Western Municipal Water District

TABLE A-1 LIST OF COMMENTERS



City of Palm Springs

Department of Economic Development TEL: 619-323-8259/8197 FAX: 619-322-8325 TDD: 619-864-9527

June 24, 1996



1

⊳

Michael Schier, Planning Manager Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

Dear Mr. Schier:

I have received and reviewed the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) and Environmental Assessment No. 37011. My comments fall primarily into the area of concerns and questions at this point.

CIWMP Executive Summary, Transition from CoSWMP to CIWMP. As we 1. have communicated in previous comments, the City of Palm Springs is investigating the Bedminster municipal solid waste composting process for its own waste. You have now included it in the draft Summary Plan at our request. Our concern is that, under the "Gap Bill," the City of Palm Springs would need to receive approval from cities containing a majority of the population of the incorporated areas to receive approval for the project, if the CIWMP is not approved by then. It seems, according to your footnote, that the state is reaffirming that policy. Given our difficulty in getting other cities to approve our inclusion in the countywide Recycling Market Development Zone (little active opposition, mainly inertia) even with County EDA assistance, we are concerned that a similar delay could occur in this much more critical project. Our question: Is the CIWMP likely to be approved by the time we are permitting the Bedminster facility (probably July, 1997) or will we have to receive the approvals of the other cities? Would the District provide assistance to us in that instance? Have the other composting facilities in the County (Scotts, California BioMass) had to undergo similar processes?

Post Office Box 2743 • Palm Springs, California 92262

- 2. Section 1.6, Local Waste Management Issues. In the paragraph on the Coachella Valley, please add: "The City of Palm Springs is planning a 150 ton per day municipal solid waste composting facility in the city to handle its own waste."
- 3. Section 4.5, Discussion of Proposed Solid Waste Facilities. You can change the "As of this writing" section to: "As of this writing, the city has, through an RFQ process, certified Bedminster as the sole qualified proposer and begun negotiations on a design, build, and operate contract for a municipal solid waste composting facility."
- 4. Section 4.7, Market Development Activities. Change the date of the city's CEQA approval to April 17, 1996 from February 21. In addition, lack of action by the other RMDZ cities on approving the redesignation (required by the CIWMB) may force the city to reexamine its RMDZ strategy. We may merely market the Annexation 26 area as our RMDZ.
- 5. Chapter 8, Solid Waste Disposal Strategies When Sites for Additional Capacity Are Not Available. Please add, under Alternative Technologies:

"The City of Palm Springs, through its evaluation of the Bedminster municipal solid waste co-composting process, is also investigating postprocessing of the non-compostable residuals. Once metals have been recovered, the residual is 80-90% plastic by volume. The city has asked Bedminster to examine using a pyrolytic process (high heat, oxygen-free) to reclaim the energy value of the material without burning trash."

A combination of the two technologies could yield a 90-95% diversion rate in a cost effective, environmentally sound manner. The decision to add the second-stage processing hinges on its cost-effectiveness and the test results on the air emissions potentially released through pyrolysis itself and the combustion of the gas produced by the process (NO_x and SO_x, and particulates).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (619) 323-8264. Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. RAYMOND Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator

cc: Robert A. Nelson, RCWRMD Lesley Likins, RCWRMD ; ₩

1

Ð

1 1
COACHELLA VALLEY ABBOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

July 25, 1996

Mr. Robert A. Nelson, Chief Executive Officer Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

RE: COMMENTS ON REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT CIWMP, MAY 1996

Dear Mr. Nelson:

Attached are comments on the May 1996 Preliminary Draft CIWMP, which are submitted on behalf of the CVAG Solid Waste & Recycling Technical Working Group. These comments were reviewed and approved by the TWG at their meeting on Thursday, July 24. I will be glad to work with your staff if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

ana b

Diana Beck Director of Planning

cc. Members of Solid Waste & Recycling Technical Working Group Cerene St. John, EcoNomics California Integrated Waste Management Board

73-710 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 200 • Palm Desert, CA 92260 • (619) 346-1127 • FAX (619) 340-5949

COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Comments on Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Revised Preliminary Draft, May 1996

Summary Plan

1. Page 1-6, Section 1.6. Under the subsection "Court Decisions", the description of Waste Management of the Desert v. Palm Springs Recycling should be changed to read, "that a city does not have authority under state law to grant a private business the exclusive right to collect recyclables. The court decision determined that a city may not prohibit non-franchised companies from collecting recyclable materials which are donated or sold to the company by the waste generator."

2. Page 1-6, Section 1.6. Under the subsection "Local Waste Management Issues", replace the last sentence with the following: "In order to assist with successful financing of both existing and planned public sponsored solid waste facilities, these facilities should have contractual obligations with the participating jurisdictions which direct the flow from the jurisdictions to the facility."

The wording should be changed to reflect the ability of cities to contractually direct the flow of solid waste, even with the court rulings. The wording in the Revised Preliminary Draft, "undermining the financing of both existing and planned public sponsored solid waste facilities", second-guesses the financing community's response to a facility.

3. Page 4-12, Section 4.4. Under the subsection "Existing Composting Facilities", District staff should check with the LEA to determine the status of the permits for California Biomass.

4. Page 4-22, Section 4.5. Under the subsection "Nondisposal Facilities", the discussion of the Coachella Valley transfer station/MRF should be updated. The sentence, "four proposals, and two alternate proposals, were received and are under evaluation" should be changed to "Four proposals and two alternate proposals were received and evaluated. The Task Force selected two vendors to begin contract negotiations. Final vendor selection is scheduled for November 1, 1996. The transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by Fall 1998."

5. Page 4-22. Section 4.5. Under the subsection "Nondisposal Facilities", District staff should check with City of Palm Springs staff to update the Bedminster discussion.

6. Page 5-3, Section 5.3. This section should be expanded to outline the circumstances under which the NDFE must be amended, and by what process this is accomplished.

7. Page 5-8, Table SP 5-3 (last item in the table). "Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all HHW". Are the Programs/Tasks listed on this table taken directly from the County's SRRE? If not, under number 1, the language should be softened to something similar to the following: "The jurisdictions will work toward developing RFP's for MRF operation and ownership that include programs for the acceptance of household hazardous wastes from residents." In number 2, "The jurisdictions will work with contractors selected for each MRF to develop permanent HHW facilities at the MRF."

A-5

1

N

Ð

N

G

N 1

COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

8. Page 6-1, Section 6.2. The first bullet should be amended to read: "Revenues from landfill disposal fees and transfer station tipping fees".

Siting Element

1. Page 1-6, Section 1.8. Either before or after the citing of the District Reserves Policy Statement, the following should be added: "The District continues to work on alternatives for the funding of accrued liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation. In June 1996, the CVAG Executive Committee directed the CVAG Transfer Station/MRF Task Force to propose mechanisms to assist the County and the Waste Resources Management District to fairly, equitably and responsibly fund the remaining unfunded liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation of existing Coachella and Edom Hill Landfills".

2. Page 3-4, Section 3.3. Under the subsection "Disposal Capacity Needs Projection", Item b on page 3-4 should include in the parenthesis that the Coachella Valley transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by the Fall of 1998.

]-2 -H

'ı ⊢⊢

THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TWO CALIFORNIA PLAZA 350 SOUTH GRAND MAILING ADDRESS: BOX 54153 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90054 FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET DATE: 7/25/96 TO: <u>Riverside County</u> M COMPANY NAME Resources Mgnt. Waste Katherine Histord Ext. # COMPANY FAX NO. (909_275-1334 Michele Eskue Planning and Resources FROM: DIVISION/SECTION NAME FACSIMILE TELEPHONE NO .: (213) 217-6119 OFFICE TELEPHONE NO .. (213) 217- 6709 Hard copy is in the mail. COMMENTS: Shank you 5 TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES TRANSMITTED INCLUDING COVER SHEET **RECEIVER:**

► NOTE: IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL SENDER:

_____ (213) <u>217</u>_____



July 22, 1996

Ms. Katherine Gifford Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, California 92501-1719

Dear Ms. Gifford:

Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

We have received the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The CIWMP has been prepared by the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Act). The Act requires cities and counties to reduce solid waste disposal by 50 percent by the year 2000. The CIWMP describes the areas and strategies designed to meet the disposal needs of Riverside County over the next 15 years. The CIWMP is comprised of the following: the Countywide Summary Plan; the Countywide Siting Element; and the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements, Household Hazardous Waste Elements, and Nondisposal Facility Elements for Riverside County and each city within Riverside County. Riverside County, as Lead Agency, proposes to adopt a Negative Declaration for the CIWMP. The comments herein represent the response of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) as a potentially affected public agency.

Background

Metropolitan was formed in 1928 under an enabling act of the California legislature. Historically, Metropolitan has provided supplemental water to the southern California coastal plain to augment local water supplies developed by surface catchment, groundwater production, and wastewater reclamation. This supplemental water is delivered to 27 member agencies through a regional network of canals, pipelines, reservoirs, treatment plants, and appurtement works. Metropolitan receives water from the California Aqueduct of the State Water Project and from the Colorado River Aqueduct for distribution to about 250 cities and unincorporated communities within a 5,200-square-mile service area covering portions of Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties. Metropolitan currently provides about 55 percent of the water used in this service area, with remaining supplies consisting of local Ms. Katherine Gifford

ι U

1

≽

ι.o

1

ы

groundwater and surface water (37 percent) and water imported by the City of Los Angeles via the Los Angeles Aqueduct (8 percent).

Metropolitan's Facilities

Metropolitan has several facilities within Riverside County. Our existing facilities include, but are not limited to, San Diego Pipeline Nos. 1,2,3,4, and 5, Upper Feeder, Lower Feeder, Box Springs Feeder, Santa Ana Valley Pipeline (Department of Water Resources), Lake Perris Bypass Pipeline, Lakeview Pipeline, San Jacinto Pipeline, Auld Valley Pipeline, Colorado River Aqueduct, San Diego Canal, Casa Loma Canal, Casa Loma Siphon First Barrel, Henry J. Mills Filtration Plant, and Lakes Mathews and Skinner. Additionally, Metropolitan will be installing the Inland Feeder and San Diego Pipeline No. 6, and is currently constructing the Eastside Reservoir. The enclosed maps show Metropolitan's existing facilities, the alignment for Inland Feeder and San Diego Pipeline No. 6, and the site of the Eastside Reservoir.

In order to avoid potential conflicts with Metropolitan's facilities, we request that preliminary engineering design drawings or improvement plans for any activity in the area of Metropolitan's pipelines and rights-of-way be submitted for our review and written approval. You may obtain detailed prints of drawings of Metropolitan's pipelines and rights-of-way by calling Metropolitan's Substructures Information Line at (213) 217-6564. To assist you in preparing plans that are compatible with Metropolitan's facilities and easements, we have enclosed a copy of the "Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easements of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California." Please note that all submitted designs or plans must clearly identify Metropolitan's facilities and rights-of-way.

Comments on the Siting Element

Chapter 4 - Existing Solid Waste Disposal Facilities.

This section should be expanded to include a discussion on the relationship between existing disposal sites and groundwater aquifers. Specifically, this section should include the following: (1) identification of all existing disposal sites that overly groundwater aquifers or have the potential to contribute leachate to a groundwater aquifer, (2) identification of the existing groundwater protection system used at each disposal site associated with a groundwater aquifer, (3) data regarding the effectiveness of each of these systems, and (4) the impact that existing solid waste disposal sites currently present to drinking water supplies. Ms. Katherine Gifford

July 22, 1996

ω.

Т

0

ŝ

۱ D

ω

1

(H

Chapter 5 - Screening and Siting Criteria

The Screening Criteria presented in Table 5-1 should be modified to include a prohibition for the expansion and/or new construction of solid waste disposal facilities in areas that provide recharge to regional groundwater aquifers. This prohibition is needed to protect groundwater supplies. Current federal and state laws permit the expansion and/or new construction of solid waste disposal facilities in areas that provide recharge to regional aquifers contingent upon the installation of an engineering system that meets federal and state regulations. Metropolitan believes that these engineered systems cannot ensure proper protection of the underlying groundwater. Factors such as differential settlement and municipal waste that contains low molecular weight solvents have caused these types of systems to fail in the past. The failure of an engineered system at a solid waste disposal site that overlies a groundwater aquifer would result in the release of hazardous materials into the groundwater, thereby limiting the aquifer's capability to supply potable drinking water.

In addition, the Siting Criteria Point Weighting presented in Tables 5-2 and 5-3 allocates points based upon a project's site characteristics, then weights these points based upon the mitigability of each potential impact. The results of this method are confusing. For example, if the intent of the weighting is to ensure that more points are allocated to projects that have fewer site constraints or require less mitigation, as is stated on page 5-3 of the CIWMP, then the higher weight values should not represent criteria that is unmitigable. Please clarify the point weighting method used in this section.

Metropolitan also requests that the following be added to the Water Quality Siting Criteria in this section:

"3. No major water conveyance facility within one mile of the landfill site. (10 points)

A major water conveyance facility within one mile of the landfill site, but not less than 500 feet. (1-9 points) The range will depend on distance and whether the water conveyance facility is downstream or upstream of the landfill site.

A major water conveyance facility within 500 feet of the landfill site. (0 points)"

July 22, 1996

Chapter 6 - Proposed Facility Location and Description This section addresses the proposed expansion of the El Sobrante Landfill. Figure 6-9 indicates that the expansion area is on land designated by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA) as the Lake Mathews - Estelle Mountain Core Reserve. This reserve is one of seven Core Reserves identified in the RCHCA's Long-term Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that have been established and will be managed to preserve SKR. The Lake Mathews Multiple Species HCP and Natural Community Conservation Plan (Lake Mathews MSHCP/NCCP) is a joint conservation effort initiated by Metropolitan and the RCHCA in cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game. The Lake Mathews Multiple Species Reserve as described in the Lake Mathews MSHCP/NCCP is within the boundaries of the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Core Reserve. The discussion of land use for the El Sobrante Landfill Expansion should recognize the Lake Mathews - Estelle Mountain SKR Core Reserve.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input to your planning process. Please provide us with a copy of any response to our comments prepared prior to Lead Agency action and a copy of the Notice of Determination if and when such notice is prepared for this project. If we can be of further assistance, please contact me at (213) 217-6242.

Very truly yours,

Lamah Simonek

Laura J. Simonek Principal Environmental Specialist

MME

Enclosures

3 - F

HASTE MANAGEMEN 96 JUL 18 AH 11: 5

LARRY AND DONNA CHARPIED P.O. BOX 321 DESERT CENTER CA 92239 (619) 392-4722

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: MS. LESLEY LIKENS

FROM: CHARPIEDS

RE: COMMENTS TO CIWMP REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DATE: 7/17/96

PAGES: 9 INCLUDING COVER

Dear Ms. Likens,

Please find enclosed our comments to the CIWMP preliminary draft. As per your cover letter included with the document, this fax transmittal will reach you prior to the July 18, 1996 Task Force meeting, thus should be considered by the Task Force.

The original placed in U.S. Mail.

Sincerely,

Donna Charpied

JULY 17, 1996

MS. LESLEY LIKINS, SENIOR PLANNER WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT 1995 MARKET STREET RIVERSIDE CA 92501-1719 LARRY & DONNA CHARPIED P.O. BOX 321 DESERT CENTER CA 92239 (619) 392-4722

RE: COMMENTS ON REVISED PRELIMINARY DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP).

Dear Ms. Likens,

We first want to thank you for providing us with the above referenced document, and the opportunity to comment. Further, as per our agreement, if and when you need us to return the document, please write to the above address and we will promptly forward it. Secondly, we are aware of the comments that will be presented to the District, by THE DESERT PROTECTION SOCIETY, and incorporate their comments, as though fully set herein. Additional comments are as follow:

Please refer to Section III, Siting Element, Chapter 5, Table 5-1 (page 5-2). This table shows screening criteria by which compliance with 40 CFR Part 258, Subpart B, Sections 258.10, 258.11, 258.14, and 258.15 is met. Footnote 3, at the bottom of the page states, "If yes is indicated, the project does not comply with screening criteria based on Subtitle D and does not conform to the requirements of the Siting Element." It appears that the Siting Element does not conform to the above stated requirements, as follows:

1. Section 258.14: New MSWLF units and lateral expansions are located in a seismic impact zone -The answer is yes. Refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/EIS) prepared for the proposed Eagle Mountain dump, dated July 1996. The Technical Appendix Volume II, Appendix H-1 pages 20, 24, and 27 (footnote 2), page 28 paragraph 2, page 29 paragraphs 2 & 3, and page 30, paragraph 2. Yes the site is located in a seismic impact zone. Many more references are available.

2. Section 258.15: New MSWLF units or lateral expansions are located in an unstable area : Refer to attached EXHIBIT A; State Water Resources Control Board Comments: On page 5, Geology, paragraph 2, states, in part "...Page E6-14 states that virtually all slopes which surround the proposed upper and lower reservoirs are man-made mine benches. The report states, that by 1991, 'approximately 50 to 70 percent of the benches constructed in the bedrock of the East Pit have failed or are unstable'...". On the same page 5, paragraph 3, it states, in part, "... Page E6 -18 states that slope raveling and localized, surficial slope failures and/or rockfalls will continue to occur...". Yes, the site is located in an unstable area.

3. Section 258.11: New MSWLF units or lateral expansions are located in 100 year floodplain. Refer to DEIR/EIS for Eagle Mountain, Technical Appendices Volume II, Appendix H-1, page 16 paragraph 2, second sentence states, "The alluvium extends from the floors of the canyons within the proposed Eagle Mountain dump property in a thickening wedge into down-drainage area of the Chuckwalla Valley east and southeast of the site." Yes, the site is located in a 100 year floodplain.

4 - A

7/17/96 Comments CIWMP Cont.

4. Section 258.10: New MSWLF units or lateral expansions are located within 10,000 feet from an airport runway used by turbojet aircraft and/or 5,000 feet from an airport used solely by piston-type aircraft. The recently resurfaced runway adjacent to Kaiser Road, directly south of the Eagle Mountain school is used both by turbojet aircraft and piston-type aircraft. Kaiser, Metropolitan Water District, as well as private aircraft use the runway. So, yes, an airport runway is within 10,000 ft.

* All above Sections referenced fall under Title 40 CFR Part 258, Subpart B

Because "yes" is indicated on at least one of the criteria listed in Table 5-1, the proposed Eagle Mountain dump does not conform to the requirements of the siting element. All references to the Eagle Mountain dump must therefore be deleted from the CIWMP document.

Please refer to Chapter 7; General Plan Consistency, of the Siting Element, at page 7-4, paragraph 4: "Because the site is not consistent with the General Plan, the site will be 'tentatively reserved' as permitted by Section 18756.3 (c). By the first 5 year revision of the CIWMP, the Eagle Mountain dump proposal must meet the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 41702." Now please refer to the Riverside County Environmental Assessment Form: Standard Evaluation, prepared by Katherine M. Gifford, that accompanied the revised Draft CIWMP, page 2 Item II, Part B, sentence 3. Eagle Mountain has been referenced in the CSWMP version of CIWMP, and the 5 year limit has been exhausted. Deletion of all references to the proposed Eagle Mountain dump is mandatory.

Please refer to Chapter 8; Solid Waste Disposal Strategies When Sites For Additional Capacity Are Not Available. Landfill mining can be initiated even when sites for new dumps and expansions are available. To place landfill mining into this category is a policy decision. Not circulating the Landfill Reclamation Feasibility Study prepared for the California Integrated Waste Management Board, that we provided to you, to the COG's and solicit comments from the Cities clearly violates your Memorandum of Understanding with the COG's and Cities. See Section II, Summary Plan, Appendix A, page A-3, item 1.

Again, please refer to Section II, Summary Plan, at Appendix B; Description of Cities And County's Source – Reduction And Recycling Element (SRRE) And Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) Selected Programs. Virtually every city's program implementation schedule contains the following:

- 1. Support for on site composting,
- 2. Support salvaging with dialogue among the County, other cities, etc.,
- 3. Privately operated compost at municipal jurisdiction or private facilities,
- 4. White goods salvaging,

5. Search for loans, grants, and loan guarantees. (We have suggested applying to the California Pollution Control Financing Authority for revenue bonds, in our initial comments during the scoping session(s) for the Draft CIWMP).

All of the above are components of landfill mining. Further, the County has successfully mined the Twin Pines dump, in the past. To state that the landfill mining impact on the capacity of Riverside County waste disposal is not in the scope of the siting element is absurd. All the County needed to have done is acquire a copy of the feasibility study, (after reviewing the one that we gave you), from the California Integrated Waste

B

Þ

4

υ

4

၊ ဂ

> 4 1

١

7/17/96 Comments CWIMP Cont.

Management Board, punch holes in it, and include it your revised draft. Moreover, all the conjured up negative aspects of landfill mining have been resolved, to wit:

1. Employees should wear OSHA certified safety gear,

2. Tenting the working face of the site, and gas extraction wells as demonstrated in the on-going remediation of Stringfellow Acid Pits, as well as the use of dust suppression techniques, solve air quality issues. Keep in mind, all of the perceived negatives associated with landfill mining, are associated with landfilling, and mitigatable, otherwise, there would be no dumps. and

3. The cost associated with finding hazardous materials wanes in comparison to the cost of remediation to groundwater once hazardous materials are introduced. If hazardous materials are in the District's dumps, it behooves us to landfill mine and remove said materials. Waste represents a threat to the environment for as long as it is in the ground, and with the policies you seem to be making, that time is infinity.

Please refer to Chapter 8, page 8-3 paragraph 2, where it states, "It is not within the scope of this siting element to determine how much reduction can be achieved through the use of outside the County landfills, landfill mining, or alternative technologies." This clearly shows a predetermined decision concerning the proposed Eagle Mountain dump. The CIWMP shows quite extensively, the impacts Eagle Mountain, a non-existent dump, can have on space capacity. The proposed Eagle Mountain dump does not even meet the Siting Element criteria necessary to be included! The proposal has exceeded the 5 year limit of non-compliance with the General Plan consistency, therefore mandatory removal of any references to the project from the Revised Draft CIWMP is necessary.

We again thank you for this opportunity to comment on policies that will effect Riverside County residents for many years to come. Please provide us with a copy of the Final Plan, once it is released, and dates for comments/public hearings. We request you provide us with a copy of the Final CIWMP when it is complete. As you realize, we are known interested parties in issues surrounding solid waste management. We hope to continue the same agreement of you providing the document requested above, free of charge, with the understanding that we will have to return it, upon your request. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Charpied

Donna Charpied

enc: EXHIBIT A: Comments from SWRCB + | |

1

чj

A-16

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ADENCY

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

8

PAUL R. BONDERSON BUILDING 901 P STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

916/657-1951

FAX: 916/657-1485

MARCH

to:333:KDM:266.0

Mr. Clem Palevich Eagle Mountain Energy 19800 Mac Arthur, Suite 290 Irvine, CA 92715

1994

Dear Mr. Palevich:

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT NO. 11080--EAGLE MOUNTAIN PUMPED STORAGE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Division of Water Rights (Division) staff has reviewed the draft License Application for the Eagle Mountain Pumped Storage Hydroelectric Project (Eagle Mountain Project), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project No. 11080. The project will utilize two existing iron mining pits as the upper and lower reservoirs.

Division staff notes two primary areas of concern. The first area of concern is the quantity of water needed to serve this project, which is located in a water short area. The second area of concern is the potential to create toxic conditions in the reservoirs and underlying groundwater basin due to concentration of high TDS water over time.

Water Availability

Page A-8 states that the water required for initial filling of the reservoirs is 16,600 acre-feet (af). Page E2-1 states that 18,900 af is required for initial filling. Page E2-1 also states that approximately 2,300 afa is needed to compensate for losses due to evaporation and seepage. It appears that the quantity required for initial filling only includes one year's losses due to evaporation and seepage (16,600 + 2,300 + 18,900). For a two year filling cycle, two years of evaporation and seepage losses should be utilized in determining the total quantity of water needed to fill the reservoirs. This figure is 21,200 af (18,900 + 2,300 = 21,200).

Division staff does not concur with the methodology used to calculate the reservoir losses. Per page E6-16, the average wetted area of the reservoirs was used to calculate leakage. For the upper reservoir, the leakage ranged between 1,000 and 1,500 acre-feet a year. For the lower reservoir, the seepage ranged between 800 and 1,200 afa. The reservoirs will be filled for a minimum of eight hours per day. Thus, it appears that seepage losses should be calculated for full reservoir conditions. The combined seepage for both the upper and lower reservoirs ranges between 1,800 and 2,700 afa, using the information noted above. This is not consistent with the reported seepage of



COMMENT 4

PETE WILSON, Governor

Mailing Address DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS P.O. 80X 2000, Sacramento, CA 95912-2000



In Reply Refer

600 afa listed on page E2-8. What is the basis for negating 1,200 to 2,100 afa of seepage in the conclusions of the report?

Adding evaporation and the range of seepage listed above, reservoir losses are between 3,500 and 4,400 afa. This is significantly greater than the 2,300 afa of losses used in determining whether sufficient water is available for this project.

Page E2-15 states that design measures will reduce make-up volume due to seepage from 1,000 afa to 500 afa. What is the basis for this statement? It appears that seepage may be a greater problem than indicated in the initial project estimates. The head due to water impounded by the reservoirs should increase the seepage rates beyond the estimated rates.

It may not be reasonable to expect that seepage can be reduced by placing a layer of mine tailings in select portions of the reservoir. As stated on page E2-12, the aquifer below the pits is a fractured media. Further, several tunnels will be constructed for purposes of this project. Page E1-4, describes the project site as metasedimentary (a highly fractured material) and granitic rocks. The soil associations of the project are reported to be excessively drained, very gravelly sand to loamy sand. The project site maps omit mapping of the soil and rock substrate in the mine pits. There are no maps of the site geology for the penstock, powerhouse cavern and other site tunnels required to be built for the project. Additional geologic site maps should be included in the FERC application to better describe the project and to demonstrate that the substrate is susceptible to capping by a layer of mine tailings.

(In conclusion, the effectiveness of mine tailings to cap a fractured substrate appears limited. As noted on page E6-13, the seepage problem is not limited to the bottom surfaces of the reservoir. The east wall of the East Pit is made up of alluvial deposits, with relatively high horizontal permeability. Two mine adits are located adjacent to the central project area. Thus, it appears that water may seep out horizontally, and could possibly enter the mine adits.

The comments will now focus upon the effects of pumping project water from the groundwater basin. Page E2-7 states that the current perennial yield of the aquifer ranges from 10,000 to 20,000 afa. The amount of water currently being utilized is 8,092 afa. The landfill will require 1,700 afa. Division staff calculates the combined uses to be 9,792 afa (8,092 + 1,700 = 9,792). Division staff notes that the report does not state the source of water for the proposed increased inmate population at the prison. If groundwater will be used, this figure should be increased accordingly.

If the perennial yield of the aquifer proves to be 10,000 afa, the entire yield is needed to satisfy the 9,792 afa of existing water needs listed above. The report states that the Eagle Mountain Project requires 18,900 afa during the first two years of operation (9,450 afa per year). As noted above, Division staff maintains that the project requires more water than the report indicates.

Nonetheless, it can be concluded that if the basin has a perennial yield of 10,000 afa, no water is available for the Eagle Mountain Project without creating an overdraft situation. Further, the overdraft situation will be

Mr. Clem Palevich

exacerbated by continued pumpage to operate the project. Assuming an average water availability of 15,000 afa, the project would still create groundwater overdraft.

The report apparently attempts to minimize the claimed project impacts on the groundwater basin. Page E2-1 estimates the recoverable water in the Chuckwalla Basin (this is the regional groundwater basin, not the local groundwater basin) to be one million af. Page E2-4 states that the Chuckwalla Valley basin has nine million af of water in storage. The local basin, however, appears to experience overdraft when annual pumpage reaches 21,698 af (see page E2-1).

The report states that utilizing 18,900 af of water to fill the pump storage' facility amounts to less than 0.2 percent of the estimated 9 million af in storage. This figure was obtained by comparing the project requirements to the amount of non-recoverable groundwater in storage. This is not a valid statistical method. The project requirements should be compared to: (1) the amount of water in the local groundwater basin; and (2) the amount of recoverable groundwater in storage. The amount of

Division staff questions whether the project represents a reasonable, beneficial use of water. The projected seepage and evaporation losses listed in the FERC application of 2,300 afa represent a loss of between 11.5 and 23 percent the perennial yield of the aquifer (for a yield ranging between 20,000 and 10,000 afa). For seepage and evaporation losses of between 3,500 and 4,400 afa (averaging 3,950 afa) described above, the project losses represent a loss of between 19.8 and 39.5 of the perennial yield of the aquifer (using an average figure for losses of 3,950 afa and perennial yields of 10,000 and 20,000 afa).

The report indicates that wells in this basin tend to become clogged by sand over time. Page E2-10 indicates that two wells which Kaiser Steel drilled in 1964 have been abandoned due to sanding up. Further, a third well, well CW-3, appears to have been redrilled. When all four Kaiser wells were operable, an average of 3,558 afa was obtained. This is significantly less water than the Eagle Mountain Project requires. Further, the remaining capacity in the two operable wells is now 2,400 gallons per minute (gpm), which is 3,865 afa. If Kaiser Steel utilizes the wells to deliver 1,700 afa to the landfill, only 2,165 afa remains for use by the Eagle Mountain Project. It should be noted, however, that Kaiser Steel may require this water to serve the community of Eagle Mountain or the prison.

Further, it is my understanding that Kaiser Steel has denied access to its wells and land.

The report states that the mine uses two wells located in the Pinto Groundwater basin. Will these facilities be used for purposes of the hydropower project? If these wells will be used for the project, list the TDS level for water extracted from the wells and well output.

The report indicates that the wells owned by Kaiser Steel may have been drilled under the authority of the Desert Land Act. Is the proposed new use of the wells consistent with the Desert Land Act?

Page E2-11 states that there is a low likelihood that the groundwater mound from the Eagle Mountain project will be coincidental with the landfill liner, due to dewatering during the construction and operational phases of the project. What is the elevational difference between the standing water level in the reservoirs (when the reservoirs are full) and the landfill? What is the elevation of the groundwater mound relative to the landfill when the dewatering pumps are shut down (due to equipment failure, repairs or the end of the project life)?

Water Quality Issues

Page E2-12 states that the aquifer below the pits is a fractured media. Analytical tests were done on crushed ore from the pits. The samples reflected a geochemical matrix which is alkaline, moderately saline, with a pH values ranging from 6.5 to 9.6. The report states that stoichiometric analyses indicates that the TDS in the pits, while initially near 675 mg/l based upon the groundwater used to fill the pits, will eventually reach the solubility constant and allow precipitation of the salts in 83 years.

First, Division staff notes that the TDS concentration in the two Kaiser production wells (two wells have been abandoned) does not average 675 mg/l. Per Table E2-5, the TDS concentration in CW-3 is 1170 mg/l. The TDS in CW-4 is 685 mg/l. The calculated average TDS for the two wells is 927.5 mg/l. This is significantly greater than 675 mg/l. Thus, the conclusions reached above appear conservative due to use of a low TDS value in the calculation. Using the 927.5 mg/l TDS value calculated above, it appears that salt will precipitate from the reservoirs much earlier than calculated above.

The impact of concentrating the salts will likely have further impacts because any of the high TDS water (water which is retained in the reservoirs for a period of time, allowing evaporation and concentration of the salts) which seeps into the groundwater basin may be pumped from the groundwater wells, and reenter the reservoir. Thus, the TDS in the reservoirs will likely increase faster than calculated above, due to pumpage of groundwater with increasingly higher TDS.

The report states that the pH of the crushed ore is between 6.5 and 9.6. Addition of the high TDS water will affect the pH. What is the pH for water with an initial TDS of 927.5 mg/l, in combination with the crushed ore? Will this corrode the project machinery, or the penstock lining? Will the machinery and penstock experience corrosion as the TDS in the reservoir increases? What is the projected pH in the reservoir after 10, 20 and 50 years?

What impacts will seepage of this water have on the groundwater basin? What impacts will seepage have on the landfill and the landfill liner?

Division staff notes that the degraded water entering the groundwater basin as seepage, using an average of the seepage range of 1,800 to 2,700 afa, represents 11.2 to 22.5 percent of the perennial yield of the groundwater basin (using 10,000 to 20,000 afa as the perennial yield). Thus, the impaired groundwater is a significant percentage of the total perennial yield of the basin.

<u>Geology</u>

On page E6-5, the report states that there are a series of debris flows in the East Pit. Will the filling and dewatering of the reservoir create additional debris flows? Are there any debris flows situated in locations where falling material could enter the penstock?

Page E6-14 states that virtually all slopes which surround the proposed upper and lower reservoirs are man-made mine benches. The report states that, by 1991, "approximately 50 to 70 percent of the benches constructed in the bedrock of the East Pit have failed or are unstable." Given this information, how will the project tunnels be stabilized to prevent similar failures? Page E6-15 states that the factor of safety for the existing pit slopes is in excess of 1.5 for static conditions, and 1.1 for seismic conditions. This analysis was conducted by the mine owners, and does not consider the impacts of hydraulic loading due to creation of the proposed reservoirs. What are the factors of safety for the mine pit, for full reservoir conditions? What is the factor of safety for the penstock and tunnels?

Where will the tunnel materials be deposited? How much material will be created? Page E6-18 states that slope raveling and localized, surficial slope failures and/or rockfalls will continue to occur. Please provide information to describe the scope of the problem and any potential hazards created by slope raveling and slope failure.

The project may be within the jurisdiction of the Division of Safety of Dams, Department of Water Resources. You should contact dam safety for further information on filing requirements.

The project cost estimates are based upon leasing the land and water resources from Kaiser Steel. If, as indicated above, Kaiser Steel is not willing to enter into a lease agreement, it may be necessary to obtain the property through a purchase agreement. How much additional cost will be incurred if the project land and water resources must be purchased?

I appreciated the opportunity to comment on the license application. I can be contacted at (916) 657-1951 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

Katherine Mrowka Associate WRC Engineer Hearings Unit

cc: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 825 North Capitol Street, NE Washington, D.C. 20406

> Division of Safety of Dams 2200 X Street, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95814



July 24, 1996

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, Ca. 92501-1719

Attention: Ms. Lesley Likins, Senior Planner

Subject: Comments on the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) - May 1996

Mine Reclamation Corporation (MRC) has reviewed the above referenced document and finds it overall to be a complete and thorough document. MRC would, however, like to provide Riverside County with the following specific comments:

1. MRC recommends that the Screening Criteria presented in Table 5-1 of the Siting Element be clarified. For example, the manner in which the Screening Criteria are presented imply that sites are not acceptable if located in a "seismic impact zone" as defined by 40 CFR Section 258.14. We do not believe this was the intent of the draft Screening Criteria, since almost all of California, and certainly all of the existing and proposed sites in Riverside County, are located in a "seismic impact zone" as defined by 40 CFR 258.14. Also, Section 258.14 clearly allows for sites to be located in a "seismic impact zone" if they are designed to withstand a specific seismic event. It would be prudent to clarify your intent by changing the criteria to state that the site or proposed landfill and/or expansion must meet the requirements of 40 CFR Section 258.14 with regard to seismic location and design.

The same issue arises with regard to sites in unstable areas. The state and federal regulations clearly allow landfills to be located in areas deemed to be "unstable" if properly designed. In the case of the Eagle Mountain landfill site, a small portion of the site is located in an area where past mining has left steep excavations that are subject to localized sloughing and ravelling if not maintained. In accordance with state and federal (40 CFR 258.15) regulations, these areas should, and will be, further stabilized by excavating and/or compacting during construction of the liner system. This criteria should be changed to state that sites should meet the criteria of 40 CFR Section 258.15 with regard to landfills sited in unstable areas.

MINE RECLAMATION

CORPORATION

COACHELLA VALLEY CORPORATE OFFICE

43-645 Monterey Avenue, Suite A Palm Desert, CA 92260 (619) 779-5888 FAX (619) 779-5891 1 (800) 253-0597

EAGLE MOUNTAIN

P.O. Box 8 Desert Center, CA 92239 (619) 392-4308 FAX (619) 392-8101 5 ~ A

Ms. Lesley Likins, Senior Planner July 24, 1996 Page 2

It should also be noted that Subtitle D does not exclude siting of all landfills in 100-yr flood plains or within 5,000 ft of piston-type aircraft runways. The regulations clearly allow for the owner/operator to design the project to take such conditions into account. The Screening Criteria should provide more detail so that it more closely mirrors Subtitle D requirements.

2. It is not clear which body or regulatory group will be using the Siting Criteria presented in Table 5-2, or how they would use it and in what review process. Also, some of the Siting Criteria require subjective evaluation which may result in the criteria being applied differently from site to site, or from one evaluator to the next. While this is probably something that cannot be avoided, it would be helpful if the inherent subjectivity were noted and discussed in this section.

3. Table 6-4 of the Siting Element should be corrected as follows:

- The total acreage of the Eagle Mountain landfill footprint, as proposed, is 2,164 acres.

- The total volume of the Eagle Mountain landfill at ultimate buildout is 708 million tons.

4. It is recommended that the document should briefly discuss the geographical divisions in waste shed areas and future capacity needs should be examined not by looking at just the total capacity and need, but looking at each waste shed area. The County is very large and use of one or two in-County landfills by all jurisdictions may not be economically feasible.

5. With respect to page 6 of the Environmental Assessment form, Item 20, why are both No and Yes checked?

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the revised preliminary draft of the CIWMP. We recognize that the staff has invested a tremendous amount of time and thought in preparing a comprehensive plan for guidance of the County and cities waste disposal needs well into the future.

Please call us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

MINE RECLAMATION CORPORATION

Gary W/Johnsoff Vice President, Landfill Development

сл

1

⊳

СЛ

1

ы

ப

C

1

U

I.

Ι<u>Ξ</u>



Cal/EPA

California Environmental Protection Agency

Integrated Waste Management Board

8800 Cal Center Dr. Sacramento C.4 95826 (916) 255-2200 COMMENT 6 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT

96 JUL 29 PH 2:04



Pete Wilson Governor

James M. Strock Secretary for Environmental Protection

Mr. Michael Shier, Planning Manager
Riverside County Waste Resources Management District
Planning Division
1995 Market St.
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: Board Review and Comments on the Draft Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan for Riverside County

Dear Mr. Shier:

July 25, 1996

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) staff have reviewed the draft of Riverside County's (County) Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan for compliance with Chapter 9, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR), Planning Guidelines and Procedures for Preparing and Revising Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plans.

Staff would like to commend the County of Riverside and its 24 jurisdictions on developing such comprehensive and well organized planning documents. The Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan meet all the statutory requirements and expand, in several areas, on the regulatory requirements. The documents, as prepared, will provide a valuable waste management tool for reaching the goals mandated by the Integrated Waste Management Act.

The following comments are organized by chapter as presented in the *Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan* of the Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan, dated May 1996.

SUMMARY PLAN

Chapter 1 - Introduction No comment.

Chapter 2 - Goals, Policies, and Objectives (14 CCR §18757.1) No comment.



Riverside County July 25, 1996 Page 2

Chapter 3 - County Profile and Plan Administration (14 CCR §18757.3)

The individual city profiles (Tables 3-1 through 3-26) provide a clear and concise character description. However, not all the tables have been completed to the same degree. For example many of the profiles do not include average home prices, trends in development, median income, and/or city boundaries. Seasonal population changes are significant for many cities particularly those located in the eastern portions of Riverside County. Not all these communities have provided a description of seasonal population changes. In the final document please consider including complete tables for each city.

Chapter 4 - Current Solid Waste Management Practices (14 CCR §18757.5) No comment

Chapter 5 - Summary of SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE Programs and Facility and Program Coordination and Consolidation (14 CCR §18757.7) No comment.

Chapter 6 - Financing of Countywide Programs (14 CCR §18758) No comment.

COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Section 1.6-Annual Review Report should be revised to reflect the approval of the emergency annual report regulations which require jurisdictions to submit an annual report by August 1 of the year following Board-approval or conditional approval of the planning document.

Chapter 2 - Goals and Policies (14 CCR §18755.1) No comment.

Chapter 3 - Disposal Capacity Requirements (14CCR §18755.3) No comment.

Chapter 4 - Existing Solid Waste Disposal Facilities (14 CCR §18755.5) No comment.

Chapter 5 - Screening and Siting Criteria (14 CCR §18756) No comment.

Chapter 6 - Proposed Facility Location and Description (14 CCR §§18756.1) No comment.

Chapter 7 - General Plan Consistency (14 CCR §§18756.3) No comment δ

ł

Riverside County July 25, 1996 Page 3

Chapter 8 - Solid Waste Disposal Strategies When Sites for Additional Capacity are not Available (14 CCR §18756.5). No comment.

Chapter 9 - Siting Element Implementation (14 CCR §18756.7). No comment.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Please note that the Siting Element and Summary Plan will require environmental review. A copy of a Notice of Determination for each document must be included when the final documents are filed with the Board per 14 CCR section 18784(a)(6).

This concludes the Board staff's comments on the County's draft Countywide Siting Element and Summary Plan. If you have questions related to the comments or the review and approval process, contact Jeff Martinez of the Board's Office of Local Assistance at (916) 255-2310.

Sincerely, 2 401

Lloyd Dillon, Manager South Section Office of Local Assistance

cc: Riverside County Local Task Force

6 - C

COMMENT 7

NONHAZARDOUS SOLID WASTE LANDFILL REPORT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

RESPONSE TO

RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

(Revised Preliminary Draft - May 1996)

DESERT PROTECTION SOCIETY

Prepared by Joseph Krallinger

May 1996

DESERT PROTECTION SOCIETY NONHAZARDOUS SOLID WASTE LANDFILL REPORT

RESPONSE TO RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT (Revised Preliminary Draft - May 1996)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

L	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY BACKGROUND		Page 1
П.			2
П.	ITEMS FOR	DISCUSSION	3
IV.	RECENT RE	PORTS/STUDIES	
	А.	Reaching the Limit	6
	B.	Toward Ensuring Adequate Landfill Capacity	6
	C .	Solid Waste Workshop	10
	D.	Solid Waste - State & Federal Efforts to Manage Nonhazardous Waste	13
V.	COUNTY INFORMATION		
	А.	Orange County	16
	B.	San Bernadino County	18
	C.	San Diego County	20
	D.	Imperial County	21
	E.	Riverside County	22
	F.	Los Angeles County	38
VI.	RECYCLING IS A BIG BUSINESS AND INCREASING		40
VII.	LANDFILL MINING - One Solution?		41
VIII.	PYROGENIC GASIFIERS - A Possible Alternative?		44
IX.	GRAVITY PRESSURE VESSEL TRASH-TO-ENERGY		
X.	SUMMARY		
X1.	CONCLUSIO	DNS A-27	48

DESERT PROTECTION SOCIETY

NONHAZARDOUS SOLID WASTE LANDFILL REPORT RESPONSE TO RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT (Revised Preliminary Draft - May 1996)

Prepared by Joseph Krallinger

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to summarize and conclude on an extensive search for facts relating to nonhazardous solid waste generation and management in Southern California with particular emphasis on Riverside County. The Desert Protection Society is concerned that local decisions might be made without sufficient data on what other municipalities and businesses are doing which may seriously impact our cities, the County and other counties. Based on the data collected, our discussions with interested parties and prior experiences, the following conclusions were developed.

1. With the possible exception of Los Angeles County for which sufficient up-to-date information was not yet received to conclude, each Southern California County presently has a landfill capacity of at least 15 years, some much longer.

2. Recycling has become a profitable and big business which will continue to increase and that will ease landfill capacity requirements.

3. Solid waste generation in California has decreased 20% to 25% between 1989 and 1993. That trend will continue.

4. Tipping fees for solid wastes are declining due to competition. Such fees will continue to decline and remain at levels of \$20 per ton or less for the foreseeable future.

5. Large landfills in neighboring states are already impacting (reducing) certain Southern California tipping fees and will continue to do so. Further, if only one private Southern California mega-landfill "comes on-line" the decrease in tipping fees will accelerate significantly.

6. Privatization of landfills has started in our southern California region. The long-term impact of this change is yet to be determined.

7. Eagle Mountain landfill in Riverside County should not be permitted, appears uneconomical and should be <u>excluded</u> from Tables 9-2, 9-3 and 9-4 of the May 1996 Riverside County Siting Element. That Siting Element should conclude that the County has adequate landfill capacity for the planning period without the Eagle Mountain landfill.

7 - A

II. BACKGROUND

California State Assembly Bill AB 939 requires each county and city to achieve a 25% recycling rate by 1995 and 50% by 2000. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires each county to prepare a *Countywide Siting Element* to be part of a *Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan* for the state. The report is to include: an estimate of the total transformation or disposal capacity within the county that cannot be reduced, recycled, or composted for a 15 year period. Current law requires each county to determine if existing solid waste disposal capacity will be exhausted within 15 years, and if so, then areas for new disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities must be identified. These final reports were due in Sacramento on February 1, 1996. However, many counties were not prepared to meet that deadline.

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Obtaining accurate, reliable waste generation, diversion and recycling and data relating to future landfill capacities (5 or more years) is difficult, if not impossible, due to:

a. Aggressive source reduction and recycling programs. These are formally (Assembly Bill 939) and informally underway throughout California. According to an August 1992 report prepared by Wendy Umino, Consultant for the Assembly Office of Research titled *Eagle Mountain Landfill Project: The Conflicts*, "Reliance on inaccurate data could result in increased regional waste disposal fees, shortfalls in anticipated county revenue, and insufficient funds for necessary mitigation."

b. Difficulty in quantifying source reduction.

c. Difficulty in quantifying waste generation and diversion within, into and out of the County and State.

d. Inability to identify all solid waste diversion facilities.

e. Dynamics in recycling at the household, municipality and industrial levels.

f. Free market becoming more formal and very active in pursuit of usable

waste.

g. Impact of any one mega-landfill on neighboring counties/states and municipalities.

h. Solutions being sought to remove exposure to legal liabilities surrounding landfill operations.

i. Solutions being sought to fund landfill closure and post-closure costs.

According to correspondence between John Van De Kamp, Attorney General of California to D. S. Nellor Solid Waste Management Dept. of the Sanitation Districts of L.A. County (p. 3), calculated landfill capacity shortages: "...may well dwindle and the need for new or expanded landfill sites become less pressing".

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2. Competition for solid waste has drastically reduced tipping fees in other parts of the country and will do so in Southern California. A free market in any industry has that result. For example, if three rail haul projects in or near Riverside County in various stages of the permitting process are built, up to 60,000 tons per day of solid waste will be diverted from each existing or future landfill. The huge capital costs of these projects will then demand volume be obtained by price cutting with dramatic consequences on the tipping fee market prices and detrimental impact on certain municipal landfill revenues. The questions will be: What minimum waste stream is needed to keep a mega-landfill in business and at what price?

3. Mega-landfills will deteriorate the air quality, water quality and general quality of life due to detrimental effects of large increases in rail and truck traffic and pollution of the air.

4. As to southern California and Riverside County based on available facts and expected trends, the conclusions are:

a. Solid waste generation per person and in aggregate annual tons is dropping.

b. Landfill capacity is adequate for more than 15 years.

c. The proposed Eagle Mountain landfill will not be needed for Riverside County's solid wastes. Further, the projections of revenues and tons by year submitted to the Supervisors with the initial permitting application are no longer applicable as to timing of revenues and amounts. This in turn overstates the revenues previously anticipated by the County.

5. Landfill mining, compaction, composting, incineration, trash-to-energy and other alternative methods should be reviewed and implemented where appropriate.

6. Reductions in the amount of solids used in packaging should also be pursued actively at the state and Federal levels.

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

7. Financing will be challenging for the unfunded future costs for closing, monitoring and remediating present landfill sites, some of which have relatively short remaining lives due to capacity limits.

8. Predicting tipping fees at municipal and private landfills is difficult if not impossible.

9. Predicting future waste disposal quantities and sources is also difficult to impossible.

10. Use landfill mining and recycling to reduce waste.

11. Encourage manufacturers to reduce excessive packaging.

12. Implement incineration, compaction and trash-to-energy projects.

A. Reaching the Limit, An Interim Report on Landfill Capacity in California.

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) has issued a report entitled REACHING THE LIMIT, AN INTERIM REPORT ON LANDFILL CAPACITY IN CALIFORNIA (CIWMB 1992 a). That report concluded that as of 1/1/90 counties representing 70% of the state's population indicated they face a landfill shortage within 15 years. Also, that report concluded that 40% of the population resided in counties which had less than 5 years remaining landfill capacity.

B. Toward Ensuring Adequate Landfill Capacity dated May 9, 1995. The above listed report led to a contract with Environmental Science Associates & Pryde Roberts Carr and subsequent report titled: TOWARD ENSURING ADEQUATE LANDFILL CAPACITY dated May 9, 1995. This report has the following findings:

1. Daily solid waste generated per California resident dropped due to recycling and recession and is listed at:

1985 average for June	7.4 lbs.
1989	7.9 lbs.
Average for 1993	5.9 lbs.

2. Board of Equalization data shows solid waste for 1993 was 34 million tons representing a drop of 20% from 1989's 42.5 million tons.

3. Remaining permitted landfill capacity increased 490 million cubic yards from 1990 even though the number of landfills dropped 14% between 1990 (234) and 1994 (201) as follows:

	Landfill Capacity
	Million Cubic Yards
1/1/87	985
1/1/90	1,120
1/1/93	1,610

Of note is the fact that a summary of 1994 wastes by landfill shows:

- 7 landfills received more than 1,000,000 tons of waste.
- 8 landfills received between 500,000 and 1,000,000 tons.
- 54 landfills received 100,000 to 500,000 tons.
- Remaining 132 landfills received less than 100,000 tons.
- 69 of the landfills received 91% of all solid wastes.

4. Remaining landfill capacity by region is listed in Table 1 page 5 and the data for Region 4 Southern California as of 1/1/95 is:

Imperial	106 - 69 years
Los Angeles	17 - 13 years
Orange	69 - 44 years
Riverside	26 - 20 years
San Bernardino	35 - 30 years
San Diego	30 - 24 years
Ventura	17 - 14 years

Note that the first figure uses 1 ton per person and diversion rates of 25% in future years. The second figure uses average disposal rates reported for 1993-1994 by Board of Equalization. The diversion rates are low based on the requirements of Assembly Bill AB 939.

5. Total landfill capacity seems to have increased between 1/1/90 and 1/1/93 and annual disposal dropped from 42.5 million tons to 34 million tons during that same time frame.

6. The state may have 28 years of capacity left for solid wastes, but not available in every area of the state. Some cities are exporting wastes out-of-state.

7. Existing landfills continue to experience some success in permitting expansion areas. New landfill sites are extremely difficult and costly to get permitted.

The State has a continuing role to support development of options, including regionalization of solid waste facilities so areas without landfills can develop regional landfills or material recovery facilities/transfer stations to minimize solid waste disposal tonnage and to provide more efficient transport of wastes to distant landfills.

9. The California Integrated Waste Management Board has a continuing role to be a clearinghouse to aid local jurisdictions in solid waste issues related to siting facilities and identifying new technologies to reduce waste and conserve landfill capacity.

10. Methods to ensure adequate landfill capacity are listed in the report as:

a. Source reduction - This method is efficient, requires minimal capital, few ongoing operating costs and is often the least expensive method per unit of diversion.

b. Recycling and composting - Large diversion of wastes can be accomplished with this approach. Compared to long-term trends in landfill costs, especially under current regulations, these methods are less expensive than landfilling and save energy and natural resources.

c. More efficient use of existing landfill capacity by -

(1) Landfill mining extracts materials which may be recyclable, combustible, soil/compost material and residual waste. Materials include metal, glass, and paper which may be usable and/or marketable. Although current income may not be large, savings result from reducing remediation and closure costs of older landfills and by creating more space. East coast mining costs range from \$9 to \$16.75 per ton of excavated material.

(2) Use of green waste or slurry made from recycled paper provides a market for normally unsalable materials and creates local industry for process the materials. The CIWMB allows green waste as alternative daily cover.

(3) Fabric tarpaulins made from polypropylene and polyethylene can be used to cover the face each day and will last for long periods.

(4) Compaction can double the amount of material placeable in a landfill. Baling and shredding are also usable prior to disposal.

(5) Certain wastes such as tires and wood may be transformed into fuels, pallets, and so forth. A CIWMB study concluded that all of the tires scrapped in California alone could be used as an energy source in cement plants. Also the capital investment of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 per plant would be paid back in one year. Tires can also be used as fuel in lumber and paper mills, power plants, and other industries.

(6) Stanilaus County reported their waste-to-energy facility transforms waste and produces enough electricity to supply 25,000 homes which represents over one half million barrels of oil.

(7) Based on experience of others in the State, permitting a new landfill can take 7 to 10 years or longer. Landfill expansions require approximately 2.5 to 3 years.

(8) The main problems arising in the landfill siting process are listed below. The document does contain some solutions.

Public Opposition -

- · Potential destruction of environment.
- Perceive emphasis is on new landfills rather than diversion.
- Environmental injustice by locating sites in or near low-income and minority communities.
- · Traffic and secondary environmental impacts.
- Induces other development (infrastructure).

Lack of Waste Flow Control Authority -

- Supreme Court decisions limit states and local governments from controlling waste flow in or out.
- · Rail haul allows landfills to serve remote wastesheds.
- Lack of control inhibits new landfill development.

Short-Term Decisions VS. Long-Term Solutions -

Local pressures can change decisions.

Limited Resources and Expertise -

- · Lack of experience in permitting landfills.
- Legal exposure is high and costly.

High Cost Or Scarcity of Suitable Land.

C. Solid Waste Workshop by HDR Engineering, Inc.

1. Trash flow decreased from 42.5 million tons per year in 1990 to 34 million in 1993.

2. Daily disposal rate per person dropped from 7.9 pounds in 1990 to 5.9 pounds per day in 1993.

3. Residential solid waste component was 39% versus 61% for commercial and industrial generation. Presumably, much more waste reduction can occur in both segments, especially the larger one.

4. The drop in waste was due to 5 factors: the economy, compliance with AB 939, flow control and franchise agreements, tipping fee increases and competition, and regulatory issues.

5. Arizona has a less complex system to get a landfill permitted.

6. Landfills by county receiving more than 3,000 tons per day in 1994 in Southern California were:

a.	Riverside	1 (El Sobrante)
b.	San Diego	2 (San Marcos and Miramar)
C .	Orange	2 (F. R. Bowerman and Alpha Olinda)
d .	Los Angeles	10 (Scholl Canyon, Azusa, Spadra,
		Puenta Hills, Calabassas, Lopez Canyon,
		BKK, Bradley, Chiquita Canyon, and
		Sunshine)
е.	Ventura	1 (Simi Valley)

f. San Bernardino and Imperial landfills did not receive 3,000 tons or more per day.

7. Only Ventura and Los Angeles counties have less than 15 years landfill capacity in Southern California.

8. Components of a typical county tipping fee are:

OPERATIONS FUND:	
Regulatory	
AB 1220	\$1.34
Air quality	.78
Water quality	3.08
Other mandated regulatory costs	1.64
Environmental	
Mitigation	1.00
Insurance	.52
X transfer station	1.71
Landfill Y operations contract	4.28
Landfill Z operations contract	2.80
Other	<u> </u>
Subtotal Operations Costs	\$24.92
CLOSURE FUND:	
Future closings	4.42
Closure Plans - Active sites	.37
Inactive sites	<u>_1.71</u>
Subtotal Closure Fund Costs	\$6.50
EXPANSION FUND	\$2.15
ARTICLE V FUND (Groundwater Remediation)	1.15
DEHS DISPOSAL FEE	<u>.78</u>
TOTAL TIPPING FEE	<u>\$35.50</u>

9. Typical household cost for collection, transport and disposal based on 1.7 tons per house for L.A. County runs \$130 annually or \$75 per ton. Of that, \$55 is for collection and \$20 for disposal.

10. Transport options include:

a .	Packer truck	10 - 12 t	ons	per load.	
				•	

- b. Transfer trailer20 25 tons per load.
- c. Rail 3,000 4,000 tons per load.

California rail haul projects planned are: Mesquite (Imperial County), MRC (Riverside County), Rail Cycle (San Bernardino County) and Puente Hills MRF (LA County).
11. The engineering company suggested that Imperial County has "...exciting opportunity to ultimately share in Mesquite's success".

D. SOLID WASTE - STATE and FEDERAL EFFORTS to MANAGE NONHAZARDOUS WASTE, a Report To The Ranking Minority Member, Committee On Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate, February 1995 contains the following information.

1. Data Concerning Types of Waste going Into Landfills is shown on page 29 of this report and is reproduced below.



% Distribution Municipal Solid Waste By Type & Weight, 1993 Based On EPA Data

2. The report also lists the total container/packaging weight of 34% in the pie chart above to be before any recycling occurs. After recycling, containers and packaging still make up 32% of all discarded waste. Therefore, when and as packaging changes are introduced by industry, a significant percentage of waste will be eliminated.

IV. RECENT REPORTS/STUDIES

3. The State of California should promote such changes with urgency by promoting the concept with other interested states and urge the Federal government to also do so.

For example, the Coalition of Northeastern Governors' Source Reduction Council was formed in 1976 by Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania. Rhode Island and Vermont. Members represented state governments, public interest organizations and industry. They published guidelines for industry to (1) eliminate packaging whenever possible; (2) minimize the amount of material used in packaging; (3) design packages that are returnable, refillable or reusable; and (4) produce packages that can be recycled and use recovered material in packages. These are voluntary guidelines, but as of August 1993, 8 of the top 40 retailers endorsed them. Sears Roebuck alone eliminated 1.5 million tons of packaging by September 1994.

This Coalition also prepared model legislation establishing standards for packaging sold or distributed in the Northeast. This sets goals of reducing solid waste in packaging by 50% by the year 2000.

4. The report also contains data on percentages of waste recycled in 1993 as shown below:

<u>Millions of Lons</u>			
Material	Vol. Generated	Vol. Recycled	Percent Recycled
Paper & paperboard	77.8	26.5	34
Glass	13.7	3.0	22.0
Metals	17.1	5.2	30.4
Plastics .	19.3	0.7	3.5
Rubber & leather	6.2	0.4	5.9
Textiles	6 .1	0.7	11.7
Wood	13.7	1.3	9.6
Other	3.3	0.7	22.1
Food, yard, Misc.	<u>49.7</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>13,1</u>
Total	<u>206.9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>21.7 % Avg.</u>

5. The report cites the following percentages for California for 1993 according to Biocycle May 1993.

Solid waste recycled	11%
Solid waste incinerated	2%

•

• Percent sent to landfills 87%

Relatively small changes in the amounts recycled, or incinerated will cause dramatic reductions in quantities going to landfills.

A. Orange County (Data discussed with Cymantha Atkinson, Dick Harabedian and others.)

1. Orange County does not have a solid waste site problem and projects 53 years remaining capacity (one estimate is 135,400,000 tons remaining capacity). Orange County owns and operates a landfill network of 5 separately permitted active and 21 closed sites and administers trash hauling and recycling contracts in unincorporated areas of the county.

2. The County is committed to education to promote recycling, source reduction, composting and landfilling via its Integrated Waste Management Dept. (IWMD).

3. A 19 member Waste Management Commission recommends disposal fees to the IWMD.

4. Tipping fees increased 7/1/95 from \$22.75 to \$35 per ton. That was changed April 1996 to \$27 per ton. However, the County is seeking imported wastes according to Dick Herabedian of the County Integrated Waste Management Department who administers contracts for all solid wastes imported into the County. He said that as of January 22, 1996 the rate schedule for out-of-county waste was:

TONS PER DAY	RATE PER TON
1 - 100	\$35
101 -300	\$21
301 - 600	\$20
601 - 1,000	\$19
1,001 up	\$18

Orange County has consummated sale of 5,000 tons per day of space at \$18 and \$19 per ton to out of the county customers for 5 to 10 years. The rate table states that if subsequent contracts for out-of-county waste at lower rates, the schedule will be adjusted to be comparable to the lower rate. Sue Gordon, Public Information Officer for Orange County Integrated Waste management Department confirmed the rates on May 21, 1996.

5. Continuing owner/operator obligations of the county's disposal system are:

a. Environmental protection and site maintenance costs of closed landfills for 30 years before allowed to request relief are \$208 million over the next 30 years.

b. Quarterly monitoring of air and water and preventative actions cost \$4 million per year on 21 closed sites.

c. Santiago Canyon landfill is set to close after year 2000. Costs are estimated to be \$28 million followed by an obligation for annual maintenance and monitoring for minimum 30 years.

d. Any unknown future costs from claims, defenses litigation, and so forth are not available to project.

6. See the competition for landfills for the County in the attached Schedule 1.

7. According to the December 13, 1995 issue of the Los Angeles Times, Orange County Supervisors approved a methane gas process for installation at the Bowerman and Olinda landfills and an option to build one at the San Juan Capistrano landfill. This is reported to provide the County with \$200,000 in annual revenues toward the end of this decade. Further, the system is expected to reduce costs by at least another \$200,000 per year through sharing some maintenance and operating costs with GSF Energy Inc. (GSF) of Brea. GSF would receive a long-term contract from the County to operate the system which could power more than 11,000 homes. The project apparently has the backing of Southern California Edison Co... The same article referred to the landfill system as one of the County's most valuable assets. Officials expect to generate more than \$15 million per year by importing tons of out-of-county trash to their local landfills.

B. San Bernardino County (Data from "Partnership for County-wide Integrated Waste Management Strategy" report June 1995)

1. Critical issue is county's capacity at sites. Entire system will be out of capacity by year 2004 unless expanded and/or transfer stations developed to send to alternate sites.

2. As of November 1995, Norcal San Bernardino, Inc. manages all of the county's landfills. They bury trash, collect fees for all 16 landfills and transfer stations and do almost all engineering, planning, administration and environmental monitoring and construction for a total of \$18.44 per ton under a 5 year contract with extensions of two 15 year options and CPI adjustments (source: Report of R. A. Nelson, CEO Waste Resources Management Dist. Riverside, dated 4/9/96.). This virtually privatizes the system.

3. Currently collection and transfer of solid wastes is done by private and municipal haulers. Private haulers primarily serve unincorporated areas licensed by Dept. of Environmental Health except Big Bear and Baker which do their own. Three of the 24 cities operate municipal collection systems (Ontario, San Bernardino and Redlands). Colton has private haulers for commercial wastes. The rest have franchise agreements with private haulers for collection. Twenty commercial haulers do unincorporated areas. Seven private landfills receive only special limited wastes.

4. Assumptions are that tonnage in Valley region will decline 3% per year till 1998 then grow 2% while desert regions will increase 3% per year.

5. Closure/Post-closure and remediation costs were estimated in 1994 as: \$106 million to close all sites and \$185 million for post-closure maintenance for 30 years.

State regulations require funds to cover possible cost of remediation of groundwater estimated to be \$73 million for 15 years.

6. The County hired Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc. consultants in Falls Church, VA to assist. This firm recommends:

a. Cost savings can result by consolidating disposal at the County's landfills from the present 17 to 3 (Mid-Valley, San Timateo and Barstow) and expanding them for 30 more years to about 2025 for current and <u>future customers</u>. Three other landfills (Landers, Victorville and Colton) can be used for back-up if the first three are not approved.

A-45

Using County capacity is said to be cheaper than going to non-County owned disposal sites. Tipping fees are to be set at lowest possible rates. One reason is to get volumes to fund significant closure costs and remediation/maintenance for 30 years after closure.

b. Rail Cycle dramatically changed policy and now is aggressively pursuing County's wastes to get their project viable. This change as noted "... will undermine the benefits of the draft business agreement submitted to the Board". Apparently, Rail Cycle may be relying on San Bernardino waste for all or much of its tonnage. The County may need to modify its System Impact Fee in the Agreement draft to generate amounts to fund closure, post-closure and Article 5 remediation obligations.

c. Continue to develop network of collection centers and transfer stations and have rail access in the valley region in case needed to use remote landfills.

d. Get host communities to allow expansion of landfills probably by paying \$2 to \$3 per ton.

e. Get service agreements with cities for 3-5 years and options to go to 15-20 years. Establish tipping fees via formula rather than annual rate ordinance. Charge for disposal on a county-wide basis.

7. Per a report dated April 9, 1996 by Robert A Nelson, CEO of Riverside Waste Resource Management District, the county generated 1.57 million waste tons and the County system received 1.4 million tons in 1994/95. Further, Ontario recently agreed to have Western Waste Industries take about 165,000 tons per year to El Sobrante landfill by the end of 1996. The disposal fees are now \$35.50 per ton but may soon reduce to a sliding scale of \$32 to \$29 per ton based on the contract period.

C. San Diego County (Based on Preliminary draft of County of San Diego's *INTEGRATED* WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN - COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT dated August 10, 1995) and some telephone calls.

1. Michelle Stress stated that the city of San Diego has a separate landfill (Miramar), from the County. County has 5 landfills of which 3 are large and 2 are small. Also that North County was to go incinerator but stopped due to local pressure. Then they raised tipping fees a lot and that raised them elsewhere so some cities took trash out of state (eg. to Yuma, Arizona for a \$20 per ton tipping fee). Orange County is closer and may be a future source. Rates are to be about \$40 per ton 7/1/96 vs. \$47.50 now in effect which has driven some cities out.

2. As of June 1994 the County had capacity of 43,700,000 tons (72,026,055 cubic yards @ conversion factor of 1 ton per 1.56 cubic yards) excluding the USMC landfills. Interestingly, the county estimated capacity in 1990 at 72,692,000 cubic yards and states the same capacity at both dates is due to expansion of landfills and diversion programs.

3. Cities of El Cajon, Oceanside, Carlsbad and Escondido now export waste outside of the County. Oceanside and El Cajon have Waste Management Inc. agreements for collection and disposal of 85,000 tons per year for 3 to 5 years. El Cajon waste is disposed of at Lancaster landfill in city of Lancaster and Oceanside's waste is disposed of at the BKK landfill in the City of West Covina. Carlsbad has agreement with Coast Waste to collect 68,000 tons per year and is goes to La Paz, Arizona and Cocopa Indian Tribe landfill in Sommerton, Arizona and to SERRF planned waste-to-energy plant in Long Beach.

LANDFILL	OWNER	OPERATOR	CAPACITY YDs.
Las Pulgas	U. S. Marine Corps	USMC	888,576
San Onofre	USMC	USMC	132.787
Borrego	San Diego County	Norcal, Inc	454,574
Springs			
Otay & Annex	San Diego County	Norcal, Inc	19,789,500
Ramona	San Diego County	Norcal, Inc	1,327,650
San Marcos	San Diego County	Norcal, Inc	7,181,000
Sycamore	San Diego County	Norcal, Inc	29,392,000
Miramar	U. S. Navy	City San Diego	<u>13,881,331</u>
	TOTAL, in round		
	numbers		<u>73,000,000</u>

4. Capacities by landfill are:

5. Conclusions - City of San Diego has tentative sites for new landfills as does the County. That city has contracted with Norcal to its field operations (burying trash at a cost of \$4.32 per ton.). At present time, the capacity of existing landfills and the City of San Diego's planned new landfill will provide disposal capacity for all waste generated within the County beyond the 15 year planning period. Also, they now could send waste to Orange County.

D. Imperial County (Based on a 2 page letter from Gerald Quick, Local Enforcement Agency - Permitting Imperial County).

		1/1/93	CLOSING
SITE	TONS PER DAY	CAPACITY IN	YEAR
		YARDS	
COUNTY OPERATED:			
Brawley	68	1,379,000	2006
Calexico	70	2,846,000	2006
Holtville	19	415,000	2004
Hot Spa	4	470,000	2086
Niland	5	1,208,000	2037
Ocotillo	1	492,000	2053
Palo Verde	1	469,000	2044
Picacho	20	1,136,000	2025
Salton City	5	2,545,000	2087
Worthington (Imperial)			
	28	1,672,000	2025
PRIVATE SITE:			
Republic Imperial (Mals			
Properties)	250	5,100,000	2030

1. Current landfill sites in operation are:

2. Proposed Mesquite Regional Landfill has 20,000 tons per day limit, a 600,000,000 cubic yard capacity and an estimated closing date of 2096. This landfill permit application is being contested in court.

E. Riverside County (Data is based on the revised preliminary draft of the *RIVERSIDE* COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN dated May 1996 and on preliminary drafts dated January 1996 of the Riverside County SUMMARY PLAN and the SITING ELEMENT. Comments on the reports can be given Lesley Likins or Kathy Gifford 909-275-4375.

1. Objectives of Riverside County as shown in the SUMMARY PLAN are:

Objective 1: The unincorporated County and each city will achieve at least 25% diversion of the adjusted 1990 base year tonnage by 1995 and 50% by 2000. Reworded in the May 1996 document to "strive to comply with the waste reduction goals of AB 939 et seq. Strive to cost-effectively implement the elements and programs within the CIWMP.

Objective 2: Provide information to 75% of the general public on the issues of source reduction, recycling, and composting by 1995 and 90% by 2000. Reworded in the May 1996 document calling for education of the citizens focusing on waste prevention as first priority and composting as the second priority.

Objective 3: Provide information on household hazardous waste collection programs, safe disposal, and alternatives to common household waste products to 75% of the general public by 1995 and 100% by 2000.

Objective 4: Eliminate, to the greatest extent practical, household hazardous wastes from entering in-county and out-of-county landfills used by Riverside County jurisdictions by 2000.

Objective 5: The County and each affected city will provide technical assistance to businesses considering locating within the Recycling Market Development Zones.

Objective 6: The County and the Cities will adopt local government purchasing policies which specify requirements for the purchase of products using recycled or composted materials.

Objective 7: Develop nondisposal facilities, including but not limited to, transfer stations, materials recovery facilities, intermediate processing facilities, and composting facilities, where needed.

2. The District provides disposal facilities used by 24 incorporated cities and the unincorporated areas of the County. Disposal facilities include 12 active permitted landfills owned and operated by the District and one privately-owned facility (El Sobrante Landfill) owned by Western Waste Industries under contract to the District. County also has 2 small rural transfer stations. The only landfill operated by the County which accepts out-of-county waste is the Blythe Landfill which takes 1.5 tons of waste from sources in Arizona. El Sobrante Landfill, which has a capacity of 8 million tons, dedicated 1.1 million tons for out-of-county waste. The county operates 2 permitted transfer stations (Idylwild and Pinon Flats)

3. A comparison of 1990 and 1995 remaining refuse disposal capacity is shown in Table 3-1 of the May 1996 *SITING ELEMENT* from which only 1995 figures are listed below using a conversion factor of 1 ton equals 1.67 yards. The close dates are from Table 4-13.

	1995 REN	AAINING CAPACITY	
LANDFILLS	CLOSE DATE	TONS	CUBIC YARDS
Anza	1997	21,748	43,496
Badlands	2010	7,347,856	12,270,920
Blythe	2033	1,446,893	2,893,786
Coachella	1996	263,911	440,731
Desert Center	2012	41,034	82,068
Double Butte	Closed	Closed	Closed
Edom Hill	2006	2,081,710	3,476,456
El Sobrante	2005	4,666,637	7,793,284
Highgrove	1996	563,700	941,379
Lamb Canyon	2006	1,767,619	2,951,924
Mead Valley	1997	507,422	847,395
Mecca II	2000	52,394	104,788
Oasis	2019	<u>121.428</u>	242,856
TOTAL		<u>18,882,352</u>	32,089,082

EXTRACT FROM TABLES 3-1 and 4-13 REMAINING COUNTYWIDE DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The table above is noted in the report as showing a significant decrease in available refuse disposal capacity between 1990 and 1995 of about 52 million tons. This decrease can not be explained by tons received at the landfills which are down due to economic climate and recycling efforts. Rather it is due in part to using ultimate buildout disposal capacity figures in 1990 versus only permitted design capacity in 1995, discovery of an active fault in the planned expansion area of the Coachella landfill, and in part to less capacity for the Edom Hill, Anza, Mecca and Oasis landfills in 1995.

4. The District report shows adequate capacity, with its present facilities as is, for the next 13 years and will not need additional capacity until 2008. That is based on not using Eagle Mountain or other present or proposed landfills in or out-of-County. Additional 2 years capacity needed to have 15 years in total will be provided by siting of a proposed rail-haul landfill or landfill expansions. <u>Substantial</u> added capacity is probable from expansion of Lamb Canyon, Badlands, Edom Hill and El Sobrante. Additional capacity may also be obtained through export out of the County and/or disposal reduction programs and technologies including, but not limited to landfill mining and waste bailing.

Table 3-2 of both the May 1996 RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT and the January 1996 preliminary draft SITING ELEMENT contains the following data which is condensed:

YEAR END	DISPOSAL	ANNUAL DISPOSAL IN REGION	REMAINING CAPACITY	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY NEEDED
1994	1,258,018	1,258,018	18,882,352	
1995	1,266,346	1,280,346	17,616,006	
1996	1,267,243	1,267,243	16,348,763	
1997	1,268,176	1,268,176	15,080,587	
1998	1,269,147	1,269,147	13,811,440	
1999	1,270,156	1,270,156	12,541,285	
2000	1,283,378	1,283,378	11,257,906	
2001	1,309,045	1,309,045	9,948,861	
2002	1,335,226	1,335,226	8,613,635	
2003	1,361,931	1,361,931	7,251,704	
2004	1,389,169	1,389,169	5,862,535	
2005	1,416,953	1,416,953	4,445,582	
2006	1,445,292	1,445,292	3,000,290	
2007	1,474,197	1,474,197	1,526,093	
2008	1,503,681	1,503,681	22,412	
2009	1,533,755	1,533,755	(1,511,343)	(1,511343)
2010	1,564,430	1,564,430	(3,075,773)	(3,075,773)

TABLE 3-2
DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY
(TONS)

Note: The table above shows no exports or imports for the planned period. It also excludes waste diversion by MRF's or transfer stations which could be established during the plan period.

5. The revised draft May 1996 SITING ELEMENT should be revised by deleting Eagle Mountain from the tables referred to below and it should contain a conclusion as to the adequacy of the County's solid waste landfills for the period covered by the report.. The capacities appear adequate.

The proposed landfill expansion projects and a proposed new landfill (Eagle Mountain) are listed in the final draft (May 1996) *SITTNG ELEMENT* in Tables 9-2 and 9-3 (one line showing capacities is added from Tables 6-1 to 6-5 of that report) are summarized below.

RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES	LAMB CANYON	BADLANDS EXPANSION	EL SOBRANTE EXPANSION (near Corona)	EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL & RECYCLING CENTER	EDOM HILL
Facility Owner	District	District	Western Waste Ind. (WWI)	Mine Reclamation Corp. (MRC)	District
Facility Operator	District	District	WWI & District in private/pub. Partnership	MRC	District
Facility Design	1997/2000	1997/2000	1995/1996	1995/1996	1996
Land Use Approval and Permitting	1998	1998	1995/1996	1996	1996
Initiate Operations	2002/2003	2008/2009	1997 or later	1997	1996/1997
Capacity Added/New Per Tables 6-1 to 6-5	12,500,000 Or More Tons	20,000,000 Or More Tons	25,000,000 to 100,000,000 Tons	670,000,000 tons	709,083 Or More tons
Revenue Sources Per Table 9-4	Tipping Fees	Tipping Fees	Corporate And Tipping Fees	Corporate	Tipping Fees
			···		
Per Report of R. A. Nelson, CEO Waste Resources Management Dist. Riverside, dated 4/9/96 - Added capacity per Exhibit 1-3.	7,000,000 to 12,500,000 tons (4 out of 10 chance to get it.)	32,800,000 to 39,800,000 tons (7 out of 10 chance to get it.)	25,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons (8 out of 10 chance to get it.)	Not in Exhibit.	0 to 700,000 tons (7 out of 10 chance to get it.)

Note: "District" in the tables above refer to a separate entity owned by Riverside County separate from the County's General Fund and governed by a Board of Directors composed of the County's Board of Supervisors.

a. The Tables 9-2, 9-3 and 9-4 should delete the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill and Recycling Center from the Tables. The expansions of present landfills are much more likely of completion and at a much lower risk. Then add to the Table 9-2 the increased capacity expected for each of the expansions planned.

7 - C

7 – B

That new capacity data is now on Tables 6-1 through 6-5. <u>The County should then</u> conclude as to whether or not it has the capacity for the 15 year period as a result of those planned expansions, and exclude Eagle Mountain as not vital nor close enough to permitting to be included. These expansions should be pushed forward as quickly as possible since they represent large revenues at low risk and at a high probability of coming in operation.

b. The proposed Eagle Mountain landfill should be deleted from the report or at most be included in the text only or could be shown in a separate Table as to its impact if permitted on the County. On page 8 - 1, Section 8.2 of the May *SITING ELEMENT*, the statement is made that: "Riverside County is not required to develop alternative strategies for solid waste diversion and disposal because the county has sufficient disposal capacity for the next 15 years with the proposed expansions at Badlands, lamb canyon, and El Sobrante Landfills and the new Eagle Mountain Landfill. This is ridiculous. First, it puts too much emphasis on a rejected site which must go through the process again. Second, it indicates that the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District is biased in favor of that trash project and <u>does not even have a contract from the owners that any of the County's trash will go there. The entire project is pure conjecture, does not justify or merit the emphasis given by the subject report and must be amended to exclude the project.</u>

Further, Mr. Robert Nelson, CEO of the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District in a WHITE PAPER on "Privatization" Options dated April 9, 1996 states that one factor improving the landfill market is the Eagle Mountain landfill setback in permitting.

c. The Appendix A in the preliminary draft discusses the "waste-generation" based approach". It is not clear as to whether increasing diversion rates are expected for the 15 years and what the population projections are. The County should elaborate on:

(1) What the best estimates of waste generation are for the planning period.

- (2) What the expected diversion rates are.
- (3) What population trends are expected.

7 – D

। ज

7 - F

6. The generation and disposition of solid waste collected in 1990 is presented in Table SP 4-3 and Table 4-5 of the SUMMARY PLAN as:

	1994 TONS	1990 TONS
Generated		2,429,208
Diverted		-547,665
Transformed		-20,051
Exported		0
Landfilled	<u>1,232,815</u>	1,861,493
% of Total Generated		<u>76.6%</u>

Note: The tons disposed in 1994 were only 66% of the 1990 tons. The SITING ELEMENT on Table 3-2 shows disposal in 1994 to be 1,258,018 tons which approximate those above. Details of the tons generated, diverted, etc. are not shown in the SUMMARY PLAN or SITING ELEMENT for 1994. However, the landfilled amounts denote a significant drop in disposal in only 4 years regardless of whether diversion or other methods caused the unplanned drop. Again, this shows that projections are often overstated as to solid wastes available for landfilling. The May 1996 report shows the 1990 tons generated as 2,276,202 (6,236 tons daily) and about the same tons disposed of (1,829,250 tons) in 1990. However, the May 1996 report shows 1995 tons disposed of at about 1994 levels at 1,290,708 tons or 6,039 tons per day.

7

ഹ

7. Hilton Farnkopf and Hobson in Newport Beach were contracted to assist the County in studying the landfill/solid waste situation and reported July 7, 1995 in a document entitled *RIVERSIDE COUNTY COOPERATIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY*, Volume 1. The report is addressed to:

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Coachella Valley association of Governments Western Riverside Council of Governments

The following issues were addressed and issues noted:

a. District's disposal system is supposedly the lowest average cost disposal option for system users over next 15 years given alternative options projected.

b. District has substantial unfunded liability (estimated at \$49 to \$79 million) due to closure, post-closure and remediation costs. Further, the District has insufficient assets to finance its total obligations if existing landfill users discontinue their use of district's landfills. Apparently, officials now want to fund it over next 15 years. It should have been funded over life of the system for many years already. Some other counties are in the same shape.

c. Transfer stations are an important element of the future system due to closings of landfills and they should be owned by municipalities and/or part of a cooperative system.

A transfer station is privately being developed as a replacement for the Mead Valley landfill. They want financial support from the County for offering a commitment of waste to the District landfills. Potential waste flow to this project is 21% of the current tonnage in the system.

It is cost effective to have a small station to replace Mecca II in rural Coachella Valley and one or two larger ones in Coachella Valley. Also one to replace Anza landfill in Western Riverside County is needed. Location is not that important. The stations should be municipal owned for control and availability. Including the transfer costs in tipping fees should result in largest volumes going into the cooperative system at lowest costs.

d. Material recovery facilities developed with public funds are not required now since diversion is on track with a 50% rate by 2000, but should be designed to allow expansion for processing in future and as such should be a local decision and funded locally. Private operators may develop them.

e. County is sensitive that if tipping fees become too high, cities will take trash out of county/state.

f. City customers representing 78.5% of the system tonnage want surcharges on imports at regional landfills. This would also help fund unfunded closure costs.

g. Landfill disposal of solid wastes should be part of the cooperative system if cost effective. Lowest cost method to get future landfill capacity is by pay-as-go basis from disposal fees. Average cost of district's disposal facilities looks competitive for next 15 years.

h. Financing should be on pay-as-go basis for the cooperative system assuming current users continue to dispose in District's landfills. Complying with 50% diversion requirement will increase system costs of collecting, hauling, processing and disposal by 1 to 2% in Western Riverside and Coachella Valley if separation of materials is done by generator. Using present systemwide pricing seems cost effective for disposal servicers and the transfer stations by reducing risk of waste flows going to more distant places.

i. Current district reserve funds should finance 44% of estimated closure (\$34 million), post-closure (\$16 million) and remediation (\$31 million) and inactive landfill (\$6 million) costs. Of the total \$87 million costs, \$49 million is unfunded. Future users can finance rest if assumed disposal tonnage and rates hold. The most practical way to pay for these costs is to add \$2.45 on disposal fees based on projected 20,000,000 disposable tons for the next 15 years. Most of the landfills are older, unlined facilities which could result in higher remediation costs which would increase the future tipping fees.

However, the closure, post-closure, remediation and other costs to shut all present County-owned landfills if all users stop delivering waste is \$138,000,000.

j. District has insufficient assets to finance total obligations if existing landfill users discontinue use of District's facilities. One statement was: "...waste commitments are critical to the financial stability of the disposal system." Various options are in the report to retire the unfunded costs including:

(1) Selling the landfills and associated liabilities.

(2) Have the landfills operated by third parties and use annual savings in operating costs.

(3) Surcharge other non-county owned landfills in the County including a special surcharge on out-of-County waste imported.

(4) Use County's general reserves to pay for part.

(5) Increase tipping fees.

(6) Recover unfunded costs through parcel fees based on relative waste generation factors.

k. District plans to close up to 7 of its 13 landfills in next 7 years which will cause 60% of tonnage to be rerouted.

 District's average tipping fees of \$38.50 compares to estimated \$33 per ton for disposal and development of rural transfer stations to replace Anza and Mecca II over next 15 years. Average tipping fees would be \$36 if transfer stations are developed at Anza, Mecca II, Coachella and Edom Hill. The average for the next 15 years would be \$40 per ton if Agua Mansa and Perris are added to the other stations noted in the preceding sentence.

Cost per ton for the next 15 years for direct haul to County landfills is projected to be between \$102 and \$105 to County-owned landfills versus somewhat higher amounts to landfills in Arizona (except for Eastern Riverside), Orange County or super-regional landfills now in the permitting process. However, such comparisons must be updated via quotes to rely on them due to rapidly changing quotes (generally going down in tipping fees).

m. Bids from private contractors should be received to operate landfills to see if savings would result.

n. It is not possible to determine which, if any, of the proposed super-regional landfills will be successfully permitted & developed.

o. County has attained a 40% diversion rate for 1994. Existing mix of recycling activities is probably market driven and cost effective.

p. Inert processing and commercial waste stream recycling appear to be the most cost effective future waste diversion programs.

q. Western Riverside -

(1) District's planned expansion of existing landfills is expected to give 35 years of capacity. That regions cost of hauling, transfer and disposal at it's landfills appear less costly than out-of-county alternatives. Although Western Riverside generates sufficient waste to minimize rail haul costs, the total system costs of using rail haul facilities appears more costly than the District's landfills.

(2) Rural transfer station is needed to replace Anza landfill. Other transfer stations may not be needed there since direct hauling to District's landfills is least costly for that section.

(3) Cost of hauling and transfer to out-of-county landfills from Agua Mansa and Perris is \$3 per ton higher than developing 5 transfer stations within certain area which areas may not be available for them.

(4) This section achieved 40% diversion in 1994. Getting to 50% would increase system cost by 1%.

A-58

r. Coachella Valley -

(1) Coachella and Edom landfills may close by 2002 although wastes may be transferred to other landfills. But, the tonnage could be taken to Badlands landfill in Western Riverside if it stays in-county. However, it would be cheaper to take the waste to Orange County and it would only be a little less expensive than taking it to BFI's La Paz landfill in Arizona. Plus, La Paz is offering indemnification against Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA or "Superfund") liability. According to the report, the present difference in the system cost of collection, hauling, transfer, transit and disposal is only 5% (La Paz \$122 per ton, Badlands \$120 and Eagle Mountain \$116). If a transfer station is not installed, a private one may be to take tonnage out-of-county or out of municipal owned landfills. See Schedule 2 attached for quoted costs.

Prior to more recent data, systems costs to haul, transfer and dispose appeared competitive with out-of-county alternatives. However, the experience in other locations is that these costs vary as any one mega-landfill opens. This has now happened without a mega-landfill in the case of Orange County now looking for waste at rates at and less than \$20 per ton depending on tonnage.

(2) This area does not generate enough solid waste to result in rail haul being efficient unless another region's wastes are combined.

(3) District's plan to replace Mecca II landfill with a transfer station is cost effective.

(4) One or two transfer stations could be put in urban Coachella Valley to transfer waste to district's Badlands landfill or out-of-county after the landfills close in the county.

(5) Cost of putting two transfer stations at or near Coachella and Edom landfill sites is \$3 to \$6 per ton more costly than 1 station in mid-valley area.

(6) Coachella Valley got to 41% diversion in 1994. If 50% is achieved, it increases system costs by 2%.

s. Far Eastern Riverside -

(1) Blythe landfill has 35 years capacity.

(2) System cost of direct hauling to Blythe appears cost effective vs. out-ofcounty alternatives.

- (3) Area achieved 21% diversion, but the figure is disputed.
- 8. In general, questions about the Hilton Farnkopf & Hobson report relate to:

a. System assumptions for tipping fees are not illogical, except for the possibility that tipping fees will ultimately be set by competitive factors in the long run. All indications are that tipping fees are on the way down in this region as noted elsewhere in this Memorandum. Fees also include costs passed-through from other county departments such as enforcement, closure, remediation, and so forth. However, out-of-county or privately-owned landfills in the county which may be permitted will set rates at will to get capacity tons due to tremendous capital expended to open a landfill. The forecasts used current fees of \$38.50 per ton for 1994-95 then cost changes expected for 15 years which result in fees going down starting in 1995-96 through 2002 then rising to levels of between \$39 and \$44 in 2009-10.

Proper evaluation of future competition for solid wastes in various regions of southern California should be undertaken. In certain regions of the Eastern US, fees have fallen dramatically as large facilities were permitted and opened, so even though Riverside County got information from operators or sponsors of existing and proposed facilities, the data is not predictably accurate due to many market influences.

b. The experts hired did state that prices charged to rate payers for disposal at non-District landfills cannot be accurately estimated without competitive bids. They know of other jurisdictions where solid waste services bids varied by as much as 100%. In just a short period between May 12, 1995 and July 7, 1995, two operators reduced their bids 10 to 20%.

c. Several large landfills proposed in Southern California have capacities of 20,000 tons per day and lives up to 100 years. Further, Arizona landfills are permitted and compete for solid wastes. These include BFI's La Paz landfill and Waste management's Butterfield landfill, both of which accept well over 4,800 tons per day. Another facility is Carbon Canyon in Utah. Orange County's Brea-Olinda landfill also has 4,500 tons per day available present capacity at bargain rates.

<u>Riverside County landfills received only 4.800 tons per day of in-county waste during</u> <u>1994 based on a 5 day week.</u> If one or more of the following begin operations, fees can be expected to drop dramatically.

			PROPOSED
PROJECT	SPONSOR	LOCATION	CAPACITY
			TONS PER
			DAY
Rail Cycle (Bolo.Sta.)	Waste Management	San Bernardino County	21,000
Eagle Mountain	Mine Reclamation	Riverside County.	20,000
Mesquite Regional	Western Waste	Imperial County	20,000
Eismere Canyon	BKK	North LA County	16,500
Copperstate	Copperstate Recyc.	Welton, AZ (Yuma)	Unlimited

Such landfills in the permitting process include:

9. Eagle Mountain and other mega-landfills - Additional, new mega-landfills may not be needed for Riverside's or any other Southern California county's solid wastes. In addition, they have the potential for creating substantial liability risks for the depository County in the event of a financial collapse of the private operation entity.

Current figures are not available as to the economic viability of the Eagle Mountain project. Schedule 3 attached is an attempt to project the economics of that project assuming tipping fees for all years of \$20 per ton, certain tonnages and other financial information contained from a *Final Report ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF THE EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL PROJECT TO THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE* by KPMG Peat Marwick addressed to Mr. Richard Daniels of Mine Reclamation Corporation and dated November 1991. Based on the assumptions used and noted on Schedule 3, a loss is estimated for this project.

As shown on that Schedule 3 attached, the tons projected assumed a start of operations in 1993, That did not happen. The tons may now also be incorrect for early and later years due to local competition for waste and due to other mega-landfills in the permitting process. There is just not enough waste around to fill the capacity opened by just one mega-landfill if permitted.

Using today's lower tipping fees of say \$20 per ton and using the Host fees projected in the report referred to above, the project appears to be uneconomical. As noted, current estimates on that project would need to be available and many other details need review before firmly concluding one way or the other. The County should obtain such data. Recent tipping fee information was obtained from the Waste Resource Management District of the County. This data is attached as Schedule 4 and is a copy of a summary of responses from requests for proposals from CVAG. As shown on that Schedule 4, tipping fees quoted for delivered waste go as low as \$14.25 per ton and are mostly under \$30 and average closer to \$20 or less per ton. Such relatively low tipping fees allow for higher hauling charges to distant sites before reaching Riverside County's and other counties' rates.

The estimated tipping fees for solid waste to be received at the Eagle Mountain site were once quoted at \$40 per ton by Richard Daniels, President of Mine Reclamation Corporation per the minutes of the September 29, 1992 Riverside County Board of Supervisors hearing on Eagle Mountain.

Another consideration concerns the County's direct and indirect costs if the Eagle Mountain landfill is permitted and opens. Presumably, the County (the Host) will incur significant infrastructure costs and expenses during the many years of operation of the landfill relating to fire, police, road maintenance and so forth. Such costs are not included in estimates available to the public.

10. The Riverside County Waste Management District issued a WHITE PAPER on "Privatization" Options dated April 9, 1996, submitted by Robert A. Nelson, Chief Executive Officer. That report in summary concludes that:

a. "Sale of District landfills is not recommended at this time for various reasons..."

b. "Advance sale of District landfill space to existing customers chould be considered as a means to protect the District and its customers". However, the report recommends it only after the excess capacity is permitted at the Badlands landfill. The District's other significant disposal capacity will be available when the El Sobrante Landfill expansion (or other private capacity) is permitted. The report refers to a agreement with Western Waste Industries on the El Sobrante expansion that precludes sale of any of the 40 million tons assigned to the District to out of county customers.

Advance sale of landfill space is then recommended to customers within the county

at:

(1) El Sobrante where over 4 million tons of permitted space is available and would last 12 to 15 years with the current customer base.

(2) Badlands landfill with over 7 million tons of capacity is available and projected to last current customers 10 or more years.

(3) Edom Hill space may be evaluated for sale later in 1996 after disposition of CVAG landfill shopping and the success of vertical expansion permit application now in process.

c. Certain District functions could be privatized which include: Specified disposal operations, and all fee activities. Consultants or private contractors are recommended for:

- (1) Major contract construction.
- (2) Quality control/quality assurance on liner and closure contracts.

V.

(3) Specialized engineering, remediation and geotechnical designs.

(4) Peak load engineering design for liner development and landfill closure.

- (5) Environmental impact reports.
- (6) All laboratory testing of air and water samples.
- d. The report does not recommend privatizing the following activities:
 - (1) Monitoring/reporting air and groundwater.

(2) Operation and maintenance of gas flares and groundwater remediation facilities.

- (3) Engineering design staff to meet 70% of annual design load.
- (4) Planning and recycling functions.
- (5) Environmental assessments.
- (6) Receivables, payables, accounting and administration.

e. The report then lists the factors which are depressing the landfill market and those improving it as:

- (1) Improving the landfill market -
 - Closure of BKK landfill in West Covina set for 9/15/96.
 - Eagle Mountain landfill setback in permitting.
- (2) Depressing the landfill market -
 - Success of recycling in last 5 years plus economic slowdown.
 - Orange County "firesale" of its excess capacity.
 - Success in permitting Sunshine Canyon landfill in LA.

- La Paz, Arizona taking southern California waste.
- Lancaster landfill pursuing imports.
- Lowering of tipping fees in various counties.
- Probability of success in permitting El Sobrante landfill (outlet for 10,000 tons per day).
- Local approval of Goldfields/Mesquite regional landfill in Imperial County.
- Permitting opportunity at proposed BOLO regional landfill in San Bernardino County via voter initiative.
- Others not listed herein.

The "Nelson" report also discusses the responsibility of the County to protect the general health, safety and welfare of the citizens and the state laws mandating the county to provide for the disposal of solid waste generated in unincorporated portions of the County, but not necessarily for its cities.

F. Los Angeles County - (SITING ELEMENT REPORT WAS NOT BE AVAILABLE

The data below is extracted from a memorandum and attached background paper dated August 19, 1993 prepared by Liza Smith, Deputy Director Waste Prevention & Education of the California Integrated Waste Management Board and a report dated August 6, 1992 prepared by the Enforcement Branch, Fullerton, CA of the California Integrated Waste management Board.

1. LA County has 20 active, permitted solid waste landfills. These receive 40,026 tons per working day (TPD). There are also 2 waste-to-energy facilities receiving 1,695 TPD and 42 transfer stations receiving 13,329 TPD. Of these, 38 are in the county, 22 in the city of LA, 3 in Long Beach and 1 in West Covina. When the final *SITING ELEMENT REPORT* is available, the capacities are expected to be much higher due to planned expansions, diversions and transfers-out-of-County. The City of LA generated 4.8 million tons per year in 1992 and disposed of 3.8 million tons (20.6% diversion rate. However, they target a 36% diversion rate for 1995 and 57% for 2000. The County of LA diverted 13.8% in 1990 compared to 12,292,049 tons generated.

2. Data per Table II of a memorandum and attached background paper dated August 19, 1993 prepared by Liza Smith, Deputy Director Waste Prevention & Education of the California Integrated Waste Management Board summarizes solid waste facilities presumably as of the end of 1992 or mid-1993.

SOLID WASTE FACILITY SUMMARY (Active, Permitted - Los Angeles County - All Areas

	QUANTITY	PERMITTED TPD	ACTUAL TPD
Landfills	20	63,826	40,026
Transfer Stations	42	22,334	13,329
Waste-to-Energy	2	1,932	1,695

		Permitted	Actual	Remaining
Facility	Location	TPD	TPD	Life In Years
Bradley Ave. West	City of LA	7,000	5,000	25
Calabassas Landfill #5	Agoura	3,500	2,800	16
Chiquita Canyon	Castaic	5,000	1,300	7.3
Lopez Canyon as is	City of LA	4,000	1,800	2.5
If extended use	permit			
issued				5
Puente Hills #6	Whittier	12,000	11,680	1.25
Unpermitted				
capacity				20
Scholl Canyon	Glendale	3,400	2,100	15
Spadra	Pomona	3,700	3,700	5.5
BKK Disposal Site	West Covina	12,000	9,215	2.5
Applied for total				9.5
Other Landfill	N/A	<u>13,226</u>	<u>2,431</u>	Not Available
TOTALS		<u>63,826</u>	<u>40,026</u>	

MAJOR LANDFILLS _ LOS ANGELES COUNTY (All Areas)

VI. RECYCLING IS A BIG BUSINESS AND INCREASING

According to <u>U.S.</u> News and World Report, as written in the December 1995 issue of <u>Money World</u>, demand for recyclables has caught up to and surpassed the supply in recent years. Browning-Ferris Industries had recycling revenue increases from \$32 million in 1990 to \$359 million in 1994. Other corporations in their business also experienced similar growth.

Not many years ago, old newspapers were not in demand by recycling businesses. Some cities paid to have them accepted and taken away. Prices of various recyclables dropped. However, today's prices and demand are up across the line. Since May 1993, used clear glass container prices jumped 78% and used aluminum can prices also experienced large increases. Meanwhile, old newspaper prices are up 1,338%.

Further, according to the same article cited above, "In the U. S. between 1990 and 1994, more than 85 new paper mills using recycling technology were built. ... Weyerhaeuser... offers municipalities 20-year contracts to remove all the paper the municipalities can provide."

The impact of such recycling growth will have a positive and large impact on solid waste storage capacity since increasing quantities will be recycled.

The County of Riverside does have a program underway to promote recycling, composting and some material recovery processes.

VII. LANDFILL MINING - One Solution?

A report dated October, 1993 titled LANDFILL MINING FEASIBILITY STUDY was prepared by CalRecovery Incorporated for California Integrated Waste Management Board and the Science Applications International Corporation. George Savage is Executive Vice President of this engineering services business located at 725C Alfred Nobel Dr. in Hercules, California, 94547 (510-724-0220). The following points are in the report:

1. Landfill mining (LFM) is the process of excavating solid waste landfills and processing excavated materials using mechanical separation equipment to reclaim one or all of: soil fractions(soil/compost), recoverable materials for reuse or as solid fuel, and landfill space.

- 2. Potential benefits and uses of LFM are:
 - a. Extension of the life span of the landfill.

b. Material recovery, including fuel (combustible waste) and soil fraction (composed of the soil used for covering the waste when originally landfilled and finely sized particles of the decomposed wastes as landfill cover material).

c. Landfill removal (clean closure) is increasingly being considered for small

sites.

- d. Site upgrading.
- e. Remediation (remedying) of a site and reducing the footprint of the site.
- f. Reduction (smaller footprint) or delay of closure and post-closure costs.
- g. Energy recovery from combustibles.
- 3. Potential disadvantages of LFM include:
 - a. Accelerate need for new landfill space to dispose of residue.
 - b. Deemphasis of recycling at generation point.
 - c. Cost.
 - d. Possibly encountering unexpected hazardous materials.

VII. LANDFILL MINING - One Solution?

4. The soil fraction comprises the largest % of weight of the materials recovered. That is a function of the type of waste stored, but in several projects studied averaged 60 to 66% by weight and volume. The soil fraction can be used as landfill cover immediately or stored for future use.

5. Biggest obstacles to marketing mined materials in California are:

a. Level of contamination in the product.

b. Limited availability of waste-to-energy facilities in the state for combustible materials.

6. In 1993, the estimated base cost for landfill mining was \$5 to \$15 per ton mined and the cost of disposal of residue was \$2 to \$20 per ton. Whereas, the cost of a new landfill was in the range of \$20 per ton or more. Therefore, LFM is economical if a large % of the material could be reused and if the cost of disposing is relatively low.

7. The May 1996 SITING ELEMENT of Riverside County does contain a brief description of landfill mining. However, it does not contain a plan to test and/or implement this important approach as one of the solutions solving landfill capacity issues for the County.

VII. LANDFILL MINING - One Solution?

<u>STATUS - 1993</u>	SITE
Full Scale Operational	Bethlehem, NH
	Lancaster, PA - Operated by Lancaster
	County Solid Waste Authority.
	Averages about 2,650 tons per week.
Pilot/Demo	Barre, MA
	Collier County, FL - Operated by Collier
	County Solid Waste Management
	Dept. in Naples, FL. Over 70,000 tons
	residential mined which were there for
	over 15 years.
	Edinburg, NY
	Thompson, CT
	Sandtown, DE
Planning/Feasibility Study or Permitting Stage	Canton, OH
	York County, PA
	Lake County, FL
	Berlin, CT
	Middletown, CT
	Preston, CT

8. A limited number of LFM's were found in 1993 in the U.S.:

9. Conclusion was that LFM has applicability in California and entities should be sought to try LFM. However, Mr. Savage of CalRecovery did tell me that each landfill is different and economics will drive off the particular situation of a specific landfill. Yet, given the cost of a new landfill and the problems of some existing ones (environmental pollution dangers due to their state and method of construction) it is reasonable to study LFM as a real alternative to many landfills. A feasibility study by experts would be expected to run from \$8,000 to \$15,000.

References, other than that cited above are: (1) Evaluation of Collier County, Florida Landfill Mining Demonstration by CalRecovery, Inc. and the Solid Waste Association of North America for the U.S. EPA, September 1993; and (2) Assessment of Landfill Mining and the Effects of Age on the Combustion of Recovered Municipal Solid Waste by G. A. Forster, et al, Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority in August 1994.

VIII. PYROGENIC GASIFIERS - A Possible Alternative?

1. H. M. Kossrin, Principal Engineer at R. W. Beck and Associates said "One of the more promising techniques for reclaiming energy from municipal solid wastes is through pyrolysis which is the destructive distillation of waste materials, thereby converting them to clean fuels such as low-BTU gas, residual oil and char".

Pyrogenic gasification is a process of heating without burning and many undesirable chemical compounds are thereby transformed into useful forms of energy. Volume is often reduced by 90% as a result of the process. Some of carbonaceous char is used in plant to purify process water and less than 25% of the gas produced is required to operate the gasifier so it can be used as fuel elsewhere. The process can be used in landfill mining.

2. This process can use industrial wastes, some toxic wastes, municipal wastes, sewage sludge and many other forms.

3. The useful life of a landfill can be increased by a factor of 10 according to a brochure by Pyrowaste Corporation of Huntsville, AL (205-464-0975). A new landfill with only the residue from such a process would last ten times as long.

4. The May 1996 SITING ELEMENT does contain two paragraphs on "Alternative Technologies". A statement is made that the County will work with the Local Task Force, the CIWMB, Southern California Association of Governments, western riverside Council of Governments, CVAG and cities in the county to develop waste disposal policies which will consider landfill mining and alternative technologies.

IX. GRAVITY PRESSURE VESSEL --- TRASH TO ENERGY

1. The Gravity Pressure Vessel is a completely contained waste treatment system reportedly capable of destroying or manipulating organic matter and oxidizing metals and industrial waste Streams.

The process is proposed by GeneSyst International Inc. of Hudson, Ohio (216-655-2699)

2. According to literature, the water based system uses gravity pressure and intense heat generated by the reaction of oxygen and organic waste to sustain supercritical wet oxidation. That oxidation is said to be the combustion of matter suspended in water at temperatures and pressures exceeding the critical point of water. At that stage, organic waste is said to revert to its elements including carbon dioxide and water. The process is described as completely sealed, without toxic residuals, emissions or operator exposure.

Established drilling technology is used to reach 5,000 to 12,000 feet depths depending on the gravity pressures required to destroy various types of waste.

3. A Canton, Ohio facility is to be used for a prototype solid waste-to-ethanol plant.

X. SUMMARY

1. ACCURATELY FORECASTING WASTE GENERATION, DIVERSION, RECYCLING AND LANDFILL CAPACITIES IS NOT POSSIBLE - Future landfill capacities for solid wastes can not be reliably predicted at this time due to: accelerating source reduction and recycling programs, dynamics in landfill permitting processes and related applications in southern California and nearby states, technological changes in processing such wastes and reductions in packaging.

2. TIPPING FEES ARE HEADED DOWN - Tipping fees are critical to any county's projections and those fees can not be accurately estimated for more than a few years due to large changes in fees whenever a new or expanded landfill is approved. Such projects are so capital intensive, that every ton will be sought from anywhere to keep the cash flowing to pay the debt service costs. Although this has not yet happened on a large scale in Southern California it will. To wit, Orange County, Yuma and La Paz are already examples of good locations with negotiable and low tipping fees.

2. WASTE STREAM WILL DROP AND COMPETITION FOR WASTE WILL INCREASE - Repackaging, recycling, compaction and diversion will decrease the quantities of trash otherwise stored in Southern California. Nevertheless, new landfills in and out of state, the rise of commodity exchanges and expansions of existing landfills will swell the demand for solid wastes.

California should join other states in pushing the Federal government to request all manufacturers and producers to reduce packaging to save landfill space and thereby reduce costs for buyers and landfill storage.

3. UNFUNDED CLOSURE/REMEDIATION COSTS - The unrecorded and unpaid closure costs for every municipal landfill are huge and are only now beginning to be evaluated and planned for. Yet a number of landfills are reaching capacity limits in the relatively near future.

4. LANDFILL MINING SHOULD BE TRIED.

5. PYROTECHNICAL AND OTHER WASTE-TO-ENERGY SYSTEMS ARE EXPECTED TO BE COST EFFICIENT AND WILL REDUCE FUTURE LANDFILL NEEDS.

IX. SUMMARY

6. BASED ON AVAILABLE FACTS AND EXPECTED TRENDS, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COUNTIES IN TOTAL AND RIVERSIDE COUNTY ITSELF WILL:

a. Experience solid waste generation per person and in aggregate with annual tons disposed in landfills dropping.

b. Landfill capacity is adequate for more than 15 years.

c. Additional, new mega-landfills may not be needed for Riverside's or any other county's solid wastes. In addition, they have the potential for creating substantial direct and/or indirect liability risks for the depository County in the event of a financial collapse of the private operation entity.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

1. With the possible exception of Los Angeles County for which sufficient up-to-date information is not yet publicly available to conclude, each Southern California County presently has a landfill capacity of at least 15 years, some much longer.

2. Recycling has become a profitable and big business which will continue to increase and that will ease landfill capacity requirements.

3. Solid waste generation in California has decreased 20% to 25% between 1989 and 1993. That trend will continue.

4. Tipping fees per ton for solid wastes are declining due to competition. Such fees will continue to decline and remain at levels of \$20 per ton or less for the foreseeable future.

5. Large landfills in neighboring states are already impacting (reducing) certain Southern California tipping fees and will continue to do so. Further, if only one private Southern California mega-landfill "comes on-line" the decrease in tipping fees will accelerate significantly.

6. Privatization of landfills has started in our southern California region. The long-term impact of this change is yet to be determined.

7. Eagle Mountain landfill in Riverside County should not be permitted, appears uneconomical and should be <u>excluded</u> from Tables 9-2, 9-3 and 9-4 of the May 1996 Riverside County Siting Element. That Siting Element should conclude that the County has adequate landfill capacity for the planning period without the Eagle Mountain landfill.
SCHEDULE 1

POTENTIAL LANDFILL COMPETITION FOR ORANGE COUNT/Sheef1 Based on Data Received From Orange County In 1985

County	Site	Owner or	Daily Capacity C	Current (Jally Usage Anr Tono Mil	Current Pr nual Tons term	ermitted Mining Ton	Disposal Transport Life Costs	Tipping Fee Total Transp \$/Ton It Disposal Co #/Ton/	xt sst Comments
Orange	Alt 5	County	21,600	11,200	3.2	60 5	X3 to 65 year N/A	\$35	Self Sufficient as far out as needed.
Los Angeles	BKK West Covin	BKK Corp	12,000	8-10,000	ю	11	o	\$32.01	
Los Angeles	Bradiet West (Sun Vattey)	Waste Management	7,000	4,300	t.3	8 0	Ø	08/02/5	Land use Permit expires in 2007
Los Angeles	Puente Hills (Whittier)	LA County Sanitation	13,200	11,100	3,424	3.5 B	8 But suit re expansion	\$16.67	Expansion approved but suft on it.
Los Angeles	Scholl Canyon LA/Giendale	Glendale City & LA Santtation	3,400	1,620	Q. Q	11.5	21	\$25.11	
Los Angeles	Southeast Resou Recovery Facility (Willmington)	t Long Beach & LA Sanitation	2,240	1,850	0.5 N7A		Restricted to what mcan be burned within AQMD limits	\$27.19	
Los Angeles	Spadra (Wainut)	Cal State Poly Pomona/LA	3,700	2,550	0.7	2.9	4	\$16.67	Appears to have capacity to 2018.
Los Angeles	Commerce Refui Energy Facility (Commerce)	t JPA City of Comme Refuse to Energy Auth & LA	₿	8	0.1	NIA	NA	8	Restricted to current burn rate.
San Bemadir	Milliken	County	1,200	1,438	0.4	1.5 Č	N	\$26.50	Restricted to only county waste.
San Bernadir	Mid-Valley (Fontana)	County	290	827	0.25	2.7	4	\$41.10	Awaiting expansion & only for county waste.
San Bernadir	Colton	county	180	1,070	0.3	0.5	ນ	\$35.50	Only county waste.
San Diego	San Marcos	County	3,700	1,500	500,000	4.4	Ŋ	3 3	Accepts out of county wastes but discourages it. Has appeal on its vertical expansion.
Riverside	El Sobrante	Western Waste Industries	4,000	1,900	0.6	7	5 Expansion fi	r \$38.50 or 30 years requested	Allows 60% out of county waste. Seeking expansion for 30 years
Riverside	Highgrove	County	2,700	38 5	0.2	0.7	2	\$28.50	No out of county waste May be expanded.
Riverside	Mead Valley	County	1,100	80	0.2	1.5	ы	\$38.50	No out of county waste.
CONCLUSIO	N: Orange Couni Atthough the q what market or Memorandum	<pre>y had this prepared inte worled tipping fees are p onditions were at the tim attached in the section.</pre>	irnality to dete vrobably no K Me. Later, the on Orange C	ermine what loca onger applicable a County began county.	Il competition su . this shows the trying to import	urrounds the at County lool waste into th	r County. Ked into is County as discussed in	the	

Page 1

Comparison of District & La Paz Transportation & Disposal Costs for the Coachella Valley

	1	irst Year Cos	(5		Average	15-Year Cou	11 (d) 22 22 22 22 22 22
Cast Category	"District's Badlands Landfill	La Paz Mudel Calculation	"La Paz"" "Expected" Bid	^{ar} Diätriche ^{re} Badlands Landfill	Model Calculation	"Expected" "Expected" Bid	District's Badlands LF with "Systemized" Tipping Fees (g)
Dispusal fee/Tun	\$39	(r) 81\$	(q) 91 \$	\$ 33 (c)	\$23	16 \$20	\$ 30
Transfer Station	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$9	\$6	6 \$9	(3) n¢
Transportation	(r) ZS	\$12 (c)	(e) <u>212</u>	5 3	521	हाड प्रा	(?) [7
Tutal Transfer,	\$53	\$12	\$ 38	\$51	\$53	a ste	
וגפטקצוע א וזטקגוובז ן						Ð	

La Paz contirmed an \$18 tipping fee in writing to CVAG consultant William OToole on May 23, 1995. "Expected" La Paz bid per OTrote menu to Diana Beck on May 30, 1995. Based on model calculation. Assumes transportation costs of \$60 per hour. All first year consetmereased for inflation by 3% annually for 14 years. 15-year average is 25% higher than first year costs. Calculated based on model assumptions. **eecece**

Roundtrip distances from mid-valley transfer station (including street and highway mileage): Badlands - 100 miles; La Paz - 310 miles.

Transfer and transportation are included in systemwide disposal fees. 3

subject to Cham in code જ

RED SCHEDULE 3	JES 80,0000 80,0000 80,000 80,000 80,000 80,000 80,000 80,000 80,000 80,		000'00		00.000 blars and estimated cash outflows 6 of total annual amounts. Economic eat Manvick. mated based ated cash flows.
ESTIMAT DEVENU	REVEN RE	24 \$114,4 24 \$114,4 224 \$114,4	AL \$ \$1,773,20	- 145.0 - 1361.0 - 1361.0 - 1361.0 - 1502.0 - 1502.0	per ton in 1996 d per ton in 1996 d earm is about 40% dated Nov. 1991 ared by KPMG P etax loss are estim puted from estimator
DAYS	新聞に 1998年 1		BC,000 TOT/	rt page 2-2. port page 2-2. port page 2-2. TAL COSTS	DEBT SERVICE Ipping fee is \$20 of the host fee strued from a report of Riverside prepring of costs and privalues were comini-
AT 2601	100 Flag 100 Flag	20000 20000 20000 21	TONS 89,6 5 for next 1,872 se tons per year	ments per repoint the second schemes per repoint the second states of the second states of SUBTO	RETAX & PRE uue reduction if t present value o the same deri- to The County C and the subtota mated. Present:
MO			0,000 7,527 TOTAL 8,837 1,toms per year, \$ ach ton over tho	f for site improve for Operating E for Capital Exp i Costs estimate	LOSS P LOSS P they above. The s per day and th Landfill Project 1 & st \$20 per ton th costs are estit
CASH FL	- FOR COU - 2010 - 20	828.82 828,82 828,82	S \$452.40 \$169.10 \$189.04 \$189.04 and \$6 for ea	Assumptions Assumptions Assumptions Development Other Costs Host Fees	ss results due to are as estima r for County, toni agle Mountain L timated revenue: on. Developmer
	Investment 1983 1986 1986 1986 1986 1986 1986 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 20	2017 2017 2017	TOTAL HOST FEE Present Value at 8% at 7% Host fee = \$4 //on fr		CONCLUSION: Lot Source of Cash flow Berrefits Of The E Tons per, year, est on other Informati

Another consideration concerns the County's direct and indirect costs if the Eagle Mountain landfill is permitted and opens. Presumably, the County (the Host) will incur significant infrastructure costs and expenses during the many years of operation of the landfill relating to fire, police, road, etc.

A-78

ৰশ্	
101	
2	
a	
HE	
S	

Landfill Proposal Summary / November 30, 1995*

	Rabanco/BLT	La Paz Co./ BFI	San Bernardino Co.	XIVIM	RCWRMD	Eagle Mt.	Samifill, AZ
Landfill Name	Frank Bowerman Landfill/Olinda	La Paz County Landfill	Landers Landfill (Twenty-nine Palms	Lancaster Landfill or	Badlands Landfill	Eagle Mountain Landfill	Copper Mountain Landfill
Location	Tustin, CA; Brea, CA	18 miles southeast of Parker, AZ	Landers, CA (30 miles north of Decert Hot Services)	Lancaster, CA or Mohile A2	Riverside Co., north of 1-60 at Theodore Street	Eastern Riverside Co., 60 miles east of Indio	35 miles east of Yuma, AZ (approx. 120 mi one uav)
trisdiction Approval	Yes. Letter from Orange Co. enclosed.	Yes. La Paz County is partner in this proposal	Yes. San Bernardino Co. owns the site	Proposal states none needed	Operating permit wund need to be revised. Should take approv. 4 mos.	Permit will be issued by Riverside County	None required according to propusal
Decating Now?	Yes	Yes	Ya	Yes Yes	Yes	No	Operations begin December 1995
rmit Status	Permitted & operating	Permitted & operating	Permitted & operating	Both permitted & operating	Permitted & operating	still must receive	operating permits as
rping Feco 5 year 10 year 15 year	\$36.53/lon* \$36.53/ton* \$36.53/ton* *includes haul to site from transfer station	\$17-18.25/ton \$16-17.25/ton \$15-16.25/ton	\$35.50/tun is current lipping fee. County expects "significant reduction" in spring 1990 and would like ho submit reduced hipping fee at that time.	\$18.15-29.25/ton \$18.15-28.00/ton \$18.00-36.50/ton OR \$30.50-43.00/ton at \$30.50-43.00/ton at Butterfield-factudes rail hawl (are comments beforw)	\$28.27/kon \$25.25/lon \$24.50/ton	\$19.05-22.25/ton \$18.55-21.75/ton \$18.05-21.25/ton	\$14.75-16.5 0/ton \$14.50-16.25/ton \$14.25-16.00/tou
Contract :xceptions	Nane	Requests refine CERCLA indemnification language. Objects to transfer of capacity to non-CVAG jurisdictions	Noue	None	For CERCLA indemnification must operate foud clieck program/no absolute right to transfer capacity/no performance bond	Must limit capacity transfer to cities in Riverside County or tip fees increase	None
Additional Monte Meeded	Need info on landfill operations [Forms 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]	Minsing text at bottom of page 8-1 (submitted)	Need additional tipping fee info.	Confirm no juriodictional approval needed	Determine what tip fee reduction for transfer trailers is proposed	Need to coalitm schedule for permitting & any potential opposition	Need to cuntitm no additional permits required
Comments	Proposal includes haul & tip fee @ landfills. Landfills operated by Orange Cn. If operator of transfer station haufs waste to site and Orange Cu. operates site, unclear what proposer would	City of Escondido now using site. Also many local bushnesses. Site is lined.	San Bernardiano Co. contracts with Norcal for operation of its landfills. County is setting San Bernardiano Co. dites to aign waste flow waste to County waste to County	Lancaster can accept 500 tpd now. After expansion planned for 1997, could accept 1500 tpd. Butterfield can accept 1500 tpd now WMX estimates adding rail facilities costs \$2.6 million. Butterfield is lined.	District willing to commit 2.5 million lons to CVAG jurisdictions. Proposal speaks about providing 166,500 tpy. Proposal tates fip fee may be reduced by Board for Lander trailers	MRC has no operating experimence. However proposal interust from Norcal and Sanifil to per- form site operation once landiil receives permits. Site will be	Sue is trand new and tweet Samili has operating expenience since 1990. It specializes in band till operations (both hazardous & MSW Lawfills)
HIS SCH	IEDULE PROVES	RECENT TIPPIN Numics, Inc. Subject to	VG FEES ARE W	<i>JEL BELOW THA</i> items in the second seco	se Jost A Yent puested train propriet	Cor 50 100.	-

A-79



PM 3: 33 FIRE DEPARTMENT

210 WEST SAN JACINTO AVENUE • PERRIS, CALIFORNIA 92570 • (909) 657-3183

To: Lesley Likins, Senior Planner Waste Resources Management District

From: D. Andrew Avila

Re: Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

The Riverside County Fire Department has no comments or conditions.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Raymond H. Regis Chief Fire Department Planner

by

D. Andrew Avila Fire Captain Specialist

RIVERSIDE OFFICE
 3760 12th Street, Riverside, CA 92501
 (909) 275-4777 • FAX (909) 369-7451

FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION PLANNING SECTION

 INDIO OFFICE
 79-733 Country Club Drive, Suite F, Indio, CA 92201 (619) 863-8886 • FAX (619) 863-7072
 printed on recycled paper (2)

A-80



Western Riverside Council of Governments

County of Riverside. City of Banning, City of Beaumont, City of Calimesa. City of Canyon Lake. City of Corona. City of Hemet, City of Lake Elsinore, City of Moreno Valley. City of Murrieta, City of Norco, City of Perris, City of Riverside, City of San Jacinto. City of Temecula

August 14, 1996

Robert Nelson Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501

96	AN COL
AUG	STE
9	MA
Þ	RIV
0 H	ERS
~	N 0

REGARDING: Revised Draft Countywide Summary and Siting Elements

The Executive Committee of Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) met on July 2, 1996 to review and discuss the Revised Draft Countywide Summary and Siting Elements. The Committee's formal position was to support the adoption of these documents with the changes your staff presented during our committee meetings.

This has been an excellent example of the positive effects of a good cooperative effort. The Solid Waste Technical Committee (SWTC) and WRCOG staff has worked diligently with your staff to rewrite the documents. The SWTC members reviewed and provided input on numerous revisions to the preliminary drafts over the past five months. At the request of member jurisdictions, WRCOG staff prepared and has encouraged each jurisdiction to carefully review their geographical profile in section 3.3, and the Summary of Planned and Implemented Programs Table in Appendix C. Other significant changes were made to the summary element based on the input of the member jurisdictions. Member jurisdictions have expressed that the document is more reflective of the countywide group as a whole. Based upon the discussions held during the SWTC meetings each jurisdiction present appeared to be much happier and supportive the current revised draft of the document

Thank You

Sincerely,

Jarshall

Joyce M. Marshall Director of Local Government Programs

3880 Lemon Street, Suite 300 • Riverside, CA 92501 • (909) 787-7985 • Fax (909) 787-7991



COUNT OF PLACE PLACE PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRI

COMMENT A

Þ

Т

-

 \triangleright

1

N

180 WEST 14TH AVENUE - BLYTHE, CALIFORNIA 92225

TELEPHONE (619) 922-3144

June 26, 1996

Leslie Likins, Senior Planner Riverside County Waste Management Dept. Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, Ca. 92501-1719

Review of Negative Declaration Pursuant to Section 15073 of Re: State CEQA Guidelines and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Dear Leslie Likins:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your June 6, 1996 Draft Negative Declaration for Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) and Environmental Assessment #37011.

The CIWMP does not adequately address the problem we are having in the Palo Verde Valley with illegal dumping. The CIWMP should be encouraging people to utilize legal dump sites, recycling centers etc. instead of penalizing them to use it. The present CIWMP is encouraging people to illegally dump waste on canals, drains, vacant lots and in the desert. One of the reasons promoted by illegal dumpers is "why drive a long distance to a legal dump site just to be turned away because it's closed or they are in the wrong area or they have to pay an unreasonable fee when they can drive a couple of miles and get rid of it". The CIWMP encourages an illegal dumping attitude. The unfairness to the property owner of having to pay for cleanup of illegally dumped material was not addressed by the Plan.

The Environmental Assessment does not address the significant increase in illegal dumping that has occurred in the last few years. Illegal dumping changes a scenic area into an eyesore. Once started, it continues to grow as more people use it. Dumping tires, refrigerators etc. along shoulders of roadways increase hazards to traveling public. Recreational facilities are no longer useable once people start illegally dumping in the area. Illegally dumped materials and runoff from sites affect water quality especially when they are dumped into the water. Hazardous materials being illegally dumped on land or in water creates health hazards.

REH\LIKINS.L

120,500 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE COLORADO RIVER

Leslie Likins June 26, 1996 - 2 -

In retrospect, the existing plan has affected the environment. The proposed plan does not address the problem of illegal dumping or who cleans illegal dump sites. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated into the Plan to justify your Negative \int_{ω}^{ω} Declaration position regarding illegal dumping.

Sincerely,

Roger Henning

⊳

1

Roger E. Henning Chief Engineer

REH/bmm

REH\LIKINS.L



GOVERNOR

State of California

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH

1400 TENTH STREET SACRAMENTO 95814



July 10, 1996

KATHY GIFFORD RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCES MGMT. DISTRICT 1995 MARKET STREET RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

Subject: RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN SCH #: 96061023

Dear KATHY GIFFORD:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named environmental document to selected state agencies for review. The review period is closed and none of the state agencies have comments. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. When contacting the Clearinghouse in this matter, please use the eight-digit State Clearinghouse number so that we may respond promptly.

Sincerely,

weters Q. Masilata

ANTERO A. RIVASPLATA Chief, State Clearinghouse

			activeza
Notice of Completion	<u>) </u>	Appendix F	See NOTE below
Mail 10: State Clearinghou	ise, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento,	CA 95814 (916) 445-0613	96061023
Project Title: Riverside	Countywide Integrated Waste M	figmt, Plan (CIWMP)	
Lead Agency: <u>Rivers</u>	ide County Waste Resources Ma	magement District	
Street Address: 1995 M	farket Street	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Contact Person: Kathy Gifford
City: Riversid	<u>e</u> Zip: <u>92501</u>	County: <u>Riverside</u>	Phone: (909) 275-4366
Project Location			
County:Rivers	side City/Ne	arest Community: All C	Cities in Riverside County
Cross Streets: Coun	tywide	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Total Acres:1.322
Assessor's Parcel #:	Section:	Twp:	Range: Base:
Within 2 Miles: State	Hwy #:	Waterways:	
Airpo	rts: Railways:		Schools
Document Type (Note:	Previously circulated as Mitigat	ted Negative Declaration)	
CEOA: INOP	O Supplement/Subsequent	NEPA: DNOI	Other: Digital Document
D Farly Cons	D FIR (Prior SCH #)	DFA	
B Nan Dec	Other	DDroft El	
Local Action Type			
General Plan Update	Specific Plan	Rezone	Annexation
General Plan Amendi	ment 🗆 Master Plan	Prezonc	Redevelopment
General Plan Elemen	t I Planned Unit Develop	ement 🗅 Use Permit	Coastal Permit
Community Plan	🗆 Site Plan	Land Division (Subdivision, Parcel N	Other <u>Compliance W/AB939</u> Map. Tract Map etc.)
Development Type			
D Residential: Units	Acres	D Water F	acilities: Type MGD
Office: Sa Ft:	Acres Employ	ees 🗅 Transpo	ortation: Type
Commercial: Sa Ft:	Acres Employ	ees D Mining	Mineral
\square industrial: So Ft:	Acres Employ		Type Watts
D Educational		D Waste 7	Treatment Type
© Recreational			Waste Type
	B Other: Comp	liance with requirements of	f AR039 and CIWMR
	= odiet	nance with requirements o	
Project Issues Discusse	d in Document		
D Aesthetic/Visual	Flood Plain/Flooding	D Schools/Universities	D Water Onabity
D Agricultural Land	D Forest Land/Fire Hazard	D Septic Systems	DWater Surphy/General Water
D Air Quality	Geologic/Seismic	D Sewer Capacity	D Wetland/Ringrian
D Archeological/Historic	al D Minerals	C Soil Erosion/Compactic	on/Grading G Wildlife
D Coastal Zone	D Noise	Solid Waste	Growth Inducing
Draining/Absorption	C Population/Housing Balance	D Toxic/Hazardous	
D Economic/Jobs	Public Services/Facilities	D Traffic/Circulation	Circulative Effects
O Fiscal	O Recreation/Parks	D Vegetation	O Other
Present Land Use/Zoni Current Land Use: Zoning: General Plan:	ing/General Plan Use: Countyw	ride Document - No specif	fic land use, zoning, or general plan.
Project Description C	IWMP, including Summary Pla	n and Siting Element S	ce Attahement A for a full project
descripcion.		at and onoig Liement. d	a remaining a for a full project

State Clearinghouse Contact.	Mr. Chris Belsky (016) 445-0613	Project Sent to the	following State Agencies
State Review Began 2 Dept. Review to Agency 2 Agency Rev to SCH 2 SCH COMPLIANCE 2	<u>10.96</u> <u>3</u> <u>9</u> <u>10</u>	_X_Resources Boating Coastal Comm Colorado Rvr Bd Conservation X_Fish & Game # Delta Protection Forestry	State/Consumer Svcs General Services Cal/EPA ARB CA Waste Mgmt Bd SWRCB: Grants SWRCB: Delta SWRCB: Wtr Quality
Please note SCH Number on a 960	all Comments 6 1 0 2 3	Parks & Rec/OHP Reclamation BCDC DWR	X Reg. WQCB # DTSC/CTC
Please forward late comments Lead Agency	s directly to the	OES Bus Transp Hous Aeronautics	Yth/Adit Corrections Corrections Independent Comm
AQMD/APCD 3 (Resource	es: 6:157	CHP Caltrans # S Trans Planning Housing & Devel Health & Welfare Drinking H20 Medical Waste	Energy Comm NAHC PUC Santa Mn Mins State Lands Comm Tahoe Rgl Plan Other:





ESTABLISHED IN 1918 AS A PUBLIC AGENCY COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISJRPCT

POST OFFICE BOX 1058 · COACHELLA, CALIFORNIA 92236 · TELEPHONE (619) 398-2651

DIRECTORS DIRECTORS TELLIS CODEKAS, PRESIDENT RAYMOND R. RUMMONDS, VICE PRESIDENT JOHN W. MCFADDEN DOROTHY M. NICHOLS THEODORE J. FISH

July 5, 1996

OFFICERS THOMAS E. LEVY, GENERAL MANAGER-CHIEF ENGINEER BERNARDINE SUTTON, SECRETARY OWEN McCOCK, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER REDWINE AND SHERRILL, ATTORNEYS

File: 1150.01

Katherine Gifford Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, California 92501

Dear Ms. Gifford:

Subject: Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan

We have reviewed the Notice of Negative Declaration for the Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan and we have no comments.

If you have any questions please contact Joe Cook, planning engineer, extension 292.

Yours very truly,

Tom Levy General Manager-Chief Engineer

JEC:rmc\eng\sw\jun\gifford

TRUE CONSERVATION USE WATER WISELY



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT

96 JUL 18 AM 11: 32

Director

Donald L. Harriger General Manager

Wayne C. Keith Wayne H. Holcomb President Vice President

Elizabeth L. Cunnison Secretary/Treasurer

Donald L. Schroeder Dale D. Dunn Director

July 12, 1996

Ms. Lesley Likins, Senior Planner Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

NOTICE OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION REQUEST FOR AGENCY COMMENT

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Revised Preliminary Draft Riverside Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) and Environmental Assessment No. 37011.

Western Municipal Water District's staff has no objection to the finding that the proposed project will not have a significant effect upon the environment and that a Negative Declaration be adopted.

٩

JEFFREY D. SIMS, P.E. Civil Engineer

KD/dld

E330 KD; LTR: NND COM

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP)

COMMENT LETTER NO. 1:

CITY OF PALM SPRINGS, dated June 24, 1996

1-A: According to the current schedule, the CIWMP will be forwarded to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) in December, 1996. The CIWMB has "at least 90 days, but not more than 120 days, with a median of 105 days, to review and act upon the CIWMP," according to the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 8, Section 18785. The District, Councils of Governments, and affected cities will work to complete all of the CIWMP components in order to obtain final approval of the document by the CIWMB. It is expected that this effort can be completed early in 1997.

The City of Palm Springs has an adopted Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) which does not identify and describe the Bedminster facility. According to staff (Martinez) of the CIWMB, the Palm Springs NDFE can be amended by going through the process outlined in Attachment 1 of this Response and will not be required to comply with the "Gap Bill" requirements. The District will, if requested, assist the City in the process of amending its NDFE. Any other jurisdiction that plans to utilize this facility will also need to amend its NDFE. Once the facility is identified and described in the NDFE, it is considered consistent with the CIWMP. However, the applicant may be required to solicit a CIWMP consistency finding from the Local Task Force (LTF) in order to secure a composting permit to operate. (Note: The Scotts facility was required to comply with the "Gap Bill," because the County's NDFE had not yet been prepared. In regard to California Biomass, if this facility requires a permit to operate from the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), and it is not already identified and described in the appropriate NDFEs, it will be subject to the same process as the Bedminster facility.)

- 1-B: Paragraph 2 under "Local Waste Management Issues" of Section 1.6 (Chapter 1 of Summary Plan) has been amended by adding the following sentence to the end of the paragraph: The City of Palm Springs is planning a 150-ton per day municipal solid waste composting facility to handle the majority of its own waste."
- 1-C: The third sentence in the last paragraph under "Nondisposal Facilities" of Section 4.5 (Chapter 4 of Summary Plan) has been amended to read:

As of this writing, the city has, through an RFQ process, certified Bedminster as the sole qualified proposer and begun negotiations on a design, build, and operate contract for a municipal solid waste composting facility. 1-D: Based upon the comment and a telephone conversation with John Raymond, Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator, with the City of Palm Springs, the last portion of Paragraph 2 under "Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone" of Section 4.7 (Chapter 4 of Summary Plan) has been amended to read:

The Environmental Assessment of the redesignation, required by newer California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for RMDZ's, was approved by the Palm Springs City Council on April 17, 1996. The City continues to pursue a redesignation of the RMDZ to include the city limits of Palm Springs and is working with the Riverside County EDA toward that end. The CIWMB approval of the redesignation is expected to occur by November, 1996.

1-E: Under "Alternative Technologies" of Section 8.2 (Chapter 8 of Siting Element), the following paragraph has been added before the last paragraph:

The City of Palm Springs, through its evaluation of the Bedminster municipal solid waste co-composting process, is investigating post-processing of the non-compostable residuals. Once metals have been recovered, the residual is 80-90% plastic by volume. The City has asked Bedminster to examine using a pyrolytic process (high heat, oxygen-free) to reclaim the energy value of the material without burning trash. According to the City (John Raymond, Economic Development/Recycling Coordinator), a combination of the two technologies could yield a 90-95% diversion rate in a cost-effective, environmentally sound manner. The decision to add the second-stage processing hinges on its cost-effectiveness and the test results on the air emissions potentially released through pyrolysis itself and the combustion of the gas produced by the process (NO_X , SO_X , and particulates).

COMMENT LETTER NO. 2:

COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (CVAG), dated July 25, 1996

2-A: The last two sentences of Paragraph 2 under "Court Decisions" of Section 1.6 (Chapter 1 of Summary Plan) have been amended to read:

In this case, the State Supreme Court ruled, in a 5-2 decision, that a city does not have authority under state law to grant a private business the exclusive right to collect recyclables. The court decision determined that a city may not prohibit non-franchised companies from collecting recyclable materials which are donated or sold to the company by the waste generator.

2-B: The written comment refers to the subsection titled as "Court Decisions," and not "Local Waste Management Issues." The last sentence of Paragraph 3 under "Court Decisions" of Section 1.6 (Chapter 1 of Summary Plan) has been amended to read:

In order to assist with successful financing of both existing and planned public-sponsored solid waste facilities, these facilities should have contractual obligations with the participating jurisdictions which direct the flow from the jurisdictions to the facility.

2-C: The last sentence of Paragraph 4 under "Existing Composting Facilities" of Section 4.4 (Chapter 4 of Summary Plan) has been amended to read:

Though the facility has opened, composting operations are pending the issuance of a permit (anticipated in 1996/97) from the Local Solid Waste Management Enforcement Agency (LEA).

2-D: The fifth sentence of Paragraph 1 under "Nondisposal Facilities" of Section 4.5 (Chapter 4 of Summary Plan) has been amended. It has been moved to the end of the paragraph, along with the following additional language, and should read:

Four proposals and two alternate proposals were received and evaluated. The Task Force selected two vendors to begin contract negotiations. Final vendor selection is scheduled for November 1, 1996. The transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by Fall 1998.

- 2-E: Comment acknowledged. District staff have received separate comments regarding Bedminster from the City of Palm Springs. See Comment and Response 1-A, contained herein.
- 2-F: The following paragraph has been added to Section 5.3 (Chapter 5 of Summary Plan): *A jurisdiction that plans to utilize a nondisposal facility that has not already been identified and described in its NDFE must amend its NDFE to include the facility. Prior to the public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment, the city or county shall send a copy of the final draft to the Local Task Force (LTF) for review. Within 90 days of receipt of the final draft NDFE amendment, the LTF must provide written comments to the city or county and the CIWMB regarding the final draft NDFE amendment. The governing body of the jurisdiction shall conduct a public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment. A city must transmit a copy of its NDFE to the county in which it is located for incorporation into the CIWMP within 30 days of its adoption by the city. Copies of the NDFE amendment, along with all of the required supporting documentation, must be submitted to the CIWMB for consideration.*
- 2-G: Comment is noted. However, as stated under "Coordination Schedules" of Section 5.4 (Chapter 5 of Summary Plan), the wording in Table 5.3 is taken directly from the cities' and County's SRRE's and HHWE's. The program, "Public-Sponsored MRF Collection of all HHW" is taken directly from the County's SRRE.

- 2-H: The first bullet point of Section 6.2 (Chapter 6 of Summary Plan) has been amended to read: *revenues from landfill disposal fees and MRF tipping fees;*
- **2-I:** The following paragraph has been added before the last paragraph under Section 1.5 (Chapter 1 of Siting Element):

The District continues to work on alternatives for the funding of accrued liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation. In June 1996, the CVAG Executive Committee directed the CVAG Transfer Station/MRF Task Force to propose mechanisms to assist the County and the District to fairly, equitably and responsibly fund the remaining unfunded liabilities for closure, postclosure and remediation of existing Coachella and Edom Hill Landfills.

2-J: The parenthetical information in Item "b" on Page 3-4 under "Disposal Capacity Needs Projection" of Section 3.3 (Chapter 3 of Siting Element) has been amended to read: (It should be noted, however, that the Moreno Valley MRF has begun operations, the Perris MRF is scheduled to begin operations in the Fall of 1996, and the Coachella Valley transfer station/MRF is scheduled to be operational by the Fall of 1998.)"

This same modification has been added to Item "b" on Page 6-2 of Section 6.4 (Chapter 6 of of Siting Element).

COMMENT LETTER NO. 3:

METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, dated July 22, 1996

- **3-A:** Comment is acknowledged. The information which is provided in your letter will be utilized to assist in determining if a project is located in the area of Metropolitan Water District's (Metropolitan) pipelines and rights-of-way and to ensure appropriate notification and coordination with Metropolitan.
- **3-B:** The purpose of Chapter 4 of the Siting Element is to identify each solid waste disposal facility that is currently permitted to operate in Riverside County. The summary does not include a description of the landfill's environmental characteristics, including groundwater. A description of these characteristics is included in the environmental documents and quarterly groundwater reports for each of the landfills. Groundwater protection is coordinated with the staffs of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado Regional Water Quality Control Board and Local Enforcement Agency.
- **3-C:** The Siting Criteria are intended to measure a site's suitability in complying with federal, state and local regulations, including Subtitle D and Title 23. The District notes Metropolitan's concerns regarding the adequacy of engineered systems providing protection for underlying

groundwater and will continue to work with the regulatory agencies to protect groundwater supplies.

- **3-D:** Table 5-3, "Siting Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities," of Section 5.2 (Chapter 5 of Siting Element) uses a relative scale for comparing proposed projects. The weighting factor indicates the relative importance of the identified issue. The weighting factor is applied to all projects. Projects "lose" or fail to earn more points on relatively important issues because of the multiplier effect of the weighting factor. The overall standing of a project with environmental constraints would then be measurably lower, when compared to a project without these environmental constraints.
- **3-E:** Your comment is acknowledged. The District will continue to work with MWD to ensure that landfills in Riverside County will not conflict with water supply systems. The criteria which MWD proposes exceeds any current regulations and does not take into account the site specific conditions which may affect decisions regarding the proximity of landfill operations and water conveyance facilities. For these reasons, the siting criteria proposed by MWD were not added to Table 5-3.
- **3-F:** The last sentence of Paragraph 1 has been amended, and additional language has been added under "El Sobrante Landfill Expansion" of Section 7.3 (Chapter 7 of Siting Element) and reads as follows:

The Composite Environmental Resources Map (Figure VI.32 of the General Plan) shows that the site contains "Wildlife Resources." The expansion has the potential to impact Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR), California gnatcatcher, and several sensitive animal and plant species. The Environmental Impact Report for the proposed expansion, consisting of the Draft EIR, dated April 1994, and the Final EIR, dated April 1996, outlines extensive mitigation that includes such measures as the conveyance of 292 acres of the eastern portion of the project property as part of a permanent multi-species reserve, the nondisturbance of an additional 180 acres, and, upon completion of the landfill expansion, the conveyance of the acreage utilized for the landfill (approximately 645 acres) by a conservation easement.

Additionally, the expansion area of the landfill is located within the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Core Reserve of the SKR Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Western Riverside County, dated February 1995. The expansion area is identified as "land under negotiation for conservation easements." The HCP includes discussion of the proposed SKR mitigation for the expansion of the landfill, including the dedication of a portion of tipping fees to SKR conservation revenues and the advanced payment of \$500,000 of these funds to the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA). The SKR HCP acknowledges that the revenue source is dependent upon approval of the landfill expansion.

COMMENT LETTER NO. 4:

LARRY AND DONNA CHARPIED, dated July 17, 1996

4-A: Table 5-1, "Screening Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities," on Page 5-2 under Section 5.2 (Chapter 5 of Siting Element) lists Screening Criteria that mirror Subtitle D requirements for new landfill units and lateral expansions (Section 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations). New landfill facilities and lateral expansions of existing landfills must comply with these Siting Criteria in order to be found consistent with the Siting Element. These Siting Criteria are not intended to be more stringent than Subtitle D requirements, which allow a landfill operator to demonstrate compliance. Consequently, the third footnote to Table 5-1 has been amended by action of the Local Task Force (LTF), at its meeting on July 18, 1996, to read as follows:

> ³If yes is indicated, additional environmental and technical studies would be required to ensure that the project can demonstrate compliance with Subtitle D before the project can be determined to be consistent with the Countywide Siting Element and these Screening Criteria.

- **4-B:** Your comments, numbered 1 through 4, address the consistency of the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill with the Screening Criteria. As noted under "Applying the Screening and Siting Criteria to Facilities Which Have Been Identified in the Siting Element" of Section 5.3 (Chapter 5 of Siting Element), the Eagle Mountain Landfill, as well as the identified expansions for the Badlands, Edom Hill, El Sobrante, and Lamb Canyon Landfills, were screened against the Subtitle D requirements in Table 5-1 and met the criteria. These facilities are, therefore, consistent with the Siting Element and the CIWMP. The determination that Eagle Mountain meets the Screening Criteria was based upon the environmental documents and technical studies that have been prepared to date for this project that demonstrate that Subtitle D compliance is attainable. As stated under "Environmental Review and Permitting" of Section 5.3 (Chapter 5 of Siting Element), the finding that a project is consistent with the CIWMP does not in any way supercede the environmental review, land use, and permitting processes.
- 4-C: Section 18756.3(c) of the California Code of Regulations (Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 6.5) specifies that "by the first five-year revision of the Countywide and Regionwide Integrated Waste Management Plan all areas identified to assure the minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity as described in CCR 18755(a) of this article must meet the requirements of Public Resources Code section 41702," which deals with consistency with a city or county general plan. The fact that the Eagle Mountain Landfill is identified and described in the County Solid Waste Management (CoSWMP) is not relevant.

This regulation applies only to the CIWMP.

- **4-D:** There has been no violation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Western Riverside Council of Governments and the Coachella Valley Association of Governments, known as the COGs, with regard to circulating the Landfill Reclamation Feasibility Study (Study). Item 1 of the MOU states that the District "shall submit all significant policy and major fiscal matters...to the Executive Committee" of the COGs in order to allow input from the cities. Since the CIWMP is a significant policy document for Riverside County and its cities, both COGs have actively participated in the preparation of the document. Both COG staff representatives on the LTF were provided with copies of the Study to circulate to their COG committees and City representatives at their discretion. More specifically, the Study was circulated in the following manner:
 - A copy of the Study, along with video tapes on landfill mining, were first made available to District staff at a public scoping meeting held during the preparation of the Preliminary Draft Summary Plan and Siting Element of the CIWMP on May 15, 1995. As stated in our letter to you, dated June 19, 1995, the printed material was copied and shared with the members of the LTF CIWMP Subcommittee. The LTF CIWMP Subcommittee includes the representatives from both COGs, as well as two cities.
 - A copy of the Study was provided to District staff for dissemination to LTF members at a public hearing on the CIWMP held by the LTF on February 15, 1996. Following the LTF hearing, copies of the Study were made available to all LTF members. LTF members include representatives from both COGs and various cities in the County.
 - The Study was utilized as a resource in writing "Landfill Mining" under Section 8.2 (Chapter 8 of Siting Element) and is referenced accordingly. Two copies of the *Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP*, dated May 1996, were distributed directly to each city in Riverside County for comment, during the period of June 10, 1996 to July 25, 1996.
- 4-E: The primary purpose of the Countywide Siting Element is to demonstrate that Riverside County can provide its participating jurisdictions with a minimum of 15 years of disposal capacity. However, it is the County's goal and policy to promote efforts that will provide for up to 30 years of capacity. This amount of disposal capacity may be developed through the expansion and/or siting of new landfills, or it may be provided through other technology, such as the development of capacity from landfill mining of existing/closed landfills. The Siting Element does not preclude either method. However, the District is currently relying upon the proposed expansions or siting of the new landfill for its disposal capacity, because of the site-specific data and information that is available to document capacity of these identified sites.

On the other hand, the feasibility study, to which you refer, does not provide the site-specific information that would be needed for the District to demonstrate that landfill mining is a feasible alternative in providing additional disposal capacity at its landfills. The District has also never had site-specific experience in landfill mining to predict its effectiveness in creating disposal capacity. The Twin Peaks "clean closure" that is referred to in your comment did not involve landfill mining. The landfilled waste was excavated and then disposed at another County landfill. Consequently, landfill mining remains as a strategy for consideration in the Siting Element.

Issues that would need to be examined before landfill mining would be considered include: 1) the additional cost associated with the removal of landfilled materials, sorting of waste, disposal of solid waste unsuitable for recycling and reuse, and disposal/treatment of hazardous waste uncovered, 2) how the additional cost of landfill mining would be borne and by who, and 3) would landfill mining create additional capacity (as you infer in your comment, landfill mining may be more appropriate as a strategy in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element of the CIWMP).

- NOTE: The LTF, at its July 18, 1996 meeting, requested that alternatives to landfilling, such as landfill mining or pyrolysis, be brought forward for discussion at a future meeting.
- 4-F: Most of the issues raised in this comment have been addressed in prior responses. Please refer to Response 4-B regarding the consistency of the Eagle Mountain Landfill proposal with the CIWMP, Response 4-C regarding General Plan consistency of reserved facilities by the 5-year revision of the CIWMP, and Response 4-E regarding the District's reliance upon proposed expansions of existing landfills or the siting of the Eagle Mountain Landfill for its long-term disposal capacity. The fact that the amount of landfill capacity saved from exporting waste to out-of-county landfills, landfill mining, or other technologies has not been calculated in the Siting Element is not reflective of a "predetermined decision" on the Eagle Mountain Landfill project. It can be attributed to the fact that these strategies have not yet been fully studied, nor have they been approved by the Board of Directors for implementation.

COMMENT LETTER NO. 5:

EAGLE MOUNTAIN LANDFILL AND RECYCLING CENTER, dated July 24, 1996

- 5-A: Please refer to Responses 4-A and 4-B.
- 5-B: Table 5-2 explains the siting criteria point weighting which was used to develop Table 5-3. If the comment is directed to Table 5-3, "Siting Criteria for New/Expanded Disposal Facilities," Section 5.3 of the Siting Element, beginning on Page 5-11, provides an explanation of how these criteria would be used and by whom. As noted on Page 5-3,

"documentation should be provided at the end of the table to identify the source(s) of information or the basis upon which the point allocation was determined." Through this documentation, subjectivity should be reduced.

- 5-C: The recommended changes regarding the total acreage and total volume of the Eagle Mountain Landfill have been incorporated into Table 6-4 of the Siting Element.
- 5-D: The issue of geographical divisions in waste shed areas, or the "geographical disparity" in disposal capacity between different areas of the County, is discussed on Page 3-4 of the Siting Element. It is acknowledged that there is a lack of disposal capacity in different areas of the County and that economics will be a factor in diverting waste from an area without capacity to an area with capacity. However, to study this issue based upon waste sheds implies that there are established waste shed areas, which there are not. Riverside County is operated as a landfill system, and the system approach was taken in determining capacity needs. This approach is consistent with State regulations.
- 5-E: Error is noted. Item 20 (Groundshaking Zone) on Page 6 of the Environmental Assessment has been corrected. An "N" or "No" is the correct response.

COMMENT LETTER NO. 6:

CAL/EPA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD (CIWMB), dated July 25, 1996

- 6-A: As noted under "Political Units" of Section 3.2 (Chapter 3 of Summary Plan), the information contained in Tables 3-1 through 3-26 is *supplementary* information requested by members of the CIWMP Steering Committee and is **not** required by the regulations for inclusion in this document. The Steering Committee and District staff requested the information from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), and cities, so that it would reflect each city's unique profile. After receiving the CIWMB comment, District staff requested that each city provide any missing information. The tables in the *Final Draft* Countywide Summary Plan have been updated accordingly to incorporate this additional information. However, some information remains unavailable. General discussions of categories, including seasonal population fluctuations, are included in Section 3.2.
- 6-B: The following information has been added to the CIWMP Executive Summary under Annual Reports and Five-Year Review and Revisions of the CIWMP:

Prior to the adoption of the CIWMP, the County and cities within the County were required to submit annual reports regarding the SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE by August 1 of the year following Board approval or conditional approval of their jurisdiction's documents. 6-C: Environmental review of the Summary Plan and Siting Element is being completed, and a Notice of Determination will be forwarded to the CIWMB in accordance with 14 CCR section 18784 (a)(6).

COMMENT LETTER NO. 7:

DESERT PROTECTION SOCIETY, prepared by Joseph Krallinger, dated May 1996 ("Nonhazardous Solid Waste Landfill Report - Southern California")

This report includes extensive comments that describe recent waste management reports and studies, data regarding waste management in Riverside County and other counties, an evaluation of recycling as a business, landfill mining, pyrogenic gasifiers, and gravity pressure vessel (trash-to-energy). It is beyond the scope of these responses to verify or respond to all the comments which were incorporated into this report. The summary approach taken by the report made it difficult to confirm the source of information which was used to reach various conclusions. Lack of a response to any of the comments within the report does not imply concurrence with the comments contained therein.

Responses have been prepared to address specific comments within the report which apply specifically to the CIWMP, Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Siting Element and/or Revised Preliminary Draft Countywide Summary Plan. The following is a response to these specific comments:

7-A: As noted in Chapter 6 of the Siting Element, "This finding of consistency with the planned facility as identified and described in the Siting Element does not supersede any other planning requirements, nor does it guarantee approval of the facility." The comment regarding permitting should be addressed during the public hearing process on the Eagle Mountain project.

Tables 9-2, 9-3, and 9-4 of the Siting Element identify the responsible entities, schedule and revenue sources for the Eagle Mountain Landfill project and other proposed expansions. It is unclear from the comment what the basis would be for excluding the Eagle Mountain Landfill project from these tables, as it is a project which is currently under consideration by the County of Riverside and it appears to comply with the criteria included in Chapter 5 of the Siting Element, specifically Subtitle D as noted in the Responses to Letter 4.

Chapter 3 of the Siting Element discusses the assumptions which were used to determine the 15-year disposal capacity of the system. It is noted in Chapter 6 of the Siting Element, page 6-2, paragraph 2 that: "Any one of the expansions proposed at Lamb Canyon, Badlands, or El Sobrante Landfills, or the development of the Eagle Mountain Landfill project, when combined with the existing permitted capacity described in Chapter 3, provide Riverside County and its residents with a greater than 15-year disposal capacity."

7-B: See Response 7-A.

- 7-C: See Response 7-A. Table 9-2 is required to show responsible entities. It is inappropriate to add the increased capacity expected for each of the planned expansions.
- 7-D: Please refer to Responses 4-C, 4-E, and 7-A. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was released for the Eagle Mountain Landfill project in July 1996. At this stage it is farther along in processing than the proposed expansions of the Badlands or Lamb Canyon Landfill projects. The El Sobrante Landfill expansion project was tentatively approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on June 17, 1996, and an EIR is currently being prepared for the Edom Hill Landfill expansion. The basis for including these proposals in the Siting Element was to provide a full disclosure of "planned" landfill expansions or new facilities that may provide disposal capacity to Riverside County and its participating jurisdictions.
- 7-E: See Response 7-A. The intent of the statement regarding alternative strategies was not to negate the importance of alternative strategies nor to rely on any proposed expansion or new landfill. The statement was included to note the finding in Chapter 6 that the proposed expansions at the Badlands, Lamb Canyon, and El Sobrante Landfills or the new Eagle Mountain Landfill along with existing landfill capacity could provide 15 years of waste disposal capacity.
- 7-F: Tables A-1 through A-5 provide estimates of waste generation based upon the Department of Finance's projections contained in "Total Population by County by Year by Race/Ethnicity, 1993 Population Series" and the Southern California Association of Governments' long range population projections. Expected diversion rates are noted in each of these tables. The assumptions used in these tables are further explained under A.2.1. Application of Waste-Generation-Based Approach.
- 7-G: The amount of waste which is being landfilled has dropped due to reasons which are not entirely understood. The decrease may be due to diversion programs but also may be due to the slowdown in the local economy. The disposal tonnage projected in Table 3-2 assumes that there will be no increase from 1995 to 2000 at all County landfills except at the Blythe Landfill where disposal will increase by 4% annually. The projection assumes that after the year 2000, disposal will grow 2% annually. The District's projections are based upon currently available information. Annual reports will be prepared and the Siting Element will be amended if significant changes occur.
- 7-H: See Response 7-A.

COMMENT LETTER NO. 8:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT LETTER (not dated) [No Comments]

COMMENT LETTER NO. 9:

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (WRCOG), dated August 14, 1996

[No Comments]

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON CIWMP ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMMENT LETTER NO. A:

PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT LETTER, dated June 26, 1996

A-1: Illegal dumping is a concern throughout the County and its cities. The CIWMP acknowledges this issue and notes in Chapter 1 of the Summary Plan that policies and strategies will need to be determined to address illegal disposal of solid waste along roadways and on agricultural and other lands throughout the County. (See page 1-7 of the Summary Plan.) Chapter 2 of the Summary Plan includes a policy which states:

"Continue to examine countywide policies, practices, and/or ordinances that can be implemented to reduce illegal dumping."

This issue is further identified in Chapter 2 of the Summary Plan in a related objective which states:

"Disseminate for consideration all significant waste management matters to the Local Task Force (LTF), in accordance with state regulations, to affected cities, and Executive Committees of the Councils of Governments to allow the input of all jurisdictions within Riverside County. These matters could include, but are not limited to: development of nondisposal facilities, new waste management technologies (including landfill mining), and illegal dumping ordinances/programs."

The Board of Supervisors has taken several actions recently to address the problem of illegal dumping. During the 1996-1997 fiscal year, the Board of Supervisors allocated \$137,000 to the Code Enforcement Section of the Riverside County Building and Safety Department to assist them in their litter control enforcement efforts. On April 30, 1996, the Board of Supervisors approved the imposition of a surcharge of \$0.25 per residence and \$.50 per cubic yard collected from commercial customers. The surcharge is intended to fund the cost of hauler collection of illegally dumped roadside waste, for both the current pilot project and potential long-term programs. Following a public hearing on June 18, 1996, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors directed the Department of Environmental Health to establish a trust fund to collect and hold the surcharges collected for Illegal Dumping Retrieval until a distribution process is developed.

The District and Solid Waste Management Advisory Council/Local Task Force (LTF) continue to study approaches which can be taken to reduce illegal dumping. A by-product of the reduced tipping fees may be that more waste is disposed of properly. The District can appreciate the concern expressed regarding operating hours of the landfills; illegal dumping was one issue discussed with the Board of Supervisors when the operating hours for County landfills was discussed. It should be noted that the CIWMP also includes the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) which includes programs which can reduce illegal dumping. Some of the programs which were identified in the County's SRRE included: Referral System for Household Owners of White and Repairable Goods and Drop-Off Centers.

The CIWMP acknowledges the issue of illegal dumping and the District, cities, and Councils of Government are working to reduce this complex problem.

- A-2: The Environmental Assessment (EA) did not address the specific issue of illegal dumping because it was outside the scope of the defined project. The EA assessed the impacts related to the policies and plans in the Summary Plan and Siting Element. Specifically, the Summary Plan summarizes the policies and programs contained in the County's and cities SRRE's, Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWE's) and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE's). The Siting Element is required to demonstrate that there is a countywide minimum of 15 years of combined permitted disposal capacity through existing or planned solid waste disposal and transformation facilities or through additional strategies. While recognizing the importance of illegal dumping as an issue to this County and its cities, the Summary Plan and Siting Element were not the vehicles for identifying the programs to reduce illegal dumping in the County.
- A-3: See Responses A-1 and A-2.

COMMENT LETTER NO. B:

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE, dated July 10, 1996

[No Comments]

COMMENT LETTER NO. C:

COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, dated July 5, 1996

[No Comments]

COMMENT LETTER NO. D:

WESTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, dated July 12, 1996

[No Comments]

Source: CIWMB Jeff Martinez

DATE: July 9, 1996

SUBJECT: NDFE Amendment Requirements

Per your request I am providing you with a summary of the requirements to amend a NDFE to include new or proposed composting facilities.

- 1. County or city must amend NDFE to include proposed or existing composting facilities. The amendment must include information presented in CCR sections 18752 through 18754.5.
- 2. Prior to the public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment, the city or county shall send a copy of the final draft to the LTF for review. Within 90 days of receipt of the final draft NDFE amendment, the LTF must provide written comments to the city or county and the Board regarding the final draft NDFE amendment (CCR 18765 (b)).
- 3. The governing body of the jurisdiction shall conduct a public hearing for the adoption of the NDFE amendment. To inform the public of the hearing, the jurisdiction must publish a notice in a newspaper of general circulation at least 10 days prior to the scheduled public meeting (CCR 18766 (b)).
- 4. A city must transmit a copy of its NDFE to the county in which it is located for incorporation into the CIWMP within 30 days of its adoption by the city (CCR 18767 (b)). A county must transmit a copy of its NDFE amendment to the cities which are located within the county within 30 days of adoption by the county (CCR 18767 (c)).
- 5. The city or county must submit three copies of the NDFE amendment to the Board, along with the following documentation: a copy of the public notice for the public hearing, a copy of the resolution adopting the NDFE amendment, and a copy od the LTF comments (CCR 18768 (b)).
- 6. If three copies of the NDFE amendment, along with all of the required supporting documentation is received, the Board has a 50 day review period for consideration of approval of the amendments to the NDFE (CCR 18768 (e)).

At its June 30, 1993 Regular Board Meeting, the California Integrated Waste Management Board approved the solid waste facilities permit for the La Pata Road Greenwaste Facility located in Orange County. As a part of the approval of the SWFP, and responding to recently passed legislation (AB3001, Cortese, 1992) addressing local siting of nondisposal facilities, the Board members and Permitting and Enforcement Committee members expanded the definition of a "materials recovery facility" (MRF) for a conformance finding with Public Resources Code section 50000(a)(4). For purposes of conformance findings, as required under PRC section 50000, that definition of a "MRF" will now include material recovery facilities, composting facilities, transfer stations, etc., and other solid waste diversion facilities necessary for the local jurisdictions to adequately implement their source reduction and recycling element programs.

Previously, for purposes of conformance findings per PRC section 50000, for any solid waste handling facility <u>other than</u> a MRF the LEA had to certify that one of the following had taken place: (1) the facility is identified and described in or found to conform with a county solid waste management plan; or (2) pursuant to the procedures in PRC section 50000 subdivision (b), the facility has been approved by the county and by a majority of the cities within the county which contain a majority of the population of the incorporated area of the county. PRC section 50000(a)(4) requires that "MRFs", transfer stations designed to divert for reuse at least 15% of the incoming materials, only need to have a finding done by the Local Task Force. Starting with those SWFP applications received after July 1, 1993, conformance findings for all facilities other than disposal or transformation facilities now only need conformance findings as required by PRC section 50000(a)(4), ie, review and comment by the Local Task Force.

If you have questions about the conformance finding process, please contact the Board's Office of Local Assistance, at (916) . 255-2555.

50000(a) Until a countywide integrated waste management plan has been approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board pursuant to Division 30 (commencing with Section 40000), no person shall establish a new solid waste facility or transformation facility or expand an existing solid waste facility or transformation facility which will result in a significant increase in the amount of solid waste handled at the facility without a certification by the local enforcement agency that one of the following has occurred:

(a) (4) The facility is a material recovery facility and the site identification and description of the facility has been submitted to the task force created pursuant to Section 40950 for review and comment, pursuant to the procedures set forth in subdivision (c). For purposes of this paragraph, "material recovery facility" means a transfer station which is designed to, and, as a condition of its permit, shall, recover for reuse or recycling at least 15 percent of the total volume of material received by the facility.

(c) To initiate the review and comment by the task force required by paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) and subdivision (d), the person or agency proposing the facility shall submit the site identification and description of the facility to the task force. Within 90 days after the site identification and description is submitted to the task force, the task force shall meet and comment on the facility in writing. Those comments shall include, but are not limited to, the relationship between the proposed new or expanded material recovery facility and the requirements of Section 41780. The task force shall transmit those comments to the applicant, to the county, and to all of the cities in the county.

APPENDIX B

CITIES' RESOLUTIONS ON THE FINAL DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

RESOLUTION NO. 1996-133

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF BANNING, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with § 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, (Assembly Bill 939); and

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and /or transformation; and

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT ON

FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK. N'I Marie 4. (alduce DATE 1-2-97

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and

circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on December 10, 1996, the City Council of the City of Banning held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Banning, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 10, 1996, that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Banning.

ADOPTED this 10th day of December, 1996

City of Banning, California

ATTEST:

Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk of the City of Banning, California

Approved as to Form and Legal Content:

John Wilson.

City Attorney

CERTIFICATION

I, Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk of the City of Banning, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 1996-133, was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Banning. California, at a Regular meeting thereof held on the 10th of day of December 1996, by the following vote to wit:

AYES: Councilmembers Jenkins, Lucsko, Palmer, Williams, Mayor Hunt

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk City of Banning, California

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

415 No.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT/ENGINEERING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) { **\$**5. County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County The stad, Eltim over the age of eighteen years, and promiparty to uninterested in the above entitled matter is am the principal clerk of the printer of The DAILY RECORD-GAZETTE

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of Banning **County of Riverside** and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of October 14, 1966, Case Number 54737, that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

PUB: 11/6 ONLY

all in the year 19.96

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature 19.96

Date November 6

at Riverside, California

CITY OF BANNING NOTICE OF **FUBLIC HEARING** PURSUANT TO LAW. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of a Public Hearing before the City Council of the City of Banning, to be heard December 10, 1996, at 1 6:30 p.m., in the City of **Banning Council Cham**bers, City Hall, 99 East Ramsey Street, Banning, California, to consider the following: 1. Consider Final Draft of County Wide Integrated Waste manage Plan (CIWMP) (see Resolution No. 1996-133)

Information regarding Filing Stamp the foregoing can be obtained by contacting the City's Public Works Department, Engineering Division at (909) 922-3130 or by visiting City Hall at 99 East Ramsey Street, Banning. Ca. between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. ALL INTERESTED PARTIES are invited to attend said hearing and present oral or written testimony on the matter or send their written comments to the City Clerk, P.O. Box 998. Banning, CA 92220. If you challenge any decision regarding the

above proposal in court. you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised in written correspondence delivered to the City Clerk at, or prior to, the time it makes its decision on the proposal, or, if a public hearing is held on the proposal, you or someone else must have raised those issues at the 1 public hearing or in i written correspondence | delivered to the City Clerk at, or prior to, the hearing (Calif. Govt. Code Sub-Section 65009). BY ORDER OF THE CITY CLERK of the City of Banning, California. Date: November 6, 1996. ---- Marie Calderon Marie Calderon City Clerk, City of Banning, California Publish The Record-Gazette

No. 415 11-6, 1996



City of Beaumont

550 East Sixth Street Beaumont, CA 92223 (909) 769-8520 FAX (909) 769-8525 FAX (909) 769-8526

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the Beaumont City Council will hold a public hearing to consider by Resolution to either approve or disapprove the Final Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). This hearing will be held December 9, 1996, at 6:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, located at 550 E. Sixth Street, Beaumont.

On public hearings, the public may present testimony to the City Council either in person or by mail. Written comments will be accepted until the night of the hearing.

ALAN C. KAPWNICAS Deputy City Clerk

Dated: November 4, 1996 Dated: November 4, 1996 Publish: One time only, November 7, 1996 in the Commu
RESOLUTION NO. <u>1996</u>–57

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Beaumont, California Approving

The Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Including The Countywide Summary Plan and The Countywide Siting Element

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with §40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CTWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation form the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs, and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Sitting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received form the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45day public comment period form June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its

cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on December 9, 1996, the City Council of the City of Beaumont held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED BY the City Council of the City of Beaumont, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 9, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft

CTWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element. Subject to the prioritization of the expansion of the Lambs Canyon Landfill and the Badlands Landfill over all others identified in the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Beaumont,

ADOPTED this 9 day of December, 1996, with the following vote:

AYES:Mayor Leja, Councilmembers Parrott, Westcot and Zeller.NOES:None.ABSTAIN:None.ABSENT:Mayor Pro Tem Berg.CLTY OF

CITY OF BEAUMONT (Mayor)

ATTEST:

ery N. Jaylor

City Clerk



City Of Calimesa

November 20, 1996

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Attention: Katherine Gifford, Planner III 1995 Market Street Riverside, California 92501-1719

RE: Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Resolution No. 96-30

Dear Ms. Gifford:

Per your request, enclosed is a copy of Resolution No. 96-30 which was adopted by the Calimesa City Council at their regular meeting of November 4, 1996. Also enclosed is a certified copy of that portion of the minutes.

If anything further is needed, please let us know.

Sincerely, Ubuda Ateadman

Wanda Steadman, City Clerk

Council Member Hyatt inquired on Warrant Number 8040 and 8042 to which staff explained. He moved to approve Item A of the Consent Calendar. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Draeger. Motion carried 5-0.

Mayor Winningham inquired on the Planning Commission report to which Planning Director Buydos clarified.

Council Member Hyatt asked for the status of the Plantation on the Lake tract recordation, to which Planning Director Buydos explained.

Mayor Winningham inquired on the drainage concerns regarding tract 26548. Planning Director Buydos responded that the drainage would flow from the southern portion of the tract onto the north side of Avenue L. Mayor Pro Tem Draeger requested a copy of the final conditions.

Mayor Winningham moved to approve Item B of the Consent Calendar. Seconded by Council Member Hyatt. Motion carried 5-0.

III **PUBLIC HEARING**

A. <u>Resolution Number 96-30 for Adoption</u> A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Calimesa, California, approving the final draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, including Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

Staff report by Acting City Manager Fessenden, who presented the background and recommended approval.

Discussion was held regarding the funding and the City's responsibilities.

The Hearing was opened for public comment. Since there was no member of the public wishing to address the issue, that portion of the meeting was closed and opened to the City Council for discussion.

Council Member Hyatt moved to waive further reading of Resolution Number 96-30 and adopt by title only. Seconded by Council Member Morton. Motion carried 5-0.

B. <u>Appeal - Crestwood Corporation - DPR 9610-006, Tract 27733, Phase II (Silverado)</u> Mayor Winningham inquired on the posting and advertising legalities of this tract, to which Planning Director Buydos clarified.

Staff report by Planning Director Buydos who explained the history of this project and the developers request. He reported staff's recommendation to follow the Planning Commission's compromised motion, and approve lots 2, 3,5 and 8 for use of two story homes. He responded to questions by Council.

Allenda teadixan

PROOF OF PUBLICATION (2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the DESERT SUN PUBLISHING COMPANY, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in the city of Palm Springs, County of Riverside, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California; under the date of March 24, 1988. Case Number 191236; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

November 5th

all in the year 1996.

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Palm Springs, California this <u>5th</u> day of <u>November</u>, 1996.

Sie Clake

SIGNATURE

Proof of Publication of



PROOF OF PUBLICATION

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND PUBLIC HEARING FOR FINAL DRAFT OF COUNTY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

In compliance with the State of California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939, Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989, et. seq.), the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, on behalf of Riverside County, has completed the preliminary drafts of the Riverside County Summary Plan and the Riverside County Siting Element. These documents represent the final two components of the Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan.

The Riverside County Summary Plan includes the Countywide goals, policies and objectives for integrated waste management planning; a description of the administrative structure for preparing and maintaining the Summary Plan; a description of current solid waste management practices; a summary of all the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs), Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs), and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFEs) for Riverside County and its 24 cities; and a discussion of COUNTY WIDE programs, how they will be structured, administered and financed.

The Riverside Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity for solid waste that has first been reduced through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.

The Riverside County Summary Plan and the Riverside Countywide Siting Element are available for public review at the Coachella City Hall, 1515 Sixth St. Coachella CA, 92236. These documents may also be viewed at the following libraries: Riverside Main Branch, Beaumont District Library, Corona Public Library, Desert Hot Springs Branch, Gien Avon Branch, Hemet Public Library, Idyllwild Branch, Indio Branch, Mecca-North Shore Branch, Moreno Valley Branch, Nuview Branch, Lake Tamarisk Branch, Palm Springs Branch, Palo Verde Branch, Sun City Branch, and Temecula Branch.

The City of Coachella will consider a Resolution to approve the Final Draft CIWMP at a public hearing on December 5, 1996 at 6:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as is possible, at the City's Council Chambers, 1515 Sixth St. Coachella, California, 92236.

Any comments on these documents can be presented at the public hearing or may be directed to the attention of John E. Curtis, Public Works Director at (619) 398-3002.

Olga Delgado, Depury City Clerk



CITY of DESERT HOT SPRINGS

December 19, 1996

96

5 DEC 23 PM 1: 50

Mr. Lesley Likins, Senior Planner COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

Dear Mr. Likins:

The City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs at its regularly scheduled meeting of December 17, 1996, adopted Resolution 96-38 (copy attached), a resolution approving the final draft County-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan.

Please feel free to contact me, (619) 329-6411 ext. 222, if further information is required.

Sincerely,

Khart

Kathie Hart City Clerk

/kdh (w:\citycIrk\WASTMGMT.ttr) Encl.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-38

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTY WIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTY WIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTY WIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act:), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with § 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG") the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SREEs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and Countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996, and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 (EA No. 37011:) was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on December 17, 1996. the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793. w:\cityclrk\96-38.res

RESOLUTION 96-38 December 17, 1996 Page 3

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 17, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 17th day of December 1996.

GERALD F. PISHA, Mayor

ATTEST:

KATHLEEN D. HART, City Clerk

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Desert Hot Springs at a regular meeting thereof, held on the 17th day of December 1996, by the following vote of the Council:

AYES: Councilmembers Bosworth, Donnelly, Sherman, Smith, and Mayor Pisha NOES: None ABSTENTIONS: None ABSENT: None

Kathleen D. Hart City Clerk

PROOF OF PUBLICATION (2015.5 C.C.P)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, County of Riverside,

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the

DESERT SENTINEL

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published weekly in the City of Desert Hot Springs, County of Riverside, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under the date of February 21, 1975, Case Number 19169; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

NOVEMBER 7. 1996

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Desert Hot Springs, California

this 7TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 1996 Signature

Proof of Publication of

PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE OF PUPING	
The City Council of the Church HEARING	
OUCL & Dublic hand the City of Desert Hor Card	101
interest intering to consider the Ct.	/= will can
They waste Manager and Treverside C	CI IT DOLLAR
conduct as inlinent Plan. The mean	- CHILLY WICH
Date: Distant	ng wili pe
The Uecember 17 1004	
(me: 5:30 p.m.	
Location Cont Man	· •
MEY COMMUNITY COM	1
All 11-711 West Dates D	· · ·
All members of the mublic Unive, Desert Hot Sou	
Their concerne the provinciane invited in annext	" GS, CA
commente anyone unable to entend a	nd volce
the city Cierts on a start may subm	it want the
0er 17, 1996, Please contract of Defore 5:30 p.m	Deces
for additional later working City Clark at 810 a	naceu.
firmetion.	29-6411
in you crallenge any item or ontine	
you may be limited to mining a short at this meeting	
One else relead and only those lesing only those lesing	" COUNT,
ared to the set and at anis meeting or in comes you o	SOMe-
sied to the City at or prior to in correspondence	A lain &
Dated this 1st day, to this meeting	- Oblig-
Child ally of November 1000	Party L
Byskame Hert Cir Circ. 1996.	· D)
(Pub. D.S. New Oily Clerk	- m.
1996)	- - -



City of Hemet

RECYCLING DIVISION

3777 INDUSTRIAL AVENUE • HEMET, CALIFORNIA 92545 • (909)765-2319

December 19, 1996

Riverside County Waste Resources Management District Att.: Stacy Hubbard, Recycling Specialist 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

RE: Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Resolution

Dear Ms. Hubbard:

Enclosed is a certified copy of the resolution number 3275-A of the City Council of the City of Hemet approving the Final Draft Coutywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. In addition to the resolution, a copy of the proof of publication for the notice of public hearing is included herewith.

If you have any questions regarding this matter please feel free to contact me at (909) 765-2379.

Sincerely,

Eliza E. Harms Administrative Analyst

cc: Joyce Marshall, WRCOG Director of Local Programs Robert L. Farni, IWM Superintendent

RESOLUTION NO. 3275 -A

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Hemet, California, approving the Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, including The Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with §40000), was added by chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resource Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised

Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP withing 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the City; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, Pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) And the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepares a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 1996, the City Council of the City of Hemet held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Hemet, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 17, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct,.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Hemet.

ADOPTED this 17th day of December, 1996 by the following votes:

AYES: Councilmembers Alberg, Tandy, VanArsdale, Venable and Mayor Lowe

NOES: None

ABSENT:None

ABSTAIN: None

C. Robin Reeser Lowe, Mayof

ATTEST:

Leanna Keltner, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED, TO FORM:

Robert T. Henderson, City Attorney

THE FOREGONG INSTRUMENT IS A CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE Kerlein C. H. Manicion ATTEST_ MARILYN A. HAMPTON, DEPUTY CITY CLERK CITY OF HEMET, CALIFORNIA 12 10, 19 -1/

PROOF OF PUBLICATION (2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of The Hemet News, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of Hemet, County of Riverside and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of October 10, 1927, Case Number 17137: that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

11/09/96

ertify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature

.

Dated at Hemet, California, this 9th day of

November, 1996

This space is for the County Clerks's Filing Stamp

CITY OF HEMET

NOV 1 3 1996

Proof of Publication

PLANNING

Notice of Public Hearing

December 10, 1996 - Hearing Protests

Final Draft (CIWMP) - City of Hemet

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that on December 10, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, Civic Center, 450 E. Latham Avenue, Hernet, California, the Hernet City Council will hold a public hearing on:

Hearing protests in reference to the adoption of the Final Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), including the Final Draft Countywide Summary Plan and Final Draft Countywide Siting Element.

Further details, including reviewing a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP are available at the Department of Public Works, Corporation, 3777 Industrial Avenue, Hemet, California, Telephone 909/765-2319.

s/Eliza E. Harms Administrative Analyst The Hernet News November 9,1996

> RECEVED NOV 1 3 1995 CITY CLERK





November 26, 1996

Lesley Likins, Senior Planner Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

> RE: Resolution 96-126 Approving the Final Draft of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)

Dear Ms. Likins:

It is the intent of this correspondence to notify you that at a duly noticed public hearing held on November 21, 1996, the Indian Wells City Council unanimously approved the Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). This hearing was conducted in accordance to Section 41793 of the California Public Resources Code. There were no public comments. A certified copy of Resolution 96-126 approving the final draft CIWMP has been enclosed for your records.

Should you have any questions or need additional clarification regarding this matter, please contact me at (619) 346-2489.

Sincerely,

Troy L Butzlaf Assistanto the City Mahager

TLB:

Enclosure

0

RESOLUTION NO. 96-126

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INDIAN WELLS, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with \$40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statues of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC §40900, <u>et sea</u>., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC §§41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWND"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Governments ("CVAG'), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG'), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

City of Indian Wells Resolution No. 96-126 Page 2

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities with the County, in accordance with PRC §41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA'), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") §18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and CIWMB, in accordance with CCR §18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the California environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC §21000 <u>et sea</u>.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to §15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on November 21, 1996, the City Council of the City of Indian Wells held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC §41793.

NOW, THERE, BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Indian Wells, State of California, in a regular session assembled on November 21, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Indian Wells.

City of Indian Wells Resolution No. 96-126 Page 3

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Indian Wells, California, this 21st day of November, 1996.

PHIL J. BOSTLEY, JR., MAYOR

CERTIFICATION FOR RESOLUTION NO. 96-126

I, George J. Watts, City Clerk of the City Council of the City of Indian Wells, California DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the whole number of the members of the City Council is four (4); that the above and foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Indian Wells on the 21st day of November, 1996, by the following vote:

AYES: Bostley, Killion, Leming, McIntyre

NOES: None

ATTEST:

GEORGE J. WATTS CITY MANAGER/CITY CLERK

HEREBY CERTIFY this to be m a true copy of _ 94-126 held (dated 1996 **E**() 11/22/96 Carole Johnson - Boddin Date Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

L'Call

JOHN L. COOK

PROOF OF PUBLICATION (2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the DESERT SUN PUBLISHING COMPANY, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in the city of Palm Springs, County of Riverside, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California; under the date of March 24, 1988. Case Number 191236; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

October 21st

all in the year 1996.

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Palm Springs, California this 21st day of October, 1996.

tonke

SIGNATURE

This space is for County Clerk's Filing Stamp

\$55.68

Proof of Publication of

No. 1015 No.1015 NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING A1773 of the Californie Public Resources Code thi Indian Wells: Clor: Council with hold a PUBLIC HEARING on November 21, 1976, 20,530 p.m., or at soon thereafter as the metter can be hand in the Council Chambers at 44-502 idorade Dave, in the Cliry, of Indian Wells, California, on the Blanking in them. City of Indian Wells, California, on metallowin item. A RESOL UTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MDIANIWELLS, CALIFORNIA APPROV ING. THE FINAL DRAFT, COUNTY NIDE INTE GRATED, WASTE JUNANAGENETT, PLAN, IN CLUDING THE COUNTY NIDE STANAAT OF LAN AND THE COUNTY NIDE STANAAT OF LAN Section 4071 of the County The Public Resource Code regulate sects city in the County to act upon the 'County wide Integrated Thurse. Anongenetic Plan COUNTY of the County of the Resource Code regulate sects city in the County to act upon the 'County wide Integrated Thurse. Anongenetic Plan 'COUNTY of the County following control the County wide Integrated Thurse of the optime of the County within the to days is deemed to be an approval to the city. During this The City is penumediate county a plant her in the The Integrated wild be regioned and a plant her in the The City for counties of the optime of the City of the City for the the optime of the City is penumented by the City is counties of the final of the City for the the optime of the City of the City for the the optime of the City of the City for the the optime of the City of the City for the the optime of the City of the City of the city for the the optime of the City of the City of the City of the city of the formation of the City of the City for the the optime of the City of the City of the the city of the the optime of the City of the City of the the optime of the City of the City of the optime of the city of the city of the the city of the optime of the city of the city of the city of the city of the city of the city of the city of the city of the city of the the city of the Il Comments of the Final Drett Civing Prior, fo its formal adoption by the Civi, Couricle ALL INTRASTO PERSONS are invited to patronic put integrated. Weste Management Plan. (Civing the may be reviewed at City Half during normal busi-ness hours. Written comments regarding fils ma-rer anay, De subgritted to the City Clark. Office anytime prior to the hearing. FUR THER INFOR-AMATION. They be obtained by Cally of the City Clerk's Office at (S17)246-2889. CITY OF INDIAN WELLS George J: Warts George J. Watts City Manager/City Clerk PUB: October 21, 1996

RESOLUTION NO. 96 - 61

WASTE MANAGEMENT

97 JAN 16 PH 12: 59 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP), INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ('Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with S/S 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statues of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC S/S 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plan; and,

WHEREAS, PRC S/S 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and, WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan include the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May, 1996, and incorporates comments that were received form the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC S/S 41760: and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the City; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft (CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with the California Code of Regulations ("CCR") S/S 18780; and.

WHEREAS, the LIF prepared written comments on the Final Drait CIWIVE at its meeting held on October 17. 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR S/S 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California . Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC S/S 21000 et seq.) And the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration pursuant to S/S 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on November 26, 1996, the City Council of the City of Lake Elsinore held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with the PRC S/S 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Lake Elsinore, State of California, in regular session assembled on November 26, 1996, that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Lake Elsinore.

ADOPTED this Twenty-sixth day of November, 1996 at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Lake Elsinore, California, by the following vote:

ALONGI, BRINLEY, KELLEY, METZE, AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: PAPE NONE NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: NONE ABSTENTIONS: COUNCILMEMBERS: NONE EVIN W. PAPÉ, MAYOR CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE

ATTEST:

VICKI LYNNE KASAD, CITY CLERK

CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

JOHN HARPER, CITY ATTORNEY

CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) SS: CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE)

I, VICKI KASAD, CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE,

CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution duly adopted by the

City Council of the City of Lake Elsinore at a regular meeting of said Council on the

26th day of November, 1996, and that it was so adopted by the following vote:

AYES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	ALONGI, BRINLEY, KELLEY, METZE, PAPE
NOES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	NONE
ABSENT:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	COUNCILMEMBERS:	NONE

VICKI KASAD, CITY CLERK CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE (SEAL)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) SS: CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE)

I, VICKI KASAD, CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE, DO

HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of Resolution

No. 96-61 of said Council, and that the same has not been amended or repealed.

DATE: December 6, 1996

VICKI KASAD, CITY CLERK **CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE** (SEAL)

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Lake Elsinore City Council will hold a public hearing on November 26, 1996, at the Lake Elsinore Cultural Center, 183 North Main Street, Lake Elsinore, California at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following item:

SUBJECT: Acceptance of the County Wide Integrated Waste Management Plan.

LOCATION: City Wide.

"If you challenge the nature of the proposed action in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Council at, or prior to, the public hearing".

ALL INTERESTED PERSONS are invited to attend this hearing and express opinions upon the item(s) listed above, or to submit written comments to the City Council prior to this date.

FURTHER INFORMATION on this item may be obtained by contacting City Clerk's Office, at City Hall (909) 674-3124, where copies of all agenda materials are available for review.

DATE: October 24, 1996

PUBLICATION DATE: November 14, 1996

VICKI KASAD, CITY CLERK CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE

Please publish in the Sun Tribune. Thank you.

I declare under penality of resitivery that the forgoing 1111.01

RESOLUTION 96-92

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LA QUINTA, CALIFORNIA ADOPTING THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of La Quinta, California, did on the 3rd day of December, 1996, hold a duly noticed Public Hearing to seek comments, public input, and consider the Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with § 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city. A Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the county and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countrywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council

Resolution No. 96-92 Page 2

of Government ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions of the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the

Resolution No. 96-92 Page 3

County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) And the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on December 3, 1996, the City Council of the City of La Quinta held a duly notice public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMB, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of La Quinta, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 3, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby adopts the Final Draft CIWMB, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of La Quinta.

Resolution 96-92

Page 4

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 3rd day of December, 1996 by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Adolph, Henderson, Perkins, Sniff, Mayor Holt

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

GLENDA L. HOLT, Mayor City of La Quinta, California

ATTEST:

SAUNDRA L. JUHOLA, City Clerk City of La Quinta, California

AS TO FORM:

DAWN C. HONEYWELL, City Attorney City of La Quinta, California

Public Notice	Public Notice	Public Notice		
CITY OF LA QUINTA CITY COUNCIL				
NOTICE	OF PUBLIC			
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City of La Quinta City Council will hold a PUBLIC HEARING on December 3, 1996 at 7:00 P.M. in the La Quinta City Hall Council Chambers. 78-495 Calle Tampico, La Quinta, California on the following item:				
ITEM:	FINAL DRAFT OF O	COUNTYWIDE INTE		
APPLICANT:	CITY OF LA QUINTA			
LOCATION:	COUNTYWIDE			
REQUEST:	ADOPT FINAL DRAF INTEGRATED WAS PLAN (CIWMP)			
lic hearing will be held to consider the Final Draff Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element. The City will be seeking comments and public input on the Final Draft CIWMP. The final draft CIWMP may be viewed by the public Monday through Finday from 8:00 A.M. until 5:00 P.M. at the Community Development Department, La Quinta City Hall, 78-495 Calle Tampico, La. Quinta, California.				
Any person may submit written comments on this plan to the Community Development Department prior to the Public Hearing and/or may appear and be heard in support of or opposition to the plan at the time of the Hearing. If you chal- lenge the decision of this case in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues that you or someone else raised either at the Public Hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department at the prior to, the Public Hearing. The plan may be viewed by the public Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. at the Community Development Department, La Quinta Civic Center, 78-495 Calle Tampico, La Quinta, California.				
In the City's ef II of the Ame Community De son in need of accommodatio meeting, mu Development the scheduled	forts to comply with the ericans With Disabilitie evelopment Department any type of special equi- on(s), in order to commu- ust inform the Ci- Department a minimur- meeting.	e requirements of Title es Act Of 1990, the t requires that any per upment, assistance or unicate at a City public ty Clerk/Community n of 72 hours prior to		
PUBLISH ONC	CE ON OCTOBER 31,	1996		

•

RESOLUTION NO. 96-95

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with §40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq. describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Governments ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 1996, the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY,

Resolution No. 96-95

2
CALIFORNIA, that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent of the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of December, 1996

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

1. Senice

City Attorney

\96resos.ca\oct96-1.res 10/22/96/ar

Resolution No. 96-95

RESOLUTION JURAT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) § CITY OF MORENO VALLEY)

I, ALICIA CHAVEZ, City Clerk of the City of Moreno Valley, California, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 96-95 was duly and regularly adopted by the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley at an adjourned regular meeting thereof held on the 17th day of December, 1996, by the following vote:

- AYES: Councilmembers Batey, Flickinger, Stewart, West and Mayor White
- NOES: None
- ABSENT: None
- ABSTAIN: None

CITY CLERK

(SEAL)

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

(2010, 2015.5 CCP)

PROOF OF PUBLICATION OF

PUBHEARING

WASTE

I am a citizen of the United States. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to or interested in l am the above entitled matter. an authorized representative of THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the city of Riverside/ County of Riverside/ and which newspaper has been adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of April 25, 1952, Case Number 54446, under date of March 29, 1957, Case Number 65673 and under date of August 25, 1995, Case Number 267864; that the notice/ of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in said newspaper in accordance with the instructions of the person(s) requesting publication, and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

11/8/1996

I Cortify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated November 8) 1996 at Riverside/ California

l

MORENO VALLEY

CITY CLERK

CITY CLERK MORENO VALLEY RECEIVED

SKOV 18 PH 2:03

NOTICE OF PUBLIC NEARING CITY OF MORENO VALLEY Notice is noroby given that the City Council of the City of Morene Valley will consider adopting a resolution of approv-al for the Final Draft Riverpide County Integrated Waste Man-agement Pian (CiWMP). Publi-cation of this notice is in accor-dance with Bestien 18782 of the California Code of Regula-tiens. THE MEARING 18 TO BE AT 7:00 PM IN THE GOUNCIL CHAMBER AT CITY MALL 14377 FREDERICK STREET, MORENO. VALLEY. OALIFORNIA, Dete: October 24, 1996 ./S/Alicie Chavez, City Ciert 13/8

11/8

CITY OF MURRIETA

26442 Beckman Court. Murrieta, CA 92562 Telephone: 909-698-1040 Fax: 909-698-4509

December 18, 1996



Stacey Hubbard Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

Dear Ms. Hubbard:

I am forwarding a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Murrieta City Council that approves the final draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan.

A public hearing on the subject was conducted on the date of the resolution's adoption.

Sincerely,

Al Vollbrecht Senior Management Analyst Office of the City Manager

Exhibit 1

RESOLUTION NO. 96-<u>467</u> A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF MURRIETA APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Act), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) of the State of California, was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and

WHEREAS, PRC Sections 41750 through 41770 require Riverside County (County) and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) and Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element and a Countywide Summary Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District (WRMD), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force (LTF), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and cities in the county, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs and NDFEs for the County and each of its cities, and countywide programs; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings, one on the preliminary draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996, and another on the revised preliminary draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the final draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the revised preliminary draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996, through July 25, 1996, and responses to those comments; and

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of its cities, in accordance with PRC Section 41760; and

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the final draft CIWMP within 90 days of its receipt or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and

WHEREAS, a copy of the final draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency, WRCOG, CVAG and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18780; and

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the final draft CIWMP at its meeting on October 17, 1996, and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the county and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR Section 18781; and

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA (Rules); and

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a negative declaration, pursuant to Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the county for comment during the period of June 17, 1996, to July 25, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Murrieta held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the final draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC Section 41793;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. That the City finds that the previous recitals are correct.

Page 3 – Resolution 96-467

Section 2. That the City approves the final draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

ADOPTED this 3rd day of December, 1996.

Appor

Attest:

A. Kay Vinson City Clerk

Proof of Publication

(2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid: I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of



a newspaper of general circulation. published DAILY

in the City of Temecula, California 92591, County of Riverside. Three Lakes Judicial District, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside. State of California, under the Date of February 25, 1982, Case Number 147342; that the notice. of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonparell), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:



October 31

1996

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA, this

<u>31st</u> day of <u>October</u> , 1996_

unda Banon Signature

Assistant to the Publisher

Tille

Public Hearing Notice City of Murrieta

Proof of Publication of

CITY OF MURRIETA PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Gry of Murriets will conduct a public hearing at 7:00 p.m. December 3, 1996, at which time it will hear comments on even Countywide imaginated Weare Management Plan. At conclusion of the hearing, the City Council will consider wher to appreve the plan. The City of Munte

The hearing will be held in the City Hall Council Chamber at 20442 Beckman Court, Munista.

A copy of the plan is available for review at City Hall during comme business hours.

PUB: October 31, 1996

RECEIVED

4 1996 NOV

CITY OF MURPLETA FINANCE DEPT



CITY of NORCO

CITY HALL 2870 CLARK AVENUE (909) 735-3900, FAX (909) 270-5622 P.O. BOX 428, NORCO, CA 91760

December 23, 1996

Mr. Robert Nelson **Executive Director** Waste Resources Management District 1995 Marker Street Riverside, CA 92501

Re: Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

Dear Mr. Nelson:

On December 18, 1996 the Norco City Council approved the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan through the adoption of Resolution No. 96-78 (see attached). The Council took this action under protest. There seems little justification for continuing the complex and elaborate bureaucratic AB 939 process, given the excess landfill space in our County and elsewhere. The market place has responded well. As tipping fees have increased, private landfill operators have brought new landfill space on line. There is every reason to believe that this process will continue. AB 939 was passed in response to a perceived shortage of landfill space. Obviously that shortage no longer exists (if it ever did). It is time for us to reevaluate the need for AB 939 and its elaborate and expensive reporting and planning process.

Sincerely,

Gerald F. Johnson

City Manager



ROBBIN G. KOZIEL CHRISTOPHER L. SORENSEN Mayor Mayor Pro Tem

BARBARA J. CARMICHAEL TERRY A. WRIGHT Cooncilwomen

CITY COUNCIL

Councilman

WILLIAM T. VAUGHAN Councilman

1	· /	
1	RESOLUTION NO. <u>96-78</u>	
2	Resolution of the City Council	
3	of the	
4	City of <u>Norco</u> , Camornia Approving	
5	The Final Draft Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Including	
6	The Countrywide Summary Plan and The Countywide Siting Element	
7	WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being	
9	Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with	
IO	§ 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,	
11	WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste	
12	management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority,	
13	source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or	
15	transformation; and,	
16	WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions	
17	in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,	
18	WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and	
19	the state of the s	
20	its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated waste Management Board	
21	("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a	
22	Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household	
23	Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility	
24	Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a	
25	Countywide Summary Plan; and	
26	WHEREAS the Diverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD") on	
27		
28	behair of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council Countywide Local	

1

. `

19

20

21

24

25

26

1

Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CTWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

27 WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its 28 cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies

and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,
WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its
meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each
city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No.
37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary
Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California
Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to
Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA
Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the
Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated
a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the
period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, on <u>December 18</u>, 1996, the City Council of the City of <u>Narco</u> held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of <u>Norco</u>, State of California, in regular session assembled on <u>December</u> 18, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

25

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the

l City Council of the City of Norce ADOPTED this _18t May of _December, 1996. CITY OF _NORCO Robbin G. Koziel, Mayor (NAME/TITLE) ATTEST: L Mc May i

I, DEBRA L. MCNAY, City Clerk of the City of Norco, California do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was introduced and adopted by the City Council of the City of Norco at a meeting held on the 18th day of December, 1996 by the following roll call vote:

CARMICHAEL, SORENSEN, WRIGHT, VAUGHAN, KOZIEL

NOES: NONE ABSENT: NONE ABSTAIN: NONE

AYES:

City Clerk of the City of Norce

(2010, 2015.5 CCP)

PROOF OF PUBLICATION OF

PUBLICHEAR

CIVHP

I am a citizen of the United States. I as over the age of eighteen years and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I amauthorized representative of ап THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE, a newspaper of general circulation/ printed and published daily in the city of Riverside, County of Riverside, and which newspaper has been adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of April 25, 1952, 54446, under date of Number Case March 29, 1957, Case Number 65673 and under date of August 25, 1995, Case Number 267864; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in said newspaper in accordance with the instructions of the person(s) requesting publication, and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

11/14/1996

I Certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated November 14, 1996 at Riverside, California

NORCO, CITY OF

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Goundal of the City of Norce, California will conduct a public hearing in the Council Chambers, 2820 Clark Avenue, in said City of Norce on Wednesday, December 18, 1996, at 500 pmJ of there-ofter, to consider the following: PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of PUBLIC HEARING-Notice of Sountyvide integrated, Waste Management (Rish (CTWMP) and Rights of PUBLIC to Comment.

Comment. Notice is hereby given to the public that comments may be made on the CIWMP includ-lung the Final Brat County wide Summary Plen, and Final Oratt Countrywide Sitting Element at the City Council meeting scheduled for December 18, 1996 sched: 1996.

1996. Any person desiring may ap-pear et said public hearing and be heard. Any person unable to actend at said public hearing may submit written comparis to the City Clerk on or betors Wedneeday, December 18, 1996 by 4:45 p.m. 75/ DEBRA L. WILLIAMS City Clerk, City of Norco 11/14

11/14

CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE



November 22, 1996

Mr. Robert A. Nelson CEO Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

Dear Mr. Nelson:

On November 21, 1996, the City Council conducted a public hearing, at the close of which the Council did unanimously vote to approve the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan dated September 1996.

Please find attached:

- (1) An executed copy of Resolution No. 96-51, which has been certified by City Clerk Barbara Dohn.
- (2) A copy of the "Public Hearing Notice" which appeared in the Desert Sun on Monday, October 21, 1996. Please excuse the cutting off of the right-side edge; this was submitted in this condition as proof of publication by the Desert Sun. Thus, an additional copy, as laid out by City staff, is included as well such that the full text is available.

Should you require further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Colley Matton

Cathy Mitton Administrative Analyst

CM:dh

cc: Katherine Gifford, Planner III

RESOLUTION NO. 96-51

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, SEPTEMBER 1996, PREPARED BY THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT.

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("AB939"), set forth as Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California, commencing with Section 40000, was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, AB939, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote, in order of priority, the waste management practices of source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC Section 40900 et seq. describes requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC Sections 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and each city in Riverside County to prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a *Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan* ("Plan"), which includes a "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a "Household Hazardous Waste Element" ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a "Nondisposal Facility Element" ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a "Countywide Siting Element" from the County and a "Countywide Summary Plan" from the County; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of Riverside County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), prepared the Plan, comprised of the "Countywide Summary Plan" and the "Countywide Siting Element"; and,

WHEREAS, the "Countywide Summary Plan" includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in Riverside County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs HHWEs and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, together with Countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the "Countywide Siting Element" includes the identification and description of those areas that will be utilized for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and

WHEREAS, the LTF has held two duly noticed public hearings on February 15, 1996 and July 18, 1996; and,

CERTIFIED COPY Tartara Dahu

CITY CLERE CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE WHEREAS, the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, September 1996, incorporate the comments of the LTF, the Coachella Valley Association of Governments ("CVAG"), Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), cities, other agencies and interested parties which were submitted during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996, and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to PRC Section 41760, the Plan must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities; and,

WHEREAS, each city in the County must take action upon the Plan by December 20, 1996, or said Plan shall be deemed to have been approved by any city not taking action on the Plan; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Plan has been circulated in conformance with the California Code of Regulation ("CCR") Section 18780; and

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared comments on the Plan and submitted these comments to the WRMD, County and each city in the County, and the CIWMB, pursuant to CCR section 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by the WRMD in order to evaluate the Plan, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, the WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the Plan will not have a significant effect on the environment, and duly circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996, to July 25, 1996; and

WHEREAS, on November 21, 1996, the City Council of the City of Rancho Mirage held a duly noticed public hearing to consider and act upon the Plan, pursuant to PRC Section 41793;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved, found and so ordered by the City Council of the City of Rancho Mirage, State of California, in regular session assembled on November 21, 1996, that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council does hereby approve the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, constituted by the "Countywide Summary Plan" and the "Countwide Siting Element." PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this <u>21</u> day of November 1996.

CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE

w Iluma Marilyn Glassman

Mayor

ATTEST

ara E Dohn

Barbara E. Dohn City Clerk

J. Scott Zundel City Attorney

The Desert Sur Monday, October 21, 1996



DEC 3 1 1995 11 RESOLUTION NO. 19024 1 DEPT_ UP A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CHIPHELC WORKS 2 RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT 3 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN. INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT. 4 5 WHEREAS the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 6 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code 7 ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with § 40000), was 8 added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and 9 WHEREAS the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions 10 to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source 11 reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally 12 13 safe land disposal and/or transformation; and WHEREAS PRC § 40900 et seq. describe requirements to be 14 met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing 15 16 integrated waste management plans; and 17 WHEREAS PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of 18 Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to 19 the California Integrated Waste Management Board "(CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP") which 20 21 includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from 22 the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility 23 Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide 24 Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and 25 WHEREAS the Riverside County Waste Resources Management 26 27 District ("WRMD") on behalf of the County and in cooperation with

City Attorney's Office 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92522 (909) 782-5567 기록 기 날 날

the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element and have followed the required procedures for review and revision; and

8 WHEREAS the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a 9 majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC 10 § 41760; and

WHEREAS each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and

WHEREAS on November 16, 1996, a notice was published in The Riverside Press Enterprise that a public meeting would be held at 9:00 a.m. on December 17, 1996 to hear and rule on objections to the CIWMP; and

18 WHEREAS on December 17, 1996, the City Council of the 19 City of Riverside, held a duly noticed public meeting to consider 20 the Final Draft CIWMP in accordance with PRC § 41793;

21 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the 22 City of Riverside, California, that the Final Draft CIWMP

26 / 27 / City Attorney's Office 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92522

(909) 782-5567

23

24

25

111

| | |

1

11

-2-

composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting 1 Element is hereby approved.

ADOPTED by the City Council and signed by the Mayor and attested by the City Clerk this 17th day of December, 1996.

Attest:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Assistant City

COLLEEN J. NICOL City Clerk of the City of Riverside

I, Colleen J. Nicol, City Clerk of the City of Riverside, 12 13 California, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced and adopted at a meeting of the City 14 Council of said City at its meeting held on the 17th day of 15 16 December. 1996 , by the following vote, to wit: Councilmembers Beaty, Moore, Defenbaugh, Kane, Clifford, 17 Ayes: Thompson and Pearson. 18 19 Noes: None. 20 Absent: None. IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and 21 22 affixed the official seal of the City of Riverside, California, this 17th day of December, 1996. 23 24 COLLEEN J. NICOL Clerk of the City of Riverside City 25

Correa

City Attorney's Office 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92522 (909) 782-5567

26

27

CC/sb 12/11/96

-3+

• BEL401401 ,, L4;11/14.15:50, LE,, 14-NOV-96 15:52:40

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND PUBLIC HEARING TO CITY OF RIVERSIDE RESIDENTS FOR FINAL DRAFTS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUMMARY MAN AND ROVERSIDE COUNTY SITTING ELEMENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH the State

Inc # 1095 S

The Riverside County with many Plan includes the county-mide grank, policies and objec-tives for integrated waste management plenning a decrip Con of the administrative Date for opposition د bi a of carse . Y . (SRREA), N Es) O now they will a

C

and they have T A 5.00 522

n Der P the Ch nia D 9) 782.5 ŧγ until 5:00 pl 1996, AB w 33. Ar. 5770. All writin comments will be included in the Meal disfts of the Riverude County Sutmeary Plan and the River-side County Simg Evenent. College J, Nicol City Clerk of the City of Riverside

iđe

11/16

RESOLUTION NO. 96-49

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JACINTO, CALIFORNIA APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California (commencing with Section 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act, as amended, requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC Section 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRREs, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary

Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revision to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested partles during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and,

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC Section 41760; and,

WHEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") Section 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR Section 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996 and,

WHEREAS, on November 19, 1996, the City Council of the City of San Jacinto held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC Section 41793; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of San Jacinto, State of California, in regular session assembled on November 19, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final

Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of San Jacinto.

ADOPTED this 3rd day of December 1996.

CITY OF SAN JACINTO

Jin Conner, Mayor

ATTEST:

la P. fr **City Clerk**

H:ITIM\RESO\CIWMPAGM.RES

Approved by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Cornett, Smedley, Solorio, Williams & Conner NOES: None ABSENT: None ABSTAIN: None



PROOF OF PUBLICATION (2015.5 C.C.P.)

7000

CODY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of Riverside

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the county aforesaid; I amover the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of The Hernst News, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of Hernet, County of Riverside and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of October 10, 1927, Case Number 17137: that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

10/19/96

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Bianeture

Jated at Hemet, California, this 19th day of

<u>Detober, 1996</u>

Proof of Publication

Notice of Public Hearing

November 19, 1996 - Final Draft Riverside

Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

(CIWMP) - City of San Jacinto

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT, ON NOVEMBER 19, 1996 & 8:00 P.M. AT THE COMMUNITY CENTER, 625 S. PICO STREET, SAN JACINTO, CALIFORNIA, THE CITY OF SAN JACINTO WILL HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING. NEW ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING ARE:

1. FINAL DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWIMP)

Applicant: City Instated

Description: Adoction of the Final Draft Countywide Insegrated Waste Management Plan (ClWMP), including The Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Samp Element, in accordence with Section 18783 of the Catternia Code of Regulations (CCR). The document is evaluable for review at 201 E. Main Streat, San Jacinto, Cattornia.

FURTHER DETAILS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, 201 EAST MAIN STREET, SAN JACINTO, CALIFORNIA. PHONE: (809) 487-7330.

ALL INTERESTED PARTIES ARE INVITED TO ATTEND.

DATE: October 19, 1958 The Hermit Nors Constar 18, 1895



THE HEMET NEWS - P.O. BOX 12003 - HEMET, CA 92546 - 909-487-2200 - FAX 909-487-2250

÷

MINUTE ACTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL/OF THE CITY OF TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA \mathcal{H}_{F}

DATE: November 27, 1996

TO: Beryl Yasinosky, Development Services Analyst

MEETING OF: November 26, 1996

AGENDA ITEM

No.: Item 10

SUBJECT: FINAL DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP)

The motion was made by Councilmember Stone, seconded by Councilmember Birdsall to approve staff recommendations.

10.1 Adopt a resolution entitled:

RESOLUTION NO. 96-136

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMECULA APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	4	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Birdsall, Ford, Stone, Lindemans
NOES:	0	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	1	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Roberts

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) ss CITY OF TEMECULA)

I, June S. Greek, City Clerk of the City of Temecula, California, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, under penalty of perjury, the foregoing to be the official action taken by the City Council at the above meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 27th day of November, 1996.

June & Greek, City Clerk, CMC [SEAL]

RESOLUTION NO. 96-136

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMECULA APPROVING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT.

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act"), being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the Sate of California (commencing with § 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939); and,

WHEREAS, the ACT, as amended requires local jurisdictions to prepare integrated waste management plans that promote waste management practices that include, in order of priority, source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe land disposal and/or transformation; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 40900, et seq., describe requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, PRC § 41750 through 41770 require the County of Riverside ("County") and its cities to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE") from the County and each city, a Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE") from the County and each city, a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE") from the County and each city, a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and;

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD"), on behalf of the County and in cooperation with the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representation from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG"), the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"), and cities in the County, have prepared the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan includes the identification and description of solid waste management practices in the County, programs and facilities found in the SRRES, HHWEs, and NDFEs for the County and each city in the County, and countywide programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP on July 18, 1996; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments that were received from the LTF, CVAG, WRCOG, the cities, and other agencies and interested parties during the 45-day public comment period from June 10, 1996 through July 25, 1996 and responses to those comments; and

WHEREAS, the CIWMP must be approved by the County and a majority of the cities within the County, in accordance with PRC § 41760; and,

WIIEREAS, each city of the County must act upon the Final Draft CIWMP within 90 days of receipt of the Final Draft CIWMP or it shall be deemed approved by the city; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County and its cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other agencies and interested parties, in accordance with California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 18780; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at it meeting held on October 17, 1996 and submitted these comments to the County, WRMD, each city in the County, and the CIWMB, in accordance with CCR § 18781; and,

WHEREAS, an initial study for Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA NO. 37011") was prepared by WRMD to evaluate the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality ACT ("CEQA") (PRC § 21000 et seq.) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA ("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, WRMD prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to § 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, on the basis that the CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and circulated a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration to each city in the County for comment during the period of June 17, 1996 to July 25, 1996; and;

WHEREAS, on November 12, 1996, the City Council of the City of Temecula held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Final Draft CIWMP, in accordance with PRC § 41793; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Temecula, State of California, in regular session assembled on November 12, 1996 that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council that it hereby approves the Final Draft CIWMP, composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall take effect upon consent by the City Council of the City of Temecula.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of November, 1996.

CITY OF TEMECULA

F. Lindemans, Mayor

ATTEST:

لعمع hne Greek. CMC

City Clerk

[SEAL]

Resos\96-136

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) SS CITY OF TEMECULA)

I, June S. Greek, City Clerk of the City of Temecula, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 96-136 was duly and regularly adopted by the City Council of the City of Temecula at a regular meeting thereof held on the 26th day of November, 1996 by the following vote:

AYES:	4	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Birdsall, Ford, Stone, Lindemans
NOES:	0	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	1	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Roberts

Une S? Greek, CMC City Clerk

of of Publication

,15.5 C.C.P.)

JATE OF CALIFORNIA

l am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid: I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of



a newspaper of general circulation. published DAILY

in the City of Temecula. California 92591. County of Riverside. Three Lakes Judicial District. and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside. State of California, under the Date of February 25. 1982. Case Number 147342: that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

October 12

19_96__

i certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA, this

Signature

Assistant to the Publisher

Title

Notice of Public Hearing City of Temecula

Proof of Publication of

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HELPENS

- Charles In HEAM TO In the train stratight taken the Chy of Internate Cart's County of Strategies (In the Cart's Strategies)

Ciano No: Applicant: Lightion: Proposit:

City of Termenule

Xing Wide, spraw the Finel Draft Countywide inscreed Wides, Management Plan, naturing the Countywide Burgmany Plan and Countywide Biggi Gament

'Environmental Addicition 'I

ACE OF HEAVING

Tempolds, CA Management 12, 1904

· HATE OF HEAVENCE

Affet person may submit vision comments to the Cay Courter statute the hearing of stray activities and hearing of the apport of or opposition to the approve of the project(s), at the time of the training only index the project(s), at the time of the rest of the project of the project of the protocol the rest of the project of the project of the protocol applies at the provide the project of the following of the rest of the provide the project of the protocol applies at the provide the project of the following of the protocol of the provide the provide the provide the test applies to the provide the provide the provide the test applies to the provide the provide the provide the test applies the test of the provide the provide the test of the test applies the test of the provide the provide the test of the test applies the test of the test of the provide the test of the test applies the test of the test of the test of the test of the test applies the test of test of test o

Pub.: October, 12, 1998

APPENDIX C

RIVERSIDE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTION ON THE FINAL DRAFT RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT

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



FROM: Waste Resources Management District SUBMITTALDATE: January 14, 1997

SUBJECT: Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan - Resolution No. 97-018

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

1. Adopt Resolution No. 97-018 to adopt the De Minimis Finding and a Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 37011, based on the finding that the Final Draft Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), composed of the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element, will not have a significant effect on the environment, and to approve the Final Draft CIWMP.

BACKGROUND: The Final Draft CIWMP has been prepared in accordance with the State of California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Statutes of 1989, Chapter 1095 [AB 939]). Incorporated, therein, are the final two components of the Final Draft CIWMP, the Countywide Summary Plan and Countywide Siting Element. The Final Draft CIWMP, in its entirety is comprised of not only the Countywide Summary Plan and the Countywide Siting Element; but also the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRRE's), Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWE's), and Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE's) for Riverside County and each of the cities in Riverside County. (Continued)

Robert A. Nelson, Director

FINANCIAL DATA: N/A CURRENT YEAR COST: \$_____ NET COUNTY COST: \$_____ SOURCE OF FUNDS: N/A ANNUAL COST:\$__0___ IN CURRENT YEAR BUDGET: YES_ NO_N/A__ BUDGET ADJUSTMENT: YES__ NO__ FOR FY: N/A

COUNTY C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE.

Executive Officer Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Ayes:	Buster, Tavaglione, Venable and Mullen
Noes:	None
Absent:	Wilson
Date:	January 14, 1997
xc:	Waste Resources, Co.Co.

Gerald A. Maloney Clerk of the Board Deni

Agenda No.

Prev. Agn. Ref.

□ Consent

but Recommendation:

xecutive Office:
F11 - Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan - Resolution No. 97-018 January 14, 1997 Page 2

The Countywide Summary Plan includes the countywide goals, policies and objectives for integrated waste management planning; a description of the administrative structure for preparing and maintaining the Summary Plan; a description of current solid waste management practices; a summary of all the SRRE's, HHWE's, and NDFE's for Riverside County and its 24 cities; and a discussion of countywide programs, how they will be structured, administered, and financed. The Countywide Siting Element includes the identification and description of those areas that will be used for the development of 15 years of adequate disposal capacity for solid waste that has first been reduced through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.

On October 17, 1996, the Solid Waste Advisory Council (Countywide Local Task Force) recommended approval of the Final Draft Riverside CIWMP, on the basis that the Final Draft CIWMP has been prepared in accordance with AB 939. Each incorporated city within the County was notified of the Local Task Force's action and was instructed to hold a noticed public hearing and to adopt the Final Draft CIWMP by resolution in accordance with Section 18783 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) within the 90-day time frame of September 19 to December 20, 1996. As shown in the attached table, the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Hemet, Indian Wells, La Ouinta, Lake Elsinore, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Rancho Mirage, Riverside, San Jacinto and Temecula held noticed public hearings and recommended approval of the Final Draft CIWMP by resolution. The City of Corona has referred the item to a committee and has not taken a final action on the Final Draft CIWMP. The cities of Blythe, Canyon Lake, Indio, Palm Desert and Perris chose not to hold a public hearing or take any action on the Final Draft CIWMP. Staff has contacted the remaining cities in Riverside County but has not yet received notification of any action taken by their city councils. Section 18783 (a)(1) of the CCR states that failure by a city to take action on the Siting Element or Summary Plan within the prescribed time frame is deemed an approval of the Siting Element or Summary Plan.

Section 41760 of the Public Resources Code requires that: "The countywide integrated waste management plan and any amendments thereto, with the exception of any source reduction and recycling element, household hazardous waste element, or nondisposal facility element, prepared by a city or county, shall be approved by the county and by a majority of the cities within the county which contain a majority of the population of the incorporated areas of the county..." The cities which have adopted resolutions approving the Final Draft CIWMP contain the majority of the incorporated population.

The Final Draft CIWMP was evaluated through an initial study for Environmental Assessment (E.A.) No. 37011, which was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA. Based on the finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, a Notice to Adopt a Negative Declaration was circulated during the period of June 17, 1996 and July 25, 1996, for public comment. One comment letter from the Palo Verde Irrigation District was received on the E.A. A response to this comment letter is included in Appendix A of the Final Draft CIWMP.

The proposed motion is in compliance with the CCR requirements for local adoption of the Final Draft CIWMP. Following adoption of the attached resolution, the Final Draft CIWMP will be submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for adoption by that body.

Approving The Final Draft Countywide

RESOLUTION NO. 97-018

Integrated Waste Management Plan (Including The Countywide Siting Element and The Countywide Summary Plan)

WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (the "Act"),
being Division 30 of the Public Resources Code ("PRC") of the State of California
(commencing with § 40000), was added by Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 (Assembly Bill
939); and,

WHEREAS, the Act generally describes requirements to be met by local jurisdictions in developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and,

WHEREAS, the Act specifically requires the County of Riverside ("County") and the cities situated therein to each prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste

13 Management Board ("CIWMB") a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan

14 ("CIWMP"), which includes a Source Reduction and Recycling Element ("SRRE"), a

Household Hazardous Waste Element ("HHWE"), a Nondisposal Facility Element ("NDFE"),

a Countywide Siting Element, and a Countywide Summary Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District ("WRMD") has prepared the Countywide Siting Element and Countywide Summary Plan in cooperation with the County, the cities, and the Solid Waste Advisory Council/Countywide Local Task Force ("LTF"), which includes representatives from the Coachella Valley Association of Government ("CVAG") and the Western Riverside Council of Governments ("WRCOG"); and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element identifies and describes those areas that will be used for the development of adequate disposal capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Summary Plan identifies and describes countywide and city specific solid waste management practices, programs and facilities; and,

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element and Countywide Summary Plan are set forth in a document entitled Final Draft CIWMP; and,

WILLIAM C. KATZ TEIN, COUNTY COUNSEL 3535 TENTH STREET, SUITE 300 RIVERSIDE, CA 92501-3674 1

2

3

4

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2ф

JAN 06 1997 BY <u>Kulver</u> K WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP incorporates by reference the remaining elements
 that were separately prepared by the County and each city; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF held two duly noticed public hearings; one on the Preliminary
Draft CIWMP on February 15, 1996 and another on the Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP
on July 18, 1996; and,

6 WHEREAS, the Final Draft CIWMP, dated September 1996, reflects revisions to the
7 Revised Preliminary Draft CIWMP, dated May 1996, and incorporates comments received
8 during the 45-day public comment period and responses thereto; and,

9 WHEREAS, the Act requires that the Final Draft CIWMP be approved by the County
10 and a majority of the cities situated therein; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of the Final Draft CIWMP has been circulated to the County, the
cities, the LTF, the Local Enforcement Agency ("LEA"), WRCOG, CVAG, and other
agencies and interested parties, in accordance with applicable provisions of the California
Code of Regulations; and,

WHEREAS, the LTF prepared written comments on the Final Draft CIWMP at its
October 17, 1996 meeting and submitted those comments to the WRMD, the County, each
city, and the CIWMB, in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Code of
Regulations; and,

WHEREAS, Environmental Assessment Number 37011 ("EA No. 37011") has been
prepared to evaluate the Final Draft CIWMP, pursuant to the requirements of the California
Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the Riverside County Rules to Implement the Act
("Rules"); and,

WHEREAS, on January 14, 1997, the County Board of Supervisors held a duly
noticed public hearing to consider approval of the Final Draft CIWMP and adoption of a
Negative Declaration for EA No. 37011; and,

WHEREAS, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation
presented by the public and affected governmental agencies; now, therefore,
/////

3

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the Board of
 Supervisors of the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on
 January 14, 1997, that the previous recitals are correct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered EA No. 37011 in evaluating the Final Draft CIWMP, that EA No. 37011 is an accurate and objective statement that complies with CEQA and the Rules, and that EA No. 37011 is hereby incorporated herein by this reference.

8 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors, based on evidence
9 presented on this matter, both written and oral, including EA No. 37011, that the Final Draft
10 CIWMP will not have a significant effect on the environment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it hereby adopts aNegative Declaration for EA No. 37011 and approves the Final Draft CIWMP.

13

4

5

6

7

14 ROLL CALL: Buster, Tavaglione, Venable and Mullen Ayes: 15 None Noes: Wilson 16 Absent: 17 18 The foregoing is certified to be a true copy of a resolution du raco steady said Bourd of Super-19 sors cr. its dato therein set forth. SNEY CL 20 of and Board Deputy 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

APPENDIX D

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD ACTION ON THE RIVERSIDE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT



Cal/EPA

California Environmental Protection Agency

Integrated Waste Management Board

8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento, CA 95826 (916) 255-2200





July 11, 1997

Mr. Michael Schier, Solid Waste Planning Manager Riverside County Waste Resources Management District 1995 Market Street Riverside, CA 92501-1719

RE: Board Approval of the Riverside Countywide Siting Element, Conditional Approval of the Riverside Countywide Summary Plan, and Approval of Riverside County's Amended Nondisposal Facility Element

Dear Mr. Schier:

On June 25, 1997, the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) voted to approve Riverside's Countywide Siting Element, to conditionally approve the Countywide Summary Plan, and to approve Riverside County's Amended Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE).

The Board determined that the Riverside Countywide Siting Element substantially complied with all statutory and regulatory requirements. A copy of Resolution No. 97-229 approving your Siting Element is attached.

The Board voted to conditionally approve your Summary Plan due to the lack of Board actions on all of the County's jurisdictions' planning documents. A copy of Resolution No. 97-230 conditionally approving your Summary Plan is attached. Jurisdictions that have not submitted their final documents to the Board will need to do so before approval of the Summary Plan. The City of Beaumont's planning documents are scheduled to be acted on at the July 23, 1997 Board Meeting, but the following planning documents still need to be submitted to the Board:

- 1. City of Murrieta's SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE
- 2. City of Hemet's HHWE

The Summary Plan may need to be revised if there are significant changes in the planning documents not acted on by the Board and are not reflected in the existing Summary Plan. Riverside County will need to submit an Annual Report to the Board for the Siting Element and Summary Plan no later than August 1, 1998. The information in the Annual Report will serve as a basis for determining whether a revision is necessary.

The Board determined that the Amended NDFE substantially complied with all statutory and regulatory requirements. Those requirements provide that the NDFE adequately identify and describe facilities located in the jurisdiction and those facilities to be used outside the jurisdiction to reach the mandated goals. The NDFE becomes part of the SRRE at the five-year revision. A copy of Board Resolution No. 97-231 approving your Amended NDFE is attached.

In closing, we would like to congratulate you on the approval of Riverside's Countywide Siting Element, conditional approval of the Countywide Summary Plan, and approval of the Amended NDFE. We look forward to working with you as the County implements its programs. If you have any questions about these written findings, please contact Nancy Carroll of the Office of Local Assistance at (916) 255-2659.

Sincerely,

Kehen

Judith J. Friedman, Deputy Director Diversion, Planning & Local Assistance California Integrated Waste Management Board

Attachments:

Resolution #97-229	Approval of the Siting Element
Resolution #97-230	Conditional Approval of the Summary Plan
Resolution #97-231	Approval of the Amended Nondisposal Facility
	Element

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD RESOLUTION 97-229

FOR CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 40900 et seq. describe the requirements to be met by cities and counties when developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41700 requires that each county shall prepare a Countywide Siting Element which provides a description of the areas to be used for development of adequate transformation or disposal capacity concurrent and consistent with the development and implementation of the county and city Source Reduction and Recycling Elements adopted; and

WHEREAS, California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 18783 requires that the County comply with the California Environmental Quality Act and it has provided a Notice of Determination from the State Clearinghouse as required; and

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41701 requires that the Countywide Siting Element contain a statement of goals and policies for the environmentally safe transformation or disposal of solid waste which cannot be reduced, recycled, or composted; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element must include an estimate of the total transformation or disposal capacity in cubic yards that will be needed for a 15-year period; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Siting Element must be approved by the county and by a majority of the cities within the county which contain a majority of the population of the incorporated area of the county; and

WHEREAS, resolutions from the majority of the cities representing a majority of the population were included with the submittal of the Countywide Siting Element; and

WHEREAS, based on review of the Countywide Siting Element, Board staff found that all of the foregoing requirements have been satisfied and the Countywide Siting Element substantially complies with PRC Section 41700, et seq. and recommends approval; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves the Countywide Siting Element for Riverside County.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned Executive Director of the California Integrated Waste Management Board does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the California Integrated Waste Management Board held on June 25, 1997.

Dated: JUN 2 6 1997

Ralph E. Chandler Executive Director

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD RESOLUTION 97-230

FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 40900 et seq. describe the requirements to be met by cities and counties when developing and implementing integrated waste management plans; and

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41751 requires that each county shall prepare a Summary Plan, as a component of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), which identifies significant waste management problems facing the county; and

WHEREAS, the Summary Plan should include an overview of the specific steps that will be taken by local agencies, acting independently and in concert, to achieve the purpose of this division; and

WHEREAS, Title 14 California Code of Regulations sections 18757 et seq. provide that this summary shall be provided in a Summary Plan as a separate component of the CIWMP; and,

WHEREAS, the Summary Plan shall contain a statement of the goals and objectives set forth by the countywide local task force; and

WHEREAS, the Summary Plan must be approved by the county and by a majority of the cities within the county which contain a majority of the population of the incorporated area of the county; and

WHEREAS, resolutions from the majority of the cities representing a majority of the population were included with the submittal of the Summary Plan for approval; and

WHEREAS, California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 18783 requires that the County comply with the California Environmental Quality Act and the County has provided a Notice of Determination as required; and

WHEREAS, the final Summary Plan for Riverside County, which was submitted to the Board for approval on February 7, 1997, included all the required locally adopted elements and documentation; and

WHEREAS, based on review of the Summary Plan, Board staff found that all of the foregoing requirements have been satisfied and the Summary Plan substantially complies with PRC Section 41750, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the submittal of the SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE for the City of Murrieta and the HHWE for the City of Hemet are not complete and the Board has not acted on these planning documents, nor acted on the City of Beaumont's SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE; and

WHEREAS, in that case, the Summary Plan may also need to be revised; and

WHEREAS, PRC Section 41800 (a) allows the Board to conditionally approve the Summary Plan; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby conditionally approves the Countywide Summary Plan for Riverside County. As a condition, all of the jurisdictions must submit their SRRES, HHWES, and NDFEs to the Board for Board action, and the Summary Plan may have to be revised if there is a significant change in the SRRES, HHWES, or NDFES.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned Executive Director of the California Integrated Waste Management Board does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the California Integrated Waste Management Board held on June 25, 1997.

Bated: JUN 2 6 1997 Ti

Ralph E. Chandler Executive Director