STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP 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. This 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template was developed in an effort to provide a cost-effective method to streamline the 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP review and reporting process. The purpose of this 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report template is to document compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and to request Board approval of the 5-Year CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report findings.

After reviewing and considering the Local Task Force (LTF) comments submitted to the county or regional agency and the Board on areas of the CIWMP or RAIWMP that need revision, if any, the county or regional agency may use this template for its 5-year CIWMP or RAIWMP Review 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* 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report, OLA staff will review the request and prepare an agenda item with their findings for Board consideration.

If you have any questions about the 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review process or how to complete this form, please contact your OLA representative at (916) 341-6199. Mail completed and signed 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP 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 or RAIWMP 5-Year Review Report on behalf of:			
County or Regional Agency Name Kern County		County Kern	
Authorized Signature D B Harley		Title Director	
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Daphne B. Harley	Date Jan. 20, 2006	Phone (661) 862-8900	
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Donn Fergerson	Title Waste Management Specialist	Phone (661) 862-8765	
Mailing Address 2700 M Street, Suite 500	City Bakersfield	State CA	Zip 93301-2372
E-mail Address donnf@co.kern.ca.us			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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	OTHER ISSUES	16
6.0	ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW	16
7.0	SUMMARY of FINDINGS	17
8.0	REVISION SCHEDULE	17
9.0	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	17
APPENDIX A	LTF COMMENTS	
APPENDIX B	KERN COUNTY & INCORPORTED CITIES INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN; SITING ELEMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is Kern County's (County) first 5-Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

The jurisdictions in the County include Arvin, Bakersfield, California City, Delano, Maricopa, McFarland, Ridgecrest, Shafter, Taft, Tehachapi, and Wasco.

☒ Other than Delano (has a time extension), each jurisdiction in the County has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. The details are provided in the table below.

Jurisdiction	Type of Alternative Diversion Requirement	Diversion Requirement (%)	Goal/Extension Date
Delano	Time Extension	50	2003

Additional Information: The Cities of Arvin and McFarland are under a Compliance Order by the Board.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

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

Name	Representative Of
Mariana Teel	CITY OF TEHACHAPI
Mike Maggard	BAKERSFIELD CITY COUNCIL
Supervisor Don Maben	COUNTY OF KERN
Supervisor Michael Rubio	COUNTY OF KERN
Larry Moxley (Chairman)	FRANCHISE HAULERS, METRO-BAKERSFIELD
Paul Benz	FRANCHISE HAULERS, NON-METRO BAKERSFIELD
Dennis Lynch	RECYCLER
Patricia DeMond (Vice-Chair)	PUBLIC-AT-LARGE, Universal Collection Area
Michael Geyer	PUBLIC-AT-LARGE, NON-UNIVERSAL COLLECTION AREA
Supervisor Ray Watson	COUNTY OF KERN-ALTERNATE MEMBER
Harold Hanson	BAKERSFIELD CITY COUNCIL--ALTERNATE MEMBER
(Not Designated)	ASSOCIATION OF CITIES

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 January 13, 2006LTF meeting.

3. The County received the written comments from the LTF on January 17, 2006, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the 5-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to the Board and the LTF.

4. A copy of the LTF comments:
   ☒ Is included as Appendix A – LTF Comments.
   ☒ Was submitted to the Board on January 18, 2006.

5. In summary, the LTF comments conclude that no revision of the CIWMP is necessary at this time.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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

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

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

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

☒ The residential/non-residential generation percentages have changed significantly since the preparation of the original planning documents. The following table documents the new percentages and the data source.

Table 1. Sources of Generation

JURISDICTION	RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE		NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE	
	OLD	NEW	OLD	NEW
Shafter	7.5	35	92.5	65

Source: Board-approved new base-year.

Table 2. Demographics*

POPULATION			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	**1990**	**2002**	**% Change**
Arvin	9,286	13,550	45.9
Bakersfield	174,978	258,300	47.6
California City	5,955	10,850	82.2
Delano	22,762	41,000	80.1
Maricopa	1,193	1,130	-5.3
McFarland	7,005	10,050	43.5
Ridgecrest	28,295	25,550	-9.7
Shafter	8,409	13,050	55.2
Taft	5,902	8,950	51.6
Tehachapi	6,182	11,050	78.7
Wasco	12,412	21,700	74.8
Kern-Unincorporated	262,602	273,800	4.3
Countywide	544,981	688,900	26.4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(12/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

EMPLOYMENT			
Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	**1990**	**2002**	**% Change**
Countywide Employment	234,000	262,000	12

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS			
Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	**1990**	**2002**	**% Change**
Arvin	26,693	34,055	27.6
Bakersfield	2,169,239	3,828,193	76.5
California City	10,729	16,975	58.2
Delano	132,119	194,983	47.6
Maricopa	1,327	1,983	49.4
McFarland	7,584	13,666	80.2
Ridgecrest	172,721	216,536	25.4
Shafter	41,605	170,125	308.9
Taft	95,606	107,910	12.9
Tehachapi	40,370	77,980	93.2
Wasco	44,170	66,766	51.2
Kern-Unincorporated	1,510,120	1,904,407	26.1
Countywide	4,850,289	7,565,892	56.0

Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index	**1990**	**2002**	**% Change**
	135.0	186.1	37.9

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

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

Table 3. Dwelling Information

Jurisdiction	1990 Single Family Dwellings	2002 Single Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Multi-Family Dwellings	2002 Multi-Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Mobile Homes	2002 Mobile Homes	% Change
Arvin	1,741	2,448	40.6	548	543	-0.9	161	256	59.0
Bakersfield	41,491	63,514	53.1	22,726	25,131	10.6	2,010	2,554	27.1
California City	1,803	2,738	51.9	378	538	42.3	203	300	47.8
Delano	4,492	6,965	55.1	1,605	1,707	6.4	385	449	16.6
Maricopa	245	255	4.1	16	14	-12.5	177	193	9.0
McFarland	1,533	1,717	12.0	206	301	46.1	8	27	237.5
Ridgecrest	7,554	7,859	4.0	2,581	2,462	-4.6	1,114	992	-11.0
Shafter	1,935	2,998	54.9	475	470	-1.1	231	211	-8.7
Taft	1,869	1,866	-0.2	394	537	36.3	107	96	-10.3
Tehachapi	1,723	1,999	16.0	709	666	-6.1	155	281	81.3
Wasco	2,702	3,524	30.4	779	731	-6.2	116	131	12.9
Kern-Unincorporated	66,935	74,274	11.0	11,122	10,858	-2.4	18,407	18,046	-2.0
Countywide	134,023	170,157	27.0	41,539	43,958	5.8	23,074	23,536	2.0

Sources: CA Department of Finance website: http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5.xls and http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/demograp/E5a.xls

Analysis

☒ These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the Countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided in section 7.0.

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 documents the 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.

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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 2002).

Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)

Year	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001*	2002*
Arvin	10,073	7,290	6,872	7,467	8,896	7,850	8,609	9,461	8,519
Bakersfield	327,772	241,670	230,699	234,352	252,982	258,330	256,685	256,262	260,111
California City	6,616	2,916	3,034	3,159	3,247	3,788	3,290	4,666	5,238
Delano	37,629	25,213	25,101	26,038	28,191	31,839	31,186	30,716	31,790
Maricopa	4,447	1,010	1,025	952	868	814	734	790	790
McFarland	6,580	4,920	4,134	4,937	4,502	5,990	6,243	6,168	7,143
Ridgecrest	58,829	39,582	33,856	35,978	37,975	41,571	37,585	29,682	36,663
Shafter	16,585	28,848	31,578	13,672	15,348	18,804	16,047	13,349	14,489
Taft	23,157	11,566	10,129	6,446	9,557	10,447	9,625	8,565	8,107
Tehachapi	21,326	7,362	5,415	6,041	4,835	4,970	4,985	6,887	9,402
Wasco	24,531	12,118	13,635	11,716	13,306	13,602	13,458	14,513	15,158
Kern-Unincorporated	511,766	273,340	286,445	286,149	295,747	286,411	281,153	308,384	308,318
Countywide	1,049,311	655,835	651,923	636,907	675,454	684,417	669,598	689,442	705,726

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, *Board-Approved SRRE Agenda Items.*

*CIWMB internal DRS Database confirmed Maricopa's 2001 and 2002 to be correct.

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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
Arvin	5,436	8,609	-58.4
Bakersfield	114,988	256,685	-123.2
California City	4,903	3,290	32.9
Delano	16,861	31,186	-85.0
Maricopa	646	734	-13.6
McFarland	3,690	6,243	-69.2
Ridgecrest	39,699	37,585	5.3
Shafter	11,797	16,047	-36.0
Taft	8,513	9,625	-13.1
Tehachapi	17,646	4,985	71.7
Wasco	11,481	13,458	-17.2
Kern-Unincorporated	339,177	281,153	17.1
Countywide	574,837	669,598	-16.5

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), *and Board-Approved SRRE Agenda Items.*

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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 Kern County Jurisdictions (1990to 2002)

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Arvin	1995	33%	Board Approved
	1996	39%	Board Approved
	1997	34%	Board Approved
	1998	21%	Board Approved
	1999	32%	Board Approved
	2000	28%	Board Approved – Alternative Div. Rate (45%)
	2001	No Rate	Compliance Active
	2002	No Rate	Compliance Active
Bakersfield	1995	34%	Board Approved
	1996	38%	Board Approved
	1997	38%	Board Approved
	1998	35%	Board Approved
	1999	38%	Board Approved– Good Faith Effort
	2000	49%	Board Approved – Good Faith Effort
	2001	48%	Board Approved
	2002	50%	Board Approved
California City	1995	61%	Board Approved
	1996	60%	Board Approved
	1997	60%	Board Approved
	1998	61%	Board Approved
	1999	54%	Board Approved
	2000	62%	Board Approved
	2001	48%	Board Approved – Good Faith Effort
	2002	44%	Board Approved – Good Faith Effort

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(08/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Delano	1995	39%	Board Approved
	1996	39%	Board Approved
	1997	42%	Board Approved
	1998	39%	Board Approved
	1999	32%	Board Approved
	2000	36%	Board Approved – Time Extension
	2001	43%	Board Approved – Time Extension
	2002	41%	Board Approved – Time Extension
Maricopa	1995	60%	Board Approved
	1996	35%	Board Approved
	1997	41%	Board Approved
	1998	61%	Board Approved
	1999	56%	Board Approved
	2000	62%	Board Approved
	2001	63%	Board Approved – Compliance Fulfilled
	2002	57%	Board Approved
McFarland	1995	32%	Board Approved
	1996	47%	Board Approved
	1997	38%	Board Approved
	1998	45%	Board Approved
	1999	No Rate	Board Approved – Compliance Fulfilled
	2000	No Rate	Board Approved – Compliance Fulfilled
	2001	36%	Board Approved – Compliance Fulfilled
	2002	25%	Board Approved – Compliance Fulfilled
Ridgecrest	1995	48%	Board Approved
	1996	54%	Board Approved
	1997	54%	Board Approved
	1998	51%	Board Approved
	1999	49%	Board Approved

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(08/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
	2000	55%	Board Approved
	2001	67%	Board Approved
	2002	59%	Board Approved
Shafter	1995	30%	Board Approved
	1996	25%	Board Approved
	1997	71%	Board Approved
	1998	68%	Board Approved
	1999	60%	Board Approved
	2000	70%	Board Approved
	2001	77%	Board Approved
	2002	76%	Board Approved
Taft	1995	51%	Board Approved
	1996	57%	Board Approved
	1997	75%	Board Approved
	1998	63%	Board Approved
	1999	63%	Board Approved
	2000	67%	Board Approved
	2001	72%	Board Approved
	2002	73%	Board Approved
Tehachapi	1995	67%	Board Approved
	1996	77%	Board Approved
	1997	77%	Board Approved
	1998	81%	Board Approved
	1999	84%	Board Approved
	2000	85%	Board Approved
	2001	79%	Board Approved

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(08/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
Tehachapi	2002	71%	Board Approved
Wasco	1995	59%	Board Approved
	1996	54%	Board Approved
	1997	62%	Board Approved
	1998	57%	Board Approved
	1999	56%	Board Approved
	2000	58%	Board Approved
	2001	58%	Board Approved
	2002	56%	Board Approved
Kern-Unincorporated	1995	46%	Board Approved
	1996	47%	Board Approved
	1997	48%	Board Approved
	1998	47%	Board Approved
	1999	48%	Board Approved
	2000	51%	Board Approved
	2001	52%	Board Approved
	2002	51%	Board Approved

Sources: the Board's *Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report* http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp, and Biennial Review Preliminary Review letters for 2001, 2002.

Explanation of Diversion Rate Trends

☒ 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.

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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 continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., greater than 15 years). Supporting documentation is provided in Attachment B – Kern County & Incorporate Cities Integrated Waste Management Plan; Siting Element & Environmental Impact Report.

Analysis
In 1992, the County opened the Bena Sanitary Landfill. If the CIWMB grants additional permits to develop the remainder of the site and waste diversion stabilizes at 50%, the potential remaining capacity for the Bena Sanitary Landfill site exceeds 60 years.

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

The County has experienced the following changes in the funding of the CSE or SP:

- The CSE currently underwent a text revision, but no changes have taken place.

Analysis
☒ There have been no changes in funding source administration of the CSE and SP that warrant a revision to any of the Countywide planning documents.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The County has experienced changes in the following administrative responsibilities:

- No changes have taken place.

Analysis
☒ There have been no changes in administrative responsibilities that warrant a revision to any of the planning documents.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(08/03)

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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

1. Progress of Program Implementation

   a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element

   ☒ 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.

   b. Nondisposal Facility Element

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

   c. Countywide Siting Element

   ☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current, amended CSE.

   d. Summary Plan

   ☒ There have been no changes to the information provided in the current 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 except the NDFE. The basis for this determination is provided below:

Arvin and McFarland's programs are not currently meeting their goals. These cities are on a compliance order from the CIWMB. Additionally, Delano has been issued a 1066 time extension. Please see each jurisdiction's PARIS for program details on their attempts to reach the goals.

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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.

There have not been any changes in available markets for recyclable materials therefore, no revisions to the planning documents are necessary.

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.

No revisions to the planning documents are necessary.

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.

There have been no other significant issues/changes within the County therefore, no revisions to the planning documents are necessary.

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. The following jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents:

- The County plans to amend its NDFE to include the Responsible Compost Management Facility.
- The City of Bakersfield plans to amend its NDFE to include the Mt. Vernon Green Waste Facility.

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.

No revisions to the planning documents are necessary.

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY of FINDINGS by County

The overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable.

The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources, and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the CIWMP and this document are accurately described.

Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been and are continuing to be implemented.

Although a few programs have been revised, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated.

The County continues to monitor evolving compliance issues. To better understand the effectiveness of programs, the County monitors the performance and progress of neighboring jurisdictions.

Consequently, the County feels that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports.

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

SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE

The County is not planning to revise any components of the CIWMP at this time.

SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

18788. Five-Year Review and Revision of the Countywide or Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan.
(a) CIWMP or RAIWMP Review. Prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of a CIWMP or RAIWMP, or its most recent revision, the LTF shall complete a review of the CIWMP or RAIWMP in accordance with Public Resources Code sections 40051, 40052, and 41822, to assure that the county's and regional agency's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in Public Resources Code, section 40051.

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

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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

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

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

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

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

(D) Changes in administrative responsibilities;

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

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

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

(H) Changes in the implementation schedule.

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

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

5-Year CIWMP Review Report

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

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

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

Authority:
Section 40502 of the Public Resources Code.

Reference:
Sections 40051, 40052, 41750, 41760, 41770, and 41822 of the Public Resources Code.

APPENDIX A

LTF Comments

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND LOCAL TASK FORCE

MEMBERS

ASSOCIATION OF CITIES
Mariana Teel
City of Tehachapi

BAKERSFIELD CITY COUNCIL
Harold Hanson

COUNTY OF KERN
Supervisor Don Maben

COUNTY OF KERN
Supervisor Michael Rubio

FRANCHISE HAULERS,
METRO-BAKERSFIELD
Larry Moxley (Chairman)

FRANCHISE HAULERS,
NON-METRO BAKERSFIELD
Paul Benz

RECYCLER
Dennis Lynch

PUBLIC-AT-LARGE,
UNIVERSAL COLLECTION AREA
Patricia DeMond (Vice-Chair)

PUBLIC-AT-LARGE,
NON-UNIVERSAL COLLECTION AREA
Michael Geyer

ALTERNATE MEMBERS

COUNTY OF KERN
Supervisor Jon McQuiston

ASSOCIATION OF CITIES
(Not Designated)

BAKERSFIELD CITY COUNCIL
David Couch

January 18, 2006

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

Dear Members of the California Integrated Waste Management Board:

Subject: Five Year CIWMP Review

The Kern County Waste Management Department (WMD) presented the proposed Five Year CIWMP Review report to the Local Task Force (LTF), in compliance with Public Resources Code Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788, at their meeting on January 13, 2006. The WMD requested that the LTF review the report prepared by WMD staff and provide comments.

> *The LTF has reviewed the Five Year CIWMP Review report prepared by the WMD. The LTF has no comments, except to recommend that staff proceed with the submission of the report to the CIWMB for approval.*

The LTF hereby submits this comment to the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Sincerely,

Larry Moxley, Chairman
Kern County Local Task Force

KAS:LM:pjg
I:\CLERICAL\Admin_WMD\SWMAC\2006\5yrCIWMP_ltr to CIWMB.doc
Attachment: Staff Report
cc: Nikki Mizwinski, CIWMB
WMD-IWMB
ADM-SWMAC

c/o Kern County Waste Management Department
2700 "M" Street, Suite 500, Bakersfield, CA 93301 (661) 862-8900

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

KERN COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LOCAL TASK FORCE

STAFF REPORT AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS
ON
5-YEAR CIWMP REVIEW

Date: January 13, 2006

- This report covers the period up to and including 2003.

- It does not cover current years.
    - 2004 and 2005 will be dealt with in the next 5 year review.

- The only changes identified by staff is the need to amend the NDFE for two projects:
    - Responsible Compost Management (RCM) which has been reviewed by the committee but which is still in the CEQA process, and has not received land use or permitting approvals to date.
    - The City of Bakersfield Mount Vernon facility requires a change of address in the NDFE.

- CIWMB staff has indicated that for the purposes of the Waste Board certifying this 5 year review, all required information has been included.

- Staff requests that the LTF approve the 5 year review for submission to the Waste Board.

APPENDIX B

Kern County & Incorporated Cities Integrated Waste Management Plan

Siting Element & Environmental Impact Report

KERN COUNTY AND INCORPORATED CITIES INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Siting Element and Environmental Impact Report

SCH #95102026

WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2700 "M" Street, Suite 500
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Daphne H. Washington, Director

April 23, 1996
Revised April 25, 2000

Printed on Recycled Paper

same size as the State of Hawaii). Kern County has a valley region (San Joaquin), a mountain region (Sierra Nevada Range, Temblor Range and Coast Range) and a desert region (Indian Wells and Fremont Valleys). Solid waste collection and transportation issues and constraints are different for each region. Hilly terrain between major activity centers and distances of more than 100 miles constrain the transportation of solid waste from one region to another and limit the potential for import or export of solid waste.

The County's economy is based on farming, petroleum, airborne weapons and flight testing, and mining industries. Major employers in Kern County are oil and mineral extractors, farmers, local government and the military. Recreational attractions abound in each region. Many southern Californians visit Lake Isabella Reservoir's recreation facilities, for example. Furthermore, Sierra ski areas attract Kern County residents and southern Californians alike. The only waterway of consequence is the Kern River, which flows southwestward from the Sierra Nevada into the San Joaquin Valley through Bakersfield.

Land use development and census data provided by the Kern Council of Governments (KernCOG) show Kern County having moderate growth through at least the year 2010. Between the years 1970 and 1986, population increased by 47 percent. In 1987, Kern County's population was about 499,100. In 1990, the population was 547,000 with 198,636 dwelling units. The projected population for the year 2000 is 663,000 people. By the year 2010, 766,000 might reside in Kern County. The estimated growth rate between the years 1987 and 2010 is 53 percent.

1.5 History of Solid Waste Management in Kern County

From the 1940s to 1972, most of Kern County's solid waste was disposed in burn dumps. The County Public Works Department operated some burn dumps; cities operated some and still others were privately operated. Starting in 1972, the County Public Works Department began operating sanitary landfills. Kern County built sanitary landfills in proximity to every city or population center in Kern County. In addition, the County operated the City of Bakersfield-owned Sanitary Landfill for almost ten years, before it became inactive in 1983. Since then, the County has owned and operated all publicly accessible sanitary landfills in Kern County. The city of Bakersfield has not operated any facilities since 1983. There have never been any privately operated sanitary landfills in Kern County that were open to the public and could accept Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) in sufficient quantity.

In 1992, KCWMD opened the Bena Sanitary Landfill. Bena is the County's first state-of-the-art, fully-lined landfill and serves the metropolitan Bakersfield area. If the CIWMB grants additional permits to develop the remainder of the site, waste diversion stabilizes at 50 percent, potential total capacity for the Bena Sanitary Landfill site exceeds 60 years.