Board Meeting
May 14-15, 2002

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT

for the

COUNTY OF YOLO

prepared by the

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT

Final Report

February 5, 2002

The County of Yolo Planning and Public Works Department
authorized the preparation of this Report by

California Waste Associates
A Jim Greco Consulting Organization
Post Office Box 5177
El Dorado Hills, California 95762
(916) 933-2327

Information and any questions or comments about this document should be directed to:

Sarah Kittle, Recycling Specialist
Division of Integrated Waste Management
Planning and Public Works Department
County of Yolo
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, California 95695
(530) 757-5564

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Description	Page
	TRANSMITTAL LETTER	**5**
1.0	**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**	**7**
2.0	**INTRODUCTION**	**9**
3.0	**BACKGROUND**	**10**
4.0	**PURPOSE**	**10**
5.0	**LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW**	**10**
6.0	**SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES**	**11**
	Overview	11
	Demographics	12
	Quantities of Waste	12
	Funding Sources	15
	Administrative Responsibilities	15
	Program Implementation	16
	Permitted Disposal Capacity	17
	Available Markets	19
	Implementation Schedule	19
	Other Issues	19
7.0	**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**	**19**
	Appendix A - July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter and CCR Section 18788	20
	Appendix B - Presentation to the Waste Advisory Committee on 12/13/01	25
	Appendix C - December 13, 2001 WAC Letter to County	31

(This page intentionally left blank.)

County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
292 West Beamer Street Woodland, CA 95695-2598 (530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728
www.yolocounty.org

JOHN BENCOMO
DIRECTOR

February 5, 2002

Ms. Carolyn Sullivan
Office of Local Assistance
California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB)
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, California 95812-4025

RE: County of Yolo Five Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Review

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

On behalf of the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland and the County of Yolo, please find attached a copy of the "Five-Year CIWMP Review Report". In conformance with §41822 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), the County and cities have reviewed the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

The County's Local Task Force (LTF), referred to as the Waste Advisory Committee (WAC), submitted written comments to the County within the time frame specified in Section 18788 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). A copy of the December 13th WAC letter is included in Appendix C of the "Five-Year CIWMP Review Report".

The County finds that a CIWMP revision is not necessary at this time. Guided by the current CIWMP, the County and the cities will continue to implement programs and strive to fulfill the goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act. On January 17, 2002, the WAC recommended that the Yolo County Board of Supervisors (BOS) approve the submittal of the CIWMP review report and on February 5, 2002, the BOS authorized the submittal of the "Five-Year CIWMP Review Report" to the CIWMB.

Please contact Sarah Kittle at (530) 757-5564 or Lorell Miller at (530) 666-8854 you have any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda K. Sinderson
Senior Civil Engineer

cc Bill Hedberg, City of Davis
Denise Kotko, City of West Sacramento
Jack Kelly, City of Winters
Heidi Hopper, City of Woodland
Sarah Kittle, County of Yolo
Other Waste Advisory Committee Members
Jim Greco, California Waste Associates

(This page intentionally left blank.)

CHAPTER 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State law requires that each county, and the cities within the county, review their waste management planning documents every five years. The collection of planning documents is referred to as the "Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan" (CIWMP). The review is required to be conducted by the 5th year anniversary date from when the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) approved the CIWMP – which was December 18, 1996. By December 18, 2001, the County Local Task Force, Waste Advisory Committee (WAC), is required to advise the county on whether the CIWMP needs to be revised. The WAC reviewed the CIWMP by December 13th and determined that it was not necessary to revise the planning documents so long as the annual reports prepared by all of the jurisdictions update the CIWMP.

The overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable. The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources, and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the CIWMP still are accurately described. State law also requires that the review address a number of issues, which are highlighted below in upper case, bold font type.

DEMOGRAPHICS. The calculation of the diversion rates for each jurisdiction depends upon CIWMB-established adjustment factors, for example: population, employment, taxable sales, and the consumer price index. Countywide population and employment have increased 15% and 26%, respectively, from 1990 to 2000. The greatest population increase has occurred in the City of Davis (27%); the smallest in the unincorporated area (2%). Taxable sales transactions have increased significantly (more than 36%) in all jurisdictions, averaging 75% countywide, while the statewide consumer price index (CPI) has increased 29% - from 1990 to 2000. These factors are important because they are used to calculate the estimated waste generation and diversion rates when using the CIWMB method for diversion rate measurement.

QUANTITIES OF WASTE. Estimated waste generation quantities have increased and while reported disposal tonnages have increased modestly countywide, diversion performance has increased notably. As a result, each jurisdiction has experienced an increase in its diversion rate with each exceeding 50% according to recent diversion studies.

FUNDING SOURCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES. Funding and administrative sources have been maintained and, in many instances, expanded through available grants from the CIWMB and the Department of Conservation.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION. Program implementation, as documented by each jurisdiction in the annual reports, has been sustained, enhanced, and expanded. Most selected programs have been implemented and some new programs started. A materials recovery facility was identified as an initially selected program, which prompted a feasibility study. It was determined that a MRF located at the Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL) was not economically feasible as of 1998. However, clean, mixed, and source separated recyclable materials are currently diverted at the YCCL, Esparto Convenience Center, and other drop-off locations. Some of these materials are transported to local MRF's and processed for markets.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY. Countywide permitted disposal capacity exceeds the statutory requirement of 15 years. At least 20 years of permitted disposal capacity exists in the county, with additional capacity being available, out-of-county, if needed.

AVAILABLE MARKETS. Markets for recoverable materials have fluctuated but are available in most cases.

OTHER ISSUES. The goals, policies, and objectives stated in the Summary Plan remain applicable and relevant. The Waste Advisory Committee continues to meet periodically, monitor countywide diversion performance, and provide useful input for the pursuit of AB 939 compliance strategies. Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been and are continuing to be implemented. Although a few programs have been revised, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated. The County and cities continue to monitor evolving compliance issues. Diversion studies for each jurisdiction are underway.

Consequently, the County feels that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. Countywide resources are best directed toward the development and implementation of programs rather than revising current planning documents. Where feasible and practical, increased efforts may be directed to quantifying (or estimating) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials.

Each jurisdiction should update its annual report yearly to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation.

For these reasons, the County does not feel that revision of its CIWMP is warranted or desirable at this time.

CHAPTER 2.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939) requires cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills and transformed by 25% by 1995; by 50% by the year 2000 through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. Transformation may be used to reduce the wastes sent to landfills by no more than 10% in the year 2000. The CIWMP is the guiding document for attaining these goals.

PRC Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its source reduction and recycling element (SRRE) or the CIWMP at least once every five years to:

(1) correct any deficiencies in the element or plan;
(2) comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under PRC Section 41780; and
(3) revise the documents, as necessary.

The CIWMB clarified the five-year CIWMP review process in CCR Section 18788. Section 18788 states that prior to the fifth anniversary of CIWMB Board approval of the CIWMP, the LTF shall complete a review of the CIWMP to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

(1) source reduction;
(2) recycling and composting;
(3) environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal.

The process identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- prior to the 5th anniversary, the LTF shall submit ***written comments*** on areas of the CIWMP which require revision to the County and the CIWMB;
- within 45 days of receipt of comments, the county shall determine if a revision is necessary and notify the LTF and the CIWMB of its findings in a ***CIWMP Review Report***; and
- within within 90 days of receipt of the ***CIWMP Review Report***, the CIWMB shall review the County's findings and, at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's findings.

CCR 18788 also identifies the minimum issues, which are to be addressed in the ***CIWMP Review Report***. They are:

(A) changes in demographics in the county;
(B) changes in quantities of the waste within the county;
(C) Changes in funding sources for administration of the countywide siting element and summary plan;
(D) changes in administrative responsibilities;
(E) program implementation status;

(F) changes in permitted disposal capacity and quantities of waste disposed of in the county;
(G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and
(H) changes in the implementation schedule.

On October 30, 1998 and again on July 21, 2000, the CIWMB Office of Local Assistance sent letters to jurisdictions clarifying the CIWMB's oversight of the five year revision process. A copy of the July 21st letter and CCR Section 18788 are included in Appendix A of Section 7.0 of this ***CIWMP Review Report***. The July 21st letter essentially noted that the five year anniversary is from the date of approval by the CIWMB of the CIWMP; that the CIWMB legal staff determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to update program information, if a revision is not determined by the jurisdiction to be necessary; and that if a revision is determined to be necessary, it may be submitted with the next annual report.

CHAPTER 3.0 BACKGROUND

The Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), the Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), and the Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) for Yolo County and the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland plus the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the County Summary Plan (SP) comprise the CIWMP. The NDFE's were approved on November 16, 1995. The SRRE's and HHWE's were approved by the CIWMB on November 20, 1996. The CSE, SP, and CIWMP were approved by the CIWMB on December 18, 1996. Thus, the anniversary date for the first five-year CIWMP review is December 18, 2001.

The County and each city's diversion goal is 50% for the mid-term compliance goal year (2000). No petition for a reduction in the 50% year 2000 goal has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.

CHAPTER 4.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this ***CIWMP Review Report*** is twofold: (1) to document the compliance of Yolo County and the cities with PRC 41822 and CCR 18788; and (2) to solicit a wider review, recommendations, and support for the course of action identified by the jurisdictions in Yolo County to achieve increased levels of diversion.

CHAPTER 5.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

The Yolo County Waste Advisory Committee (WAC) meets periodically, generally every other month. At the WAC December 13, 2001 meeting, the five-year CIWMP review was agendized and discussed. The WAC discussed a summary of the CIWMP review conducted by California Waste Associates (CWA). CWA reviewed the planning documents for each jurisdiction and the extent that the documents were updated by the annual reports and other reports prepared by the jurisdictions.

CWA presented an overview of the CIWMP review process, the content and adequacy of each of the planning documents, observations on the current applicability of the CIWMP, and recommendations. A copy of a memo from CWA and an outline of the presentation made at the December 13th meeting are included in Appendix B. At its December 13th meeting, the WAC approved that a letter be sent to the County transmitting the WAC's written comments. A copy of the WAC letter is included in Appendix C. A copy was forwarded to the CIWMB.

CHAPTER 6.0 SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES

OVERVIEW

CWA reviewed each CIWMP document and found that the documents, accompanied by the annual reports, continue to serve as appropriate reference tools for implementing and monitoring compliance with AB 939. The Summary Plan adequately summarizes the solid waste and household hazardous waste management infrastructure within the county.

The goals, objectives, and policies in the elements are still applicable and consistent with PRC 40051 and 40052. The selected programs for each component were reviewed. Nearly all programs were being implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County and each city are up to date. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs, and results, these changes are not considered to be significant. Furthermore, it is felt that continued emphasis on program development, evaluation, and implementation are more important than refining the CIWMP documents through a revision.

The diversion performance for the county and each city is identified in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Diversion Rate Trends (1995-2000) *

Year	Davis	West Sacramento	Winters	Woodland	County Unincorporated
1995	48%	27%	50%	42%	29%
1996	45%	35%	30%	41%	21%
1997	46%	42%	29%	41%	16%
1998	46%	39%	26%	43%	37%
1999	43%	41%	25%	42%	40%
2000	57%	55%	53%	71%	57%

* Source: CIWMB Website - Diversion Measurement for 1995-1999 years; recently completed waste generation studies for year 2000.

A diversion survey and waste generation study for the year 2000 has been conducted for the County and all of the cities to better quantify diversion attainment by program and sector (residential, commercial, government). The studies for the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, and Winters have been submitted to the CIWMB whereas the studies for the City of Woodland and the unincorporated county are expected to be completed and submitted to the CIWMB by

February 1st, 2002. These studies are being used to substantiate the establishment of a new base year and associated base year waste generation quantification. The waste generation studies are expected to be the basis for a new base year (2000). The CIWMB has not yet completed its review of the new base years.

Using the current CIWMB-approved base year waste generation quantities and the adjustment methodology for each jurisdiction to calculate the year 2000 diversion rate results in the rates depicted in Table 5-2. This adjustment methodology used for each jurisdiction is not considered to be representative of actual waste generation levels within each jurisdiction due to the growth experienced in the waste stream.

Table 5-2. Year 2000 Diversion Rate (per adjustment methodology, using original 1990 base year)

Year	Davis	West Sacramento	Winters	Woodland	County Unincorporated Area
2000	49%	42%	31%	49%	37%

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 5-3 depicts demographic trends from 1990 to 2000. The cities and County have experienced significant growth, which has resulted in increased waste generation.

QUANTITIES OF WASTE

Table 5-4 provides the calculated per capita (pounds per person per day - ppd) of residential and total waste generation within each jurisdiction. The statewide average per capita in 1990 for total waste generation was approximately 8 ppd; for residential waste per capita, about 3 ppd. Whereas the per capita total waste generation rates within the cities of Davis and Winters are below the statewide average, West Sacramento and Woodland are notably higher than the statewide average. The County unincorporated area is slightly more than the statewide average. The countywide per capita base year waste generation rate is 9.5 ppd, about 19% higher than the statewide average.

The base year waste (1990) and reported disposal tonnage, according to the CIWMB Disposal Reporting System (DRS), are compiled in Table 5-5 for each jurisdiction for the base year (1990) and the period 1995 through 2000. Except where noted by bold type font, the tonnage has increased and likely reflects the significant growth, which has occurred in the County from population growth, housing construction, and the expansion of the commercial sector. Solid waste disposal and waste generation quantities were projected for the fifteen-year period (1990-2005) in the SRRE's.

Table 5-3. Demographic Trends *

Demographic Factor for each Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Change
Population			
City of Davis Population	46,322	58,600	27%
City of West Sacramento Population	28,898	31,000	7%
City of Winters Population	4,639	5,525	19%
City of Woodland Population	40,230	46,300	15%
Unincorporated Population	21,121	21,450	2%
Countywide Population	141,210	162,875	15%
Employment			
Countywide Employment	71,000	89,600	26%
Taxable Sales Transactions			
City of Davis Taxable Sales Transactions	$221,944,000	$424,742,000	91%
City of West Sacramento Taxable Sales Transactions	$490,028,000	$906,453,000	85%
City of Winters Taxable Sales Transactions	$12,291,000	$18,163,000	48%
City of Woodland Taxable Sales Transactions	$380,478,000	$633,978,000	67%
Unincorporated Taxable Sales Transactions	$133,818,000	$181,893,000	36%
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	$1,238,559,000	$2,165,229,000	75%
Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index (CPI)	135.0	174.8	29%

* Source: CIWMB Website - Default Adjustment Factors.

Table 5-4. 1990 Base Year Per Capita Calculations *

Parameter (1990 Values)	Davis	West Sacramento	Winters	Woodland	Unincorp County	Countywide
Population	46,322	28,898	4,639	40,230	21,121	141,210
Waste Generation (tons)	60,765	60,870	5,889	84,480	33,755	245,759
WG Per Capita (ppd)	7.2	11.5	7.0	11.5	8.8	9.5
Residential % WG	40%	37%	42%	29%	50%	37%
Residential WG (tons)	24,063	22,644	2,473	24,204	16,844	90,228
Res Per Capita (ppd)	2.8	4.3	2.9	3.3	4.4	3.5

* Source: CIWMB Website.

Table 5-5. Disposal Tonnage Trends (1995-2000) *

Year	Davis	West Sacramento	Winters	Woodland	Uninc County	Countywide
1990	38,960	48,727	4,836	69,222	23,953	185,698
1995	33,790	47,710	3,102	53,419	28,402	166,423
1996	36,912	42,992	4,474	54,657	30,839	169,874
1997	**36,390**	**38,901**	4,602	55,146	**21,047**	**156,086**
1998	38,408	42,703	4,966	**54,903**	22,830	163,810
1999	42,050	**42,436**	5,223	57,936	25,540	173,185
2000	**41,562**	45,844	5,231	**55,195**	27,206	175,038

* Source: CIWMB Website - Disposal Reporting System.

The SRRE projections for disposal quantities in the year 2000 were compared with the reported disposal tonnage (DRS) for 2000. The comparative results are presented in Table 5-6. Whereas, the reported disposal is fairly close to the SRRE projected disposal for the cities of West Sacramento and Winters (within 5%), the other jurisdictions vary by more than 19%. The significance of these comparisons is difficult to assess since:

(1) the derivation of the year 2000 projected waste disposal when the SRRE's were prepared may or may not have been accurately derived;
(2) the effectiveness of diversion program implementation may (or may not) have affected disposal in the jurisdictions; and/or
(3) the comparisons are merely coincidental.

It should also be noted that when the SRRE planning documents were developed, there appears to have been no accounting of the increased waste generated from the non-year round student population attending U.C. Davis. This results in an underestimation of the waste generation and disposal associated with this increased part-year population.

Table 5-6. Comparison of SRRE 2000 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2000 Reported Disposal Tonnage

Jurisdiction	SRRE Projected	DRS Reported	% Difference
Davis	31,815	41,562	31%
West Sacramento	47,684	45,844	-4%
Winters	5,448	5,231	-4%
Woodland	46,267	55,195	19%
Unincorporated County	18,238	27,206	49%
Countywide	149,612	175,038	17%

Table 5-7 compares the year 2000 waste generation quantities projected in the SRRE, estimated by the adjustment methodology, and the recently determined new base year waste generation studies. The results show that the SRRE predictions differed notably from the adjustment methodology-estimated waste generation amounts for Davis, West Sacramento, and Winters (all greater than 24%) Countywide, however, the year 2000 waste generation is fairly close (within 6%). In every case, the new waste generation studies resulted in increased waste generation levels.

Estimated waste generation quantities have increased and while reported disposal tonnages have increased modestly countywide, diversion performance has increased notably. As a result, each jurisdiction has experienced an increase in its diversion rate with each exceeding 50% according to recent diversion studies. In summary, the noted comparisons lend support for the decision by each jurisdiction to undertake diversion surveys in 2000 to more accurately describe the waste generation characteristics for each city and the county.

Table 5-7. Comparison of SRRE 2000 Projected Waste Generation Tonnage vs. 2000 Estimated Waste Generation Tonnage (Adjustment Methodology)

Jurisdiction	SRRE Projected	Estimated by Adjustment Methodology	% Difference	New Base Year (2000) Waste Gen Study
Davis	66,328	81,984	24%	97,767
West Sacramento	106,111	79,717	-25%	103,200
Winters	11,701	7,576	-35%	11,011
Woodland	120,723	108,919	-10%	190,686
Unincorporated County	37,890	42,952	13%	63,881
Countywide	342,753	321,148	-6%	466,545

FUNDING SOURCES

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the CSE and the Summary Plan. The primary source of funding these programs is the County Sanitation Enterprise Fund, which derives monies from the tipping fees at the Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL). The enterprise fund pays for landfill operations, closure, capital improvements, household hazardous waste collection, program administration, and regulatory compliance in addition to AB 939 programs. Locally based programs for the cities (e.g. public education, municipal staffing, and other local activities) are funded from local refuse rates for collection service, grant funds, and other locally appropriate sources.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Although there has been some reorganization of responsible personnel, no significant changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP. Within the County, the Planning and Public Works Department has been the continuing overall responsible agency. Solid waste management activities within each city have been assigned to the following offices:

- City of Davis Public Works Department
- City of West Sacramento Finance Department
- City of Winters Public Works Department
- City of Woodland Environmental Operations

The county and cities have advised the CIWMB from year-to-year of the primary responsible individuals for AB 939 in their annual reports.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Summary Plan included the following goals and policies:

* minimize disposal quantities using the integrated waste management hierarchy;
* all integrated waste management programs will continue to be implemented;
* seek increased interagency cooperation among jurisdictions;
* reasonable access for residents and appropriate businesses for HHW management;
* develop local market development programs;
* cooperative development of public education programs; and
* maintain ongoing analysis of new waste management technologies and programs

Objectives were established focused upon these goals and policies. The annual reports have provided updated information concerning program implementation. Nearly all selected programs have been implemented. Table 5-8 depicts the nondisposal facilities (existing and proposed) which were identified in the Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) as facilities to be used to assist with diversion performance.

Table 5-8. Listing of Identified Nondisposal Facilities for Diversion

Jurisdiction	Existing Nondisposal Facilities (1995)	Proposed Nondisposal Facilities
Davis	Yard Material: CWRS Lodi Composting Facility Recyclables: DWR MRF Inerts, Scrap Metal, Tires: YCCL	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: None planned; optional YCCL MRF
West Sacramento	Recyclables: WMI Woodland Facility Inerts, Scrap Metal, Tires: YCCL	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: IPC (short term); YCCL MRF for non-source separated commercial/industrial (c/i) waste
Winters	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: WMI Woodland Facility Inerts, Scrap Metal, Tires: YCCL	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: YCCL MRF for non-source separated c/i waste
Woodland	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: WMI Woodland Facility Inerts, Scrap Metal, Tires: YCCL	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: YCCL MRF for non-source separated c/i waste
County Unincorporated	Yard Material: Valley By-Products Recyclables: DWR MRF; YCCL, Esparto Drop-off, WMI Woodland Facility Inerts, Scrap Metal, Tires: YCCL	Yard Material: Valley By-Products, Spreckels Sugar Company Composting Facility, Environmental Reclaiming Solutions Composting Facility Recyclables: YCCL MRF for non-source separated c/i waste

On the next page, Table 5-9 identifies the diversion programs selected in 1990 on a countywide basis while also presenting the trend in program implementation from 1995 through 2000. The jurisdictions are associated with the following letters in the table:

A City of Davis
B City of West Sacramento
C City of Winters
D City of Woodland
E Yolo County Unincorporated Area

A MRF was selected as a contingency program by the County; other cities, if selected by County. The City of Davis indicated limited participation if a MRF was implemented at the YCCL.

Significant changes, which have occurred regarding the implementation of diversion programs, involve "program expansion". The County and cities continue to build upon prior years' experience and the increasing support of the general public to increase diversion quantities. The primary diversion programs have been built around the YCCL and through the authorized waste service providers.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The YCCL continues to have disposal capacity available for the solid waste generated but not diverted. Available capacity reported in the Y2K annual report by the County was 20 years. At current anticipated disposal levels, the facility is expected to provide disposal capacity until the year 2020. The County Siting Element (CSE) is kept current through the County's annual report and continues to be an applicable planning tool.

The goals and policies identified in the CSE are listed as:

- comply with regulations and standards, minimize environmental impacts, nuisances;
- eliminate knowing disposal of HHW at landfills;
- ensure long term disposal capacity;
- maximize cost-effectiveness and convenience;
- promote community awareness;
- consider regional approaches that are mutually convenient and beneficial;
- prevent solid waste facilities in incompatible land use areas;
- protect existing facilities from encroachment of incompatible land uses; and
- maintain an integrated waste management system based on AB 939 hierarchy.

These goals and policies continue to be applicable.

A siting criteria was developed and a siting process was described in the CSE, as required by the regulations. The CSE called for the continued use of YCCL and U.C. Davis Landfill.

Table 5-9. Countywide Diversion Program Implementation *

Program	Code	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
SOURCE REDUCTION								
Xeri/Grasscycling	1000			D	D	D	D	ABCDE
Backyard Composting	1010	ABCDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Business Waste Reduction	1020	ACDE	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABCD
Procurement	1030	ABCD	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABDE
School Source Reduction	1040		E	E	E	E	E	AE
Govt Source Reduction	1050	ABCDE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABCDE
Material Exchange/Thrift	1060	DE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABCDE
RECYCLING								
Residential Curbside	2000	ABCD	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Residential Drop-off	2010	CE	ACE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE
Buyback Centers	2020	C	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
Commercial Onsite Pickup	2030	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Commercial Self haul	2040		ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE
Schools	2050		ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Government Recycling	2060		E	E	E	E	E	ABE
Special Collection/Seasonal	2070		ACE	ACE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ABCDE
Special Collection Events	2080	A	BCDE	BCDE	BCD	BCD	BCD	ABCDE
Other/Business Recycling	2090							
MRF	7000	ABCDE	B	B	B	B	B	E
Landfill	7010	A	BE	BE	BE	BE	BE	BE
ADC	7040		ADE	ADE	ADE	ADE	ADE	ABDE
COMPOSTING								
Residential Curbside GWC	3000	ABCD	ABD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCDE
Residential GW Self haul	3010	CD	B	B	B	B	B	B
Commercial Onsite GW P/U	3020	ABCD	B	B	B	B	B	ABC
Commercial GW Self haul	3030		DE	DE	DE	DE	DE	ABDE
Food Waste Composting	3040							AB
School Composting	3050		E	E	E	E	E	AE
Compost Facility	7030	ABCDE	ABE	ABE	ABE	AE	AE	AE
Other Facility (mattresses)	7050							E
SPECIAL WASTE								
Sludge	4010		AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	AB
Tire Recycling	4020	E	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
White Goods	4030	CDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	ABCDE
Scrap Metal	4040	E	BDE	BDE	BDE	BDE	BDE	ABDE
Wood Waste	4050	CDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ABCDE
Concrete, Asphalt, Rubble	4060	ACDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Rendering	4090		C	C	C	C	C	C
Other Special Waste (PVC)	4100	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
TRANSFORMATION/BIOMASS								
Biomass/Cogeneration	8010		ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE
Transformation/Tires	8020	E	CE	CE	CE	CE	CE	E
Other Transformation	8030		E	E	E	E	E	E

* Information obtained from jurisdictions' SRRE's, CIWMB SRRE approval agenda item, and annual reports for 2000.

Key: A: City of Davis; B: City of West Sacramento; C: City of Winters; D: City of Woodland; E: Yolo County Unincorporated

AVAILABLE MARKETS

Markets for recovered recyclable materials have been available. Though the market material quantity supply and demand and resulting market prices often fluctuate, outlets continue to be available.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Changes in the implementation schedule have occurred but have not significantly affected the ability of the County and cities to realize planned diversion levels in Y2K. The annual reports submitted by the jurisdictions have updated the status of program implementation.

OTHER ISSUES

The County and cities have had some discussion regarding the feasibility of establishing a regional agency, however, there is no active interest at the present time. The jurisdictions continue to meet periodically and cooperate with the implementation of programs selected in their planning respective planning documents.

CHAPTER 7.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

In this section on the following pages are included the cited correspondence, regulatory requirements, and reports.

Appendix A - July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter and CCR Section 18788
Appendix B - December 13, 2001 Presentation to Local Task Force
Appendix C - December 13, 2001 WAC Letter to the County

Appendix A - July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter and CCR Section 18788

California Integrated Waste Management Board

Linda Moulton-Patterson, Chair
8800 Cal Center Drive • Sacramento California 95826 • (916) 255-2200
www.ciwmb.ca.gov

Gray D
Govern

Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for Environmental Protection

July 21, 2000

ALL CITY/COUNTY CONTACTS

Re: FIVE-YEAR REVISION PROCESS

The purpose of this letter is to clarify the Board's oversight of the five-year revision process. The Board previously sent notification to jurisdictions on October 30, 1998 regarding the Board's oversight of the 5-year revision process. While still maintaining the integrity and intent of AB 939, the Board is also very interested with assisting jurisdictions in the development of efficient and effective planning and reporting processes.

Existing law (PRC Section 41770) states that "each countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan, and the elements thereof, shall be reviewed, revised, if necessary, and submitted to the Board every five years in accordance with the schedule set forth under Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 41800)." The following items provide specific information regarding the five-year revision process.

- Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 18788 provides that the five-year revision schedule is calculated from the date of Board approval of the original Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and all its elements, not the approval dates of the individual elements;

- PRC Section 18788 provides that prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of a countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan (CIWMP or RAIWMP), or its most recent revision, the Local Task Force (LTF) shall complete a review of the CIWMP or RAIWMP in accordance with PRC Sections 40051, 40052, and 41822, to assure that the county's and regional agency's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051. The LTF shall submit written comments on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP, which require revision, if any, to the county or regional agency and the Board.

- **Submittal of a five-year revision is only required if either the Board or the jurisdiction determines that a revision would be necessary** "to correct any deficiencies in the element or plan, [and] to comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under Section 41780" as required by PRC Section 41822. The Board's Legal staff has determined that jurisdictions can utilize their Annual Reports to the Board to update program information where it has been determined that a revision is not necessary. In addition to the updates in the Annual Report, the LTF comments and the CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report should be included.

- Jurisdictions that have determined that a five-year revision is necessary may include the revision under cover of the existing Annual Report document that is to be submitted to the Board for that year. The procedures set forth in 14 CCR 18788 must still be complied with before the Board can consider approval of the five-year revision document.

We hope this clarifies any questions you may have regarding the five-year revision process. If you have any questions regarding this process, please feel free to contact your Office of Local Assistance representative at (916) 255-2555.

Sincerely,

Cara Morgan

Cara Morgan, Acting Branch Manager
Office of Local Assistance

Attachment

Section 18788. Five-Year Review and Revision of the Countywide or Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan.

(a) CIWMP or RAIWMP Review. Prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of a CIWMP or RAIWMP, or its most recent revision, the LTF shall complete a review of the CIWMP or RAIWMP in accordance with Public Resources Code sections 40051, 40052, and 41822, to assure that the county's and regional agency's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in Public Resources Code, section 40051.

(1) Prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP, the LTF shall submit written comments on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP which require revision, if any, to the county or regional agency and the Board.

(2) Within 45 days of receiving LTF comments, the county or regional agency shall determine if a revision is necessary, and notify the LTF and the Board of its findings in a CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report.

(3) When preparing the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report the county or regional agency shall address at least the following:

(A) changes in demographics in the county or regional agency;

(B) changes in quantities of waste within the county or regional agency;

(C) changes in funding sources for administration of the Siting Element and Summary Plan;

(D) changes in administrative responsibilities;

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

(F) changes in permitted disposal capacity, and quantities of waste disposed of in the county or regional agency;

(G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and

(H) changes in the implementation schedule.

(4) Within 90 days of receipt of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report, the Board shall review the county's or regional agency's findings, and at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's or regional agency's findings. Within 30 days of its action, the Board shall send a copy of its resolution, approving or disapproving the county's or regional agency's findings, to the LTF and the county or regional agency. If the Board has identified additional areas that require revision, the Board shall identify those areas in its resolution.

3

(b) CIWMP or RAIWMP Revision. If a revision is necessary the county or regional agency shall submit a CIWMP or RAIWMP revision schedule to the Board.

(1) The county or regional agency shall revise the CIWMP or RAIWMP in the areas noted as deficient in the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report and/or as identified by the Board.

(2) The county or regional agency shall revise and resubmit its CIWMP or RAIWMP pursuant to the requirements of sections 18780 through 18784 of this article.

(c) The county shall submit all revisions of its CIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised CIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

(d) The regional agency shall submit all revisions of its RAIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised RAIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

NOTE: Authority: Section 40502, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 40051, 40052, 41750, 41760, 41770, and 41822, Public Resources Code.

Appendix B - December 13, 2001 Presentation to Local Task Force

Board Meeting
May 14-15, 2002

Agenda Item
Attachment 1

CALIFORNIA WASTE ASSOCIATES

A Jim Greco Consulting Organization

MEMO TO : Waste Advisory Committee (WAC) Members

FROM : Jim Greco

RE : Yolo County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Five-Year Review

DATE : December 5, 2001

The AB 939 law requires that a county's local task force (LTF) review the CIWMP prior to the 5th year anniversary of the approval of the CIWMP.

Since the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) approved the Yolo County CIWMP on December 18, 1996, the WAC is tasked to review the CIWMP and submit written comments to the County with a copy to the CIWMB by December 18th.

The CIWMP includes each jurisdiction's:

- Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE);
- Nondisposal facility Element (NDFE); and
- Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

In addition, the CIWMP also includes the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the Summary Plan (SP).

According to the regulations promulgated by the CIWMB, a revision can require a multiple public review process to include noticing, commenting, evaluation, and revising elements with as many as two public hearings being conducted by each City Council and the County Board of Supervisors. In short, extensive time periods and resources may be necessary for a CIWMP revision.

However, the CIWMB Legal staff has determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to the CIWMB to update program information where it has been determined that a revision is not necessary. This determination starts with the LTF (the WAC) submitting a recommendation to the County, then the County submitting a report to the CIWMB, and lastly, the CIWMB, making a final determination.

This is further explained in the attached materials, namely:

- An outline of the presentation I have been requested to make at the December 13th WAC meeting;
- A draft letter for the WAC to send to the County, if agreeable to you; and

P.O. Box 5177 * El Dorado Hills, California 95762 * (916) 933-2327 * FAX (916) 933-3157 * jgwaste@aol.com

This is further explained in the attached materials, namely:

- An outline of the presentation I have been requested to make at the December 13th WAC meeting;
- A draft letter for the WAC to send to the County, if agreeable to you; and
- A copy of the El Dorado County "CIWMP Review Report" which was 1st and still the only CIWMP review approved by the CIWMB (in April of this year). This report is included in order to provide you with a preliminary general familiarization of such a report. The CIWMP regulations require that Yolo County prepare a "CIWMP Review Report" to be submitted to you and the CIWMB within 45 days of the anniversary date for your review and comment. You will be receiving this report in January.

Please review these materials prior to the meeting.

I am looking forward to working with you to determine whether the CIWMP for Yolo County should be revised or not.

Please feel free to contact me prior to the meeting, if you have any questions or comments about this process and your responsibility.

Thank you.

cc Sarah Kittle
Lorell Miller
Linda Sinderson

Outline of Presentation to Waste Advisory Committee (WAC)
Yolo County CIWMP Five Year Review

Thursday, December 13th, 2001 at 4:30 p.m.

1. **Overview of Statutory Requirement and Process**

   - Local Task Force (WAC) Review by 5th Year Anniversary with Any Comments to County and CIWMB (12/18/01)
   - County "CIWMP Review Report" to WAC and CIWMB within 45 days of WAC Recommendation (~ 2/1/02)
   - CIWMB Review of "CIWMP Review Report" within 90 days to review and approve or disapprove of County's findings (~ 5/2/02)

2. **Only One County Approved Thus Far (El Dorado on 4/24/01); 13 others are pending; Yolo County is the 15th due.**

3. **CIWMB Policy has been expressed in July 21, 2000 letter sent to all jurisdictions by Cara Morgan, which states:**

   "Submittal of a five-year revision is only required if either the Board or the jurisdiction determines that a revision would be necessary 'to correct any deficiencies in the element or plan, to comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under section 41780' as required by PRC Section 41822. The Board's Legal staff has determined that jurisdictions can utilize their Annual Reports to the Board to update program information where it has been determined that a revision is not necessary. In addition to the updates in the Annual Report, the LTF comments and the CIWMP Review Report should be included."

4. **Meaning of the Term "Revision" – May Require an Extensive Public Review Process with Actions Required by Resolution by City Councils and the Board of Supervisors**

5. **California Waste Associates (CWA):**

   - Was selected and started work in early November;
   - Reviewed each jurisdiction's Y2K PARIS, diversion calculations, and CIWMB database;
   - Met with CIWMB staff on November 14th;
   - Met with City and County staff on November 15th;
   - Commenced the review of each jurisdiction's SRRE, NDFE, HHWE, PARIS information, annual reports, new waste generation studies, and relevant demographic, funding, and staffing information for each jurisdiction; and
   - Prepared a working draft of the Yolo County "CIWMP Review Report".

6. **CWA Preliminary Findings**

- Countywide population and employment have increased 15% and 26%, respectively, from 1990 to 2000. The greatest population increase has occurred in the City of Davis (27%); the smallest in the unincorporated area (2%).
- Taxable sales transactions have increased significantly (more than 36%) in all jurisdictions, averaging 75% countywide, while the statewide consumer price index (CPI) has increased 29% - from 1990 to 2000.
- Estimated waste generation quantities have increased and while reported disposal tonnages have increased modestly countywide, diversion performance has increased notably. As a result, each jurisdiction has experienced an increase in its diversion rate with each exceeding 50% according to recent diversion studies.
- Funding and administrative resources have been maintained and, in many instances, increased.
- Program implementation, as documented by each jurisdiction in the annual reports, have been sustained, enhanced, and expanded. Most programs have been implemented and some new programs implemented. A materials recovery facility was identified as an initially selected program, which prompted a feasibility study. It was determined that a MRF located at the Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL) was not economically feasible as of 1998. However, clean, mixed, and source separated recyclable materials are diverted at the YCCL, Esparto Convenience Center, and other drop-off locations. Some of these materials are transported to local MRF's and processed for markets.
- Countywide permitted disposal capacity exceeds 15 years. 20 years of permitted disposal capacity exists in the county, with additional capacity being available, out-of-county, if needed.
- Markets for recoverable materials have fluctuated but are available in most cases.
- The goals, policies, and objectives stated in the Summary Plan remain applicable and relevant.
- The County LTF, WAC, continues to meet periodically, monitor countywide diversion performance, and provide useful input for the pursuit of AB 939 compliance strategies.

6. CWA Preliminary Recommendations

- A CIWMP Revision is not necessary at this time;
- Countywide resources are best directed toward the development and implementation of programs rather than revising current planning documents;
- Each jurisdiction should update its annual report yearly to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation; and
- Where feasible and practical, increased efforts should be directed to quantifying (or estimating) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials.

Appendix C - December 13, 2001 WAC Letter to the County

Board Meeting
May 14-15, 2002

Agenda Item
Attachment 1

County of Yolo

WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

c/o PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT – DIVISION OF INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT
292 West Beamer Street Woodland, CA 95695-2598 (530) 666-8852FAX (530) 666-8853
www.yolocounty.org

December 13, 2001

Linda K. Sinderson, PE, RG
Senior Civil Engineer
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, California 95695

Subject: Five-Year Review of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)

Dear Ms. Sinderson:

The Waste Advisory Committee (WAC), which serves as the County's AB 939 Local Task Force, completed the review of the CIWMP as required by Public Resources Code Section 41770 and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Section 18788).

The planning documents which comprise the CIWMP continue to serve as useful background and reference documents while the annual reports submitted by the County and the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland have provided updated information concerning the status of program implementation on a yearly basis.

Because the updated information has been provided in the annual reports and the development and implementation of selected and alternative programs is continuing, the WAC feels that it is not necessary to revise the elements of the CIWMP at this time. The goals, objectives, and policies in the elements remain accurate and applicable. Furthermore, waste generation studies have been completed for each jurisdiction, which substantiates a more accurate accounting of ongoing diversion within the cities and the county unincorporated area.

The status of selected programs has been adequately described in the CIWMB Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS), which has been included in the annual reports. It is recommended that the format for the year 2001 annual report, and subsequent annual reports, include updates in program implementation.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andrew Hurst
Chairperson

cc Carolyn Sullivan, CIWMB
Jim Greco, California Waste Associates

Board Meeting
May 14-15, 2002

Agenda Item
Attachment 1

County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
292 West Beamer Street Woodland, CA 95695-2598 (530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728
www.yolocounty.org

JOHN BENCOMO
DIRECTOR

March 21, 2002

Ms. Carolyn Sullivan
Integrated Waste Management Specialist
Office of Local Assistance
CIWMB
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, California 95814-4025

RE: Five-Year CIWMP Review Report – Updated Information Requested in Your Letter Dated March 5, 2002

Dear Carolyn:

Your March 5th letter requested additional information about programs which were selected to be implemented but were not, a statement as to why they were not implemented, the progress of programs that were implemented, a statement as to whether programs are meeting their goals, and what contingency measures are being enacted to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code (PRC) section 41751.

Please find attached insert pages for the "Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Five-Year Review Report" dated February 5th, 2002. These pages include a revised cover page and numbered pages 17-a, 17-b, 17-c, 17-d, and 18. They replace the prior pages 17 and 18. Page 18 includes updated data to conform to the listing of selected programs, which are included on the CIWMB Website under the section for "Jurisdiction Diversion Program List" for each Yolo County municipality.

In summary, the programs, which were selected but reported in the annual reports as not implemented, include:

1) **Procurement** (PARIS Code 1020) by the City of Winters, although the City reported that it does buy recycled-content products, whenever possible.

2) **Materials Recovery Facility** (MRF) (7000) by the cities of West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland, and the County. The MRF program selected was to conduct a feasibility study for a MRF to be located at the Yolo County Central Landfill. It

was determined that:

- it was not cost-effective to construct and operate a mixed waste MRF;
- private sector owned and operated MRF's were constructed in Davis and Woodland, which receive many of the material types targeted by the planned YCCL-based MRF;
- drop-off areas were established at the YCCL for other targeted material types (e.g., scrap metal. wood waste, tires, white goods, and inerts); and
- diversion performance was being realized through these and other programs (e.g., onsite business recycling and source reduction, ADC use, drop-off centers, and biomass conversion).

3) **Composting Facility** (7030) by all five jurisdictions. When the SRRE was prepared, it was envisioned that a regional composting facility located at the YCCL could be developed. As alternative markets developed for the compost material feedstocks (e.g., yard waste, wood waste) and the adjacent applications became feasible (chip and grind, utilization as an alternative daily cover and for fuel), the feasibility of a regional facility was not realized. Additionally, the wood recycling center located adjacent to the YCCL and operated by Waste Management attracted wood waste for diversion purposes and Environmental Reclaiming Solutions established and permitted a composting facility in Zamora, which serves communities including Willowbank, El Macero, and other areas of the County.

4) **Other Facility Recovery** (7050) by the cities of Davis, Winters, Woodland, and the County. On occasion, this program has been referred to as a self-haul bin/transfer operation located at the YCCL. It was determined that this facility, as initially envisioned, would be a series of debris boxes for self-haulers to deliver certain material types. This program has been replaced by designated drop-off areas at the YCCL for metal recovery, wood waste and brush, inerts, tires, white goods, newspaper, cardboard, and beverage container recyclables.

5) **Sludge** (4010) by the City of Winters. Further study of the opportunity to divert sludge-drying beds is currently underway on a low priority basis.

Also, as reported in the annual reports, all Yolo County jurisdictions have promoted and implemented additional, alternative and new programs including:

- Xeriscaping/Grasscycling (Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, County)
- School Source Reduction Programs (Davis)
- Residential Drop-Off Programs (West Sacramento)
- Commercial Self-Haul (Woodland, County)
- Government Recycling Programs (Davis, West Sacramento)
- Special Collection/Seasonal (West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland,

County)

- Special Collection Events (Winters)
- Alternative Daily Cover (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Residential Curbside Greenwaste Collection (County)
- Residential Self-Haul Green Waste Programs (West Sacramento)
- Commercial Self-Haul Green Waste (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Food Waste Composting (West Sacramento)
- School Composting Programs (Davis)
- Sludge Diversion (West Sacramento)
- Tire Recycling (West Sacramento)
- Scrap Metal Recovery Programs (Davis, Woodland0
- Wood Waste Diversion (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Biomass Conversion (Woodland)

The County and cities would like to include, by reference, the year 2000 annual reports and the submitted waste generation studies as part of its CIWMP Five-Year Review Report. These materials include descriptions of the status of the above-cited programs, identification of new and alternative programs, and quantification of diversion tonnages by program.

If the staff desires additional information to deem the CIWMP Five-Year Review report to be complete, please advise Sarah Kittle as soon as possible.

We appreciate the opportunity to work with you to complete the CIWMB's evaluation of the progress being made in Yolo County and its municipalities.

Sincerely,

Linda K. Sinderson
Senior Civil Engineer

cc: Sarah Kittle
Lorell Miller
Jim Greco, California Waste Associates

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT

for the

COUNTY OF YOLO

prepared by the

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT

Final Report

February 5, 2002
Updated March 19, 2002

The nondisposal facilities identified in Table 5-8 have been developed and used by Yolo County jurisdictions. The Valley By-Products facility has been acquired by Waste Management and is known as the "Waste Management Collection and Recycling Wood Recycling Facility".

Table 5-9 identifies the diversion programs selected in 1990 by each jurisdiction while also presenting the trend in program implementation from 1995 through 2000. The jurisdictions are associated with the following letters in the table:

A City of Davis
B City of West Sacramento
C City of Winters
D City of Woodland
E Yolo County Unincorporated Area

A mixed waste MRF was selected as a contingency program to be assessed and developed by the County and all of the other cities except the City of Davis, if selected by County. The City of Davis indicated limited participation, if a MRF was implemented at the YCCL. According to the County Source Reduction and Recycling Element (page 4-1), the MRF was expected to divert approximately 2,702 tons annually or 6.6% of the unincorporated generated waste stream. A self-haul bin transfer station program was selected to target 451 tons annually by 2000 or 1.1% of the unincorporated generated waste stream.

A yard debris composting program was also selected as a program to be developed as an expanded composting program in conjunction with Valley By-Products at the YCCL. Most of the significant diversion programs were landfill-based, including diversion and reuse of inert materials as road base construction at the YCCL, tire reuse and recovery, white goods, recovery, and a wood debris recovery program.

Programs Scheduled for Implementation but Were Not and A Statement as to Why They Were Not Implemented. Programs, which were selected, but reported in the annual reports as not implemented, include:

1) **Procurement** (PARIS Code 1020) by the City of Winters, although the City reported that it does buy recycled-content products, whenever possible.

2) **Materials Recovery Facility** (MRF) (7000) by the cities of West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland, and the County. The MRF program selected was to conduct a feasibility study for a MRF to be located at the Yolo County Central Landfill. It was determined that:

- it was not cost-effective to construct and operate a mixed waste MRF;
- private sector owned and operated MRF's were constructed in Davis and Woodland, which receive many of the material types targeted by the planned YCCL-based MRF;
- drop-off areas were established at the YCCL for other targeted material types (e.g., scrap metal. wood waste, tires, white goods, and inerts); and

- diversion performance was being realized through these and other programs (e.g., onsite business recycling and source reduction, ADC use, drop-off centers, and biomass conversion).

The County did fund and finalize the preparation of a "Feasibility Evaluation for a Material Recovery Facility, Floor Sorting Operation, and Re-Use Facility at the Yolo County Central Landfill" in June 1998. This evaluation determined that such facilities were not feasible at the time.

3) **Composting Facility** (7030) by all five jurisdictions. When the SRRE was prepared, it was envisioned that a regional composting facility located at the YCCL could be developed. As alternative markets developed for the compost material feedstocks (e.g., yard waste, wood waste) and the adjacent applications became feasible (chip and grind, utilization as an alternative daily cover and for fuel), the feasibility of a regional facility was not realized. Additionally, the wood recycling center located adjacent to the YCCL and operated by Waste Management attracted wood waste for diversion purposes and Environmental Reclaiming Solutions established and permitted a composting facility in Zamora, which serves communities including Willowbank, El Macero, and other areas of the County.

4) **Other Facility Recovery** (7050) by the cities of Davis, Winters, Woodland, and the County. On occasion, this program has been referred to as a self-haul bin/transfer operation located at the YCCL. It was determined that this facility, as initially envisioned, would be a series of debris boxes for self-haulers to deliver certain material types. This program has been replaced by designated drop-off areas at the YCCL for metal recovery, wood waste and brush, inerts, tires, white goods, newspaper, cardboard, and beverage container recyclables.

5) **Sludge** (4010) by the City of Winters. Further study of the opportunity to divert sludge-drying beds is currently underway on a low priority basis.

Progress of Programs that Were Implemented. The programs, which were implemented, are also depicted in Table 5-9 during the period 1995 through 2000. It is felt that these programs have been very effective, as demonstrated by the waste generation studies undertaken by all of the cities and the county in 2000 to quantify diversion effectiveness. As submitted, these generation studies indicate that all of the Yolo County jurisdictions have exceeded the 50% year goal. Also, as reported in the annual reports, all Yolo County jurisdictions have promoted and implemented additional, alternative and new programs including:

- Xeriscaping/Grasscycling (Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, County)
- School Source Reduction Programs (Davis)
- Residential Drop-Off Programs (West Sacramento)
- Commercial Self-Haul (Woodland, County)
- Government Recycling Programs (Davis, West Sacramento)

- Special Collection/Seasonal (West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland, County)
- Special Collection Events (Winters)
- Alternative Daily Cover (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Residential Curbside Greenwaste Collection (County)
- Residential Self-Haul Green Waste Programs (West Sacramento)
- Commercial Self-Haul Green Waste (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Food Waste Composting (West Sacramento)
- School Composting Programs (Davis)
- Sludge Diversion (West Sacramento)
- Tire Recycling (West Sacramento)
- Scrap Metal Recovery Programs (Davis, Woodland)
- Wood Waste Diversion (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Biomass Conversion (Woodland)

The County and cities would like to include, by reference, the year 2000 annual reports and the submitted waste generation studies as part of its CIWMP Five-Year Review Report. These materials include descriptions of the status of the above-cited programs, identification of new and alternative programs, and quantification of diversion tonnages by program.

Contingency Measures Planned to Ensure Compliance with PRC Section 41751. The County still views the MRF, composting facility, and bin transfer operation as contingent alternatives for future implementation, as necessary in later years. The County Planning and Public Works Department recently (March 1, 2002) released a notice of preparation and subsequent environmental impact report for permit revisions for the YCCL. The environmental documentation identifies the following operations as planned activities at the landfill so as to facilitate the future implementation of the following programs:

- Landfill mining of all waste management units;
- Construction and operation of a MRF at the landfill;
- Construction and operation of a composting facility at the landfill;
- Expanded salvage operations; and
- Conversion of the existing temporary household hazardous waste program to permanent status.

Mined waste would be processed with a trommel screen to separate it into three fractions: (1) metals and other recyclables; (2) an under-size fraction consisting of inert material and soil suitable for use as daily and intermediate cover material for landfill operations; and an over-sized fraction that would be disposed.

Furthermore, all selected educational and household hazardous waste management programs have been implemented by the jurisdictions in addition to diversion-promoting policies, such as:

- Ordinances (West Sacramento, Woodland)
- Economic Incentives (Davis, West Sacramento, Woodland, County)

Significant changes, which have occurred regarding the implementation of diversion programs, involve "program expansion". The County and cities continue to build upon prior years' experience and the increasing support of the general public to increase diversion quantities. The primary diversion programs have been built around the YCCL and through the authorized waste service providers. Nevertheless, the County and cities will explore innovative program enhancements, expansion, and new technology, as needed, to realize increased diversion levels.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The YCCL continues to have disposal capacity available for the solid waste generated but not diverted. Available capacity reported in the Y2K annual report by the County was 20 years. At current anticipated disposal levels, the facility is expected to provide disposal capacity until the year 2020. The County Siting Element (CSE) is kept current through the County's annual report and continues to be an applicable planning tool.

The goals and policies identified in the CSE are listed as:

- comply with regulations and standards, minimize environmental impacts, nuisances;
- eliminate knowing disposal of HHW at landfills;
- ensure long term disposal capacity;
- maximize cost-effectiveness and convenience;
- promote community awareness;
- consider regional approaches that are mutually convenient and beneficial;
- prevent solid waste facilities in incompatible land use areas;
- protect existing facilities from encroachment of incompatible land uses; and
- maintain an integrated waste management system based on AB 939 hierarchy.

These goals and policies continue to be applicable.

A siting criteria was developed and a siting process was described in the CSE, as required by the regulations. The CSE called for the continued use of YCCL and U.C. Davis Landfill.

Table 5-9. Countywide Diversion Program Implementation *

Program	Code	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
SOURCE REDUCTION								
Xeri/Grasscycling	1000			D	D	D	D	ABCDE
Backyard Composting	1010	ABCDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Business Waste Reduction	1020	ABCD	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABD	ABCDE
Procurement	1030	ABCDE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABDE
School Source Reduction	1040	E	E	E	E	E	E	AE
Govt Source Reduction	1050	ABCDE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABE	ABCDE
Material Exchange/Thrift	1060	ABCDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABCDE
RECYCLING								
Residential Curbside	2000	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Residential Drop-off	2010	ACE	ACE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE	ABCE
Buyback Centers	2020	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
Commercial Onsite Pickup	2030	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Commercial Self haul	2040	AB	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE	ABDE
Schools	2050	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Government Recycling	2060	E	E	E	E	E	E	ABE
Special Collection/Seasonal	2070	A	ACE	ACE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ABCDE
Special Collection Events	2080	BDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCD	BCD	BCD	ABCDE
Other/Business Recycling	2090							
MRF	7000	BCDE	B	B	B	B	B	E
Landfill	7010	BE	BE	BE	BE	BE	BE	BE
ADC	7040	AE	ADE	ADE	ADE	ADE	ADE	ABDE
COMPOSTING								
Residential Curbside GWC	3000	ABCD	ABD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCDE
Residential GW Self haul	3010		B	B	B	B	B	B
Commercial Onsite GW P/U	3020	BCD	B	B	B	B	B	ABC
Commercial GW Self haul	3030	E	DE	DE	DE	DE	DE	ABDE
Food Waste Composting	3040							AB
School Composting	3050	E	E	E	E	E	E	AE
Compost Facility	7030	ABCDE	ABE	ABE	ABE	AE	AE	AE
Other Facility (bin/transfer)	7050	ACDE						E
SPECIAL WASTE								
Sludge	4010	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	AB
Tire Recycling	4020	ACDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
White Goods	4030	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	BCDE	ABCDE
Scrap Metal	4040	BE	BDE	BDE	BDE	BDE	BDE	ABDE
Wood Waste	4050	ACE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ABCDE
Concrete, Asphalt, Rubble	4060	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE	ABCDE
Rendering	4090	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Other Special Waste (PVC)	4100	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
TRANSFORMATION/BIOMASS								
Biomass/Cogeneration	8010	ACE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE	ACDE
Transformation/Tires	8020	CE	CE	CE	CE	CE	CE	E
Other Transformation	8030	E	E	E	E	E	E	E

* Information obtained from jurisdictions' SRRE's, CIWMB SRRE approval agenda item, and annual reports for 2000.

Key: A: City of Davis; B: City of West Sacramento; C: City of Winters; D: City of Woodland; E: Yolo County Unincorporated