



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT**

1. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT Region D Recycling & Waste Management District	2. FISCAL YEAR PERIOD: FROM JULY 1, 2,010. TO JUNE 30, 2,011.0
--	---

**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?

Goals are in place to assist residents with the proper disposal or recycling of hard to dispose and/or banned waste. The one-day Region D sponsored collection events, whereas provides a limited opportunity, it is the only local opportunity available for proper disposal and/or recycling for banned or often dangerous materials.

Education has always been a major part of Region D's plan. An education project provided the funding for an educator to promote recycling, waste reduction and activities within Region D. An educator was selected from potential applicants through an interview and presentation to the Executive Board. 45 programs were held, 40 programs were budgeted, educator provided 5 programs free of charge.

A mass mailing of 19,518 pcs are directed mailed to District residents. The informational brochure lists Region D's collection events scheduled for the upcoming year, along with opportunities for appliances and miscellaneous metals at local scrap metal yards, and electronics opportunities at Best Buys Stores, Second Hand Wireless and Goodwill Industries. Also listed are area recycling programs and how to prepare instructions for everyday recycling of glass, plastics, aluminum & tin cans, cardboard, paper products, and plastic bags.

Electronic collections were held in July and August 2010 at 8 locations throughout Region D. A fee of \$10 per tv and per monitor was collected. The event collected a disappointing 6.84 tons. The 2009 collection, which was offered free of charge netted 41.98 tons. 2011 electronic recycling opportunities were promoted at Best Buys Stores and Goodwill Industries locations.

(continued on attachment 3(a))

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.

Goals continue to provide collection events for recycling and proper disposal of hard to dispose and/or banned items. The feedback on the Education project was very positive and will be continued for 2012 fiscal year.

Collections for scrap tires are scheduled through DNR's Tire Dump Round-Up Program for April 6, 2012 in Andrew County and October 20, 2012 in the City of Cameron.

Collections for Electronics will be held throughout the District. Many residents expressed the need for local opportunities for electronic recycling as Best Buy and Goodwill Industries are not easily accessible to many residents. There will be a \$5 charge for tvs and monitors.

(continued on Attachment 3(b).)

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 requests that all collected materials during our special event collections be recycled when possible. The District continues to promote city and county recycling programs through news releases, and our 19,518 pc mailer.
2. Andrew County received funds for a heavier recycling trailer needed for the increase in recycling, Clinco was funded fans for the recycling/sorting area to allow work to continue through hot days. (continued on attachment 4(a) 2).

RECEIVED BY  
OCT 17 2011  
SWMP OPERATIONS

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 request that all collected materials during our special event collections be recycled when possible. The District will promote city and county recycling programs through news releases, and our massive (19,518) pc mailer.

For the upcoming fiscal year, Andrew County will be adding concrete to their drop-off center for the parking of the rotating recycling trailer, the City of Stewartville has been allotted funds for the purchase of a forklift to provide efficiency in the loading of the recycling bins at the drop-off recycling center. (continued on Attachment 4(b)).

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?

Event recycling containers are made available through news releases sent to local papers. Organizers were encouraged to call for availability of containers. Containers were used during 4th of July celebrations, 4-H camps and fairs, art festivals and county fairs. Containers are checked out and loaned for the events. Organizers are responsible for getting materials to a recycling center or processor. Event containers are also used during special waste collections, collecting cans and bottles from laborers and volunteers refreshments.

Buchanan County Courthouse now has paper recycling opportunities through Abitibi. The District assisted with collection containers from MORA'S Alcoa Bin Project.

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.

Event recycling containers will be made available on a loan or check out procedure. News releases will be provided to local papers and organizers will be encouraged to call. Containers collect plastic and aluminum, which are often a large trash source during outside events. Event containers will continue to be used during special waste collection events for collecting cans and bottles from volunteers and laborers refreshments.

No specific grants were sought. All proposals are welcome and scored using the same criteria.

**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
Stewartville Recycling Trailer	2,613.84	30.49	85.73
Clinco Tipper & Conveyor	13,448.00	697.06	19.35
Andrew County Recycling Trailer	3,262.00	146.45	22.27

**Measurable outcomes achieved**

ShredFest	\$2,025.00	9.04 tons	\$224.00
-----------	------------	-----------	----------

RECEIVED BY  
 OCT 17 2011  
 SWMP OPERATIONS

**7. SUMMARIZE PROJECTS NOT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION**

Projects not resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills	Cost of Project
Education Project	10,485.00
District Operations	73,462.00
Clinco Fans & Bins	6,800.00

Measurable outcomes achieved for these projects.  
 Note the bins were used for sorting and collecting of recyclables on the Clinco Fans & Bins Project.

**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
District-Wide Collections	20,584.04 <i>corrected</i>	14.16	1,453.68 <i>corrected</i>
See Attachment 8	952.22	20,703 <i>ties</i>	

**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

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

Grants are solicited through public notices published in 6 area newspapers. News releases are also submitted to 6 area newspapers. Region D Board Members also receive a grant packet.

Grants are solicited for not less than 30 days (usually mid to late March with an early May due date). The grant review committee (4 members) review, evaluate and score the applications using criteria as outlined by DNR. Each grant packet contains the evaluation criteria to assist applicants with the application process. The grant review committee makes recommendation of funding to the complete Region D Council. After Region D Council approval the applications and required documentation is prepared and sent to DNR for approval.

**BOARD AND COUNCIL MEMBERS** **RECEIVED BY**

NOV 30 2011  
 SWMP OPERATIONS

### **Attachment 3(a)**

September 2010 and May 2011 Region D promoted DNR's Tire Dump Round Up Program. The City of Savannah hosted the event in September 2010 collecting 9,328 tires. The event hosted by DeKalb County in May 2011 collected 11,375 tires. Promoting DNR's Tire Dump Round Up Program has proved to be very successful in getting those scrap tires recycled. Previous tire recycling events sponsored by Region D only allowed participants a limited number of tires for recycling and charged a fee of \$1 per tire over the allowed 25 free and charged \$3 per tire for large truck and tractor tires. Many participants were past participants bringing the maximum tires for free recycling. With DNR's no limit program many residents was able to clean up those existing tire dumps.

April 30, 2011 Region D promoted the National Prescription Drug Take Back Day. Working with local law enforcement agencies and DEA (Drug Enforcement Agency), seven locations were set up to provide residents the opportunity for proper disposal of unwanted, unused pharmaceutical products. 371 lbs of drugs were collected by local law enforcement agencies. DEA provided proper disposal for the collected drugs.

May 2011 a HHW collection was held in the Village of Agency. This was a first time event at this location. It was a cold day with light rain. Participation was low with 62 residents recycling and/or proper disposing of household hazardous waste and/or agricultural chemicals. Recycling 7.32 tons of hhw. Countless times Region D has assisted residents' family members with the cleaning out of a loved one's home or barn when they move or pass. New home owners are often left paint from previous tenants which are thought to be a good deed, but often become unwanted paint, varnishes or stains needing proper disposal. With low participation another event was scheduled for the fall of 2011.

June 2011 a pilot project of offering community document shredding was held in nine locations throughout Region D. The event was sparsely attended at some locations and better at others. A total of 32 participants took advantage of the free event. 9.04 tons of paper was recycled. This was under the hopeful goal of 20 tons. Many participants would like to see the event again in the future, as many had remaining documents to shred, but unsure of the process brought limited quantities. Several expressed the satisfaction of seeing their materials shredded on site.

### **Attachment 3(b)**

HHW collections again will be held throughout the District. Collection quantities seem to be less as the truck loads of rusted out cans of materials were less in 2012 than in previous collections. Surveys indicate the majority of people participating would pay

RECEIVED BY

OCT 17 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

for the service if available more often. The collections to be held in 2012 will require a \$5 participation fee per car.

The educator position is out for bid. The previous educator has submitted a bid for the position. The previous educator received an award from the Missouri Recycling Association for the Outstanding Individual Achievement in Recycling. Bids were solicited to local retired teacher associations.

#### **Attachment 4(a) 2**

Clinco was also funded additional recycling bins. The bins allow the switch out with city/county programs when full bins are delivered. Clinco received a tipper/sorting line, this allows for a proficient way to sort and separate recycling. Source recycling allows Clinco to receive top dollar for their baled material.

City of Stewartville received funding for a larger trailer needed to deliver bins to Clinco from the new drop-off recycling center.

#### **Attachment 4(b)**

Recycling Taxi a business expansion will be funded front load containers, personalized for cardboard recycling only. This will allow new customers to be serviced. They currently own 2 balers and bale their materials and work with a broker in the Kansas City area. They may expand into other commodities at customers request.

Clinco Sheltered Industries serves as the MRF for the materials collected throughout Region D. Clinco provides recycling bins for all the cities and counties programs and they often need replaced. New bins allow Clinco to expedite their unloading of full tubs and replacement of empty tubs. This permits the city/county employee minimal unloading time.

No specific grant proposals are solicited. The same evaluation criteria developed under DNR guidelines is used for every application received

#### **Attachment 8**

Tire Dump Round Up (Savannah & DeKalb Co.)	\$952.22	Savannah 9,328 tires (not tons) DeKalb County 11,375 tires (not tons)
---	----------	--

RECEIVED BY

OCT 17 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

## Region D Recycling & Waste Management District 2011 Council

Larry Atkins & Greg Wall  
Andrew County Commission  
P O Box 206  
Savannah, MO 64485  
816-324-5716 816-324-6154  
In session Monday & Thursday  
andrewcounty@hotmail.com

Carroll Fisher  
City Hall  
P O Box 408  
Gower, MO 64454  
City Barn 816-424-3583  
City Hall 816-424-6617 fax 816-424-3366

Larry King  
Clinton County Commission  
207 N Main – Room103  
Plattsburg, MO 64477  
816-539-2536 fax 816-539-3072  
In session Tuesday & Thursday

Harold Spangler  
Lathrop Representative  
504 Park  
Lathrop, MO 64465

Clinton County Rep - Vacant

Dennis Hudson  
City Hall  
114 Maple  
Plattsburg, MO 64477  
City Hall 816-539-2148 fax 816-930-3260  
dhudson@plattsburg-mo.gov

Harold Allison & Wayne Colhour  
DeKalb County Commission  
P O Box 248  
Maysville, MO 64469  
816-449-5402 fax 816-449-2440  
In session Monday

Vernon Townsend  
1204 W Market  
Savannah, MO 64485

Frank Buck  
Cameron City Council  
203 W 13th  
Cameron, MO 64429

Gaylon Whitmer  
709 W 6<sup>th</sup> Street - home  
Stewartsville, MO 64490  
City Hall 816-669-3278 fax 816-669-3646

Drew Bontrager  
Cameron Public Works  
205 N Main  
Cameron, MO 64429  
816-632-2177 fax 816-632-1067  
publicworks@cameron-mo.com

Julia Elder  
Village of Country Club  
P O Box 8572  
St. Joseph, MO 64508  
816-232-4621 fax 816-233-5488  
villageclerk@villageofcountryclubmo.org

Mary Lou Holley  
City Hall  
P O Box 470  
Maysville, MO 64469  
816-449-2185 fax 816-449-5755  
mavsvillicity64469@yahoo.com

Dan Hausman & Ron Hook  
Buchanan County Commission  
411 Jules – Room 122  
St Joseph, MO 64501  
816-271-1503

RECEIVED BY  
OCT 17 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

# Region D Recycling & Waste Management District 2011 Executive Board

Chair –

Greg Wall  
Andrew County Commission  
P O Box 206  
Savannah, MO 64485

Vice-Chair -

Ron Hook  
Buchanan County Commission  
411 Jules – room 122  
St Joseph, MO 64501

Treasurer -

Larry King  
Clinton County Commission  
207 N Main – Room 103  
Plattsburg, MO 64477

Andrew County Representative –

Larry Atkins  
Andrew County Commission  
P O Box 206  
Savannah, MO 64485

Buchanan County Representative –

Dan Hausman  
Buchanan County Commission  
411 Jules – Room 122  
St Joseph, MO 64501

Clinton County Representative –

Vacant

DeKalb County Representative –

Gaylon Whitmer  
709 W 6<sup>th</sup> St  
Stewartsville, MO 64490

Member At Large –

Drew Bontrager  
Public Works  
205 N Main  
Cameron, MO 64429

Non-voting Member –

Brenda Kennedy  
Region D Recycling & Waste  
Management District  
PO Box 139  
Clarksdale, MO 64430

RECEIVED BY

OCT 17 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

DO NOT RETURN WITH APPLICATION

Region D Recycling & Waste Management District  
District Grant Evaluation Review Form 2012

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant Address: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Ziip code \_\_\_\_\_

Amount Requested: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Total Project Cost: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Project Category (Circle One) Waste Reduction Recycling Composting  
Market Development Education

**1. Conforms with State Resource Recovery Priorities:** priority is granted to projects which work towards waste reduction and implementing Missouri's Policy on Resource Recovery (enclosed).

- 10 points - The project is for waste reduction or reuse.
- 5 points - The project is for collection / processing, market development or composting.
- 2 points - The project is for energy recovery.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**2. Conforms to Targeted Materials as approved by the District Board.**

- 10 points - The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in list A.
- 5 points - The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in list B.
- 3 points - The project reduces or recycles a material not targeted.
- 0 points - The project does not involve any specific material.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**3. Economic Development:**

- 25 points – Project employs an employee with a minimum commitment to continue the project for two years beyond the grant funding.
- 10 points – Project employees an employee with a one-year commitment to continue the project beyond the grant fund.
- 0 points – No commitment to continue the project beyond the grand funding.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**4. Local private or public competition for similar service:** project tasks or equipment purchases in direct competition with existing business.

- 10 points – Proposal does not have direct competition with any District business.
- 5 points – Proposal is in minimal competition with a District business.
- 0 points – Proposal is in direct competition with a District business.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 1      55 Points Possible**

RECEIVED BY

NOV 30 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

**5. Degree of waste reduction or recycling or results in an environmental benefit:** criterion evaluates reduction or recycling or environmental benefit impact for short or long term.

10 points – Proposal results in the reduction or recycling of more than one waste stream component .

5 points – Proposal results in the reduction or recycling of a single waste stream component

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**6. Cooperative Efforts:** works cooperatively with local governments in the District as documented by letters, ordinance or resolution from the local governing body in which the project is located.

10 points – Documentation of support and approval of the local governing body.

0 points – No documentation of support from local governing body.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**7. Compliance with Federal, State and Local Requirements:** Not all projects will need federal, state and local permits, approval, licenses and waivers. However, a discussion of why permits are needed must be include to receive full points for this criterion. If federal, state and local permits, approvals, license and waivers are necessary, a discussion of how this will be accomplished or copies of applications or actual permit documents should be included in the application.

10 points – Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been applied for (copies of applications attached) and/or demonstrates that permits are not needed.

5 points – Proposal indicates awareness of necessary permits but applications have not been submitted.

0 points – Applicant submitted no evidence of obtaining needed permits and no documentation that permits are not needed.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**8. Compliance with Local Zoning Laws:** A discussion of compliance with local zoning laws.

10 points – Proposal demonstrates that project is in compliance with local zoning laws. Provides documentation to compliance.

5 points – Proposal indicates awareness of local zoning laws, with no documentation.

0 points - Applicant submitted no evidence of local zoning laws compliance.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**9. Transferability of Results:** criterion will determine whether the project has set forth in the application, if proven successful, lends itself to being easily duplicated by others.

5 points – Information from this project will be actively disseminated to others through a plan.

3 points – Information from this project demonstrates the possibility of transferring project results to others.

0 points – Proposal does not demonstrate transferability.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 2**

**45 Points Possible**

**10. Need for the information:** criterion will be evaluated by the evidence documenting the need for the proposed project.

- 10 points – Proposal provides documentation for need for proposed project
- 5 points – Proposal reports need for proposed project with no documentation
- 0 points – Proposal does not demonstrate need.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**11. Technical Capability of Applicant:** the ability of the applicant to implement and operate the project based on previous work experience and demonstrated expertise in the field. Resumes from those individuals with operational responsibilities for the project.

- 7 points – Extensive experience (5 years or more)
- 5 points – Limited experience
- 0 points – No experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**12. Managerial Experience of Applicant:** resumes of project manager

- 7 points – Extensive experience (5 years or more)
- 5 points – Limited experiences
- 0 points – No experience

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**13. Project Implementation:** feasibility of completing the project in realistic time frame.

- 10 points – Project likely to be completed in a timely manner based on the time line and other data.
- 5 points - Implementing project in a timely manner is a concern.
- 0 points - Project is not likely to be implemented in a timely manner.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**14. Technical Feasibility:** Is the technology or data available to implement this project?

- 10 points – Project will provide new and useful technology for waste reduction or resource recovery efforts
- 5 points – Project may provide new and useful technology for waste reduction or resource recovery efforts
- 0 points - Project will provide relatively little new or useful technology for waste reduction or resource

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**15. Availability of Feedstock:** measure the strength of commitment of feedstock materials needed to complete the project as documented by letters of commitment, contracts or other verifiable documentation.

- 5 points – Proposal identifies a sufficient supply of feedstock within the District or that recovered materials are not needed.
- 3 points – Proposal identifies a sufficient supply of feedstock outside the District
- 0 points – Adequate supply of feedstock is questionable.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**16. Committed Financing:** strength of commitments for financial resources as indicated by letter, contract or other verifiable documents.

- 10 points – All financing for the project is committed and documented.
- 3 points - Sufficient financing is likely, but not yet committed
- 0 points - Proposed financing is questionable.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

RECEIVED BY

NOV 30 2011

SWMP OPERATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 3**

**59 Points Possible**

**17. Type of Contribution: Cash Match**  
20 points –above 25% cash match  
10 points – up to 25% cash match  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**18. Marketing Strategy:** A marketing strategy defines how materials collected or manufactured will be distributed from the collection point or producer to the consumer or end-market. A marketing strategy should include information on how materials are to be sold, advertised, packaged and distributed.  
20 points – The project has a strong marketing strategy, utilizing Clinco Sheltered Industries.  
3 points – The project has an acceptable marketing strategy, utilizing other resource than Clinco.  
0 point - The marketing strategy for the project is questionable.  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**19. Quality of Budget:** Budget must delineate percentage of requested funds and match. Budget must provide itemized expenses in the form of budget notes. Expenses over \$2,999.99 require documentation  
15 points – Budget is complete  
5 points – Expenses are not itemized and budget note for expenses over \$2,999.99 not included.  
0 points – Requested funds not directly related to scope of work and will they be spent most efficiently?  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**20. Financial Ratios:** Selected values on entity's financial statement. Required for requests of \$50,000 or more.  
10 points – Financial statements or credit histories are included  
0 points - No financial statement or credit history included  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**21. Completeness of Application:** pre-application checklist, application form, budget form, executive summary, bid record/procurement form and required attachments are:  
25 points – Complete with no additional data required to complete review of application  
5 points - Substantially complete but additional data is required to complete review.  
0 points - Not complete or insufficient data for consideration  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

**22. Project Site Identification:** where project will be located as documented by letters, lease or other verifiable documentation.  
10 points – Location within the District  
5 points - Location within adjoining District in a cooperative effort  
0 points - Location not identified  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Points**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 4**      **100 Points Possible**

**23. Past Performance Rating:**

- 0 points - Applicant has demonstrated satisfactory performance in the administration of previous grants.
- 25 points - Applicant has demonstrated less than satisfactory performance in the administration of previous grants.
- 50 points - Applicant has failed to meet the minimum performance requirements of a previous project funded by the District, or MDNR due to non-criminal mismanagement.
- 125 points - Applicant has been convicted of defrauding the District or MDNR, or has failed to honor a previous contractual agreement with the District or MDNR.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 5**      **-0 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 1**      **55 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 2**      **45 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 3**      **59 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 4**      **100 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points – Page 5**      **0 Points Possible**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Points**      **259 Points Possible**

**Applications must score 125 to be eligible for funding.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Reviewer**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

**RECEIVED BY**

**NOV 30 2011**

**SWMP OPERATIONS**