SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

2007 FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

FINAL

DECEMBER 2007

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT

November 1997
Revised December 2007

Final Report

Prepared by

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION
Planning and Permitting Section
222 W. Hospitality Lane, Second Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0017

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Description	Page
CHAPTER 1.0	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	**1**
Purpose and Requirements	1
Current Solid Waste Management System	2
System Needs	3
Recommended and Implemented Programs	3
CHAPTER 2.0	
INTRODUCTION	**5**
Background	5
Purpose	6
Local Task Force	6
CHAPTER 3.0	
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES	**7**
Summary	7
Countywide Goals	7
Countywide Objectives	8
Countywide Policies	9
Implementation Schedule	10
CHAPTER 4.0	
FINDINGS OF THE FIVE-YEAR REPORT	**12**
(California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 18788(a)(3) [A Through H])	
Overview	12
Diversion Rate Measurement	12
New and Revised Base Year Studies Rate Measurement	12
Demographics	14
Quantities of Waste	18
Funding Sources	23
Administrative Responsibilities	24
Program Implementation	24
Source Reduction Programs	24
Recycling Programs	24
Household Hazardous	24
Nondisposal Facilities	25

COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Description	Page
Permitted Disposal Facilities	29
Recent Events Affecting Countywide Disposal Capacity	29
Permitted Disposal Capacity	29
Planned Disposal Capacity	30
Available Markets	35
Recycling Market Development Zones	35
Implementation Schedule	38
CHAPTER 5	
CONCLUSION	**40**
Overview	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	**Diversion Rate and Biennial Review Status (1995-2005)**	**13**
Table 2A	**Countywide Population Trends by Jurisdiction**	**15**
Table 2B	**Countywide Employment**	**16**
Table 2C	**Consumer Price Index**	**16**
Table 2D	**Taxable Sales Transaction (in thousands of dollars)**	**17**
Table 3A	**Waste Generation Per Capita (1990-2005)**	**19**
Table 3B	**Countywide (1995-2000) Diversion Rates versus (2000-2005) Diversion Rates**	**20**
Table 4	**Disposal Tonnage Trends (1995-2005)**	**21**
Table 5	**Offices Responsible for Solid Waste Administration**	**26**
Table 6	**Summary of Nondisposal Facilities**	**27**
Table 7A	**San Bernardino County Systemwide Landfill Site Life Assessment**	**31**
Table 7B	**Countywide Landfill Capacity**	**32**
Table 7C	**15-Year Estimate of Refuse Generation for Disposal**	**32**
Table 7D	**Systemwide Landfill Diminishing Capacity**	**33**
Table 8	**Countywide Diversion Program Implementation (1995-2005)**	**39**
Table 9	**Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Five-Year City/County Review Summary**	**41**

CHAPTER 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

State law requires counties in California, in conjunction with their cities, to prepare a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) to reduce dependence on landfilling solid waste, and to ensure an effective and coordinated effort to safely manage solid waste generated within the state. In order to reach these goals, the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (known as AB 939 or the IWM Act) was enacted by the California Legislature and set forth policies and mandated requirements for state and local governments. The highest priority is to reduce the amount of waste generated at its source (source reduction). The second set of priorities is: reuse, extending the life of existing products; recycling of materials as feed stock for the manufacture of new products; and composting of organic materials. Source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting are jointly referred to as waste diversion methods, because they divert materials from landfill disposal. The third priority in the hierarchy is disposal by transformation and then landfilling. Jurisdictions were required by IWMA to reduce the amount of waste disposed by 25 percent by 1995 and by 50 percent by the year 2000, using 1990 as the base year. The County Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) is one of the requirements of IWMA and it is the guiding document for attaining the reduction mandate.

The CIWMP consists of a Countywide Siting Element, a Countywide Summary Plan, and the following three elements: (1) a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), which analyzes the local waste stream to determine where to focus diversion efforts, and presents diversion programs and funding; (2) a Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), which includes programs to encourage safe management of household toxics waste and provides a framework for recycling, treatment, proper disposal and funding. Finally (3) a Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE), which lists existing and planned transfer stations, material recovery facilities, and composting facilities located in and available to each designated jurisdiction within the county.

The County's Countywide Siting Element (CSE) is a document "which provides a description of the areas to be used for development of adequate transformation or disposal capacity" (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 41700). The CSE demonstrates that the County has sufficient disposal capacity to provide a minimum of 15 years of solid waste disposal for its jurisdictions. The CSE serves as a policy manual, rather than a specific development program. It provides strategies for meeting the County's disposal needs.

The Siting Element was formally approved by the CIWMB in 1997. Since that time, the CSE has had three amendments (1998, 2000 and 2005) to reflect changes in the County's solid waste system. The 2005 Amendment No. 3 to the Countywide Siting Element was completed and processed in accordance with State laws and regulations as required by the Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41700 through 41721.5 and the California Code of Regulations Title 14 (14 CCR), Sections

18776 through 18788 to reflect the Victorville and Barstow Sanitary Landfill Expansion projects approved by the County Board of Supervisors on May 17, 2005, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) in October 2005.

The County's Countywide Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE), which lists facilities that are or will be used to implement diversion programs in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element, was also amended during the last five years. The 2007 NDFE Amendment No. 7 was completed and processed in accordance with State law and regulations as required by Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41732 and 41733, and the California Code of Regulations Title (14 CCR) Sections 18752 through 18754 to show the location of the Nursery Products, Hawes Composting Facility. The NDFE was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on January 9, 2007, and by the CIWMB on July 17, 2007. The City of Chino amended their NDFE and presented information at the April 2006 SWAT meeting for the Viramontes Express Compostable Materials Handling Operation to be included in the CIWMP Table 6 (Summary of Nondisposal Facilities) as one of the jurisdiction's Source Reduction and Recycling Element programs for waste diversion.

Table 6 (Summary of Non-Disposal Facilities) lists all of the existing and currently planned non-disposal facilities in the county to be used by the cities and the county, the location of each facility, and the jurisdictions within their sphere of influence.

The Countywide Summary Plan contains countywide integrated waste management goals and policies that profile the County's current waste as well as a summary of integrated waste management issues faced by the County and strategies being utilized in its approach to these issues. It summarizes waste management programs designated by the County's jurisdictions to meet their 50 percent waste reduction mandates. It also suggests steps necessary to cooperatively implement and administer specific programs regionally or countywide. The Summary Plan is to be viewed for updating every five years along with any of the elements of the CIWMP. The first Summary Plan was approved by the CIWMB in 1997. This is the second five-year review of the CIWMP.

II. CURRENT SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Each jurisdiction in the region is responsible for its own integrated solid waste management planning, implementation, monitoring, public information, budgeting, and enforcement. In some cases, these responsibilities may be delegated to a franchised hauler. The County has created franchise areas (except in the most sparsely populated area east of the City of Barstow), so that residents of unincorporated areas, particularly city spheres, can have compatible recycling services to those nearby city residents.

III. SYSTEM NEEDS

The Countywide disposal system includes nine (9) landfills, thirteen (13) transfer stations, which includes five (5) limited volume transfer operations (LVTO), owned and operated by the San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division and four (4) privately owned transfer stations.

The County and the cities have implemented several programs to achieve the state's mandated fifty percent (50%) diversion requirement. Most of the 25 jurisdictions in the County saw an increase in their diversion rate from 1995 to 2000. Those increases ranged from two (2) percentage points to thirty-two (32) percentage points in the 1995 to 2002 five-year period. Seven jurisdictions have reached or exceeded the 50% goal. Two cities received a "good faith effort" designation for the year 2000. Ten other jurisdictions have a diversion rate between 41% and 50%. Six jurisdictions are between 33%, and 40% and only one is below 30%. The percentage points that are included in this five-year review period for the year 2005 are preliminary due to jurisdictions' requesting time extensions from the CIWMB. The diversion performance for the County and each city is identified in Table 1 (Diversion Rate and Biennial Review Status [1995-2005]).

The County's unincorporated area diversion rate is currently forty-nine percent (49%). Many of the jurisdictions' solid waste customers already have a significant portion of their waste diverted through curbside recycling programs; however, residential and commercial self-haul customers that take their waste to disposal facilities have had limited diversion opportunities. The County is implementing its Comprehensive Disposal Site Diversion Program (CDSDP) at County owned disposal facilities to divert self-hauled residential and commercial waste.

IV. RECOMMENDED AND IMPLEMENTED PROGRAMS

Implementation of programs planned in the jurisdictions' SRREs, as updated in their annual reports, are designed to improve their diversion rates by diverting 50 percent of all solid waste on and after January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. The implementation of the County's Comprehensive Disposal Site Diversion Program (CDSDP) at County owned disposal facilities will target and divert construction and demolition materials, green and wood waste, bulky items, tires and other recyclable materials.

The implementation of the CDSDP is based on the 2006 pilot program conducted at the Victorville Sanitary Landfill, which was approved by the Local Enforcement Agency. The program was determined to be effective in increasing the diversion of commercial and self-haul wastes at the landfill. SWMD proposes the implementation of the CDSDP on a regional basis at County landfills in conjunction with associated transfer stations. The CDSDP was recommended for implementation by the Local Solid Waste Advisory Task Force (SWAT) on October 18, 2006 and approved by the Board of Supervisors on January 9, 2007.

The CDSDP is seen as a solution to refuse and construction/demolition debris that is not currently being recycled, which consist of self-haulers, businesses and roll off boxes. The program is designed to assess approximately 600,000 eligible tons, then separate approximately 300,000 tons or 50% of the eligible tons for processing, and divert approximately 150,000 tons or 25% of the eligible tons.

Eligible and Ineligible Tons

The CDSDP classifies all materials coming into a disposal site as eligible or ineligible tonnage. Eligible tonnage is waste that is not subject to a recycling program prior to arriving at the disposal site and self-haul or in roll-off boxes. Ineligible tonnage has been subject to a recycling program or is classified as restricted waste or non-waste material. Based on the incoming waste streams concentration, end-use markets availability, regulatory mandates, and recovery costs, other eligible materials maybe targeted for diversion by the program. The CDSDP, for the unincorporated area, is expected to garner 2-3% in diversion.

The degree of diversion obtainable depends on several factors, including the changing nature of refuse within a local economy, approval of establishment of processing facilities and market demand for underutilized divertible materials. A cooperative effort among all jurisdictions of the county to generate local markets for recycled materials is important to sustain and support the recovery of recyclables from the waste stream. Public education and changes in lifestyles are needed for consumers to buy products with minimal packaging, which can be reused, and that are made from recycled materials. Remaining vigilant of new technologies that are continually under development is necessary to provide ways to recover reuse, and recycle waste materials. Providing more programs to promote and assist industry to use recycled content materials would help make the County's CDSDP more effective.

A list of goals, objectives, and policies developed by the SWAT in 1996 is shown on page 31 in Chapter 4 to address the development of markets for recyclable materials.

CHAPTER 2.0
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its SRRE and 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.

In July of 2000 the CIWMB provided clarification for the Board's oversight of the five-year revision process beyond that which is indicated in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788. Section 18788 states that, prior to the fifth anniversary of the CIWMB Board approval of the CIWMP, a County's AB 939 Local Task Force (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. In San Bernardino County, the AB 939 Local Task Force (LTF) is called the Solid Waste Advisory Task Force, or "SWAT".

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is: (1) Source reduction; (2) Recycling and composting; and (3) Environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal

The process for the CIWMP Five-Year Review identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- Prior to the 5th year 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 Five-Year Review Report***.

- Within 90 days of receipt of the ***CIWMP Five-Year 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 Five-Year 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
(H) Changes in the implementation schedule

PURPOSE

The purpose of this ***CIWMP Five-Year Review Report*** is twofold: (1) to document the compliance of San Bernardino 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 San Bernardino County to achieve increased levels of diversion.

LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

The San Bernardino County Solid Waste Advisory Task Force (SWAT) is the County's Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (LTF). SWAT meets biannually in April and October and its propose is to provide advice and assistance to the cities and the County on the Siting Element, other CIWMP components, and other integrated waste management issues in complying with the IWMA. The Local Task Force is comprised of elected officials; city and county solid waste and recycling officials; representatives of solid waste and recycling industries; representatives of environmental groups; and representatives from the general public. The LTF standing Technical Committee also meets twice each year in March and in September. The CIWMP countywide elements were prepared with coordination and input from the SWAT.

This document was reviewed by the SWAT in October 2007, with SWAT comments due to the County by November 5, 2007 (Attachment 1: Table 9 [Countywide City and County 2007 Five-Year Review Summary]).

CHAPTER 3
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICES

SUMMARY

This chapter of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan describes the goals, policies and objectives of the county for coordinating efforts to divert, market, and dispose of solid waste during the planning period through the year 2017. Requirements for this chapter are in California Code of Regulations Section 18757.1.

COUNTYWIDE GOALS

To ensure an effective and economical integrated waste management system throughout the county, all of the cities via the (Solid Waste Advisory Task Force [SWAT]) in conjunction with the County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division, developed goals, objectives and policies to encourage jurisdictions in the County of San Bernardino to work together to comply with the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act. Chapter 4 of this Summary Plan contains the goals and policies developed for marketing of recyclable materials. The Countywide Siting Element contains the goals and policies relating to the siting of new or expanded disposal facilities. Every local jurisdiction is encouraged to use the listed goals, objectives, and polices as applicable, and coordinate their efforts and conserve their resources.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR SOURCE REDUCTION/DIVERSION DEFINITIONS

Goals are the desired outcome; the vision. The following goals are components of the future Countywide IWM system, which will emphasize source reduction, recycling, composting and reduce dependency on disposal as well as promote conservation of landfill capacity and natural resources.

GOAL I. Achieve Integrated Waste Management Act objectives of 50% diversion.

- Implement short-term programs
  - Source reduction (backyard composting, waste audits)
  - Recycling (residential curbside and commercial/industrial)
  - Composting (curbside collection, development of processing facilities)
  - Education and public information

- Implement medium-term programs
  - Source reduction (quantity based rates)
  - Recycling (recovery and processing facilities)
  - Composting (mixed waste composting)
  - Education and public information

- Participate in the development of regional material processing facilities and local composting facilities.

- Review waste characterization information to find ways to increase diversion.

- Develop new programs or focus existing programs on large recyclable portions of waste stream.

GOAL II. Support existing diversion programs and work together toward economically feasible diversion programs and facilities to conserve efforts and resources.

- Review adjacent jurisdictions' programs to find compatibility.

- Adopt enabling franchising ordinance to enhance diversion efforts and broaden programs.

- Negotiate franchising agreements that include recycling services to provide additional recycling opportunities.

GOAL III. Eliminate barriers and create opportunities for diversion program implementation.

- Review and change prohibitive local ordinances.

- Lobby State agencies to change prohibitive ordinances.

- Create new opportunities to reuse or compost diverted materials.

- Review use of incentives, such as variable can rates.

- Network with other jurisdictions to share information on successful and non-successful ideas.

COUNTYWIDE PLAN OBJECTIVES

Objectives are specific and measurable actions; the milestones. The following objectives are meant to assist local jurisdictions in implementing the IWM Act hierarchy of: 1) reducing the production of waste at its source; 2) recycling, and (3) composting.

The overall objectives of this plan are as follows:

OBJECTIVE 1: Divert 50 percent of all solid waste on and after January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities.

OBJECTIVE 2: Develop reduction, recovery, and reuse goals for recyclable materials and focus programs on materials that make up a large portion of the waste stream.

OBJECTIVE 3: Coordinate or combine similar programs in neighboring jurisdictions to achieve economies of scale and potentially reduce costs to ratepayers.

OBJECTIVE 4: Enhance waste collection services by including recycling programs.

OBJECTIVE 5: Eliminate ordinances and other barriers which discourage recycling or composting.

OBJECTIVE 6: Explore incentives to encourage source reduction and recycling.

COUNTYWIDE POLICIES

Policies are strategies for meeting the specific goals; the guidelines. The following policies are aimed at reducing the amount of waste disposed and cooperatively implementing programs identified in each jurisdiction's SRRE and HHWE, as well as developing markets for recyclable materials.

POLICY A: Utilize or implement programs identified in the Source Reduction and Reduction Elements (SRREs) or alternative programs so that recyclable materials may feasibly be reduced at the source, recycled, or composted.

POLICY B: Implement recycling procurement policy by expanding the purchase of recycled/recyclable materials and by encouraging contractors to use recycled materials

POLICY C: Continue educational programs for the general public, schools, and businesses.

POLICY D: Cooperatively establish and expand recycling programs regionally or Countywide.

POLICY E: Network with other jurisdictions to learn about successful diversion programs.

POLICY F: Support expedited local and state permit processing for recycling/composing facilities.

POLICY G: Pursue state grants for establishing and enhancing diversion programs.

POLICY H: Utilize the Solid Waste Advisory Task Force as a forum for roundtable discussions on regional or Countywide issues regarding AB 939.

Note: Goals IV, V, Objectives 7-10, and Policies I-P, that were added in 1996 and were included as part of the Summary Plan, are referenced in Chapter 4 on page 31.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Table 1 (Diversion Rate and Biennial Review Status [1995-2005]) identifies the required diversion and biennial review status of each jurisdiction and the compliance status of their diversion programs with the CIWMB.

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS OF THE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

OVERVIEW

The CIWMP was reviewed and it was found that the component 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, including the County's four Recycling Market Development Zones.

The goals, objectives, and policies in the elements are still applicable and consistent with applicable laws and regulations. The selected programs for each component were reviewed. Nearly all programs have been implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County unincorporated area and each city are up-to-date, in that the 2005 reports have been submitted for review by the CIWMB. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs and results, these changes are not considered to be significant enough to require revision of the CIWMP.

DIVERSION RATE MEASUREMENT

The diversion performance for the County and each city is identified on the following page in Table 1 (Diversion Rate and Biennial Review Status [1995-2005]).

Most of the 25 jurisdictions in the County saw an increase in their diversion rate from 1995 to 2000. The increases ranged from two percentage points to 32 percentage points in this five-year period. The 25 jurisdictions in the County are making significant progress toward the AB 939 goal of 50% diversion. Seven jurisdictions have reached or exceeded the 50% goal. Eleven other jurisdictions have a diversion rate between 41% and 50%. Six jurisdictions are between 33% and 40% and only one is below 30%.

The CIWMB biennial review of each jurisdiction's compliance status for 2005 is as follows: six have received Board approval, sixteen have requested time extensions, two have received a "good faith effort" designation and one is under compliance.

NEW AND REVISED BASE YEAR STUDIES

Seventeen jurisdictions (Adelanto, Apple Valley, Barstow, Big Bear Lake, Chino, Colton, Fontana, Hesperia, Highland, Loma Linda, Needles, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Twentynine Palms, Victorville, Yucaipa, and the County unincorporated area) have either revised their base years or conducted new base year studies since 1990, and have had those studies approved by the CIWMB.

Table 1
Diversion Rate and Biennial Review Status (1995-2005)

Jurisdiction	1995 Diversion	2000 Diversion	2004 Diversion	Biennial Review Status
Adelanto[1]	N/A	37%	No Rate	Under Compliance
Apple Valley	19%	43%	25	Time Extension
Barstow	25%	57%	54	Approved
Big Bear Lake	N/A	59%	70	Approved
Chino	24%	51%	56	Time Extension
Chino Hills	34%	42%	61	Approved
Colton	32%	41%	57	Approved
Fontana	20%	53%	49	Approved Good Faith Effort
Grand Terrace	30%	52%	48	Approved Good Faith Effort
Hesperia	39%	41%	54	Time Extension
Highland	31%	27%	42	Time Extension
Loma Linda	N/A	37%	37	Time Extension
Montclair	28%	43%	45	Time Extension
Needles[1]	24%	33%	11	Time Extension
Ontario	N/A	37%	51	Time Extension
Cucamonga	26%	35%	52	Time Extension
Redlands	35%	45%	39	Time Extension
Rialto	43%	51%	43	Time Extension
San Bernardino	23%	44%	45	Time Extension
Twentynine Palms[2]	40%	37%	60	Approved
Upland	23%	41%	44	Time Extension
Victorville	22%	45%	35	Time Extension
Yucaipa	38%	41%	39	Time Extension
Yucca Valley	58%	65%	62	Approved
Unincorporated, County	44%	43%	49	Time Extension

Source: CIWMB web-site.

[1] Requested Adjustment to 1990 base year to reflect adjusted Board of Equalization disposal.

[2] Requested 1990 base year adjustment to capture Twenty-nine Palms Marine Base annexation.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Until 1990, San Bernardino County experienced unprecedented growth, primarily due to the influx of people from other states because of our climate, lifestyle and available jobs. Affordable housing continues to attract residents from neighboring Los Angeles and Orange Counties. From 1970 to 1990, the County's population more than doubled from 685,300 persons to 1,418,380. Residential housing and business growth followed that same pattern during that time period.

San Bernardino County's population, from 2000-2006, grew from 1,709,434 people to 1,999,332, a gain of 289,898 or 17% in six years (Table 2A [Population Trend by Jurisdiction]). In this same period, the State of California population increased 2,585,901, a gain of 7.6%. San Bernardino County ranked second in size among the inland region's counties. Among the state's projected five largest counties by population at mid-century, San Bernardino County is listed as fifth in population.

Over 80% of the population lives in the incorporated areas of the cities and towns within the County. Countywide, as of January 1, 2007, there were 676,909 housing units of which about 75% were single family residences, 19% were multiple dwelling units and 6% were mobile homes. Approximately 80% of the County's population and housing is located in the Valley region. The Mountain region has significant seasonal population changes due to recreational uses such as skiing. Approximately 73% of Big Bear area housing is comprised of weekend rental cabins and second homes.

Pursuant to CCR Section 18757.3, the following information is provided. The Census data from the year 2000 on race and ethnicity shows that approximately 44% of County's residents are white non-Hispanic, 8.8% are black, 39.2% are Hispanic, 4.6% are Asian, Pacific Islander 0.3%, 0.2% Native American, other 0.2% and 2.5% are Multi-Racial (2000 Census data developed by the County Department of Economic and Community Development). The 2000 Census indicated that the County's population is diverse and young: the median resident age is 28 years compared to the California median age of 33 years. The estimated population in July 2006 was 1,999,332 (the population percent change, April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006 was 17%). The estimated median household income in 2005 was $47,501 (it was $42,066 in 2000), which was less than the statewide average of $53,629.

The County's population currently is over 2 million, with growth in individual jurisdictions ranging from -9% to 113%. As of January, 2007, San Bernardino County has a population estimate of 2,028,013 as reported by the California Department of Finance.

Tables 2A (Population Trend by Jurisdiction), 2B (Countywide Employment), 2C (Consumer Price Index [CPI]), and 2D (Taxable Sales Transaction) depict demographic trends from 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2006.

Table 2A
Countywide Population Trends by Jurisdiction

				1990-2000				2000-2006	
Jurisdictions	1990	2000	2006[3]	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change
Adelanto[1]	8,517	18,130	27,139	9,613	113%	11.30%	9,009	50%	8.30%
Apple Valley	46,078	57,000	70,297	10,922	24%	2.40%	13,297	23%	4.00%
Barstow	21,472	23,300	23,943	1,828	9%	0.90%	643	3%	0.50%
Big Bear Lake[1]	5,351	6,352	6,207	1,001	18%	1.90%	(-)145	(-)1.6%	(-)0.4%
Chino	59,682	66,700	81,224	7,018	12%	1.20%	14,524	22%	4.00%
Chino Hills[2]	56,682	60,200	78,668	3,518	6%	0.60%	18,468	31%	5.10%
Colton[1]	40,273	47,350	51,797	7,077	18%	1.80%	4,447	9%	1.60%
Fontana	87,535	117,400	181,640	29,865	34%	3.40%	64,240	55%	9.10%
Grand Terrace	10,946	13,550	12,380	2,604	24%	2.40%	(-)1,170	(-)9%	(-)14.1%
Hesperia	50,418	63,600	85,876	13,182	26%	2.60%	22,276	35%	5.80%
Highland	34,439	44,450	52,186	10,011	29%	2.90%	7,736	17%	2.90%
Loma Linda[1]	18,470	22,300	22,451	3,830	2%	2.10%	151	1%	0.70%
Montclair	28,434	30,950	36,622	2,516	9%	0.90%	5,672	18%	3.10%
Needles	5,191	5,925	5,759	734	14%	1.40%	-166	(-)3%	(-).5%
Ontario	133,179	151,500	172,701	18,321	14%	1.40%	21,201	14%	2.30%
Rancho Cucamonga	101,409	125,600	172,331	24,191	24%	2.40%	46,731	37%	6.20%
Redlands	60,395	67,800	71,375	7,405	12%	1.20%	3,575	5%	0.90%
Rialto	72,395	83,700	99,064	11,305	16%	1.60%	15,364	18%	3.10%
San Bernardino	164,676	186,400	205,010	21,724	13%	1.30%	18,610	10%	1.70%
Twentynine Palms	11,821	15,100	24,830	3,279	28%	2.80%	9,730	64%	11%
Upland	63,374	68,800	75,169	5,426	9%	0.90%	6,369	10%	1.50%
Victorville	40,674	64,500	102,538	23,826	59%	5.90%	38,038	59%	10%
Yucaipa[2]	32,819	39,850,	51,784	7,031	21%	2.10%	11,934	30%	5%
Yucca Valley	13,701	19,200	21,044	5,499	40%	4%	1,844	10%	1.60%
County Unincorporated	322,557	292,300	295,978	-30,257	(-10)	(-)1%	3,678	1%	0.20%
San Bernardino County	1,418,380	1,709,434	1,999,332	291,054	21%	2.10%	289,898	17%	2.80%
State of California	29,760,021	33,871,648	36,457,549	4,111,627	14%	1.40%	2,585,901	7.60%	1.30%

Source: CIWMB web-site.
[1]U.S. Census Bureau and Calfornia Department of Finance.
[2]State Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for cities, counties and state, 01-01-1990.
[3]State Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for cities,counties and state, 01-01-2007.

Table 2B: Countywide Employment									
				1990-2000			2000-2006		
	1990	2000	2006[1]	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change
San Bernardino County	602,000	695,700	840,700	93,700	16%	2%	145,000	21%	3.50%
State of California	14,525,500	16,027,100	17,064,400	1,501,600	10%	1%	1,037,300	7%	1.10%

[1]Source: State of California Employment Development Department.

Table 2C: Consumer Price Index* (CPI)									
				1990-2000			2000-2006		
San Bernardino County	1990	2000	2006[1]	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change
	136	172	202	36	27%	3%	30	17%	2.90%

Source: CIWMB web-site.
*Data for Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside Counties.
[1]California Department of Finance, August 2006.

Table 2D
Taxable Sales (in thousands of dollars)

					1990-2000			2000-2005	
Jurisdictions	1990	2000[1]	2005[1]	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change	Numeric Change	% Change	Average Annual Rate of Change
Adelanto	19,738	62,472	113,518	42,734	217%	22%	51,046	82%	16%
Apple Valley	98,582	202,701	312,502	104,119	106%	11%	109,801	54%	11%
Barstow	279,686	415,552	515,747	135,866	49%	5%	100,195	24%	5%
Big Bear Lake	91,164	143,853	192,135	52,167	58%	6%	48,282	34%	7%
Chino	503,324	1,181,638	1,512,949	678,314	135%	14%	331,311	28%	6%
Chino Hills	n/a	236,464	418,716	n/a	n/a	n/a	182,252	77%	15%
Colton	407,598	575,575	970,911	167,977	41%	4%	395,336	69%	14%
Fontana	602,676	1,054,250	1,955,036	451,574	75%	8%	900,786	85%	17%
Grand Terrace	29,857	45,274	79,169	15,417	52%	5%	33,895	79%	15%
Hesperia	257,288	344,077	614,039	86,789	34%	3%	269,962	79%	16%
Highland	73,192	106,036	115,151	32,844	45%	5%	91,692	87%	17%
Loma Linda	97,662	233,182	255,894	135,520	139%	14%	22,712	10%	2%
Montclair	778,982	954,684	1,264,502	175,702	23%	2%	309,818	33%	7%
Needles	46,439	39,134	45,365	-7,305	-16%	(-)1.9%	6,231	16%	3%
Ontario	1,264,753	3,383,624	5,308,705	2,118,871	168%	17%	1,925,081	57%	11%
Rancho Cucamonga	1,476,610	1,163,045	2,210,171	-313,565	27%	(-)2.6%	1,047,126	90%	18%
Redlands	446,621	655,550	1,100,337	208,929	47%	14%	444,787	68%	14%
Rialto	327,157	686,644	976,752	359,487	110%	11%	290,135	42%	9%
San Bernardino	1,914,529	2,349,850	3,278,406	435,321	23%	8%	928,556	40%	8%
Twentynine Palms	45,512	60,406	78,515	14,894	33%	3%	18,109	30%	6%
Upland	541,739	605,542	886,697	63,803	12%	1%	281,155	46%	9%
Victorville	647,684	1,045,818	2,001,454	398,134	61%	6%	955,636	91%	18%
Yucaipa	84,985	131,348	231,080	46,363	55%	5%	99,732	76%	15%
Yucca Valley	n/a	186,957	278,928	n/a	n/a	n/a	91,971	49%	10%
San Bernardino County	10,522,992	18,885,438	29,744,868	8,362,446	80%	8%	10,859,430	58%	12%

Source: CIWMB web-site.
[1]California State Board of Equalization.

QUANTITIES OF WASTE

CIWMB approved base year waste generation quantities are presented in Table 3A (Waste Generated Per Capita [1990-2005]) for each jurisdiction. The per capita waste generation rate in pounds per person per day (ppd) was calculated for residential and total waste generation. The statewide average per capita in 1990 for total waste generation was approximately 8 ppd; for residential waste per capita, the average is about 3 ppd.

Whereas the per capita total waste generation rates within the cities of Fontana, Victorville and Yucca Valley were notably higher than the statewide average, Loma Linda was the only city below the average. Waste generation is significant because it establishes the reference level from which disposal reduction and diversion are measured.

The jurisdictions' data that was provided for per capita waste generation for the year 2005 is being reviewed by the CIWMB and is consider preliminary until the evaluation process is completed.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Disposal quantities estimated for the base year and reported for the period 1995-2005, according to the CIWMB Disposal Reporting System (DRS), are compiled in Table 3B (Countywide [1995-2000] Diversion Rates versus [2000-2005] Diversion Rates) and Table 4 (Disposal Tonnage Trends (1995-2005) for each jurisdiction. Countywide, waste disposal increased overall between 1995 and 2005, which is likely due to the growth that has occurred in the County from population increases, housing construction, and the expansion of commercial sectors. Individual jurisdictions have shown fluctuating increases and decreases in waste disposal tonnage from year to year. These fluctuating patterns may be due to a variety of factors, including the scheduling of diversion program implementation by the individual jurisdictions, reporting of waste disposed, and allocation of alternative daily cover tonnages. When the County is taken as a whole, the increases and decreases at the individual jurisdiction level combine to form a smoother pattern of nearly steady and more modest growth. Likewise, the diversion rates have improved significantly due to the programs that have been implemented. Refer to Table 8 (Countywide Diversion Program Implementation [1995-2005]) for contingency plans that have been identified.

Table 3A
Waste Generated Per Capita (1990-2005)

Jurisdictions	Population in Base Year 1990	Waste Gen. in 1990 (tons)	Waste Per Capita (lbs/day)	Res. % of Waste Gen. (tons)	Res. Waste Gen. (tons)	Res. Waste Gen. Per Capita (lbs/day)	Population in 2005	Waste Gen. in 2005 (tons)	Waste Per Capita (lbs/day)	Res. % of Waste Gen. (tons)	Res. Waste Gen. (tons)	Res. Waste Gen. Per Capita (lbs/day)
Adelanto[1]	15,300	24,796	8.9	61%	15,126	5.4	23,432	58,511	13.7	11%	6,303	1.5
Apple Valley	46,079	53,518	6.4	60%	32,111	3.8	64,009	91,577	7.8	48%	44,196	3.8
Barstow	21,472	44,150	11.3	37%	16,336	4.2	23,604	71,347	16.6	29%	20,661	4.8
Big Bear Lake[2]	6,050	38,345	34.7	11%	4,218	3.8	6,164	56,785	50.5	9%	4,976	4.4
Chino	59,682	113,006	10.4	34%	38,422	3.5	76,233	264,802	19	11%	29,979	2.1
Chino Hills[3]	42,600	42,923	5.5	78%	33,480	4.3	78,011	67,137	4.7	82%	55,252	3.9
Colton[1]	46,800	104,927	12.3	37%	38,823	4.5	51,756	144,924	15.3	28%	41,372	4.4
Fontana	87,535	139,092	8.7	67%	93,192	5.8	160,409	358,119	12.2	64%	227,651	7.8
Grand Terrace	10,946	12,655	6.3	46%	5,821	2.9	12,421	20,310	9	36%	7,400	3.3
Hesperia	50,418	70,075	7.6	57%	39,943	4.3	76,298	161,453	11.6	17%	26,818	1.9
Highland	34,439	30,016	4.8	77%	23,112	3.7	50,984	72,346	7.8	20%	14,381	1.5
Loma Linda[1]	21,600	26,797	6.8	28%	7,503	1.9	21,643	35,777	9.1	23%	8,341	2.1
Montclair	28,434	48,210	9.3	38%	18,320	3.5	35,617	77,823	12	31%	23,861	3.7
Needles	5,191	6,474	6.8	55%	3,561	3.8	5,566	10,289	10	43%	4,474	4.4
Ontario	133,179	236,095	9.7	27%	63,746	2.6	170,790	636,030	2.04	14%	91,404	2.9
Rancho Cucamonga	101,409	145,847	7.9	50%	72,924	3.9	162,219	406,063	13.7	12%	47,292	1.6
Redlands	60,395	88,768	8.1	60%	53,261	4.8	70,490	140,392	10.9	50%	69,685	5.4
Rialto	72,395	113,404	8.6	41%	46,496	3.5	99,483	193,090	10.6	34%	65,371	3.6
San Bernardino	164,676	273,981	9.1	30%	82,194	2.7	200,280	445,405	12.2	24%	107,492	2.9
Twentynine Palms	11,821	16,972	7.9	56%	9,504	4.4	27,387	55,955	11.2	37%	20,516	4.1
Upland	63,374	82,862	7.2	56%	46,403	4	73,876	131,540	9.8	44%	58,285	4.3
Victorville	40,674	85,243	11.5	49%	41,769	5.6	86,680	161,803	10.2	35%	56,662	3.6
Yucaipa	32,819	41,549	6.9	36%	14,958	2.5	49,506	69,088	7.6	40%	28,010	3.1
Yucca Valley[3]	16,850	38,159	12.4	44%	16,790	5.5	19,774	61,250	17	35%	21,180	5.9
Unincorporated, County	322,557	421,304	7.2	65%	273,848	4.7	1,950,806	646,804	1.8	53%	344,119	0.97

Source: CIWMB web-site

Base Years used: 1999[1] and 1998[2]

[3]Chino Hills was incorporated in 1991 and Yucca Valley was incorporated in 1992.

Table 3B
Countywide (1995-2000) Diversion Rates versus (2000-2005) Diversion Rates

Jurisdictions	1995				2000				1995-2000	2005(11)				2000-2005(11)
	1995 Waste Generated (tons)	Disposal (tons)	Diversion (tons)	Diversion Rate	2000 Waste Generated (tons)	Disposal (tons)	Diversion (tons)	Diversion Rate	% Improve-ment	2005 Waste Generated (tons)	Disposal (tons)	Diversion (tons)	Diversion Rate	% Improvement
Adelanto(1)	24,796	17,594	7,202	29%	26,264	16,474	9,790	37%	28%	58,511	26,825	31,686	54%	46%
Apple Valley	47,079	38,014	9,065	19%	73,660	41,972	32,688	43%	126%	91,577	75,782	15,795	17%	(-)153%
Barstow	34,649	25,870	8,779	25%	55,842	24,034	31,808	57%	128%	71,347	30,975	40,372	57%	0%
Big Bear Lake(2)	39,345	17,147	22,198	56%	44,963	18,562	26,401	59%	5%	56,785	19,164	37,621	66%	12%
Chino(3)	131,158	99,633	31,525	24%	173,193	84,488	88,705	51%	112%	264,802	103,855	160,947	61%	20%
Chino Hills	45,950	30,307	15,643	34%	70,842	41,091	29,751	42%	23%	67,137	46,258	20,879	31%	(-)35%
Colton(4)	56,821	38,741	18,080	32%	111,817	48,736	63,081	56%	75%	144,924	66,496	78,428	54%	(-1)4%
Fontana(5)	150,125	127,951	22,174	15%	267,825	123,822	144,003	54%	260%	358,119	199,438	158,681	44%	(-)23%
Grand Terrace	12,204	8,565	3,639	30%	16,088	7,665	8,423	52%	73%	20,310	11,253	9,057	45%	(-)15%
Hesperia(6)	73,063	44,453	28,610	39%	89,394	47,617	41,777	47%	20%	161,453	77,538	83,915	52%	11%
Highland(7)	31,757	21,795	9,962	31%	57,525	27,772	29,753	52%	68%	72,346	41,195	31,151	43%	(-)21%
Loma Linda(8)	26,797	18,704	8,093	30%	29,788	18,827	10,961	37%	23%	35,777	22,125	13,652	38%	3%
Montclair	49,019	35,217	13,802	28%	62,792	34,758	28,034	45%	61%	77,823	39,190	38,633	50%	11%
Needles	6,645	5,030	1,615	24%	8,135	5,453	2,682	33%	37%	10,289	6,828	3,461	34%	3%
Ontario(9)	307,288	246,140	61,148	20%	380,852	239,147	141,705	37%	85%	636,030	297,638	338,392	53%	43%
Rancho Cucamonga(10)	178,636	132,206	46,430	26%	214,965	138,815	76,150	35%	35%	406,063	192,245	213,818	53%	51%
Redlands	90,849	59,282	31,567	35%	116,141	63,569	52,572	45%	29%	140,392	84,961	55,431	39%	(-)15%
Rialto	118,164	67,752	50,412	43%	159,442	78,029	81,413	51%	19%	193,090	109,558	83,532	43%	(-)19%
San Bernardino	286,250	220,311	65,939	23%	358,308	194,846	163,462	46%	100%	445,405	238,687	206,718	46%	0%
Twentynine Palms	18,072	10,832	7,240	40%	36,636	16,819	19,817	54%	35%	55,955	24,973	30,982	55%	2%
Upland	81,268	62,901	18,367	23%	104,080	60,990	43,090	41%	78%	131,540	71,595	59,945	46%	12%
Victorville	72,479	56,326	16,153	22%	115,637	63,982	51,655	45%	104%	161,803	115,891	45,912	28%	(-)61%
Yucaipa(2)	42,378	26,427	15,951	38%	77,806	30,727	47,079	60%	58%	69,088	41,602	27,486	40%	(-)50%
Yucca Valley	38,933	16,216	22,717	58%	48,137	17,025	31,112	65%	12%	61,250	27,857	33,393	55%	(-)18%
Unincorporated, County	435,314	241,846	193,468	44%	529,414	297,678	231,736	43%	2%	646,804	370,354	276,450	43%	0%
San Bernardino County	2,399,039	1,669,260	729,779	788%	3,229,546	1,742,898	1,487,648	1187%	1596%	4,438,620	2,342,283	2,096,337	1147%	(-)200%
Countywide Improvement									51%				28%	

Source: CIWMB web-site.

During the 1995 through 2000 reporting period, the CIWMB approved New Base Years: (1)2005, (2)1998, (3)2004, (4)1999, (5)2000, (6)2004, (7)2000, (8)1999, (9)2003, and (10)2005.

CIWMP Approved/Accepted jurisdictions' reported tonnage for: Adelanto and Loma Linda in 1999 and for Ontario in 1997.

(11) The Biennial Reviews for the year 2005 have not being completed, only preliminary data is shown for each jurisidiction.

Table 4: Disposal Tonnage Trends (1995-2005)
(Figures represent tons per year)

Jurisdictions	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005[1]
Adelanto	12,689	12,040	14,305	17,032	17,594	16,474	*	*	*	*	26,825
Apple Valley	38,014	36,887	38,022	42,962	42,753	41,972	44,468	48,350	56,047	63,954	75,782
Barstow	25,870	25,842	23,805	26,113	24,604	24,034	24,116	24,529	28,436	34,716	30,975
Big Bear Lake	15,028	13,434	14,088	17,147	18,460	18,562	18,481	18,771	16,781	17,001	19,164
Chino	99,633	82,14	88,373	82,022	77,427	84,488	84,279	92,846	106,830	108,687	103,855
Chino Hills	30,307	27,145	29,797	30,573	33,497	41,091	36,191	36,281	37,175	40,634	46,258
Colton	38,741	40,575	52,685	52,085	48,464	48,736	50,884	57,428	62,181	61,065	66,496
Fontana	127,951	107,946	106,597	100,914	112,606	123,822	132,994	140,516	168,852	176,316	188,438
Grand Terrace	58,565	8,451	7,198	7,716	7,147	7,665	8,033	8,948	9,852	11,234	11,253
Hesperia	44,453	46,046	42,676	46,887	44,279	47,617	46,490	50,736	63,912	66,068	77,538
Highland	21,795	23,091	24,337	24,987	23,491	27,772	30,831	32,796	39,487	39,523	41,195
Loma Linda	22,016	21,172	20,330	18,919	18,704	18,827	18,997	19,368	18,909	20,955	22,125
Montclair	35,217	30,557	37,529	34,096	36,156	34,758	35,617	34,062	40,172	40,622	39,190
Needles	5,030	5,134	5,801	5,932	5,503	5,453	6,232	5,637	5,540	8,650	6,827
Ontario	222,595	230,671	246,140	268,943	257,474	239,147	230,630	273,782	276,370	290,996	297,638
Rancho Cucamonga	132,206	117,260	119,231	126,481	118,699	138,815	140,815	148,163	168,629	185,318	192,245
Redlands	59,282	51,132	53,130	54,551	58,138	63,569	67,979	70,868	82,106	83,297	84,961
Rialto	67,752	65,718	66,051	63,027	64,897	78,029	85,918	87,220	93,236	102,782	109,558
San Bernardino	220,311	186,489	165,649	173,389	176,667	194,846	200,438	205,741	224,298	229,317	238,687
Twenty-nine Palms	10,832	11,214	11,272	11,262	10,422	16,819	18,289	21,131	23,410	20,421	24,973
Upland	62,901	57,228	57,108	58,741	60,659	60,990	62,080	63,174	66,935	68,910	71,595
Victorville	56,326	57,477	59,160	64,646	62,130	63,982	68,294	75,237	86,861	96,108	115,891
Yucaipa	26,427	30,071	27,378	29,738	30,727	31,303	30,471	31,495	36,068	39,294	41,602
Yucca Valley	16,216	14,214	15,228	15,899	15,484	17,025	18,349	18,091	22,075	24,895	27,857
Unincorporated, County	241,846	249,969	243,201	296,925	303,543	297,678	310,354	316,319	342,582	376,671	370,354

Source: CIWMB web-site.

*Under compliance for Biennial Review.

[1]The Biennial Reviews for the 2005 have not been completed, only preliminary data is shown for each jurisdiction.

FUNDING SOURCES

The basic funding sources for the administration of the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan have not changed significantly since the Summary Plan was approved. The sources of funding for cities and the unincorporated areas of the County continue to include tipping fees at the County's disposal system, fees from solid waste collection rates and franchise fees. Locally based programs for the cities are funded from local refuse rates for collection services, fees charged on local refuse rates, and grant funds.

The County continues to operate a countywide disposal system. Revenue from tipping fees is used to pay the contractor, to both operate the landfills and collect and divert recyclables brought to the landfills and transfer stations. Other County programs are also funded from a component of the tipping fees (such as landfill closure, capital improvements, household hazardous waste collection community clean-up programs, program administration, regulatory compliance, and AB 939 programs).

Locally based programs for the cities and the unincorporated County are funded from local refuse rates for collection services, fees charged on local refuse rates, and grant funds. All but one jurisdiction include curbside recycling services in the basic solid waste collection service rate. Fifteen of the jurisdictions and the unincorporated County fund residential curbside green waste collection in this manner. Some public education programs, holiday tree recycling, and other local diversion activities are funded this way as well. Twenty jurisdictions and the unincorporated County charge franchise, AB939, administrative or other fees on top of the basic collection rate in order to support diversion programs and administration. Some jurisdictions in the County receive Department of Conservation grants or CIWMB grants, including used oil grants. The City of Needles received a State of Arizona Department of Environmental Quality grant, since the city disposes of its waste in the state of Arizona.

In Fiscal Year 2006-2007, the County expanded AB939 related programs with the development of the Comprehensive Disposal Site Diversion Program (CDSDP). On January 9, 2007, the County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors approved the CDSDP and the collection of additional tipping fees. Based upon the initial pilot program at the Victorville Landfill, SWMD determined that the program is effective in increasing the diversion of these loads. Under the program, self-haul vehicles are directed to proceed to a load checking station where the potential for diversion is assessed. Loads that appear to have substantial divertible materials are sent to the diversion area for processing. Currently, approximately fifty (50) percent of the targeted, or eligible, loads are directed to the on-site processing area and approximately fifty (50) percent of that tonnage processed is diverted.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

No significant changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP other than normal personnel turnover. Within the County, the Department of Public Works Solid Waste Management Division continues to be the responsible agency. Table 5 (Offices Responsible for Solid Waste Administration) lists the department in each city that is responsible for solid waste management activities.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The goals and objectives, which were described in the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, are still valid and continue to form the basis of the County's diversion program planning. These goals and objectives are listed in Chapter 3 of this report.

SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAMS

The County has implemented the County's Comprehensive Disposal Site Diversion Program (CDSDP) at its major disposal sites. This program will benefit all jurisdictions that send waste to these County facilities. These sites can be used by county jurisdictions (once they allow the County to process their waste loads). As of December 2007, eleven cities have signed up to participate in this program.

The County's unincorporated diversion rate is at 49% (2005) and with the full implementation of the County's CDSDP; diversion is expected to exceed the 50% diversion requirement. The Solid Waste Management Division's Special Program Section has developed a campaign to inform residents and businesses of the new CDSDP rate change. The campaign includes press releases for news publications customized for Victor Valley, the Valley, the Mountains and the low Desert, so that customers in those areas are notified as the programs are implemented at the landfills and transfer stations. Flyers will be given as handouts to the customers visiting those sites. In addition, staff will be available to respond to press and/or public inquires.

RECYCLING PROGRAMS

Many of the County's and the jurisdictions' selected and alternative programs are on-going and consist of, but are not limited to those indicated in Table 8 [Countywide Diversion Program Implementation, 1995-2005]).

HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS

The Countywide Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) identifies the safe collection, recycling, treatment, and disposal of hazardous wastes, as defined in Section 25117 of the Health and Safety Code, which are generated by households in the unincorporated area of the county and which should be separated from the solid waste stream.

The Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) program consists of fourteen permanent HHW collection facilities, a Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator Program and six antifreeze, batteries, oil and latex paint collection facilities. During this reporting period (2005), 38,275 county residents used the permanent HHW collection facilities, resulting in the collection of approximately 3,300,281 pounds of waste. Of this amount, 480,482 pounds was collected from 5,587 county unincorporated area residents. The program added fluorescent tubes to the list of collected waste.

NONDISPOSAL FACILITIES

Table 6 (Summary of Nondisposal Facilities) in Chapter 3 depicts the nondisposal facilities (existing and proposed) which were identified in the Nondisposal Facility Elements (NDFE) for all of the jurisdictions in the County, as facilities used to assist with diversion performance. There are several nondisposal facilities located throughout the County in the following categories listed in the table (bio solids, composting, green waste processing, material recovery, recycling, and transfer stations).

Table 5
Offices Responsible for Solid Waste Administration

Jurisdiction	Department or Office Responsible for Solid Waste Administration
City of Adelanto	Department of Sanitation
Town of Apple Valley	Municipal Services Department
City of Barstow	Finance Department, Contract/Project Coordinator
City of Big Bear Lake	Engineering Department
City of Chino	Public Works/Engineering Division
City of Chino Hills	City Clerk's Office
City of Colton	City Manager's Office
City of Fontana	Public Services Department
City of Grand Terrace	City Manager's Office
City of Hesperia	City Manager's Office
City of Highland	Planning Department
City of Loma Linda	Public Works Department
City of Montclair	City Clerk's Office
City of Needles	City Engineer's Office
City of Ontario	Public Works/Community Services Agency, Solid Waste/Equipment Services
City of Rancho Cucamonga	Engineering Department
City of Redlands	Municipal Utilities Department, Solid Waste and Recycling Division
City of Rialto	Airport/Solid Waste Management Department
City of San Bernardino	Public Service Department, Integrated Waste Management Division
City of Twentynine Palms	City Manager's Office
City of Upland	Public Works – Integrated Waste
City of Victorville	Public Works Department
City of Yucaipa	Director of General Services, City Clerk
Town of Yucca Valley	Town Manager's Office
Unincorporated, County	Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Management Division

Source: CIWMB web site and jurisdictions' staff review.

Table 6
Summary of Nondisposal Facilities

Facilities	Adelanto	Apple Valley	Barstow	Big Bear Lake	Chino	Chino Hills	Colton	Fontana	Grand Terrace	Hesperia	Highland	Loma Linda	Montclair	Needles	Ontario	Rancho Cucamonga	Redlands	Rialto	San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms	Upland	Victorville	Yucaipa	Yucca Valley	Unincorporated, County
Bio-Solids Treatment Facility																									
Ener Tech Environmental, Inc.																		x							
Composting Facilities																									
ABT-Haskell Compost Facility																									x
Fort Irwin																									x
IEUA Co-Composting Facility					x	x		x					x		x	x					x				x
Nursery Products Composting																									x
1-Stop Landscape Supply Ctr								x	x			x					x						x		x
Victor Valley Regional																									x
Viramontes Express					x																				
Green Waste Processing Facilities																									
Apollo Wood Recycling								x										x							x
Barstow Municipal Yard			x																						
City of Barstow /Desert Disposal			x																						
Blue Ribbon Organic									x			x													
CST Organic Recycling											x								x						x
Victor Valley MRF		x																				x			x
Material Recover Facilities & Intermediate Processing Facilities																									
Advance Disposal (Hesperia)										x															x
Burrtec Recycling								x			x	x	x			x		x					x		x
City of Barstow/Desert Disposal*																									
City of San Bernardino			x																x						x
CVT/Taormina Indstries							x		x		x								x						x
Victor Vallely/Burrtec Waste Industries		x																			x				x
Waste Management of the Desert																								x	x
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center																				x					x
West Valley MRF/Kaiser Resource/Burrtec								x					x			x		x							x
Recycling Facilities																									
Colton Iron and Metal																							x		x
Fontana Paper Mills																							x		x
Golden Aluminum							x		x			x											x		x
Main Street Recycling																									x
Transfer Stations																									
Apple Valley																									x
Baker																									x
Big Bear Transfer Station																									x
Camp Rock Transfer Station																									x
City of San Bernardino																			x						
Heap's Peak Transfer Station																									x
Hesperia Transfer Station																									x
MorongoValley																									x
Newberry Springs																									x
Ontario Transfer Station					x										x						x				
Public Trash Site #1				x																					
Public Trash Site #2				x																					
Public Trash Site #3				x																					
Public Trash Site #6				x																					
Sheep Creek																									x
Silver Valley (Daggett)																									x
Trona-Argus																									x
Twenty-nine Palms																									x
Victor Valley MRF		x																				x			x
West Valley MRF/Kaiser Resource/Burrtec								x										x							x
Yermo/Calico																									x

Sources: CIWMB's Solid Waste Information System Database and Jurisdiction's Staff Updates.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL FACILITIES

Recent Events Affecting Countywide Disposal Capacity

When the Countywide Siting Element was first drafted, the County-owned and operated disposal system had 17 landfills in operation. Since that time, the County has closed 11 County-owned landfills and replaced many of them with transfer stations to continue to provide convenient disposal sites for the residents in more remote areas of the County. Currently, there are nine landfills in the Desert and Valley regions, and 21 transfer stations. Six of the landfills and 13 transfer stations are owned and operated by the County and have drop-off sites for recyclable materials.

During the 1990's, several of the jurisdictions in the County were able to secure waste agreements at competing landfills in other counties through their hauler, and thus, their waste was exported through transfer stations, to landfills outside San Bernardino County. During the years 1993 to 2001, a significant amount of waste from several jurisdictions in San Bernardino County was disposed of in landfills in Orange and Riverside Counties. In 2000, the County re-bid the landfill operation contract for the County-owned system, and negotiated an agreement with the new contractor to return County-generated waste to the system. As a result, beginning in July 2001, the majority of the jurisdictions in the County now dispose of their waste in County landfills.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The County of San Bernardino continues to have disposal capacity available for solid waste generated, but not diverted, in excess of 15 years as required under Public Resources Code Section 41701. Permitted disposal capacity is available at the Barstow, California Street, Colton, Fort Irwin, Landers, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, Mid-Valley, San Timoteo and Victorville Landfills. The California Street, Colton, Mid-Valley and San Timoteo Landfills are located in the Valley Region of the County and the Barstow, Fort Irwin, Landers, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center and Victorville Landfills are located in the Desert region of the County. Table 7A (San Bernardino County Systemwide Landfill Site Life Assessment) provides an overview of the projected number of years of landfill capacity remaining Countywide as of calendar year (January-December) 2006. The systemwide characteristics indicate that the County has an estimated site-life capacity of 38 years; however, the projected site life is calculated at 26 years of refuse capacity. The total systemwide remaining refuse capacity is estimated at 95 million tons. Table 7B (Countywide Landfill Capacity) presents the Countywide annual tons received based on the actual 2006 disposal records. Table 7C (15-Year Estimated Refuse Generation for Disposal) projects refuse generation for disposal within the County of San Bernardino over the next 15 years. Approximately 346 million tons of refuse for disposal is projected to be generated within the County during the next 15-year planning period for the years 2007 through 2021. As shown in Tables 7A, 7B, 7C, and 7D (Systemwide Landfill Diminishing Capacity) and based on the remaining permitted refuse capacity and the

projected refuse generation for disposal, landfills in the County of San Bernardino have approximately 26 years of capacity.

Through the County's annual report, the Countywide Siting Element is kept current and continues to be a useful planning tool. The goals and policies identified in the Countywide Siting Element are listed as:

- Comply with regulations and standards.
- Minimize environmental impacts and nuisances.
- Eliminate known 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 within incompatible land use areas.
- Protect existing facilities from encroachment of incompatible land uses.
- Maintain an integrated waste management system based on the AB 939 waste management hierarchy.

These goals and policies as defined in the Countywide Siting Element continue to be applicable. As required by regulations, siting criteria were developed and a siting process was described in the Countywide Siting Element. Since the County Siting Element was originally written, the County has undergone some consolidation with the closure of several landfills. The Partnership Strategy Implementation Plan (PSIP), that was prepared by the County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division (SWMD) in 1996, documented the County's strategic plan to consolidate County-owned and –operated landfills. SWMD has been implementing this plan since that time. To date, the County has reduced the number of active landfill sites from 17 sites down to six sites. As described above, there are currently nine active landfills that provide disposal capacity to County residents and six of those sites are owned by the County of San Bernardino. SWMD eventually plans to operate only five regional landfill facilities which will be expanded to provide long term (in excess of 15 years) refuse capacity. SWMD has identified Colton, Landers, and San Timoteo landfills for potential expansion. The estimated closure year indicated for these three sites is 2011 through 2013. No substantial actions have been implemented, as yet, on the planned expansion of these landfills. The following section discusses the planned landfill expansion projects within the County.

PLANNED DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division, the owner and operator of six of the County's landfills, was granted approval for the expansion of the Victorville Landfill and is currently working on the expansion of the Barstow Landfill. These landfill expansion projects will provide the County with an additional 59.7 million tons of refuse capacity. The necessary approval for the Barstow expansion project should be obtained in 2008. Also, the Barstow Landfill capacity increased an additional 237,000 tons due to a sliver fill that was approval in July 2007. No other planned landfill disposal capacity increase is proposed at this time.

Table 7A
San Bernardino County Estimated Systemwide Landfill Site Life Assessment

Disposal Facility	SWIS#	Designed Capacity (Tons)	Landfilled As of 2006[1] (tons)	Remaining[1] Capacity (tons)	Annual Refuse Tonnage (tons/yr)	Annual Total Tonnage (ADC and Soil)[3]	Permitted Site Life	Approx. Site Life (years)
Valley								
California Street	36-AA-0017	6,000,000	2,460,000	3,510,448	60,703	80,937	2031	
Colton[2]	36-AA-0051	9,339,160	8,368,158	850,652	239,767	319,689	2011	
Mid-Valley	36-AA-0055	55,715,000	16,868,500	38,413,712	853,113	1,137,484	2033	
San Timoteo	36-AA-0087	11,220,000	10,252,975	865,694	206,047	274,729	2011	
Valley Totals		82,274,160	37,949,633	43,640,506	1,359,630	1,812,840		
Current Years of Capacity Remaining in Region:		**14**						
East Desert								
Landers	36-AA-0057	1,464,662	1,063,684	502,733	105,501	140,668	2013	
MCAGCC	36-AA-0067	1,275,093	3,197	1,269,198	7,327	9,769	2076	
East Desert Totals		2,739,755	1,066,881	1,771,931	112,828	150,437		
Current Years of Capacity Remaining in Region:		**7**						
North Desert/Mountain								
Barstow	36-AA-0046	2,177,637	1,462,103	449,127	63,553	84,737	2010	
Fort Irwin	36-AA-0068	7,605,000	1,939,140	5,752,269	7,850	10,467	2405	
North Desert Mountain Totals		9,782,637	3,401,243	6,201,396	71,403	95,204		
Current Years of Capacity Remaining in Region:		**37**						
Victor Valley								
Victorville	36-AA-0045	45,760,000	1,727,000	43,856,743	358,434	477,912	2047	
Victor Valley Totals		45,760,000	1,727,000	43,856,743	358,434	477,912		
Current Years of Capacity Remaining in Region:		**52**						
Countywide Total Tons		140,556,552	44,144,757	95,470,576	1,902,295	2,536,393		
***Projected Years (Approximate Site life [Years]) of Capacity Remaining Countywide - All Landfills:**								38

[1]Based on remaining tonnage capacity as of calendar year (January-December) for 2006 .
[2]Colton's tonnage capacity increase is due to Sliver filling operations and increased settlement.
[3]Based on a 3:1 soil to trash ratio.
*Based on current systemwide characteristics.

Table 7B
Countywide Landill Capacity

Landfill Site	Remaining Permitted Disposal Capacity (tons) (1)	Planning Additonal Disposal Capacity (tons)	Annual Total Tonnages (ADC, Soil, and Refuse) Received 2006 (2)
Barstow	449,127	237,500	84,737
California Street	3,510,448	None	80,937
Colton	850,652	None	319,689
Fort Irwin	5,752,269	None	10,467
Landers	502,733	None	140,668
MCAGCC	1,269,198	None	9,769
Mid-Valley	38,413,712	None	1,137,484
San Timoteo	865,694	None	274,729
Victorville	43,856,743	None	477,912
Totals	95,470,576	237,500	2,536,392

(1) Remaining permitted capacity was calculated as of calendar year (January-December) for 2006.
(2) Annual tons received in 2006 is based on actual 2006 disposal records.

Table 7C
15-Year Estimated Refuse Generation for Disposal

Number of Years	Year	Annual Total Tonnages (ADC, Soil, and Refuse) Received 2006 (1)	Cumulative Tons Disposed
1	2007	2,536,393	2,536,393
2	2008	2,604,876	5,141,269
3	2009	2,675,208	7,816,477
4	2010	2,747,439	10,563,916
5	2011	2,821,620	13,385,536
6	2012	2,897,804	16,283,340
7	2013	2,976,045	19,259,385
8	2014	3,056,398	22,315,783
9	2015	3,138,921	25,454,704
10	2016	3,223,672	28,678,376
11	2017	3,310,412	31,989,088
12	2018	3,399,793	35,388,881
13	2019	3,491,587	38,880,468
14	2020	3,585,860	42,466,328
15	2021	3,682,678	46,149,006
Estimated total tons disposed in a 15-Year Period.			346,308,950

(1) A 2.7% growth rate was utili zed as obtained from San Bernardino Association of Governments.

Table 7D
Systemwide Landfill Diminishing Capacity

Number of Years	Year	Annual Total Tonnages (ADC, Soil, and Refuse) Received 2006 (1)	Cumulative Tons Disposed	Total Tons Remaining Capacity (2)
	2006			95,470,576
1	2007	2,536,393	2,536,393	92,934,183
2	2008	2,604,876	5,141,269	90,329,307
3	2009	2,675,208	7,816,477	87,654,099
4	2010	2,747,439	10,563,916	84,906,660
5	2011	2,821,620	13,385,536	82,085,040
6	2012	2,897,804	16,283,340	79,187,236
7	2013	2,976,045	19,259,385	76,211,191
8	2014	3,056,398	22,315,783	73,154,793
9	2015	3,138,921	25,454,704	70,015,872
10	2016	3,223,672	28,678,376	66,792,200
11	2017	3,310,412	31,989,088	63,481,788
12	2018	3,399,793	35,388,881	60,081,995
13	2019	3,491,587	38,974,741	56,590,408
14	2020	3,585,860	42,560,601	53,004,548
15	2021	3,682,678	46,149,006	49,321,870
16	2022	3,782,110	49,931,116	45,539,760
17	2023	3,884,227	53,815,343	41,655,533
18	2024	3,989,101	57,804,444	37,666,432
19	2025	4,096,807	61,901,251	33,569,625
20	2026	4,207,421	66,108,672	29,362,204
21	2027	4,321,021	70,429,693	25,041,183
22	2028	4,437,689	74,867,382	20,603,494
23	2029	4,557,507	79,421,889	16,045,987
24	2030	4,680,560	84,102,449	11,365,427
25	2031	4,806,935	88,909,384	6,558,492
26	2032	4,936,722	91,846,106	1,621,770
Total Systemwide Site Life				**26 Years**

(1) The growth rate used was 2.7 percent as obtained from the San Bernardino Association of Governments.
(2) Total Systemwide Capacity.

AVAILABLE MARKETS
Recycling Market Development Zones (RMDZs)

The development of markets adequate to ensure stability of the Integrated Waste Management system is an important issue facing San Bernardino County jurisdictions. Portions of San Bernardino County are relatively remote from end users of most recycled materials, and this isolation intensified difficulties of transporting and marketing secondary materials. These remote areas, however, generate a minimal amount of the total County waste stream due to their sparse population. The Valley area and the Desert's population centers are directly connected via highway and rail to the major market and international port area of Los Angeles.

During the development of the SRREs, a number of multi-jurisdictional groups were formed that have addressed strategies for marketing development in the County. These groups include the Countywide Solid Waste Advisory Task Force (SWAT), and both the East Valley and West Valley Coalition. Each Coalition has studied the issue of diversion facilities, feedstock, and secondary markets. The Mojave Desert and Mountain Joint Power Authority composed of nearly all the desert cities and the City of Big Bear Lake was involved in the development of the Victor Valley MRF and has established a Recycling Market Development Zone.

The State of California established the Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ) program to build markets for recyclable material recovered from the waste stream in compliance with the IWM Act. The CIWMB offers low interest loans for 75 percent of a project's costs up to $2,000,000, to attract businesses that will use recyclable material as feedstock in a secondary manufacturing process. Help with financing strategies, marketing, and technical assistance is also available form the CIWMB. Local jurisdictions that administer the RMDZs offer incentives such as permit streamlining, fee reductions, loans, and bonds. The RMDZs develop markets through advertising and outreach. As recyclable materials increase from diversion programs and mixed waste processing facilities, identifying markets for the materials becomes more crucial.

There are four RMDZs (Agua Mansa, Chino Valley, High Desert, and Riverside County) located in San Bernardino County. Local governmental authorities apply to the CIWMB to have a specific geographical area designated as a RMDZ. The designation is valid for a fixed period of time. If no application for renewal is filed, the zone designation expires.

Agua Mansa Recycling Market Development Zone

The Agua Mansa RMDZ is centrally located in the Western Riverside/San Bernardino County area. The jurisdictions in this RMDZ include the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside and the cities of Colton, Rialto, and Riverside. This zone is also designated as an Enterprise Zone by the California State Department of Commerce.

Materials targeted within the RMDZ include mixed waste paper, glass, tires and rubber, plastic, yard waste, and inert solids (targeted for retention only). The Robert A. Nelson Transfer Station in Riverside County is located in this zone and receives materials from jurisdictions in the County of San Bernardino. The goal of this RMDZ is to attract businesses that can process these materials within this zone. Incentives include tax credits, low-interest loans, and technical and marketing assistance.

The Agua Mansa RMDZ zone designation was renewed April 23, 2003 and will expire in April 2013.

Chino Valley Recycling Market Development Zone

The Chino Valley RMDZ includes the industrial-zoned areas of the cities of Chino and Chino Hills, and is bordered by the counties of Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles. This area is serviced by major highways and has ample industrial-zoned land. The Chino Valley RMDZ has targeted these materials: plastics, wood, organics and yard waste, textiles, paper, and metal.

The Chino Valley RMDZ offers financial incentives, assistance with site selection, technical and general business assistance, and a streamlined permitting process to businesses in the zone. The zone designation for the Chino Valley RMDZ was renewed in 2004 and will expire in 2014.

High Desert Recycling Market Development Zone

The High Desert (formerly known as the Mojave) RMDZ includes the five high desert communities of Apple Valley, Barstow, Twenty-nine Palms, Victorville, and Yucca Valley. The zone benefits are available in some adjacent unincorporated San Bernardino County communities. RMDZ activities are administered and coordinated by the Mojave Desert and Mountain Solid Waste Joint Powers Authority. The goal of the zone is to provide local and regional markets for diverted waste materials in the Mojave Desert. Targeted materials include recycled paper and compostables, glass, scrap tires, plastics, and inert solids.

Municipalities in the zone offer different incentives to attract business development, including permit assistance, no development fees, flexible air-quality and land-use standards, and even allow some businesses to operate outdoors. The cities have funds to assist with financing, and offer access to other public financing sources as well. This RMDZ has attracted the Victor Valley Regional Composting Facility, which is an organics and food waste composting facility located in Victorville. Victor Valley Regional Composting Facility opened in 2000.

The High Desert RMDZ zone designation was renewed May 2005 and will expire in May 2015.

Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone

The Riverside County Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ) is a public partnership between the incorporated cities of Blythe, Cathedral City, Coachella, Hemet, Indio, Moreno Valley, Perris, and San Jacinto. The RMDZ is located in the lower parts of the desert known as the Coachella Valley and includes some unincorporated and incorporated areas of the county. Much of the zone is known as the Inland Empire. Targeted materials include newspaper, high grade and mixed paper, yard waste, metal, tires, and wood. Marketing, financing, and permitting assistance is available for new and expanding businesses within the RMDZ.

The zone designation for the Riverside County RMDZ was renewed August 30, 2003 and will expire in August 2013.

Beyond the RMDZ program, the SWAT Technical Committee developed the following goals, objectives, and policies to address the development of markets for recyclable solid wastes.

GOAL IV.	Develop local markets for recyclable materials and encourage development of secondary processing and manufacturing facilities, which utilize recyclable materials.
GOAL V.	Encourage utilization of Recycling Market Development Zones (RMDZs).
OBJECTIVE 7:	Increase usage of recycled materials.
OBJECTIVE 8:	Eliminate stringent specifications and other barriers, which discourage usage of recycled materials.
OBJECTIVE 9:	Increase the number of secondary processors and manufacturers located in the Cities and County.
OBJECTIVE 10:	Assist secondary processors and manufactures in locating local recyclable feedstock.
POLICY I:	Give purchasing preferences to vendors who use recycled materials, especially materials produced within San Bernardino County.
POLICY J:	Support expedited permit processing for secondary processors and manufacturers.
POLICY K:	Support state/federal policies that promote recycled material market development.
POLICY L:	Encourage existing manufacturing facilities to utilize recyclable material as feedstock.

POLICY M: Support coordination efforts between material generators and secondary material processors to reuse materials.

POLICY N: Encourage coordination between material generators, RMDZs, and secondary processors and manufacturers to focus on materials and marketing strategies and avoid duplication of efforts.

POLICY O: Promote existing RMDZs.

POLICY P: Support increased state funding and technical assistance for RMDZs.

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. The annual reports submitted by the jurisdictions have updated the status of program implementation.

Table 8 (Countywide Diversion Program Implementation [1995-2005]) summarizes actual programs implemented, regardless of whether the programs were initially selected for implementation in 1990 or were added later. Data is only presented through the year 2005 because the year 2006 data has not yet been reported by all jurisdictions.

Table 8
Countywide Diversion Program Implementation (1995-2005)

Programs Implemented	Code	Adelanto	Apple Valley	Barstow	Big Bear Lake	Chino	Chino Hills	Colton	Fontana	Grand Terrace	Hesperia	Highland	Loma Linda	Montclair	Needles	Ontario	Rancho Cucamonga	Redlands	Rialto	San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms	Upland	Victorville	Yucaipa	Yucca Valley	Unincorp. County
Xeri/Grasscycling	1000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Backyard and On-Site Composting/Mulching	1010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Business Waste Reduction	1020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Procurement	1030	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Government Source Reduction	1050	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Material Exchange/Thrift	1060	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Residential Curbside	2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Residential Drop-off	2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Residential Buy-Back Centers	2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Commercial On-site Pickup	2030	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Commercial Self-Haul	2040	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School Recycling	2050	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Government Recycling	2060	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special Colleciton/Seasonal	2070	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Residential Self-Haul Greenwaste	3010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Commercial Self-Haul Greenwaste	3030	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sludge (sewage/industrial)	4010	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tire Recycling	4020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
White Goods	4030	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scrap Metal	4040	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wood Waste	4050	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Concrete, Asphalt, Rubble	4060	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rendering	4090	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
Other Special Waste	4100	Yes														Yes			Yes				Yes			
Electronics (radio, TV)	5000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Printed (brochures, flyers, guides, articles)	5010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outreach (presentations, fairs, field trips)	5020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Schools (eduation and curriculum)	5030	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Economic Incentives	6010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ordinances	6020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Material Recovery Facility	7000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Composting Facility	7030	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alternative Daily Cover	7040	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes
House Hazardous Waste (HHW)	9000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobile or Periodic Collection	9010						Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes						Yes		Yes			Yes		Yes
Education Programs	9040	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Sources: CIWMB web-site, October 2002 report tables, and jurisdiction staff review.

(This page intentionally left blank)

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

OVERVIEW

While there has been substantial growth in the last five (5) years, the character of the County's waste stream has not significantly changed.

The CIWMP was reviewed and it was found that the component 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, including the County's four Recycling Market Development Zones.

The goals, objectives and policies in the elements are still applicable and consistent with applicable laws and regulations. The selected programs for each component were reviewed. Nearly all programs have been implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County unincorporated area and each city are up to date, in that the 2005 reports have been submitted for review by the CIWMB. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs and results, these changes are not considered to be significant enough to require revision of the CIWMP.

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 have provided updated information concerning the status of program implementation on a yearly basis.

Neighboring jurisdictions should continue to benefit by consolidating all or portions of their programs with their neighbors in order to conserve their efforts and resources. The implementation of all of the programs planned in the jurisdictions' SRREs will also continue to boost their diversion rates. Material recovery facilities and yard/wood waste processors are also needed to serve the population centers throughout the County to maintain maximum diversion levels.

Based on the updated status provided by the annual reports, the continuing development and implementation of selected and alternative programs, the information received from the County's Local Task Force, the recent amendments to the Countywide SE and NDFE, and the information presented in this report, SWMD has determined that no other revision to the CIWMP is necessary at this time.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Table 9
Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan
Five-Year City/County Review Summary

City	City Contact/Manager	City Recycling Coordinator	Address	Comments
City of Adelanto	Jim Hart	Harriette Fisher	11600 Air Express Way P.O. Box 10 Adelanto, CA 92301	Submitted (08-27; 10-17-2007)
Town of Apple Valley	Bruce Williams	Diana McKeen	14955 Dale Evans Parkway Apple Valley CA 92307	Submitted (10-15-2007)
City of Barstow	Hector Rodriguez	Belinda Barbour	220 E. Mountain View Barstow CA 92311	
City of Big Bear Lake	Jess Mathieu	Jackie Heule	PO Box 10000 39707 Big Beat Blvd. Big Bear Lake CA 92315	
City of Chino	Patrick J. Glover	Sylvia Ramos	13220 Central Avenue PO Box 667 Chino CA 91710	Submitted (10-23; 10-25-2007)
City of Chino Hills	Douglas La Belle	Raymond L. Hansen, Jr.	2001 Gran Avenue Chino Hills CA 91709	Submitted (11-30-2007)
City of Colton	Dearyl Parrish	Maritza Tapia	650 N,. La Cadena Drive Colton CA 92324	
City of Fontana	Kenneth Hunt	Tony Mata	8353 Sierra Avenue Fontana CA 92335	Submitted (08-28; 11-29-2007)
City of Grand Terrace	Thomas Schwab	Steve Berry	22795 Barton Road Grand Terrace CA 92313	
City of Hesperia	Mike Podegracz	Julie Ryan	9700 Seventh Avenue Hesperia CA 92340-7000	Submitted (08-30-2007)
City of Highland	Joe Hughes	Melissa Morgan	27215 Baseline, Suite A Highland CA 92346	Submitted (11-30-2007)
City of Loma Linda	Dennis Halloway	Jeffrey Peterson	25541 Barton Road Loma Linda CA 92354	Submitted (08-29-2007)
City of Montclair	Lee Mc Dougal	Roxaynn Robinson	5111 Benito Street PO Box 2308 Montclair CA 91763	Submitted (08-29; 11-05-2007)
City of Needles	Richard Rowe	Dave Brownly	817 Third Street Needles CA 92363	Submitted (08-22-2007)
City of Ontario	Gregory Devereaux	Deborah Allen	303 E. B Street Ontario CA 91764	Submitted (08-24; 11-05; and 11-19-2007)
City of Rancho Cucamonga	Jack Lam	Bob Zetterberg	10500 Civic Center Drive PO Box 807 Rancho Cucamonga CA 91729	
City of Redlands	N. Enrique Martinez	Cecilia Gonzalez	35 Cajon, Suite 200 PO Box 3005 Redlandsd CA 92373-1505	
City of Rialto	Henry Garcia	Amy Crow	150 South Palm Avenue Rialto CA 92376	Submitted (08-27-2007)
City of San Bernardino	Fred Wilson	Linda Ceballos	300 North D Street San Bernardino CA 92418	Submitted (11-30-2007)
City of Twentynine Palms	Michael Tree	Char Sherwood	6136 Adobo Road Twentynine Palms CA 92277	Submitted (11-30-2007)
City of Upland	Robb Quincey,	Janice Fletcher	PO Box 460 460 N. Euclid Avenue Upland CA 91786	Submitted (08-22 and 11-05-2007)
City of Victorville	Jon Roberts	Dana Armstrong	14343 Civic Drive Victorville CA 92392	Submitted (09-05; 11-05-2007)
City of Yucaipa	John Tooker	Jennifer Shankland	14343 Yucaipa Blvd. Yucaipa CA 92398	Submitted (11-05-2007)
Town of Yucca Valley	Andy Takata	Curtis Yakimow	57090 Twentynie Palms Hwy. Yucca Valley CA 92284	Submitted (11-30-2007)
Solid Waste Advisory Task Force (SWAT)				The CIWMP Five-Year Report was mailed to SWAT members on 10-04-2007 for their review before the October 24, 2007 SWAT meeting. Minutes of the meeting are included in Appendix A of the CIWMP Report.
County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors	Perter Wulfman Division Manager	Erma Hurse Senior Associate Planner	County of San Bern - SWMD 222 W. Hospitality Ln, 2nd Fl San Bernardino CA 92415-0017	Approved CIWMP Five-Year Review Report on January 15, 2008 at the County Board of Supervisors' meeting.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Five-Year CIWMP Review Report Template

(January 31, 2008)

Five–Year CIWMP 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), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised, if necessary, and submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) every five years. This Five–Year CIWMP Review Report template was developed in an effort to provide a cost-effective method to streamline the Five–Year CIWMP/) review and reporting process. The purpose of this Five–Year CIWMP Review Report template is to document compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and to request Board approval of the Five–Year CIWMP 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 that need revision, if any, the county or regional agency may use this template for its Five–Year CIWMP Review Report. The Five–Year 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–Year CIWMP Review Report, OLA staff will review the request and prepare their findings for Board consideration.

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

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

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 Five–Year Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name County of San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division		County San Bernardino	
Authorized Signature Peter H. Wulfman		Title Division Manager	
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Peter H. Wulfman	Date 1-31-08	Phone (909) 386-8703	
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Erma J. Hurse	Title Senior Associate Planner	Phone (909) 386-8763	
Mailing Address 222 W. Hospitality Lane, Second Floor	City San Bernardino	State CA	Zip 92415-0017
E-mail Address ehurse@swm.sbcounty.gov			

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 San Bernardino County's second Five–Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

The number of jurisdictions in San Bernardino County includes twenty-four (24) jurisdictions and the County unincorporated area.

☐ 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 San Bernardino 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
Adelanto	No Rate Available	50%	Compliance Active
Apple Valley	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Chino	Time Extension	56%*	12/31/2005
Hesperia	Time Extension	54%*	12/31/2005
Highland	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Loma Linda	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Montclair	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Needles	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Ontario	Time Extension	51%*	12/31/2005
Rancho Cucamonga	Time Extension	52%*	12/31/2005
Redlands	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Rialto	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
San Bernardino	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Upland	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Victorville	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Yucaipa	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Unincorporated County	Time Extension	50%	12/31/2005
Total Number of Jurisdictions with Time Extensions is 18 and one Jurisdiction is Under Active Compliance. *The minimum diversion requirement is 50%, the percentage shown was provided by the jurisdiction.			

Additional Information (e.g., recent regional agency formation, newly incorporated city, etc.)
None.

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

1. The Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:
   ☒ Please see Attachment 1, Table 9 (Countywide City/County 2007 Five-Year Review Summary) on page 41 in the CIWMP Five-Year Review Report for additional information.

Name	Representative Of (e.g., City or County)
City of Adelanto	Harriette Fisher
Town of Apple Valley	Diana McKeen
City of Barstow	Belinda Barbour
City of Big Bear Lake	Jackie Heule
City of Chino	Sylvia Ramos
City of Chino Hills	Raymond Hansen
City of Colton	Maritza Tapia
City of Fontana	Tony Mata
City of Grand Terrace	Steve Berry
City of Hesperia	Julie Ryan
City of Highland	Melissa Morgan
City of Loma Linda	Jeffrey Peterson
City of Montclair	Roxaynn Robinson
City of Needles	Dave Brownly
City of Ontario	Deborah Allen
City of Rancho Cucamonga	Bob Zetterberg
City of Redlands	Cecilia Gonzalez
City of Rialto	Amy Crow
City of San Bernardino	Linda Ceballos
City of Twentynine Palms	Char Sherwood
City of Upland	Janice Fletcher
City of Victorville	Dana Armstrong
City of Yucaipa	Jennifer Shankland
Town of Yucca Valley	Curtis Yakimow

2. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP and finalized its comments:
   ☒ At the October 24, 2007 Local Task Force (LTF) meeting. ☐ Other (Explain):

3. The County of San Bernardino received the comments from the LTF on October 24, 2007, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the Five–Year CIWMP Review Report to the Board and the LTF.

4. A copy of the LTF agenda and minutes
   ☒ is included in Appendix A.
   ☐ was submitted to the Board on .

5. In summary, the LTF comments conclude that Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAT), 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 within the county 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 on-going, the SWAT 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.

   The status of selected programs has bee 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 subsequent annual reports, include updates in program implementation.

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 San Bernardino County since 2000. 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 (1990)	NEW (2005)	OLD (1990)	NEW (2005)
City of Adelanto	78%	24%	22%	76%
Town of Apple Valley	60%	60%	40%	40%
City of Barstow	36.6%	36.6%	63.4%	63.4%
City of Bear Lake	40%	11%	60%	89%
City of Chino	34%	15%	66%	85%
City of Chino Hills	78%	78%	22%	22%
City of Colton	82%	37%	18%	63%
City of Fontana	67%	85%	33%	15%
City of Grand Terrace	46%	46%	54%	54%
City of Hesperia	57%	30%	43%	70%
City of Highland	77%	25%	23%	75%
City of Loma Linda	32%	28%	68%	72%
City of Montclair	38%	38%	62%	62%
City of Needles	55%	55%	45%	45%
City of Ontario	27%	24%	73%	76%
City of Rancho Cucamonga	50%	22%	50%	78%
City of Redlands	60%	60%	40%	40%
City of Rialto	41%	41%	59%	59%
City of San Bernardino	30%	30%	70%	70%
City of Twentynine Palms	56%	56%	44%	44%
City of Upland	56%	56%	44%	44%
City of Victorville	49%	49%	51%	51%
City of Yucaipa	36%	36%	64%	64%
City of Yucca Valley	44%	44%	56%	56%
Unincorporated County	65%	65%	35%	35%

Sources (e.g., Board-approved new or corrected 1999 generation study): Old Percentage is 1990 Original Base Year and New Percentage is the Current New Base Year.

Table 2[1]. Demographics*

POPULATION			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	**2000**	**2006**	**% Change**
Adelanto	18,130	27,139	50%
Apple Valley	57,000	70,297	23%
Barstow	23,300	23,943	3%
Big Bear Lake	6,352	6,207	(-)1.6%
Chino	66,700	81,224	22%
Chino Hills	60,200	78,668	31%
Colton	47,350	51,797	9%
Fontana	117,400	181,640	55%
Grand Terrace	13,550	12,380	(-)9%
Hesperia	63,600	85,876	35%
Highland	44,450	52,186	17%
Loma Linda	22,300	22,451	1%
Montclair	30,950	36,622	18%
Needles	5,925	5,759	(-)3%
Ontario	151,500	172,701	14%
Rancho Cucamonga	125,600	172,331	37%
Redlands	67,800	71,375	5%
Rialto	83,700	99,064	18%
San Bernardino	186,400	205,010	10%
Twentynine Palms	15,100	24,830	64%
Upland	68,800	75,169	10%
Victorville	64,500	102,538	59%
Yucaipa	39,850,	51,784	30%
Yucca Valley	19,200	21,044	10%
Unincorporated Population	292,300	295,978	1%
Countywide Population	1,709,434	1,999,332	17%

EMPLOYMENT			
Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	**2000**	**2006**	**% Change**
Countywide Employment	695,700	840,700	**21%**

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)			
Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	**2000**	**2005**	**% Change**
Adelanto	62,472	113,518	82%
Apple Valley	202,701	312,502	54%
Barstow	415,552	515,747	24%
Big Bear Lake	143,853	192,135	34%

Chino	1,181,638	1,512,949	28%
Chino Hills	236,464	418,716	77%
Colton	575,575	970,911	69%
Fontana	1,054,250	1,955,036	85%
Grand Terrace	45,274	79,169	79%
Hesperia	344,077	614,039	79%
Highland	106,036	115,151	87%
Loma Linda	233,182	255,894	10%
Montclair	954,684	1,264,502	33%
Needles	39,134	45,365	16%
Ontario	3,383,624	5,308,705	57%
Rancho Cucamonga	1,163,045	2,210,171	90%
Redlands	655,550	1,100,337	68%
Rialto	686,644	976,752	42%
San Bernardino	2,349,850	3,278,406	40%
Twentynine Palms	60,406	78,515	30%
Upland	605,542	886,697	46%
Victorville	1,045,818	2,001,454	91%
Yucaipa	131,348	231,080	76%
Yucca Valley	186,957	278,928	49%
Unincorporated County Taxable Sales	19,072,592	29,744,868	56%
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	18,885,438	29,744,868	58%

Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index	**2000**	**2006**	**% Change**
	172	202	17%

*Source: ☒ Board's Default Adjustment Factors
(http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp) ☐ Other:
[1]Data for Table 2 is provided in Attachment 2 for the Years 1990-2000.

Table 3. Dwelling Information

Jurisdiction	Single Family Dwellings (2000)	Single Family Dwelling (2006)	% Change	Multi-Family Dwellings (2000)	Multi-Family Dwellings (2006)	% Change	Mobile Homes (2000)	Mobile Homes (2006)	% Change
Adelanto	3,917	6,591	68 %	1,137	1,205	6.0%	493	508	3.0%
Apple Valley	15,678	20,048	28%	3,451	3,775	9.4%	1,034	1,043	0.9%
Barstow	5,500	5,880	7%	2,558	2,954	15%	1,095	1,115	1.8%
Big Bear Lake	7,621	8,278	9%	701	776	11%	383	390	2%
Chino	13,414	15,179	13%	3,956	4,271	8%	528	528	0%
Chino Hills	17,886	19,748	10%	1,842	2,419	31%	686	686	0%
Colton	9,699	10,209	5.2%	5,166	5,173	0.13%	815	815	0%
Fontana	27,737	39,451	42%	7,288	7,465	2.4%	882	1,159	31%
Grand Terrace	3,038	3,095	2.0%	1,170	1,170	0%	250	250	0%
Hesperia	17,526	23,450	34%	2,628	3,124	19%	1,198	1,300	8.5%
Highland	11,312	12,937	14%	2,741	2,727	-0.5%	809	861	6.4%
Loma Linda	3,835	4,775	24%	3,687	3,735	1.3%	562	562	0%
Montclair	5,960	6,317	6.0%	2,352	2,384	1.4%	754	861	14%
Needles	1,476	1,643	11%	541	621	15%	534	628	18%
Ontario	30,406	31,179	2.5%	12,709	13,569	7.0%	2,067	2,211	7.0%
Rancho Cucamonga	31,752	38,198	20%	9,010	14,834	65%	1,372	1,380	0.58%
Redlands	16,723	18,037	8.0%	7,162	7,571	6.0%	905	919	1.5%
Rialto	19,069	19,504	2.3%	5,185	5,330	3.0%	1,794	1,803	0.50%
San Bernardino	40,081	41,801	0%	18,970	20,200	6.5%	4,480	4,485	0.11%
Twentynine Palms	4,709	6,276	33%	1,738	2,136	23%	505	543	7.5%
Upland	16,311	17.055	5.0%	8,311	8,713	4.8%	845	845	0%
Victorville	16,457	26,579	61%	4,284	4,619	8.0%	1,757	1,781	1.4%
Yucaipa	10,604	13,429	27%	1,282	1,636	28%	4,226	4227	0.02%
Yucca Valley	6,228	7,703	24%	1,017	1,053	3.5%	707	707	0%
County Unincorporated	336,939	107,534	-213%	108,886	121,460	11%	28,681	29,607	3.2%

Source: Department of Finance Population and Housing Estimates, (4/1/1990 to 4/1/2000); (1/1/2007).
[1]Data for Table 3 is provided in Attachment 2 for the Years 1990-2000.

☒ 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, .

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 REGINAL 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 San Bernardino County from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction's Annual Reports (1977 through 2005).

Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)

Year	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Adelanto	14,305	17,032	17,594	16,474	*	*	*	*	26,825
Apple Valley	38,022	42,962	42,753	41,972	44,468	48,350	56,047	63,954	75,782
Barstow	23,805	26,113	24,604	24,034	24,116	24,529	28,436	34,716	30,975
Big Bear Lake	14,088	17,147	18,460	18,562	18,481	18,771	16,781	17,001	19,164
Chino	88,373	82,022	77,427	84,488	84,279	92,846	106,830	108,687	103,855
Chino Hills	29,797	30,573	33,497	41,091	36,191	36,281	37,175	40,634	46,258
Colton	52,685	52,085	48,464	48,736	50,884	57,428	62,181	61,065	66,496
Fontana	106,597	100,914	112,606	123,822	132,994	140,516	168,852	176,316	188,438
Grand Terrace	7,198	7,716	7,147	7,665	8,033	8,948	9,852	11,234	11,253
Hesperia	42,676	46,887	44,279	47,617	46,490	50,736	63,912	66,068	77,538
Highland	24,337	24,987	23,491	27,772	30,831	32,796	39,487	39,523	41,195
Loma Linda	20,330	18,919	18,704	18,827	18,997	19,368	18,909	20,955	22,125
Montclair	37,529	34,096	36,156	34,758	35,617	34,062	40,172	40,622	39,190
Needles	5,801	5,932	5,503	5,453	6,232	5,637	5,540	8,650	6,827
Ontario	246,140	268,943	257,474	239,147	230,630	273,782	276,370	290,996	297,638
Rancho Cucamonga	119,231	126,481	118,699	138,815	140,815	148,163	168,629	185,318	192,245
Redlands	53,130	54,551	58,138	63,569	67,979	70,868	82,106	83,297	84,961
Rialto	66,051	63,027	64,897	78,029	85,918	87,220	93,236	102,782	109,558
San Bernardino	165,649	173,389	176,667	194,846	200,438	205,741	224,298	229,317	238,687
Twentynine Palms	11,272	11,262	10,422	16,819	18,289	21,131	23,410	20,421	24,973
Upland	57,108	58,741	60,659	60,990	62,080	63,174	66,935	68,910	71,595
Victorville	59,160	64,646	62,130	63,982	68,294	75,237	86,861	96,108	115,891
Yucaipa	27,378	29,738	30,727	31,303	30,471	31,495	36,068	39,294	41,602
Yucca Valley	15,228	15,899	15,484	17,025	18,349	18,091	22,075	24,895	27,857
Unincorp.Co.	243,201	296,925	303,543	297,678	310,354	316,319	342,582	376,671	370,354
Countywide	1,390,172	1,278,510	1,031,456	1,069,438	1,116,204	1,033,393	1,625,363	1,791,804	1,919,998

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility*
[1]The 1990 Solid Waste Generation Study data for Table 4 is provided in Attachment 2.
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):

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

See Table 3B: Countywide (1995-2000) Diversion Rates versus (2000-2005) Diversion Rates, in the 2007 CIWMP Five-Year Review Report on page 20 for a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

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 of San Bernardino 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 San Bernardino County Jurisdictions (1996 to 2005)

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Adelanto	1995	N/A%	Compliance Fulfilled
	1996	NR	Compliance Fulfilled
	1997	25%	Board Accepted
	1998	39%	Board Accepted
	1999	29%	Board Approved
	2000	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	NR	Compliance Active
	2002	NR	Compliance Active
	2003	NR	Compliance Active
	2004	NR	Compliance Active
	2005	54%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Apple Valley	1995	19%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	26%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	40%	Board Accepted
	1998	34%	Board Accepted
	1999	39%	Board Approved
	2000	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	38%	Board Approved Time Extension

Cont. Apple Valley	2003	30%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	25%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	17%	Other

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Barstow	1995	25%	Board Approved
	1996	33%	Board Approved
	1997	51%	Board Accepted
	1998	47%	Board Accepted
	1999	53%	Board Approved
	2000	57%	Board Approved
	2001	59%	Board Approved
	2002	59%	Board Approved
	2003	54%	Board Approved
	2004	57%	Board Approved
	2005	57%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Big Bear Lake	1995	N/A%	Compliance Fulfilled
	1996	NR	Compliance Fulfilled
	1997	NR	Board Accepted
	1998	56%	Board Accepted with New Base Year
	1999	56%	Board Approved
	2000	59%	Board Approved
	2001	60%	Board Approved
	2002	60%	Board Approved
	2003	66%	Board Approved
	2004	70%	Board Approved
	2005	66%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Chino	1995	24%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	37%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	35%	Board Accepted
	1998	41%	Board Accepted
	1999	48%	Board Approved
	2000	51%	Board Approved
	2001	47%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	56%	Preliminary Data
	2004	56%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	61%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Chino Hills	1995	34%	Board Approved
	1996	41%	Board Approved
	1997	37%	Board Accepted
	1998	48%	Board Accepted
	1999	49%	Board Approved
	2000	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	54%	Board Approved
	2002	55%	Board Approved
	2003	57%	Board Approved
	2004	61%	Board Approved
	2005	31%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Colton	1995	32%	Board Approved
	1996	30%	Board Approved
	1997	NR	Board Accepted
	1998	NR	Board Accepted
	1999	54%	Board Approved
	2000	56%	Board Approved
	2001	55%	Board Approved
	2002	51%	Board Approved
	2003	49%	Board Approved
	2004	57%	Board Approved
	2005	54%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Fontana	1995	15%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	29%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	31%	Board Accepted
	1998	38%	Board Accepted
	1999	42%	Board Approved
	2000	54%	Board Approved
	2001	52%	Board Approved
	2002	52%	Board Approved
	2003	46%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2004	49%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2005	44%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Grand Terrace	1995	30%	Board Approved
	1996	38%	Board Approved
	1997	48%	Board Accepted
	1998	48%	Board Accepted
	1999	53%	Board Approved
	2000	52%	Board Approved
	2001	52%	Board Approved
	2002	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	46%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2004	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2005	45%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Hesperia	1995	39%	Board Approved
	1996	38%	Board Approved
	1997	45%	Board Accepted
	1998	41%	Board Accepted
	1999	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	50%	Board Approved
	2002	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	35%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	54%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	52%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Highland	1995	31%	Board Approved
	1996	29%	Board Approved
	1997	27%	Board Accepted
	1998	29%	Board Accepted
	1999	37%	Board Approved
	2000	52%	Board Approved
	2001	48%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	45%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	43%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Loma Linda	1995	N/A%	Compliance Fulfilled
	1996	NR	Compliance Fulfilled
	1997	NR	Board Accepted
	1998	NR	Board Accepted
	1999	30%	Board Approved
	2000	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	36%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	35%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	38%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Montclair	1995	28%	Board Approved
	1996	39%	Board Approved
	1997	28%	Board Accepted
	1998	37%	Board Accepted
	1999	38%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	44%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	41%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	50%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Needles	1995	24%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	24%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	17%	Board Accepted
	1998	18%	Board Accepted
	1999	28%	Board Approved
	2000	33%	Board Approved Alternative Diversion Reqmt.
	2001	27%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	36%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	11%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	34%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Ontario	1995	N/A%	Compliance Fulfilled
	1996	NR	Compliance Fulfilled
	1997	20%	Board Accepted
	1998	17%	Board Accepted
	1999	26%	Board Approved
	2000	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	32%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	49%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	51%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	53%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Rancho Cucamonga	1995	26%	Board Approved
	1996	35%	Board Approved
	1997	37%	Board Accepted
	1998	37%	Board Approved
	1999	45%	Board Approved
	2000	35%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	37%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	55%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	52%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	53%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Redlands	1995	35%	Board Approved
	1996	45%	Board Approved
	1997	45%	Board Accepted
	1998	45%	Board Accepted
	1999	45%	Board Approved
	2000	45%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	41%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	34%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	39%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Rialto	1995	43%	Board Approved
	1996	45%	Board Approved
	1997	48%	Board Accepted
	1998	54%	Board Accepted
	1999	55%	Board Approved
	2000	51%	Board Approved
	2001	49%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	43%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
San Bernardino	1995	23%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	35%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	44%	Board Accepted
	1998	43%	Board Accepted
	1999	46%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	46%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	45%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	46%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Twentynine Palms	1995	40%	Board Approved
	1996	39%	Board Approved
	1997	41%	Board Accepted
	1998	43%	Board Accepted
	1999	49%	Board Approved
	2000	54%	Board Approved
	2001	54%	Board Approved
	2002	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	44%	Board Approved
	2004	60%	Board Approved
	2005	55%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Upland	1995	23%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	29%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	36%	Board Accepted
	1998	37%	Board Accepted
	1999	38%	Board Approved
	2000	41%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	46%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Victorville	1995	22%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	22%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	NR	Board Accepted
	1998	NR	Board Accepted
	1999	43%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	44%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	35%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	35%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	28%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Yucaipa	1995	38%	Board Approved
	1996	31%	Board Approved
	1997	39%	Board Accepted
	1998	44%	Board Accepted
	1999	49%	Board Approved
	2000	60%	Board Approved
	2001	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	41%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	40%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Yucca Valley	1995	58%	Board Approved
	1996	64%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	63%	Board Accepted
	1998	63%	Board Accepted
	1999	66%	Board Approved
	2000	65%	Board Approved
	2001	64%	Board Approved
	2002	65%	Board Approved
	2003	59%	Board Approved
	2004	62%	Board Approved
	2005	55%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
County Unincorporated	1995	44%	Board Approved
	1996	44%	Board Approved
	1997	37%	Board Accepted
	1998	25%	Board Accepted
	1999	39%	Board Approved
	2000	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	42%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2003	40%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2004	38%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2005	43%	Biennial Review Not Completed Yet

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report* http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp): _____

Explanation of Disposal and Diversion Rate Trends (if applicable)

☒ 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 San Bernardino 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 Tables 7A, 7B, 7C, and 7D of the CIWMP 2007 Five-Year Review Report.

☐ The County of San Bernardino 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

The County of San Bernardino continues to have disposal capacity available for solid waste disposal. Available capacity as calculated in attached Tables 7A (San Bernardino County System-wide Landfill Site Life Assessment) and Table 7D (Systemwide Landfill Diminishing Capacity) is estimated at 30.28 years. (See pages 31 and 33, respectively in the 2007 CIWMP Five-Year-Review Report). At current anticipated disposal levels, the County's system is expected to provide disposal capacity until the year 2037. The County's Siting Element (CSE) is kept current through the County's annual report and continues to be an applicable planning tool.

SECTION 4.3 CHANGES IN FUNDING SOURCE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT (SE) AND SUMMARY PLAN (SP)

The County has not experienced any changes in the funding of the SE or SP:

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the SE and the SP. The primary sources of funding include tipping fees received from the County's disposal system, fees from solid waste collection rates and franchise fees. 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.

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 County of San Bernardino 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 County of San Bernardino Countywide planning documents. Specifically,

SECTION 4.4 CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

The County of San Bernardino has experienced changes in the following administrative responsibilities:

▪

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, .

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 such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is needed.

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 such that a revision to one or more of the planning documents is necessary.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES

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

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

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

The discussion below addresses San Bernardino 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.

Based on the updated status provided by the annual reports, the continuing development and implementation of selected and alternative programs, the information received from the County's Local Task Force, the previous (2004 and 2007, respectively) amendments to the Countywide SE and NDFE, and the information presented in this report, SWMD has determined that no other revision to the CIWMP is necessary at this time.

SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS BY

SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if any)

SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

-
-
-

Last Page