MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

1. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT	2. FISCAL YEAR PERIOD:
District R	FROM JULY 1, 2009 TO JUNE 30, 2010

GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

3 (a). What waste goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

The Solid Waste Management District's goals remained to support state efforts to reduce material going into landfills by 40%. As in the past, the approach to accomplishing this was to fund projects to enhance or develop recycling efforts.

RECEIVED BY
SEP 15 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

3 (b). What waste goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals. Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The primary goal will remain to support efforts to divert material from landfills through funding local reuse and recycling efforts. A slight change in emphasis is contemplated with District-wide projects being supported where appropriate.

4 (a). What recycling goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

1. The District's recycling goals were not quantified. Rather, the ongoing efforts to expand recycling efforts throughout the District were pursued. One of the more obvious success stories was the small grant awarded to Bollinger County Recycling, Inc. which helped this group initiate a recycling effort in a rural area where there had been no such program before.

2. Actions continued to be to provide funding to local efforts which were consistent with the District's goals.

4 (b). What recycling goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The District will continue to fund projects supporting recycling, recovery and reuse. The grant call recently completed will fund additional equipment purchases, paving of a recycling center, the expansion of another recycling center, and second year support for a fledgling recycling program in a rural area. A complete listing of these projects in included in the attached narrative report.

5 (a). What resource recovery goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

The District has never established a specific recovery goal. The District staff will be undertaking a review of the Solid Waste Management Plan with the assistance of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. This review will doubtless result in some modifications to the existing program although it is not clear what goals will be developed during the process. It is the staff view that funding for waste oil heaters in the City of Cape Girardeau's Public Works Department shops represents an effective recovery of this material.

5 (b). What resource recovery goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

No specific goals for resource recovery have been established. Such goals may be developed as part of the plan review project mentioned above.

6. SUMMARIZE THE TYPES OF PROJECTS AND RESULTS DURING FISCAL YEAR (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NEEDED.)

Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfills	Cost of Project	Number of Tons Diverted	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted
See Attached			

Measurable outcomes achieved

See the attached program narrative and accompanying "District Diversion Summary" spreadsheet.

7. SUMMARIZE PROJECTS NOT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION	
Projects not resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills	**Cost of Project**
See Attached	

Measurable outcomes achieved for these projects.

See the attached program narrative.

8. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STATISTICS FOR ITEMS BANNED FROM LANDFILLS			
List projects resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills	List cost of project resulting in tonnage diversion	Number of tons diverted from project	Average cost per ton diverted
See Attached			

9. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STATISTICS FOR ITEMS NOT BANNED FROM LANDFILLS			
List projects resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills	List cost of project resulting in tonnage diversion	Number of tons diverted from project	Average cost per ton diverted
See Attached			

10. Describe your district's grant proposal evaluation process.

See the attached program narrative.

Annual Report
Southeast Missouri Solid Waste Management District
District R
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

1. Goals and Accomplishments

The goal of the Southeast Missouri Solid Waste Management District remains what it has been since the organization was formed - - to assist the state of Missouri in meeting the state's goal of reducing, by 40%, the amount of solid waste entering landfills. This goal is met by encouraging recycling projects and programs. The District accomplishes this by providing funding to recycling operations within the District to allow them to better serve the public and recycle a greater quantity and wider variety of materials, in turn reducing the volume of material entering landfills. Minor problems encountered were delays in startup or completion of some of the projects. These delays were overcome in most instances and the projects completed and put into service.

In two cases though, projects did not move forward and the funds were recaptured by the District. In one case budgetary constraint meant that the City of Fredericktown was not in a position to purchase additional recycling bins as they had hoped. In another case, a one-time clean-up event was first delayed and then cancelled when the project sponsor suffered health problems that did not allow him to work on the project.

In the upcoming year, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee will be consulted and provide guidance as these basic goals, unchanged for a decade, are reviewed. Staff intends to produce a formal plan update, probably in the form of a "mini" Solid Waste Management Plan focusing on projects and programs appropriate to the goal. Preliminary discussions have included possible consideration of direct SWMD operation of programs or projects of a regional nature.

By way of example, these discussions have included:

1. the potential for a district-wide contract to handle e-Waste events;
2. the potential for a district wide contract to handle Household Hazardous Waste events;
3. the potential for a district-wide contract to promote educational programs; and,
4. the potential for a district-wide program to sponsor fluorescent lamp disposal.

As the review process moves ahead it is likely that additional possibilities will be identified.

In the meantime, District goals will remain essentially the same as the past years. The District will continue to solicit grant applications from qualified individuals and organizations to enhance and expand their capacity to recycle. The District membership feels that this is the approach that will provide the greatest return for the grant dollars available and best support the State's recycling goals.

2. Types of Projects and Results During Fiscal Year

During this fiscal year, eight grant projects were closed resulting in the expenditure of $155,999.33 to support eight different projects. Ten projects were approved originally, but budgetary constraints and illness among principals resulted in two not being implemented. The funds expended supported the diversion of some 6,295 tons of recyclable materials from landfills. This level of activity was higher, in dollar terms than last year's $106,591.50 and lower in tonnage terms than last year's 13,977 tons. This disparity is simply the result of timing since four projects had been initiated in January of 2009 and therefore, a half year's diversion results showed up on the 2008-09 report while the expenses show up on this FY 2009-10 report. For this year then, the recycling effort cost $24.78 per ton. Obviously, this was significantly higher than the $8.40 a ton reported last year for the reasons noted.

Of the material diverted, the vast majority was not material banned from landfills. Indeed, only the 247 tons of White Goods, 56.5 tons of electronic waste, and 4,182 gallons of waste oil fall into this category. Virtually all communities offer some type of yard waste and storm damage pickup service, but none were funded through the SWMD and therefore, no statistics were gathered. Although "recovery" has not been identified as a specific goal in the past, the project identified below to install a waste oil heater in the City of Cape Girardeau certainly represents a recovery of that material.

During this fiscal year, the District had ten active grants to assist recycling operations. All carryover funds as well as interest earned on SWMD funds were committed to these projects. The projects included:

1. Perry County Recycling Center: A grant in the amount of $17,760 was made to support the purchase of Roll-off containers to help improve collection efficiencies for that organization. The project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $13,961.25.
2. City of Cape Girardeau: A grant in the amount of $15,882.38 was made to help defray the costs of a Residential E-Waste Collection event. The event was promoted and held as scheduled. This project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $14,996.90.
3. City of Fredericktown: A grant in the amount of $8,451.75 was made to help defray the costs of purchasing new recycling bins to be distributed throughout the community. Due to fiscal constraints encountered by the City this grant was ultimately returned. Recaptured funds were available for the next grant call.
4. City of Farmington: A grant in the amount of $25,929.00 was made to help defray the costs of construction of a new municipal recycling collection site. This project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $25,929.00.
5. Bollinger County Recycling: A grant in the amount of $951.00 was made to help defray the startup costs associated with getting a new recycling organization going. The grant helped pay for basic equipment including scales and can openers, as well as helping cover transportation expenses as the organization was established. This is one of the most successful examples of a rural recycling organization being established from "scratch" of which District R staff is aware. The project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $951.00.

6. City of Cape Girardeau: A grant in the amount of $17,250.00 was made to help defray the expense of purchasing and installing two waste oil heaters in the City of Cape Girardeau's Public Works Department shops. The project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $17,250.00.
7. Cape Girardeau Community Sheltered Workshop, Inc. d/b/a VIP Industries: A grant in the amount of $19,501.38 was made to help defray the cost of purchasing a new fork lift with a bale handling attachment. The equipment was purchased and since the actual cost was lower than estimates a budget revision allowed the center to purchase additional bale ties. The project was extended to allow these final purchases to be completed.
8. City of Jackson: A grant in the amount of $55,282.10 was made to help defray the expense of purchase and installation of a new horizontal baler. The project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $48,447.30.
9. E3Quilibrium: A grant in the amount of $10,086.00 was made to help defray the costs of a general waste collection effort focusing on the Big River watershed area of St. Francois County. The project, as sometimes happens with volunteer efforts, was plagued with delays. Ultimately the project was dropped due to health problems with the key person and the funds recaptured.
10. Ste. Genevieve Recycling Center: A grant in the amount of $14,962.50 was made to help defray the cost of purchasing a new glass crusher and conveyor system to improve the handling and marketability of materials. The project was closed successfully with a total expenditure of $14,962.50.

3. Grant Proposal Evaluation Process

The District renewed and clarified its policy regarding application evaluations. This policy codified the system that had been in place for several years. Under this policy, a minimum "score" of 115 points, average of all evaluators, is required for consideration. The Proposal Review Committee rates each grant application and their average scores are used to arrive at the final rating for each application. A copy of the District's evaluation form is included as Attachment 4.

These evaluations are then presented to the Board of Directors for final approval. The District funds the applications that score the highest and for which there are sufficient funds. The Southeast Missouri Solid Waste Management District's policy is that prior year recipients may be funded as long as there have been no problems in their past performance.

Historically, District R funds only capital projects. It does not fund on-going operations of recycling centers. The Board feels that a recycling operation should be able to sustain day-to-day operations from its own resources, especially if the recycling operations receive assistance from the District with major capital expenditures.

The District authorized a grant call at the January 26, 2010 meeting with the call to be offered in March, 2010. Pursuant to this authorization the formal notification was made on March 12, 2010 with April 30, 2010 set as the deadline for submitting applications. The call resulted in receipt of 16 applications for an aggregate request of almost $283,000 against fund availability of approximately $145,000. Since demand far exceeded availability the proposal review process was key to allocating funds.

At the May 25, 2010 Board of Directors meeting the recommendations of the Proposal Review Committee were presented. The staff planner pointed out that it appeared that approximately $145,000 would be available at the end of the Fiscal Year. He also explained that the regulations allowed a "forward commitment" of funds if the Board chose that approach. Based on these recommendations the Board of Directors unanimously voted to approve seven projects in an aggregate amount of approximately $159,000. Details are included in the Proposal Review Summary included as Attachment 5 to this report.

Applications were prepared and submitted to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) on June 11, 2010. As of the end of the Fiscal Year on June 30, 2010 final approval had not been received on these applications. The SWMP staff had forwarded them with a recommendation to approve and it is confidently anticipated that the projects will move forward soon.

Approved projects include:

1. VIP Industries, Purchase of Fork Lift, $19,628.00 in District funding;
2. Perry County Sheltered Workshop, Purchase of Baler, $32,158.50 in District funding;
3. Ste. Genevieve Recycling Center, Driveway Paving, $9,351.75 in District funding;
4. Bollinger County Recycling Center, Continue and Expand Operations, $3,446.70 in District funding;
5. City of Jackson, Expansion of Recycling center, $40,378.00 in District funding;
6. Perry County Recycling Center, Purchase of Fork Lift, $24,640.50 in District funding, and,
7. Midwest Recycling Center, Equipment and Subsidy for HHW Events, $29,000.00 in District funding.

4. Future

FY 2011 will include the biannual update of the Assessment Inventory as a primary work element. In addition, staff intends to pursue the twice-delayed effort to update the regional Solid Waste Management Plan. Very preliminary email exchanges with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee were held during FY 2010, and a concerted effort will be made to update the Solid Waste Management Plan during FY 2011.

A *de facto* change from old guidelines and precedent was seen in the proposal review process for FY 2011 subgrant funding. In funding a project to provide a generalized support for electronic waste collection the Board made a shift from its historical support for projects specifically funded to accomplish very precise tasks.

One specific issue revolves around new requirements that are being implemented at the federal level to, essentially, do away with tungsten filament incandescent lamps and replace them with fluorescent lighting. This has presented a new challenge to the Solid Waste Management District. Given the composition of fluorescent lamps, specifically the presence of mercury, these are not allowed in landfills. Separate recycling collection will be required. Staff will propose a district-wide program to place appropriate collection bins/boxes/bags or such other devices as are appropriate be provided to the various recycling centers with the cost to be borne by the District.

Finally, the reporting requirements imposed on grant recipients have been changed slightly. Historically, the District has required quarterly reports for the term of the grant award. Typically, then, this has meant that each grantee submits four quarterly reports. This meets the fiscal and program requirements, but limits the value of these reports as planning tools. In recognition of this, the Scope of Work associated with individual Financial Assistance Agreements has been modified by the addition of an additional four years of diversion reporting requirements. This will allow District staff to better evaluate the effectiveness of projects receiving funding.

Attachment 4
Sample Evaluation Criteria Scoresheet

RECEIVED BY
SEP 1 5 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

Project: City of Cape Girardeau Electronic Waste Collection

Points

Consistency of the Proposed Project with State Resource Recovery Priorities

1. Conformance with the Solid Waste Management Hierarchy:

   5 points - The project is for waste reduction.
   3 points - The project is for collection/processing, composting, or market development.
   1 point - The project is for the recovery and use of energy from waste materials.

2. Market Viability:

   9 points - Includes documented commitments from end-markets for all of the end-product
   5 points - Includes documented commitments from end-markets for 50% of the end-product.
   3 points - Includes documented commitments from end-markets for less than 50% of the end-product.
   0 points - Does not include targeted end-markets for the end-product.

3. Waste Reduction/Recycling Process:

   9 points - Project results in the reduction of more than one waste stream component through changes in the design or manufacturing process, or stimulates the demand for an end-product which utilizes recovered materials.
   7 points - The project results in the reduction of a single waste stream component through changes in the design or manufacturing process, or stimulates the demand for an end-product which utilizes recovered materials.
   0 points - The project does not result in the reduction of waste stream components through changes in the design or manufacturing process, or stimulates the demand for an end-product which utilizes recovered materials.

4. Marketing Strategy:

5 points - The project has a strong marketing strategy.
3 points - The project has an acceptable marketing strategy.
1 point - The marketing strategy for the project is questionable.
0 points - The project has no marketing strategy included.

Potential Impact Upon Public/Private Sectors

1. Community-Based Market Development:

10 points - The project is very likely to result in the development of a needed local market for the community.
6 points - The project has the potential to result in the development of a needed local market for the community.
0 points - The project will not result in the development of a needed local market for the community.

2. Community-Based Job Development:

5 points - The project is very likely to result in the development and retention of jobs for the community.
3 points - The project has the potential to result in the development and retention of jobs for the community.
1 point - The project does not directly result in the development of jobs for the community.

3. Cooperative Efforts:

(a) 5 points - The project results in the development of a regional cooperative partnership.
3 points - The project results in the development of a public/public cooperative partnership.
0 points - The project does not result in the development or support of a regional cooperative partnership.

(b) 5 points - The project results in the development of a public/private cooperative partnership.
3 points - The project results in the development of a public/public cooperative partnership.
0 points - The project does not result in the development of a cooperative partnership with the public.

4. Transferability:

5 points - Information from the project will be actively disseminated to others through a plan that conforms with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources guidelines.
3 points - Information from the project will be transferable to others as public information.
1 point - Information from the project will be available through commercialization arrangements.
0 points - The project does not contain or plan to actively disseminate information to others.

Administrative Considerations

1. Technical Capability of Applicant:

10 points - The applicant has strong technical qualifications for implementing the project.
5 points - The applicant has acceptable technical qualifications for implementing the project.
1 point - The applicant has questionable technical qualifications for implementing the project.

2. Managerial Capability of Applicant:

10 points - The applicant has strong managerial qualifications for implementing the project.
5 points - The applicant has acceptable managerial qualifications for implementing the project.
1 point - The applicant has questionable managerial qualifications for implementing the project.

3. Operational Experience of Applicant:

10 points - The applicant or operator demonstrates the experience and training needed to implement the project.
5 points - The proposal includes a means to obtain the training needed to implement the project.
0 points - The applicant or operator does not demonstrate the experience and/or training needed to implement the project.

4. Project Implementation:

10 points - The project is very likely to be implemented in a timely manner, based upon the timeline provided in the application.
5 points - There are concerns about whether the project will be implemented in a timely manner, based upon the timeline provided in the application or past experience with this applicant.
1 point - The project is unlikely to be implemented in a timely manner.

Technical Considerations:

1. Technology:

5 points - The technology to be used in the project is a proven technology (previously operated on a commercial scale).
3 points - The project consists of combining technologies proven individually but not simultaneously.
0 points - The project utilizes unproven technology(s).

2. Compliance with Federal, State and Local Requirements:

10 points - Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been obtained and/or demonstrates that permits are not needed.
5 points - Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been applied for.
2 points - Proposal indicates awareness of necessary permits but applications have not been submitted.
0 points - Applicant submitted no evidence of obtaining needed permits or documentation that permits are not needed.

3. Supply of Recovered Material(s):

5 points - Applicant provides documentation that sufficient supply of recovered material(s) has been secured for the project or that recovered material(s) are not needed.
3 points - Applicant has identified an adequate supply of recovered material(s) for the project.
1 point - Adequate supply of recovered material(s) for the proposal are questionable.

4. Landfill Diversion:

10 points - The project directly results in a sustainable long-term reduction in the amount of waste being generated for disposal in Missouri.
5 points - The project results in a sustainable intermediate-term reduction in the amount of waste being generated for disposal in Missouri.
1 point - The project results in a one-time reduction in the amount of waste being generated for disposal in Missouri.

5. Targeted Materials List:

7 points - The project reduces or recycles material(s) listed 1 through 3 on the District's Targeted materials List.
5 points - The project reduces or recycles material(s) listed 4 through 6 on the District's Targeted materials List.
3 points - The project reduces or recycles material(s) not specifically itemized on the District's Targeted Materials List.

Economic Feasibility

1. Private, Not-for-Profits and Public Entities Committed Financing:

10 points - All financing for the project is committed and documented.
6 points - Sufficient financing for the project is likely, but not yet committed
1 point - The likelihood of the project obtaining sufficient financing is questionable.

2. Applicant's Contribution:

10 points - Project financing includes over 50% cash contribution of the total project costs.
5 points - Project financing includes over 25% cash contribution of the total project costs.
3 points - Project financing includes below 25% cash contribution of the total project costs.

3. Project Site Identification:

5 points - The applicant currently owns or leases site for the proposed project.
3 points - The applicant has identified a site for the project but cannot demonstrate commitment for obtaining it for the specified use.
0 points - The applicant does not identify a site.

Financial Consideration

1. Budget:

5 points - The project budget is well thought out and reasonable.
3 points - The project budget contains some questionable items.
1 point - The project budget is incomplete, confusing or problematic.

TOTAL POINTS

Name of Reviewer: Albert Fults

Signed:_____

Date:_____

District Diversion Summary
FY 2009-10
Annual Rollup

1st Quarter

Project #	Cardboard	Newspaper	Magazines	Office Paper	Mixed Paper	Clear Glass	Brown Glass	Other Glass	Aluminimum	Single Stream	Food Cans	PET #1	HDPE		Other Plastic	White Goods	Waste Oil *	Electronics
R2009-1	264.72	24.76	20.27	31.61		9.94	42.52		0.55		14.50	17.83	10.90		1.00		2,000.00	
R2009-2	E-waste event scheduled for October.																	
R2009-3	110.60	50.50		92.00								32.00						
R2009-4	23.10									21.00								
R2009-5	1.00	0.80			1.00				0.01		0.80	0.15						
R2009-6	75.22	146.10			12.70			61.77	2.27		11.93				39.59	247.21		
R2009-7	1,115.00				124.00				3.69									
R2009-8	Bid process has been initiated.																	
R2009-9	Event rescheduled for Spring, 2010.																	
R2009-10	45.23		21.00			8.97	13.84		0.64									
TOTALS	1,634.87	222.16	41.27	123.61	137.70	18.91	56.36	61.77	7.16	21.00	27.23	49.98	10.90		40.59	247.21	2,000.00	0.00

2nd Quarter

Project #	Cardboard	Newspaper	Magazines	Office Paper	Mixed Paper	Clear Glass	Brown Glass	Other Glass	Aluminimum	Single Stream	Food Cans	PET #1	HDPE	Styrofoam	Other Plastic	White Goods	Waste Oil *	Electronics
R2009-1	174.18	27.04	25.49	28.23		4.00	18.54		0.53		18.00	8.10	5.85		1.50		1,700.00	
R2009-2																		56.00
R2009-3	98.20	47.30		86.80								25.00						
R2009-4	25.20									31.20								
R2009-5	2.00				0.70				0.04		1.30	0.16	0.16					
R2009-6																	482.00	
R2009-7	282.29			96.79														
R2009-8	13.90	10.40	5.50		3.60							1.10	0.70	0.30	1.30			
R2009-9																		
R2009-10	71.04	21.00		22.30	21.00	9.00							14.35					
TOTALS	666.81	105.74	30.99	234.12	25.30	13.00	18.54	0.00	0.57	31.20	19.30	34.36	21.06	0.30	2.80	0.00	2,182.00	56.00

3rd Quarter

Project #	Cardboard	Newspaper	Magazines	Office Paper	Mixed Paper	Clear Glass	Brown Glass	Other Glass	Aluminimum	Single Stream	Food Cans	PET #1	HDPE	Styrofoam	Other Plastic	White Goods	Waste Oil *	Electronics
R2009-1	Project closed																	
R2009-2	Project closed																	
R2009-3	**																	
R2009-4	Project closed																	
R2009-5	0.50				0.70				0.04		2.00	0.16	0.16					
R2009-6	Project closed																	
R2009-7	761.84			84.63														
R2009-8	Project closed																	
R2009-9	***																	
R2009-10																		
TOTALS	762.34	0.00	0.00	84.63	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	2.00	0.16	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

4th Quarter

Project #	Cardboard	Newspaper	Magazines	Office Paper	Mixed Paper	Clear Glass	Brown Glass	Other Glass	Aluminimum	Single Stream	Food Cans	PET #1	HDPE	Styrofoam	Other Plastic	White Goods	Waste Oil *	Electronics
R2009-1	Project closed																	
R2009-2	Project closed																	
R2009-3	**	Project closed																
R2009-4	Project closed																	
R2009-5											0.90							0.50
R2009-6	Project closed																	
R2009-7	1,244.86			94.77														
R2009-8	Project closed																	
R2009-9	***																	
R2009-10	64.32				43.57	10.35	8.43		0.59						16.32			
TOTALS	1,309.18	0.00	0.00	94.77	43.57	10.35	8.43	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.32	0.00	0.00	0.50

Annual Wrap Up

Project #	Cardboard	Newspaper	Magazines	Office Paper	Mixed Paper	Clear Glass	Brown Glass	Other Glass	Aluminimum	Single Stream	Food Cans	PET #1	HDPE	Styrofoam	Other Plastic	White Goods	Waste Oil *	Electronics
R2009-1	438.90	51.80	45.76	59.84		13.94	61.06		1.08		32.50	25.93	16.75		2.50		3,700.00	
R2009-2																		56.00
R2009-3	208.80	97.80		178.80								57.00						
R2009-4	48.30									52.20								
R2009-5	3.50	0.80			2.40				0.09		5.00	0.47	0.32					0.50
R2009-6	75.22	146.10			12.70			61.77	2.27		11.93				39.59	247.21	482.00	
R2009-7	3,403.99			276.19	124.00				3.69									
R2009-8	13.90	10.40	5.50		3.60							1.10	0.70	0.30	1.30			
R2009-9																		
R2009-10	180.59	21.00	21.00	22.30	64.57	28.32	22.27		1.23				14.35		16.32			
TOTALS	4,373.20	327.90	72.26	537.13	207.27	42.26	83.33	61.77	8.36	52.20	49.43	84.50	32.12	0.30	59.71	247.21	4,182.00	56.50

* Waste oil measured in gallons rather than tons.

** City of Frederiektown returned funds due to budget constraints.

*** E^3Quilibrium returned funds.