# Five–Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 require that each countywide or regional agency integrated waste management plan (CIWMP/RAIWMP), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised, if necessary, and submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) every five years. This Five–CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template was developed in an effort to provide a cost-effective method to streamline the Five–CIWMP/RAIWMP review and reporting process. The purpose of this Five–CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template is to document compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and to request Board approval of the Five–CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report findings.

After reviewing and considering the Local Task Force (LTF) comments submitted to the county or regional agency and the Board on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP that need revision, if any, the county or regional agency may use this template for its Five–CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report. The Five–County or Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Review Report Guidelines describe each section of this template and provide general guidelines with respect to preparing the report. Completed and signed reports should be submitted to the Office of Local Assistance (OLA) at the address below. Please know that upon submittal, OLA staff may request additional information if the details provided in this form are not clear or are not complete. Within 90 days of receiving a *complete* Five–CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report, OLA staff will review the request and prepare an agenda item with their findings for Board consideration.

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

California Integrated Waste Management Board
Office of Local Assistance, MS-25
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

Form can be unlocked and modified (e.g., adding rows to tables) by clicking on the "Protect Form" icon in the forms tool bar. If you have any questions, please contact your OLA representative at (916) 341-6199.

**General Instructions**

Please complete Sections 1 through 9, and then all other applicable subsections.

| **SECTION 1.0 COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five–Review Report on behalf of: | | | |
| County or Regional Agency Name<br>Contra Costa | | County<br>Contra Costa | |
| Authorized Signature | | Title<br>Solid Waste Program Manager | |
| Type/Print Name of Person Signing<br>Deidra Dingman | Date<br>6/12/2006 | Phone<br>(925) 335-1224 | |
| Person Completing This Form (please print or type)<br>see above | Title<br>see above | Phone<br>(925) 335-1224 | |
| Mailing Address<br>651 Pine St., 4th Floor - North Wing | City<br>Martinez | State<br>CA | Zip<br>94553 |
| E-mail Address<br>dding@cd.cccounty.us | | | |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**


| Section | Description | Page |
|---|---|---|
| **1.0** | **COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION** | **1** |
| **2.0** | **BACKGROUND** | **3** |
| **3.0** | **LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW** | **4** |
| **4.0** | **TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES** | **5** |
| | 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency | |
| | 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency | |
| | 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element and Summary Plan | |
| | 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities | |
| | 4.5 Programs that were Scheduled to be Implemented but were not | |
| | 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials | |
| | 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule | |
| **5.0** | **ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW** | **14** |
| **6.0** | **OTHER ISSUES** | **14** |
| **7.0** | **SUMMARY of FINDINGS** | **15** |
| **8.0** | **REVISION SCHEDULE** | **15** |
| **9.0** | **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** | **15** |

## SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is the county's second Five–Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP.

The jurisdictions in the county include Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Clayton, Concord,Danville, Lafayette, Martinez, Moraga, Orinda, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, San Ramon, Walnut Creek, the Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency and the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority.

☐ Each jurisdiction in the county has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. No petition for a reduction in to the 50% requirement or time extension has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.

☒ One or more of the jurisdictions in the county has an alternative diversion requirement or time extension. The details are provided in the table below.

| Jurisdiction | Type of Alternative Diversion Requirement | Diversion Requirement (%) | Goal/Extension Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| City of Antioch | Time Extension | | 12/2005 |
| City of Clayton | Alternative Diversion Requirement | 40% | 12/20003 |
| City of Orinda | Time Extension | | 12/2003 |
| City of Pleasant Hill | Time Extension | | 12/2004 |
| WCCIWMA | Time Extension | | 12/2005 |

**Additional Information** (e.g., recent regional agency formation, newly incorporated city, etc.)
The West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA) is a regional agency comprised of the City's of El Cerrito, Hercules, Pinole, Richmond and San Pablo.

Unincorporated Contra Costa, the City of Oakley and the Ironhouse Sanitary District comprise the Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency (CoCoRA).

## SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

1. The Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:
   ☐ Please see Attachment for additional information.

| Name | Representative Of (e.g., City or County) |
|---|---|
| Julie Haas-Wajdowicz | City of Antioch |
| Jon Carlson | City of Brentwood |
| Laura Hoffmeister | City of Clayton |
| Peter Dragovich | City of Concord |
| Bart Carr | City of Martinez |
| Laura Wright | City of Pittsburg |
| Annette Kaufmann | City of Pleasant Hill |
| Karen McNamara | City of San Ramon |
| Sharon Maves | Cities of Danville, Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda & Walnut Creek |
| Deidra Dingman | Contra Costa County (CoCoRA) |
| Steve Devine | West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA) |
| Dennis Nunn | Ironhouse Sanitary District (CoCoRA) |
| Barry Garfield | Kensington Community Services District (pocket of unincorporated) |

2. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP or RAIWMP and finalized its comments:
   ☐ At the LTF meeting.
   ☒ Other (Explain): The 5-year review was discussed with LTF members at meetings on July 22, 2005 and October 28, 2005. Members who elected to comment did so in writing, where appropriate.

3. The county received the written comments from the LTF on 10/4/2005, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the Five–CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to the Board and the LTF.

4. A copy of the LTF comments:
   ☐ is included as Appendix .
   ☒ was submitted to the Board on 6/12/2006.

5. In summary, the LTF comments conclude that the CoIWMP is adequate and no revision to the countywide planning documents is necessary.

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

The subsections below address not only the areas of change specified in the regulations, but also provide specific analysis regarding the continued adequacy the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

### Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

The following tables document the demographic changes in the county since 1990. The analysis addresses the adequacy of the planning documents in light of these changes and the need, if any, for revision.

☒ The residential/non-residential generation percentages have not changed significantly since the preparation of the planning documents.

☐ The residential/non-residential generation percentages have changed significantly since the preparation of the original planning documents. The following table documents the new percentages and the data source (i.e., corresponding Board-approved new generation study).

**Table 1. Sources of Generation**

| JURISDICTION | RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE | | NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OLD | NEW | OLD | NEW |
| City of | | | | |
| City of | | | | |
| City of | | | | |
| City of | | | | |
| Unincorporated Area | | | | |

Sources (e.g., Board-approved new or corrected 1999 generation study): n/a

**Table 2. Demographics***

| POPULATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Population For Each Jurisdiction** | **1995** | **2003** | **% Change** |
| City of Antioch | **75,800** | **99,100** | **31%** |
| City of Brentwood | **10,950** | **33,000** | **201%** |
| City of Clayton | **8,425** | **10,950** | **30%** |
| City of Concord | **115,000** | **124,700** | **8%** |
| City of Danville | **36,150** | **43,100** | **19%** |
| City of Lafayette | **23,250** | **24,350** | **5%** |
| City of Martinez | **34,400** | **36,800** | **7%** |
| City of Moraga | **15,950** | **16,500** | **3%** |
| City of Orinda | **16,900** | **17,800** | **5%** |
| City of Pittsburg | **51,300** | **60,900** | **19%** |
| City of Pleasant Hill | **31,250** | **33,600** | **8%** |
| City of San Ramon | **39,250** | **46,950** | **20%** |
| City of Walnut Creek | **61,600** | **65,800** | **7%** |
| West Contra Costa IWMA | **180,150** | **195,300** | **8%** |
| Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency | **168,600** | **183,850** | **9%** |
| **Countywide Population** | **869,200** | **992,700** | **14%** |
| **EMPLOYMENT** | | | |
| **Countywide Employment Factor** | **1995** | **2003** | **% Change** |
| Countywide Industry Employment | **292,700** | **336,300** | **15%** |
| Countywide Labor Force Employment | **429,900** | **489,000** | **14%** |
| **TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS** | | | |
| **Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction** | **1995** | **2003** | **% Change** |
| City of Antioch | **438,703** | **812,987** | **85%** |
| City of Brentwood | **87,786** | **232,542** | **106%** |
| City of Clayton | **23,884** | **34,355** | **44%** |
| City of Concord | **1,557,731** | **2,553,253** | **64%** |
| City of Danville | **234,558** | **351,488** | **50%** |
| City of Lafayette | **155,962** | **208.432** | **22%** |
| City of Martinez | **261,714** | **318,521** | **22%** |
| City of Moraga | **57,213** | **68,212** | **19%** |
| City of Orinda | **55,581** | **72,879** | **31%** |
| City of Pittsburg | **488,198** | **599,319** | **23%** |
| City of Pleasant Hill | **387,111** | **602,822** | **56%** |
| City of San Ramon | **517,257** | **652,307** | **26%** |
| City of Walnut Creek | **1,070,497** | **1,670,891** | **56%** |
| West Contra Costa IWMA | **1,255,853** | **1,864,173** | **48%** |
| Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency | **653,063** | **746,603** | **14%** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions** | **8,339,755** | **12,223,295** | **47%** |
| | | | |
| **Consumer Price Index (CPI)** | | | |
| | **1995** | **2003** | **% Change** |
| **Statewide CPI** | **154.0** | **190.4** | **24%** |
| **San Francisco Bay Area CPI** | **151.6** | **196.4** | **30%** |

*Source: ☒ Board's Default Adjustment Factors (http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp) ☒ Other: San Francisco CPI statistics from ABAG website (http://www.abag.ca.gov/abag/overview/datacenter/retail/cpi.html)

**Table 3. Dwelling Information**

| Jurisdiction | 2000 Single Family Dwellings | 2005 Single Family Dwellings | % Change | 2000 Multi-Family Dwellings | 2005 Multi-Family Dwellings | % Change | 2000 Mobile Homes | 2005 Mobile Homes | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Antioch** | **24,283** | **27,294** | **12%** | **5,564** | **5,861** | **5%** | **269** | **269** | **0%** |
| **Brentwood** | **6,768** | **12,683** | **87%** | **672** | **674** | **0.3%** | **348** | **351** | **0.9%** |
| **Clayton** | **3,873** | **3,929** | **1%** | **46** | **46** | **0%** | **5** | **5** | **0%** |
| **Concord** | **29,803** | **30,486** | **2%** | **13,904** | **14,280** | **3%** | **1,377** | **1,377** | **0%** |
| **Danville** | **14,179** | **14,570** | **3%** | **951** | **1,035** | **9%** | **0** | **0** | **0%** |
| **Lafayette** | **7,761** | **7,779** | **0.2%** | **1,573** | **1,657** | **5%** | **0** | **0** | **0%** |
| **Martinez** | **11,488** | **11,794** | **3%** | **3,085** | **3,095** | **0.3%** | **24** | **24** | **0%** |
| **Moraga** | **4,965** | **4,987** | **0.4%** | **788** | **788** | **0%** | **7** | **7** | **0%** |
| **Orinda** | **6,431** | **6,465** | **0.5%** | **306** | **306** | **0%** | **7** | **7** | **0%** |
| **Pittsburg** | **13,240** | **14,804** | **12%** | **4,390** | **4,596** | **5%** | **670** | **674** | **0.6%** |
| **Pleasant Hill** | **9,804** | **10,067** | **3%** | **4,169** | **4,174** | **0.1%** | **61** | **52** | **-15%** |
| **San Ramon** | **12,708** | **14,834** | **17%** | **4,833** | **5,063** | **5%** | **11** | **11** | **0%** |
| **Walnut Creek** | **16,823** | **17,053** | **1%** | **14,554** | **15,126** | **4%** | **48** | **48** | **0%** |
| **WCCIWMA** | **47,109** | **49,152** | **4%** | **21,162** | **22,021** | **4%** | **963** | **975** | **1%** |
| **CoCoRA** | **52,755** | **56,117** | **6%** | **9,011** | **10,007** | **11%** | **3,789** | **3,800** | **0.3%** |

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 City / County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-2004, with 2000 DRU Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2005.

*Analysis*

☒ These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

☐ These demographic changes warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

Although some jurisdictions have experienced higher rates of growth than others, these individual jurisdictions have established and/or expanded integrated waste management programs to address this growth. Additionally, as needed, jurisdcitions identify new "alternative" programs in their Annual Reports. Examples of new or enhanced programs include but are not limited to: expanded amount of materials collected curbside (e.g. separated yardwaste, co-mingled recycling, used oil/filters), expanded

outreach, volume based pricing for refuse collection service, on call curbside ewaste collection and construction & demolition (C&D) ordinances.

The majority of the growth occurred in Eastern Contra Costa County. The City of Brentwood experienced the most notable growth, which was primarily residential growth. The City has continued their residential single stream recycling and yard waste collection programs. These bi-weekly collection programs were expanded a few years ago to allow residents up to two carts for recycling or yard waste at no charge. Furthermore, to address increases in waste resulting from residential construction, Brentwood adopted a C&D Recycling Ordinance.

While the City of Antioch has seen significant growth in both population and taxable sales, the impacts of this growth on the waste generation is adequately being addressed by new "alternative" programs. The increase in taxable sales is the result of increased retail construction. To address this issue, most new commerical projects had recycling service as a requirement of their use permit. During plan check, projects are also evaluated to make sure they have adequate storage space for recycling and recyclable collection. The City of Antioch has implemented a C&D Ordinance to address the increase in construction related waste. A new franchise agreement for waste services will address recycling programs for all sectors of waste generators.

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

1. *Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency (as it relates to diversion program implementation)*

   The data below document changes in reported disposal compared to original SRRE projections. Additionally, the Biennial Review findings for each jurisdiction are provided in Table 6 below to demonstrate progress in implementing the SRRE and achieving diversion mandates. The analysis at the end of this section addresses how these changes are being addressed (e.g., how existing, new or planned programs deal with the reported changes in the quantities of waste) relative to the jurisdictions' ability to meet and maintain the diversion goal and the need, if any, for a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

**Disposal**

The following table provides disposal data for the county from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction's Annual Reports (1996 through 2003).

**Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)**

| Jurisdiction | 1990 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antioch | 51,297 | 63,971 | 67,396 | 64,744 | 78,328 | 74,789 | 86,357 | 90,238 | 84,012 |
| Brentwood | 9,112 | 11,171 | 12,730 | 13,858 | 18,149 | 19,368 | 18,972 | 24,252 | 32,024 |
| Clayton | 6,675 | 6,603 | 7,439 | 6,641 | 9,210 | 8,357 | 7,712 | 8,248 | 7,161 |
| Concord | 128,330 | 109,568 | 127,633 | 128,425 | 126,091 | 97,931 | 114,018 | 133,459 | 147,284 |
| Danville | 34,603 | 26,119 | 27,665 | 29,831 | 33,048 | 33,089 | 32,596 | 28,821 | 24,613 |
| Lafayette | 25,429 | 18,267 | 19,550 | 18,355 | 21,522 | 21,649 | 21,284 | 18,727 | 19,710 |
| Martinez | 41,379 | 36,091 | 36,126 | 31,517 | 40,585 | 38,117 | 40,378 | 41,708 | 40,736 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Moraga | 14,817 | 10,853 | 9,152 | 8,638 | 10,481 | 10,714 | 9,431 | 8,740 | 8,020 |
| Orinda | 18,356 | 11,475 | 12,464 | 13,305 | 13,437 | 13,901 | 13,366 | 11,676 | 12,132 |
| Pittsburg | 42,895 | 43,422 | 54,456 | 50,234 | 44,768 | 39,099 | 59,825 | 60,228 | 75,518 |
| Pleasant Hill | 34,359 | 27,210 | 28,871 | 31,061 | 34,954 | 32,874 | 31,286 | 31,628 | 31,569 |
| San Ramon | 47,488 | 35,299 | 36,538 | 37,381 | 42,755 | 44,242 | 41,711 | 40,198 | 45,538 |
| Walnut Creek | 91,444 | 62,906 | 58,685 | 59,302 | 65,640 | 70,669 | 83,067 | 69,074 | 57,059 |
| WCCIWMA | 224,151 | 170,363 | 174,573 | 194,923 | 194,842 | 199,176 | 210,726 | 229,228 | 223,353 |
| CoCoRA* | 185,384 | 103,703 | 132,715 | 144,121 | 156,568 | 131,042 | 124,258* | 122,978* | 138,141* |

*Contra Costa/Oakley/Ironhouse Regional Agency formed in 2001, data prior to that year is for Contra Costa Unincorporated.

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Orgin/WFOrgin.asp): Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary: http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/DRMCMain.asp

**Table 5. Comparison of SRRE-2003 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2003 Disposal Totals**

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the 2003 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

| Jurisdiction | SRRE 2003 Projected | Disposal 2003 Reported | % Difference |
|---|---|---|---|
| City of Antioch | 44,118 | 84,012 | 90% |
| City of Brentwood | 9,076 | 32,024 | 253% |
| City of Clayton | 8,665 | 7,161 | -17% |
| City of Concord | 119,531 | 147,284 | 23% |
| City of Danville | 21,347 | 24,613 | 15% |
| City of Lafayette | 11,958 | **19,710** | 65% |
| City of Martinez | 17,070 | **40,736** | 139% |
| City of Moraga | 7,508 | **8,020** | 7% |
| City of Orinda | 8,336 | **12,132** | 46% |
| City of Pittsburg | 27,822 | **75,518** | 171% |
| City of Pleasant Hill | 18,385 | **31,569** | 72% |
| City of San Ramon | 36,199 | **45,538** | 26% |
| City of Walnut Creek | 48,189 | **57,059** | 18% |
| WCCIWMA | 168,318 | **225,353** | 34% |
| CoCoRA* | 76,790 | 138,141 | 80% |

*Contra Costa/Oakley/Ironhouse Regional Agency formed in 2001.

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Orgin/WFOrgin.asp):

**Diversion**

The Biennial Review findings for the county and associated cities are listed in Table 6 to demonstrate each jurisdiction's progress in implementing its SRRE and achieving the mandated diversion requirements. Additionally, following these data is an explanation of any significant changes in diversion rate trends (e.g., report year tonnage modification, new or corrected Solid Waste Generation Study, newly implemented programs).

**Table 6. Biennial Review Data for County Jurisdictions ( 1995 to 2003 )**

| Jurisdiction | Year | Diversion Rate | Biennial Review Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| Antioch | 1995 | N/A% | Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1996 | N/A% | Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1997 | N/A% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | N/A% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 37% | Board Approved with New Base Year |
| | 2000 | 45% | Board Approved Time Extension |
| | 2001 | 38% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2002 | 37% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2003 | 45% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Brentwood | 1995 | 40% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 38% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 37% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 41% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 34% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 59% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet NBY |
| | 2001 | 61% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2002 | 53% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2003 | 49% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Clayton | 1995 | 18% | Board Approved Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1996 | 28% | Board Approved Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1997 | 25% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 37% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 17% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 25% | Board Approved Alternative Diversion Requireme |
| | 2001 | N/D% | Board Approved Alternative Diversion Requireme |
| | 2002 | 48% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet NBY |

| Jurisdiction | Year | Diversion Rate | Biennial Review Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2003 | 55% | Other: CIWMB Default Amounts |
| Concord | 1995 | 16% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 1996 | 28% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 1997 | 19% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 27% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | N/D% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 50% | Board Accepted New Base Year |
| | 2001 | 41% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2002 | 48% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort w/ New Base Y |
| | 2003 | 48% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Danville | 1995 | 34% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 32% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 42% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 40% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 48% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 51% | Board Approved |
| | 2001 | 53% | Board Approved |
| | 2002 | 55% | Board Approved |
| | 2003 | 62% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Lafayette | 1995 | 30% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 30% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 38% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 42% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 40% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2000 | 45% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2001 | 51% | Board Approved |
| | 2002 | 51% | Board Approved |
| | 2003 | 48% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Martinez | 1995 | N/D% | Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1996 | N/D% | Compliance Fulfilled |
| | 1997 | N/D% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | N/D% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 45% | Board Approved with New Base Year |
| | 2000 | 51% | Board Approved |
| | 2001 | 47% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |

| Jurisdiction | Year | Diversion Rate | Biennial Review Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2002 | 45% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2003 | 46% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Moraga | 1995 | 29% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 38% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 53% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 55% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 49% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2000 | 49% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2001 | 51% | Board Approved |
| | 2002 | 55% | Board Approved |
| | 2003 | 58% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Orinda | 1995 | 25% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 36% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 46% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 41% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 44% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 44% | Board Approved Time Extension |
| | 2001 | 49% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2002 | 55% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2003 | 53% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Pittsburg | 1995 | N/D% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | N/D% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | N/D% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 56% | Board Approved with New Base Year |
| | 1999 | 62% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 68% | Board Approved |
| | 2001 | 59% | Board Approved |
| | 2002 | 59% | Board Approved |
| | 2003 | 53% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Pleasant Hill | 1995 | 16% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 1996 | 29% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 1997 | 28% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 34% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 29% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 38% | Board Approved Time Extension |
| | 2001 | 40% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2002 | 38% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2003 | 37% | Preliminary Data Only |
| San Ramon | 1995 | 40% | Board Approved |

| Jurisdiction | Year | Diversion Rate | Biennial Review Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1996 | 37% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 53% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 49% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 53% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | 50% | Board Approved |
| | 2001 | N/D% | Board Approved |
| | 2002 | N/D% | Board Approved |
| | 2003 | 54% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet NBY |
| Walnut Creek | 1995 | 32% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 34% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 50% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 53% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | 44% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2000 | 47% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2001 | 44% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2002 | 45% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2003 | 55% | Preliminary Data Only |
| West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA) | 1995 | 37% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 33% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 34% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 29% | Board Accepted |
| | 1999 | N/A% | Board Approved |
| | 2000 | N/A% | Board Approved Time Extension |
| | 2001 | 41% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2002 | 36% | Biennial Review Not Completed Yet |
| | 2003 | 36% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Contra Costa/Ironhouse/Oakley Regional Agency (CoCoRA) | 1995 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 1996 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 1997 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 1998 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 1999 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 2000 | No Data% | Regional Agency Formation at a Later Date |
| | 2001 | 48% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2002 | 49% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2003 | 45% | Preliminary Data Only |
| Unincorporated Contra Costa County | 1995 | 49% | Board Approved |
| | 1996 | 54% | Board Approved |
| | 1997 | 38% | Board Accepted |
| | 1998 | 35% | Board Accepted |

| Jurisdiction | Year | Diversion Rate | Biennial Review Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1999 | 33% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2000 | 46% | Board Approved Good Faith Effort |
| | 2001 | No Data% | Member of a Regional Agency |
| | 2002 | No Data% | Member of a Regional Agency |
| | 2003 | No Data% | Member of a Regional Agency |

N/D=Not Determined
Sources (e.g., the Board's *Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report* http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp): CIWMB's Jurisidiction Diversion Rate Summary

Explanation of Disposal and Diversion Rate Trends (if applicable)
Since about 1997, detailed origin tracking (involving gathering address data during survey weeks) has been in place at a Central County transfer station to minimize misallocation of waste from unincorporated areas that share their neighboring city's name. As shown above, some cities/regional agencies have sought approval of new base years (e.g. Antioch, Concord, Martinez, Pittsburg), time extensions (e.g. Pleasant Hill, WCCIWMA) or alternative diversion requirements (e.g. Clayton) to address disposal/diversion rate issues. Additionally, in conjunction with their Annual Report, some jurisdictions have requested significant reporting year tonnage modifications related to disposal of certain Class II wastes. Below are several examples of new programs that have been implemented by jurisdictions to deal with changes in the waste stream.

As mentioned previously, the City of Brentwood, which experienced the largest growth, has adopted a C&D Recycling Ordinance to address the substantial amount of construction-related debrisgenerated from within Brentwood's borders.

The City of Antioch has a new franchise agreement that improves recycling programs for all sectors of the city. There will be a new curbside recycling program and garbage rate restructuring for residential customers, mandatory recycling for multi-family complexes and a new plan for commercial recycling. Staff hopes that this new agreement, in conjunction with the other programs already in place with be adequate to deal with the reported changes in quantities of waste.

The City of San Ramon recently negotiated a new franchise agreement which should incorporate new diversion avenues for San Ramon (including potential organic waste program and two HHW and/or e-waste events). Another factor in San Ramon for the years to come will be population growth with the new Dougherty Valley area (incorporating from County to the City upon completion) where development is occurring quickly at a rate of approximately 1000 homes a year. To help address this waste stream and generate additional diversion, the County adopted a C&D Ordinance in 2004 and the City of San Ramon is working on a C&D Ordinance

☒ These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided in the analysis section below.

☐ These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

2. *Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency*

The following addresses whether changes in permitted disposal capacity and waste quantities (both imported from out of county and generated in the county) affect the county's ability to maintain 15 years of disposal capacity and includes a determination regarding the need for planning document revision.

☒ The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., greater than 15 years). Supporting documentation is provided in Attachment (see Table E-2).

☐ The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity. The analysis below provides the strategy for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. Attached is a revision schedule for the SE.

*Analysis*
Remaining disposal capacity for all landfills in the County is identified each year in the Annual Report submitted by Contra Costa County. A copy of the data submitted with the County's 2003 Annual Report is attached as Table E-2 and it identifies a range of remaining site life between 39.4 and 69.2 years depending on the rate of incoming waste (incoming waste continues at existing levels; waste increases to maximum permitted amounts per day; or all waste generated within the County is disposed of within in-County landfills, which would exceed the amounts allowed under existing landfill permits).

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

The county has experienced the following changes in the funding of the SE or SP:

- There have not been any significant funding changes related to the administration of the County's SE or SP during the last five years.

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

☐ These changes in funding source for the administration of the SE and SP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

**Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities**

The county has experienced changes in the following administrative responsibilities:

- There has not been any significant change to the County's CoIWMP administrative responsibilities during the last five years.

*Analysis*

☒ These changes in administrative responsibilities do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.

☐ These changes in administrative responsibilities warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, .

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

1. Progress of Program Implementation

a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

☒ All program implementation information has been updated in the Board's Planning and Reporting Information System (PARIS), including the reason for not implementing specific programs, if applicable. Additionally, the analysis below addresses the progress of the programs that have been implemented.

☐ All program implementation information has not yet been updated in PARIS. Attachment lists the SRRE and/or HHWE programs selected for implementation but which have not been implemented, including a statement as to why they were not implemented. Additionally, the analysis below addresses the progress of the programs that have been implemented.

b. Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE)

☒ There have been no changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFE).

☐ Attachment lists changes in the use of nondisposal facilities (based on the current NDFE).

c. Countywide Siting Element (SE)

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SE.

☐ Attachment lists changes to the information provided in current the SE.

d. Summary Plan

☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current SP.

☐ Attachment lists changes to the information provided in current the SP.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting their Goals

☒ The programs are meeting their goals.

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

*Analysis*

☒ The aforementioned changes in program implementation do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

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

Changes in program implementation as well as the progress of programs implemented is addressed by each jurisdiciton in their Annual Reports. None of the changes in program implementation during the last five years warrant a revision to the CoIWMP.

**Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials**

The following discusses any changes in available markets for recyclable materials **including** a determination as to whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed.

Over the last five years there have not been any significant or sustained changes in available markets that have made the CoIWMP inadequate.

**Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule**

Below is discussion of changes in the implementation schedule and a determination as to whether these changes affect the adequacy of the CIWMP or the RAIWMP such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is necessary.

Over the last five years there have not been any significant changes in program implementation schedules that have made the CoIWMP inadequate. Jurisdictions note pertinent program implementation schedule changes in their Annual Reports, none of these schedule changes were considered significant enough to affect the adequacy of the CoIWMP.

**SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES**

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

n/a

## SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

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

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

.

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

None of the cities/regional agencies in the County have identified inadequacies of any CoIWMP elements in their Annual Reports during the last five years.

## SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY of FINDINGS by COUNTY

Although there have been demographic, programmatic and regulatory changes over the past five years, none of these changes affect the adequacy of the CoIWMP. Changes to programs and quantities disposed/diverted are being addressed annually by local cities/regional agencies, primarily through their Annual Reports. Additionally, to supplement programs implemented at the jurisdiction level, cities/regional agencies within the County continue to seek opportunities to collaborate on new/expanded programs to maximize potential diversion.

## SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if any)

n/a

## SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

- n/a
-
-

**Table E-2: Estimated Remaining Capacity and Site Life**
**For Contra Costa County Landfills, as of January 1, 2004**

| Landfill | Remaining Capacity Cubic Yds | Remaining Capacity Tons | Average TPD[/4/] | Tons Disposed 2003 | Maximum Permitted TPD | Site Life in Years at Avg. Daily | Site Life in Years at Max. Daily | Site Life in Years at County Avg.[/5/] | Days Operation Per Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Keller Canyon LF[/1/] | 63,530,563 | 36,847,727 | 2,375 | 789,458 | 2,750 | 49.7 | 42.9 | 38.0 | 312 |
| Acme LF[/2/] | 578,648 | 347,189 | 69 | 16,950 | 1,500 | 16.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 312 |
| WCCSL[/3/] | 1,670,931 | 960,785 | 815 | 291,085 | 2,500 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 360 |
| TOTAL | 65,780,142 | 38,155,701 | 3,259 | 1,097,493 | 6,750 | 69.2 | 44.8 | 39.4 | |

Notes:

/1/ Remaining Capacity as of January 1, 2004 based on aerial survey conducted Feb. 12, 2004, and adjusted back using average daily disposal for 2003. Tonnage figures based on in-place density of 1,160 pounds per cubic yard.

/2/ Remaining Capacity based on aerial survey conducted January 31, 2004, and adjusted back to January 1, 2004 using average daily receipt for 2003. Note that remaining capacity reflects a height expansion approved for the landfill in October, 2004. JTD estimates closure date of Jun, 2021. Based on in-place waste density of 1,200 pounds per cubic yard.

/3/ Remaining Capacity as reported as of June 1, 2004, and adjusted back to January 1, 2004 using average daily disposal for 2004. WCCSL received CIWMB concurrence in a revised SWFP in December, 2004 that includes a height increase from 130 feet to 160 feet, and which is reflected in the figures presented; however, the facility's WDRs require closure by January 31, 2006. Tonnage figures are based on in-place waste density of 1,150 pounds per cubic yard.

/4/ For each landfill, this figure represents the average of daily receipts for the years 2001, 2002, and 2003.

/5/ Projected annual average of 969,632 tons per year based on average reported annual disposed waste from all Contra Costa County jurisdictions for the period 2001--2003.

Sources:

CIWMB Disposal Reports
Eric Fung, CCEH, personal communication with Dan Sicular, 3/2/05 re: Keller Canyon Landfill.
Acme Landfill Operations and Site Life Summary, September 9, 2004, prepared by Acme Landfill, and provided by CCEH.
West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill, Remaining Landfill Capacity report, March 2005.
Vince Spencer, CCEH, personal communication with Dan Sicular, 2/23/05 re: Acme Landfill.