

Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report

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

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

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

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



General Instructions

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

SECTION 1.0 COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION			
I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five-Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name County of Santa Clara		County Santa Clara	
Authorized Signature		Title Program Manager	
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Elizabeth Constantino	Date 8-22-07	Phone (408) 282-3165	
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Clifton Chew	Title Management Analyst	Phone (408) 282-3167	
Mailing Address 1553 Berger Dr., Bldg #1	City San Jose	State CA	Zip 95112
E-mail Address clifton.chew@aem.sccgov.org			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

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

The jurisdictions in the county include Campbell, Cupertino, Gilroy, Morgan Hill, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Mountain View, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Saratoga, Sunnyvale and the Unincorporated Areas of Santa Clara County.

- Each jurisdiction in the county has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. No petition for a reduction in to the 50% requirement or time extension has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.
- One or more of the jurisdictions in the county has an alternative diversion requirement or time extension. The details are provided in the table below.

Jurisdiction	Type of Alternative Diversion Requirement	Diversion Requirement (%)	Goal/Extension Date
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		
	Click here for drop down menu		

Additional Information (e.g., recent regional agency formation, newly incorporated city, etc.)
 The CIWMP was approved by the CIWMB in 1996. Thus, the first anniversary date for the first Five-Year CIWMP Review was 2001. Due to limited staff resources, the report was delayed until 2004. This second Five-Year CIWMP Review was due in 2006. During this time, County staff was involved in a very large Request for Proposals for garbage, recycling and yardwaste services and did not have sufficient staffing resources to prepare the Five-Year Review concurrently. As the annual reports submitted by the County and local cities demonstrate, the focus on implementation and expansion of programs was very effective, accomplishing diversion of 50 percent or higher in most Santa Clara County jurisdictions.

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

1. The Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:

Please see Attachment _____ for additional information.

Name	Representative Of (e.g., City or County)
Kansen Chu	San Jose
Jose Esteves	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Steve Glickman	Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Saratoga
John Howe	Mountain View, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale
Patrick Kwok	All County Jurisdictions
Pete McHugh	County of Santa Clara
Jamie McLeod	All County Jurisdictions
Dolly Sandoval	Cupertino, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills
Roland Velasco	Gilroy, Morgan Hill
Vacant	Milpitas, Santa Clara

2. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP or RAIWMP and finalized its comments:

At the August 22, 2007 LTF meeting. Other (Explain): _____

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

4. A copy of the LTF comments:

is included as Appendix A.

was submitted to the Board on _____.

5. In summary, the LTF comments conclude that the overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable.

**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 of the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each subsection necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

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

- The residential/non-residential generation percentages have not changed significantly since the preparation of the planning documents.
- The residential/non-residential generation percentages have changed significantly since the preparation of the original planning documents. The following table documents the new percentages and the data source (i.e., corresponding Board-approved new generation study).

Table 1. Sources of Generation

JURISDICTION	RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE		NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE	
	OLD	NEW	OLD	NEW
City of Campbell	42	24	58	76
City of Cupertino	31.50	30	68.50	70
City of Gilroy	20.70	26	79.30	74
City of Los Altos	37	35	63	65
City of Los Altos Hills	31.38	N/A	68.62	N/A
City of Los Gatos	33.64	N/A	66.36	N/A
City of Milpitas	21.69	8	78.31	92
City of Monte Sereno	54.48	N/A	45.52	N/A
City of Morgan Hill	43.96	43.96	56.04	56.04
City of Mountain View	35.73	18	64.27	82
City of Palo Alto	24.43	24.43	75.57	75.57
City of San Jose	33.56	25	66.44	75
City of Santa Clara	22.70	11	77.30	89
City of Saratoga	52.60	N/A	47.40	N/A
City of Sunnyvale	33.20	33.20	66.80	66.80
Unincorporated Area	31.38	N/A	68.62	N/A

Sources: CIWMB Staff (Piper L. Migueltorrey/Marshalle Graham/Peter Staklis gathered data).

Table 2. Demographics*

POPULATION			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2005	% Change
City of Campbell Population	36,088	38,262	6.02
City of Cupertino Population	39,967	53,238	33.20
City of Gilroy Population	31,487	47,482	50.80
City of Los Altos Population	26,599	27,505	3.41
City of Los Altos Hills Population	7,514	8,417	12.02
City of Los Gatos Population	27,357	28,863	5.50
City of Milpitas Population	50,690	64,751	27.74
City of Monte Sereno Population	3,287	3,491	6.21
City of Morgan Hill Population	23,928	36,279	51.62
City of Mountain View Population	67,365	71,747	6.50
City of Palo Alto Population	55,900	61,431	9.89
City of San Jose Population	782,224	941,116	20.31
City of Santa Clara Population	93,613	108,680	16.09
City of Saratoga Population	28,061	30,729	9.51
City of Sunnyvale Population	117,324	132,555	12.98
Unincorporated Population	106,173	98,107	-7.60
Countywide Population	1,497,577	1,752,653	17.03

EMPLOYMENT			
Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2005	% Change
Countywide Employment	806,900	778,700	-3.49

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS			
Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2005	% Change
City of Campbell Taxable Sales	542,512	815,050	50.24
City of Cupertino Taxable Sales	598,866	1,040,560	73.76
City of Gilroy Taxable Sales	396,789	1,209,737	204.88
City of Los Altos Taxable Sales	184,939	200,659	8.05
City of Los Altos Hills Taxable Sales	6,978	7,283	4.37
City of Los Gatos Taxable Sales	315,446	729,540	131.27
City of Milpitas Taxable Sales	568,751	1,271,309	123.53
City of Monte Sereno Taxable Sales	2,810	2,027	-27.86
City of Morgan Hill Taxable Sales	185,685	524,558	182.50
City of Mountain View Taxable Sales	1,089,448	1,241,047	13.92
City of Palo Alto Taxable Sales	1,271,704	1,709,121	34.40
City of San Jose Taxable Sales	6,730,697	11,706,693	73.93
City of Santa Clara Taxable Sales	2,135,359	3,198,588	49.79
City of Saratoga Taxable Sales	76,893	86,101	11.98
City of Sunnyvale Taxable Sales	1,652,664	2,195,178	32.83
Unincorporated County Taxable Sales	253,127	384,922	52.07
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	17,914,405	30,193,802	68.54

Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index	1990	2005	% Change
	135.0	202.6	50.07

*Source: Board's Default Adjustment Factors
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp> Other:

Table 3. Dwelling Information

Jurisdiction	1990 Single Family Dwellings	2005 Single Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Multi-Family Dwellings	2005 Multi-Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Mobile Homes	2005 Mobile Homes	% Change
Campbell	8,441	9,005	6.68	7,044	7,197	2.17	398	257	-35.43
Cupertino	11,448	14,176	23.83	4,384	5,539	26.35	7	9	28.57
Gilroy	6,621	10,140	53.15	2,777	3,483	25.42	369	431	16.80
Los Altos	9,582	9,515	-0.70	738	1,200	62.60	3	16	433.33
Los Altos Hills	2,647	3,003	13.45	31	26	-16.13	4	6	50.00
Los Gatos	8,523	8,963	5.16	3,150	3,493	10.89	149	123	-17.45
Milpitas	11,444	13,154	14.94	2,449	4,355	77.83	573	586	2.27
Monte Sereno	1,182	1,158	-2.03	7	91	1200.00	1	0	-100.00
Morgan Hill	5,961	9,285	55.76	1,344	1,895	41.00	852	912	7.04
Mountain View	12,343	13,100	6.13	17,955	18,817	4.80	1,189	1,231	3.53
Palo Alto	16,253	16,568	1.94	8,822	10,790	22.31	113	164	45.13
San Jose	174,931	192,179	10.70	72,684	94,233	29.65	11,743	11,028	-6.09
Santa Clara	19,897	22,134	11.24	17,624	20,211	14.68	352	109	-69.03
Saratoga	9,697	10,204	5.23	613	798	30.18	5	7	40.00
Sunnyvale	24,109	25,225	4.63	22,459	25,155	12.00	4,221	4,096	-2.96
Santa Clara Unincorporated	27,801	26,651	-4.14	6,353	4,173	-34.31	947	683	-27.88

Source: City/County Population And Housing Estimates, 1991-2000, with 1990 Census Counts (CA Department of Finance), E-5 City / County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-2005, with 2000 Benchmark (CA Department of Finance).

Analysis

- These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.
- These demographic changes warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

Santa Clara County has experienced a 17% population growth between 1990 and 2005. However, this growth was not evenly distributed throughout the County. Cities with low growth like Los Altos (3%), Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno (6%), and Mountain View (7%) include areas already well developed. Cities with high growth include Milpitas (28%), Cupertino (33%), Gilroy (51%), and Morgan Hill (52%) include areas that are being developed. Unincorporated Santa Clara County areas experienced a population decline due to annexations of developed areas into cities.

The economy in Santa Clara County has expanded, contracted and started growing slowly again following the dot com boom then bust and subsequent recovery. The taxable sales show an

increase of nearly 70% from 1990 to 2005 reflecting the changes in the economy as can be seen with the Consumer Price Index increase of 50% during the same time period.

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

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

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

Disposal

The following table provides disposal data for the county from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction’s Annual Reports (1995 through 2005).

Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)

Year	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
City of Campbell	N/A	37,952	39,617	41,281	43,034	40,426
City of Cupertino	N/A	37,013	38,601	41,078	45,571	41,812
City of Gilroy	42,559	37,256	45,131	48,195	46,479	48,513
City of Los Altos	25,721	27,448	20,364	21,583	21,893	21,568
City of Los Altos Hills	6,246	4,785	5,045	5,935	5,659	6,069
City of Los Gatos	N/A	30,768	30,285	32,742	34,636	31,607
City of Milpitas	79,036	68,427	70,666	72,257	77,857	67,785
City of Monte Sereno	N/A	1,895	1,525	2,583	2,059	2,198
City of Morgan Hill	39,367	32,015	32,030	33,930	34,292	32,039
City of Mountain View	93,833	68,417	71,701	72,942	68,237	68,386
City of Palo Alto	115,255	84,293	90,067	88,935	79,702	80,187
City of San Jose	992,300	709,862	739,213	792,672	844,157	791,556
City of Santa Clara	240,061	153,253	173,586	194,806	183,699	195,984
City of Saratoga	N/A	18,859	17,992	21,091	19,647	21,071
City of Sunnyvale	199,933	113,675	112,497	115,016	115,735	111,806
Unincorporated County	111,045	70,693	63,118	79,110	101,584	79,428
Countywide	1,945,356	1,496,611	1,551,439	1,664,155	1,724,242	1,640,434

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
City of Campbell	41,143	42,264	40,349	37,190	36,366	38,955
City of Cupertino	39,731	39,498	36,750	38,562	38,506	38,028
City of Gilroy	52,870	52,118	52,972	44,437	51,210	46,904
City of Los Altos	14,912	23,207	22,464	22,218	20,405	21,233
City of Los Altos Hills	4,553	4,033	4,347	4,529	4,641	4,703
City of Los Gatos	33,644	31,618	23,839	25,297	28,067	28,075
City of Milpitas	65,979	67,737	62,351	66,646	68,431	66,158
City of Monte Sereno	1,803	1,660	807	849	1,109	1,343
City of Morgan Hill	34,324	37,443	33,571	32,348	32,553	29,929
City of Mountain View	70,948	65,421	57,319	54,779	54,578	53,859
City of Palo Alto	87,941	78,063	78,272	71,379	70,226	69,491
City of San Jose	773,526	715,873	664,498	692,686	670,979	711,975
City of Santa Clara	197,306	185,144	174,443	154,437	150,381	162,325
City of Saratoga	23,101	21,900	16,473	15,694	15,616	16,547
City of Sunnyvale	122,271	110,866	96,218	95,024	95,355	94,556
Unincorporated County	76,341	69,095	51,767	56,245	55,863	59,268
Countywide	1,640,393	1,545,938	1,416,442	1,412,320	1,394,287	1,443,347

Sources: 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>

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

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the 2000 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	SRRE 2000 Projected	Disposal 2000 Reported	% Difference
City of Campbell	27,863	41,143	48%
City of Cupertino	25,450	39,731	56%
City of Gilroy	56,042	52,870	-6%
City of Los Altos	16,960	14,912	-12%
City of Los Altos Hills	6,581	4,553	-31%
City of Los Gatos	23,505	33,644	43%
City of Milpitas	55,000	65,979	20%
City of Monte Sereno	1,884	1,803	-4%
City of Morgan Hill*	24,791	34,324	38%
City of Mountain View	98,257	70,948	-28%
City of Palo Alto	75,146	87,941	17%
City of San Jose	752,953	773,526	3%
City of Santa Clara	130,198	197,306	52%
City of Saratoga	29,890	23,101	-23%
City of Sunnyvale	107,550	122,271	14%
Uni. County	64,654	76,341	18%
Countywide	1,496,724	1,640,393	10%

*Morgan Hill's 2000 SRRE projected disposal tonnage was recalculated due to a typographical error in the original SRRE.

Sources: 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/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>

Diversion

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

Table 6. Biennial Review Data for Santa Clara County Jurisdictions (1995 to 2005)

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Campbell (BY 1991)	1995	39%	Board Approved
	1996	40%	Board Approved
	1997	41%	Board Accepted
	1998	36%	Board Accepted
	1999	41%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	46%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	40%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	41%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	N/A%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2004	49%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2005	46%	Priliminary Data Only
Cupertino (BY 1998)	1995	31%	Board Approved
	1996	37%	Board Approved
	1997	30%	Board Accepted
	1998	25%	Board Accepted
	1999	53%	Board Approved
	2000	58%	Board Approved
	2001	55%	Board Approved
	2002	54%	Board Approved
	2003	48%	Board Approved
	2004	53%	Board Approved
	2005	52%	Priliminary Data Only

Gilroy (BY 2000)	1995	20%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	17%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	18%	Board Accepted
	1998	23%	Board Accepted
	1999	N/A%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	49%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	50%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	54%	Board Approved
	2004	52%	Board Approved
	2005	56%	Priliminary Data Only
Los Altos (BY 2002)	1995	12%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1996	39%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1997	38%	Board Accepted
	1998	39%	Board Accepted
	1999	41%	Board Approved
	2000	64%	Board Approved
	2001	N/A%	Board Approved
	2002	50%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2003	48%	Board Approved
	2004	54%	Board Approved
2005	52%	Priliminary Data Under Staff Review	
Los Altos Hills (BY 1990)	1995	47%	Board Approved
	1996	48%	Board Approved
	1997	42%	Board Accepted
	1998	46%	Board Accepted
	1999	43%	Board Approved
	2000	62%	Board Approved
	2001	63%	Board Approved
	2002	55%	Board Approved
	2003	51%	Board Approved
	2004	57%	Board Approved
2005	51%	Priliminary Data Only	

Los Gatos (BY 1991)	1995	35%	Board Approved
	1996	41%	Board Approved
	1997	40%	Board Accepted
	1998	38%	Board Accepted
	1999	46%	Board Approved
	2000	52%	Board Approved
	2001	48%	Board Approved
	2002	57%	Board Approved
	2003	53%	Board Approved
	2004	56%	Board Approved
	2005	51%	Priliminary Data Only
Milpitas (BY 2003)	1995	33%	Board Approved
	1996	42%	Board Approved
	1997	46%	Board Accepted
	1998	41%	Board Accepted
	1999	52%	Board Approved
	2000	56%	Board Approved
	2001	52%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	54%	Board Approved
	2004	54%	Board Approved
	2005	56%	Priliminary Data Only
Monte Sereno (BY 1991)	1995	54%	Board Approved
	1996	63%	Board Approved
	1997	55%	Board Accepted
	1998	65%	Board Accepted
	1999	63%	Board Approved
	2000	70%	Board Approved
	2001	68%	Board Approved
	2002	83%	Board Approved
	2003	81%	Board Approved
	2004	78%	Board Approved
	2005	71%	Priliminary Data Only

Morgan Hill (BY 1990)	1995	31%	Board Approved
	1996	35%	Board Approved
	1997	34%	Board Accepted
	1998	37%	Board Accepted
	1999	45%	Board Approved
	2000	53%	Board Approved
	2001	47%	Board Approved
	2002	50%	Board Approved
	2003	50%	Board Approved
	2004	59%	Board Approved
	2005	64%	Priliminary Data Only
Mountain View (BY 2004)	1995	37%	Board Approved
	1996	43%	Board Approved
	1997	43%	Board Accepted
	1998	45%	Board Accepted
	1999	47%	Board Approved
	2000	52%	Board Approved
	2001	50%	Board Approved
	2002	51%	Board Approved
	2003	51%	Priliminary Data Only
	2004	73%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2005	74%	Priliminary Data Only
Palo Alto (BY 1996)	1995	39%	Board Approved
	1996	49%	Board Approved
	1997	52%	Board Accepted
	1998	57%	Board Accepted
	1999	59%	Board Approved
	2000	59%	Board Approved
	2001	61%	Board Approved
	2002	55%	Board Approved
	2003	57%	Board Approved
	2004	62%	Board Approved
	2005	63%	Priliminary Data Only

San Jose (BY 1999)	1995	44%	Board Approved
	1996	43%	Board Approved
	1997	43%	Board Accepted
	1998	42%	Board Accepted
	1999	59%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2000	64%	Board Approved
	2001	63%	Board Approved
	2002	62%	Board Approved
	2003	59%	Board Approved
	2004	62%	Board Approved
	2005	59%	Priliminary Data Only
Santa Clara (BY 1999)	1995	45%	Board Approved
	1996	43%	Board Approved
	1997	39%	Board Accepted
	1998	40%	Board Accepted
	1999	45%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2000	50%	Board Approved
	2001	49%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	45%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2003	49%	Board Approved
	2004	53%	Board Approved
2005	48%	Priliminary Data Only	
Santa Clara - Unincorporated (BY 1990)	1995	43%	Board Approved
	1996	53%	Board Approved
	1997	48%	Board Accepted
	1998	42%	Board Accepted
	1999	46%	Board Approved
	2000	54%	Board Approved
	2001	56%	Board Approved
	2002	61%	Board Approved
	2003	56%	Board Approved
	2004	62%	Board Approved
2005	55%	Priliminary Data Only	

Saratoga (BY 1991)	1995	48%	Board Approved
	1996	51%	Board Approved
	1997	53%	Board Accepted
	1998	57%	Board Accepted
	1999	55%	Board Approved
	2000	56%	Board Approved
	2001	54%	Board Approved
	2002	62%	Board Approved
	2003	62%	Board Approved
	2004	67%	Board Approved
	2005	61%	Priliminary Data Only
Sunnyvale (BYC 1997)	1995	46%	Board Approved
	1996	51%	Board Approved
	1997	51%	Board Accepted
	1998	52%	Board Accepted
	1999	55%	Board Approved
	2000	56%	Board Approved
	2001	56%	Board Approved
	2002	57%	Board Approved
	2003	56%	Board Approved
	2004	61%	Board Approved
	2005	57%	Priliminary Data Only

Sources: 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)

Table 5 lists the projected vs. disposed tonnage in the SRRE for 2000 while the disposal and diversion rates in Tables 4 and 6 follow the economic and population trends from 1995 through 2005. These trends appear to follow the economic and popouation conditions of the slow recovery from the dot com bubble burst.

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

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

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

- The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., greater than 15 years). Supporting documentation is provided in Attachment 1.
- The county does not have 15 years remaining disposal capacity. The analysis below provides the strategy for obtaining 15 years remaining disposal capacity. Attached is a revision schedule for the SE.

Analysis

The County currently has greater than 15 years of disposal capacity. The development, implementation and adoption of diversion programs established by all jurisdictions help extend landfill capacity and will continue to do so as these programs and outreach help the community understand and buy into the alternatives to landfilling waste.

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

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

-

Analysis

- There have been no changes in funding source administration of the SE and SP or the changes that have occurred do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents.
- These changes in funding source for the administration of the SE and SP warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The county has experienced changes in the following administrative responsibilities:

- No changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP. Each city and the County (for the unincorporated area) implements and oversees its own AB939 programs.

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, .

Existing SRRE and HHWE goals, policies and objectives remain consistent with requirements of PRC. Existing and selected programs for each SRRE and HHWE are reviewed at least annually by local jurisdictions. Nearly all programs have been implemented. The Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) reports for the County and each city are up to date. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs, and results, changes are not significant.

Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

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

The markets listed in the previous 5-year report still exist and continue to serve all the jurisdictions within the County. The County continues to contract with San Jose State University for the Countywide Recycling Hotline and expand its services on-line. Additionally, the CIWMB helped establish BayMax in 2000 as local exchange market.

Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule

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

All sixteen jurisdictions within Santa Clara County have implemented and continue to run multiple programs to increase diversion.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES

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

During the timeframe covered by this report, the permanent Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facility in the City of San Jose lost its lease and had to close operations. Advance notification of the closure allowed the HHW program to plan and conduct additional temporary events as well as increase the number of events at the SMaRT Station located in nearby Sunnyvale while a new facility can be located and agreed upon.

Additionally, the expiration of the Universal Waste exemption was anticipated to increase collection of HHW materials. In the last half of 2006 the Santa Clara County HHW program collected approximately 151,000 feet of fluorescent bulbs and 34,000 pounds of batteries. In response to the expiration of the Universal Waste exemption, the Household Hazardous Waste Program increased their fees to handle the additional Universal Waste. This increase was approved by the fifteen cities in the County and the County itself. Neither of these issues affect the adequacy of the CIWMP as the flexibility of the plan allows us to make adjustments to meet the needs presented.

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

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

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

.

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

Most jurisdictions in Santa Clara County have met the 50% diversion requirement in AB939 as shown in their annual reports (with only one of sixteen jurisdictions actually below 50% in 2004 and 2005).

SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY of FINDINGS by COUNTY

Jurisdictions countywide strive to maintain the highest level of diversion with the available resources. This level of cooperation has allowed countywide diversion to be extremely successful with the diversity of programs each jurisdiction brings.

SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if any)

SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

-
-
-

Attachment 1

Name of Facility	Remaining Site Life	Disposed Tonnage in 2005	Diverted Tonnage in 2005
Guadalupe Landfill	25 years	190,465	286,270
Kirby Canyon Landfill	29 years	290,320	332,182
Newby Island Landfill	14 years	636,198	819,283
Pacheco Pass Landfill	9 months	19,302	88,490
Palo Alto Landfill	5 years	20,985	38,210
Zanker Material Processing Facility	15 years	23,074	148,027
Zanker Road Landfill	18 years	13,805	283,876

Diverted includes the following: ADC, Inert, Recycled/Salvaged, Transformed/AIC and Earthen Cover