



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

1. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management District - Region A	2. FISCAL YEAR PERIOD: 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 Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management District's primary goal is to reduce the amount of waste entering the local waste stream. The District continues to strive for 40% waste diversion; however, due to lacking infrastructure in northwest Missouri the achievement of this goal is difficult. The District believes continuous education of the public is of utmost priority to create an increased demand for waste reduction services.

During the past fiscal year the District utilized Plan Implementation funds to hold a public outreach event for northwest Missouri elementary students. The idea that kids are our future was the driving force for targeting children. It was also the goal that students are a powerful force to teach their parents and other adults in their lives about waste reduction, reuse and recycling. The event was conducted on the campus of Northwest Missouri State University. The District was able to create a partnership with the university to provide an opportunity for students to learn about local sustainability efforts of the university through guided tours. After the tours the students participated in an interactive presentation provided by Mr. Renner, a professional performer from Lawrence, Kansas and hear from local high school students about initiatives started by class projects to begin recycling in their schools and communities.

The District also showed the importance of education through awarding Northwest Missouri State University grant monies to teach college students the importance of waste reduction and reuse. The award assisted in purchasing cloth reusable bags that were handed out to the university's population along with educational material.

In attempt to bridge the infrastructure gap in northwest Missouri the District also provided grants to eligible subgrantees to fund the purchase of a pellet mill and monies to hold district-wide banned item collections. The subgrantee who was awarded funds for the pellet mill experienced difficulty during the year, but the banned-item collections were completed with relative ease. The District's monies for the district-wide collection diverted waste tires, household hazardous waste and electronic waste.

RECEIVED BY
OCT 27 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.

For the upcoming fiscal year the District plans to continue its focus on its high-priority goal of education. With limited funding the District wants to take advantage of free to minimal cost avenues to share and discuss current solid waste issues. The District is looking to create and release press releases on a regular basis. The goal is through district-wide press releases a larger population and demographic will be reached. The idea was also presented to talk with various community organizations to share about solid waste issues for northwest Missouri and how the members can be of assistance. Funding through Plan Implementation is going to be utilized to create described press releases.

The District also wants to review its Solid Waste Management Plan for the region and conduct necessary updates due to changes in the local environment. The District wants to continue to stay abreast of current ideology. Plan Implementation funds will assist in the funding of this effort.

Finally, the District also wants to continue to provide opportunities to citizens to recycle material and disposal of waste such as household hazardous waste (HHW) and electronic waste (E-waste). The region does not have a permanent collection site for HHW or E-waste, so special district-wide collections are deemed vital by the District. The board will focus on funding grant awards to subgrantees that have similar ambitions.

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 felt the region needed more education regarding recycling and reducing waste. This has been and continues to be the goal with top priority because the board and committee feel that without education the public will not recognize the need to improve their solid waste actions/habits. The District shifted its focus from adults toward educating student-aged children during the past year. Through plan implementation the District held an educational event with a partnership with Northwest Missouri State University that provided students a fun learning experience about reducing, reusing, and recycling.

2. The District wanted to reduce as much electronic material from the waste stream as possible due to no infrastructure in the region for recycling electronics. The District was also concerned about the amount of televisions entering the landfill due to the digital conversion process a year ago and the potential levels of lead from the cathode ray tubes of televisions. In order for the District to achieve the goal it looked toward its grant applicants and funded a banned item collection that encompassed the collection of electronics.

RECEIVED BY

OCT 27 2010

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 recycling goals during the new fiscal year are similar to last year's. The District still feels the region needs more education regarding solid waste issues. The District has decided to try district-wide press releases in order to reach a large demographic of individuals and use Plan Implementation funds to assist in educating the public. The board though has already approved a couple of grants for the upcoming year that a large portion deals with educating the public of what and how items can be recycled and/or composted.

Other goals are continuing to reduce waste by 40% and that is only possible by helping build the infrastructure in northwest Missouri. The District has approved subgrants that will help start recycling projects in their area by providing needed funds for recycling containers. The approved projects have the support from the community and interested parties to help sustain such efforts.

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's board seeks out potential grants that provide resource recovery. The board was able to fund a project that recovered wood waste from local businesses through funding the purchase of a pellet mill. The waste recovered would be utilized in heating homes and businesses instead of ending up in the landfill or local ditches. The subgrantee's goal was to eventually recover paper once wood recovery process was perfected.

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.

The District is conscious about the potential of all types of wastes being recovered. The board seeks out potential grants that provide this benefit. The District was able to approve a new grant for the upcoming year to collect glass and then recover its potential by using in various landscaping and construction projects on the subgrantees property. The subgrantee, Northwest Missouri State University, has had great success with paper and is excited to add glass to its recovery efforts. The District's goal in providing funding for this project is that it will eventually lead to a regional outlet for glass.

RECEIVED BY

OCT 27 2010

SWMP OPERATIONS

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

Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfills.	Cost of Project.	Number of Tons Diverted.	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted.
A2010-03 Collection A	\$14,955.41	99.75 tons	\$149.93/ton
A2010-04 Collection B	\$4,906.08	1.83 tons	\$2,680.92/ton
A2010-05 Collection C	\$25,285.61 budgeted \$5,573.33 cost at 6/30/10	2.9 tons diverted at 6/30/10	\$1,921.84/ton based on cost at 6/30/10

Measurable outcomes achieved.

The three collections were all banned-item collections. Collection A's funding was used for waste tire collections. Collection B and C were household hazardous waste and electronic waste collections. Due to funds remaining in Collection C the FAA was amended to extend the project until December 31, 2010. There will be another event held and more tonnage to report for the overall tonnage diverted for Collection C.

The costs of projects reported are at actual amounts except for Collection C which includes the budgeted amount as well for the project. The average cost per ton diverted is based off the costs of the projects at June 30, 2010. The materials collected for all three collection projects would have resulted in illegal dumping and increased health and environment risks for the region.

See Attachment 1 for additional projects that resulted in diversion and measurable outcomes achieved.

MO 780-1989 (06-08)

7. SUMMARIZE PROJECTS NOT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION

Projects not resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	Cost of Project
A2010-02 Plan Implementation	\$4,970.52

Measurable outcomes achieved for these projects.

Plan Implementation encompassed tasks that did not have any recordable diversion, but the tasks have indirectly affected diversion rates because these projects were educational in nature. Implementation of a district-wide educational show helped teach elementary age students what they can do to help reduce their waste. There were 10 schools who participated with approximately 400 students participating. The response from teachers and students was very positive.

RECEIVED BY
OCT 27 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

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.
A2010-03 Collection A	\$14,955.41	99.75 tons	\$149.93/ton
A2010-04 Collection B	\$4,906.08	1.83 tons	\$2,680.92/ton
A2010-05 Collection C	\$5,573.33 cost at 6/30/10	2.90 tons	\$1,921.84/ton

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.
A2010-06 Triple B Biomass	\$16,829.00 budgeted \$0.00 cost at 6/30/10	9 tons	\$0/ton
A2010-08 NWMSU	\$8,736.90	.302 ton	\$28,930.13/ton

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

The grant proposal evaluation process is completed by the Executive Board. Board members receive a copy of each application, grant criteria point sheet to know how to allocate points to the applicant, a targeted materials list, a grant evaluation score sheet to record points awarded to applicant, and a spreadsheet showing available funds that may be awarded. Once each board member is done reviewing the applications the results are tallied from the individual board member's score sheet. The applicants who receive the highest scores are approved for the grant. The board may choose to partially fund some projects. The number of projects approved depends on the level of funding available.

See Attachment 2 for grant criteria point sheet.

RECEIVED BY
OCT 27 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

MO 780-1989 (06-08)

BOARD AND COUNCIL MEMBERS			
<input type="checkbox"/> Board Member <input type="checkbox"/> Council Member Name:		Address:	
Representative of: <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> City <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		City:	State: ZIP:
		Phone:	Fax:
Officer: <input type="checkbox"/> Chair <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-Chair <input type="checkbox"/> Secretary <input type="checkbox"/> Treasurer <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		E-mail:	
Official Title:		Comments:	

ATTACHMENT 1

6. SUMMARIZE THE TYPES OF PROJECTS AND RESULTS DURING FISCAL YEAR

Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfill	Cost of Project	Number of Tons Diverted	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted
A2010-06 Triple B Biomass	\$16,829.00 budgeted \$0.00 cost at 6/30/10	9 tons	\$0/ton
<p>Measurable outcomes achieved</p> <p>The funds allocated to the Triple B Biomass project were to help purchase a pellet mill to recover wood waste and make wood pellets to be burned in home and commercial furnaces. The grant was supposed to create new jobs in the region as well. At June 30, 2010 the company had yet to purchase the pellet mill due to the original mill being sold before the grant received final approval. The subgrantee continues to search for a mill within budget. The subgrantee has stock piled wood waste so when a machine is located production can start immediately. The project has been extended until December 31, 2010.</p>			
Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfill	Cost of Project	Number of Tons Diverted	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted
A2010-08 NWMSU	\$8,736.90	.302 ton	\$28,930.13/ton
<p>Measurable outcomes achieved</p> <p>The funds allocated to Northwest Missouri State University were to help purchase reusable cloth grocery bags. There were 13,800 bags distributed among students and faculty of the university. The reusable cloth bags will be able to be used over and over yielding an immeasurable/incalculable diversion of plastic and paper bag waste from the landfills in the future.</p>			

RECEIVED BY
 OCT 27 2010
 SWMP OPERATIONS

ATTACHMENT 2

**Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management District
District Grant Evaluation Review Criteria**

Conformance with Policies, Targets & Other Requirements – 40 points possible

1. **Conforms with State Resource Recovery Priorities and priority is granted to projects which work toward implementing Missouri's Policy on Resource Recovery**
 - 10 points – The project promotes and/or practices waste reduction
 - 5 points – The project promotes and/or practices collection/processing, market development or composting
 - 2 points – The project promotes and/or practices recovery and use of energy from waste materials
 - 0 points – The project does not conform with the state resource recovery priorities

2. **Conforms with State/District targeted materials list**
 - 10 points – The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in Priority List 1
 - 5 points – The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in Priority List 2
 - 3 points – The project reduces or recycles a material not targeted
 - 0 points – The target does not involve any specific material

3. **Promotes waste reduction/recycling and/or results in an environmental benefit related to the District's Solid Waste Management Plan**
 - 10 points – All aspects of the project target the goals of the District's plan
 - 6 points – The project will address waste reduction in ways not specifically mentioned in the District's plan
 - 0 points – The project does not address the plan's goals

4. **Complies with federal, state or local requirements**
 - 10 points – Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been applied for and has provided documentation for verification
 - 4 points – Proposal indicates awareness of permits, but applications have not been submitted
 - 0 points – Applicant submitted no evidence of obtaining needed permits and no documentation that permits are needed

Conformance with Policies, Targets & Other Requirements Subtotal: _____ points

Community Impact – 105 points possible

5. **Contributes to community-based economic development through potential job creation and/or job retention**
 - 25 points – The project employs an employee with a minimum commitment to continue the project two years beyond the grant funding period
 - 10 points – The project employs an employee with a one year commitment to continue the project beyond the grant funding period

RECEIVED BY

OCT 27 2010

SWMP OPERATIONS

0 points – No commitment to continue the project beyond the grant funding period

6. Contributes to community-based economic development through potential market development

30 points – The project produces a product using post-consumer resources located within the District

10 points – The project produces a product using post-consumer resources located outside the District

0 points – The project does not contain post-consumer resources

7. Affects on private business entities in the marketplace

25 points – Project does not negatively affect private entities during and/or beyond the grant funding period

10 points – Project negatively affects private entities during the grant funding period only

0 points – The project negatively affects private entities during and after the grant funding period

8. Demonstrates a compelling argument documenting the need for the proposed service, information or market within the District

10 points – Proposal provides a high level of need for the service, information or market within the District

5 points – Proposal provides an intermediate level of need for the service, information or market within the District

0 points – Proposal does not demonstrate need within the District

9. Quality and accessibility of method the project uses to disseminate information or services

5 points - High quality information/service will be readily available at no fee

2 points – Information/service of medium quality or will be available for a fee

0 points – Information is of low quality or will be kept proprietary

10. Degree of community outreach which promotes the project and/or improves participation in waste reduction, reuse and recycling practices

10 points – Proposal clearly demonstrates community outreach methods identifying audience and number people reached

5 points – Proposal includes community outreach component identifying audience

0 points – Proposal does not include or demonstrate community outreach component

Community Impact Subtotal: _____ points

Cooperative Efforts – 15 points possible

11. Demonstrates cooperative efforts to work with local governments and/or public/private partners as documented by a letter, ordinance, or resolution from the entity

10 points – Proposal includes documentation of support and approval from local governing body and support of other partner organization(s)

5 points – Proposal includes documentation of support and approval of local governing body

RECEIVED BY
OCT 27 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

0 points – No documentation of support from local governing body and/or public/private partner

12. Transferability of results by which project innovations and successes may be applied elsewhere in the district and/or state

5 points – The project can easily be replicated in other areas of the region or state

0 points – The project is site specific and cannot be replicated in other areas

Cooperative Efforts Subtotal: _____ points

Technical & Administrative Considerations – 45 points possible

13. Technical capability of the applicant and staff to implement and operate the project based on previous work experience and demonstrated expertise in the field

5 points – Applicant has extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Applicant has limited experience

0 points – Applicant has no experience

14. Managerial capability of the applicant and staff to effectively administer the project based on previous work experience

5 points – Applicant has extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Applicant has limited experience

0 points – Applicant has no experience

15. Knowledge of appropriate accounting procedures

5 points – Extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Limited experience

0 points – no experience

16. Ability to implement project in a timely manner

10 points – The project likely to be implemented based on the timeline

5 points - Implementing the project in a timely manner is a concern

0 points – The project is not likely to be implemented in a timely manner

17. Feasibility to implement project as stated in application

10 points – The project is capable of achieving its goals such as proposed tonnage diversion or any other measurable goals

5 points – Achieving the project's goals is a concern

0 points – The project is not technically feasible

18. Availability of feedstock

5 points – Sufficient supply of material within the District

3 points – Sufficient supply of material outside the District

0 points – Adequate supply of material questionable

19. Effectiveness of marketing strategy

5 points – Marketing strategy expected to generate sufficient participation to meet established goals

RECEIVED BY
OCT. 27 2010
SWMP OPERATIONS

0 points - Marketing strategy not expected to generate enough participation to meet established goals

Technical & Administrative Considerations Subtotal: _____ points

Finances – 30 points possible

20. Level of commitment for financing

10 points – All financing for the project is committed and documented except for grant requests as indicated by letters, contracts and other verifiable documents

3 points – Sufficient financing is likely, but not yet committed

0 points – Proposed financing is questionable

21. Type of contribution by applicant

10 points – Applicant contributes both cash and in-kind match to project

7 points – Applicant contributes cash match to project

5 points – Applicant contributes in-kind match to project

0 points – Applicant does not contribute match to project

22. Match ratio or level of contribution by applicant display high level of commitment

10 points – Match greater than 30%

7 points – Match 25% - 30%

5 points – Match 20% - 24%

0 points – Match less than 20%

Finances Subtotal: _____ points

Other Possible Points – 45 points possible

23. Detail in which the proposal was created

25 points – detailed, complete with no additional data required to complete review of application

10 points – Substantially complete but additional data required to complete review of application

0 points – Not complete or insufficient data for consideration

24. Budget quality

20 points – Well organized, thorough budget that includes explanatory notes on all expenditures and items over \$3,000 documented with quote or catalog price

10 points – Budget is complete, but unorganized and missing information and/or budget notes

0 points – No budget included in the application

Other Subtotal: _____ points

Total: _____ points

RECEIVED BY

OCT 27 2010

SWMP OPERATIONS