

Base Year Modification Request Certification
 C7/NMB 628 (NEW 7/99)

To request a correction to or substitution for a previously approved base-year amount used in calculating the diversion rate for your jurisdiction, please complete and sign this form and return it to your Office of Local Assistance (OLA) representative at the address below, along with any additional information requested by OLA staff. When all documentation has been received, your OLA representative will work with you to prepare for your appearance before the Board. If you have any questions about this process, please call (916) 255-2555 to be connected to your OLA representative.

Mail completed documents to:

California Integrated Waste Management Board
 Office of Local Assistance, MS 8
 8800 Cal Center Drive
 Sacramento CA 95826

General Instructions:

Please select the **ONE** choice below that best explains your request to the Board, and complete the appropriate sections. **All respondents must complete Section I and either Section II A or II B, as noted.**

- 1. Correct our existing Board-approved base-year generation (disposal or diversion) tonnage. (Please complete Section I and Section II A.)
- 2. Use a recent generation-based study to substitute for our existing Board-approved base-year generation amount, but not officially change our existing Board-approved base year. (Please complete Section I and Section II B.)
- 3. Use a recent generation-based study to officially change our Board-approved existing base year to a new base year. (Please complete Section I and Section II B.)

Section I: Jurisdiction Information and Certification

All respondents must complete this section.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to make this certification on behalf of:

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Jurisdiction Name | | County | |
| Consolidated Waste Management Authority | | Tulare | |
| Authorized Signature <i>Raymond H. Millard</i> | | Title Chairperson | |
| Type/Print Name of Person Signing Raymond K. Millard | Date November 6, 2000 | Phone (559) 591-5906 | |
| Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Lori Thomas | Title Administrative Aide | Phone (559) 782-7513 | |
| Mailing Address 555 North Prospect | City Porterville | State CA | ZIP Code 93258 |

Section II B: Information for New Generation-Based Study for Existing or New Base Year

Respondents who chose option 2 or 3 on the first page must complete this section.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., B4).

B1. Current Board-approved base-year:

1990

B2. Proposed new generation-based study year:

1997

B3. Is the proposed generation study year representative of average annual jurisdiction disposal and diversion patterns? Yes No

B4. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your diversion data.

- All diversion tonnage claimed is from a 100 percent audit (full enumeration) of all available diversion programs.
 SOME diversion data were estimated or extrapolated from representative sampling. (Explain amount and method in detail below.)

A diversion survey was done for the most likely diversion sources and the total tonnage used as the 1997 diversion. We did not extrapolate the results of the survey to the entire population of diversion sources.

We had included 255 tons of wood and 111 tons of other recycling from the County landfill program. Part of the wood was sent to a biomass facility. Part of the other recycling was metals. Since data was not available to clearly quantify the amounts, we did not include them, but are requesting the CIWMB to review its biomass policy and credit the material as either disposal or diversion.

| Diversion Program | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|
| Hauler | 4,208 | Weight Tags | Pena |
| CRV Recycling | 202 | DOR report | DOR |
| City Inerts | 150 | City records | City Offices |
| County Self-Haul | 0 | Weight Tags | County |
| Fruit culls | 20,504 | Company Information | Consultant Office |
| Source reduction and recycling | 15,184 15,285 RSB 12/100 | Company Information | Consultant Office |

B6. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

- a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (1995 and after). (No explanation required. Skip to B9.)
 b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage (pre-1995). (Please complete B7 and then skip to B9.)
 c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please skip to B8.)

B7. If you chose "b" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

B8. If you chose "c" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Explain tonnage amount, correction method used, and correct owner of disputed tonnage in detail.

See attachment

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Correction Method Used | Correct Owner |
|--------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| TCR | 239 | Weight Tags | City gets credit from Tulare County |

B9. Enter your diversion rates in the table below.

| | 1997 | 1998 | Other Year: (please specify) |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|
| Current calculated diversion rate: | a. 46% | b. % | |
| Proposed diversion rate: | c. 77% | d. % | e. % |

B10. If the proposed base-year generation tonnage correction results in an increase in either your 1997 or 1998 waste diversion rate, please explain how the diversion rate is consistent with your diversion implementation efforts.

The programs that were included in our currently calculated diversion have continued under the proposed diversion rate. The new programs were in place when the currently calculated diversion rate was computed. The survey identified several other sources (businesses and the use of fruit culls for animal feed). These sources have been added to our diversion calculation under the proposed diversion rate.

B11. If the difference between the proposed diversion rates in B9c and B9d or B9d and B9e is greater than 5 percentage points, please explain the reasons for the difference in the rates. (For example: program implementation or data errors.)

The diversion added by the use of fruit culls for animal feed and the diversion sources identified in our survey were much greater than the diversion through the residential and commercial programs. The fruit cull diversion program was recently approved by the CIWMB for Tulare County. The diversion programs used by the other sources are similar to those included in other Waste Generation Studies the CIWMB has approved. No existing programs sponsored by the City have been reduced or discontinued or are expected to be.

Section II B: Information for New Generation-Based Study for Existing or New Base Year

Respondents who chose option 2 or 3 on the first page must complete this section.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., B4).

B1. Current Board-approved base-year:

1990

B2. Proposed new generation-based study year:

1997

B3. Is the proposed generation study year representative of average annual jurisdiction disposal and diversion patterns? Yes No

B4. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your diversion data.

- All diversion tonnage claimed is from a 100 percent audit (full enumeration) of all available diversion programs.
 Some diversion data were estimated or extrapolated from representative sampling. (Explain amount and method in detail below.)

A diversion survey was done for the most likely diversion sources and the total tonnage used as the 1997 diversion. We did not extrapolate the results of the survey to the entire population of diversion sources.

We had included 180 tons of wood and 39 tons of other recycling from the County landfill program. Part of the wood was sent to a biomass facility. Part of the other recycling was metals. Since data was not available to clearly quantify the amounts, we did not include them, but are requesting the CIWMB to review its biomass policy and credit the material as either disposal or diversion.

B5. In the table below, list the diversion data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Diversion Program | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hauler | 1,591 | Weight tags | Bevers Recycling & Disposal |
| Green Waste | 1,110 | Weight tags | Bevers Recycling & Disposal |
| City Inerts | 2,106 | City records | City offices |
| County Self-haul | 0 | Weight tags | County office |
| Fruit culls | 4,696 | Company Records | Consultant office |
| Source reduction and recycling | 1,440 | Company information | Consultant office |

B6. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

- a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (1995 and after). (No explanation required. Skip to B9.)
 b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage (pre-1995). (Please complete B7 and then skip to B9.)
 c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please skip to B8.)

B7. If you chose "b" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

B8. If you chose "c" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Explain tonnage amount, correction method used, and correct owner of disputed tonnage in detail.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Correction Method Used | Correct Owner |
|--------------------|------|------------------------|---------------|
| | | | |

B9. Enter your diversion rates in the table below.

| | 1997 | 1998 | Other Year: (please specify) |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|
| Current calculated diversion rate: | a. 27% | b. % | |
| Proposed diversion rate: | c. 61% | d. % | e. % |

B10. If the proposed base-year generation tonnage correction results in an increase in either your 1997 or 1998 waste diversion rate, please explain how the diversion rate is consistent with your diversion implementation efforts.

The programs that were included in our currently calculated diversion have continued under the proposed diversion rate. The new programs were in place when the currently calculated diversion rate was computed. The survey identified several other sources (businesses and the use of fruit culls for animal feed). These sources have been added to our diversion calculation under the proposed diversion rate.

B11. If the difference between the proposed diversion rates in B9c and B9d or B9d and B9e is greater than 5 percentage points, please explain the reasons for the difference in the rates. (For example: program implementation or data errors.)

The diversion added by the use of fruit culls for animal feed and the diversion sources identified in our survey were much greater than the diversion through the residential and commercial programs. The fruit cull diversion program was recently approved by the CIWMB for Tulare County. The diversion programs used by the other sources are similar to ones included in other Waste Generation Studies the CIWMB has approved. No existing programs sponsored by the City have been reduced or discontinued or are expected to be.

Section II B: Information for New Generation-Based Study for Existing or New Base Year

Respondents who chose option 2 or 3 on the first page must complete this section.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., B4).

| | |
|--|--|
| B1. Current Board-approved base-year: 1990 | B2. Proposed new generation-based study year: 1997 |
|--|--|

B3. Is the proposed generation study year representative of average annual jurisdiction disposal and diversion patterns? Yes No

B4. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your diversion data.

All diversion tonnage claimed is from a 100 percent audit (full enumeration) of all available diversion programs.

Some diversion data were estimated or extrapolated from representative sampling. (Explain amount and method in detail below.)

A diversion survey was done for the most likely diversion sources and the total tonnage used as the 1997 diversion. We did not extrapolate the results of the survey to the entire population of diversion sources.

We had included wood and other recycling from the County landfill program. Part of the wood was sent to a biomass facility. Part of the other recycling was metals. Since data was not available to clearly quantify the amounts, we did not include them, but are requesting the CIWMB to review its biomass policy and credit the material as either disposal or diversion.

| Diversion Program | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------|
| Green Waste | 5,588 | Weight Tags | City |
| CRV Recycling | 1,328 | Weight Tags | DOR |
| City Drop-Off | 440 | Weight Tags | City |
| County Self-Haul | 0 | Weight Tags | County |
| Fruit Culls | 2,578 | Company Records | City |
| Source reduction and recycling | 43,286 10,568 RSB 12/00 | Company Information | City |
| Yard sales | 540 0 RSB 12/00 | Advertisements | City |

B6. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (1995 and after). (No explanation required. Skip to B9.)

b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage (pre-1995). (Please complete B7 and then skip to B9.)

c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please skip to B8.)

B7. If you chose "b" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

B8. If you chose "c" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Explain tonnage amount, correction method used, and correct owner of disputed tonnage in detail.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Correction Method Used | Correct Owner |
|--------------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------|
| TCR | 25 | Weight Tags | City taken from County |
| Self-Haul errors | -1,199 | Survey | Tulare County |

B9. Enter your diversion rates in the table below.

| | 1997 | 1998 | Other Year: (please specify) |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|
| Current calculated diversion rate: | a. 19% | b. % | |
| Proposed diversion rate: | c. 44% | d. % | e. % |

B10. If the proposed base-year generation tonnage correction results in an increase in either your 1997 or 1998 waste diversion rate, please explain how the diversion rate is consistent with your diversion implementation efforts.

The change in diversion rate reflects assessment of more of the recycling programs being conducted in the City. It also reflects the level of effort of the City's programs more accurately than the Adjustment Method.

B11. If the difference between the proposed diversion rates in B9c and B9d or B9d and B9e is greater than 5 percentage points, please explain the reasons for the difference in the rates. (For example: program implementation or data errors.)

The increase in diversion is a result of surveying businesses within the city to ascertain their diversion rates. No City sponsored programs have been discontinued and none are expected to be.

Section II B: Information for New Generation-Based Study for Existing or New Base Year

Respondents who chose option 2 or 3 on the first page must complete this section.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., B4).

B1. Current Board-approved base-year:

1990

B2. Proposed new generation-based study year:

1997

B3. Is the proposed generation study year representative of average annual jurisdiction disposal and diversion patterns? Yes No

B4. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your diversion data.

- All diversion tonnage claimed is from a 100 percent audit (full enumeration) of all available diversion programs.
 Some diversion data were estimated or extrapolated from representative sampling. (Explain amount and method in detail below.)

A diversion survey was done for the most likely diversion sources and the total tonnage used as the 1997 diversion. We did not extrapolate the results of the survey to the entire population of diversion sources.

We had included 765 tons of wood and 149 tons of other recycling from the County landfill program. Part of the wood was sent to a biomass facility. Part of the other recycling was metals. Since data was not available to clearly quantify the amounts, we did not include them, but are requesting the CIWMB to review its biomass policy and credit the material as either disposal or diversion.

B5. In the table below, list the diversion data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Diversion Program | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| City Recycling | 1,162 | Weight Tags | City |
| Green Waste | 8,640 | Weight Tags | TCR |
| CRV Recycling | 762 | DOR records | DOR |
| City Inerts | 800 | Weight Tags | City |
| County Self-Haul | 0 | Weight Tags | County |
| Source reduction and recycling | 31,494 31,763 | Company Information | Consultant Office |
| Yard sales (This is tonnage from Cattle manure at sales yards) | 200 RSB 12/00 | Advertisements | City |

B6. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

- a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (1995 and after). (No explanation required. Skip to B9.)
 b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage (pre-1995). (Please complete B7 and then skip to B9.)
 c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please skip to B8.)

B7. If you chose "b" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

B8. If you chose "c" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Explain tonnage amount, correction method used, and correct owner of disputed tonnage in detail.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Correction Method Used | Correct Owner |
|--------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1997 TCR billings | 13 | Weight tags | City, taken from County |

B9. Enter your diversion rates in the table below.

| | 1997 | 1998 | Other Year: (please specify) |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|
| Current calculated diversion rate: | a. 42% | b. % | |
| Proposed diversion rate: | c. 55% | d. % | e. % |

B10. If the proposed base-year generation tonnage correction results in an increase in either your 1997 or 1998 waste diversion rate, please explain how the diversion rate is consistent with your diversion implementation efforts.

The programs that were included in our currently calculated diversion have continued under the proposed diversion rate. The new programs were in place when the currently calculated diversion rate was computed. The survey identified several other sources (businesses and the use of fruit culls for animal feed). These sources have been added to our diversion calculation under the proposed diversion rate.

B11. If the difference between the proposed diversion rates in B9c and B9d or B9d and B9e is greater than 5 percentage points, please explain the reasons for the difference in the rates. (For example: program implementation or data errors.)

The diversion added by the use of fruit culls for animal feed and the diversion sources identified in our survey were much greater than the diversion through the residential and commercial programs. The fruit cull diversion program was recently approved by the CIWMB for Tulare County. The diversion programs used by the other sources are similar to one included in other Waste Generation Studies the CIWMB has approved. No existing programs sponsored by the City have been reduced or discontinued or are expected to be.

Section II B: Information for New Generation-Based Study for Existing or New Base Year

Respondents who chose option 2 or 3 on the first page must complete this section.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., B4).

B1. Current Board-approved base-year:

1990

B2. Proposed new generation-based study year:

1997

B3. Is the proposed generation study year representative of average annual jurisdiction disposal and diversion patterns? Yes No

B4. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your diversion data.

- All diversion tonnage claimed is from a 100 percent audit (full enumeration) of all available diversion programs.
 Some diversion data were estimated or extrapolated from representative sampling. (Explain amount and method in detail below.)

A diversion survey was done for the most likely diversion sources and the total tonnage used as the 1997 diversion. We did not extrapolate the results of the survey to the entire population of diversion sources.

We had included 3,071 tons of wood and 679 tons of other recycling from the County landfill program. Part of the wood was sent to a biomass facility. Part of the other recycling was metals. Since data was not available to clearly quantify the amounts, we did not include them, but are requesting the CIWMB to review its biomass policy and credit the material as either disposal or diversion.

| Diversion Program | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| City Recycling | 18,270 | Weight Tags | TCR |
| Green Waste | 14,489 | Weight Tags | City |
| CRV Recycling | 2,549 | Weight Tags | DOR |
| City Inerts | 3,000 | Weight Tags | City |
| County Self-Haul | 0 | Weight tags | County |
| Source reduction and recycling <i>RSB 12/00</i> | 24,889 23,071 | Survey | Consultant Office |

B6. Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

- a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (1995 and after). (No explanation required. Skip to B9.)
 b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage (pre-1995). (Please complete B7 and then skip to B9.)
 c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please skip to B8.)

B7. If you chose "b" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Include type of record and location; for example, weigh tickets from transfer station.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Type of Record | Location of Data |
|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

B8. If you chose "c" in B6, list the disposal data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit in the table below. Explain tonnage amount, correction method used, and correct owner of disputed tonnage in detail.

| Source of Disposal | Tons | Correction Method Used | Correct Owner |
|--------------------|-------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| TCR | 1,752 | Weight Tags | City waste comes from Tulare County |

B9. Enter your diversion rates in the table below.

| | 1997 | 1998 | Other Year: (please specify) |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|
| Current calculated diversion rate: | a. 31% | b. % | |
| Proposed diversion rate: | c. 42% | d. % | e. % |

B10. If the proposed base-year generation tonnage correction results in an increase in either your 1997 or 1998 waste diversion rate, please explain how the diversion rate is consistent with your diversion implementation efforts.

The programs that were included in our currently calculated diversion have continued under the proposed diversion rate. The new programs were in place when the currently calculated diversion rate was computed. The survey identified several other sources (businesses and the use of fruit culls for animal feed). These sources have been added to our diversion calculation under the proposed diversion rate.

B11. If the difference between the proposed diversion rates in B9c and B9d or B9d and B9e is greater than 5 percentage points, please explain the reasons for the difference in the rates. (For example: program implementation or data errors.)

The diversion added by the use of fruit culls for animal feed and the diversion sources identified in our survey were much greater than the diversion through the residential and commercial programs. The fruit cull diversion program was recently approved by the CIWMB for Tulare County. The diversion programs used by the other sources are similar to one included in other Waste Generation Studies the CIWMB has approved. No existing programs sponsored by the City have been reduced or discontinued or are expected to be.

Staff analysis of Consolidated Waste Management Authority Generation Study and Request to change its Base Year to 1997

Staff received the Consolidated Waste Management Authority's (CWMA) request to change its Base Year to 1997 in October 2000. The CWMA is made up of five cities (Dinuba, Lindsay, Porterville, Tulare and Visalia.) After communication between staff and the Authority's consultants, Mark White of the Pacific Waste Consulting Group and Jim Greco of California Waste Associates, staff will be submitting the following information for the Board's consideration. A Waste Generation Study was completed for each jurisdiction and then combined to obtain the final figures for the CWMA's new Base Year.

1997 Diversion rate: 51%

Generation: 343,700 tons.

Disposal: 167,782 tons. The disposal amounts were calculated using adjusted information from the Disposal Reporting System (DRS). The DRS reported 166,951.6 tons disposed for all jurisdictions within the CWMA. The City of Porterville does quarterly surveys at the Teapot Dome Landfill to validate the origin of self-hauled wastes. Porterville sends the corrections to the County, the County agrees to the changes and the corrected disposal amounts are noted in the Annual Reports. In 1997, Porterville determined the County misallocated 1,199 tons to them so this amount was been deducted from their total disposed and allocated to the County.

During the first quarter of 1997, Tulare County Recycling Co. (TCR) designated their residuals as orphaned wastes. TCR had weight tickets to verify that 39 tons should have been allocated to Dinuba and 1,752 tons should have been allocated to Visalia. Since there were no weight tickets for Porterville or Tulare, the Consultant calculated their allocations by calculating the average of each jurisdiction's amount for six months (April – September) of 1997 to calculate the additional waste for the first quarter. The 4th quarter was left out because of a significant increase in residuals at the end of the year.

Diversion: 175,916 tons

Discussion of Diversion Activities

Hauler Recycling: 25,231 tons. This material includes paper, OCC, aluminum, glass, and plastic collected by the haulers. Material was collected from the commingled residential curbside programs and from the collection of source separated materials from the commercial sectors. Materials collected from these programs are processed at the Tulare County Recycling (TCR), a privately owned mixed waste MRF.

Hauler Organics: 29,827 tons. Greenwaste materials are collected in curbside programs and during seasonal programs at community drop-off sites. The material is sent to Tulare County Compost for processing.

City Drop Off: 440 tons. Porterville provides an expanded municipal drop-off recycling site.

CRV-DOR: 4,841 tons. Recycling done at certified recycling centers was identified in the Division of Recycling report for 1997.

Inerts: 6,056 tons. All the programs were begun after 1990 and four of the member Cities are recycling and/or re-using the asphalt or concrete from public works and roads projects.

Business Recycling and Source Reduction: This information is the result of research done in the five jurisdictions of the CWMA. Extrapolation was not used to determine diversion from the commercial sector. The methodology included surveys sent to businesses, on-site surveys, and telephone surveys and focused on the largest 20 percent of the businesses.

Business Recycling: 47,792 tons. The commercial sector's recycling programs included office paper, cardboard, newspaper, aluminum, plastic, pallets, and nylon scrap in carpet manufacturing.

Business Source Reduction: 19,503 tons. It represents diversion from double-sided copying, electronic communications, reusable totes, re-use of pallets, and donations of office equipment and food to non-profits.

Fruit Culls: 36,586 tons. Fruit culled from the packinghouses was diverted as animal feed or as a soil amendment. Documentation used was the same as that provided for Tulare Uni.'s request in 1998. Documents include: historical

resolutions discussing the need for a disposal method for culled fruit within the county and that provides for a cell at the landfill for its disposal, and a 1986 CoSWMP excerpt recommending that the public works director of the County direct the disposal of culled fruit. This documentation is provided to show historical disposal of this material.

Recycling Businesses: 5,642 tons. Porterville segregated the amount of materials handled by recyclers as a method to avoid double counting and exclude CRV recycling. Most of these materials were OCC and paper.

Diversion not counted

Thrift stores and Yard Sales: 3,704.2 tons. The diversion coming from yard sales and thrift stores was not included in this data. These are acceptable diversion programs but because of lack of concurrence regarding acceptable methodology for calculating diversion from these sources, the estimated 3704.2 tons from thrift stores and yard sales in 1997 was not incorporated into the diversion calculations.

Top ten businesses within the CWMA (based on total diversion tons).

| Type of Business | Specific Diversion Activities (e.g. paper recycling, pallet reuse) | Total Diversion Tons |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Manufacturing-Food | Fruit Culls | 36,586 |
| Construction | Asphalt, C&D, Pallets | 28,954 |
| Manufacturing- Printing/Publishing | OCC, paper, ONP | 3,937 |
| Manufacturing-Paper/Allied | OCC | 4,200 |
| Wholesale-Durable Goods | OCC | 4,835 |
| Retail-General Merchandise Stores | Pallets, toner cartridges | 4,004 |
| Retail-Food Stores | Pallets, rendering, OCC | 2,187 |
| Retail-Auto and Service Station | OCC, metals, wheels | 3,837 |
| Finance/Insurance/R.Estate/Legal | Paper, OCC | 4,198 |
| Services-Other | Paper, OCC, Grasscycling | 4,641 |
| Totals | | 93,379 |

Summarized data from the Waste Generation Surveys in each of the jurisdictions of the Tulare Consolidated Waste Management Authority. *

| | Hauler/ City Recycling | Hauler/ City- Organics | City Drop- off | CRV-DOR Inerts | Business Recycling | Business Source Reduction | |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| CWMA | 25231 | 29827 | 440 | 4841 | 6056 | 47792 | 19503 |
| Dinuba | 4208 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 150 | 7560 | 7412 |
| Lindsay | 1591 | 1110 | 0 | 0 | 2106 | 1280 | 160 |
| Porterville | 0 | 5588 | 440 | 1328 | 0 | 510 | 4416 |
| Tulare | 1162 | 8640 | 0 | 762 | 800 | 24634 | 959 |
| Visalia | 18270 | 14489 | 0 | 2549 | 3000 | 13808 | 6556 |

| | Yard Fruit Culls Sales | Thrift Stores | Recycling businesses | Total Source Reduction | SR as a % of generation | Commercial Tons | % non-res | |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----|
| CWMA | 36586 | 0 | 0 | 5642 | 19503 | 6% | 239368 | 70% |
| Dinuba | 20504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7412 | 14% | 41727 | 80% |
| Lindsay | 4696 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 1% | 11627 | 65% |
| Porterville | 2578 | 0 | 0 | 5642 | 4416 | 9% | 34300 | 68% |
| Tulare | 6101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 959 | 1% | 62587 | 80% |
| Visalia | 2707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6556 | 5% | 89127 | 61% |

| | Diversion Rate | Generation | Disposal (DRS) | Disposal Deductions | Disposal Adjustments Additions | Total Disposal | Total Diversion |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| CWMA | 51% | 343699.62 | 166951.6 | -1199 | 2029 | 167781.6 | 175918 |
| Dinuba | 77% | 51940.4 | 11665.4 | 0 | 239 | 11904.4 | 40036 |
| Lindsay | 61% | 18022.66 | 7079.66 | 0 | 0 | 7079.66 | 10943 |
| Porterville | 41% | 50274.52 | 30946.52 | -1199 | 25 | 29772.52 | 20502 |
| Tulare | 55% | 77893.34 | 34822.34 | 0 | 13 | 34835.34 | 43058 |
| Visalia | 42% | 145568.7 | 82437.7 | 0 | 1752 | 84189.7 | 61379 |

* Provided for clarification of corrections on certification forms.